# Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee

Meeting Notice and Agenda:

Special Trails Meeting February 14, 2001 1 to 3 p.m. Metro Regional Center, rm 370

#### AGENDA

1:00 - 1:15 pm (15 min.) Presentation: Goal 5 inventory update Paul Ketcham, Metro Growth Management

1:15 – 1:30 pm (15 min.) Presentation: Performance Measures Gerry Uba, Metro Growth Management

1:30 - 3:00 pm (90 min.) Discussion and Possible Action Item: Regional Trails & Greenways - Proposed changes to Regional Trails & Greenways Plan map Mel Huie, Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

#### Next GTAC meeting: Wednesday, March 14, 1 to 3 p.m. at Metro

#### **Existing Regional Trails**

- Trails which have been built and are open to the public, and
- Generally these trails are multi-use (e.g. pedestrians, bicyclists, skateboarders, in-line skaters, and equestrian (where allowed). Some trails may be in environmentally sensitive areas though, thus only allowing pedestrians. These designations are locally determined.
- Surfaces of the trails are generally asphalt, chip seal, boardwalk or concrete. In environmentally sensitive areas, soft surfaces (e.g. bark dust) or compacted dirt or gravel may be the trail surface. (Permeable surfaces should be used if possible.<sup>\*</sup>) The selection of the surface material is a local decision.
- Accessibility to the trails for everyone, including people with disabilities, should be encouraged.<sup>\*</sup>

#### **Proposed Regional Trails**

- Trails which are still in the conceptual stage, and
- Descriptions for use and surfaces are the same as for existing regional trails.

#### **Regional Greenways**

- Greenways generally follow riparian corridors, and
- Greenways may or may not provide for public access.
  - In some cases, greenways may be a swath of green (plants and trees) with no public access, or
  - In other cases, greenways may allow for an environmentally compatible trail, viewpoint or access point, or boat/canoe launch sites.

#### **Proposed Greenways**

- Greenways which are still in the conceptual stage.
- When public access is provided (e.g. trail, boardwalk, viewpoint, boat ramp, etc.) descriptions for uses are the same as for regional greenways.

#### **River Trails**

- Trails that are actually in the water body (including necessary portages). Canoes, boats, rafts are used to traverse the trail.
- Public access points (e.g. boat / canoe launch sites) should be available.
- The Tualatin River is a good example of a river trail.

#### Inter-Regional Trails

• Trails connecting the Metro region to other areas (e.g. Clark Co., Columbia River Gorge, Mt. Hood National Forest, Pacific Coast, Willamette Valley, etc.)

#### **Off-Road Trails**

• Metro Parks and Greenspaces, Portland Parks and Portland Department of Transportation staff have been assigned to come up with a comprehensive and clear definition.

#### Note

Generally, "proposed trails" and "proposed greenways" are conceptual alignments. Potential alignments would need to be thoroughly studied. Public involvement and local governmental review would be necessary prior to any final alignment designation. All necessary permits would need to be obtained before trail construction could begin.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*</sup> Comments from a Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District board member on 2/06/01.

I:\PARKS\LONGTERM\Open Spaces\HUIEM\G. Protection Plan\glossary of terms.doc

Regional Trails and Greenways Plan Criteria for Determining Regionally Significant Trails and Greenways adopted by Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee, Jan. 10, 2001

The Greenspaces Master Plan, which was adopted in July 1992 by the Metro Council, included a regional trails and greenways component and map. This map is proposed to be incorporated into Metro's new Greenspaces Protection Plan as the regional trails and greenways component. The existing and proposed 35 trails and greenways from the 1992 master plan will be grandfathered into the new Greenspaces Protection Plan.

The following is the screening process used to add additional trails and greenways to the Greenspaces Protection Plan. Both levels must be met before a new trail could be added.

Amendments to the regional trails and greenways component of the Greenspaces Protection Plan can be made whenever the plan is updated. In addition, amendments can be made by Metro Council action.

The following is the screening process used to add new trails and greenways to the Greenspaces Protection Plan. Both levels must be met before a new trail or greenway could be added.

#### First Level to Be Met

Trail or greenway must be primarily off-road (e.g. at least 75% of the trail's length).

Trails primarily in the public street right-of-way (e.g. bike lane on the side of a street) or on a sidewalk are addressed by the regional bike and pedestrian systems in Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

If the first level is met, then at least three of the following second level criteria must also be met:

#### Second Level to Be Met

#### Criteria for Regional Significance (at least three must be applicable)

- A. Located along the Willamette Greenway state of Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) goal
- B. Multi-jurisdictional, including Washington State
- C. Connects regionally significant parks and greenspaces
- D. Connects to other regionally significant trails (e.g. forms a loop system of trails)
- E. Connects regional centers, town centers, industrial areas and light-rail station areas
- F. Connects to or through significant habitat areas, wildlife corridors or other publicly-owned LCDC Goal 5 resources (e.g. historical and scenic sites)

I:\PARKS\LONGTERM\Open Spaces\HUIEM\G. Protection Plan\criteria for regional significance.doc

#### Regional Trails and Greenways Plan

**Proposed Additions to the Regional Trails and Greenways Plan Map** approved by Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee, Jan. 10, 2001

These four corridors have been previously discussed at GTAC meetings during the past year.

#### Trail Descriptions

- The trails are conceptual only.
- Exact alignments have not been determined. Alignments would need to be thoroughly studied (e.g. feasibility study).
- Public involvement and local governmental review would be necessary prior to any alignment designation.
- They have been discussed at previous GTAC meetings. No action was taken.

**North Willamette River Greenway Trail** – a six-mile multi-use trail adjacent to the eastbank of the Willamette River between the Steel Bridge and the St. Johns Bridge in Portland. The trail would connect to the Eastbank Esplanade and OMSI to Springwater Corridor Trail, Tom McCall Waterfront Trail, Peninsula Crossing Trail, 40-Mile Loop (Marine Dr.) and the proposed Sullivan's Gulch/Banfield/I-84 Corridor Trail.

The trail would connect Downtown Portland to the Oregon Convention Center, Rose Quarter Entertainment District, Lloyd District, and St. Johns Main Street/Business District. The trail would connect Waterfront Park to Willamette Cove and Smith and Bybee Lakes Natural Area.

<u>Meets these Regional Criteria</u>: A, C, D, E

**Willamette Trolley Shoreline Trail** – a seven-mile "Rail with Trail" corridor along the westbank of the Willamette River between downtown Lake Oswego and River Place in downtown Portland. A consortium of governments (e.g. Portland, Lake Oswego, Tri-Met, Metro, etc.) currently owns most of the corridor for transit use. An excursion trolley currently runs in the corridor. The Consortium plans to carry out a "Rail with Trail" feasibility study in the near future if funding can be obtained.

The trail connects to Tom McCall Waterfront Trail, OMSI to Springwater Corridor Trail (at the Sellwood Bridge), 40-Mile Loop at Terwilliger in Lake Oswego, and the proposed Willamette Greenway Trail between Lake Oswego and West Linn (major segments in Lake Oswego are currently being designed and built).

The trail would be the region's second "Rail with Trail" project, offering multi-modes of transportation without using a car (e.g. walk, bike, transit). The corridor would connect the downtowns of Portland and Lake Oswego.

Tryon Creek State Park would be connected to the Willamette Greenway.

<u>Meets these Regional Criteria</u>: A, B, C, D, E **East Buttes Loop Trail** – a ten-mile trail system in east Multhomah County connecting regionally significant greenspaces purchased by Metro and the cities of Gresham and Portland on and around the east buttes. Metro has purchased 408 acres of open space adjacent or near the proposed loop trail. The loop trail system would connect to the Springwater Corridor Trail, Powell Butte Nature Park, Jenne Butte, Gresham Butte, Butler Ridge, Hogan Cedars / Ambleside and Gabbert Hill.

The trail would also provide connections to Clackamas County via the Springwater Corridor and proposed Scouter Mt. Trail.

Adjacent segments of the proposed corridor could provide habitat areas for wildlife corridors.

<u>Meets these Regional Criteria</u>: B, C, D, F

**Sullivan's Gulch / Banfield / I-84 Corridor Trail** – a sixteen-mile urban trail which would parallel I-84 from the Willamette River in Portland to the planned Gresham-Fairview Trail. The proposed trail would connect the Eastbank Esplanade Trail and proposed N. Willamette River Greenway Trail to the I-205 Bike/Ped. Trail and east to the Gresham-Fairview Trail. Between the river and I-205 the trail would be on the north side of the freeway, MAX Light Rail Line and Union Pacific Railroad Line. East of I-205, the trail would be on the south side of the freeway connecting to an existing trail along the freeway.

The trail would provide a much-needed off-road trail corridor in the heart of the city of Portland. The trail could be the Springwater Corridor Trail for northeast Portland. Downtown Portland, northeast neighborhoods, Hollywood District, Parkrose, and Gateway District would all be connected to Gresham and Fairview. Trail users and bikers could easily transfer to the existing MAX line and the new Air MAX line at the Gateway Transit Center and future Interstate Max (IMAX) line at the Rose Quarter.

Even though the corridor is located in a narrow corridor, there does appear to be enough space to fit in a tail. To ensure safety, a fence could be built between the trail and rail lines. The corridor would provide both recreational and commuter trail access to a highly urbanized area which is currently under served by an off-road trail system.

<u>Meets these Regional Criteria</u>: B, D, E

#### **Other Nominations**

Other trail nominations and one deletion were offered to the Metro Parks and Greenspaces staff at a Metro workshop on April 26. These are shown on a map available from Metro. These proposals will need additional analysis.

