

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING)
REVISIONS TO THE REGIONAL)
TRANSPORTATION PLAN)
)
)
)
)

ORDINANCE NO. 92-433
Introduced by Councilor
David Knowles

WHEREAS, The federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, the state LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule and the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives have been adopted subsequent to the Regional Transportation Plan update in March of 1989; and

WHEREAS, This RTP is a transition document, major updates will be conducted to comply with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives, and the Goal 12 Transportation Rule; and

WHEREAS, Project descriptions need to be updated to reflect policy changes; and

WHEREAS, The Regional Transportation Plan update of 1989 calls for regular Plan updates; now, therefore,

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT HEREBY
ORDAINS:


1. The 1991 revision of the Metropolitan Service District Regional Transportation Plan, a functional plan, copies of which are on file with the Clerk of the Council, is hereby adopted.

2. The 1991 RTP revision amends the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted in 1982 and updated in 1983 and in 1989. The proposed amendments are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

3. In support of the Plan revisions, the Findings attached hereto as Exhibit B are hereby adopted.

4. Metro Council directs staff to evaluate a high transit scenario as part of the next update of the RTP in order to address vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) reduction goals as required by the Goal 12 Transportation Rule (OAR 660-12-000), the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and by the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 23rd day of January, 1992.



Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

Attest:



Clerk of the Council

92-433.ORD
JC:lmk
1-22-92

EXHIBIT A

Proposed Amendments to the March 9, 1989 Regional Transportation Plan

Exhibit A provides a line-by-line description of the deletions (lined-out material) and additions (underlined material) included in the 1991 RTP revision.

Summary Chapter

Page S-1, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

After extensive public review and comment, the RTP was adopted by the Metro Council in 1982 and ~~last~~ updated in 1983. The plan, incorporating the 1989 update and the current ~~(1989)~~(1991) update revision, give the Portland metropolitan region a much needed direction for meeting our transportation needs over the next two decades...

Page S-1, following paragraph 4, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the 1991 revision, the RTP recognizes and begins to incorporate the policy direction laid out by the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO). A full examination of alternative transportation and land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule will coincide with and follow the Region 2040 plan, which is an outgrowth of the RUGGO process.

Page S-6, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor -- Consider constructing ~~construct~~ a new four-lane limited access facility from I-5 to Tualatin Valley Highway and an ~~an~~ five-lane arterial from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 ~~(Proceed with I-5 to the Highway 99W segment and arterial segment from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 as a 10 year priority.)~~ as one of several corridors and mode opportunities, such as light rail transit, highway and bus service, to be analyzed through ODOT's Western Bypass study. Alternatives to be studied will include transit and transit/highway combinations with and without a new highway facility and an interactive land use/transportation strategy (If the 1000 Friends of Oregon LUTRAO Study produces a viable land use/transportation strategy, it would be folded into the Western Bypass Study). A corridor-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative modes and corridors to meet project goals and objectives and to consider their environmental impacts. Through this effort, one alternative will be selected and advanced to a second phase of study.

The second phase will include a design EIS or Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify specific alignments within the selected corridor(s) for the selected mode(s). This effort will examine a range of alignments for analysis in the EIS, and conclude with selection of the alternative that best meets study goals and objectives. As defined in the Intergovernmental Agreement for decision-making on this project, Metro will conduct an independent review of the selected alternative for appropriate RTP amendments and consistency with RUGGO.

Page S-6, paragraph 5, amend as follows:

Mt. Hood Parkway I-84/U.S.26 Connector

2. Light Rail Transit (Figure S-2)

Priority 1: Westside Light Rail -- Begin the preliminary engineering final design work and pursue finalize discretionary funding for the project from through the federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA).

Page S-8, paragraph 1 and 2, amend as follows:

I-205/Milwaukie HCT and I-5 North/I-205 North HCT Studies -- Conduct Pre-Alternatives Analysis level studies geared toward selecting priority corridors for advancement to full alternatives analysis. An action plan will be developed for the corridors not selected as the priority corridors for alternatives analysis.

~~I-205 Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering work using funds from bus lanes withdrawn from the Interstate system.~~

~~Milwaukie Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering as soon as allowable after Westside light rail. Pursue funding from UMTA after receiving funding for the Westside light rail.~~

Page S-11, paragraphs 3 and 4, amend to read:

Funding for 50 to 75 percent of the Westside and Milwaukie light rail and up to 50 percent for the next priority corridor can be sought has been committed from UMTA through a national competitive process. A strategy incorporating federal, state and local funds must be developed for corridors beyond the Westside. However, local matching funds must be obtained first.

A unique opportunity exists to fund the initial stages of work toward an I-205 light rail line. Through the Federal-Aid Interstate program, \$16.6 million ~~is~~ was originally available for bus lane construction. However, with the approval of FHWA and UMTA, this money ~~can and would be shifted to~~ is available for light rail construction.

Introduction Chapter

Page I-1, amend the second bullet under A. THE CONTEXT OF THE PLAN as follows:

- serves as a regional framework for the coordination of the transportation and land use elements of local comprehensive plans consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO);

Page I-3, add a paragraph following the final paragraph of Section B which will read as follows:

The amendments contained in the 1991 RTP revision have been found to be consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives. Future updates will reflect consistency with the Region 2040 Planning Process, the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the new Surface Transportation Act. Future RTP updates will have to reflect RUGGO and local comprehensive plans may have to change to meet RUGGO.

Page I-7, final paragraph under Federal Planning Requirements, amend as follows:

In addition to the requirements of FHWA and UMTA, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (~~carried out~~ administered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)) requires each urbanized area to meet federal standards for clean air.

Page I-7, under State Planning Requirements, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the adoption of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, Metro must adopt a Transportation System Plan (TSP), complying with Goal 12, which is consistent with the State TSP. In the case of the State, the TSP is the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and, in the case of Metro, the TSP is the RTP. Metro is working with ODOT to ensure consistency between the OTP and the RTP (see also Chapter 8).

Chapter 1

Page 1-3, add as final paragraph under Section B. History

1991 LCDC adopts the Goal 12 Transportation Rule requiring a reduction in the reliance on single occupant vehicles and requiring local actions which encourage the development and use of reasonable alternatives such as transit and ridesharing. The Transportation Rule also requires the development of Transportation System Plans to be completed

consistent with the state requirements within four years for the RTP and within five years for local jurisdictions. The plans must include methods to achieve reductions in per capita vehicle miles traveled, increases in peak-hour auto occupancy rates and examinations of alternative land use scenarios to address transportation needs.

