

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ELIMINATING ) RESOLUTION NO. 92-1619  
BYPASS OPTION B FROM FURTHER )  
WESTERN BYPASS STUDY ) Introduced by  
Councilor Richard Devlin

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District is a signatory to the Western Bypass Study Planning Coordination Agreement to seek solutions to north-south and circumferential travel congestion in Southeast Washington County; and

WHEREAS, The Coordination Agreement, as amended by Resolution No. 92-1550, commits JPACT and Metro to consider ODOT recommendations for the elimination of any strategies from further detailed consideration prior to the refinement of detailed alternatives; and

WHEREAS, Bypass Option B would establish a new, limited access roadway to the far west of and mostly outside the Urban Growth Boundary generally in the Highway 219 corridor; and

WHEREAS, ODOT's analysis of projected travel shows that the roadway in Bypass Option B would be underutilized and that Bypass Option A was a better proposal as a bypass strategy; and

WHEREAS, The ODOT Study committees have recommended elimination of Bypass Option B, the westernmost corridor along Highway 219, from further study as not a reasonable option to meet ODOT's Purpose and Need Statement, which states the transportation problem to be solved; and

WHEREAS, No amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan is required because Bypass Option A remains as an alternative for

further study and Bypass Option B is not identified in the Regional Transportation Plan as an alternative to consider; now, therefore,


BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That Bypass Option B, the westernmost bypass corridor along Highway 219, is hereby eliminated from further consideration as an alternative for Draft Environmental Impact Statement evaluation in the Western Bypass Study because this bypass strategy is not a reasonable strategy to meet the Western Bypass Study Purpose and Need Statement.

2. That the reasons for the eliminated strategy failing to meet the Purpose and Need Statement are explained in the staff reports, the matrix summary of projected utilization, and the data ODOT has presented in the record.

3. That remaining alternatives and strategies considered for DEIS inclusion address the Transportation Planning Rule, the federal Clean Air Act of 1990, relevant Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO), and funding programs and policies.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 10th day of September, 1992.

  
Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 92-1619 FOR THE PURPOSE OF  
ELIMINATING BYPASS OPTION B FROM FURTHER WESTERN BYPASS STUDY

-----  
Date: September 3, 1992

Presented by: Councilor McLain

Committee Recommendation: At the August 25 meeting, the Transportation and Planning Committee voted unanimously to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 92-1619. Voting in favor: Councilors Devlin, McLain, Buchanan, and Washington. Absent: Councilor Bauer.

Committee Issues/Discussion: Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, presented the staff report. He said that the Western Bypass Study has evolved to the point of eliminating strategies from further study. This allows for a narrowing of the field to those strategies that should proceed to evaluation in the Environmental Impact Statement, and, finally, the selection of a preferred alternative. This resolution is one of two, each recommending elimination of an individual strategy from further consideration.

Councilor Devlin explained that Option B, is the most western of the two options, running west of Highway 219 outside the Urban Growth Boundary. It is the less controversial of the two resolutions, and has no apparent opposition.

Michal Wert, Oregon Department of Transportation, suggested that the committee, in recommending approval of the resolution, base their recommendation on the information contained in two documents she presented as supporting documentation. This was generally agreed upon.

There was no public comment at the meeting either in support or opposition to the resolution and the resolution was approved without further discussion.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 92-1619 FOR THE PURPOSE OF  
ELIMINATING BYPASS OPTION B FROM FURTHER WESTERN BYPASS STUDY

Date: July 14, 1992

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

Resolution No. 92-1619 adopts a regional position to delete "Bypass Option B" as one of the alternatives being carried forward for consideration in the Environmental Impact Statement.

TPAC reviewed this proposal at its July 13 meeting and recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1619.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

This alternative is the western of two bypass proposals (the other is Bypass Option A to the east of this location). It runs essentially along, or west of, Highway 219 outside the Urban Growth Boundary.