For more information, contact Mel Huie at (503) 797-1731 or huiem@metro.dst.or.us.

i:\parks\longterm\open spaces\huiem\g. protection plan\proposed additions.doc



### Managing Growth: Where Have We Been? Where Are We Heading?

A Community Planner Forum Sponsored by the Metro Technical Advisory Committee and local planners

> February 16, 2001 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Metro 600 NE Grand, Portland Council Chamber

Come join other planners from throughout the region for a discussion on how the Portland metropolitan region is managing growth. Conceived by local government planners, this forum will bring together people to discuss where we have been and where we are going to make this region a place where people want to live.

- What is 2040?
- Why did we do it?
- Is it working?
- What lessons are we learning?
- How is the 2040 plan playing out in the local arena?
- Are we meeting the goals we set out for ourselves?

Come join the discussion.

#### Agenda

- Welcome, Richard Ross, Project and Policy Manager, City of Gresham
- The Nature of 2040, Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, Metro
- Local Planners Round Table
  - Wink Brooks, Planning Director, City of Hillsboro
  - Ron Bunch, Government Affairs Manager, City of Lake Oswego
  - Maggie Collins, Planning Manager, City of Oregon City
  - Maggie Dickerson, Principal Planner, Clackamas County
  - Gil Kelley, Planning Director, City of Portland
- Group Round Table Discussion
- Wrap-up

Space is limited. RSVP to Paulette Copperstone at (503) 797-1562 or <u>copperstonep@metro.dst.or.us</u> by Friday, February 9, 2001 to reserve your space.

### Handouts For December 15, 2000 Goal 5 Technical Advisory Committee

The attached tables, charts, and maps display data that Metro is capable of generating for inventorying regional fish and wildlife resources. Two watersheds are analyzed for illustration purposes: Rock Creek in Clackamas County and Bronson Creek in Washington County. This handout includes the following:

Table 1: Summary data for Rock Creek and Bronson Creek watersheds (page 3)
Tables 2, 3: Forest banding analysis for both watersheds (page 4)
Tables 4, 5: Forest banding dispersion analysis for both watersheds (page 4)
Tables 5, 6: Development banding area analysis for both watersheds (page 5)
Tables 7, 8: Development dispersion analysis for both watersheds (page 5)
Charts 1, 2: Forest patch distribution for both watersheds (page 6)
Charts 2, 3: Forest Gap distribution for both watersheds (page 7)
Map 1: Banding analysis example (Separate Handout)
Map 2: Banding dispersion analysis example (Separate Handout)

#### Levels of Analysis

The data is summarized at the sub basin level. However, it is important to note that most of the data in the tables can be presented for stream reaches and for specific channel types. For example, forest canopy cover along streams in the upper watershed can be compared with forest canopy in the lower end of the watershed. Development patterns can also be analyzed in the same way.

#### **Banding Analysis**

Banding analysis is an accepted GIS tool for analyzing vegetation and development patterns within geographic areas of concern. Here, banding analysis at specified intervals along streams allows an objective comparison of the extent, type, and distribution of vegetative cover along streams. Development can also be analyzed in a similar fashion.

#### **Patch Analysis**

The forest canopy delineation within watersheds allows us to get an objective picture of the condition of forest canopy and its distribution within the watershed. Patch size and gap size are both indicators of the degree of forest fragmentation.

Summary points for the watersheds

- About one third of each watershed is forested
- Rock Ck. is more agriculture, Bronson Ck. is more developed
- Rock Ck. has about 1 stream crossing per mile, compared to about 5 for Bronson Ck.
- Rock Ck. is more moderate gradient, compared to mostly low gradient for Bronson Ck.

• Bronson Ck. has higher number of gaps in its forest canopy and smaller average patch size compared to Rock Creek

Table 1: Summary data for Rock Creek and Bronson Creek watersheds					
Stream Name	Rock Creek (Clack Co.)	Bronson Creek			
Sub Basin	Rock Creek (Clack Co.)	Rock Creek (Wash Co.)			
Basin	Clackamas R.	Tualatin R.			
1998 Landsat TM Landcover Summ	ary				
Total Acres In Watershed	5495.23	3028.53			
% Forested Land Cover	44	48			
% Shrub/Scrub Land Cover	5	8			
% Grass Meadow Land Cover	5	7			
% Agricultural Land Cover	37	11			
% Barren Land Cover	8	. 26			
% Water Land Cover	0	0			
1998 Landsat TM Landcover Summ	ary for Riprarian Areas				
Total Acres Riprarian Area	1977.13	1149.15			
% Forested Land Cover	53	58			
% Shrub/Scrub Land Cover	7	9			
% Grass Meadow Land Cover	6	8			
% Agricultural Land Cover	27	12			
% Barren Land Cover	8	13			
% Water Land Cover	0	0			
Resource Summary	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Significant Forested Area (Acres)	1814	943			
% Forested	33	31			
Forest Perimeter (Ft)	543419	466269			
# of Forested Patches	90	65			
# of Gaps in Forest	19	42			
Average Patch Size (acres)	20	15			
Average Gap Size	8	4			
Title 3 Wetlands (acres)	13	56			
Title 3 Wetlands Contiguous to					
Riprarian Area (acres)	13	55.80			
Floodplain (acres)	3	175			
Riverine Slopes > 25% (acres)	351	283			
Encroachment Summary					
Developed Area (acres)	1753	1482			
% Developed	32	49			
Total Stream Crossings	30	59			
Stream Crossings Per Stream Mile	1.216	5.148			
Culverted Crossings	27	44			
Culvert Crossings Per Stream Mile	1.094	3.839			
Road Density (Miles/Miles <sup>2</sup> )	5.664	8.674			
Channel Type Summary					
Total Stream Miles	24.67	11.46			
% SV/BC/MV Channel Type - High	10	24			
% VH Channel Type - High	1	0			
% LM Channel Type - Mid	19	0			
% MH/MC Channel Type - Mid	18	11			
% MH/MV/BC Channel Type - Mid	34	12			
% MM Channel Type - Mid	2	0			
% LUS Channel Type - Low	4	45			
% Undetermined Channel Type	0.00	0.00			

Table 2: Forest Banding Area Analysis For Rock Creek Watershed						
Band Width (Ft)	Total Area (acres)	Forested Vegetation Area (acres)	Percent of Band Area	Percent of Total Forest in Banded Areas	Percent of Total Forest in Watershed	
30	179	114	63	16	6	
50	297	183	62	26	10	
100	586	329	56	48	18	
200	1139	540	47	78	30	
300	1666	692	42	100	38	
Watershed	5495	1814	-	-	100	

					100	
Table 3: Forest Banding Area Analysis For Bronson Watershed						
Band Width (Ft)	Total Area (acres)	Forested Vegetation Area (acres)	Percent of Band Area	Percent of Total Forest in Banded Areas	Percent of Total Forest in Watershed	
30	81	45	55	. 13	5	
50	135	73	54	21	8	
100	269	138	51	40	15	
200	531	255	48	73	27	
300	783	349	45	100	37	
Watershed	3028	943	-	-	100	

Table 4: Forest Banding Dispersion Analysis For Rock Creek Watershed						
Band Width (Ft)	Percent of Band Length Occupied by Adjacent Woody Vegetaion					
30	258497	157994	61			
50	256031	143443	56			
100	· 248486	112929	45			
200	238129	76820	32			
300	228451	61885	27			

Table 5: Forest Banding Dispersion Analysis For Bronson Creek Watershed					
Band Width (Ft)	Total Band Length (Ft)	Length Occupied By Adjacent Woody Vegetaion (Ft)	Percent of Band Length Occupied by Adjacent Woody Vegetaion		
30	117988	63310	54		
50	117262	60236	51		
100	116028	54118	47		
200	113117	47441	42		
300	110004	36611	33		

Та	Table 5: Development Banding Area Analysis For Rock Creek Watershed							
Band Width (Ft)	Total Area (acres)	ea Developed Area Percent of (acres) Band Area		Percent of Total Development in Banded Areas	Pecent of Total Development in Watershed			
30	179	49	27	9	3			
50	297	81	27	15	5			
100	586	166	28	31	9			
200	1139	350	31	65	20			
300	1666	542	33	100	31			
Watershed	5495	1753	-	-	100			

Tab	Table 6: Development Banding Area Analysis For Bronson Creek Watershed							
				Percent of				
Dand Width	Total Area	Developed Area	Porcent of	Total	Pecent of Total			
	(acros)	(acros)	Percent of Band Aroa	Development	Development in			
(14)	(acres)	(acies)	Dallu Area	in Banded	Watershed			
	· ·		Areas					
30	81	18	23	7	1			
50	135	32	23	13	2			
100	269	67	25	27	5			
200	531	152	29	60	10			
300	783	253	32	100	17			
Watershed	3028	1482	-	-	100			

Table 7: Developed Banding Dispersion Analysis For Rock Creek					
Band Width (Ft)	Total Band Length (Ft)	Length Occupied By Adjacent Development (Ft)	Percent of Band Length Occupied by Development		
30	258497	70384	27		
. 50	256031	71397	28		
100	248486	77639	31		
200	238129	83171	35		
. 300	228451	84398	37		

Table 8: Developed Banding Dispersion Analysis For Bronson Creek				
Band Width (Ft)	Total Band Length (Ft)	Length Occupied By Adjacent Development (Ft)	Percent of Band Length Occupied by Development	
30	117988	27968	24	
50	117262	29363	25	
100	116028	33213	29	
200	. 113117	40655	36	
300	110004	46952	43	

#### Chart 1: Rock Creek Watershed Patch Size Distribution



#### Patches





Patches

6·













Plot date: Dec 14, 2000; j:\houk\projects\goal5\inventory\pilot\_study\metric\metric.spr

#### FLOW CHART OF 2040 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROJECT STRUCTURE

This flowchart describes the process for evaluating the effectiveness of the 2040 Growth Concept policies and actions.



