A G E N D A

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736 TEL 503 797 1542 | FAX 503 797 1793



Agenda

MEETING:	METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION MEETING
DATE:	June 15, 2004
DAY:	Гuesday
TIME:	1:00 PM
PLACE:	Metro Council Chamber

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1:00 PM	1.	DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, JUNE 17, 2004	
1:15 PM	2.	CARBON MONOXIDE AIR QUALITY PLAN	Nordberg/Turpel
1:35 PM	3.	METRO'S TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES APPROVAL	Leybold
2:00 PM	4.	CEMETERY POLICIES	Kromer/Desmond
2:15 PM	5.	CITIZEN COMMUNICATION	
2:25 PM	6.	CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATI	ON
2:35 PM	7.	COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION	
ADJOURN			

CARBON MONOXIDE AIR QUALITY PLAN

Metro Council Work Session Tuesday, June 15, 2004 Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: June 15, 2004 Time: 1 PM

Length: 20 minutes

Presentation Title: Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Plan

Department: Transportation

Presenters: Mark Turpel, Metro and Dave Nordberg, DEQ

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

In 1996, the Oregon Environmental Quality Council (EQC), after public review and comment (including Metro recommendations), adopted a Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Plan and submitted it to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for consideration. This plan was developed to address carbon monoxide (CO) levels in the region in order to maintain air quality and to meet the carbon monoxide air quality standards of the Federal Clean Air Act. In 1997 EPA approved the Plan and it became the regulations specific to the Metro jurisdictional boundary. Regional transportation plans (RTP) and metropolitan transportation improvement programs (MTIP) have been regularly evaluated against these standards, particularly the motor vehicle emission budgets (maximum levels of emissions allowed from on-road sources) as well as progress with transportation control measures (TCMs).

The 1997 approved plan is being updated consistent with a schedule concluded by EPA and the EQC. Accordingly, a Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Plan is being completed. Prior to the draft Plan completion for a public comment period, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) working with Metro to craft the draft document. Policy issues for Metro Council consideration include:

1) What should be the region's CO motor vehicle emission budgets (maximum levels of CO that transportation sources could generate out to the year 2020 and beyond)?

2) Should subregions for analyzing CO concentrations in downtown Portland and 82nd Avenue be continued?

3) Should local air quality actions (known as Transportation Control Measures, or TCMs) be included in the CO Plan?

4) Should the DEQ vehicle emissions test procedure be changed?

5) Should Contingency Plan provisions be maintained?

6) What should be the CO Growth Allowance for new businesses in the region?

7) Should oxygenated fuels in the region be recommended to be continued or not?

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

The Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) have recommended that draft Resolution No. 04-3457 be adopted and forwarded to the EQC. Some of these recommendations are technical in nature and do not appear to have policy implications (such as deleting subregions, changes to emission test procedures and contingency plan provisions).

However, there are some items that do include policy issues. These include: the new motor vehicle emission budgets, TCMs and oxygenated fuel. TPAC and JPACT have recommended that the motor vehicle emission budgets, or maximum on-road generated CO emissions, included in the draft Resolution 04-3457, are sufficient to provide for transportation growth into the future at least to the year 2020. Other options have been developed that could be explored by the Metro Council if there are concerns with those developed.

With regard to TCMs, the recommendation is to reduce the number from nine to three and include contingent TCMs should rate of vehicle miles per capita increase substantially more than forecast. As TCMs are not required, the Metro Council could choose to eliminate, reduce or revise the TCMs should they desire.

Finally, oxygenated fuels have been required by the current CO Plan. Pros and cons to continuing requiring these fuels will be provided by DEQ.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

None beyond those included in the materials.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Seven questions are listed in the Issues section of this document and suggested responses are provided in the staff report.

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION _x_Yes __No DRAFT IS ATTACHED _x_Yes ___No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval ______ Chief Operating Officer Approval

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

)

)

)

)

)

)

FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON CONCERNING THE SECOND PORTLAND AREA CARBON MONOXIDE MAINTENANCE PLAN

RESOLUTION NO. 04- 3457

Introduced by Councilor Park

WHEREAS, in 1996 the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality prepared a draft Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan; and

WHEREAS, Metro reviewed the draft Plan, and, after consultation with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, adopted Resolution No. 96-2260, For the Purpose of Recommending to the Environmental Quality Commission the Transportation Control Measures (TCM's), contingencies, and emissions budgets to be included in the Portland Region's Ozone and Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plans; and

WHEREAS, in 1996, the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission approved a Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan and submitted the Plan to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); and

WHEREAS, on September 2, 1997 the EPA approved the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for the Portland, Oregon area; and

WHEREAS, the EPA and the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission agreed that an updated plan would be submitted to the EPA by the year 2005; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Environmental Quality is producing a draft Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan; and

WHEREAS, while the subject of the Maintenance Plan is carbon monoxide, other pollutants including volatile organic compounds, oxides of nitrogen, air toxics such as benzene and acrolein and other emissions from transportation sources are of concern and can be ameliorated through local air quality actions; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Administrative Rules for the Department of Environmental Quality concerning transportation conformity (OAR 340-252-0060) state that the metropolitan planning organization shall be responsible for: "(iv) Developing and evaluating TCMs in ozone and/or carbon monoxide nonattainment and/or maintenance areas"; and "(v) providing technical and policy input on emission budgets"; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Council have reviewed and discussed the transportation aspects of the draft Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan including transportation control measures, emission budgets, subregional areas and oxygenated fuels; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. The Metro Council recommends to the Environmental Quality Commission of the State of Oregon that the transportation control measures as listed in Exhibit A, be included in the Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan.

2. The Metro Council will take the following actions and encourages and supports its local government partners and state and other regional agencies to:

a. continue support of efforts to develop and redevelop in centers and mixed use areas within the urban portion of the region by providing funding for, and cooperating, with the Transit Oriented Development program, the Regional Travel Options program, and any similar programs and projects in the urban area,

b. continue to implement the 2040 Growth Concept to encourage growth patterns that can be served by a balanced transportation system, including walking, biking, transit as well as motor vehicles in order to maintain air quality within the region as well as meeting other region-wide goals.

c. keep urban growth boundary and growth forecasts and allocations up-to-date and coordinated for use in future conformity determinations,

d. maintain support for the Portland Central City Transportation Management Plan, including its parking regulations, to encourage transit use, walking and biking as convenient and effective methods of transportation for people within the Central City area, recognizing that auto trips and goods movement via trucks will remain an important component of travel within the Central City. Any changes to parking regulations should strive to realize or exceed the existing central city parking assumptions of the regional transportation model, especially the parking, transit pass and fareless area factors.

e. maintain support of the Metro code provisions that regulate parking requirements for the region;

f. maintain and enhance support for the DEQ Employee Commute Option program to find ways of encouraging employers to provide ECO programs and advance the participation of employees in such programs.

3. The Metro Council recommends that the carbon monoxide motor vehicle emission

budgets (winter, daily) for the region be set as follows:

2005	2010	2017
1,238,575 lbs	1,033,578 lbs	1,181,341 lbs

4. The Metro Council recommends that the emission set asides for industrial sources be set at 14,880 pounds per day of carbon monoxide or 2,700 tons per year.

5. The Metro Council recommends that the subregional areas, namely, that area included in the Portland Central City Transportation Management Plan, and the 82nd Avenue subregion, not be included in the Second Portland Area CO Maintenance Plan and that the region not be required to complete additional air quality analyses for subregions over and above the required region-wide analysis.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of June, 2004.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

1

Transportation Control Measures Recommended for Inclusion in the Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Maintenance Plan

1. Transportation Control Measures.

a. a 5 year rolling average of 1.0 % per cent per year increase in regional transit revenue hours weighted by capacity, including the addition of Interstate MAX in 2004, between the years 2006 through 2017; and

b. program at least 28 miles of bikeways or trails, consistent with State and regional bikeway standards between the years 2006 through 2017, including a cumulative average of 5 miles funded in each biennium from all sources in the MTIP, these facilities in addition to those required for expansion or reconstruction projects under ORS 366.514; and

c. program at least nine miles of pedestrian paths in mixed use centers between the years 2006 through 2017, including the funding of a cumulative average of 1 ¹/₂ miles in each biennium from all sources in each MTIP, these facilities in addition to those required for expansion or reconstruction projects under ORS 366.514, except where such expansion or reconstruction is located within a mixed use center.

2. Contingent Actions.

a. Metro will review the vehicle miles traveled per capita (vmt/capita) based on the most recent estimates of population and daily vehicle miles traveled from Federal, State sources, as reviewed and verified by Metro.

b. Should reported vmt per capita exceed a rate of 21.5 vmt/capita (a 10 percent increase above the 2002 rate) for the Oregon portion of the Portland-Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area for two successive years, the following measures would become required TCM for the region:

i. Washington County Commuter Rail within six years after exceeding the 21.5 vmt/capita rate;

ii. I-205 LRT within six years after exceeding the 21.5 vmt/capita rate;

iii. an increase of efforts for the Regional Travel Options Program sufficient to increase the number of employers reached by the program by at least 5 % per year the number of employers currently subject to the DEQ Employee Commute

Exhibit A

Options program. Alternatively, specific projects from the Regic Resolution No. 04-3457 Transportation Options program could be substituted.

iv. an increase of funding of at least 5 % per year greater than current funding for Transit Oriented Development projects.

v. Other programs or projects consistent with State and Federal law as may be determined by the Metro Council after consultation with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation.

c. Should vmt/capita exceed 20.5 daily vmt/capita (a 5 % increase above the 2002 rate) for two successive years, the Standing Committee [TPAC, as defined at OAR 340-252-0060 (2) (b) (A) (iii)] shall be convened to consider:

i) whether there is a data problem with the trigger; and,

ii) if there is not a data problem with the trigger, identification of and analysis of effectiveness of those local actions that could reduce air pollutant emissions; and,

iii) whether a recommendation to initiate one or more of these local air quality actions until the 2002 vmt/capita level is one again attained, should be made to JPACT.

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 04-3457, FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON CONCERNING THE SECOND PORTLAND AREA CARBON MONOXIDE MAINTENANCE PLAN

Date: June 1, 2004

Prepared by: Mark Turpel

BACKGROUND

Consistent with Federal Clean Air Act, the Environmental Quality Commission of the State of Oregon (EQC) has directed that a draft Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan (CO Plan) be prepared. This CO Plan will be completed in draft form and provided to the public for review in Fall, 2004 with an anticipated final decision by the EQC late 2004 or early 2005. The EQC's CO Plan will then be submitted to the US Environmental Protection Agency for approval.

In order to coordinate with the region, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has worked with local governments in the region to identify CO Plan issues prior to completion of a draft plan. Accordingly, the region has the opportunity to make recommendations about the CO Plan prior to a draft CO Plan being completed for public comment. In addition, Metro and local governments may also participate in the Fall CO Plan public process.

Several issues have been identified that pertain to transportation and/or the region's economy. On May 28,2004, TPAC met and provided technical review and recommendations. These issues include:

1) What should be the region's CO motor vehicle emission budgets (maximum levels of CO that transportation sources could generate out to the year 2020 and beyond);

(TPAC recommended that budgets that provide a 1 percent per year increase to the year 2010 be used and that a 2017 and beyond budget be based on a 1 percent per year to 2017 plus a 1.5 percent per year to 2037 be used for the 2017 budget.)

2) Should subregions for analyzing CO concentrations in downtown Portland and 82nd Avenue be continued?

(TPAC recommended deleting these subareas and no longer requiring separate conformity determinations for these subareas consistent with the DEQ recommendation.)

3) Should local air quality actions (known as Transportation Control Measures, or TCM) be included in the CO Plan;

(TPAC recommended reducing the number of TCM from nine to three and including contingent TCM should there be unexpected increases in vehicle miles per capita.)

4) Should the DEQ vehicle emissions test procedure be changed;

(TPAC recommended these tests be changed consistent with the DEQ recommendation)

5) Should Contingency Plan provisions be maintained;

6) What should be the CO Growth Allowance for new businesses in the region;

(TPAC recommended the previous growth allowance level be used as all CO emissions are expected to be reduced over the lifetime of the Plan.)

7) Should oxygenated fuels in the region be recommended to be continued or not.

(TPAC heard DEQ information about this issue, but made no recommendations.)