1991 Metro Council adopts the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives which provide a set of land use planning goals and objectives, which are consistent with statewide planning goals, for purposes of planning coordination in the region.

Page 1-7, under 3. Objective: To maintain the region's air quality. Amend paragraph 3 as follows:

The Annual Element of the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) should must be consistent with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality and must conform with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Page 1-15, item 6 is amended to read as follows:

~~6. Elderly and Handicapped Service — Based on the Special Needs Transportation Plan adopted by Tri Met, the transit system will:~~

~~• Continue to provide accessible service at all LRT stations.~~

~~• Continue to specify lifts on all new buses until at least 50 percent of the bus fleet is accessible.~~

~~• Continue to work with local jurisdictions to make as many transit stops as possible accessible.~~

~~• Continue to provide door to door demand responsive service to individuals who are unable to use Tri Met buses due to physical or mental disabilities.~~

6. Service to the Disabled -- Based on the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Tri-Met will offer services which address the special needs of the disabled population:

• Continue to develop complementary paratransit services which comply with the ADA.

• Continue to specify lifts on all new transit vehicles until 100 percent of the fleet is accessible.

• Continue to work with local jurisdictions to make transit stops accessible.

- . Continue to develop other facilities and services which are accessible to the disabled as required by the ADA.

Chapter 2

Page 2-1 under A. Overview, amend the second paragraph as follows:

- . The regional land use pattern defined by the local jurisdictional comprehensive plans developed under the LCDC Statewide Planning Goals will determine in large part the location of future development in the region. (These land use patterns, upon which the RTP travel forecasts are based, will be subject to change based upon the policies included in the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule and other functional plans adopted to implement RUGGO. These changes in residential distribution and density will be incorporated into the travel forecasts in future RTP updates);

Chapter 4

Page 4-1, amend paragraph 4 as follows:

The region has taken a strong policy position to promote orderly urban development. Metro adopted the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) and administers a the regional Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). RUGGO provides a policy framework for Metro's functional plans and, through these adopted functional plans, for land use planning in the region consistent with the statewide planning goals. ~~that~~ The UGB clearly identifies the extent of the area in which urban development will occur in the Oregon portion of the region over the next 20 years....

Page 4-20 through 4-22, Transitways, amend as follows:

- . In the Western Corridor, ~~the Sunset LRT with a long tunnel and a zoo station~~ has been selected as the preferred alternative to connect downtown Portland and Beaverton Hillsboro. The LRT corridor west of Beaverton ~~would will~~ follow the ~~185th east/west alignment~~ Burlington Northern ROW to 185th Avenue. The extension to Central Hillsboro will follow the BN ROW into Hillsboro or an alternative alignment identified through the Alternatives Analysis process. The Sunset Westside LRT is the top regional priority for LRT implementation (see Chapter 8).
- . ~~In the Southern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland to Milwaukie via the Portland Traction Company or McLoughlin alignments is called for in this Plan.~~

Southeastern Sector, two alternative transitway corridors will be examined in a preliminary alternatives analysis to be conducted by Metro. The study will examine alternative high capacity transit (HCT) alternatives between downtown Portland and Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Milwaukie and in the I-205 Corridor between Portland International Airport (PIA) and CTC. As a result of this study, one corridor will be recommended for advancement to the Alternatives Analysis phase and an action plan and recommendation on the other corridor will be developed.

The alternatives to be considered in the Milwaukie corridor include a Portland Traction Company (PTC) alignment, McLoughlin alignment and a Johns Landing/Sellwood Bridge alignment. Alternatives in the Highway 224 corridor include a Railroad/Harmony alignment and a Highway 224 alignment. The I-205 alternative includes a major portion of existing reserved ROW although there are alternative access options in the vicinity of both termini.

~~In the I-205 circumferential corridor, an LRT line connecting Portland International Airport (PIA) and the Clackamas Town Center (CTC) is called for in the RTP.~~

In the Northern Corridor a locally funded Preliminary Alternatives Analysis will examine HCT options connecting Vancouver with the Portland CBD. Alternative alignments which will be analyzed include I-5 and Interstate Ave. Possible connections across the I-205 bridge into east Clark County will also be examined in this study.

Beyond these four corridors, the long-term (beyond 2005) regional transitway system includes ~~two additional LRT corridors:~~

- ~~In the Northern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland and Vancouver via either I-5 or Interstate Avenue, and~~
- ~~In the Southwestern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland with Tigard via Barbur Boulevard. or I-5.~~

Possible extensions and future branches of the identified LRT corridors include those to Hillsboro (~~via Sunset or 185th extension~~), Oregon City (via McLoughlin or I-205 extension), Lake Oswego (via the Jefferson Street Branch) and Tualatin (via Milwaukie extension through Lake Oswego, Barbur extension, or Highway 217 circumferential extension through Tigard).

~~The adopted RTP also recommends acquiring the abandoned SPRR right of way connecting downtown Portland and Lake Oswego to protect the resource and allow future consideration of this alignment for rail transit in the Macadam/Lake Oswego radial~~

~~corridor.~~

Add a bullet at the end of Section c. Land Use Decisions as follows:

- . Other land use actions consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives or resulting from the Region 2040 planning process.

Chapter 5

Page 5-2, amend as follows:

City of Portland Downtown Carpool Parking Program: A cooperative program between Tri-Met and the City of Portland whereby carpools of three or more can purchase monthly parking permits ~~for \$25/~~ month and receive unlimited parking at ~~any of 1,400 six-hour~~ long-term meters in downtown Portland. The City of Portland has also designated approximately 200 parking meters in Portland as "carpool only" before 9:00 a.m. on weekdays.

Page 5-9, under "improve transit service in the sector by:" Amend the 10-Year Priority Projects as follows:

- consider pursuing the implementation of LRT and other HCT alternatives in the I-205 Corridor from Portland International Airport (PIA) to Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Gateway (Figure 5-3). The decision to proceed to construction of LRT, however is subject to: ~~1) an assessment of impacts associated with the project and selection of a preferred alternative and alignment; and 2) the development of a funding strategy for the project. the results of the I-205/Milwaukie Preliminary Alternatives Analysis which will recommend one of the two corridors to proceed to full alternatives analysis and will develop an action plan for the other corridor.~~

Page 5-10, under "improve connectivity and access in East County by:" Amend the 10-Year Priority Projects as follows:

- Constructing all or part of the Mt. Hood Parkway, a new principal arterial connection between I-84 and U.S. 26 (134)
- Constructing all or part of a new NE 207th Avenue arterial between Sandy Boulevard and Glisan.

