REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION METROPOLITAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

THIS WILL be an unusual report, in light of recent revelations concerning the preparation of the budget for Tri-Met.

THE COMMITTEE considered board comments concerning HB 2048 and HB 5018 and nonetheless continues to support passage of the measures providing for the state of Oregon to pay the payroll tax for mass transit. Committee reasoning was that while a comprehensive review of the payroll tax may be necessary, such a review is not likely to occur during the present legislative session. HB2048 and HB 5018 (the former authorizes the tax, the latter makes an appropriation to pay it) are about all that we've got in terms of providing increased support for transit at a time when we are looking at decreased support from the federal government.

THE COMMITTEE also would like the board to be on record in opposition to SB 802, which requies that boundaries of transit districts conform to those of metropolitan service districts. The legislation may be necessary in the future if Tri-Met does not alter its boundaries on its own. The agency is looking at boundary realignment now, and the committee thinks Tri-Met should be given another year to come up with its own plan.

THE CHAIRMAN, as a member of the Metro Citizens League board, recommends rejection of the committee's first recommendation; support of the second. I don't see how a citizens group such as ours can recommend additional state support for Tri-Met when evidence seems to show such poor citizen involvement in the preparation of the Tri-Met budget. As a board member I recommend that the committee **be** asked to examine Tri-Met's budget process, and return with a thorough report including how the process has worked in the past, and specific recommendations for changes in the future.

Dennis Ryerson Committee Chairman 5/14/81

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION METROPOLITAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

THIS WILL be an unusual report, in light of recent revelations concerning the preparation of the budget for Tri-Met.

THE COMMITTEE considered board comments concerning HB 2048 and HB 5018 and nonetheless continues to support passage of the measures providing for the state of Oregon to pay the payroll tax for mass transit. Committee reasoning was that while a comprehensive review of the payroll tax may be necessary, such a review is not likely to occur during the present legislative session. HB2048 and HB 5018 (the former authorizes the tax, the latter makes an appropriation to pay it) are about all that we've got in terms of providing increased support for transit at a time when we are looking at decreased support from the federal government.

THE COMMITTEE also would like the board to be on record in opposition to SB 802, which requies that boundaries of transit districts conform to those of metropolitan service districts. The legislation may be necessary in the future if Tri-Met does not alter its boundaries on its own. The agency is looking at boundary realignment now, and the committee thinks Tri-Met should be given another year to come up with its own plan.

THE CHAIRMAN, as a member of the Metro Citizens League board, recommends rejection of the committee's first recommendation; support of the second. I don't see how a citizens group such as ours can recommend additional state support for Tri-Met when evidence seems to show such poor citizen involvement in the preparation of the Tri-Met budget. As a board member I recommend that the committee be asked to examine Tri-Met's budget process, and return with a thorough report including how the process has worked in the past, and specific recommendations for changes in the future.

Dennis Ryerson Committee Chairman 5/14/81



1912 S.W. SIXTH AVENUE, ROOM 252 PORTLAND, OREGON 97201 / (503) 229-3097

| Red Lion Motor Hotel | | | |
|----------------------|------------|---------------------|----|
| S.W. 4th & Lincoln | 12:00 Noon | Wednesday, February | 27 |

| LIGHT RAIL: | WILL IT WO SHOULD IT CORRIDORS? | RK? HOW WI BE PLANNED | LL IT WORK? FOR OTHER |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| SPEAKERS: | Robert Pos Planning a | t, Executiv nd Developm | e Director of ent Tri-Met |
| | Andy Catug Metro | no, Transpo | rtation Planner |
| NOTE: | Please bri location t | ng a guest. his month. | Note change in |
| COST: | Luncheon: Audit: | \$8.00 \$1.00 | Astoria Room |

RESERVATIONS & CANCELLATIONS: Please call 229-3049 2 days prior to the meeting. Cancellations should be made at least 1 day prior to the meeting. No-shows will be billed because we must pay the hotel.

To serve as a forum for metropolitan citizens to have an effective voice in the events and decisions made throughout the local metropolitan area.

Metropolitan Citizens League 1912 S.W. 6th Avenue Rm # 252 Portland, Oregon 97201



Moved, left no address
No such number
Moved, not ferwardable
Addressee unknown

ROBERT B WILSON 1303 AMERICAN BANK BLDG PORTLAND OR 97205





Overview

Durina 1980/81 high interest rates and a deepening recession severely impacted the region's housing construction and population arowth. New housing was constructed at half the rate set during the '70s, while the region's population growth was down by two-thirds from past trends. However, this reduction in new housing and population growth has not been uniform across the region. Rural areas remained relatively unaffected by the unexpected economic downturn and were much closer to past trends than urban areas.

Economic conditions impacted the central urban area more severely than suburban areas. Although Portland and Multhomah County together added approximately the same number of new housing units as Clackamas and Clark Counties combined, they registered an overall population loss due, in part, to out-migration.

During this same period, despite the general decline in Multnomah County, population increases were recorded in the suburban cities of Gresham and Troutdale.

The most resilient portion of the region to the impacts of this recession seemed to be Washington County. Although below its normal population growth rate, Washington County increased its share of the region's annual population growth from one-third in past years to nearly threequarters in 1980/81.

Two Washington County cities, Tualatin and

Beaverton, actually exceeded their past growth rate for both population and housing.

Given the region's performance for the past two vears, are there any conclusions or inferences to be drawn having implications for regional or local governmental planning activities? At this time, the answer should probably be no: this period represents an anomaly in the context of long-range forecasting and planning, being the worst economic downturn in the Northwest since the Great Depression; and two years is too short a period to use as the basis for drawing long-term planning conclusions; the past two years' slowdown is nearly identical to that in 1973 which was followed by a period of very high growth.

Introduction

This is the first annual edition of Regional Development Trends, a report which monitors the growth and development of this region.

The focus this year is on population growth and

housing construction for the years 1980-81. Future editions will be expanded and refined over time as data becomes available and needs become evident. For example, some major 1980 census items (e.g., income) have only recently become available and will be offered in the next edition as a demographic profile of the region.

We welcome suggestions on pertinent information items to include in future editions.

Purpose

The primary purpose is to offer a concise summary of recent development trends in the Portland/ Vancouver metropolitan area and to see how consistent they are with Metro's long-range forecasts. This edition monitors many of the trends and assumptions used for Metro's long-range population, employment, land development and transportation forecasts. While a single year's development activity cannot serve as the basis for revising a 20-year forecast, yearly monitoring of actual growth rates will identify new trends as they emerge and signal the need to revise forecasts. On the following pages, frequent reference is made to the Year 2000 Population and Employment Forecast. This 20-year forecast was made in 1981 when Metro hosted a series of workshops attended by representatives from the region's cities and counties. These workshops produced a growth scenario for the next two decades which assumes a continuation of the expansive economic growth experienced during the 1970s.