Items 1,2, 4 through 7 are addressed in the accompanying memorandum from DEQ, marked attachment A. Item 3 is addressed in the accompanying Metro memorandum marked attachment 2.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

- 1. Known Opposition There is no know opposition concerning the motor vehicle emission budgets, removing subregions, continuing with contingency plans or using the proposed growth allowance. Some have expressed concern with including TCM in the CO Plan, with changing DEQ vehicle emission procedures and with either including or eliminating oxygenated fuels.
- 2. Legal Antecedents Federal law includes the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401) as well as transportation legislation (23 U.S.C 109j) concerning transportation plans, programs and projects developed, funded or approved by the US Department of Transportation. State legislation includes OAR Chapter 340, Division 252. Metro legal antecedents include *Resolution No. 96-2260, For the Purpose of Recommending to the Environmental Quality Commission the Transportation Control Measures (TCM's), contingencies, and emission budgets to be included in the Portland Region's Ozone and Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plans, and numerous resolutions concerning transportation conformity of the region's transportation plan and metropolitan transportation improvement program.*
- 3. Anticipated Effects Adoption of this resolution will support the progress of the CO Plan, which, when adopted will make it possible for the region to demonstrate required transportation conformity for CO.
- 4. Budget Impacts No direct budget impacts to Metro.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that Resolution 04-3457 be approved.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report for Resolution 04-3457

State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Memorandum

Date: May 19, 2004

To: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee

From: Dave Nordberg, (503) 229-5519

Subject: Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan

Background

In the early 1970s, the Portland area exceeded the 8 hour air quality standard for carbon monoxide (CO) approximately 1 out of every 3 winter days. The Environmental Protection Agency, Oregon DEQ, Metro and the City of Portland adopted a number of control measures that effectively reduced CO concentrations. These measures included new car emission controls, the vehicle emissions testing program, wintertime oxygenated fuel, LAER (Lowest Achievable Emissions Rate) emissions control equipment for expanding industry, the downtown parking lid and the downtown traffic circulation plan. In 1991, the area achieved the 9 ppm National Ambient Air Quality Standard for CO, and in 1997 EPA redesignated the area to attainment for carbon monoxide.

As a condition of being designated to attainment, DEQ prepared the first CO Maintenance Plan. That plan detailed the strategies the area would use to stay within the carbon monoxide limit ten years into the future. The Plan took advantage of the area's Urban Growth Boundary and the 2040 Growth Concept by using both as new control measures. The plan demonstrated that air quality could be maintained while eliminating the downtown parking lid, and reducing the emission control requirement on new industry from LAER to the less restrictive BACT (Best Available Control Technology). The plan also demonstrated that the wintertime oxygenated fuel requirement was no longer needed for the area to continue to comply with the CO standard, however the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) decided to retain the oxy-fuel requirement to provide an added degree of safety.

Since the Plan was adopted, carbon monoxide concentrations continued to decline as shown below:



Portland's Second CO Maintenance Plan

The Clean Air Act requires a second maintenance plan to be submitted to EPA 8 years after the first plan is approved. DEQ is now preparing the second plan to meet that requirement and to establish a new Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets using EPA's new Mobile6 emissions factor model. Because many of the emissions reduction strategies used in the plan affect transportation planning DEQ is involving the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) in shaping the plan's requirements before it is proposed for public comment. DEQ's schedule for developing and implementing the plan follows:

TPAC Review	May 28, 2004
JPACT Review	Jun. 10, 2004
Metro Council Recommendation	Jun. 17, 2004
Public Comment Period:	~Aug. 16 to Sept. 17, 2004
Public Hearing:	~Sept. 16, 2004
EQC Plan Adoption:	Dec. 9 or 10, 2004 (target)
Submission to EPA:	Dec. 31, 2004
EPA Approval (Federal Register):	Aug. 2005?
Effective Date:	Nov. 2005?

While the Department is requesting the MPO's recommendations on several issues, it is important to note that Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) has final responsibility for determining the requirements of the next Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Plan. The Commission may or may not agree with recommendations made by the MPO, local jurisdictions, or others who comment on the new plan.

Future Carbon Monoxide Projections

DEQ estimated the amount of regional carbon monoxide emissions expected in the future using Metro's travel demand model and Metro's estimates of future growth. The Department then compared future emissions to the airshed's capacity (to accommodate carbon monoxide) and found that the region would stay well below the 9 ppm CO standard throughout the foreseeable future. Projected emissions are shown below in comparison to the airshed's capacity of 3,344,000 lbs. of CO per winter day.



	<u>1999</u>	2005	2020
Industrial Emissions Area Sources On-Road Emissions	104,984 809,454 1,525,100	65,517 872,794 1,226,312	76,258 1,031,289 730,941
Non-Road Emissions	365,950	515,067	675,430
Total:	2,805,488	2,679,690	2,513,918

[Projections assume no oxygenated fuel and replacing the enhanced emissions test with the basic test.]

Preliminary CO Plan Provisions

Because the airshed analysis shows the region will continue to maintain the CO standard by a wide margin, DEQ proposes to rely on basic provisions to demonstrate how the area will maintain the CO standard in the future. These provisions will include the Tier II/Low Sulfur Fuel federal requirements, and BACT--the existing level of industrial control requirements. DEQ also proposes to continue the vehicle emissions testing program (in slightly modified form) and to maintain the current industrial growth allowance of 14,880 lbs. of CO per day.

Because oxygenated fuel is not needed to continue meeting the carbon monoxide standard, DEQ may recommend that the EQC discontinue that requirement. However, oxygenated fuel enjoys significant support in the community and the decision of the Commission will not be known until late this year. Therefore, DEQ is developing the Portland area plan without relying on the CO emissions reductions produced by oxygenated fuel which will allow the Environmental Quality Commission the flexibility to retain or eliminate the wintertime oxygenated fuel requirement.

Finally, the Portland CO Plan is being written to project maintenance through 2020--the last transportation analysis year on which the air quality plan is based. However, the area's obligation for the second plan only extends to 2017, so the plan will expire after 2017.

Requested MPO Recommendations

DEQ requests the MPO's recommendations on 3 issues related to transportation planning:

1. Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (MVEBs)

MVEBs are typically established in relation to projected future vehicle emissions. Given the large safety margin between projected future emissions and airshed capacity, DEQ recommends setting CO MVEBs at projected on-road motor vehicle emissions plus an additional amount. Two techniques for doing this are to add a flat 10% to projected on-road emissions or to increase future emissions projections by 1% per year.

In addition, DEQ suggests that the CO plan set a single MVEB for years beyond 2020. The Department recommends that the post plan budget be sized to accommodate vehicle emission growth of 1.5% per year through 2037 (20 years beyond the end of 2017--the last year of the required air quality planning period). This approach would allow the MPO to write a 20 year Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in the final year of the Second CO Maintenance Plan that is able to demonstrate conformity with the 2020+ emissions budget for the last year of the RTP.

Emissions budgets based on the above rationales would be:

Year	2005	2010	2020	2020+
Forecast	1,226312	975,074	730,941	
10%	1,348,943	1,072,581	804,035	1,009,064
1% per yr.	1,238,575	1,033,578	847,891	1,064,103

(Emissions are expressed in lbs. of CO per winter day.)

Issue for TPAC: Does the committee prefer to add a safety margin to the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget for carbon monoxide? If so, should that margin be based on a flat 10% or an annual 1% increase?

2. Sub Regions

In addition to specifying emissions budget for the Portland region, the current CO Plan includes additional emissions budgets for two sub regions: the Central Business District of downtown Portland and 82nd Ave. Corridor (Division to Woodstock). Designation of these sub regions seems to have had little or no air quality benefit and adds administrative burden to Metro's conformity demonstrations. DEQ proposes eliminating these sub regions from the new plan.

Issue for TPAC: Does the committee concur with DEQ's recommendation to eliminate sub regions?

3. Transportation Control Measures (TCMs)

The current CO Plan includes a variety of TCMs—measures that are reinforced under the transportation conformity rules. Metro is the lead agency for developing any new TCMs and has prepared a separate staff report on this issue.

Issue for TPAC: Which TCMs (if any) should be specified in the new CO plan?

Other CO Plan Issues

The new CO maintenance plan will address additional issues that are not directly related to transportation planning. The Department is not asking for the Metropolitan Planning Organization's recommendation on these matters, but will note whatever comments are offered.

4. Enhanced Emissions Test

Under DEQ's current emissions testing program in the Portland area, 1981 through 1995 vehicles are subject to the "enhanced" test while 1996 and newer vehicles are subject to the more OBD (On Board Diagnostics) test. The OBD test is quicker and more effective than the enhanced test and will become increasingly dominant as 1996 and newer vehicles become an ever larger portion of the fleet. DEQ will therefore propose to replace the enhanced test requirement for 1981 – 1995 vehicles with the quicker and easier "basic" (two speed idle) emissions test. This change would increase on-road emissions from the Portland area fleet 1.4% in 2005 and by smaller amounts thereafter. This change would be a SIP revision only. The actual test requirement would not occur until DEQ demonstrates that the change is also acceptable in for precursors of ozone.

5. Contingency Plan

DEQ proposes to continue the current contingency plan provisions (possibly modified by TCM decisions):

Phase 1: CO within 90% of National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) (2nd high =8.1 ppm):

Convene planning group to consider applying additional strategies

Phase 2: Violation of CO NAAQS (2nd high =9.5 ppm):

Reinstate LAER for industrial sources Remove Growth Allowance (Offsets Required) Reinstate Downtown Parking Lid (if violation is downtown) Reinstate Oxy-fuel (if removed)

6. Growth Allowance

The current CO maintenance plan specifies an amount of CO emissions that can be used by new or expanding industry. This relieves new businesses from having to offset their increased emissions with a greater of emission reductions in the same airshed. DEQ suggests continuing the Industrial Growth Allowance for carbon monoxide at the existing level: 14,880 lbs. per day or 2700 tons per year.

7. Oxygenated Fuel

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 mandated the use of wintertime oxygenated fuel in areas such as Portland that failed to meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for carbon monoxide. Since then, Portland's CO concentrations have improved significantly, and oxygenated fuel has a far lower CO reduction benefit. This reduced benefit is largely due to the increasing prevalence of computerized engine controls which effectively minimize emissions without fuel additives. However, oxygenated fuel continues to generate significant carbon monoxide reductions in the less sophisticated engines used in non-road vehicles (such as lawnmowers, generators and construction equipment). Emissions projections with and without oxygenated fuel show the following carbon monoxide reduction effects:

 Oxy-fuel effects (on-road vehicles):
 -5.1 % in 2005, -1.6% in 2020

 Oxy-fuel effects (non-road engines):
 -16.5% in 2005, -15% in 2020

 Net effects of oxy-fuel:
 -5.2% in 2005, - 4.5% in 2020

While oxygenated fuel is no longer needed for Portland to continue meeting the air quality standard for CO, fuel oxygenated with ethanol can have other benefits. First, gasoline oxygenated with 10% ethanol produces an estimated 5 to 8% net reduction in the toxicity of motor vehicle emissions. Second, using ethanol to fuel motor vehicles is generally considered to reduce greenhouse gas emissions significantly; however, estimates are subject to some debate. Estimated greenhouse gas benefits vary according to the type of milling process used, the distance between where feedstock is raised and where it is used, plus the degree to which dried distillers' grain (a by-product of ethanol production) displaces the use of whole grain for fattening livestock. Another benefit is that ethanol is a renewable fuel that decreases the nation's dependence on foreign oil.

On the other hand, the petroleum industry indicates that retaining an oxygenated fuel requirement could contribute to an upward pressure on fuel cost and would perpetuate an unnecessary requirement. The use of ethanol as fuel also qualifies for a 52¢ per gallon federal tax credit which may affect some evaluations of net costs and benefits.

The Department's recommendation to the Environmental Quality Commission on this matter is being developed in consultation with other government agencies.

State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Memorandum

Date: May 27, 2004

To: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee

From: Dave Nordberg, (503) 229-5519

Subject: Portland Area Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plan

DEQ, in consultation with EPA Region 10, has determined that the last year of the Portland Area CO Maintenance Plan does not need to be a full transportation analysis year. Therefore, DEQ will be able to end the Maintenance Plan 2017 without triggering significant additional modeling effort. To accommodate this change DEQ must express a Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget for the last year of the plan. Therefore, DEQ recommends that the emissions budgets proposed in the Department's memo of May 19, 2004 be modified as shown:

Year	2005	2010	2017
Forecast	1,226312	975,074	804,181
10% 1% per yr.	1,348,943 1,238,575	1,072,581 1,033,578	1,149,979 1,181,341

(Emissions are expressed in lbs. of CO per winter day.)