Page 5-12, move "- Widening Graham Road structure (165)" from 10-Year Priority to Committed Project.

Page 5-16, under "10-Year Priority Projects," amend as follows:

consider pursuing the implementation of LRT and other HCT alternatives in the McLoughlin Milwaukie Corridor from downtown Portland to Milwaukie (Figure 5-3). The decision to proceed to construction, however, is subject to: 1) a final assessment of impacts associated with the facility and a selection of a preferred alternative and alignment, and 2) the development of a funding strategy for the project the results of the I-205/Milwaukie Preliminary Alternatives Analysis which will recommend one of the two corridors to proceed to full alternatives analysis and will develop an action plan for the other corridor.

Page 5-17, under "remove traffic from local streets by:" Amend 10-year Priority Project as follows:

~~implementing improvements recommended as a result of examination of identified in the Southeast Corridor Transportation Improvement Plan for resolving east/west traffic problems east of McLoughlin (Metro's Southeast Corridor Study).~~

Page 5-17, under "increase east/west access in the sector by:" Delete as follows:

~~10-Year Priority Project~~

~~—improving Thiessen Road (215 between Catfield Road and Johnson Road~~

Page 5-18, under "10-Year Priority Projects," amend as follows:

~~constructing a Sunnybrook Road arterial from 92nd to 108th or Valley View Road at Sunnyside Road (108)~~

Page 5-19, under "improve the Highway 212 portion of the Sunrise Corridor from Rock Creek Junction to U.S. 26 by:" Amend as follows:

10-Year Priority Projects

~~constructing a climbing lane on Highway 212 east of Rock Creek Junction (130)~~

~~widening Highway 212 from Rock Creek Junction to Chitwood (131)~~

~~widening Highway 212 through Damascus (132) and Boring (133)~~

~~completing other operations and safety improvements in this~~

section

10-20 Year Projects

~~widening and realignment of Highway 212 from Royer to School Road (310, 311) and from Lani Lane to U.S. 26 (312)~~

~~improving the intersection of Highway 212 with U.S. 26 (313)~~

Widening and realigning Highway 212 from Rock Creek Junction through Damascus and Boring to the interchange at Highway 26; or construct an expressway on a new alignment between Rock Creek Junction and Highway 26 at the existing Highway 212 interchange.

Page 5-24, 1st paragraph, amend as follows:

consider constructing the first phase of the a limited access facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor from I-5 to Highway 99W including the interchanges at I-205 and Boones Ferry Road (123) and a three lane widening of Boones Ferry Road to I-5/Stafford (122) or other alternatives as identified in the ODOT Western Bypass Study.

Page 5-24, under 10-20 Year Projects amend as follows:

- widening Boones Ferry Road to five lanes between the proposed bypass facility and I-5/Stafford (122) (The proposed bypass is contingent upon the recommendations of ODOT's Western Bypass Study. If a decision is made to not build the bypass facility then the need for this improvement will be re-evaluated)
- adding a southbound climbing lane on I-5 from Hood Avenue to Terwilliger (304)
- constructing interchanges on the proposed bypass facility at Highway 99W and Tualatin-Sherwood/Edy Roads (The proposed bypass is contingent upon the recommendations of ODOT's Western Bypass Study. If a decision is made to not build the bypass facility, then the need for these improvements will be re-evaluated)

Page 5-25, top of the page, amend as follows:

- ~~conducting Preliminary Engineering on the second phase of the Tualatin Hillsboro corridor facility from Highway 99W to the Sunset Highway (124)~~
- Consider constructing facility improvements in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor from Highway 99W to Tualatin

Valley Highway and from Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset Highway, or other highway, transit or land use alternatives as identified in ODOT's Western Bypass Study.

~~10-20 Year Projects~~

~~constructing the second (Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway 124) and third (Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset 125) phases of the bypass facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor. Actual construction of Phase II of the Western Bypass is subject to: 1) a determination that the facility is consistent with local comprehensive plans and state land use policies; and 2) a detailed assessment of the impacts associated with such a facility provided through the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. If at the conclusion of either of these processes, a decision is made to not build this portion of the Western Bypass, a planning study will be initiated to address the circumferential travel problem in some other manner.~~

- ~~as warranted, constructing the second phase of a Highway 217 widening to include six lanes from the Sunset Highway to the Hall Boulevard Overcrossing (117, 119)~~

Page 5-27, under 10-Year Priority Projects, amend as follows:

- constructing an interchange at I-5/I-205 and the proposed bypass facility (103) (The proposed bypass is contingent upon the recommendations of ODOT's Western Bypass Study. If a decision is made to not build the bypass facility then the need for this improvement will be re-evaluated)

Page 5-30, under "reduce congestion in the circumferential corridors by:" amend as follows:

~~conducting Preliminary Engineering on the second (Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway 124) and third (Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset 125) phases of the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor bypass facility~~

Consider constructing facility improvements in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor from Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway and from Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset Highway, or other highway, transit or land use alternatives as identified in ODOT's Western Bypass Study.

~~10-20 Year Projects~~

~~constructing the second (Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway 124) and third (Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset 125) phases of the bypass facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor. Actual construction of Phase II of the Western Bypass is subject to: 1) a determination that the~~

~~facility is consistent with local comprehensive plans and state land use policies; and 2) a detailed assessment of the impacts associated with such a facility provided through the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. If at the conclusion of either of these processes, a decision is made to not build this portion of the Western Bypass, a planning study will be initiated to address the circumferential travel problem in some other manner.~~

~~as traffic demand warrants, upgrading the intersections to interchanges on the bypass facility~~

~~as warranted, constructing the second phase of a Highway 217 widening to include six lanes from the Sunset Highway to the Hall Boulevard Overcrossing (117, 119)~~

Page 5-31, under 10-Year Priority Projects, amend as follows:

constructing some portion of a to be designed improvement the East-West Arterial from Murray Blvd to S.W. 110th as a bypass to Tualatin Valley Highway and parallel facilities in the central Beaverton area (137) with the construction timed to accommodate and facilitate the construction of the Westside LRT

Page 5-33, amend as follows:

~~proceed with preliminary engineering construction on the region's next priority LRT corridor -- the Sunset Westside LRT (Figure 5-3) -- to provide the major transit trunk service connecting downtown Portland with central Washington County, and Beaverton (to 185th) and Hillsboro. The decision to proceed to construction, however, is subject to: 1) an analysis of the facility in relation to updated population and employment forecasts and changes in travel patterns; 2) a final assessment of impacts associated with the facility; 3) an evaluation of the operation of the Banfield LRT; and 4) the development of a funding strategy for the project~~

Chapter 6

Page 6-1, paragraph 2, last sentence, amend as follows:

...with transit's share of the peak-hour travel market increasing from 6 percent in 1985 to 9 percent by the year 2005.