In this document, the actual growth (or decline) from 1980-1982 is compared to the growth trend used for the year 2000 Population Forecast. The growth projection used for these comparisons represents a two-year "slice" out of the 20-year forecast (2/20ths) which is a smoothed future growth curve with no attempt to forecast the cyclic nature of growth as would be necessary for short-range projections.

Year 2000 Forecast

The U.S. census provides a "benchmark" every 10 years, describing the region's demographic characteristics. Between census years, the State carries out estimates of change at the county and city level. For various needs at Metro, updates of key information items for the intermediate years by census tract are made, based on building permits, the State's growth estimates by county and city, and Oregon Employment Services data. The census tract level of detail on file at Metro is, in effect, an "update" of selected census information which is available as a unique resource to both governments and the private sector.

The Census and Intermediate Year Estimates

For business and government decision-makers who need information on the existing and forecast development of this region, the annually "updated" census information is kept on computer files by Metro. Individuals in need of more detailed information should contact Metro's Data Resource Center, which has been recently formed to provide easier access to regional data.

In addition, as a U.S. Census Affiliate Data Center, we can provide

historical census data. The information (either historical census or updates of selected items) can be accessed for either standard census geography (e.g., census tracts) or for custom geography (such as a specific market area). Our information base also includes non-census items such as current and year 2000 forecast employment data by place of employment, traffic volumes and land use patterns at the census tract level of detail.

Establishment of the Data Resource Center represents a significant expansion of Metro's information services to the business community. Fees charged for customized reports and services are calculated on the cost of preparation plus a database development surcharge. Free estimates for services are available. As a nonprofit agency, all revenue from sales are reinvested in the Data Resource Center Program.

Data Resource Center

After the Census:

Fig. 1 Population Forecast

Regional Growth Since 1980





During the past decade, 1970 to 1980, the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area increased by 237,800 people, a compound growth rate of 2.1 percent per year. Of the country's 323 metropolitan areas (SMSAs), this rate made us 85th fastest growing. Most of this increase came from the people moving here to fill jobs created by our expanding economy. This influx of new employees and their families accounted for 75 percent of the region's growth during the 70s.

The current recession has now reduced the number of available jobs to below 1980 levels. Since 1980, the region's yearly population growth rate has been only 1.2 percent. In-migration has accounted for only 11 percent of this increase with the remaining 89 percent coming from natural increases.

Figure 1 shows that the estimated population growth for the last two years is down significantly from the average annual growth trend implicit in the year 2000 forecast. However, the region's population growth rate has historically fluctuated up and down in response to economic conditions. Figure 2 illustrates the actual yearly population growth for the period 1970-82 as compared to the 10-year average yearly growth rate. Interestingly, the actual average growth rate between 1970 and 1974 (the last recession) was 1.3 percent per year, barely above the current 1.2 percent; during the second half of the decade it was much higher 4.3 percent per year from 1975 to 1980.



In both the Oregon and Washington portion of the region, governmental actions have been taken to direct the pattern of population growth in order to economize upon the provision of urban services and avoid premature conversion of productive farm land.

In Oregon the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) was established by Metro, and in Washington the Regional Planning

ł.

Council of Clark County has adopted an Urban Services Boundary (USB). Other urban growth boundaries for outlying communities such as Gaston, Estacada and Sandy have been adopted through the local planning process.

In 1980 and 1981, 69 percent of the region's population growth and 84 percent of new housing units constructed occurred inside areas designated for urban development. This gap between population and dwelling unit growth is due to a decline in population in several cities and unincorporated communities inside the growth boundary, resulting from the current economic recession and the family life cycle impacts from the older population in these areas (children leaving homesmaller family size).

Urban Versus Rural Growth

The Portland metropolitan UGB in Oregon was adopted by Metro in January 1979. At that time, an estimated 93 percent of the threecounty population resided inside these limits. Forecasts to year 2000 assumed a slight increase to 95 percent of that population.

In 1980 and 1981, 72 percent of the area's population growth and 85 percent of the new housing construction took place inside the Metro UGB.

Portland Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary



Urban Population Growth Distribution*



* within the Metro Urban Growth and Clark County Urban Services Boundaries

Urban Growth Distribution

The western portion of the urban area, Washington County, received 72 percent of the region's "urban" 1980-81 population growth and, during this adverse economic period, came the nearest to its projected growth (58 percent of the projected 13,800 people).

Clark and Clackamas Counties combined grew at about half the rate of Washington County. At the same time, Multnomah County and the City of Portland experienced population declines.

Housing Construction in the Urban Area

For the urban portion of the region, total housing construction reached 55 percent of its forecasted level for the two-year period. Washington County again had the largest share with over a third of all new housing constructed.

Of the 2,081 single family homes constructed within urban Multnomah County, 618 were built in the City of Portland as were 1,023 of the 1,641 new apartment units.

Of the total number of new housing units constructed inside the urban area, 62 percent were single family and 38 percent were apartments. This compares to a projected ratio of 55 percent single family and 45 percent multi-family. The ratio of these two housing types is important in determining the region's long-term need for urban land (inside the UGB). If the projected ratio of single to multifamily units does not hold true over time, then adjustments to the region's supply of urban land may be necessary due to the greater land requirements of single family housing.

Housing Construction in the Rural Area

New housing units constructed in rural areas constituted 16 percent of the region's total new housing units. In Clark County, 1,180 housing units or 36 percent were built in the rural area. Clackamas County had 24 percent of its new housing units built on rural land.



•within the Metro Urban Growth Boundary and Clark County Urban Services Boundaries

Lands lying beyond the Portland metropolitan urban growth limits are designated by county comprehensive plans primarily for agricultural and forestry uses. The exceptions are a few small cities and rural residential communities. In the four-county region, 31 percent of all new population growth has occurred outside all urban boundaries (i.e., Portland area UGB, Clark County USB, Sandy, Estacada, etc.). The greatest amount of "rural" population growth occurred in Clark County where a gain of 2,357 people accounted for 66 percent of the County's growth. Clackamas County was second with 1,476 people, 35 percent of the County's growth.

Rural Growth Distribution



Fig. 7

| Housing Construction in the Rural Area* | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|---------------------|---|------------------|------|--|
| 1980 Thousands | | | 1980 to 1982 GROWTH | | | | |
| | 10 20 | Multnomah County | | 500 | 1000 | 1500 | |
|] | | Clark County | | /////////////////////////////////////// | | | |
| | | Clackamas County Washington County | | | | | |
| | Single Famil Multi-Family | y Actual Gro | owth | F | Projected Growth | | |

*outside the Metro Urban Boundary and Clark County Urban Services Boundaries

Multnomah County Growth Distribution



Multhomah County experienced an overall loss in population, primarily due to out-migration. However, population gains were tallied by Gresham, Troutdale, Fairview, Wood Village and the unincorporated Wilkes/Rockwood area in East County. Gresham showed the strongest growth, adding 920 people, 30 percent of their projected growth. The greatest population loss was experienced in the center of the County where the Hazelwood and Culley/Parkrose communities lost 1,500 residents.