#### December 29, 2000

To: Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee

From: Mel Huie, Senior Regional Planner Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

Sub: Review and Update of Regional Trails and Greenways Definitions, Criteria and Map

#### A. Definitions for Trails and Greenways

• See Attached Glossary

#### B. Action Item - Approval of Criteria

Criteria for Determining Regional Significance

- See Attached
- C. Action Item Addition of Four Trails to the Regional Trails and Greenways System
  - North Willamette River Greenway Trail
  - Willamette Trolley Shoreline Trail (Rail with Trail)
  - East Buttes Loop Trail
  - Sullivan's Gulch / J-84 Corridor Trail (See attached descriptions)

#### **D.** Regional Trails and Greenways Map

- Proposed Changes Which Are Technical Changes or Housekeeping Items Action Item: Approval of These Changes
- Proposed Changes Which Metro Parks & Greenspaces Staff Agree With *Action Item: Approval of These Changes*
- Proposed Changes Which Need Further Discussion or Which Metro Staff Disagree With *Informational at Jan GTAC Meeting / Approval at Feb or Mar GTAC Meeting*

#### E. List of Meetings and Attendees

#### F. Draft Trails and Greenways Map

For more information: Mel Huic, Metro Regional Parks & Greenspaces (503) 797-1731 or huiem@metro.dst.or.us

### **REGIONAL TRAILS and GREENWAYS MAP**

#### Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department in cooperation with local, state and federal parks providers and nonprofit environmental organizations

#### Comments from Public Agencies and Nonprofit Organizations *April - December 2000*

The Regional Trails and Greenways Map, adopted by the Metro Council in 1992, is currently being updated. The only change to the 1992 map was the addition of the Peninsula Crossing Trail in 1993. All the existing and proposed trails and greenways from the original 1992 map will be included in the updated map. Changes to these trails & greenways will be made if appropriate. These trails are off - road trails.

# Proposed changes which are technical changes or housekeeping items:

(Rep)	intrintria:	(1955)7717719776517775	Maiosai	211002101
1	Oregon State Parks	Add <b>"Banks-Vernonia Rail to Trail"</b> as an existing Inter-Regional trail	Agree	The trail has been completed and is owned and maintained by Oregon State Parks
3	Metro Parks and Portland Parks	Change trail designation from proposed to existing for <b>Springwater Corridor from</b> <b>Palmblad Rd. to Rugg Rd.</b>	Agree	Trail was completed in September 2000. Trail now complete to Clackamas County line.
20	City of Happy Valley	Move trail alignment of proposed Mt. Scott Trail closer to Mt. Scott Creek	Agree	Technical realignment of trail to be closer to the creek per city parks and trails plan.
34	City of Tualatin	Make technical corrections to show where trail has been built along the Tualatin River	Agree	City of Tualatin has built sections of the trail since the Greenspaces Trails and Greenways map was adopted in 1992.
39	Columbia Slough Watershed Council	Add portion of trail built along <b>Columbia</b> <b>Slough (NE 158<sup>th</sup> to Marine Dr. Trail)</b> (Change from dotted green-line to solid red line.)	Agree	Trail has been built and should be added to the Regional Trails and Greenways Map
47	Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces	Map needs to reflect existing trail on the 40-Mile Loop between Terwilliger Blvd. at SW Capitol Hwy. south to Tryon State park	Agree	Multi-use Path and Bike Lanes have been installed since 1992
48	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services	<b>40-Mile Loop Trail from Kelley Point</b> <b>Park</b> heading south along Leadbetter Point is shown as an existing trail, but is actually not built yet. Make change on map to reflect this.	Agree	Housekeeping Item

# Proposed changes which Metro staff agree with:

.

.

Ced Ceda	TEEDIDIG	(1350))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	Manosali Geomenness	त्वराणाहीक
2	U.S. Forest Service, Clackamas County Parks, Oregon State	Add <b>"Springwater Corridor Trail from</b> Estacada east to Mt. Hood National Forest trails and Pacific Crest Trail as a proposed "Inter-regional Trail"	Agree	Oregon State Parks, Portland Parks, Gresham Parks, Estacada, U.S. Forest Service and PGE would like to make this future trail connection.
	Parks			Clackamas Co. Parks or Oregon State Parks to take lead on this effort. A feasibility study is the next step.
5	City of Portland Parks	Columbia River Trail Add proposed trail segment near the river between Fairview and mouth of the Sandy River	Agree	As industrial uses leave the area, a future trail is possible. Metro has purchased land in this area. Work with Mult. Co. Drainage District.
12	Port of Portland & Portland Bureau of	<b>40-Mile Loop Trail in North Portland</b> Move proposed trail alignment from along	Agree	Marine terminals along the Columbia River preclude a trail along the river's edge.
	Environmental Services	between the Peninsula Crossing Trail, Smith and Bybee Lakes, and Kelley Point Park.		City of Portland and Port of Portland are planning a Bike/Ped. Path along Marine Dr. Portland Parks supports the change.
13	Port of Portland	<ul> <li>W. Willamette River Greenway Trail between Steel Bridge and St. Johns Bridge:</li> <li>Remain on the river's edge north to NW Nicolai St., then go west to NW Front (e.g. away from the river), and then go north along NW Front to Wacker Siltronic Facility on the river (just north of the BN Railroad Bridge). At this point, the trail would go back to the river's edge for this property and then go back to NW Front to head north to the St. Johns Bridge along Hwy. 30 which is the connection for the 40-Mile Loop Trail. Change the greenway designation to a future trail (dotted red line) in this corridor.</li> <li>As non-river dependent development occurs along the shoreline, a trail along the river's edge is encouraged. The Portland Bureau of Planning is encouraged to designate this section of the Willamette River in the City's comprehensive plan as a trail.</li> </ul>	Agree	Portland Parks agrees. Proposed trail alignment in the city's Comprehensive Plan would be followed.
18	Oregon City Mayor and Council member and Parks staff	Add a connection between <b>Canemah</b> Bluffs Regional Park to Willamette River Greenway and downtown Oregon City	Agree. If an off- road connection can be made. It also meets three of the six criteria.	Oregon City should take the initiative to make the trail connection.

.

iced Cedd	(III)IIII	(TECOMMENCELLOT)	Clanosenn Cenninentation	GENOME
25	Unified Sewerage Agency (USA) of Washington Co.	Keep <b>Bronson Creek</b> as a wildlife corridor. Don't designate it as a trail	Agree	Keep as a corridor- links two regionally significant sites
26	City of Tualatin Parks	Add future Fanno Creek Trail Bridge over Tualatin River which would be next to the railroad bridge	Agree	The Fanno Creek Greenway Trail is intended to connect to the city of Tualatin on the south side of the river.
28	City of Lake Oswego	Change greenway designation to future land based trail in Lake Oswego from Terwilliger Blvd. south to city limits with West Linn	Agree	Lake Oswego Open Space Program has designated a trail for this corridor.
29	City of West Linn	Change greenway designation to future land based trail from LO city limits south to mouth of the Tualatin River	Agree	West Linn Parks and Trails Master Plan calls for a land based trail for this corridor.
33	Same as above	Re-designate all of <b>Fanno Creek</b> <b>Greenway Trail</b> from greenway to land- based trail (red solid line where trail exists, and red dotted line where trail is proposed.) The trail will connect the Willamette River at Willamette Park to the Tualatin River where Fanno Creek ends, and where the city of Tualatin begins.	Agree	Fanno Creek Greenway Trail is intended to be a land based trail
• 38	City of Troutdale	Re-designate <b>Beaver Creek Greenway</b> to land based trail (solid red line where completed and dotted red line where proposed) from SE Stark St. north to Glenn Otto Park at the Sandy River)	Agree	City of Troutdale is building the trail in the corridor
40	City of Portland, Metro Parks and Greenspaces	Add N. Willamette River Greenway Trail (Steel Bridge north to St. Johns Bridge)	Agree	Meets 4 Regionally Significant Criteria
41	Portland Parks, Lake Oswego, Three Rivers Land Conservancy, Metro Parks and Greenspaces	Designate the Willamette Trolley Shoreline Trail Corridor (Riverplace in downtown Portland to Lake Oswego) as a land based trail.	Agree	Meets 5 Regionally Significant Criteria. Feasibility Study is the next step. Should be studied as a "Rail with Trail" corridor.
42	Portland Parks, Gresham Parks, Metro Parks and Greenspaces	Add <b>East Buttes Loop Trail</b> in east Multnomah County area	Agree	Meets 4 Regionally Significant Criteria. Coordinate with Pleasant Valley area planning efforts.
43	Portland Parks, Metro Parks and Greenspaces	Add <b>Sullivan's Gulch / I-84 Trail</b> (Eastbank Esplanade east to I-205 Bike Path and NE 207 <sup>th</sup> on I-84)	Agree	Meets 3 Regionally Significant Criteria. Coordination with Union Pacific RR and Tri-Met.
49	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services	<b>Columbia Slough Greenway Trail</b> will connect to Peninsula Crossing Trail and N. Marine Dr. Trail (40-Mile Loop) adjacent to Portland International Raceway (PIR) and the Blue Heron Golf Course. Make map change to reflect this.	Agree, pending confirmation with City plans	Metro Parks staff will meet with Portland Parks and BES staff

.

.

.