Page 6-16, paragraph 4, amend as follows:

improvements to I-84 and the Gresham Mt. Hood Parkway in Gresham...

Page 6-17, third bullet under Southwestern Corridor, amend as follows:

- the new Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor facility and improvements to Highway 217 resulting from the Western Bypass Study will provide increased access between rapidly growing portions of Washington County.

Page 6-17, fourth item under "Western Sector," amend to read as follows:

major LRT investments in the corridor and transit stations in the Peterkort, Beaverton, Sylvan, Raleigh Hills and Tanasbourne (The Tanasbourne Transit Center will be relocated to 185th and Baseline upon completion of the Westside LRT to 185th Avenue) areas...

Page 6-17, fifth bullet under Western Sector, amend as follows:

- the new facility improvements in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor and improvements to Highway 217 resulting from the Western Bypass Study will provide greater north/south mobility connecting developing areas in the Southwestern and Western Sectors.

Page 6-18, under "Downtown Portland Sector," amend as follows:

...2) increased transit capacity (Banfield LRT, Sunset Westside LRT, McLoughlin Milwaukie LRT, Vancouver LRT, Mall LRT, transit mall extension);...

Chapter 7

Page 7-18, last paragraph under 2. Evaluation, amend as follows:

The region has taken positive steps toward the implementation of the transit elements of this plan through the successful region-wide vote in November 1990 approving a \$125 million bond measure to provide half of the 25 percent local match for the Westside LRT and to provide funding for planning, engineering and ROW acquisition for an East Portland/Clackamas County LRT project. In addition, the State Legislature approved state funding to cover the remaining one-half of the 25 percent Westside local match.

If the region intends is to pursue implementation of the recommended transportation plan, it is apparent that several steps efforts must be taken to increase transit funding. First, the region must continue to aggressively seek congressional action to assure the continuance of federal capital grants, argue against the phasing out of federal operating assistance and ensure a continuance of state matching funds for federal capital

grants. Secondly, the region, must be prepared to accept an increased reliance on local funding sources in order to construct and operate the recommended transit system. Failure to secure the necessary funding to expand the transit system would require a reexamination of the RTP to expand the recommended highway system or a reexamination of land use plans to reduce planned levels of development.

Chapter 8

Page 8-2, paragraph 2, sentences 1 and 2 are amended to read:

While all RTP provisions are recommendations unless clearly designated as a requirement of local government comprehensive plans, all local comprehensive plans and future amendments to local plans shall be consistent with all adopted RTP policies and guidelines for highway and transit system improvements and demand management programs as described in detail in as explained in Section C. For inconsistencies, local governments or Metro may initiate the dispute resolution process in Section F prior to action by Metro to require an amendment to a local comprehensive plan.

Page 8-8 under Transitway Implementation, amend as follows:

...The next priority for transitway construction is the Westside Corridor, where the ~~Sunset Westside~~ LRT (long tunnel with Zoo station) alignment has been selected as the preferred alternative to connect downtown Portland and Beaverton (to 185th) Hillsboro. ~~The decision to proceed to construction of the Sunset LRT, however, will not be made until after the preparation of an FEIS on the project and an evaluation of the operation of the Banfield LRT. JPACT has identified~~ A Preliminary Alternative Analysis study will result in a decision between the Milwaukie LRT or I-205 LRT as the next priority after ~~Sunset Westside~~ for UMTA Section 3 or other regional, state or federal funding, and I-205 LRT for development concurrent with the Westside LRT with non-Section 3 funds. A similar Pre-AA study will be conducted for high capacity transit alternatives designed to serve Clark County, Washington in either the I-5 North corridor or in the I-205 corridor. Implementation of a transitway in the remaining radial corridors (and potential extensions and branches) will be pursued in a phased manner, as follows: The purpose and scope of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and the full Alternatives Analysis studies are described in the following:

Phase I Preliminary Alternative Analysis studies will be initiated to identify the next priority corridor which warrants consideration of a transitway investment and

~~identify a set of alternatives to be examined in more detail~~ which set of promising alternatives in a corridor warrant further consideration. The ~~Phase I~~ Pre-AA study will consider the short and long-term ridership potential, capital and operating costs, existing or planned transit-supportive land uses and right-of-way availability.

~~Phase II~~ The full Alternatives Analysis will be initiated to examine alternatives in detail and select the one that is most cost-effective. The ~~Phase II~~ study will conclude with an Environmental Impact Statement presenting costs, benefits and impacts of the alternatives, ~~and identifying leading to the identification of the preferred alternative for implementation.~~

The implementation of high capacity transitway alternatives in additional corridors will utilize the results of a Regional HCT Study which will identify promising HCT alternatives within the study corridors for advancement to Alternatives Analysis.

Page 8-9, Section 8. Handicapped Transit Service is amended as follows:

Tri-Met is responsible for providing handicapped transit accessibility including coordination of special transit services provided by social service agencies. In addition, Tri-Met conducts the detailed special handicapped transit planning necessary to identify required service improvements and adopt a plan for meeting federal requirements for handicapped accessibility consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991 (ADA). ~~Metro must endorse Tri-Met's plan for handicapped accessibility (Appendix-B), Metro must certify that Tri-Met's Paratransit Plan conforms to the RTP and include expected uses of federal funding in the TIP.~~ In addition to Tri-Met's handicapped service, private, nonprofit agencies provide handicapped services and may apply for federal funding for equipment (through the UMTA Section 16(b)(2) program). Use of this equipment must be consistent with Tri-Met's plan, be included in Metro's TIP and be endorsed by the ODOT - Transit Division to be funded. ~~(Note: The currently adopted plan for handicapped accessibility may be revised due to changes in federal regulations).~~

Page 8-12, E.2.a. is amended to add a new second paragraph as follows:

OAR 660, Division 12, requires development of MPO Transportation System Plans (TSP) by 1995 for development of local TSPs which include public facilities plan provisions for transportation facilities.