Fig. 9

East Multnomah County Population * 1980 to 1982 GROWTH **1980 POPULATION** 1000 1000 Hazelwood Culley/ Parkrose Centennial Errol Heights/ Powellhurst Wilkes/ Rockwood Fairview/ Wood Village Troutdale Gresham Actual Growth Projected Growth

*within the Metro Urban Growth Boundary

Fig. 10

Multnomah County Population Forecast * (excluding Portland)



Gresham led all other cities and unincorporated communities in the County, building 537 houses and 241 apartment units. The Hazelwood, Culley/Parkrose, Centennial and Errol Heights/Powellhurst communities all slightly exceeded their projection for new single family housing units. In spite of the number of dwelling units added to the County's housing stock, higher vacancy rates and decreasing household size produced a population loss.

Housing Construction: Multnomah County

Fig. 11 East Multhomah County Housing Construction*

1980 Thousands

1980 to 1982 GROWTH



Washington County Growth Distribution

Most of the cities and unincorporated urban areas in Washington County have experienced population gains since the 1980 census. However, a major decrease occurred in the Cedar Hills/West Slope area where there was a net loss of 1,000 people over the two-year period. The largest gain was registered in unincorporated Aloha, which grew by 3,100 people, 90 percent of its forecast growth.

The Westside city receiving the most new residents was Tualatin with a gain of 1,350 people, nearly 300 percent of its projected growth of 484 people.

Hillsboro, forecasted to be the County's fastest growing city, was second with 1,030 people at 36 percent of its expected growth.



Fig. 13



Fig. 14

Washington County Population Forecast *



The unincorporated Aloha community saw the highest level of housing construction in Washington County, 677 new houses and 728 apartments, for a total of 1,405 dwelling units. The city of Beaverton was second with 734 units, 283 houses and 451 apartments. Aloha did not attain its forecast construction rate. Beaverton, however, exceeded its projected rate of single family construction by 48 percent and multi-family by 162 percent.

Housing Construction: Washington County

Fig. 15



Clackamas County Growth Distribution

In urban Clackamas County, the cities received the majority of new growth with Wilsonville gaining 470 new residents, 44 percent of its projection. Gladstone exceeded its growth forecast more than four times, adding 310 people when only 70 were projected.

All of the urban unincorporated areas experienced a decline except the Clackamas community which grew by 1,150, 59 percent of its expected growth. The Oak Grove area showed the greatest loss, 680 people. It was projected to add 360 over the two-year period.



Fig. 17



Fig. 18

Clackamas County Population Forecast *



West Linn led the County, constructing 188 new houses and 265 apartments for a total of 453 units. This exceeded the City's forecast by 32 percent for single family construction and 263 percent for multi-family.

Fig. 19

The unincorporated Clackamas community tallied 443 units, 305 of which were single family dwellings. While this area fell short of its forecast construction rate for houses by 24 percent, the multi-family rate was off by 70 percent (138 units built when 449 were projected). West Linn constructed considerably more apartments than projected. Housing Contruction: Clackamas County



Single Family Multi-Family

Projected Growth

*within the Metro Urban Growth Boundary

Clark County Growth Distribution

Nearly all of urban Clark County's population growth occurred in unincorporated communities. While this amounted to 1,160 people, it was only 14 percent of the 8,030 projected for unincorporated urban Clark County. The only population loss was experienced by the city of Vancouver, 230 people.





* within the Clark County Urban Services Boundary

Fig. 22 Clark County Population Forecast *



Three-fourths of Clark County's new housing was constructed in the unincorporated communities lying east and north of the city of Vancouver. The City itself fell short of its projected rate of single family construction by 66 percent but exceeded the multi-family forecast by 241 percent.

Housing Construction: Clark County





* within the Clark County Urban Services Boundary

Implications for Future Planning

As further editions of this report are published, continued monitoring will provide a valid basis for revising the Year 2000 Population and Employment Forecast. Even the two years presented here raise questions regarding communities which have met or exceeded their expected growth during a period of slow growth. For instance, what will happen in these areas as the economy recovers? Can they be expected to grow even faster? Further monitoring will resolve such questions and provide the basis for "fine tuning" the forecasts with resultant improvements to the regional and local plans they are predicated upon.



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

Providing Zoo, Transportation, Solid Waste and other Regional Services

527 SW Hall St./Portland, OR 97201/(503) 221-1646

Rick Gustafson Executive Officer

Metro Council

Cindy Banzer Presiding Officer District 9

Bob Oleson Deputy Presiding Officer District 1

Richard Waker District 2

Charlie Williamson District 3 Corky Kirkpatrick District 4

Jack Deines District 5

George Van Bergen District 6

Sharron Kelley District 7 Ernie Bonner District 8

Bruce Etlinger District 10

Marge Kafoury District 11

Gary Hansen District 12



METRO DATA RESOURCE CENTER • 221-1646



What Is Light Rail?

Light Rail is the modern version of the streetcar—but far more efficient and safer than yesterday's trolleys. Powered electrically through an overhead wire, a two-car Light Rail train may carry more than 300 passengers. Unlike expensive subway systems, Light Rail will be completely built at street level next to auto and bus traffic.

Why Light Rail?

Tri-Met's goal is to carry an increasing number of passengers in the most cost efficient ways—ways that will help keep fares down. By adding Light Rail to the east side, Tri-Met may save up to \$4 million yearly over the cost of running an all-bus system in the same area.

Significant labor savings are gained in using Light Rail. Only one driver is necessary to operate a two-car train. That's one operator for over 300 passengers. It saves on gas, too. But the main reason Light Rail was chosen is because it was the community's choice over building a new freeway—a freeway which would have displaced hundreds of homes, families and businesses.

Transit By Rail . . . Still A Good Idea

Perhaps a photo taken in 1902 says it best. The viewpoint is from Southwest Fifth Avenue and Morrison Street—the heart of Portland's commercial and financial district.

On the left side of Morrison is the Pioneer Courthouse, already an historic landmark by the turn of the century. Across the street stands the stately Meier and Frank building. Off in the distance the Portland Hotel—the elegant meeting place of the city—dominates the horizon. And in the foreground, a Mt. Tabor streetcar readies to take on passengers.

A half-century later the streetcar tracks are gone and diesel buses serve downtown. By 1985 the picture will change again. Standing at the same corner, a pedestrian will be able to watch as Banfield Light Rail cars head westbound up Morrison, gliding past the Courthouse and Meier and Frank toward Pioneer Square, a public plaza erected on the old hotel site.