This option is overshadowed by Bypass Option A in that it does not perform as well in meeting the objectives of the study. It is shown in ODOT's analysis to be not significantly better than the No-Build strategy, would be little utilized if built, and would not significantly lessen congestion. A full description of the ODOT study process is included as Attachment A.

RECOMMENDATION

Delete Bypass Option B from further consideration.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1619.

ATTACHMENT A

WESTERN BYPASS STUDY: ELIMINATION OF STRATEGIES  
FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

A. Introduction

As amended earlier this year, the Western Bypass Study Planning Coordination Agreement adopted by Metro, ODOT, and affected Washington County jurisdictions provides for ODOT to recommend, and JPACT and Metro to consider, the elimination of strategies from further detailed study as alternatives. The intergovernmental agreement provides in pertinent part:

"Based on the strategies recommended for elimination by ODOT's staff, JPACT and Metro shall consider recommending or requiring elimination of strategies considered unreasonable to meet the purposes and needs identified in the [Purpose and Need] Statement. As part of this process, JPACT and Metro shall consider any appropriate amendments to the RTP to eliminate strategies from further study. The adoption of any RTP amendments eliminating strategies from further study shall be accompanied by findings demonstrating compliance with applicable statewide planning goals and regional goals and objectives, if necessary. For each strategy eliminated, Metro shall demonstrate the reasons why the eliminated strategy cannot meet the identified statewide and regional transportation system needs."

Following review and action by its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and Steering Committee, ODOT is now before you to request elimination of two strategies from further detailed consideration as alternatives: Bypass Option B, which considered a new limited access facility essentially along or west of Highway 219 outside the Urban Growth Boundary, and a transit-intensive strategy which considered the ability to meet the identified purposes and needs through an approach relying primarily on transit.

Elimination of these strategies would not require an RTP amendment. Eliminating Bypass Option B does not require an RTP amendment because ODOT intends to carry forward Bypass Option A for further study as an alternative. Bypass Option A is located in an area similar to that identified in the RTP. ODOT's committees found that Bypass Option A would be more effective at meeting the identified purpose and need.

Bypass Option B is located well to the west of Bypass Option A, along and west of Highway 219 and is outside the corridor identified in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Regarding elimination of a transit-intensive strategy, ODOT considered whether a strategy relying primarily on transit, rather than a combination of transit and roadway improvements, could meet the purposes and needs identified for the Study. To develop the transit-intensive strategy, ODOT considered high-capacity transit corridors in the form of light rail transit along Highway 217 and Barbur Boulevard in addition to the Westside LRT to Hillsboro. ODOT supported these high-capacity transit corridors with park-and-ride lots, transit stations, and an expanded feeder bus network, and called this strategy the "Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy."

Eliminating the Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy would not require an RTP amendment because (1) the Barbur corridor lies outside the Western Bypass study area and is not affected by ODOT's proposal, (2) the RTP identifies the Highway 217 corridor as a possible future extension of light rail; and (3) none of the alternatives recommended for further study will preclude light rail transit along Highway 217. ODOT's position is that a strategy relying primarily on transit rather than a combination of transit and roadway expansion cannot meet the purposes and needs identified in this Study and does not merit further consideration.

While the purposes and needs identified in this Study cannot be met only through transit, ODOT recognizes that circumferential high-capacity transit (bus or light rail) combined with roadway improvements and demand reduction measures does merit further consideration in this Study.

Although RTP amendments are not required to eliminate either strategy, the intergovernmental agreement still requires Metro to demonstrate reasons why each strategy eliminated cannot meet the identified statewide and regional Westside circumferential travel needs identified in the Purpose and Need Statement. This staff report provides those reasons.

## B. Background

Section III of the intergovernmental agreement requires ODOT to "study, develop and refine strategies to meet the statewide and regional Westside circumferential travel needs identified in the Purpose and Need Statement." Those needs include the need to adequately provide for north-south and circumferential travel in the study area.