Page 8-13, E.2.a., paragraph 4, is amended to read as follows:

In addition, OAR 660-18-022(1) allows local governments to make determinations that the statewide goals do not apply to a particular land use decision. Such a decision is considered a land use decision and is itself appealable and, as such, must still demonstrate compliance with any applicable comprehensive plan policies and with RTP requirements.

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 2, is amended to read as follows:

Complete or final goal findings for aspects of some projects, however, will require detailed impact information not typically available until preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In these cases, jurisdictions should adopt as full a set of findings as can be made upon the information available at the time the project is included in the PFP regarding the need, mode, and general location, and to identify ~~at the time the PFP is adopted whether the need for additional project level goal findings will be made when~~ at the time the EIS is prepared shall be identified. In addition ~~the what~~ issues these findings will address, and what form and when this latter decision will be made shall be determined."

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 3, is amended to read as follows:

Local comprehensive plans and the RTP are intended to identify projects needed to serve development land uses identified in the acknowledged comprehensive plans over the long term as these acknowledged comprehensive plans are amended to comply with Goal 12 and other Metro functional plans.

Page 8-14, E.2.c., 2) is amended to read as follows:

At the time the projects are included in the PFPs, All RTP projects all projects recommended in the RTP to meet the long-term needs of the region, must satisfy all the applicable state planning goals regarding need, mode, and general location of the project requirements

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 7) is amended to change "Section D" to "Section C."

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 8) is amended to read as follows:

In general, compliance consistency of the RTP with all applicable state planning goals is achieved through the procedures described in this chapter. ~~These procedures assure that RTP policies comply directly with the goals, and that RTP projects are in turn consistent with RTP~~

projects. These amendments to the RTP (November 1991) are consistent with Regional Growth Goals and Objectives which are, in turn, consistent with statewide goals, as well as with the Local comprehensive plans and local findings of goal compliance when needed shall generally establish statewide goal compliance for RTP projects. Exceptions to this occur when:

Page 8-15, 8-16, F.1, paragraph 1, first sentence, is amended to read as follows:

1. RTP Policy, System Plan and Consistency Criteria
When Metro amends RTP policies (Chapter 1, 4 and 8), system plan elements (Figures 4-1, 4-4, 4-5 and 4-7) or compliance criteria (Chapter 8), it will evaluate and adopt findings regarding consistency with Regional Growth Goals and Objectives.

Page 8-16, F.1., paragraph 2, is amended to read:

In addition, in those cases where an RTP goal, policy or system plan element implies a particular improvement to such an extent that the goal, policy or system plan element would change as the result of a 'no build' project decision later in the process due to goal compliance issues, Metro will prepare findings to address an analysis of the broad regional interest in the statewide planning goals based on the information used in the RTP consistency review (Chapter 8, Section F.2.). and Metro will identify as part of its goal findings analysis related to the RTP amendment any and all goals it believes must be addressed by the local jurisdiction before a project decision to implement the system plan can be finalized. If the local jurisdiction determines that the project cannot comply with the statewide planning goals, the RTP will be amended as needed to eliminate reliance on such a project and initiate a cooperative analysis to develop an alternative solution.

Page 8-24, G, paragraph 1, is amended to read as follows:

Major outstanding issues to be resolved at a later date and which may be included as amendments to the Plan are as follows:

Page 8-24, G2, is deleted:

~~2. Westside Corridor Project — The process to complete preliminary engineering, develop a final EIS and alignment selection, and prepare a financial plan are currently underway. The engineering of the Westside LRT is being undertaken in a manner designed to complement the Sunset Highway improvements recommended in this plan.~~

Page 8-24, G2, added as follows:

2. Transportation Rule/Region 2040 -- The next major update of the RTP will reflect requirements of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule and follow the direction and guidelines established as part of the Region 2040 planning process. The Transportation Rule requires that regional and local planning bodies develop policies and implementation measures which avoid a principal reliance on a single mode of transportation.

Both the Transportation Rule and the Region 2040 planning process will require the region to better understand the transportation/land use relationship as the region grows to the level allowed in local comprehensive plans. The RTP will be developed as the region's Transportation System Plan (TSP) as called out in the Transportation Rule. As such, it must be consistent with the state TSP (the Oregon Transportation Plan) and will guide local TSPs. As a TSP, the RTP will also be designed to meet state requirements for per capita VMT reductions, increased peak-hour auto occupancy rates, and will examine alternative land use scenarios to address transportation needs.

As part of the Region 2040 planning process, alternative land use and transportation scenarios will be evaluated consistent with RUGGO in an effort to formulate a vision for how and where the region should develop as it approaches build-out of the current comprehensive plans over the next 50 years. To evaluate those scenarios and develop the vision, Metro has begun a three to four-year study. The RTP will be updated as necessary consistent with results of the study and findings of consistency with RUGGO will be developed for the entire document.

Both the Region 2040 process and Rule 12 implementation will utilize updated employment, population, and travel forecasts.

Page 8-25, under 3. Bi-State Transportation Study, amend as follows:

~~—In conjunction with the Bi State Policy Advisory Committee, Metro may participate in a study designed to address the long range land use plans and the associated concerns that have been raised regarding future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington. Metro and the Intergovernmental Resource Center of Clark County (IRC) initiated the Bi-State Transportation Study in the summer of 1990 to address the future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington based on anticipated growth to 2010 and an RTP level of~~

improvements. The study is also examining the economic inter-relationships between the two sides of the river and is developing a methodology for evaluating the impact of major transportation investments in the corridor on land use. The study is scheduled for completion in late 1991.

A decision must be made on whether to proceed with further evaluation of Bi-State alternatives which would include the alternative land use scenarios and the evaluation of urban form resulting from the Region 2040 Plan process.