After a three-decade absence, rail transit will return to Portland. The 15-mile Portland-to-Gresham Light Rail line represents a \$211.7 million dollar investment (in 1985 dollars) in public transportation for the region. Fast, efficient, and comfortable, Light Rail will offer commuters a quick 40-minute ride from east Multnomah County to downtown. The Banfield line will connect Gresham, Rockwood, East Burnside, Gateway, Hollywood, Lloyd Center, Old Town and downtown Portland, forming the backbone of public transit on the east side.



The view from Southwest Fifth and Morrison in 1902 (above), when the streetcar was king, and an artist's concept of what the same intersection will look like in 1985, when the Banfield Light Rail line begins operation. (Photo courtesy of Oregon Historical Society.)



Route Description

Starting in downtown Gresham at Eighth and Cleveland, the Banfield line will follow the old Portland Traction Co. rail right-of-way—a former trolley line—through Gresham. The old tracks will be removed and new ones laid.

At 11 Mile Avenue (199th) and Burnside the tracks will leave the Portland Traction Co. right-of-way and run down the center of Burnside to 97th Avenue. Burnside will be reconstructed with single auto lanes on both sides of the separated trackway. Street lighting will be added to Burnside.

At 97th, the line will enter the I-205 freeway, heading north to Gateway and then follow the

Banfield Freeway between Gateway and the Lloyd Center. The Banfield line will be situated north of the freeway and south of the existing Union Pacific tracks. Stations in Sullivan Gulch will be accessible by stairs and elevators.

Leaving the gulch at Lloyd Center, the line will run down the north side of Northeast Holladay Street, crossing the Willamette River on the upper center lanes of the Steel Bridge.

Once in downtown Portland, the tracks will run along First Avenue to Southwest Morrison Street. Inbound trains will travel west on Morrison to Southwest 11th Avenue, the line's terminus. Outbound, or eastbound, trains will travel on Yamhill to First.

Light Rail Stations

Three different types of stations will dot the Banfield line. In the downtown area, simple shelters will be installed. Careful consideration will be taken to blend the stations in with the two historic districts-Yamhill and Skidmore/Old Town.

The three stations along the Banfield-Hollywood, 60th and 82nd Avenues-will be bilevel, connecting the trains with street traffic and buses. Elevators and stairs will connect the two levels.

Stations along East Burnside and in Gresham will be designed to shield commuters from east county's winter weather. Stations will be designed to blend with the surrounding community.

Where To Get More Information

More detailed information on a variety of subjects may be obtained from the Banfield Light Rail Project office at 421 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Portland, OR 97204. Find out about:

Fact sheets: A series of fact sheets on several topics, such as vehicles and the maintenance building, is available.

Displays: Light Rail displays, featuring scalemodel replicas of trains and stations, are exhibited throughout the community. Find out where the one nearest to you is located.

Newsletter: Keep up to date on a monthly basis. Add your name to the mailing list for the project newsletter, Light Rail's Movin'!. Information book: For the most detailed explanation, including preliminary engineering plans, see the Banfield Information Book at local libraries.

(503) 238-5878

The preparation of this report has been financed in part through a grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation, under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended.

March 1982

71









Tri-Met Light Rail Vehicles

Tri-Met has ordered 26 vehicles from a Canadian mass transit equipment builder-Bombardier Inc. (Bom-BAR-dee-ay) of Quebec. Bombardier is building the cars under a licensing agreement with one of Europe's leading transit vehicle designers-BN of Belgium. Vehicle assembly will be completed in the United States at Bombardier's Barre, Vermont plant.

The six-axle cars are articulated-they bend in the middle like Tri-Met's new extra-long buses. They feature four double doors on each side, allowing for quick loading and unloading. Purchased at a cost of about \$775,000 each, Light Rail cars last an average of 30 years-more than twice the active life of a bus.

Vehicle specifications:

Manufacturer: Bombardier Inc. Mass Transit Division at La Pocatiere. Quebec, Canada and Barre, Vermont Design: **BN** of Belgium



Delivery:

Cost per car: Contract costs:

Type:

Wheels:

Gauge:

Length: Width: Height: Floor height: Empty weight: Seats: Standing and seated passengers: Wheelchair spaces: Maximum speed: Minimum radius curve: Nominal overhead voltage: Brakes:

To Portland starting in September 1983 \$775,521 \$21.6 million for 26 cars. spare parts, special tools and training, and technical support Single articulated, six-axle, double door, four doors per side 88 feet 8 feet, 8 inches 12 feet, 5 inches 3 feet, 2 inches 43.5 tons 76 166 2 per trip 55 mph

82 feet

750 VDC Dynamic, disc, and magnetic Resilient Standard railway gauge *Resilient wheels contain layered materials between the rim and axles to reduce vibration for quiet operation.

What Is A Transitway?

After deciding not to build the Mt. Hood Freeway, local governments in the region set out on a new course. They decided to improve existing highways and transit. As a result, the Banfield Transitway was proposed.

The Oregon Department of Transportation will widen 4.3 miles of the Banfield Freeway (I-84) to six standard-sized lanes between the Willamette River and the new I-205 freeway. At the same time Tri-Met will construct a 15mile Light Rail line between downtown Portland and Gresham.

Even after the freeway is expanded, the Banfield won't be able to handle all the auto traffic projected for the corridor. So the Light Rail line will take up to 58,000 daily trips off the freeway by 1995.



Jobs For The Region

At a time of economic recession, the Banfield Transitway means jobs. During its four-year building phase, the transitway will result in 665 jobs per year for the local construction trade industry. Whenever possible, local contractors and suppliers will be used. The impact of the transitway project on the local economy is estimated at more than \$300 million.

The project, too, is seen as a chance to revitalize business along the rail alignment, especially in the Gresham area where an extensive commercial development plan is being studied for the downtown area.

Construction Schedule

| March 1982 | Groundbreaking at Ruby |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| | Junction maintenance |
| | complex. |
| July 1982 | ODOT starts Banfield |
| 5 1 | Freeway improvements. |
| Winter 1982 | Reconstruction of East Burn- |
| | side starts. Roadbed work |
| | between Gresham and Ruby |
| | Junction along Portland Trac |
| | tion Co. rail right-of-way. |
| Mid 1983 | Ruby Junction maintenance |
| | shop completed. Light Rail |
| / | work in Banfield begins. |
| / | Light Rail work in downtown |
| | Portland begins. |
| September 1983 | First Light Rail car arrives fo |
| | testing. |
| September 1984 | Last (26th) Light Rail car |
| | arrives. |
| Late 1985 | Light Rail passenger service |
| | begins. |
| | |
| - | |



Operations

During commuter hours, two-car trains carrying as many as 330 riders will operate every five to ten minutes. Single-car trains will run about every 10 to 20 minutes in the off-peak hours. All Banfield stops will be accessible to people in wheelchairs via a special lift mounted at the end of the station platform.