(Kep) H	(IIODEE)	accommendation	MERONEN) NUERONNEED	(Elimitis)
50	Clark County and Vancouver Parks	Map Regionally Significant Trails and Greenways in <b>Clark Co.</b> on Metro's regional map.	Agree	Even though Metro has no jurisdiction in Washington State, we will add the trails layer to show Inter-Regional Trail connections

# Proposed changes which need further discussion or which Metro staff disagree with:

ගහා 	(JTQJQSEB)	(EEFMINEN/AUOD	Maiosan Recommendation	Feitorela
NA	Metro Councilor Bill Atherton	Create a Trunk System of off-road Regional Trails for multi-use. Recreational and commuter usage. The corridors would also serve as linear parks. Metro would design, build, own and operate the system. Funding would need to be found.	Further Discussion Needed	Conceptual routes for the trunk system are already on the regional trails and greenways plan and map. Input from the public and local park providers would be needed. Funding is not currently available.
NA	Congressman Earl Blumenauer	Save all former Railroad lines and ROW for potential trail and transportation corridors	Further Discussion Needed	Metro has initiated an inventory of railroad lines, which are still in use, no longer in use, or "abandoned" in the region.
NA	Congressman Earl Blumenauer	Estimate the cost for completing the regional trails and greenways system (acquisition, design, engineering and construction)	Further Discussion Needed. (Metro staff may be able to estimate costs for certain trails that are more likely to become a reality in the next five years.)	Rep. Blumenauer would like this information for potential future federal assistance. He is a member of the Congressional Bike Caucus and Livable Communities Movement.
NA	City of Wilsonville	Work to implement trails in the suburban areas, not just in urban areas.	Further Discussion Needed	Metro and local partners are planning and building trails throughout the region (both urban and suburban areas).
10	City of Portland Parks	Add a trail located along <b>Tryon Creek in</b> southwest Portland.	Further Discussion Needed (Check against the criteria to determine if trail would qualify as regionally significant)	Tryon Creek is a sensitive area and environmentally protected riparian corridor. Any land- based trail would still need to be planned and approved by local agencies. Would this be a local trail or a regional trail?
14	Trust for Public Land	Add proposed trail connection from the Willamette River Greenway to Canby	Further Discussion Needed	Trail connection to Molalla State Park is possible.
15	Trust for Public Land	Add Proposed Trail Connection between Canby and Molalia	Further Discussion Needed	An off road / former logging road could be developed into a trail near Canby.

	ued H	(1101053)	CECOMOLECTION	Meroszii References	albials
	16	Gresham Comm. & Economic Dev. Dept.	MAX line: Ruby Jct. to Cleveland Station Add Multi-Use Path	Further Discussion Needed	Connections to Light Rail bus transit and 2040 Centers.
	17	Clackamas Co.Parks, City of Happy Valley & Clackamas River Watershed Council	Add a connection between the existing Scouter Mt. Trail and the proposed East Buttes Loop Trail	Further Discussion Needed	Would provide direct trail access to east Multnomah County, Gresham and East Buttes from urban portions of Clack. Co.
	19	City of Wilsonville	Add a trail connection from <b>Tonquin</b> Trail to "Wilsonville Tract" which is currently owned by the state of Oregon.	Further Discussion Needed. (generally agree to this proposal)	Tonquin Trail already is connected to Wilsonville. Could add a spur trail from the Tonquin Trail to the Wilsonville Tract on the regional map.
					This would add a connection to the future Natural Area and 2040 Town Center.
					The state of Oregon and Metro are still negotiating the terms of a sale of this property.
	21	City of Happy Valley	Extend southward from <b>Gresham</b> , a PGE powerline trail corridor <b>to Pleasant</b> <b>Valley.</b> This would connect to the future Gresham to Fairview Trail.	Further Discussion Needed '	Appears to meet three of the criteria. Also, the areas are already connected by the Mt. Scott Trail, Scouter Mt. Trail, and the Springwater Corridor Trail, thus adding a new trail may not be necessary.
	23	THPRD Trails Advisory Committee	Add a <b>Cedar Mill Trail</b> connection to Fanno Creek Greenway Trail.	Disagree	Locally Significant Trail. THPRD should take the lead.
	24	THPRD Trails Advisory Committee	Add Willow Creek Trail from Beaverton Creek to Forest Park	Further Discussion Needed	Would this be a regional or local trail?
X	27	Lake Oswego, West Linn, Tualatin & Three Rivers Land Conservancy	Create <b>a West Side trail loop</b> – Bringing the 40-Mile Loop west of the Willamette River.	Further Discussion Needed	There are few off road trails and pathways on the west side. Planning is underway for the Fanno Creek Greenway Trail to connect the Willamette River to the Tualatin River.
<i>a</i> l	(30)	West Linn, Lake Oswego, Tualatin, Three Rivers Land Conservancy	Add proposed land based trail designation from mouth of Tualatin River west to west side of Tualatin city limits. Maintain greenway corridor and river trail designations as well.	Further Discussion Needed	Additional trail opportunities need to be explored for the west side.
	31	Same as above	Add future land based trail designation from West Linn to Wilsonville along the north side of the Willamette River. Also keep the greenway designation.	Further Discussion Needed	Same as above

٠,

U Vlemette

I:\PARKS\LONGTERMOpen Spaces\HUIEMG. Protection Plan\Trails Map Comments Dec00.doc 03/08/01

\*\* ;

٠

,"a

٠

iii	ы» 3	ग्रिस्ट्रास्ट्र	TEETIMERCELLON		FEIDELE
	32	Lake Oswego West Linn Three Rivers Land Conservancy	Add future land based trail designation along the <b>west side of the Willamette</b> <b>River between Sellwood Bridge and</b> <b>City of Lake Oswego (where</b> <b>Terwilliger Blvd. ends at Hwy. 43)</b>	Further Discussion Needed	This corridor is currently a trolley / rail corridor in public ownership and should be studied as a potential "Rails with Trail" project
	35)	Three Rivers Land Conservancy	Add a future trail from Lake Oswego: Willamette River at Terwilliger west to Fanno Creek Greenway Trail at the Tualatin River. Trail would be on the south side of Oswego Lake.	Further Discussion Needed	There are few off road trails and pathways on the west side.
3	36	Lake Oswego, West Linn, Tualatin, Three Rivers Land Conservancy	Add a future land based trail from the <b>Tonquin Trail east to West Linn (</b> e.g. from Sherwood east through Tualatin to West Linn)	Further Discussion Needed	There are few off road trails and pathways on the west side.
3	37	City of Hillsboro, Portland Parks	If <b>Burlington Northern Rails to Trail</b> project becomes infeasible, what is an alternate trail route to connect Forest Park and the Willamette River to the Tualatin Valley?	Further Discussion Needed	Short Line RR Operator is currently using the corridor, thus precluding a trail.
4	14	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services	<b>Columbia Slough Greenway</b> should also be designated as a proposed land based trail (e.g. red dotted line). Entire length of the slough.	Further Discussion Needed	Environmentally sensitive area. Generally, very narrow width in the riparian zone. Industrial uses may be incompatible with trail use.
4	45	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services	Columbia Slough Greenway Land Based Trail should connect to Blue Lake Park, Johnson Lake, Delta Park, Whitaker Ponds, and Airport Way.	Further Discussion Needed	Spur Trails could be added to the Regional Trails and Greenways Map, but with same constraints as listed above.
4	16	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services	Connect <b>Gresham to Fairview Trail</b> to Columbia Slough Greenway Trail on the west side of Fairview Lake and Blue Lake	Further Discussion Needed	Additional discussion with Gresham, Fairview & Metro staff, and 40-Mile Loop Land Trust needed. A trail connection does make sense.
5	51	Port of Portland	Smith & Bybee Lakes and old St. Johns landfill area: Make proper connection from Leadbetter Peninsula south to Columbia Blvd. and city neighborhoods.	Further Discussion Needed	Port of Portland staff will describe the proposed alignment change at the Jan. 2001 GTAC meeting. A mini- master plan for trails is proposed for this area.
5	52	City of Forest Grove	Add a land based <b>trail between Forest</b> <b>Grove and Haag Lake.</b> Current proposal is a greenway along the Tualatin River.	Further Discussion Needed	Land based trails to connect the Metro region to the coast and Tualatin Valley are needed.
5	53	City of Forest Grove	Look at the potential for a trail connection between <b>Haag Lake and McMinville</b>	Further Discussion Needed	Land based trails to connect the Metro region to the Tualatin Valley are needed.

•

۰.

٠

.

CIED CALE	PECTOR	TESOMMENTELION	NLEOTED COLLECTED	(EllOIEIE)
54	City of Forest Grove	Trail connections from the city to the open space along <b>Gales Creek</b>	Further Discussion Needed	Would this be a local trail vs. being part of the regional system? City owns the local utilities. Trails could be in these utility corridor ROWs.
55	THPRD, April Olbrich and Friends of the Westside Greenway	<b>Power Line Trail (north – south)</b> from Willamette River through Forest Park, Beaverton and just west of King City to the Tualatin River is on the current plan and map. The feasibility of a future trail should be investigated.	Further Discussion Needed	BPA has issued regulations permitting trails within power line corridors. There was a moratorium.
56	City of Milwaukie, City of Gladstone, NCPRD	PTC Trail (old Portland Traction Co. streetcar line) Milwaukie to Gladstone) needs to be purchased and converted into a trail (e.g. Rail to Trail). ROW currently owned by Union Pacific RR Could this become a trail owned by local jurisdiction(s) or Metro?	Further Discussion Needed as to which agency will own and operate the trail. The current proposal has the North Clackamas Parks District as the future trail owner and operator. It is on the regional trails plan.	Gladstone has purchased the PTC ROW in its city limits and has converted it to a trail. N. Clackamas Parks District has funding from Metro's Local Share program to purchase the ROW from Union Pacific RR Co.
57	Oregon City	Purchase old Railroad ROW near Oregon City connecting Environmental Learning Center at the community college to Abernethy Creek	Further Discussion Needed	Is this a regional or local trail?
58	Oregon City	Add the old Railroad Corridor from Oregon City to Mollala	Further Discussion Needed	Research needs to be undertaken to see if the ROW still is intact
59	Milwaukie City Council member, Ardenwald Neighborhood Association, City of Portland	Complete the <b>missing link in the</b> <b>Springwater Corridor</b> Trail between the Sellwood Bridge and the existing trail just east of McLoughlin Blvd. near SE Ochocco St Seek TEA-21 federal transportation funding for the three trail bridges needed.	Further Discussion Needed	Metro and local partners are working on this missing segment. Portland Parks is taking the lead on seeking funds to build the three trail bridges. Metro is planning to purchase ROW. The trail could also follow streets if necessary.
60	City of Fairview	Seek other <b>north-south trail</b> <b>connections in east Multnomah Co.</b> (e.g. N.E. 223 <sup>rd</sup> Ave. with a bike/ped. way could connect the city to Blue Lake Park)	Further Discussion Needed	There are two proposed trail corridors for east county in the regional plan now (Gresham – Fairview Trail and 40-Mile Loop Trail from Springwater Corridor north to Troutdale.)