Page 8-25, items 4, 5 and 6 are amended to read as follows:

4. I-205 LRT/Milwaukie LRT/Vancouver LRT -- These, in addition to the Westside Corridor (discussed above), have been identified by JPACT as the region's priority corridors for the next 10 years. For the I 205 LRT, the region may withdraw the federal Interstate Funds for the I 205 Buslanes and initiate the preliminary engineering/EIS effort on the I 205 LRT (with the specific process subject to UMFA approval). The Milwaukie LRT will require an alternatives analysis (see also No. 5) and DEIS process and will consider alignments east and west of the Willamette River. This analysis will be coordinated with the river crossing aspects of the Southeast Corridor Study (see No. 5). Two Preliminary Alternatives Analysis studies will be conducted concurrently examining high capacity transit (HCT) alternatives in travel corridors serving north Clackamas County and serving south Clark County, Washington. The I-205/Milwaukie HCT study will select either the Portland CBD to Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Milwaukie corridor or the I-205 corridor between the Portland International Airport (PIA) and CTC (connecting east Portland and north Clackamas County with Gateway and the Portland CBD via the Banfield LRT) for advancement to a full scale Alternatives Analysis. The study will also select a set of promising alternatives to be carried into the AA and develop an action plan for the corridor not selected for Alternatives Analysis.

The I-5/I-205 Portland-Vancouver HCT study will make a decision on the preferred corridor for HCT development to connect downtown Portland with Clark County. The alternatives are the I-5 corridor connecting the Portland CBD with central Vancouver and the I-205 corridor connecting east Clark County with Gateway (and the Portland CBD via the Banfield LRT). (The I-205 corridor north to Clark County will not be considered for LRT development within the next 20 years but may be considered for LRT development beyond twenty years.) This study will recommend a priority corridor to pursue through an Alternatives Analysis. The timing of the AA for the priority corridor to Clark County will be dependent on the

overall funding strategy developed in conjunction with the I-205/Milwaukie study.

- ~~5. Build Out Analysis — The local comprehensive plans are designed to accommodate more growth than will be realized by the year 2005 (the scope of the RTP). As such it is necessary for long range planning purposes to identify the travel demand associated with the full build out of the local plans and examine the effects of this level of development on the transportation system beyond the year 2005.~~
- 6-5. Southeast Corridor Study -- The initial phase of the Southeast Corridor Study has been completed. The first phase examined a series of transportation alternatives for minimizing traffic impacts on Johnson Creek Boulevard and recommended an action plan. Several other outstanding transportation issues which exist in the Southeast Corridor extending from the I-5/I-405 loop to U.S. 26 in Boring include: Among the issues being addressed in this corridor are: a) an analysis of transportation alternatives to minimize excessive traffic impacts on Johnson Creek Boulevard; b) an evaluation of the adequacy of Willamette River crossing capacity needs; and c) the engineering and definition of improvements to Highways 224 and 212 in the Sunrise Corridor from McLoughlin Boulevard to U.S. 26 (including the alternative designs of expressway or freeway). Portions of the Sunrise Corridor improvement as currently defined may impact resources protected by Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues).

Page 8-26, amend and renumber as follows:

- 7-6. Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor -- The alignment for the proposed highway improvement in the Tualatin Hillsboro Corridor must be determined through preliminary engineering and the EIS process. The Western Bypass was adopted as a contingent recommendation subject to the findings of a land use and environmental analysis. ODOT has begun a study of the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor evaluating the need for transportation improvements in the corridor and assessing the land use consequences of a range of reasonable alternatives. The ODOT Western Bypass Study will incorporate the results of the 1000 Friends of Oregon LUTRAQ Study if that study produces a viable land use/ transportation strategy. This process will need to address the nature and scope of the 216th/219th corridor improvement north of T.V. Highway (arterial or limited access facility) and land use issues related to resources protected by Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues).

~~8-7. I-84 to U.S. 26 Connector Mt. Hood Parkway~~

~~9. East Bank Freeway Relocation — Options for relocating the I-5 Freeway on the east bank of the Willamette River are currently being examined. If a decision is reached to significantly alter the nature and scope of improvements to this section of the facility from those previously adopted in the RTP, the RTP must be amended to delete the existing improvements and include the revised project. Relocating the freeway may impact resources protected by the Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues).~~

~~10-8. T.V. Highway Corridor -- The adopted RTP recognizes the need for improvements in the T.V. Highway Corridor west of Highway 217. Two study efforts are currently underway in the corridor to determine the nature and scope of required improvements: the City of Beaverton's Central Beaverton Study (Highway 217 Murray) and ODOT's T.V. Highway Reconnaissance (Murray Hillsboro). Some of the alternatives being evaluated in the Beaverton Study would necessitate a change to the RTP Principal Arterial System and would probably impact resources protected by Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues). The east-west arterial north of T.V. Highway will construct a five-lane arterial between 110th and Murray Road. The route will parallel Center Street and then utilize the existing Milikan Way between Hocken and Murray Road. The major outstanding issue with this project is the proposed arterial's interface with Highway 217. The city and ODOT must decide whether a new interchange will be developed or whether the arterial will simply cross over Highway 217 with no direct access.~~

ODOT's T.V. Highway Reconnaissance Study will examine issues in the segment of T.V. Highway between Murray Blvd. and Hillsboro.

~~11-9. Land Use Issues~~

Page 8-27, under "Land Use Issues," amend as follows:

~~As a result, consistency with the Statewide Land Use Planning Goals must be demonstrated prior to a "build" decision and a final RTP decision. Metro and Washington County have ratified a working agreement and scope of work to provide the information necessary to address the land use issues associated with the proposed facility in the Tualatin Hillsboro Corridor (as required by the adoption of the Southwest Corridor Study recommendations). Similar efforts may be required in the other two corridors.~~

~~In addition, several planning studies currently underway to address outstanding transportation issues are evaluating~~

~~alternatives that would likely impact Goal protected resources.~~

The Goal 12 Transportation Rule details the criteria for "Exceptions for Transportation Improvements on Rural Land". It requires that an exception adopted as part of a transportation system plan (TSP) (i.e., the RTP and local comprehensive plans) shall, at a minimum, decide need, mode, function and general location for the proposed facility or improvement. The finding of need must show that the transportation need cannot be accommodated through alternative modes, TSM measures or improvements to existing facilities.

Studies are underway in each of these three corridors to determine whether the transportation needs in those corridors warrant a finding of exception to Goal 14.