To speed up passenger loading and unloading, Self-Service Fare Collection will be used. Riders may purchase tickets at the station and then validate them on board the train. Fare inspectors will randomly check riders for proof of payment—either a validated ticket or a Tri-Met monthly pass.

The Light Rail and bus lines will be integrated, allowing riders to easily transfer at no extra charge. Bus routes will be restructured to tie in with Light Rail stations. Transit centers, where buses will meet the trains, will be built in Gresham and Gateway.

The speed of Light Rail cars generally will match auto traffic, but trains will experience few of the delays. Trains will travel about 20 mph downtown, 55 mph next to the freeway and 45 mph on Burnside.









LIGHT RAIL CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

1

à

| 1983 | |
|--------|--|
| April | Gresham trackway construction begins (in the operations facility yard and between 8th and Cleveland to 199th Avenue and East Burnside near City Hall). |
| Summer | Ruby Junction Operations Facility finished. |
| | Steel Bridge redecking begins. |
| | Burnside road and trackway construction begins between 197th and 146th Avenues. |
| | Holladay Street/Downtown utility relocation and street, trackway and station construction begins. |
| Fall | Burnside road and trackway construction begins between 146th and 97th Avenues. |
| | Downtown trackway work starts. |
| 1984 | |
| Spring | Gresham road and trackway construction finished. |
| Summer | I-205 overpass trackway and Gateway station construction begins. |
| Fall | Burnside road and trackway between 197th and 97th Avenues finished. |
| Winter | Holladay segment finished. |
| 1985 | |
| Spring | Banfield Freeway trackway and station construction begins. |
| | I-205 overpass trackway and Gateway station construction finished. |
| Winter | Steel Bridge construction finished by ODOT. |
| | Banfield Freeway widening project finished by ODOT. |
| 1986 | |
| Spring | Downtown segment finished. |
| Summer | Banfield Freeway widened to six full lanes with Light Rail track on north side. |
| | Banfield Transitway system ready for operation. |

PLEASE NOTE: THIS IS NOT A FINAL SCHEDULE AND IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE



6 DIFFERENT IMPROVEMENT CALEPTS CATEGORIES O REGIONAL CORRIDORS EAGH HAS ITS OWN PLAN (FOR IMPROVEMENT) 2 SUBURB. AREA 3 - ORBAN HiwAY ALLES/ INDUST. MRETS 4 Gen. TRAMS. Concept 5 Ride-SHARING Points REZIANCE ON TRANSIT 50/0 - DOUBLE TRIPLE RIDERSIHP - PUB. TRANSIT 3090 increase - RIDE-TO-WORK-(SHARE) 1.0 BRIDGES-) IN PLACE 122 CAPARGERIES TUNNELS LOADS 1-405 609 FOR TRAFFIC = 6 LANE MAX- CAPACITY Will NEEP MENTS BANFIELD - MAX. GLANE L'INDUST. ALLESS JOS, ODD CARS REGIMAL Jan GRADORS / AIRPORT WAY 40,000 - CITE RAIC (TRANIT) CORRIDOR 21-84-11-205 1 RIJER GATE ACCESS 100,000 - CARS 1-205 1-5 45,000 L. R (mansis SWAM ISCAMD GREELY AVE TO COM SUNSET-HWY 99 WRIDOR N. WAREA 30,000 TRAMSIT) 17405 SUNSET HiwAU







REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION: The decision-making process

INFORMATION FROM METRO: SERVING THE REGION

METRO

Every metropolitan area must have a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) designated by the governor to receive and disburse federal funds for transportation projects. Metro (the Metropolitan Service District) is the MPO for the Portland metropolitan area and, therefore, approves the expenditure of all federal transportation funds in this region. To assure a well-balanced regional transportation system, a decision-making process has been established to assist the Council in making these important funding allocations.



METRO COUNCIL

Metro is our directly elected regional government, with responsibility for garbage disposal, development assistance and management of the Zoo as well as transportation. The Metro Council is composed of 12 members elected from districts. The Council approves transportation projects and programs recommended by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT).

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Regional Development Committee is a committee of the Metro Council, responsible for transportation and development issues. It consists of six Councilors appointed by the Presiding Officer. The committee reviews recommendations from JPACT for consistency with regional development decisions.

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION (JPACT)

JPACT provides a forum for elected officials and representatives of agencies involved in transportation projects to evaluate all the transportation needs in this region and to make recommendations for funding to the Metro Council. JPACT's membership is made up of elected officials from local governments within the region, three Metro Councilors and representatives of the agencies involved in regional transportation, plus representatives from governments and agencies of Clark County, WA. and the city of Vancouver.

Agencies represented on JPACT include the Oregon Dept. of Transportation (ODOT), Tri-Met, the Port of Portland, the Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and the Washington Dept. of Transportation (WDOT).

TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE (TPAC)

While JPACT provides a forum for recommendations on transportation issues at the <u>policy</u> level, TPAC provides input from the <u>technical</u> level.

TPAC's membership includes technical staff from the same governments and agencies in JPACT plus representatives of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), and the Regional Planning Council of Clark County. There are also five citizen representatives appointed to TPAC by the Metro Presiding Officer.

AIR QUALITY ADVISORY

This committee advises both Metro and DEQ on the air quality aspects of transportation proposals. All regional transportation plans must include strategies to comply with state and federal air quality standards. The committee includes both citizen representatives and people with a specific interest in air quality planning.

100% Recycled Paper. Please Recycle It Again. THANKS



CIRCUIT COURT OF OREGON FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT MULTNOMAH COUNTY COURTHOUSE 1021 S.W. 4TH AVENUE Classing PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

June 13, 1983

STEPHEN B. HERRELL JUDGE

COURTROOM 324 (503) 248-3060

R. Wisdidiad

Mr. Andy Cotugno Director of Transportation Metro Service District 527 S.W. Hall Portland, OR 97201

Dear Mr. Cotugno:

This will confirm our telephone conversation on June 10, 1983, in which you kindly agreed to meet with the Portland City Club Standing Committee on Transportation at its next regular meeting to be held on Wednesday, July 13, 1983. The meeting, beginning at 12:00 noon and ending at 1:30 p.m. will be held in the conference room at the offices of Stoel, Rives, Boley, Fraser & Wyse in the Georgia-Pacific Building, 900 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oregon.

The purpose of the meeting will be to give the standing committee members a broad overview of transportation policy and planning in the metropolitan area.

As I indicated, we intend to video tape the meeting and I understand you have no objection to our doing so.

This will confirm that you will send to the City Club office for advance distribution to the members about 20 copies of a summary of the Regional Transportation Plan.

We will provide a lunch for you. If you will be bringing with you any other members of your staff, please call Mimi Bushman at the City Club office to let her know so that we can provide lunches for them as well.