The May 19th memo describes two techniques for setting the emissions budget out to 2017: adding a flat 10% to emissions projections, and adding 1% per year to emissions projections. (2017 emissions actually accommodate growth to 2037.)

Environmental Impact of Motor Vehicle Exhaust Emissions in Portland, Oregon

Background

Air pollution from cars comes from by-products of the combustion process (burning fuel in the engine to power the car) and from the evaporation of the fuel itself. Emissions from an individual car vary greatly, depending on the type of car, how it is driven, and the time of year it is driven, among other things.

Gasoline and diesel fuels are mixtures of hydrocarbons, which are compounds which contain hydrogen and carbon atoms. In a "perfect" engine, oxygen in the air would convert all of the hydrogen in the fuel to water, and all of the carbon in the fuel to carbon dioxide. Nitrogen in the air would remain unaffected. In reality, the combustion process cannot be perfect, and automotive engines emit several types of pollutants.

Pollutants and Health Effects

Here are the types of air pollutants associated with motor vehicles, and their health effects:

Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC):

Volatile organic compound emissions result when fuel molecules in the engines do not burn or burn only partially. VOCs also escape into the air through fuel evaporation. VOCs react in the presence of nitrogen oxides and sunlight to form ground-level ozone, a major component of smog. Ozone irritates the eyes, damages the lungs, and aggravates respiratory problems.

Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x):

Under the high pressure and temperature conditions in an engine, nitrogen and oxygen atoms in the air react to form various nitrogen oxides, collectively known as NO_x . Nitrogen oxides, like volatile organic compounds, are precursors to the formation of ozone. They also contribute to the formation of acid rain.

Carbon Monoxide (CO):

Carbon monoxide is a product of incomplete combustion and occurs when carbon in the fuel is partially oxidized rather than fully oxidized to carbon dioxide. Carbon monoxide reduces the flow of oxygen in the bloodstream and is particularly dangerous to persons with heart disease.

Carbon Dioxide (CO₂).

Carbon dioxide does not directly impair human health, but it is a "greenhouse gas" that traps the earth's heat and contributes to the potential for global warming.

Air Toxics:

Air toxics are air pollutants that cause adverse health effects. Carcinogens are compounds that cause cancer. Non-cancer health effects such as reproductive and neurological problems are also of concern. Motor vehicles emit several pollutants that are known or probable carcinogens, such as benzene; formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, 1,3-

butadiene and diesel particulate matter. The danger to human health from a toxic air pollutant depends on the amount and length of exposure.

EPA estimates that mobile sources of air toxics (cars, trucks and buses) account for as much as half of all cancers attributed to outdoor sources of air toxics. Non-road mobile sources (such as construction equipment and watercraft) emit air toxics as well. Some toxic compounds (such as benzene) are present in gasoline and are emitted to the air when gasoline evaporates or passes through the engine as unburned fuel. A significant amount of automotive benzene comes from the incomplete combustion of compounds such as toluene and xylene that are chemically very similar to benzene. Formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, diesel particulate matter, and 1,3-butadiene are not present in fuel but are by-products of incomplete combustion. Formaldehyde and acetaldehyde are also formed through a secondary process when other mobile source pollutants undergo chemical reactions in the atmosphere.

Environmental Impact:

Much progress has been made in both automotive technologies and fuel formulations to reduce the amount of air pollution from motor vehicles. However, much of the recent improvements in the amount of emissions from motor vehicles have been offset by increases in the number of miles driven. Therefore, local actions to encourage citizens to use alternatives to driving motor vehicles will have a beneficial impact on air quality.

The following is an illustration of "typical" motor vehicle pollutants for the Portland fleet in the year 2005, based on emission factors generated by the Mobile6 model, using winter driving conditions with oxygenated fuel at 40 mph.

Pollutant	Emissions
VOC	1.064 g/mi
NO _x	2.199 g/mi
CO	18.9 g/mi
CO2	20 lb/gallon of gasoline
Benzene	38.493 mg/mi
1,3 Butadiene	3.563 mg/mi
Formaldehyde	14.703 mg/mi
Acetaldehyde	10.844 mg/mi
Acrolein	0.763 mg/mi

Prepared by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, May 19, 2004

Sources:

EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality factsheet 400-F-92-007 and OMS-2 http://www.epa.gov/air/transport/index.html Mobile 6 model run dated 9/24/03 (VOC, NO_x, CO) and 3/4/2004 (air toxics)



Attachment 2 to Staff Report for Resolution 04-3457

TO:Andy Cotugno, Planning DirectorFROM:Mark Turpel, Principal PlannerDATE:June 1, 2004SUBJECT:Air quality, CO Maintenance Plan and Transportation Control Measures (TCM)

In response to the upcoming draft Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Maintenance Plan (CO Plan), there has been substantial discussion of TCMs by TPAC and an ad hoc TCM subcommittee formed that held two meetings to discuss the best approach to TCMs. From these discussions, the issues have been raised that include the following:

1. Should TCMs be included in the CO Plan.

Response. TCMs are voluntary and if they are included in the plan and not implemented Federal funds could be withheld for transportation expansion projects, so there is a risk assumed if included in the new CO Plan (the current plan has nine TCMs). In addition, CO has become much less of a problem in this region, actual levels of CO have dropped well below maximum limits and are expected to decrease even more in the future. However, the region may wish to consider the impact of other transportation generated air pollutants, such as volatile organic compounds and oxides of Nitrogen (precursors of ground level ozone, or smog). Transportation shares the airshed with industrial ozone sources and the region is very close to the maximum permitted level. In addition, there are air toxics such as benzene or acrolein and other air pollutants, including greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide for which concerns have been raised. The CO Plan provides a regulatory means of addressing air pollution while other pollutants do not have plans with this feature. Accordingly, it is recommended that the number of TCMs be decreased from nine to three to recognize progress made with CO and that contingent TCMs also be included in the plan in the event that transportation trends are adverse in order to provide some means of addressing other pollutants as well as to continue to encourage reducing CO emissions.

2. If contingent TCMs are included, what trigger should be used and how will it work.

Response. Contingent TCMs are proposed using a vehicle miles traveled per capita measurement. Each year the vmt/capita will be calculated and reported. Action would be triggered: 1) (at greater than 5 percent above 2002 levels for two years in a row) evaluation of whether there is a transportation/air quality problem (or whether there is a vmt/capita measurement problem) that should be addressed and if so, what local air quality actions might be taken - without any commitment to take action; 2) (at greater than 10 percent above 2002 levels for two years in a row) specific TCMs are required to be implemented including transit improvements, alternatives to single occupant vehicle use and transit oriented development support.

3. Concerning contingent TCM, is the baseline year (2002), a reasonable starting point? Have past trends been influenced by employment trends and 2002 vmt/capita dampened by unemployment? and,

4. Concerning contingent TMC, is HPMS data reliable enough to use as an evaluation factor?

Table 1 plots vmt/capita (dvmt/person) and vmt/employee. Each show a similar pattern - that is, increases during the 1980's and a plateau and slight decline over the 1990's. This leads to the conclusion that the vmt has not been greatly influenced by employment or population growth. However, it does appear that vmt/employee is a somewhat more stable measure (less deviation from the mean) than vmt/capita (see Table 2).

However, using employment based data to compare against vmt has its own issues. For example, the employment data used in the analysis is from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA). BEA data lags by about 2 years, therefore we do not have 2001 and 2002 data. So use of BEA data for a trigger would mean comparing the most current vmt data against employment data that is two year old or simply using two year old vmt and employment data.

Generally speaking, Metro is migrating from the use of BEA data to Bureau of Labor Statistics data (BLS) BLS employment data, however, uses SMSA geography. As the SMSA boundaries have changed over the past years, we don't have a continuous, consistent set of historical BLS employment data from which to analyze the use of BLS data for past stability (deviation from a mean) and appropriateness for use in a vmt/employee measurement.

A suggestion was made to State of Oregon Office of Economic Analysis data. While population and unemployment data is readily available from this source, historical employment data was not found and it would take additional time to explore whether OEA has historical employment data different from BLS and BEA, whether such data could be broken down for the Metro area and whether any time lag exists for these data.

Accordingly, a trigger measure choice must be made between: 1) using BEA employment data that would always be two years old but more stable than population data; 2) using BLS employment data that would be timely, but no analysis of its historical stability could be done; 3) taking more time to explore the use of OEA data, or 4) using population data that would be timely, but not quite as stable as BEA employment data.

The other part of the measurement, vehicle miles traveled, is another variable about which concerns have also been expressed. That is, the HPMS data (gathered by ODOT and recommended for use in the trigger) varies from year to year. Concern has been expressed about not making the trigger so sensitive that it could be set off by slight variations, or "noise" in the data. Accordingly, in order to examine variability of the vmt data, traffic volumes reported by electronic sensors managed by ODOT for the freeways ringing downtown Portland were gathered for analysis. Table 3 shows five days in April and four days in May, 2002 when traffic volumes

at single points on the reported freeways were gathered. It has been hypothesized that ideally, the mean variation for each freeway should be the same. However, the data show that different freeways have differing means, with as little variation as six percent to as much as nine percent. It does seem likely however, that the larger the data set, the less noise is likely to be reported as individual low anomalies would likely cancel out high deviations. In addition, Metro forecasts future vmt in the region to remain flat (that is, not to increase) Nevertheless, designing a trigger that is activated by "noise" is a concern.

Several choices exist for how sensitive a trigger to set. One approach is to consider just the past historic rate of variability and to avoid activating the trigger needlessly. Another choice is to consider both the historic rate and the forecasts of future. It has been proposed that the trigger not be activated for a high reading for just one year, rather that it be triggered only if two consecutive years are registered in order to avoid an anomalous year or reading. In addition, the contingent TCM trigger has been proposed to include two levels - the first being a "soft" trigger that would activate analysis of the change in vmt per capita or job and why that reading might have occurred and to consider, but not mandate, a list of possible local air quality actions that could be initiated. The second trigger level - a "hard" trigger, would be activated at a higher threshold and would include a specific list of local air quality actions that would have to be done or risk loss of transportation funds.

Accordingly, the following is recommended for contingent TCM triggers.

- 5% trigger - would require that should reported vmt/capita for two consecutive years exceed 20.5 dvmt/capita, that the Standing Committee (TPAC) shall be activated to consider:

a) whether there is a data problem with the trigger; and,

b) if there is not a data problem with the trigger, identification of and analysis of effectiveness of those local actions that could reduce air pollutant emissions; and,

c) whether a recommendation to initiate one or more of these local air quality actions should be made to JPACT.

- 10% trigger - would require two consecutive years exceeding 21.5 daily vmt/capita. Should this level of vmt/capita be exceeded, mandatory TCM would be required.

Should HMPS data parameters change (such as higher quality ITS data become available) the region could, with the advise of the Standing Committee (TPAC) revise the trigger, including using another data base, if warranted. Triggers are calculated using a 2002 base year of 19.5 dvmt/capita (daily vehicle miles data from the Highway Performance Monitoring System, HPMS, and population for the three Oregon counties as checked by Metro prior to use)

5. Is vmt/capita the right measure for a trigger or should emissions be used?

Carbon monoxide is one of many transportation air emissions. CO generation from transportation sources is expected to continue to drop, as is total CO to the year 2020. (Transportation based CO emissions are estimated to drop by about 50 percent - from 1.5 million pounds per winter day ion 1999 to .731 million pounds per day in 2020. Total CO emissions are expected to decrease from 2.8 million pounds in 1999 to 2.5 in the year 2020.

However, there are other air pollutants from transportation that are high and trending higher. These include precursors of ground level ozone (volatile organic compounds and oxides of Nitrogen). While we do not currently forecast that the region will exceed air quality standards in the implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan, the region is close to the maximum standard. Exceeding the standard could have adverse consequences to the region's economy as well as transportation system.

In addition, there are several air toxics about which concern has been stated. Transportation is responsible for as much as $\frac{1}{2}$ or more of some of these toxics, including benzene and acrolein.

Although contested, greenhouse gases such as CO_2 are of concern such that the Governors of the three western US states (California, Oregon and Washington) are looking at means to decrease greenhouse gases, including those from transportation sources. Greater vehicle miles traveled, (even if vmt/capita or job decreases) could lead to added levels of some of these pollutants and air toxics even though CO emissions continue to decrease. Accordingly, using CO emissions as a trigger would not track with the expected increase of other air pollutants. Measuring all pollutants of concern, while very useful, is not data readily available on a yearly basis at this time.