Page 8-27, items 4, 5 and 6 are renumbered, retitled, or amended as follows:

12-10. Goods Movement

13-11. Five-Year Transit Development Plan

14-12. Demand Management Planning -- The Rideshare Advisory Subcommittee will examine the candidate demand management strategies identified in the Policy Framework and develop recommendations on which are the most promising to pursue. The FY 92 Unified Work Program identifies a number of air quality planning activities, including a regional demand management planning study. The study will evaluate and adopt demand management programs for inclusion in the RTP to, in part, reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce automobile-related emissions, conserve energy, and generally assist other objectives related to congestion and mobility. Study recommendations will reflect both RTP and Oregon Transportation Plan demand management policies. The study process will coordinate with the Portland Area Demand Management Working Group.

15-13. Access Control Plans

16-14. Light Rail Analyses

Page 8-28, renumber and amend as follows:

17-15. Development Impacts

18-16. U.S. 26/I-405/I-5 Connection

19-17. Cornell and W. Burnside

- ~~20. Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Periodic Review The modification of the UGB as a result of the periodic review process would require the development of a new series of population and employment projections to reflect such amendments.~~
18. Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 -- The region must comply with the provisions of the CAAA which include a requirement that the projects included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) demonstrate conformity by reducing regional VMT when compared with a No-Build condition.
- ~~21-19. 2010 RTP Update -- After the completion of a regional 2010 population and employment forecast, the travel demand associated with this level of growth will be developed and used as the basis for a 2010 RTP Update. The Interim RTP update scheduled for next year will begin to address the changing policy issues brought about by the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments and RUGGO. This will involve updating the population and employment forecasts and analyzing a new series of travel forecasts for the year 2010. This interim update will provide the opportunity to address alternative transportation strategies consistent with RUGGO but will stop short of thoroughly addressing the analysis of alternative land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule. An RTP update will provide 2015 travel forecasts and will implement functional plans and the Region 2040 transportation and land use recommendations.~~
- ~~22. I 5 North/N. Kerby Avenue Off Ramp Based on the results of the privately funded studies called for in Chapter 5 of the Plan, determine if sufficient justification exists for the project to pursue further planning and public involvement efforts (such as an EIS).~~

Page 8-29, delete and add as follows:

- ~~• Gladstone Bridge~~
- I-5 North/N. Kerby Avenue Off-Ramp
- Birdsdale Bypass/Corridor Study

JC:lmk
91-433.ATT
1-22-92

Exhibit B

Findings of Consistency with Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO)

Since the adoption of RUGGO in Ordinance No. 91-418B on September 26, 1991, Metro has had new regional goals and objectives. Functional plans which implement new regional goals and objectives, like the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), must now maintain consistency with the new regional goals and objectives. The following are findings of consistency with RUGGO for these RTP revisions.

Summary Chapter

S-1 recognition of state, federal and regional policy initiatives:

- all of these policy initiatives are consistent with Goal II.ii. which seeks to maintain and enhance livability by coordination of the development of public facilities.
- recognition of federal Clean Air Act amendments is consistent with Objectives 8 and 8.2 requiring development of new regional strategies to comply with the Clean Air Act.
- the policy initiatives recognized are consistent with Objective 13 because they include all of the elements of a regional transportation plan in Objective 13 i-v.

S-6 Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor revision to reflect alternatives under study by ODOT:

- outlining alternatives to be studied and the steps in the study and evaluation process is consistent with Goal I.ii. because it helps avoid creating duplicative processes, standards, or governmental roles and is consistent with Objective 1.2 as an additional means of public notification to ensure a high level of awareness on the part of affected citizens.
- study of alternatives, including transit and transit/highway combinations is consistent with Objective 13 considerations of reduced reliance on auto and a balanced regional transportation system, assuring adequate levels of mobility, energy efficiency, comparison of financial restraints, and environmental impacts.

S-6 Westside Light Rail amendments reflecting progress of the region's longstanding top light rail transit (LRT) priority to final design and funding:

- updating the progress of the region's top LRT priority in the RTP is consistent with Objective 1.2 as an additional means of public notification to ensure a high level of awareness on the part of affected citizens.
- revision of the RTP to reflect Tri-Met's Preferred Alternative Decision is required by Oregon Laws 1991, Chapter 3.
- finalizing design and funding is consistent with Objectives 8 and 13 because this project has been recognized to be a primary step in maintaining air quality and a balanced regional transportation system that reduces reliance on auto by Oregon Laws 1991, Chapter 3.

S-8 LRT Corridor updates on I-205/Milwaukie and I-5 North/I-205 North:

- updating the progress of study of secondary LRT priorities in the RTP is consistent with Objective 1.2 as an additional means of public notification to ensure a high level of awareness on the part of affected citizens.
- proceeding with the study process required to qualify for federal funding for additional LRT corridors is consistent with Objectives 8 and 13 as projects to maintain air quality by reducing reliance on auto in a balanced regional transportation system.

S-11 revisions to reflect federal UMTA and state commitment to Westside LRT funding and its impact on other corridors:

- updating the progress of LRT funding is consistent with Objective 1.2 as an additional means of public notification to ensure a high level of awareness on the part of affected citizens.
- building the Westside LRT is consistent with Objectives 8 and 13 because this project has been recognized to be a primary step in maintaining air quality and a balanced regional transportation system that reduces reliance on auto by Oregon Laws 1991, Chapter 3.

Introduction Chapter

I-3:

- all of the policy initiatives cited are consistent with Goal II.ii. which seeks to maintain and enhance livability by coordination of the development of public facilities.

- recognition of federal Clean Air Act amendments is consistent with Objectives 8 and 8.2 requiring development of new regional strategies to comply with the Clean Air Act.
- the policy initiatives recognized are consistent with Objective 13 because they include all of the comments of a regional transportation plan in Objective 13 i-v.

I-7 restates recognition of the latest amendments to the Clean Air Act consistent with Objective 8.

I-7 State Planning Requirements recognizing future Transportation Rule relationships between state and regional Transportation System Plans (TSPs):

- coordination of state and regional TSPs is consistent with Goal II.ii. which seeks to maintain and enhance livability by coordination of the development of public facilities.
- Transportation Rule requirements to be included in the TSPs are consistent with Objectives 8 and 13 by their emphasis on maintaining air quality by reduction of auto reliance in a balance transportation system in which the regional transportation system recognizes the impact of state transportation needs.

Chapter 1

1-3 History amendments reflect 1991 adoption of the LCDC Transportation Rule and RUGGO.

1-7 revisions now require that the regional transportation program must be consistent with state and federal air quality requirements:

- this revision to mandatory compliance is consistent with Objective 8.1 which requires all strategies for managing air quality to be consistent with the state plan and federal law.