We look forward to meeting with you on July 13, 1983.

2 Jener

SBH:cyd

cc: Standing Committee Members Ms. Mimi Bushman

Summary Comparison of Project Alternatives

| | 1995 Westside Transit System | 1. No Build | 2. Bus Service Expansion | 3. Sunset Busway | 4. Sunset LRT | 5. Multnomah LRT |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| | Vehicles Required | 146 standard buses | 136 standard buses | 136 standard buses | 154 standard buses | 174 standard buses |
| | Facilities Required | 44 articulated buses 2 transit centers 0 miles of transitway 181 Park & Ride spaces 1 bus maintenance | 176 articulated buses 6 transit centers 0 miles of transitway 1381 Park & Ride spaces 2 bus maintenance | 173 articulated buses 6 transit centers 7.2 miles of transitway 1381 Park & Ride spaces 2 bus maintenance | 69 articulated buses 52 light rail vehicles 6 transit centers 12.2 miles of transitway 2175 Park & Ride spaces | 54 articulated buses 74 light rail vehicles 6 transit centers 15.5 miles of transitway 2317 Park & Ride spaces |
| Transit Characteristics and Impacts | Service Provided in Annual Place Miles (annual vehicle miles × vehicle canacity) | 491 million place miles | yards | yards | yard 1 LRT maintenance yard | 1 bus maintenance yard 1 LRT maintenance yard |
| | SERVICE OUALITY | 491 million place miles | 989 million place miles | 982 million place miles | 989 million place miles | 1030 million place miles |
| | | areas west of Highway 217. Peak-hour capacity is insuffi- cient to meet projected de- mand; potential riders will not be accommodated. | Westside. Improved travel speeds between Portland and Beaverton. Expanded and improved transfer capabil- ities. Capacity sufficient to accommodate projected demand. | same as bus service Expan- sion Alternative, with higher speeds between Portland and Beaverton due to separation of buses from auto traffic and congestion. | Same as Sunset Busway, with higher speeds between 185th Ave. and Beaverton, and Beaverton and Portland, due to exclusive guideway and better vehicle char- acteristics. | Generally same as Sunset LRT except longer travel time between Beaverton and Portland. Has greater trans- fer capabilities than Sunset LRT. |
| | SCHEDULE RELIABILITY | Frequent peak-hour delays due to operation of transit vehicles in increased volumes of mixed traffic. Poor schedule adherence. | Improved flow of buses on Sunset Hwy., Hwy. 217 and arterials because of ramp metering and bus priority measures. Delay to buses will occur sporadically due to traffic accidents and adverse weather conditions. | High schedule adherence for trunkline buses due to separation of buses from traffic between Portland and Beaverton. | High schedule adherence for l tion of rail vehicles from traff Avenue. More reliable bus ope configuration. | ight rail vehicles due to separa- ic between Portland and 185th gration due to shorter bus route |
| | ABILITY TO ABSORB FUTURE GROWTH | Bus service will be over- loaded during peak hours and unable to accommodate short-term ridership in- creases. There will be no capital facilities to expand service. | Expanded bus system has a modest capability for accom- modating short-term increases in ridership. Transit centers and maintenance facilities will be in place for future service. Only limited space exists in downtown Portland and central Beaverton for future increases in bus volumes. | | LRT could be extended west to Hillsboro or south to Tigard. LRT volumes can double without additional construction. | LRT could be extended west to Hillsboro, south to Tigard and Lake Oswego or south- east to Milwaukie. LRT volumes can double without additional construction. |
| | RIDERSHIP AND OPERATING COST | | | | | |
| | 1995 Annual Ridership on the Transitway | None | None | 12 300 000 | | |
| | 1995 Westside Total | 16 500 000 | 17 000 000 | 13,200,000 | 14,600,000 | 14,000,000 |
| | 1995 Westside Annual | 18,500,000 | 27,500,000 | 28,200,000 | 30,300,000 | 30,600,000 |
| | 1995 Westside Annual Op- | \$18,900,000 | \$33,800,000 | \$32,700,000 | \$30,900,000 | \$33,700,000 |
| | erating Cost per Passenger HIGHWAY CAPACITY | \$1.02 | \$1.21 Sunset Highway and Highway | \$1.16 217 ramp metered to maintain st | \$1.02 able flow. Climbing lane added to | \$1.10 |
| Highway Impacts | AND TRAFFIC FLOW IMPROVEMENTS | None | modate an additional 1000 cars per hour during the peak. Sylvan interchange area improved. Traffic flow improvements in downtown Portland, central Beaverton and on arterials in central Washington County. | | | |
| | HIGHWAY LANE MILES OF CONGESTION (Level-of-Service "E" or "F") | 51.7 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 9.9 | 10.1 |
| nts | PROJECTED CAPITAL COSTS (in millions of 1980 dollars) | 0 - | \$80.3 - \$90.7 | \$146.1 - \$157.0 | \$227.2 - \$236.7 | \$300.5 - \$307.2 |
| and Displacement | AFFORDABILITY DISPLACEMENTS | Expansion of Westside transit service does not occur until after 1995. Therefore, there are no increased capital or operating expenditures. | Construction revenue re- quirements can be met with available federal and local funds. Immediate expansion of service would require ad- ditional revenue beyond that projected until the mid- 1980's. | To meet construction costs, an additional \$70-80 million would have to be obtained from federal and/or local sources. Phased implementa- tion can proceed by imple- menting the Bus Service Ex- pansion Alternative. | To meet construction costs, an additional \$150-160 million would have to be ob- tained from federal and/or local sources. Phased im- plementation can proceed by implementing the Bus Ser- vice Expansion Alternative. | To meet construction costs an additional \$225-235 mil- lion would have to be ob- tained from federal and/or local sources. Phased imple- mentation can proceed by implementing the Bus Ser- vice Expansion Alternative. |
| osts | Range of Dwelling Units | 0 | 0 | 9/18 | 7/101 | 17/88 |
| 50 | Range of Businesses | 0 | 2 | 10/16 | 8/16 | 25 |
| roje | Range of Jobs Displaced | 0 | 22 | 81/121 | 51/141 | 240 |
| P | (Low/High) LAND USE AND ECONOMIC | Does not provide the | Provides needed transportation | capacity to the developing | Provides better mitch filter on h | |
| DEVELOPMENT IMPACT | | transportation service re- quired to support the land use development plans of Portland, Beaverton or Washington County. The in- ability to develop to planned densities could contribute to increased sprawl. | areas in Washington County and transit service required for reas downtown Portland and its Wes long term, reliability and systen reduce the development benefit | inty and Beaverton. Also provides for reasonable access between d its Westside market area. In the d system expansion limitations will t benefits of this alternative. | | |
| nmunity Impact | NEIGHBORHOOD IMPACT | Increases in regional auto traffic on neighborhood streets in S.W. and N.W. Portland, Garden Home, Cedar Hills and Beaverton. | Significant decreases in regional Highway from several local stre | traffic through neighborhoods. ets between S.W. 70th and S.W. | Elimination of access to Sunset 86th Avenues. | Significant decreases in re- gional traffic through neigh- borhoods. Reduced access to properties along Multnomah Boulevard and some along Macadam Avenue. LRT alignment divides the Vista Brook neighborhood. |
| ç | ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT | Not applicable | Modest decreases in air pollution levels compared to No-Build. No endangered species affected. | Modest decreases in air pollutio encroachment but no significan | n levels compared to No-Build. M t impacts. No endangered species | inor floodplain and wetland affected. |
| | CULTURAL IMPACT | Not applicable | None | Right-of-way required from inactive section of Wash- ington Park, south of Sunset Highway. Five historic land- marks affected indirectly. | Right-of-way required from inactive section of Washing- ton Park, south of Sunset Highway. One historic land- mark affected directly, eight indirectly. | Some airspace and right-of- way required from Willam- ette Park. Five historic land- marks affected directly, eight indirectly. |