Accordingly, a transportation based measure that is consistent with the definition of Transportation Control Measures ("...any measure....for the purpose of reducing emissions or concentrations of air pollutants from transportation sources by reducing vehicle use...") has been proposed.

3

6. Should the proposed bike and ped facilities financed through the MTIP be the only improvements counted or should the region be able to count all additions, including those required by existing state law?

An easy method of accounting for bike and ped facilities is for Metro to track the MTIP. Are local governments and ODOT willing to agree to reporting requirements for number of bike and ped facilities built? It is suggested that short of local and State agreement to report such data, that Metro track MTIP funding of bike and pedestrian projects as the appropriate method of tracking progress for this TCM.

7. Should the synergistic effects of bike and ped facilities placed in the right places be taken into consideration?

Bike and ped facilities along with other local actions (land use patterns and designs, transit service, etc.) interact to encourage or discourage walking and biking. However, Metro staff is not aware of how to account for these interactions. How should these synergistic effects be taken into consideration? This question may be better answered in broader discussions during future MTIP updates.

8. The trigger numbers should be clarified so that further interpretation is not needed.

This was done. See above.

9. Do we have the capacity to easily achieve the full TCM's?

We have checked with TriMet and they have agreed with the transit service increase TCM. Counting all types of bike facilities we have built 103 miles compared with a goal of 28. Pedestrian facilities built were 10.6 miles compared with a goal of 9.

10. Are the contingent "hard trigger" TCM measures flexible enough to be managed?

The soft trigger trips before the hard trigger and should provide help to avoid the hard trigger. By introducing flexibility to the hard trigger, we can't quantify them and therefore could not advance them in the event of conformity lapse, losing one benefit of having them listed as contingent TCM.

11. The formula for the annual average transit increase should be clarified.

The basic idea of the formula is to recognize that increases in transit service differs depending on the type of vehicle used. Buses typically are able to accommodate about 60 people (seated and standing), while LRT vehicles can accommodate as many as 200 people (again counting people both seated and standing). A formula has been proposed as follows: bus hours of transit revenue hours plus LRT transit hours (weighted by the difference between LRT vehicles and buses) plus streetcar revenue hours (weighted by the difference between streetcars and buses) plus commuter rail revenue hours (weighted by the difference between commuter rail cars and buses). In formula format this would be expressed as:

Bus + (LRT x factor) + (streetcar x factor) + commuter rail x factor). The total increase for the year will be compared with the previous transit revenue hours and in order to meet the TCM, TriMet will need to show at least a one percent increase over the past year. (The measure is cumulative average, so that for example in the first year transit revenue hours could increase by 2 percent and the second year by only $\frac{1}{2}$ percent and the TCM would still be met.)

Please let me know if you have any questions about this information.



Portland Population and Travel (DVMT, Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel) are from the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS, ODOT-Salem). Data from correspondence, and verified with the FHWA, Wash., D.C. Portland is defined as the Oregon portion of the Federal-Aid Urban Area 27 (The Portland-Vancouver Urbanized Area), and consists of a geographic area which includes Multnomah County and portions of Washington and Clackamas Counties in Oregon.
 **Employment is for the Portland Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and includes Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties in Oregon. An area basically equivalent to that used for population and DVMT. The data is from the Metro Regional Data Book, September 2002; and originally is from the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Table CA 25; REIS, May 2002; (nonfarm employment includes proprietors).

A Comparison of Por	tlan	d Da	ily V	ehic	le M	iles d	of Tra	avel	Per	Perso	on a	nd Pe	er Em	ploye	96
	1980	1985	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
DVMT/ Person (Miles)*	12.0	15.1	18.8	19.2	19.8	20.9	20.1	20.9	21.7	20.8	21.0	20.5	20.0	19.8	19.5
DVMT/ Employee (Miles)	18.7	24.3	25.2	25.6	26.5	27.9	26.0	26.3	26.6	26.2	26.3	25.7	25.5	n/a	n/a
DVMT/ Person % Change		26%	25%	2%	3%	6%	-4%	4%	4%	-4%	1%	-2%	-2%	-1%	-2%
DVMT/ Employee % Change		30%	4%	2%	3%	5%	-7%	1%	1%	-1%	0%	-2%	-1%		
				and as an an experimental					anga (at biog			25 V *			
DVMT/ Person, Mean 1991 to 20	000		20.5			na anna anna (mana) ann ann a 1									
DVMT/ Employee, Mean 1991 to	2000		26.3	1.011.1.01011.01011111111111111		area an	ant santh santh				2				
DVMT/ Person, Standard Deviat	ion 19	991 to 2	2000		=STDI	EV(19.2	2,19.8,2	20.9,20	.1,20.9	,21.7,20	0.8,21.0	0,20.5,2	0.0)		0.72
DVMT/ Employee, Standard Dev	viatior	n 1991	to 2000)	=STD	EV(25.6	5,26.5,2	27.9,26	.0,26.3	,26.6,26	5.2,26.3	3,25.7,2	5.5)	Smallest	0.69
DVMT/ Person, Mean + & -1 Sta	ndard	Devia	tion 19	91 to 2	2000 = 2	20.572	2; 20.5-	+.72 =	19.78	21.22	anna agus a sanna darlana darlan	80% fa	l within	1 SD of I	Mean
DVMT/ Employee, Mean + & -1 S	Standa	ard De	viation	1991 t	o 2000	= 26.3	69; 26	6.3+.69	25.61	26.99		90% fa	ll within	1 SD of	f Mean
	000		20.2				1 2 1				1927 - 2000 - 201				
DVMT/ Person, Mean 1990 to 2	2000		26.2				s								
		×													
DVMT/ Person, Standard Deviat	tion 1	990 to	2000		=STD	EV(18.	8,19.2,	19.8,20	.9,20.1	,20.9,2	1.7,20.	8,21.0,2	20.5,20.0))	0.8
DVMT/ Employee, Standard Dev	viatio	n 1990	to 200	0	=STD	EV(25.)	2,25.6,2	26.5,27	.9,26.0	,26.3,2	6.6,26.	2,26.3,2	25.7,25.5	Smallest	0.73
DVINT/ Domon Moon + & -1 Sta	ndarc	Devia	tion 10	90 to 2	2000 =	20.3-8	5: 20.3	+.85 =	19.45	21.15		73% fa	ll within	1 SD of	Mean
DVMT/ Employee. Mean + & -1	Stand	ard De	viation	1990	to 2000	= 26.2	73; 20	6.2+.73	25.47	26.93	and the We	82% fa	ll withir	1 SD of	f Mean

TABLE 2



Daily vmt/capita for the Portland side of the metropolitan area:

actual		Forecast	
1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 19	98 1999 2000 2001 2002	2005 2010	2020
18.8 19.2 19.8 20.9 20.1 20.9 21.7 20.8 21	.0 20.5 20.0 19.8 19.5		HPMS data
211 92 1288 TOOL 1	19.4	19.4 19.7	19.5 Forecast

5% increase over 2002 rate of 19.5 = 20.5 10% increase over 2002 rate = 21.5

Table 3

ATR Data Summary - Wednesdays In April & May 2003 By Name & Station Number; Source ODOT (Combined Traffic Volume Directions)

	Apr-02	Apr-09	Apr-16	Apr-23	Apr-30	May-07	May-14	May-21	May-28	Mean	<m></m>	>M
Stadium (I-405) 26-00	5 107,391	110,434	111,085	104,451	109,720	107,950	111,359	112,582	112,246	109,691	-5%	3%
W Banfield (1-5) 26-01	5 152,621	157,649	155,370	146,019	156,152	150,386	158,784	158,223	159,598	154,978	-6%	3%
lowa St (1-5) 84 26-01	6 157,238	158,985	162,360	153,935	160,011	158,421	161,358	162,485	163,249	159,782	-4%	2%
Yamhill (1-205) 26-01	8 167,650	168,621	171,130	158,491	171,425	170,417	n/a	163,574	171,102	167,801	-6%	2%
Minnesota (1-5) 26-01	9 141.912	141,970	144.0	140.						1,267	-3%	3%
Fremont (I-405) 26-02	7 123,730	121,990	126,552	123,547	125,640	126,618	126,659	128,263	129,141	125,793	-3%	3%
Combined ATR Mean	141,757	143,275	145,238	137,747	144,552	143,105	141,459	145,601	147,395	143,348	-4%	3%
Combined ATR Weatt	141,757	145,215	140,200	101,141	144,002	140,100	,	,	,	,		



METRO'S TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES APPROVAL

Metro Council Work Session Tuesday, June 15, 2004 Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: June 15, 2004 Time: 2:00 pm Length: 20 minutes

Presentation Title: Potential Metro Applications to Transportation Priorities program

Department: Planning

Presenters: Ted Leybold, Tom Kloster (Mel Huie; Greenspaces)

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

Metro may apply for funding from the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 transportation funding program. Metro Council must adopt at a meeting open to the public its priority applications for consideration by the funding program process. The Transportation Priorities 2006-09 funding program will be identifying transportation projects and programs to be funded with approximately \$57.75 million of new funding available through the two-year period of 2008 and 2009. Metro Council is the final decision body, acting on a recommendation from JPACT, for the selection of projects and programs to be funded through the Transportation Priorities program.

Staff has prepared a list of potential Metro applications and potential Regional applications in which Metro would be a participant with other agencies within the region for consideration by the Metro Council (Attachments A & B).

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

Metro Council should consider each of the potential applications and determine whether those applications, or any other project/program applications, should be forwarded for consideration by the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 program.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Planning staff suggests Metro Council endorse the applications summarized in Attachments A and B for consideration by the Transportation Priorities process.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Direction on which applications to submit for consideration by the Transportation Priorities 2006-09 program.

2. Feedback on any application to be submitted regarding project/program scope or budget.

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION <u>X</u> Yes <u>No</u> DRAFT IS ATTACHED <u>Yes X</u> No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION how Department Director/Head Approval Chief Operating Officer Approval

Attachment A

Potential Metro Applications Transportation Priorities 2006-09

Project or Program	Project/Program Description	Previous Allocations	Previous Allocation	Requested Allocation	Requested Allocation Notes and Regional Policy Issues
MPO Required Planning			Notes		
Existing Planning	Core Metro transportation Planning functions as required by federal rules; RTP, travel forecasting, etc.	2004 = \$753,000 2005 = \$776,000 2006 = \$800,000 2007 = \$828,000		2008 = \$853,000 2009 = \$878,000	Inflated at 3% annually.
Subtotal		2001 0020,000		\$1,731,000	
Regional Freight Planning		2004 = \$75,000 2005 = \$75,000 2006 = \$0 2007 = \$0		2008 = \$150,000 2009 = \$150,000	Funds Metro role in freight planning and project development for 06-09.
Engineering Review of TP Applications	Review of project applications for project readiness and regional consistency of cost estimate.			\$50,000	Funds two cycles, advance \$25,000 to 2006. Promotes readiness of projects and timely obligation of funds.
Corridor Planning					
Next Corridor	Complete multi-modal corridor plan in 2008-09 for the next priority corridor.	\$1,200,000	Included: • \$200k to Powell- Foster, • \$500k to Highway 217, • \$500k to I-5/99W Connector,	\$500,000	Need to complete corridor studies for 18 corridors identified in the RTP. Corridor studies define projects necessary to meet established transportation need.
Transit Oriented Development					
Station Area TOD Program	Supplement development investments with transportation infrastructure investments located in 2040 rail station communities.	2006 = \$1,500,000 2007 = \$1,500,000		2008 = \$1,500,000 2009 = \$1,500,000	Supports land-use density, design and mode split goals in 2040 station communities.
Centers Transportation Improvement Program	Supplement development investments with transportation infrastructure investments located in 2040 centers and main streets.	2006 = \$500,000 2007 = \$500,000		2008 = \$1,000,000 2009 = \$1,000,000	Supports land-use density, design and mode split goals in 2040 centers.