•

•

•

# Proposed additions to criteria for determining regional significance:

### (comments from park providers and nonprofit organizations April – December 2000)

aep #	FECTOR	CERTIFICATION (CERTIFICATION)	MERCUELI nolizimenteren	
NA	Portland Parks (relates to criteria for determining regional significance)	<b>Trail Usage</b> Add another Criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Minimum Number of <b>Projected Trail Users per year</b>	Disagree	Too difficult to determine and is subjective.
NA	Portland Parks (relates to criteria for determining regional	Historical Sites Add another Criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Trail provides access to historical sites such as Lewis & Clark routes	Further Discussion Needed	These trail connections could be spur trails or local trails.
NA	significance) Portland Parks (relates to criteria for determining regional significance)	Also <b>Define "Off-Road" Trails to</b> <b>include "Non-functioning streets"</b> <b>which could become a trail."</b> Certain ROW corridors may be paper streets (i.e. streets that were never built) which could accommodate trails (e.g. Peninsula Crossing Trail)	Further Discussion Needed	Extensive research would need to be conducted. It really should be on a case by case basis whether to determine if trail is appropriate in the ROW. In some cases, the agency in charge of the ROW may need to vacate the street in order to site a trail.
NA	Portland Parks (relates to criteria for determining regional significance)	Inter-Regional Trail Connections Add another Criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Trail connects to inter-regional, state or federally designated trails.	Disagree	Already is recommended: Criterion D (of proposed Criteria) Connects to Other Regional Trails already in place
4	City of Portland Parks	<b>Columbia River Trail</b> Add another Criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Trail (land based) located along Columbia River	Disagree. This criterion doesn't need to be added because a trail is already proposed along many parts of the Columbia River.	The 40-Mile Loop Trail along the Columbia River is on the regional trails map. There is a proposed change (from Port of Portland) to move the trail from the river to Marine Dr. between the Peninsula Crossing Trail and Kelley Point Park. Portland Parks agrees to the change.
6	City of Portland Parks	Sandy River Trail Add another criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Trail (land based) located along the Sandy River	Disagree. This criterion doesn't need to be added.	Sandy River has been designated as a river trail (e.g. use boats) The area is too environmentally sensitive for a land based multi-use path. Also, this would be inconsistent with the state adopted Scenic Waterways Act.

med 。	11010597	COLLADERDICEED	fileround constances	GLIDIELE
7	City of Portland Parks	Clackamas River Trail Add another Criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Trail (land based) located along the Clackamas River	Disagree. This criterion doesn't need to be added.	Clackamas County's comprehensive plan for this area calls for a greenway, not a trail. A river trail (e.g. use of boats) with river access points is the designation by Metro Parks for the corridor.
8	City of Portland Parks	Tualatin River Trail Add another Criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Trail (land based) located along the Tualatin River	Disagree. This criterion doesn't need to be added.	A river trail (e.g. use of boats) with river access points is the designation by Metro Parks for the corridor. Local jurisdictions may add land-based trails at their own discretion.
9	City of Portland Parks	<b>Fanno Creek Greenway Trail</b> Add another Criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Trail located along Fanno Creek	Disagree. Greenspaces Trails and Greenways Map already designates a greenway / trail for the corridor.	Metro is working with local park providers and friends groups to plan a multi-use path. The trail will need to meet Metro Title 3 and Goal 5 guidelines.
11	City of Portland Parks	Johnson Creek Trail Add another Criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Trails located along creek.	Disagree. This criterion doesn't need to be added.	Springwater Corridor Trail is a parallel to the creek. Another trail is not needed.
22	Portland Parks, Portland Planning, City of Gresham, City of Beaverton	Connections to MAX Lines Add another Criterion for Determining Regional Significance: Trail provides direct access to Light Rail, including future Air Max and IMAX lines	Further Discussion Needed	Connecting Trails to Light Rail and bus lines is a goal. Provides for multi-modal opportunities. These trail connectors tend to be locally significant rather than regional.

11

. . . .



А

N

R

D

U

Μ

TO: Charles Ciecko, Chair, GTAC
FROM: Gerry Uba, Program Supervisor, Growth Management Services Department
DATE: February 9, 2001
SUBJECT: Performance Measures (2040 Performance Evaluation)

Metro's current work plan includes the performance measures program through which we will implement Title 9 of the Functional Plan, as well as ORS 197.301 specifying nine measures to be implemented. The work would include evaluation of 2040 growth management efforts of Metro and local governments, including progress towards livable communities and values of the region.

In the past few months, Metro staff has been busy developing the framework for the evaluation. The key documents developed so far are:

- Attachment A: Performance Measures: Requirements, Regional Values and 1999 Recommendations showing the state mandates and potential goals and/or values we should be measuring.
- Attachment B: 2040 Fundamentals showing a synthesis of the various plans adopted by the Metro Council that expresses the fundamental goals and principles of the Metro 2040 Growth Concept.
- Attachment C: A basic matrix explaining how the indicators are identified and organized.
- Attachment D: Criteria for prioritizing the performance indicators.
- Attachment E: Matrix showing the indicators and how the criteria were applied in scoring the performance indicators for Fundamental #2 Protect the Natural Environment and Fundamental #6 Encourage a Vibrant Place to Live and Work.

At your meeting we would like to seek your comments or observations concerning the overall project framework. We would also solicit for few volunteers of your committee to have one meeting with staff to review the indicators for protection of the region's environment and recreation (Attachment E).

Our goal is to complete prioritizing the indicators before the end of February and then plunge into collecting data for the indicators that will be analyzed in this phase one. I look forward to your discussion and would be happy to provide further information.

Thank you.

Ε

Μ

Μ

O

cc: Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, Transportation and Growth Management Departments

#### Attachment A

### Performance Measures: Requirements, Regional Values and 1999 Recommendations November 15, 2000

Α	В	С	D	E	F	
Oregon State Statute	Metro Functional	Metro Regional	Metro RUGGO	MTAC Recommendation	What Should We Be	Measuring?
	Plan (Intent &	Framework Plan	Objective 10	(1999)	Functional Plan	2040 Regional
	measures)	(intent & measures)	intent		Titles 1 to 11?	Values?
ORS 197.301 - PerformanceMeaasures:PMs adopted by a MSD shall include butnot limited to measures that analyze thefollowing:1. Rate of conversion of land to beimproved2. Density and price ranges of residentialdevelopment3. Level of job creation within individualcities and the urban areas of a countyinside the MSD4. Number of residential units added tosmall sites assumed to be developed inthe MSD's inventory of availablelands but which can be furtherdeveloped, and the conversion ofexisting spaces into more compactunits with or without the demolition ofexisting buildings5. Amount of environmentally sensitiveland that is protected and the amountof environmentally sensitive land thatis developed6. Sales price of vacant land7. Residential vacancy rates8. Public access to open spaces9. Transportation measures includingmobility, accessibility and air qualityindicatorsORS 197.302:Requires comparison of performancemeasures results to Metro's complianceto urban growth boundary capacity listedin ORS 197.296 for the purpose ofdeveloping a corrective action plan forbuildable land supply	<ul> <li>Titles: 9 measures:</li> <li>1. Vacant land conversion*</li> <li>2. Housing amount, type, location, density and price*</li> <li>3. Job creation*</li> <li>4. Infill and redevelopment, including impact on jobs and housing*</li> <li>5. Environmentally sensitive lands protected and developed</li> <li>6. Other measures that can reliably measure progress</li> <li>7. Price of land*</li> <li>8. Residential vacancy rates</li> <li>* Items number 1,2,3,4 and 7 will be evaluated according to:</li> <li>• Jurisdiction;</li> <li>• Growth Concept Design Type; and</li> <li>• Zoning</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>PM for Chapters 2 to 6:</li> <li>Develop PMs designed for considering the RFP policies*:</li> <li>1. Vacant land conversion</li> <li>2. Housing amount, type, location, density and price</li> <li>3. Job creation</li> <li>4. Infill and redevelopment, including impact on jobs and housing</li> <li>5. Environmentally sensitive lands</li> <li>6. Price of land</li> <li>7. Residential vacancy rates</li> <li>8. Access to open spaces</li> <li>9. Transportation measures</li> <li>* "Corrective actions may be taken by the Metro Council if they find that anticipated progress is lacking or if Metro goals or policies need adjustment."</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Develop PMs designed for considering RUGGO's objectives:</li> <li>PMs for Goal I, Regional Planning Process, will use state benchmarks to the extent possible or be developed by Metro in consultation with MPAC &amp; MCCI;</li> <li>PMs for Goal II, Urban Form, will be derived from state benchmarks or detailed technical analysis that underlies Metro's RFP, Functional Plan &amp; Growth Concept Map.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Conversion rate: vacant acres to developed acres</li> <li>Number of dwelling units</li> <li>Average single- family/townhouse lot size</li> <li>Median price of single-family residential</li> <li>Average gross multi-family density</li> <li>Average gross single-family subdivision density</li> <li>Median rent of multi-family residential</li> <li>Job creation</li> <li>Residential redevelopment</li> <li>Job redevelopment</li> <li>Acres of unbuildable land protected</li> <li>Acres of unbuildable land developed</li> <li>Land price by land use type</li> <li>Acres of parks and open space per person</li> <li>Total vehicle miles traveled</li> <li>Air quality (ozone and carbon monoxide) readings</li> <li>Other:</li> <li>Do PMs and UGR in different years</li> <li>Decouple corrective actions from measurement</li> <li>Joint MPAC &amp; MTAC oversight committee</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>Monitor progress in FP implementation*:</li> <li>Title 1- Requirement of Housing</li> <li>Title 2- Regional Parking Policy</li> <li>Title 3- Water Quality, Flood Mgnt. &amp; Fish &amp; Wildlife Conservation</li> <li>Title 4- Retail in Employment &amp; Industrial Areas</li> <li>Title 5- Neighbor Cities &amp; Rural Areas</li> <li>Title 6- Regional Accessibility</li> <li>Title 7- Affordable Housing</li> <li>Title 8- Compliance Procedures</li> <li>(<i>Title 9- PM</i>)</li> <li>Title 10- Functional Plan Definitions</li> <li>Title 11- UGB Amendment Urban Reserve Plan Requirement</li> <li>* "PMs will be evaluated at least by Regional Level, Growth Concept Design Types, by Regional &amp; Town Centers market Areas, and by Jurisdictions"</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Clean air and water</li> <li>Access to nature</li> <li>Ability to get from here to there</li> <li>Safe, stable neighborhoods</li> <li>Resources for the future generations</li> <li>Strong regional economy</li> </ol>