WESTSIDE CORRIDOR PROJECT

A cooperative effort: Metro, Tri-Met, ODOT, Portland, Beaverton, Hillsboro, Washington & Multnomah Counties

The Problem

Not long ago, the land west of the City of Portland was a quiet countryside where most residents engaged in farming. Beaverton and Hillsboro were rural towns which served the local needs of the surrounding agricultural community.

Garden Home, Raleigh Hills and Aloha were little more than whistle stops on the interurban railways to Portland. Narrow county roads supplemented the interurbans in providing a way to get people and goods to market... a long and slow way, but one not out of step with the leisurely pace of life.

Today, the Westside has been transformed into an active, growing community. Homes and shopping centers cover much of the old farmland, industrial complexes provide jobs for thousands of people, and travel has increased during all hours of the day. Highways have been built to meet this increased travel demand, and bus service has expanded.

But these measures have not kept pace with the area's growth. During rush hours, highways are congested and buses operate at capacity. Many commuters find themselves caught in traffic on the old two-lane roads designed 80 years ago.

With the population of the Westside expected to increase another 50 percent by 1995, traffic congestion and delay will only get worse. It will contribute to increased accidents, noise and air pollution. The end result will be disorderly economic growth on the Westside and a decline in the attractiveness of its neighborhoods.

Improvement of the road system will eliminate many of the traffic bottlenecks experienced today. A \$60 million road development program has already been initiated to expand the capacity of Westside streets and highways. But the road system can't expand enough to accommodate all the travel in the area. A blend of both highway and mass transit improvements is needed.

A recent expansion of the bus system in 1979 resulted in ridership increases and enthusiastic acceptance by the public. For the first time, new transfer connections made convenient bus travel possible from a Westside home to a Westside destination. Transit service is now closer to more people's homes, and bus travel is easier to other parts of the metropolitan area.

The bus system, though successful, is sized for today's travel—not tomorrow's. Future travel needs will require more transit service and better facilities. This means that more bus routes must be established, with buses running more frequently. It also means that ways must be found for transit vehicles to bypass traffic congestion, thereby providing faster and more reliable service.

We Want Your Opinion Public Information Meetings

- Tuesday, May 4, 1982 Beaverton High School Cafeteria 13000 SW 2nd Ave., Beaverton 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm; Open House 7:30 pm to 9:00 pm; Presentation
- Thursday, May 6, 1982 Wilson High School Cafeteria 1151 SW Vermont, Portland 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm; Open House 7:30 pm to 9:00 pm; Presentation

Formal Public Hearings

• Tuesday, May 25, 1982 St. Vincent Hospital 9205 SW Barnes Rd., Portland Souther Auditorium (east end of hospital) 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm

You are invited to express your views through oral or written testimony. Information will be available in adjoining rooms throughout the hearings.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Westside Corridor Project can be examined at: Metro, 527 SW Hall; Tri-Met Planning, 4012 SE 17th Ave.; Oregon Dept. of Transportation, 5821 NE Glisan; city halls, county courthouses, and main libraries on the Westside.

If you need more information, contact Peg Henwood, Metro, 221-1646.



The Process

The transportation problems of the present-and those anticipated in the future-have been the incentive for the Westside Corridor Project. In 1979, Metro organized this cooperative effort with Tri-Met, the Oregon Department of Transportation, and the jurisdictions of Washington County, Multnomah County, Portland, Beaverton and Hillsboro. The aim of the Westside Project is simple: find solutions to the area's transportation problems. The results of this effort are now ready for public review and comment.

The Westside Corridor Project has concluded that four alternatives can help solve the problems discussed above. They are described in the pages of this brochure. In addition, a fifth alternative-"No Build"-has been included to assess the consequences of neglecting further transportation development in the Westside

The aim of the Westside Project is to find solutions to the area's transportation problems.

All the facts and figures developed over the course of the study are presented in the project's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Copies of this document are available for examination at local libraries and municipal buildings on the Westside. The project brochure you are now reading summarizes information from the DEIS to provide a general idea of the similarities and differences among the project alternatives.

The Westside Corridor Project has been continually reviewed over the past two years by a Citizens' Advisory Group and by a citizens' committee in Beaverton. These groups have guided project planners on the concerns of local residents and businesses.

Additionally, meetings have been held throughout the Westside to hear the concerns of each neighborhood affected by the project. This public outreach program will culminate in two information meetings and formal Public Hearings (see page 1).

After all opinions have been heard and recorded, the jurisdictions and agencies affected by the project will decide on a unified solution for implementation. This could consist of one of the four "build" alternatives, or a phasing plan involving combinations of several alternatives.

Your participation in this process is needed. Please read the material in this brochure, attend a project hearing, and let your local elected representatives know your views on the project.



No

The No Build Alternative illustrates the future for the Westside if no transportation improvements are made. While the area's population continues to expand, bus routes and schedules would remain the same as today. There would be no improvements in the capacity, coverage and convenience of the transit system. Buses would continue to operate in mixed traffic and would be subjected to greater delays because of increased traffic congestion. For example, travel by bus between Beaverton and Portland is projected to take 59 minutes during rush hours in 1995, as compared to 37 minutes today.



Buses would be overcrowded during rush hours, and would be unable to accommodate many potential riders. Many locations on the Westside would remain unserved by transit, requiring continued dependence upon the auto.



Bus Service 2. Expansion



The Bus Service Expansion Alternative seeks to meet the Westside's growing transportation needs through a series of relatively low-cost improvements to the bus system and street network.

Bus service would be doubled in the Westside, with increased route coverage of the area and better schedules. New transit centers would be constructed at six locations throughout the area. These would be simple stations where buses would come together at the same time to make transferring more convenient. (See inset below for station options in Beaverton.)