According to ODOT's Purpose and Need Statement, because of the lack of circumferential routes and expected growth projected for the study area, transportation problems will be significant by the year 2010 without major reduction or alleviation of traffic congestion. More traffic will likely use roads not designed for high traffic volumes. Through an extensive public involvement effort, ODOT has identified needs to reduce traffic congestion and reduce reliance on the private automobile. Options to satisfy those needs include increasing road capacity and transit service and implementing demand management programs.

In the spring of 1991, ODOT and its consulting team began to develop and study a number of strategies. These strategies focused on particular solutions to address the demand for north-south or circumferential travel, as the purpose of the study is not to solve every traffic congestion problem in the study area. The strategies included:

1. a "no build" strategy;
2. a "common improvements" strategy (including transportation projects and transit service expansions under active development for the study area but without committed funding);
3. an "arterial expansion" strategy, focusing on roadway improvements beyond those listed in the "common improvements" and including extension of a major discontinuous north-south route;
4. a "transit-intensive (LRT)" strategy, focusing on transit improvements adding two light rail corridors (Barbur and Highway 217) together with supporting "feeder" bus routes, park-and-ride lots and transit stations;
5. a "transit (HOV)/arterial expansion" strategy, combining transit facilities and service improvements with roadway improvements, and including express bus service and high occupancy vehicle lanes in the Highway 217 corridor as a high-capacity transit element; and
6. a "bypass" strategy, looking at two broad corridor options for a bypass facility in addition to other roadway and transit improvements.

Thereafter, following review by ODOT's advisory committees and public open houses, ODOT revised, refined and analyzed those strategies and returned them to its committees.

In October, 1991, ODOT's CAC, TAC and Steering Committee voted to recommend elimination of Bypass Option B from further detailed study as an alternative. The CAC also voted to recommend elimination of the "transit-intensive (LRT)" strategy from further study as an alternative, because this strategy did not perform better than the "common improvements" strategy which did not contain high-capacity transit elements or other transit service beyond the Westside LRT. However, the TAC and Steering Committee were not yet prepared to take that step, although they recognized its limited performance. Instead, following comments from Tri-Met's representative that the transit intensive strategy was not combined in a way that most intensively supported high capacity transit, they adopted a motion directing ODOT to remodel Highway 217 light rail, expanding on its components to consider through connection to the Central Business District, a transportation demand management program, and dial-a-ride service.

That fall and winter, Metro modeled a "revised Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy" containing the features suggested by the TAC. The revised strategy was developed by a group representing Tri-Met, ODOT's study team, and Metro. Like the original "transit-intensive (LRT)" strategy, the revised strategy focused on transit, relying on light rail along Highway 217 and Barbur Boulevard for its high-capacity element. However, the strategy added (1) through routing of Highway 217 LRT to Hillsboro and downtown Portland via the Westside and Barbur LRT corridors; (2) demand-responsive transit (DRT); and (3) transportation demand management (TDM) measures intended to see how TDM would work at the alternatives level.

Following completion of modeling, ODOT brought the revised Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy before its committees in March and April, 1992. Based on discussion and on the information generated by the modeling, the TAC voted (1) to recommend elimination from further study of a transit-intensive strategy using light rail along the Highway 217 corridor as its high-capacity transit element; (2) to combine DRT, TDM and high-capacity transit into an alternative identified for further study; and (3) that no alternative "preclude long-range implementation of LRT along the Highway 217 corridor." Tri-Met's representative to the TAC concurred with these motions. In subsequent meetings, the CAC and Steering Committee followed with similar motions.



C. Discussion

1. Bypass Option B

Metro staff concurs with ODOT's recommendation to eliminate Bypass Option B from further detailed consideration as an alternative. ODOT's committees recommended elimination of this strategy based on information showing that Bypass Option B would be underutilized and does not substantially reduce congestion compared to the No-Build strategy. Elimination of Bypass Option B does not eliminate a Bypass alternative. Bypass Option A will be taken forward for further study, consistent with the RTP.

2. Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy

Metro staff also concurs with ODOT's recommendation to eliminate a transit-intensive strategy ("transit only") from further consideration as an alternative.

ODOT's advisory committees recommended elimination of a transit-intensive strategy for the following reasons:

- Transit-intensive strategies as originally developed and as revised do not address the transportation problems identified in the Western Bypass Study.
- Additional circumferential LRT service in the Highway 217 corridor connecting to the Westside LRT, to a Barbur LRT, or to the CBD does not notably improve transit ridership in the year 2010 compared to the original Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy or compared to the No-Build strategy.
- The LUTRAQ study is considering LRT elements as part of the 1000 Friends of Oregon alternative. Changes in planned land use designations could change the ability of LRT service in the Highway 217 corridor to address the transportation problems identified in this Study and will be folded into this Study if viable.
- High-Capacity Transit through express bus service in the Highway 217 corridor will still be included as elements of the Arterial Expansion/HOV Express and Bypass alternatives. If implemented, it would provide similar service levels to light rail transit, and would provide an opportunity to build

the transit ridership demand needed for supporting light rail transit.

Although the strategy was revised in a manner that better supported light rail, the high-capacity transit component did not result in the strategy performing significantly better than the original transit-intensive strategy. Like the original transit-intensive strategy, the revised strategy did not (1) substantially reduce north-south or circumferential traffic congestion; (2) increase study area accessibility; (3) reduce traffic diversion to minor roads and neighborhoods; or (4) reduce reliance on the single occupancy automobile.

Indeed, due to the addition of "demand-responsive transit" (dial-a-ride), the revised Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy actually resulted in a decrease in work person trips by fixed route (bus and light rail) transit. This is caused by a shift in ridership from fixed route transit to demand-responsive transit. Based on the modeling, ODOT concluded that demand-responsive transit may help meet the identified purpose and need in reducing reliance on the private automobile and providing greater coverage in the study area by transit and should be carried forward as part of an alternative, but that high-capacity transit by itself does not contribute to meeting this purpose and need and therefore warrants no further detailed review in this Study as a separate (stand-alone) alternative.

Apart from demand-responsive transit, Metro has modeled transportation demand management (TDM) measures to determine their effect on reducing reliance on the single occupancy automobile. Metro found that TDM has a significant positive effect on reducing reliance on the automobile. Like DRT, ODOT will carry TDM forward into the alternatives stage supported by transit and roadway components. ODOT does not propose the elimination of DRT or TDM from further consideration.

At this point, clarification is needed. Before its committees, ODOT provided information showing how the revised Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy performed (1) with DRT and (2) with DRT and TDM. As earlier described, with just DRT, this strategy did not perform substantially better than the original transit-intensive strategy and, indeed, resulted in a lowering of combined bus and light rail ridership. However, with TDM, the strategy performed better, due to the impact of TDM measures.

Metro's modeling of the revised Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy with TDM raised questions among some ODOT committee members who compared these results with those of other

strategies recommended by ODOT for further study. They questioned why ODOT would eliminate the Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy, when it appeared to perform as well as those other strategies in meeting some of the identified purposes and needs. The answer is that the committee members were comparing this strategy with TDM to the other strategies without TDM. This was like comparing apples with oranges. While TDM substantially improved transit ridership for the Transit-Intensive (LRT) Strategy, it also substantially improves transit ridership in each of the alternatives ODOT is recommending for further study. Those proposed alternatives, with TDM, perform much better than a transit-intensive strategy with TDM at reducing congestion. Even with TDM, a transit-intensive strategy does not assist in meeting this need. ODOT is proposing to include TDM in all the alternatives recommended for further study.

MG:lmk/92-1619.AT

26793-00.001\SZMFNDGS.STR.OLD