i\gm\long\_range\_planning\erformance Measures\Requirements -4-Regional Values and 1999 Recommendations

Draft

Attachment B

## **2040 Fundamentals**

[2040 Growth Concept Performance Evaluation Program] January 10, 2000

- 1. Encourage the efficient use of land within the UGB and focus growth to 2040 mixed-use centers and corridors;
- 2. Protect the natural environment;
- 3. Provide balance to the transportation system by promoting all types of travel, such as bicycling, walking and using mass transit, as well as cars and freight movement;
- 4. Work with neighboring cities just outside the region such as Sandy, Canby and other adjacent cities – to keep the separation between communities;
- 5. Promote diverse housing options for all residents of the region;
- 6. Encourage a vibrant place to live and work; and
- 7. Encourage a strong regional economy.

#### Attachment C

### Measuring the Region's Success in Achieving 2040 Growth Concept: Policy Standards and Performance Indicators

If you don't measure results, you can't tell success from failure. If you can't see success, you can't reward it. If you can't see failure, you can't correct it. Osborne and Gaebler, Reinventing Government, 1992

### <u>2040 Fundamental</u>: (This area will include the statement of which 2040 goal we are trying to assess)

(A) Implemented Metro Policies (UGMFP, RTP, etc.)(B) Policy Standards For Local Govt. Compliance(C) Local Government Compliance Status(D) Output' Indicators (Effort) of implemented policies(E) Outcome' Indicators (Effect) of implemented policiesThis column will include adopted Metro policies relevant to the 2040 fundamental aboveThis column will include the standards that Metro has adopted for local governmentsThis column indicates how local government have progressed towards adopting Metro standardsThis column will include indicators that measure the effort in converting resources into a product. They measure activity, but not necessarily public satisfaction.This column will include indicators that focus on public satisfaction.For example: a) Miles of transportation improvements built;Miles of transportation improvements built;For example: a) Local GovernmentFor example: a) Local GovernmentDiversion of floodplain area converted to use since the implementation of Title 3			r ···		
This column will include adopted Metro policies relevant to the 2040 fundamental aboveThis column will include indicates how local governmentsThis column will include indicators that measure the effort in converting resources into a product. They measure activity, but not necessarily public satisfaction.This column will include indicators that focus on public satisfaction and more directly measure Metro's progress in meeting stated goals and objectives.This column will include the standards that Metro has adopted for local governmentsThis column will include indicators that measure the effort in converting resources into a product. They measure activity, but not necessarily public satisfaction.This column will include indicators that focus on public satisfaction and more directly measure Metro's progress in meeting stated goals and objectives.For example: a) Miles of transportation improvements built;Miles of transportation improvements slopesFor example: a) Levels of congestion;b) Percent of floodplain area converted to use since the implementation of Title 3	(A) Implemented Metro Policies (UGMFP, RTP, etc.)	(B) Policy Standards For Local Govt. Compliance	(C) Local Government Compliance Status	(D) Output <sup>1</sup> Indicators (Effort) of implemented policies	(E) Outcome <sup>2</sup> Indicators (Effect) of implemented policies
	This column will include adopted Metro policies relevant to the 2040 fundamental above	This column will include the standards that Metro has adopted for local governments	This column indicates how local government have progressed towards adopting Metro standards	<ul> <li>This column will include indicators that measure the effort in converting resources into a product. They measure activity, but not necessarily public satisfaction.</li> <li>For example: <ul> <li>a) Miles of transportation improvements built;</li> <li>b) Environmentally constrained land regulated by Title 3 (wetlands, floodplains, riparian areas, and steep slopes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>This column will include indicators that focus on public satisfaction and more directly measure Metro's progress in meeting stated goals and objectives.</li> <li>For example: <ul> <li>a) Levels of congestion;</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) Percent of floodplain area converted to use since the implementation of Title 3</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Output indicators measure an agency's effort in converting some resources into some type of product. They measure agency activity or performance, but stop short of identifying results as viewed by intended beneficiaries. <sup>2</sup> Outcome indicators focus on customer satisfaction (beneficiaries of the agency's service). They measure an agency's success in meeting stated goals and objectives.

/

### Attachment D

# Criteria for Prioritizing 2040 Performance Indicators January 17, 2001

#	Criteria	Weight		Score		Weighted Score
		(as a %)	High (score = 3)	Moderate (score = 2)	Minimum (score = 1)	(weight x score)
A	Is the indicator required by the State?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	yes/no
в	Does the indicator measure the 2040 Fundamentals directly or indirectly? (Relevant = high score) (Less Relevant = low score)	25%	Relevant		Less Relevant	e.g. 25 x 3 = 75 or 25 x 2 = 50 or 25 x 1 = 25
с	Can the results of the indicator be used to set target/benchmark?	20%	Yes- Useful benchmark	Uncertain of usefulness of benchmark	No- not applicable	
D	Does it address issues within Metro's authority to change? (Strong link to existing policy = high score) (Potential use for making new policy = moderate score) (No authority to develop policy = low score)	20%	Strong link		No authority	
E	Data availability (i.e., difficulty of gathering data, cost)	25%	Data available in DRC	Data collection requires moderate effort	Data collection requires considerable resources and effort	
F	Is the data reliable? (i.e., how precise is the data?)	10%	Yes	(e.g., old but not current)	No	
	Total	100%				

...gm\long\_range\_planning\projects\performance measures\Prioritization Criteria-Table-1

-

#### Attachment E

#### Scored Indicators for 2040 Performance Evaluation Updated February 9, 2001

If you don't measure results, you can't tell success from failure. If you can't see success, you can't reward it. If you can't see failure, you can't correct it. Osborne and Gaebler, Reinventing Government, 1992

#### 2040 Fundamental 2: Protect the natural environment.

a) Are we successful in protecting and restoring the region's natural environment, including streamside corridor system, wetlands, riparian areas and floodplains and other environmentally constrained land?

b) Are the strategies and tools we are using working?

· ·	(A) Is the indicator required by the State?	(B) Does the indicator measure the 2040 Fundamental directly or indirectly? Weight = 25%	(C) Can the result of the indicator be used to set a target/benchmark? Weight = 20%	(D) Does the indicator address issues within Metro's authority? Weight = 20%	(E) Data availability (i.e., difficulty of gathering data, cost) Weight = 25%	(F) Is data reliable? Weight = 10%	Weighted Score
Output Indicators (Effort) 2.1 Land and Water Features Protected by Regulation				· · ·			
Indicator #2.1a: Acres of: Environmentally constrained land regulated by <u>Title 3<sup>1</sup> (wetlands, floodplains, riparian areas, and steep slopes) (create map)</u> This indicator measures the amount of land by type that receives protection under adopted Title 3 regulations.	YES	3 (75)	3 (60)	3 (60)	3 (75)	3 (30)	300
Indicator #2.1b: Percent of stream miles in the region (within Metro boundary) protected by Title 3 This indicator measures the percent of the region's streams* that are protected by Title 3. (* Based on Metro stream route database)	NO	3 (75)	3 (60)	3 (60)	3 (75)	3 (30)	300

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Title 3 refers to the adopted water quality and flood management portions of this Functional Plan title. Goal 5 is the unadopted portion of this Functional Plan title that is in progress. The Goal 5 work deals with fish and wildlife of Title 3of the Functional Plan.