1

Attachment A

Potential Metro Applications Transportation Priorities 2006-09

Project or	Project/Program	Previous	Previous	Requested	Requested Allocation Nates		
Program	Description	Allocations	Allocation	Allocation	and Regional Policy Issues		
Livable Streets Program							
Policy and guidebook update	Develop guidelines/policies for encouraging use of recyclable materials and wildlife management in construction and maintenance of street system. Livable street summit. Safety research on street design issues. Reconciliation of boulevard design and truck freight issues.	- -		\$250,000	Improves delivery of regional policy and project design guidelines for regional street system to project development community		
Bke Model and Interactive Map upgrade. U-Bike?	Improve regional model forecasting of bike trips. Develop internet based bike trip planning/mapping capability utilizing existing bike map information.	v		\$200,000	Metro is responsible for the forecasting of future travel as jurisdictions complete transportation systems plans to meet regional mode split targets. Current model methods do not adequately forecast bike trip demand in response to changes in the built system. Will allow better decisions on prioritizing limited resources for bicycle facilities		
Total Application Requests				\$8.021.000			

Attachment B

Potential Regional Applications Transportation Priorities 2006-09

Project or Program	Project/Program Description	Previous Allocations	Previous Allocation	Requested Allocation	Requested Allocation Notes and Regional Policy Issues			
J			Notes		Regional Fondy locado			
Corridor Planning								
Milwaukie LRT	Funding to develop SDEIS, conceptual engineering and bridge analysis.		Previous allocations made for planning of Westside/Hillsboro and Interstate corridors.	\$4,300,000	May not apply to TP process for all of identified costs. Phase II of South Corridor project on behalf of South Corridor local governments. Environmental work needs to commence in 2005 to stay on schedule.			
Highway 43 - WSL Corridor Alternatives Analysis	Define and prepare preferred alternative project to enter EA/DEIS and PE.	\$300,000	Rail and Trail study funded for 2004.	\$1,785,000	Supports development of transit and trail improvement in the Lake Oswego corridor on behalf of the Willamette Shoreline consortium. Local funds are being sought to reduce this amount.			
Multi-use Trail Planning	 Planning and design work for several trail corridors to prepare projects to enter PE: L.O. to Milwaukie trail, Sullivan's Gulch, Mt. Scott/Scouter Mountain Loop, Tonquin Trail 	\$435,000	Red Electric and Willamette Shore Line (2 allocation cycles).	\$500,000	Supports implementation of 4 regional transportation plan trail projects.			
Transit								
Existing commitment (Res. No. 03- 3290)	Funding to I-205 LRT, Wilsonville-Beaverton Commuter Rail and South Waterfront projects.	2006 = \$8,000,000 2007 = \$8,000,000	History of previous allocations to Westside LRT and Interstate MAX.	2008 = \$8,000,000 2009 = \$8,000,000	Existing agreement commits this amount through 2015.			
I-205 LRT Supplemental	Funding to match other additional local funding to complete finance strategy for project.			2008 = \$1,300,000 2009 = \$1,300,000	This amount supplements existing agreement; to be committed through 2015.			
Transit Oriented Development								
TOD Project	t Direct funding to a specific TOD project.	\$2,000,000	Gresham Civic Station	\$3,000,000	Westgate Theater site acquisition in conjunction with Rose Biggi street project as next phase of the Beaverton Round.			
RTO Program								

1

Attachment B

Potential Regional Applications Transportation Priorities 2006-09

Project or	Project/Program	Previous	Previous	Requested	Requested Allocation Notes and
Program	Description	Allocations	Allocation Notes	Allocation	Regional Policy Issues
RTO Program (formerly Core Program)	Program Management, Collaborative Marketing, Regional Evaluation, Regional Rideshare Program	\$2,330,000	This allocation was made before the RTO 5-year strategic plan was adopted by the Metro Council.	\$3,333,924	Allocate according to Metro adopted 5- year Strategic Plan. Regional Marketing Program is the number one priority. Program is becoming more integrated. This program is primiarily a marketing program for the transportation infrastructure investments being made. The Regional Rideshare program is developing vanpool and carpool services for the region.
RTO Program Preferred	Program Management, Collaborative Marketing, Regional Evaluation, Regional Rideshare Program	same as above.		\$3,610,924	Allows for additional TravelSmart program in a center or corridor per year. Leverages transportation infrastructure investments.
RTO Program Backfill FY05/06	Telework, BETC, TravelSmart in HWY 217 corridor			\$530,000	Reintegrates the Telework and BETC programs into the Collaborative Marketing program. Implements TravelSmart in the 217 corridor including centers along corridors.
RTO Backfill FY06/07	TravelSmart in Hillsboro and Evaluation			\$600,000	Allows for additional TravelSmart program in a center or corridor. Leverages transportation infrastructure investments.
RTO Backfill 07/08	TravelSmart in CRC and Evaluation			\$600,000	Allows for additional TravelSmart program in a center or corridor. Leverages transportation infrastructure investments.
Regional TMA Program	Promotes travel options to employers as a catalyst for economic development in centers.	\$818,000		\$812,000	Maintains the current TMA program plan.
Regional TMA Program Preferred		same as above.		\$830,000	Provides additional support for innovative programs in centers.
Region 2040 Initiatives	Small TDM projects/programs oriented to 2040 priority land use areas.	Integrated into RTO Program total (\$538,000)	Reduced from 04- 05 allocation by \$86,000.	Integrate into Regional Marketing Program	This program will be integrated into the regional marketing program as recommended by the results of the RTO Marketing Plan (finalized in 12/04).

Attachment B

Potential Regional Applications Transportation Priorities 2006-09

Project or	Project/Program	Previous	Previous	Requested	Requested Allocation Notes and			
Program	Description	Allocations	Allocation	Allocation	Regional Policy Issues			
riogram	Becomption	Anocations	Notes	Anocation	Regional Policy issues			
	ECO Clearinghouse, Telework, BETC, SMART TDM	Integrated into RTO Program total (\$279,000)	Other agency programs within the RTO Subcommittee process.	Integrate into Regional Marketing Program	see notes above			
	Travel Smart and I-5 TDM Plan	Integrated into RTO Program total (\$413,000)	Other agency applications outside of RTO Subcommittee	Integrate into Regional Marketing Program	see notes about TravelSmart above.			
Base RTO Strategic Plan Subtotal		-		\$4,145,924				
Preferred RTO Plan Subtotal		<i></i>		\$4,440,924				
Backfill RTO Plan for 05-07 Subtotal				\$1,730,000				
Subtotal Regional Application Requests				\$34,355,924				
Subtotal Metro Application Requests				\$8,031,000				
Total Metro and Regional Application Requests				\$42,386,924				
Total Funds Available to Allocate				\$57,750,000				

Agenda Item Number 4.0

CEMETERY POLICIES

Metro Council Work Session Tuesday, June 15, 2004 Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date:

June 15, 2004

Time: 1:00 p.m.

Length: 30 minutes

Presentation Title: Request to add a new chapter 10.04 "Pioneer Cemeteries" to the Metro Code Title X for the management of Metro's Pioneer Cemeteries and repealing Metro Code Section 10.02.050.

Department: Regional Parks and Greenspaces

Presenters: Jim Desmond and Dan Kromer

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

Proposed Ordinance No. 04-1038 to be considered by the Metro Council will establish a new Metro Code Chapter 10.04 "Pioneer Cemeteries" to provide for the operation, management and maintenance of Metro's Pioneer Cemeteries in a manner closer to other publicly owned cemeteries in the region and state, while recognizing and preserving their unique and valuable heritage. The ordinance also repeals Metro Code Section 10.02.050 "Fees for Memorials and Cemeteries" and grants the Chief Operating Officer the authority to establish and enforce cemetery rules and set rates for graves and memorials. The proposed new Metro Code 10.04 is contained in Attachment A.

Presently the Metro Code contains no regulations directing the management of Metro's Pioneer Cemeteries. The regulations proposed in this ordinance will ensure that the Pioneer Cemeteries are managed in compliance with state law, are operated to maximize financial benefit and long term stability, are maintained as a community asset, and are appropriately protected and preserved in keeping with their historically significant nature. The ordinance vests authority to manage and operate these cemeteries in the Chief Operating Officer, who must establish rules consistent with the provisions of this ordinance to address management and maintenance issues such as: transferring grave licenses; multi-grave purchase issues; the placement of different types and shapes of headstones; installing fences, blocks and bricks to enclose graves; and the planting of flowers, trees and shrubs throughout the Pioneer Cemeteries.

Staff is recommending approval of the Ordinance No. 04-1038.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

- 1. <u>Approve the Ordinance</u>. Approval of the ordinance would establish Metro Code 10.04 governing Pioneer Cemeteries and repealing 10.02.050.
- 2. <u>Approve the Ordinance with changes</u>. Additional regulations could be added that expand the level of governance. Council could decide not to repeal section 10.02.050 and not allow the Chief Operating Officer this authority.
- 3. <u>Do not Approve the Ordinance</u>. Pioneer Cemeteries would be operated as they currently are without formal regulations to govern them.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Regional Parks and Greenspaces staff suggests that the Metro Council approves Ordinance No. 04-1038. The Ordinance will give guidance for the operation and management of Metro's Pioneer Cemeteries while establishing a level of consistency with other local publicly owned and managed cemeteries.

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Does the Metro Council wish to adopt regulations to govern Pioneer Cemeteries? If so, are these regulations adequate?

2. Ordinance No. 04-1038 repeals Metro Code Section 10.02.050 thus giving the authority to establish and periodically adjust rates for the sale of graves and niches and set fees for burial services to the Chief Operating Officer. This will make it possible to increase rates and fees commensurate with the market without amending the Metro Code in each instance.

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION X Yes No DRAFT IS ATTACHED X Yes No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval ______ Chief Operating Officer Approval

Attachment A

CHAPTER 10.04

PIONEER CEMETERIES REGULATIONS

SECTIONS	TITLE
10.04.010	Purpose
10.04.020	Policy
10.04.030	Operating Authority
10.04.040	Enforcement Authority/Cemetery Rules
10.04.050	Rates and Fees for Graves, Memorials and Services
10.04.060	Ejectment and Exclusion

10.04.010 Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to provide for the management and efficient operation, maintenance, protection and preservation of Metro's Pioneer Cemeteries.

10.04.020 Policy

The Council has determined that it is necessary to adopt these code provisions in order to ensure that Metro's Pioneer Cemeteries are managed in compliance with state law, are operated to maximize financial benefit and long term stability, are maintained as a community asset, and are appropriately protected and preserved in keeping with their historically significant nature.

10.04.030 Operating Authority

Management and operation of the Pioneer Cemeteries shall be by authority of the Chief Operating Officer, as delegated to the Parks Director.

10.04.040 Enforcement Authority/Cemetery Rules

Upon the direction of the Chief Operating Officer, the Parks Director shall establish Pioneer Cemeteries rules consistent with the provisions of this chapter (hereafter, "Pioneer Cemeteries Rules").

(a) The Pioneer Cemeteries Rules shall be in writing, filed with the Metro Council and available on Metro's internet website. Copies of the Pioneer Cemeteries Rules shall be available at the Pioneer Cemetery offices and shall be given to each grave or niche purchaser.

(b) Person(s) violating any Pioneer Cemeteries Rule shall be subject to exclusion or enforcement as set forth herein.

The enforcement of all provisions of this chapter, including but not limited to the authority to enforce any Pioneer Cemeteries rules established pursuant hereto, shall be by authority of the Chief Operating Officer, as delegated to the Parks Director.

10.04.050 Rates and Fees for Graves, Memorials and Services

(a) Upon the direction of the Chief Operating Officer, the Parks Director shall establish rates for the sale of graves and niches and shall set fees and charges for Pioneer Cemetery services, including burial and other required or optional services. Said rates, fees and charges shall be designed to recover all costs of operating the Pioneer Cemeteries and may be adjusted from time to time without notice, to reflect market rates and to ensure the solvency and financial stability of the Pioneer Cemeteries. Grave and Niche purchasers shall pay the rate, fees and surcharge on the date of purchase. No options to purchase Graves or Niches or other prospective rights to interment in the Pioneer Cemeteries shall be granted unless approved by resolution of the Metro Council setting forth the terms and conditions of said option or prospective right. Grave prices, fees and charges for services may vary among Pioneer Cemeteries, as determined by the Chief Operating Officer.

(b) A surcharge of 15% for each grave sold and 5% for each niche sold shall be charged and deposited in the Cemetery Perpetual Care Fund.

(c) Bulk grave rates shall be established for interment of wards of the Multnomah county conservator. Excepting the foregoing, bulk sales of Graves or Niches must be approved by a resolution of the Metro Council setting forth the terms and conditions of said bulk sales, including rates and the terms of resale. Bulk sales of Graves or Niches occurring prior to the effective date of this ordinance are exempt from this section.