Ramp metering, now used on Interstate 5 between Portland and Vancouver, Washington, would be installed on both the Sunset Highway (U.S. 26) and State Highway 217 to improve the traffic flow during rush hours. Buses and carpools would be allowed to bypass the meters, resulting in faster travel time for them on the highways. A bus trip between Beaverton and Portland during rush hours would take about 37 minutes in this alternative, almost 40 percent faster than if the "No Build" is selected. Similar travel time savings would be observed for other Westside travel desires. A "climbing lane" would be added to the westbound lanes of the Sunset Highway to keep slow-moving vehicles out of the traffic flow. Other improvements along arterial streets would enable buses to avoid traffic congestion, resulting in more reliable service.

Beaverton Transit Center Location Options

Option 1: Construct new Transit Center at Junction of Hall and Watson.

Option 2: Expand existing Transit Center at Broadway and Lombard.

Several different route options are under consideration in Central Beaverton for busways or light rail transit. For more information on this aspect of the project, contact John Gillam, Beaverton Transportation Coordinator, 644-2191, ext. 269









The Sunset Busway Alternative improves transit in a way similar to the Bus Service Expansion Alternative. There would be a doubling of bus service, improved schedules, and the addition of six transit centers. Traffic flow on the Sunset Highway and Highway 217 would be improved through the addition of ramp metering and the climbing lane.

The principal difference between the two alternatives is the means used to accommodate bus service on the highways. Rather than rely on ramp metering, the busway alternative involves the construction of a separated road parallel to the highways for buses only. This road—called a "busway"—would completely remove buses from traffic problems such as accidents and congestion.



The busway would be two lanes wide, allowing for two direction bus travel throughout the day. Beginning on Southwest Jefferson Street just west of downtown Portland, it would run alongside the Sunset Highway and Highway 217 to the Beaverton Transit Center. Stations would be constructed at major interchanges, such as Zoo/OMSI, Sylvan and Cedar Hills to allow access to neighborhoods and local feeder bus lines. Two station alternatives are under consideration in Beaverton (see inset on page 2). Travel time on the busway between Beaverton and Portland would be about 35 minutes.



Sunset

The Sunset LRT Alternative involves the construction of an electrically powered light rail transit (LRT) line through the Westside. This light rail line would be similar to the Eastside's Banfield line, now under construction. Modern streetcars operating in a two track right-of-way would run between Southwest 185th Avenue and downtown Portland, connecting with the Banfield line. The light rail vehicles would be electrically powered and could be coupled into two-car trains for greater efficiency during rush hours. Travel time on this route would be 23 minutes between Beaverton and Portland. Besides providing better service levels, this system would be more efficient to operate than the previous alternatives.



The line would occupy the same right-of-way and sta-tion locations along the Sunset Highway and Highway 217 as the busway proposed in Alternative 3. Unlike the busway, a tunnel option is under consideration to shorten the route through the West Hills. Also unlike the busway, the light rail line would extend west of Beaverton to newly developing areas in Washington County. As a result, Westside development and economic growth could be accommodated in an orderly fashion. (Station options in Beaverton are explained in the inset on page 2).

The expanded level of bus service on the Westside, as well as traffic flow improvements on both major highways, would be identical to those proposed in the two previous alternatives-additional bus routes and frequencies, ramp metering and the Sunset climbing

Common questions asked about the Westside Corridor Project

Q: Why is a transit improvement being

- considered? A: Because of high construction costs, environmental impacts and disruption of neighborhoods associated with roadways, the road system cannot be expanded to meet today's needs or future traffic projections. The most efficient and environmentally sound transportation system will require a blend of highway and transit in-
- vestments. Q: Why not just widen the Sunset Highway?
- A: The topography of the West Hills makes expansion of the regional road system prohibitively expensive, if not infeasible from an engineering standpoint. Even if this could be done, the limitation of traffic capacity on other Westside roads makes total reliance on automobiles impractical. Q: What if there is a surplus of oil in the coming years? Won't this reduce the need for a
- transit project like this? A: No one knows for sure what the future will bring for energy availability. If gasoline is scarce, people will need transit as an alternative to their

autos. If gasoline is plentiful, the level of road congestion will only increase and a transit alternative will be needed to reduce this congestion. Either way, transit is an essential element of any growing area like the Westside.

- Q: I don't use the bus. How will the Westside **Corridor Project help me?**
- A: The use of mass transit-buses or light rail-would reduce congestion on streets and highways, making travel easier for people who need to drive. It will provide access to customer markets for Beaverton, downtown Portland and Westside businesses. The potential for auto traffic to use local neighborhood streets would be reduced.
- Q: When could we expect to see transportation improvements begin in the Westside **Corridor**?
- A: Certain aspects of the project, such as bus priority lanes and transit centers, could be in place as early as next year. Those elements involving extensive construction and right-of-way purchase could require several years for completion.
- Q: If light rail transit is chosen as a Westside

Multnomah 5 LRT



Like Alternative 4, the Multnomah LRT Alternative offers a light rail transit line through the Westside, but it proposes a different route between Portland and Beaverton. In this alternative, the light rail line would run south from downtown Portland through John's Landing, parallel to the Southern Pacific railroad line and Macadam Avenue. The alignment would turn west at Taylors Ferry Road to Interstate 5 and follow the freeway to Multnomah Boulevard where it would operate in its own right-of-way in the center of the street. The alignment would then veer off Multnomah Boulevard and follow the abandoned Oregon Electric Railway right-of-way into Beaverton. West of Beaverton the line would follow the route to 185th Avenue proposed in the Sunset Light Rail Alternative.



Two station alternatives are under consideration in Beaverton (see inset, page 2). Travel time on this route would be 37 minutes between Beaverton and Portland. This alternative would include all the elements common to all four "build" alternatives-expanded bus service, better frequencies, six transit centers, ramp metering on the Sunset Highway and Highway 217, and the Sunset Highway climbing lane.

transportation improvement, how will it relate to the Banfield Light Rail line?

- A: If light rail transit is selected for the Westside, it would connect with the Banfield line in downtown Portland, making it possible for the public to ride from Washington County to Gresham without a transfer.
- Q: Who would pay for the improvements in the Westside Corridor?
- A: Federal funds are available to pay for several elements common to all the "build" alternatives, such as new buses and transit centers. Construct tion costs for such items as a busway or light rail transit could be sought from such sources as a special federal appropriation, a local bond issue, or private financing.
- Q: Who makes the final decision on the project? A: After the public hearings are completed, all testimony and information on the project will be reviewed by the eight jurisdictions associated with the project: Metro, Tri-Met, Oregon Department of Transportation, Washington County, Multnomah County, Portland, Beaverton and Hillsboro. Many of these bodies will conduct their own hearings on the project before coming to a unified decision.