(C) (D) (A) (B) (E) (F) Is the indicator Does the indicator Can the result of the Does the indicator Data availability (i.e., Is data reliable? required by the measure the 2040 difficulty of gathering indicator be used to set address issues within Weighted a target/benchmark? State? Fundamental directly data, cost) Metro's authority? Score or indirectly? Weight = 25% Weight = 20% Weight = 20% Weight = 10%Weight = 25% 2.2. Conversion of Regulated Land and Water Features Indicator #2.2a: Percent of Title 3 steep slope areas YES 3 3 3 3 2 converted to use. This indicator will monitor the impact (75) (60) (60) (75) (20)290 of regional policies in avoiding developments in steep slope land adjacent to streams. Indicator #2.2b: Percent of Title 3 riparian areas YES 3 3 3 3 2 (excluding Title 3 steep slopes) (see 2.2a) converted to (75) (60) (60) (75) (20)use. This indicator will monitor the impact of regional 290 policies in avoiding developments in riparian area land. Indicator #2.2c: Percent of Title 3 floodplain area YES 3 3 3 3 3 converted to use. This indicator will monitor the degree (75) (60)(60) (75) (30) to which development occurs in the floodplain. 300 Indicator #2.2d: Percent of Title 3 wetlands that were YES 3 3 3 2 3 relocated/altered through permits granted by the Oregon ·(75) (60) (60)(50)(30) 275 Department of State Lands. This indicator measures the effect of Title 3 in preserving the region's wetlands. 2.3. Land and Water Features Protected by Acquisition Indicator #2.3a: Acres of: Greenspaces acquired by Metro (create map) NO 3 3 3 3 3 300 (75) (60) (60) (75) (30) Greenspaces acquired by local governments and special districts (create map) NO 3 3 2 1 2 This indicator measures the number of acres of 225 (75) (60) (20) (50) (20) regionally significant natural areas protected\* by Metro. This indicator also measures the number of acres of lands protected\* by local governments and special districts. (\* Through acquisition, conservation easement or dedication)

Draft

Draft

	(A) Is the indicator required by the State?	(B) Does the indicator measure the 2040 Fundamental directly or indirectly? Weight = 25%	(C) Can the result of the indicator be used to set a target/benchmark? <i>Weight</i> = 20%	(D) Does the indicator address issues within Metro's authority? Weight = 20%	(E) Data availability (i.e., difficulty of gathering data, cost) Weight = 25%	(F) Is data reliable? Weight = 10%	Weighted Score
Indicator #2.3b: Miles of streams bank <sup>2</sup> in public ownership protected through acquisition <sup>3</sup> : <u>by Metro (create map)</u> <u>by local governments and special districts</u> (create map) This indicator measures the miles of streams that are protected through acquisition and conservation by local governments and special districts. (Note: These streams my or may not be Title 3 streams)	YES YES	3 (75) 3 (75)	3 (60) 2 (40)	3 (60) 1 (20)	3 (75) 2 (50)	3 (30) 2 (20)	300 205
2.4. Vegetated or Forested (Tree Canopy) Land and Water Features Protected by Regulation Indicator #2.4: Acres of Title 3 wetlands, riparian areas, flood plains and steep slopes that are vegetated or forested (tree canopy). This indicator measures the extent to which we are loosing vegetation in Title 3 areas.	NO	3 (75)	3 (60)	2 (40)	3 (75)	2 (20)	270
<ul> <li>2.5. Conversion of Vegetated or Forested (Tree Canopy) Land and Water Features</li> <li><u>Indicator #2.5: Change in acres of vegetated or forested</u> (tree canopy) Title 3 wetlands, riparian areas, floodplains and steep slopes. This indicator measures the impact of regional policies to preserve vegetation in Title 3 areas for water quality reasons.</li> </ul>	YES	3 (75)	3 (60)	2 (40)	3 (75)	2 (20)	270
2.6. Waste Disposed and Recycled <u>Indicator # 2.6a: Change in the amount of waste</u> <u>generated, recycled and disposed.</u> These indicators measure the region's success in reducing the amount of	NO	3 (75)	3 (60)	3 (60)	3 (75)	3 (30)	300

.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In some areas only one side of a stream bank is acquired, and in some areas the two sides of a stream bank are in the acquired areas <sup>3</sup> Areas in trust ownership (e.g. conservation easement) are not included.

natural resources used by residents and businesses in the production and consumption of goods and services.	(A) Is the indicator required by the State?	(B) Does the indicator measure the 2040 Fundamental directly or indirectly? Weight = 25%	(C) Can the result of the indicator be used to set a target/benchmark? Weight = 20%	(D) Does the indicator address issues within Metro's authority? Weight = 20%	(E) Data availability (i.e., difficulty of gathering data, cost) Weight = 25%	(F) Is data reliable? Weight = 10%	Weighted Score
Indicator # 2.6b: Amount of household hazardous waste collected. This indicator measures the region's success in diverting household hazardous waste from improper storage and improper disposal where it might cause injuries to persons or damage to streams and groundwater.	NO	3 (75)	3 (60)	1 (20)	3 (75)	1 (10)	. 240
Outcome Indicators (Effect) 2.7. Non-Regulated and Non-Acquired Land and Water Features Indicator #2.7a: Acres of natural vegetated or forested (tree canopy) buildable land that is unregulated and private. This includes vegetated areas in non-Title 3 and private riparian areas, steep slopes, and upland areas that are buildable (Map). (Note: All wetlands and floodplains are included in Title3). This indicator measures the number of acres of unregulated natural areas with vegetation and forested (tree canopy) that have the potential to be developed.	NO	3 (75)	3 (60)	1 (20)	3 (75)	3 (30)	260
Indicator #2.7b: Acres of urban forested (tree canopy) land in developed areas (Map). This indicator measures the number of acres of forested (tree canopy) land in developed areas, including residential neighborhoods.	NO	3 (75)	3 (60)	1 (20)	3 (75)	3 (30)	260
2.8. Conversion of Non-Regulated Land and Water Features Indicator #2.8a: Percent of natural vegetated or	VFS		2		2		
forested (tree canopy) buildable land that is unregulated and private. This includes vegetated areas in non-Title 3 and private riparian areas, steep slopes, and upland areas that are buildable (Map). This indicator will monitor the amount of unregulated	I ES	(50)	(40)	2 (40)	(50)	(20)	200

•

.

Page 4

Draft

**(B)** (A) (C) (D) **(E)** (F) Data availability (i.e., Is the indicator Does the indicator Can the result of the Does the indicator Is data reliable? required by the measure the 2040 indicator be used to set address issues within difficulty of gathering Weighted Fundamental directly State? a target/benchmark? Metro's authority? data. cost) Score or indirectly? Weight = 25%Weight = 20%Weight = 20%Weight = 25%Weight = 10%and non-acquired natural areas with vegetation and forested (tree canopy) that have been lost to development or changed over time. Indicator #2.8b: Percent of urban forested (tree canopy) YES 2 2 2 2 2 land in developed areas (Map). This indicator measures (50)(40) (40) (50) (20)200 the amount of acres of urban forested (tree canopy) land in developed areas, including residential neighborhoods that have been lost overtime. 2.9. Non-Regulated and Noon-Acquired Land and Water Features Indicator #2.9: Acres of: Vacant steep slopes not regulated by Title 3 п YES 3 3 2 3 2 (create map) This indicator measures the acres of steep slopes that do (75)(60) (40)(75) (20)270 not receive protection under adopted Title 3 regulations. 2.10. Water Quality Indicator 2.10a: DEQ Water Quality Index. This indicator uses the water quality index (such as NO 3 3 2 3 235 phosphorous, nitrogen, and dissolved oxygen) to measure the health of the body of water in the streams (75) (60) (50)(20)(30)inside the UGB. This indicator also measures how well current efforts are protecting water quality in the region. (Note: This index provides a longterm monitoring data for streams regardless of whether there are 303(d) listed or not ) (Another indirect indicator of water quality is the use of "macro invertebrate organisms" which are variably sensitive to water pollution) Indicator 2.10b: DEO 303(d) list for water quality limited waterbodies in the Metro region: This indicator NO 3 3 3 3 1 measures the health of the body of water in streams. 260 rivers and lakes in the region. (75)(60) (20)(75) (30)(Note: The 303(d) list includes sections of streams.

Page 5

Draft

		· .					<u>Draft</u>
	(A) Is the indicator required by the State?	(B) Does the indicator measure the 2040 Fundamental directly or indirectly?	(C) Can the result of the indicator be used to set a target/benchmark?	(D) Does the indicator address issues within Metro's authority?	(E) Data availability (i.e., difficulty of gathering data, cost)	(F) Is data reliable?	Weighted Score
rivers, and lakes that are listed by the Dept. of Environmental Quality as water quality limited under Section 303 (d) of the federal Clean Water Act. According to the 1996 list there are 34 stream segments (over 213 miles) and four lakes listed as water quality limited due to excessive nutrients (phosphorous, nitrogen), pesticides, sedimentation, temperature, dissolved oxygen, and other parameters)		Weight = 25%	Weight = 20%	Weight = 20%	Weight = 25%	Weight = 10%	
(Below are related indicators in Fundamental #3) Indicator #3.4h: Number of air quality violations and exceedances per year. This indicator measures the number of days the region exceeds federal air quality standards per year and the number of air quality violations the region receives over time.	Yes	3 (75)	3 (60)	2 (40)	2 (50)	2 (20)	245
<u>Pending<sup>4</sup> Goal 5 (Fish and Wildlife)</u> <u>Indicators (Output)</u> <u>Indicator #2.a: Goal 5 area with significant vegetation</u> <u>or mature canopy cover</u> . This indicator measures how well Title 3, Section 5 is preserving and/or restoring vegetation along wetlands, riparian areas, floodplains, and steep slopes and other upland for fish and wildlife values.	NO						
Indicator #2.b: Total stream miles protected by Goal 5. This indicator measures the mileage of the stream network designated as regionally significant by Metro and afforded some level of protection under Title 3 provisions for fish and wildlife.	NO						-
				1			1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> These indicators will be applied in the second phase of the 2040 Growth Concept performance evaluation.

.