(d) The Director may waive rates, fees and surcharges for grave sales and burial services in situations of extreme financial hardship. All waivers or exemptions shall be applied by written order setting forth the facts justifying the waiver or exemption

10.04.060 Ejectment, Exclusion, Citation and Arrest

Upon the authority of the Chief Operating Officer as delegated to the Parks Director, the Parks Director and authorized Parks personnel may:

(a) Eject and exclude from the Pioneer Cemeteries any person acting in violation of this chapter, the Pioneer Cemetery Rules, Metro Code Chapter 10.02 or the laws of the state of Oregon for a period of 30 days, or in case of repeated violations, permanently exclude said violators;

and/or

(b) Arrest or cite in lieu of arrest any person acting in violation of Metro Code Chapter 10.01 or the laws of the State of Oregon in the Pioneer Cemeteries

061504c-01

AGENDA

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736 TEL 503 797 1542 | FAX 503 797 1793



Agenda

MEETING:	METRO COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
DATE:	June 17, 2004
DAY:	Thursday
TIME:	2:00 PM
PLACE:	Metro Council Chamber

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

- 3. CONSENT AGENDA
- 3.1 Consideration of Minutes for the June 10, 2004 Metro Council Regular Meeting.

4. ORDINANCES – FIRST READING

4.1 **Ordinance No. 04-1038**, For the Purpose of Adding a New Chapter 10.04 "Pioneer Cemeteries" to Metro Code Title X – Regional Parks and Greenspaces providing for the Management of Metro's Pioneer Cemeteries And Repealing Metro Code Section 10.02.050.

5. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

5.1	Ordinance No. 04-1044B, For the Purpose of Adopting the Annual Budget For Fiscal-Year 2004-05, Making Appropriations, and Levying Ad Valorem Taxes, and Declaring an Emergency (<i>public hearing</i>).	Newman
5.2	Ordinance No. 04-1040A , For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary, The Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code to Increase the Capacity of the Boundary to Accommodate Growth in Industrial Employment <i>(discussion, no public hearing)</i> .	Park
5.3	Ordinance No. 04-1041, For the Purpose of Amending Metro's Regional Framework Plan to Better Protect the Region's Farm and Forest Land Industries and Land Base; and Declaring an Emergency. (discussion, no public hearing).	Hosticka

6. **RESOLUTIONS**

6.1	Resolution No. 04-3454 , For the Purpose of Adopting the Capital Improvement Plan For Fiscal Years 2004-05 Through 2008-09.	Monroe
6.2	Resolution No. 04-3457, For the Purpose of Making Recommendations to the Environmental Quality Commission of the State of Oregon Concerning the Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan.	Park
6.3	Resolution No. 04-3465 , For the Purpose of Adopting Comprehensive Financial Policies for Metro.	Park

7. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

ADJOURN

Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, Portland and Vancouver, Wash. Channel 30 (CityNet 30) -- Portland Channel 11 -- Community Access Network **Community Media** www.yourtvtv.org -- (503) 629-8534 www.pcatv.org -- (503) 288-1515 Sunday, June 20 at 8:30 p.m. Thursday, June 17 at 2 p.m. (live) Monday, June 21 at 2 p.m. **Washington County** Gresham Channel 30 -- TVTV Channel 30 -- MCTV www.yourtvtv.org -- (503) 629-8534 www.mctv.org -- (503) 491-7636 Saturday, June 19 at 11 p.m. Monday, June 21 at 2 p.m. Sunday, June 20 at 11 p.m. Tuesday, June 22 at 6 a.m. Wednesday, June 23 at 4 p.m. West Linn **Oregon City, Gladstone** Channel 30 -- Willamette Falls Television Channel 28 -- Willamette Falls Television www.wftvaccess.com -- (503) 650-0275 www.wftvaccess.com -- (503) 650-0275 Call or visit website for program times. Call or visit website for program times.

Television schedule for June 17, 2004 Metro Council Meeting

PLEASE NOTE: Show times are tentative and in some cases the entire meeting may not be shown due to length. Call or check your community access station web site to confirm program times.

Agenda items may not be considered in the exact order. For questions about the agenda, call Clerk of the Council, Chris Billington, 797-1542. Public Hearings are held on all ordinances second read and on resolutions upon request of the public. Documents for the record must be submitted to the Clerk of the Council to be considered included in the decision record. Documents can be submitted by email, fax or mail or in person to the Clerk of the Council. For additional information about testifying before the Metro Council please go to the Metro Website <u>www.metro-region.org</u> and click on public comment opportunities. For assistance per the American Disabilities Act (ADA), dial TDD 797-1804 or 797-1540 (Council Office) **RESOLUTION NO 04-3454**

.

02

0615046-

EXHIBIT B

Finance and Administrative Services

2											
Priorit	Project	Exp thru FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04 Budget	Total Prior Years	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-09	FY 2008-09	Grand Total	Funding Source
	Property Services									cruita rotar	i unung oource
B	Building Management Fund										
2	Metro Regional Center Roof Replacement	-		-	-	-	-	-	455 000	455 000	Fund Balance Capital Pesonio
3	Carpet Replacement			-	-	250,000	200.000	50,000	100,000	500,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
	Total Building Management Fund	2		-	-	250.000	200,000	50,000	455 000	955,000	and buildinge Gapital Reserve
S	Support Services Fund								100,000	000,000	
1	Copier Replacement in Print Shop	-	50,000	50,000	-	14	65,000	-		115 000	Cost Alloc Plan
4	Satellite copier replacement			Maria and an and	36.000	36 000	36,000	36,000	36,000	180,000	Cost Alloc Plan
	Total Support Service Fund	-	50,000	50,000	36.000	36,000	101 000	36,000	36,000	295,000	COSt Alloc Flatt
	Total Property Services	-	50,000	50.000	36,000	286.000	301 000	86,000	491 000	1 250,000	
					,	200,000		00,000	401,000	1,230,000	
А	Information Technology										
3	Replace/Acquire Deskton Computers	160 237	150 000	210 227	115 000	115 000	445 000	115 000			
-	Total All Funde	160,237	150,000	310,237	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	885,237	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
P	lanning Fund	100,237	150,000	310,237	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	885,237	
5	Regional Land Information System (RLIS)	706 025		706 005	20,000	20,000	70.000	05 000 1	05 000		
6	Travel Forecasting System Computer Replacement	710,666	89 200	700,025	17,000	20,000	70,000	35,000	25,000	886,025	Capital Lease/Enterprise Rev
	Total Planning Fund	1 416 691	89,200	1 505 801	17,000	142,500	127,000	25,000	57,000	1,148,366	Capital Lease/Enterprise Rev
S	upport Services Fund	1,410,001	03,200	1,303,631	47,000	142,500	197,000	60,000	82,000	2,034,391	
1	Г.			T	T				_		
	Server Management	149,965	132,000	281,965	84,000	313,000	80,000	126,000	98,000	982,965	Cost Alloc Plan/Cap. Lease/Cap Res.
2	Upgrade Network Infrastructure	143,208	25,000	168.208	55.000	55 000	25 000	55 000	25.000	383 208	Cost Alloc Plan/Can Lease/Can Pos
4	Upgrade of Business Enterprise Software (PeopleSoft)	-		-	50,000		50,000	50,000	20,000	150,000	Cost Allos Plan
7	Upgrade Desktop Operating Systems and Office Software	-		-		50,000				50,000	Cost Alloc Plan
	Total Support Services Fund	293,173	157,000	450,173	189.000	418,000	155 000	231 000	123 000	1 566 173	COST ANDE FIAIT
	Total Information Technology	1,870,101	396,200	2,266,301	351,000	675,500	467.000	406 000	320,000	4 485 901	
	Total Finance and Administrative Services	1,870,101	446,200	2,316,301	387,000	961,500	768.000	492,000	811.000	5 735 801	
						,	,		,	0,100,001	

Total FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09 3,419,500 Total Number of Projects 11

Yellow - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2004-05

Green - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2005-06 and beyond

RESOLUTION NO 04-3454

EXHIBIT B

Metro Exposition-Recreation Commission

riority		Exp thru FY	FY 2003-04	Total Prior		ALC: NO		is subjects	2 - 69-60	ALS ALS	Super- and the
	MERC Pooled Capital Fund	2002-03	Budget	Years	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-09	FY 2008-09	Grand Total	Funding Source
1	ASCH - West Entry Remodel		200,000	200,000	100.000						
2 *	ASCH - Carpet	-	200,000	200,000	180,000	-	-	-	-	380,000	City of Portland
3	ASCH - Main Street Tents			-	300,000	-			Martheau and -	300,000	Donation
4	ASCH - Dressing Tower Floweter	-		-	400,000	-	-	-	-	400,000	Donation
5	ASCH Earo Stago Lift Poplagement	-		-	-	-	100,000	-	-	100,000	City of Portland
6	ASCH - Fore Stage Lint Replacement				-	-	-	-	80,000	80,000	City of Portland
Ŭ	Tatal MEDO Dalla (1000)	-		-	÷	-	-	-	100,000	100,000	Donation
, I	MERC Pooled Capital Fund	-	200,000	200,000	880,000		100,000	-	180,000	1,360,000	
1	Keller, Batica Ungrades										
2 .	Keller - Politico Opgrades	-	110,000	110,000	95,000	-	-	-	-	205,000	Donation
2	Keller - Pit Litting System		100.000	-	100,000	1. Sec. 1. Sec				100,000	Donation
5			406,000	406,000	40,000	-	-	-	-	446,000	Donation
4	Keller - ASCH Fire Alarm Upgrade	-		-	۲.	-	150,000	-	-	150,000	Donation
5	Keller - Roof Replacement	÷			-	-	-	175,000	-	175,000	Donation
	Total MERC Pooled for Keller	-	516,000	516,000	235,000	-	150,000	175,000	-	1,076,000	
N N	MERC Pooled Capital Fund										
1 *	NTB (Winningstad) - Replace Seat Risers	÷		-	100,000	-	-		H.	100,000	Donation
2	NTB - Stage Floor Replacement (Newmark Theatre)	-		-	12	100,000	-	-	-	100.000	Donation
3	NTB - Interior Painting	-		-		300,000	-			300,000	Donation
	Total MERC Pooled for NTB	-			100,000	400,000	-	-	-	500,000	
N	MERC Pooled Capital Fund										
1	OCC - Expansion	114,748,698	1,825,000	116,573,698	450,000					117 023 698	Bond/Fund Balance Can Reserve
2	OCC - Replace Sound Proofing in Oregon Ballroom	-		-	55,000	Contraction of the last				55,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
3	OCC - Video Signage System			-	266,750					266,750	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
4	OCC - Garbage Compactors	14		-	-	70 000				70,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
5	OCC - Replace Glass-Ext Canopies, MLK & Holladay	-			-	65.000	-			65,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
6	OCC - Six Foot Round Tables	-		-	-	-	150 000			150,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
7	OCC - Resurface Exhibit Hall Moveable Partitions	-		-		2	-	150,000		150,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
	Total MERC Pooled for OCC	116,573,698	116,573,698	116,573,698	771 750	135 000	150,000	150,000		117 780 448	rund balance Capital Reserve
Ν	/IERC Pooled Capital Fund						100,000	100,000		117,700,440	2
1	Expo - Parking Lot Maintenance		40,000	40,000	50.000	50,000	50 000	50,000	50,000	290.000	Fund Balance Capital Posonio
2	Expo - In-House Electrical		-		750 000	00,000	55,500	00,000	50,000	750,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
	Total MERC Pooled for EXPO	-	40,000	40.000	800,000	50,000	50,000	50.000	50,000	1 040 000	rund balarice Capital Reserve
	Total MERC	116,573,698	117,329,698	117,329,698	2,786,750	585,000	450,000	375,000	230,000	121,756,448	

Total FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09

Total Number of Projects

4,426,750

23

Yellow - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2004-05

Green - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2005-06 and beyond

* These projects were in prior-year CIPs, but not last year's.