Draft (A) (B) (C) (D) (E) (F) Is the indicator Does the indicator Does the indicator Data availability (i.e., Can the result of the Is data reliable? required by the measure the 2040 indicator be used to set difficulty of gathering address issues within Weighted State? Fundamental directly a target/benchmark? Metro's authority? data. cost) Score or indirectly? Weight = 25% Weight = 20% Weight = 20% Weight = 25% Weight = 10% Pending Goal 5 (Fish and Wildlife) Indicators (Outcome) **Indicator #2.c:** Miles of known fish habitat blocked by NO culverts. This indicator measures the length of fishbearing streams where fish passage (or migration) is blocked by the presence culverts or pipes. Indicator #2.d: Change in number of (wild) stock NO salmon and other native species. This indicator measures the restoration and preservation of salmon habitat throughout the region. Indicator #2.e: Miles of fish bearing streams. This NO . indicator measures the habitat quality for streams in the . region. Indicator #2.f: Miles of streams daylighted and or NO restored. This indicator will measure the region's progress in returning streams to properly functioning conditions. . Indicator #2.g: Surface water and groundwater quality NO (based on Trophic State Index - TSI). This indicator measures the clarity of steams and lakes (algae and total . phosphorous values) in the region.

<u>2040 Fundamental 6</u>: Encourage a vibrant place to live.
a) Is there a sufficient supply of parks and greenspaces to satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the region?
b) Are the services provided in the mixed-use centers convenient and diverse? Are these centers desirable?

c) How well are Metro policies contributing to the balance between preservation of neighborhood character and revitalization of neighborhood where appropriate?
 d) Coordination of residential and business development with transportation and road systems

-	(A) Is the indicator required by the State?	(B) Does the indicator measure the 2040 Fundamental directly or indirectly? <i>Weight = 25%</i>	(C) Can the result of the indicator be used to set a target/benchmark? Weight = 20%	(D) Does the indicator address issues within Metro's authority? Weight = 20%	(E) Data availability (i.e., difficulty of gathering data, cost) <i>Weight = 25%</i>	(F) Is data reliable? <i>Weight = 10%</i>	Weighted Score
Output Indicators (Effort)         Recreation         Indicator #6.1: Acres of Metro parks and greenspaces         per capita:	YES	3	3	3	3	3	
Indicator #6.2: Acres of other public parks and greenspaces per capita: <u>inside the UGB; and</u> <u>outside the UGB open to the public</u> . This indicator links total acreage of other public parks and greenspaces open to the residents of the Metro region.	YES	3	3	1	3	3	

Draft

······							
	(A) Is the indicator required by the State?	(B) Does the indicator measure the 2040 Fundamental directly or indirectly? <i>Weight = 25%</i>	(C) Can the result of the indicator be used to set a target/benchmark? Weight = 20%	(D) Does the indicator address issues within Metro's authority? Weight = 20%	(E) Data availability (i.e., difficulty of gathering data, cost) Weight = 25%	(F) Is data reliable? <i>Weight = 10%</i>	Weighted Score
•		8	0		M	<u>w</u>	
Indicator #6.3: Miles of completed regional trails <sup>5</sup> . inside the UGB; and outside the UGB open to the public. This indicator measures how many miles of the Regional Trails Plan (first adopted as part of the Greenspaces Master Plan in 1992) have been constructed.	NO	3	3	2	3	3	
Indicator #6.4: Percentage of population within walking distance (1/4 mile and 1/2 mile) of public parks <sup>6</sup> , greenspaces and regional trails.	YES	3	3	2	. 3	3	
This indicator measures the accessibility of public parks, greenspaces and regional trails. (Note: ¼-mile is distance Metro transportation policies consider "walking distance" to transit).							
Mixed Use Centers (Below is related indicator in Fundamental #1)						-	
Indicator #1.7: Mixed Use Index map (consider comparison of 2000 vs. 2022 data forecast). This indicator measures the progress of integrating/connecting street developments in conjunction with development of a strong "balance" of mixed use opportunity for employment and housing.	NO	3	3	3	3	3	
Transportation/Accessibility (Below are related indicators in Fundamental #3) Indicator #3.1e: Percent of regional pedestrian system completed. This indicator measures the region's progress toward implementing a regional pedestrian system adequate to serve the 2040 Growth Concept.	NO	3	3	2	1	3	

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Regional trails are defined as those trails included in the Metro-adopted 1992 Regional Trails Plan and any additions to that plan made by the Metro Council since then (e.g., Penninsula Crossing Trail).
 <sup>6</sup> Metro does not have authority related to access to greenspaces.

٠

.

Draft

	(A) Is the indicator required by the State?	(B) Does the indicator measure the 2040 Fundamental directly or indirectly? <i>Weight = 25%</i>	(C) Can the result of the indicator be used to set a target/benchmark? Weight = 20%	(D) Does the indicator address issues within Metro's authority? Weight = 20%	(E) Data availability (i.e., difficulty of gathering data, cost) Weight = 25%	(F) Is data reliable? Weight = 10%	Weighted Score
Indicator #3.1h: Percent of regional bicycle system completed. This indicator measures the region's progress toward implementing a regional bicycle system adequate to serve the 2040 Growth Concept.	NO	2	2	2	2	1	
Indicator #3.2a: Percent of planned boulevards <u>constructed</u> . This indicator measures the percentage RTP Priority System boulevard projects constructed over time.	NO	3	2	3	2	3	
Indicator #3.2b: Percent of region with required code amendments for street design. This indicator measures the degree to which local jurisdictions have implemented RTP street policies.	NO	3	2	2	2	3	
Indicator #3.3a: Percent of the region's residential and mixed-use areas that meets RTP intersection density requirements. This indicator measures the level of local street connectivity in mixed-use and residential areas, and the degree to which connectivity requirements are being met through the land development process.	NO	3	3	2	1	. 3	
Housing Options (Below is related indicator in Fundamental #5)	· ·						
Indicator #5.2: Change in the ratio of single family to multi-family housing. This indicator reveals the extent of the diversity of housing in the region, and implicitly the degree to which local jurisdictions have implemented affordable housing policies. (MTAC recommendation in 1997)	NO	3	3	2	3	3	
Outcome Indicators (Effect)							
Neighborhoods Character and Preservation	NO	2	2	1	3	2	
Indicator #6.5: Change in diversity (or mix) of income	1						

•

J

(A) (B) (D) (E) (F) (C) Data availability Is the indicator Does the indicator Is data reliable? Does the indicator Can the result of the required by the State? (i.e., difficulty of measure the 2040 indicator be used to address issues within Weighted Metro's authority? Fundamental directly gathering data, cost) set a Score or indirectly? target/benchmark? Weight = 25%Weight = 20%Weight = 20%Weight = 25% Weight = 10%groups living in the neighborhoods. This indicator measures the impact of changes on the mix of residents in our neighborhoods. Indicator #6.6: Number of permits for rehabilitation<sup>7</sup> NO 3 3 3 3 1 projects. This indicator measures rehab investments trends in the neighborhood). Indicator #6.7: Number of new business licenses NO 2 3 1 3 3 issued by neighborhoods. This indicator measures additional business investment trends in the neighborhood). Transportation/Accessibility (Below are related indicators in Fundamental #3) Indicator #3.4a: Vehicle miles traveled per capita. This NO 2 2 2 2 indicator measures the change in vehicle miles traveled per person over time. Indicator #3.4b: Change in average travel times in key NO 3 3 2 2 2 corridors. This indicator measures the change in average travel times by motor vehicle and by transit for key corridors in the region. Housing/Affordability (Below are related indicators in Fundamental #5) Indicator #5.4: Median rent of multi-family residential. NO 3 3 1 3 3 This indicator measures the region's progress or lack of progress in the production of affordable rental housing. Indicator #5.5: Median price of single-family YES 3 3 3 1 3 residential. This indicator measures affordability of homes in the region, and implicitly measures progress or lack of progress in homeownership rate in the region.

Draft

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> All structural rehabilitation (residential and commercial) requiring a permit.

## Draft

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	
	Is the indicator	Does the indicator	Can the result of the	Does the indicator	Data availability	Is data reliable?	
· ·	required by the State?	measure the 2040	indicator be used to	address issues within	(i.e., difficulty of		Woighted
		Fundamental directly	set a	Metro's authority?	gathering data, cost)		Vergnieu
		or indirectly?	target/benchmark?				Score
		Weight = 25%	Weight = 20%	Weight = 20%	Weight = 25%	Weight = 10%	
	•						

.

•.

.

• •

# greenspaces technical advisory committee please sign in . .

name organization email City of Happy Valley Cathgel CC1. Happy-lalley, or. us Alathy Daw alete Woodruff Thetro Committee for Citiz w Suvolvement 503-252-8564 houckm@teleport. audulan he Wikefouch 7 ROX catron@ ci. City of Greshom gresham.or. VS Catron Portland Buts pkgneggy@ Evenbut Jim Sjulin) ci, portland, or, us 6. 9. 0. courney like pdot courney.dukee Tans, ci. portland. or. us WOWMSN @MSN. com Karbara lideken 40-Mile Joop Joanne Rice Washinston County Joanne\_ Fice @ Co. Washington. or. US Planning Division

# greenspaces technical advisory committee please sign in . .

organization name email City of Fairview Widmannaci. Fairview. Melissa Widman Deronice Smith City of Beaunto asmithe cibourton.or.us ocken Qci, gresham.ov.us aty of GRESHAM REDECLA OCHEN Mosno SLOT NONDLE Metro Nostin Hock Gerry Uba Motro Jayne Cronland Three Rivers Land Conserving Scott TA/but City of Hillsboro

# greenspaces technical advisory committee please sign in . .

name	organization	email	
Dawn Havtman	tualatin Hills, Parkty Rec. Wist.	dhartman@thpml	.coM
Deborah Lev	Portland Parks	dlevaci.portland.o	r.us
Velenie Loutz	City of Troutdale	Vlantz@ci.troutdele.or.4.	5
			•
SEAN LOUGHRAN	OPED	sean.loughran@state.or.	05
TimUanWormer	Fort of Portland	Vanwoteportptld.com	
Keith Nay	Lewis & clark Bicentennial, OR.	KgHAY@telepo	rt.com
Dow BArek	SW TRAILS	donbaach@k-Com.1	Je-,
Scott Talloot			