RESOLUTION NO 04-3454

EXHIBIT B

_		Oregon Zoo									
Priority	Project	Exp thru FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04 Budget	Total Prior Years	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-09	FY 2008-09	Grand Total	Funding Source
G	eneral Revenue Bond Fund (Zoo)										
15	Washington Park Parking Lot Renovation	4,376,576	-	4,376,576	178,988	-	-	-	-	4,555,564	Donations/Fund Bal Cap Reserve
	Total General Revenue Bond Fund	4,376,576	-	4,376,576	178,988	-	-	-	-	4,555,564	
Z	oo Capital Projects Fund										
1	Introduction to the Forest & Remote Forest (GNW V)	-	-	-	2,200,000	-	2,500,000	-	-	4,700,000	Donations/Fund Bal Cap Reserve
2	Lion Exhibit	-	-	-	-	1,900,000	-	-5	-	1,900,000	Donations
3	California Condor Captive Breeding Facility	-	1,200,000	1,200,000	800,000	1,000,000		-		3,000,000	Donations
4	Refurbish Tree Tops Area	-	-	-	-	400,000	-	-	-	400,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
6	Insect Zoo	-	-	-1	-	H	250,000	-		250,000	Donations
7	Primate Building	724,414	-	724,414	-	-	-	500,000	500,000	1,724,414	Donations/Fund Bal Cap Reserve
8	Admission Ticketing System Upgrade	-	-		-	200,000	-	-	· -	200,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
9	Steller Cove Upgrades		-	-	-	100,000	•	-		100,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
10	AfriCafe Terrace Permanent Cover	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	н.	100,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
11	Administration Building Upgrades	-	-	-	-	-	-	135,000	~	135,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
12	Cascade Grill and Sunset Room Remodel		-	-	-	14		100,000	-	100,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
13	Elephant Museum renovation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	100,000	Donations
	Total Zoo Capital Projects Fund	724,414	1,200,000	1,924,414	3,000,000	3,600,000	2,850,000	735,000	600,000	12,709,414	1
Z	oo Operating Fund										
14	Elevator Replacements	-	-	-			90,000	-	-	90,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
	Total Zoo Operating Fund	-	-	-	-	19	90,000			90,000	
	Total Zoo	5,100,990	1,200,000	6,300,990	3,178,988	3,600,000	2,940,000	735,000	600,000	17,354,978	1

Total FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09

```
11,053,988
Total Number of Projects
                                   14
```

Yellow - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2004-05

Green - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2005-06 and beyond

Green - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2005-06 and beyond

	Regional Parks and Green Regional Parks and Greenspaces										
Priority	Project	Exp thru FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04 Budget	Total Prior Years	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-09	FY 2008-09	Grand Total	Eunding Source
	Open Spaces Fund								112000-00	oruna rotar	running source
1	Open Spaces Land Acquisition	124,414,468	2,124,510	126,538,978	3,096,940	-	-	-		129 635 918	GO Bonds/Interest/Donations
	Total Open Spaces Fund	124,414,468	2,124,510	126,538,978	3,096,940	-	-	-	-	129,635,918	Se Bendennerees Benderens
	Regional Parks Fund										1
1	M. James Gleason Boat Ramp Renovation Phase I & II	756,540	-	756,540	300,000	9,000	600,000	6,000	-	1.671.540	Grants/ Fund Bal Capital Reserve
2	Oxbow Park - Picnic Shelters & Restrooms	380,000	-	380,000	30,000					410,000	
3	Blue Lake Park - Lakefront Enhancement	213,884		213,884	25,000					238,884	1
4	Mt. Talbert Development				150,000	1,341,600			Sul a Streke	1,491,600	Excise Tax
5	Wilsonville Tract Development				75,000	825,000	684,750		CONTRACTOR OF	1,584,750	Excise Tax
6	Cooper Mountain Park Development						150,000	650,000	780,000	1,580,000	Excise Tax
7	Three Bridges on the Springwater					4,691,000	-	-	Real and a second second	4,691,000	Grants/Government Contribution
8	Trolley Trail Engineering & Construction - Phase I		-	-	-	342,209	673,750	-		1.015,959	Grants/Local Share
9	Glendoveer Golf Course Fence Repair	-	-	-	90,000				-	90,000	Excise Tax
10	Gales Creek/Tualatin River Convluence Project		-	- 10 C	367,740					367,740	Grants/Donations
11	Road Resurfacing		-	-	255,000	1				255,000	Excise Tax
12	Water Play Area - Blue Lake Park	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	-	1	140,000		2. C. 1. C		100 M 100 M	140,000	Grants/Fund Bal Capital Reserve
13	M James Gleason Boat Ramp - Phase III	-	-			-	-	-	700,000	700,000	Grants/Fund Bal Capital Reserve
	Total Regional Parks Fund	1,350,424		1,350,424	1,432,740	7,208,809	2,108,500	656,000	1,480,000	14,236,473	
	Smith and Bybee Lakes Fund										1
1	Smith & Bybee Lakes Facility Improvements	80,714	22,536	103,250	801,349			-	-	904,599	Grants/Gov Cont/Fund Balance
	Total Smith and Bybee Lakes Fund	80,714	22,536	103,250	801,349	-	-	-	-	904,599	
	Total Regional Parks	125,845,606	2,147,046	127,992,652	5,331,029	7,208,809	2,108,500	656,000	1,480,000	144,776,990	1
	Total FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09 16,784,338 Yellow - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2004-05 Total Number of Projects 15 Green - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2005-06 and beyond										

Adopted CIP handout for Council and for Reso.xls Total Project Summary by Ye (2)

÷

EXHIBIT B

		Solid Waste	and Recycling	Solid Waste	and Recyclin	g					
Priority	Project	Exp thru FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04 Budget	Total Prior Years	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-09	FY 2008-09	Grand Total	Funding Source
5	Solid Waste General Account									onand rotal	i unung oource
1	Metro South- Relocate Latex Paint Operations	Ξ.	-	-	320,000	-	-	-	-	320,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
2	Metro South- Latex Bldg/Public Lunch Room Conversion	-	10,000	10,000	50,000	-	-	-	-	60.000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
3	Metro Central - Expansion of Hazardous Waste Facility	47,000	-	47,000	150,000	150,000	-	(A)	-	347,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
4	Metro South - Install High Capacity Baler	ша,		÷	50,000	400,000	325,000	-	-	775,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
5	Metro Central - Office Addition	-	-	-	19,000	106,000	-	-	-	125,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
6	Metro Central - Woodroom Improvements	~	20,000	20,000	216,000	-	-		-	236,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
7	Metro Central - Seismic Cleanup		A STREET, STREET, ST	1011 J. 1011 P.	25,000	175,000	Collection of the last	-		200,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
8	Metro South - Wood Processing Capacity	÷	-	-	60,000	595,000	150,000	-	-	805,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
9	Metro Central - Chimney Removal	-	-		-	10,000	165,000	-	-	175,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
10	Metro South- Install Compactor for Public Unloading Area		-	-	-	-	200,000	680,000	-	880,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
11	Metro Central - Install New Scale at Scalehouse "C"	-	-		-	25,000	252,000	-		277,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
12	Metro Central - Rainwater Harvesting	-	-	-	-	-	310,000		-	310,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
13	Future Master Facility Plan Improvements	-	-	~	-	-		400,000	1,000,000	1,400,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
	Total Solid Waste Operating Account	47,000	30,000	77,000	890,000	1,461,000	1,402,000	1,080,000	1,000,000	5,910,000	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Solid Waste Landfill Closure										1
1	St. John's - Leachate Pretreatment	224,074	195,000	419,074	105,000	-		-	-	524,074	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
2	St. John's - Groundwater Monitoring Wells	-	-	-	200,000	10,800	-	-	-	210,800	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
3	St Johns - Perimeter Dike Stabilization & Seepage Control	1,578	-	1,578	60,000	211,000	442,000	6,000	6,000	726,578	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
4	St. John's - Re-establish Proper Drainage	54,482	550,000	604,482	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	252,000	876,482	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
5	St. John's - Landfill Bridge Repairs		-		-	30,000	120,000	-	-	150,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
6	St. Johns Landfill Remediation	-	-		-	-	500,000	500,000	500,000	1,500,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
1	St. John's - Native Vegetation on the Cover Cap	82,752	5,000	87,752	15,000	15,000	10,000	15,000	10,000	152,752	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
	Total Solid Waste Landfill Closure Account	362,886	750,000	1,112,886	385,000	271,800	1,077,000	526,000	768,000	4,140,686	
	W Renewal & Replacement Account										1
1	Metro South - Convert Mechanical Room to Lockers	-	37,000	37,000	320,000	-		÷	-	357,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
2	Metro Central - Rebuild Compactor No. 2		a hand a star		400,000	÷		AGE OF THE REAL		400,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
3	Metro Central - Replace Compactor #2 Feed Conveyor	-	-	-	385,000	-	~		-	385,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
4	Metro South - Install Sidewalk on Washington Street	-	-	-	250,000		-	-	-	250,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
5	Metro Central - Replace Compactor #3 Feed Conveyor	14	-	-	59,000	325,000		-	-	384,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
6	Metro Central - Woodline	-	-	-	-	400,000	472,000	-	-	872,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
1	Replace Computer Network Components	-	-			67,000	67,000	-	-	134,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
8	Metro Central - Truckwash			-	-	30,000	150,000		-	180,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
9	Metro South - Compactor Replacement	-	-		-		150,000	750,000	750,000	1,650,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
10	Metro South - Repair Commercial Tip Floor	-	-	-	-	-	-	197,900	-	197,900	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
11	Metro Central-HHW- Ventilation System Replacement		-	-	-		-	-	100,000	100,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
12	Metro South-Replace Dust Suppression Sys Components		-	-	-	1.1.1.1.1.1.1	-	-	50,000	50,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
13	Metro South- Replace Ventilation System Components	-	-	-	-	-		100 Inc. 100	100,000	100,000	Fund Balance Capital Reserve
	Total Solid Waste Renewal & Replacement	-	37,000	37,000	1,414,000	822,000	839,000	947,900	1,000,000	5,059,900	
	Total Solid Waste and Recycling	409,886	817,000	1,226,886	2,689,000	2,554,800	3,318,000	2,553,900	2,768,000	15,110,586	

Total FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09

Total Number of Projects

13,883,700

33

Yellow - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2004-05 Green - new projects budgeted to begin in FY 2005-06 and beyond

Grand Total Metro	249,800,281	121,989,944	255,166,527	14,372,767	14,910,109	9,584,500	4,811,900	5,889,000	304,734,803
Total FY 2004-05 through FY 2008-09	49,568,276								
Total Number of Projects	96								





N.S	Portland CO Maintenance Plan					
DEQ	Existing Plan	Proposal				
	Vehicle Inspection Program (enhanced test)	Modify				
	Transportation Control Measures	Continue/Modify				
	Wintertime Oxygenated Fuel	Eliminate?				
	Industrial Source Permits	Continue BACT & Growth Allowance (No Offsets)				
	Federal rules for motor vehicles, non-road engines	Continue				

CO Plan Sched	lule
TPAC Final Review	May 28, 2004
JPACT Final Review	June 10, 2004
Metro Council Recommendation	June 17, 2004
Draft Plan Available for Public Review	Aug. 16, 2004
Public Hearing	Sept. 16, 2004
EQC Plan Adoption	Dec. 10, 2004
EPA Approval (Federal Register)	Aug. 2005?
Effective Date for CO Plan and Budget	Nov. 2005?
Related Air Quality Issues: •Ozone Maintenance Plan Fall/Wir •Portland Air Toxics Assessment Summer	nter 2004/2005



TPAC Recommendations

Draft Metro Resolution:

- Transportation Control Measures (Resolution Items 1 & 2)
- CO Emissions Budget (Item 3)
- Growth Allowance (Item 4)
- · Subregions (Item 5)





Contraction of the second seco	C	CO Emissio	ons Budge	ets
<u>1301</u>	Year	2005	2010	2017
	Forecast	1,226,312	975,074	804,181
	Budget	1,238,575 (1% over forecast)	1,033,578 (6% over forecast)	1,181,341 (47% over forecast)



CO Emissions Budget Recommendations

- Emissions Budgets for 2005 and 2010
 1% per year above forecast
- Emission Budget for 2017 is 1% per year above forecast, PLUS 1.5% annual growth for an additional 20 years
 - Accommodates high growth projections (until 2037)
 - Avoids future conformity problems



DEQ

CO Subregion Recommendations

Resolution proposes discontinuing CO Emissions Budgets for existing subregions

- · Portland Central Business District
- 82nd Ave. (Division to Woodstock)
 - Not needed for air quality protectionAdministrative burden



Oxygenated Fuel Requirement

- Originally required by Clean Air Act to meet CO standard
- No longer needed to meet air quality health standards
- · Potential additional fuel cost
- · Applies intermittently (winter only)
- Requires \$2500 permits for 13 fuel terminals, \$250 permits for 24 fuel distributors
- Small reduction in vehicle mileage
- · Concern that MTBE may displace Ethanol



Oxygenated Fuel Benefits

- Air Quality benefits using Ethanol
 Reduces CO (about 5%)
 - Reduces Air Toxics
 - Reduces Greenhouse Gases
- Renewable Resource
- Contributes to Energy Independence



Fact Sheet

Oxygenated Fuel in Portland

DEQ seeks input on continuing oxygenated fuel in the Portland area

DEQ is consulting with interested groups to determine if oxygenated fuel should remain in the carbon monoxide (CO) air quality plan for the Portland area. DEQ has determined that oxygenated fuel (oxyfuel) is not needed to meet federal air standards for CO. Oxyfuel provides reductions of carbon monoxide, air toxics and greenhouse gases.

Background

From the 1970s to the early 1990s, the Portland area failed to meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for CO. After the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, Portland and other carbon monoxide "non-attainment" areas were required to use oxygenated fuels during the coldest months of the year. DEQ implemented these rules in 1992 to reduce carbon monoxide emissions by providing extra oxygen molecules in the area's fuel, allowing vehicles to achieve more complete combustion. The two most common fuel additives that meet the oxygenate requirements are ethanol and methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE). Currently, ethanol is the only additive used in Oregon; however, in the past, MTBE was used sporadically across the state.

Current conditions

Carbon monoxide concentrations in the Portland area are now approximately half the level that air quality standards allow and are expected to remain low into the foreseeable future. Cars will continue to be built with more effective catalytic converters and computerized engine controls that optimize combustion without extra oxygen.

Benefits of oxygenated fuel

Oxyfuel continues to lower total CO emissions by about 5%, and also reduces the relative toxicity of motor vehicle emissions by a similar amount. Ethanol in fuel also decreases greenhouse gas emissions, although estimates of that benefit vary widely. In addition, ethanol is a renewable energy source and contributes to the nation's energy independence. Ethanol is produced from corn and other grains, so its use as fuel strengthens agricultural markets.

Disadvantages of oxygenated fuel

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency data show oxygenated fuel lowers vehicle mileage

about 2%; however, many drivers claim the decrease in mileage is greater.

Representatives of the petroleum industry indicate the oxygenated fuel requirement increases the consumer cost up to 3¢ per gallon. However, fuel suppliers earn a 52¢ per gallon subsidy (in the form of a federal tax credit) for each gallon of ethanol blended into gasoline. With this subsidy, the ethanol industry claims that oxygenated fuel is about 1.5¢ per gallon cheaper than conventional gasoline. Some fuel suppliers in the Portland area provide oxyfuel throughout the year.

Industry fees support administration of the oxygenated fuel program. Annual permit fees are \$2500 for each of 13 fuel terminals and \$250 for each for 24 fuel distributors.

There is concern that retaining the oxyfuel requirement may increase use of MTBE as a gasoline oxygenate in Oregon, as MTBE has been banned in California and Washington. Ingestion of MTBE-contaminated drinking water or inhalation of combustion by-products of MTBE increases the risk of contracting cancer. However, the oil refineries that produce Portland's fuel no longer make MTBE and the compound is banned from the pipeline that delivers the vast majority of fuel to the area.

Oxyfuel in the future

Given the significant drop in CO concentrations in the Portland area, DEQ has determined that oxyfuel is not needed to meet the CO standards. DEQ is preparing a new plan to show how the Portland area will continue to meet the CO standard through 2017. DEQ is consulting with government agencies and affected stakeholders on the merits of removing oxyfuel requirements. The new Portland Area CO Maintenance Plan will be available for review and public comment from Aug. 16 through Sept. 7, 2004. DEQ will report comments received to the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission along with a recommendation on whether to keep oxyfuel in the CO plan. The Commission is expected to meet in early December 2004 to consider adoption of the plan.

For more information

Contact Dave Nordberg, Air Quality Planning, Portland, (503) 229-5519 (toll-free in Oregon at 1-800-452-4011, ext. 5519).



State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Air Quality Division 811 SW 6th Avenue Portland, OR 97204 Phone: (503) 229-5359 (800) 452-4011 Fax: (503) 229-5675 Contact: Dave Nordberg www.deq.state.or.us

Alternative formats Alternative formats of this document (Braille, large type, etc.) can be made available. Contact DEQ's Office of Communications & Outreach, Portland, for more information at (503) 229-5696 (toll-free at 1-800-452-4011, ext. 5696)

Last Updated: 6/8/04 By: D. Nordberg DEQ 04-AQ-002

061504c-04

- The following four trail projects serve both recreational and commuter purposes.
- They are on Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Greenspaces Master Plan Regional Trails System, and Local Trail Plans.
- Two of the trail corridors are located in older developed areas, and two are in areas, which will be developing over the coming years, so there is a great opportunity to plan for the trails.

Lake Oswego to Milwaukie and Trolley Trail

Description

The proposed 2.5 mile trail would provide a multi-use path connecting downtown Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, the Trolley Trail and the Oak Grove neighborhood. Currently, there is no bike/ped crossing of the Willamette River between the Sellwood Bridge and the old West Linn to Oregon City Bridge.

The study would determine the feasibility of crossing the Willamette River by utilizing an existing railroad bridge. The bike/ped walkway could be similar to the trail attached to the Steel Bridge in Portland. After crossing the river, the proposed trail would have two routes: continuing north in the railroad corridor to downtown Milwaukie and the future transit center / MAX line; and south to the Trolley Trail at SE Courtney Rd.

Connections

- Terwilliger Trail
- Hillsdale to Lake Oswego Trail (proposed)
- · Willamette Shoreline "Rail with Trail" and Streetcar
- Trolley Trail (final design and engineering to start in Fall '04)
- Lake Oswego Riverfront Park (under construction)
- Lake Oswego Town Center
- Milwaukie Town Center
- Future MAX Line to downtown Milwaukie
- Oak Grove Old Town Business Area
- Major Retirement Centers on the East Side of the River

Partners

- Metro Parks and Greenspaces
- City of Lake Oswego
- City of Milwaukie
- Clackamas County
- North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District (NCPRD)

Funding Request

MTIP	\$100,000
Local	10,000
Total	\$110,000

Sullivan's Gulch / I-84 Trail

Description

The proposed 5.5 mile multi-use trail along the north side of I-84 would connect the central city to the Lloyd District, Hollywood and Gateway districts, city of Maywood Park, all the MAX stations, two major transit centers and the I-205 Bikeway. A transit oriented residential development (TOD) at NE 60th Ave. along I-84 is literally just across the freeway from the trail. The trail has been cited as an amenity for the planned future redevelopment of the Albina Fuel site at NE 33rd. The Hollywood West Fred Meyer is also adjacent to the trail. Many other infill, underutilized and vacant buildings and redevelopment opportunities are adjacent to the trail corridor. The development of these areas would literally bring the neighborhoods closer to the trail and make it more useful, friendly and safer.

The Sullivan's Gulch Trail would serve as an East-West Path in the Heart of the Region and be the Springwater Corridor for northeast Portland. More than 39,000 people live within one-half mile of the corridor, as well as 100,000 employees. Major employment centers include downtown Portland, the Lloyd District and Providence Medical Center.

The trail would also serve as the spine of a transportation network of light trail trains, bus lines, and streets with bike lanes. Inter-modal connections are at almost every intersection above the trail. In addition, the freeway has served as a physical barrier to the neighborhoods on either side of it. The Sullivan's Gulch Trail would bring the neighborhoods together.

The master plan would follow up on the work of a team of Portland State University graduate students. The PSU Team completed a trail feasibility study in June 2004. Along with assistance from an undergraduate engineering class, a potential trail alignment was determined. The trail is feasible, but will be a difficult project. That is why the next step needed is the detailed master planning process. This process would include a boundary survey, engineering work and analysis, environmental studies, and analysis of soil conditions, right-of-way analysis, real estate negotiations with adjacent property owners and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), securing trail easements, making cost estimates for trail construction (e.g. cantilevered trail, retaining walls, type of surface and trail amenities), and developing a trail maintenance plan. An extensive public outreach and citizen involvement process would also need to be undertaken.

Connections

- Downtown Portland / Central City
- Rose Quarter and Transit Center
- Oregon Convention Center
- Lloyd District
- Government Center (Metro, TriMet, State and Federal)
- Hollywood District
- Gateway District and Transit Center
- I-205 Bikeway
- Maywood Park
- Providence Medical Center
- MAX Line
- Neighborhoods on both sides of the freeway

Partners

- Metro Parks and Greenspaces
- City of Portland Parks and Recreation
- Portland Department of Transportation
- Neighborhood Associations in the Corridor

Funding Request

MTIP	\$350,000
Local	35,000
Total	\$385,000

Tonquin Trail

Description

The proposed 19-mile trail would provide a multi-use path connecting the cities of Wilsonville, Tualatin and Sherwood. Upon completion of the bike/ped bridge in the next two to three years over the Tualatin River, the Tonquin Trail will be connected to the Fanno Creek Greenway Trail and the cities of Tigard and Durham. Major private developments along the trail route will include the Ville Bois project and future industrial lands. Key public open spaces (e.g. Metro's Graham Oaks Natural Area (a.k.a. Wilsonville Tract), other Metro open spaces, Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge, Cedar Creek Greenway Trail, historic Kolk ponds, and parks and natural areas in Sherwood and Tualatin.

The master plan would follow up on a trail feasibility study scheduled to be completed in July 2004. This initial study identified potential trail routes and alignments, which will require further planning analysis and refinement. The trail was determined to be quite feasible. Additional planning work needs to be completed to determine how the trail would follow the BPA power line corridors, the ODOT owned rail line which will serve as the Westside Commuter route, and other public right-of-ways such as streets, and water/sewer line corridors. As the final gaps in the trail alignment are determined, more detailed planning activities will be required to determined trail widths, surface materials, signage, street crossings, etc. In addition, an extensive public involvement process would need to begin.

Metro and the city of Wilsonville will begin the design for the trail and its construction on the Graham Oaks Natural Area in the near future. Costa Pacific Communities has determined the trail alignment for its property. Wilsonville, Tualatin and Sherwood have or are updating their trails and parks plans to allow for the future Tonquin Trail. Transportation planners have included the trail concept in the I-5 to 99W Connector Study and the Boeckman Rd. extension. Land use planners will allow for the trail to be studied in the concept plans for the industrial lands expansion areas.

The Tonquin Trail has been included in all of these major projects, which are on the horizon during the next two to five years. We are at a key juncture to realize this major regional trail. We have the opportunity to plan the trail before the development occurs.

Connections

- Wilsonville Town Center
- Tualatin Town Center

- Sherwood Town Center
- Ville Bois Development
- Boeckman Rd. Extension
- Industrial Lands Expansion
- I-5 to 99W Connector
- Various Metro Open Spaces
- Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge
- Sherwood Water and Sewer Line Corridors
- Fanno Creek Greenway Trail and Bike/Ped bridge over Tualatin River (to be built)
- Tigard and Durham
- Powerline Trail
- Westside Commuter Rail

Partners

- Metro Parks and Greenspaces
- City of Wilsonville
- City of Tualatin
- City of Sherwood
- Clackamas County
- Washington County
- Costa Pacific Communities

Funding Request

MTIP	\$	70,000
Local	_	7,000
Total	\$	77,000

Mt. Scott - Scouter Mt. Loop Trail

Description

The proposed 13-mile trail would serve as a loop trail linking major regional trails and greenspaces, as well as a regional center and key employment center, Kaiser Hospital and Medical Center, and the future urbanized areas of Pleasant Valley and Damascus. The city of Happy Valley is also developing in a rapid manner, and the designation of a trail alignment will allow for its planning and implementation, including the allocation of local system development charge fees. Happy Valley wants to connect to the future developments around it and to other regional parks and trails outside of its city limits.

Key planning studies in the immediate area of the trail are the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan, Damascus Concept Plan, and Sunrise Corridor study.

The trail alignment study and master plan will provide the unique opportunity for the trail to be planned before the development occurs.

Connections

- Mt. Talbert
- Mt. Scott Creek
- Springwater Corridor Trail

- East Buttes Area
- East Buttes Powerline Corridor Trail (proposed)
- Clackamas River Greenway
- Clackamas Regional Center
- Pleasant Valley
- Damascus
- Sunrise Corridor

Partners **Partners**

- Metro Parks and Greenspaces
- City of Happy Valley
- Clackamas County
- North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District
- City of Portland

Funding Request

MTIP	\$ 70,000
Local	7,000
Total	\$ 77,000

For more Information and Questions:

Mel Huie, Regional Trails Coordinator Metro Parks and Greenspaces (503) 797-1731 or huiem@metro.dst.or.us

M:\rpg\parks\staff\huiem\TRAILS\MTIP\Trail Alignment Studies June 04.doc