1-15 amends Elderly and Handicapped service to include special services required by the Americans with Disabilities Act consistent with Objective 13.ii. because the regional transportation system must be consistent with state and regional policies.

Chapter 2

2-1 explains the use of travel forecasts which is consistent with Objective 13.ii. because adequacy of the regional transportation system is based on consistency with local comprehensive plans and statewide policy.

Chapter 4

4-1 recognizes adoption of RUGGO as new regional goals and objectives that are the framework for the RTP and other functional plans which is consistent with the regional planning process in Goal I.i. and the relationship of functional plans and RUGGO in Objective 5.

4-20 to 4-22 reflects as 10-year transitway priorities (1) the alignment selected by Tri-Met for Westside LRT as the Preferred Alternative; (2) study of Portland-Clackamas Town Center (CTC) and Portland Airport to CTC; (3) Milwaukie Corridor alternatives; (4) Vancouver to downtown Portland, and (5) Portland-Tigard LRT:

- restating Westside LRT as required by Oregon Laws 1991, Chapter 3 and outlining priority alternatives to be studied is consistent with Goal II.ii. because it helps avoid duplicative processes and is consistent with Objective 1.2 as an additional means of public notification to ensure a high level of awareness on the part of affected citizens.
- identification of transitways as 10-year priorities to qualify for federal funding is consistent with a balanced regional transportation system with reduced reliance on auto required by Objective 13.

4-26 c. Land Use Decisions is revised to recommend local plan consideration of travel demand management in future land use actions:

- this is consistent with Goal II.ii. which encourages regional planning to coordinate development of public facilities with other aspects of land use planning.

Chapter 5

5-2 revision of the details of the explanation of Portland's downtown carpool program.

5-9 revision of I-205 10-Year Priority Projects to reflect ongoing studies:

- this is consistent with Objective 1.2 as an additional means of public notification to ensure a high level of awareness on the part of affected citizens.

5-10 revision of East County Access 10-Year Priority Projects to add a name to the described project.

5-12 move Graham Road widening from 10-Year Priority to Committed Project is consistent with Objective 13.ii. on adequate mobility.

5-16 describing the progress of Milwaukie Corridor HCT alternatives is consistent with Objective 13.i. and 13.3 because it seeks reduced reliance on auto and 13.v. because alternatives analysis seeks to minimize environmental impacts.

5-17 amends a package of street improvement recommendations reflecting completion of the Southeast Corridor study which is consistent with Objective 13.ii.

5-17 deleting a Thiessen Road improvement from 10-Year Priority Projects because Clackamas County chose a "no build" option. This is consistent with Objective 13.ii.

5-18 deleting a Valley View Road alternative because Clackamas County did not choose that option. This is consistent with Objective 13.ii.

5-19 deleting a series of specific 10-Year Priority Projects in favor of broader alternatives currently under study because further study was required by ODOT. This is consistent with Objective 13.ii.

5-24 reflects continued study of alternatives in the ODOT Western Bypass Study consistent with Objective 13.ii. requiring consistency with state and regional policies and plans.

5-30 adds recognition of alternatives analysis for phases of Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor bypass facility consistent with Objective 13.v. requiring minimization of environmental impacts.

5-31 adds a recommended East-West Arterial bypass to coordinate with Westside LRT construction consistent with the local comprehensive plan (Objective 13.ii.) and increasing LRT efficiency (Objectives 13.i. and 13.3.2).

5-33 recommends proceeding with Westside LRT consistent with Objectives 8 and 13 because this project is a primary step in maintaining air quality and a balanced regional transportation system per Oregon Laws 1991, Chapter 3.

Chapter 6

6-1 is a clarification of the definition of the analysis of transit share which is consistent with Objectives 13.i. and 13.3 to seek increased use of transit.

6-16 merely reflects a name change of project in the RTP.

6-17 reflects the final transit stations for the Westside LRT which is consistent with local comprehensive plans and state policy in Oregon Laws 1991, Chapter 3 (Objective 13.ii.).

Chapter 7

7-18 amends an evaluation to state developments in funding LRT consistent with Objective 13.iv. recognizing financial restraints, Objectives 13.i. and 13.ii. on state policy consistency, and a balanced transportation system.

Chapter 8

8-2 restates the distinction between recommendations and requirements as used in functional planning consistent with Goal I, Objectives 3 and 5. The distinction is stated in Objective 3.i., a restatement of ORS 268.390(4). The use of recommendations in functional plans unless a requirement is stated is consistent with Objective 3.2 which separates requirements from recommendations.

The treatment of inconsistencies between the RTP and local plans in the Chapter 8 dispute resolution process is consistent with Goal I, Objective 5.3 dispute resolution process because it restates that process.

8-8 reflects the progress of the Westside LRT consistent with state policy in Oregon Laws 1991, Chapter 3 (Objective 13.ii.) and reduction of reliance on auto by increased utilization of transit (Objectives 13.i. and 13.3.2).

8-9 adds consistency with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements consistent with Objective 13.ii. because that is consistent with state and regional policy.

8-12 recognizes LCDC's Transportation Rule consistent with Objective 13.ii. because the regional transportation system must be consistent with state policies.

8-13, paragraph 2 reflects the LCDC Transportation Rule separation of need, mode, and general location into the system level decision consistent with Objective 13.ii. because it is consistent with that new state policy.

8-13, paragraph 3 merely states the source of travel needs more clearly, consistent with Objective 13.ii. because adequate levels of mobility are to be determined from local comprehensive plans.

8-14 recognizes the distinction between functional plan recommendations and requirements consistent with Goal I, Objectives 3 and 5 (see 8-2 above). Also, the recognition of the LCDC Transportation Rule separation of a systems level decision is consistent with Objective 13.ii. because it is consistent with that new state policy.

8-15 clarifies that the RTP, like all functional plans are consistent with statewide goals by RUGGO consistency. This is consistent with Objective 3.2 because functional plans generally are not required to do direct statewide goal findings and Objective 5.3 because functional plan provisions generally are recommendations that may be amended in the dispute resolution process prior to final implementation by local comprehensive plan amendment where compliance with statewide goals must be demonstrated.

8-15, 8-16, F.1 restates the last sentence of Objective 5.2 that new functional plan provisions shall include findings of consistency with RUGGO.

8-16, F.1, paragraph 2 changes reflect Goal I, Objectives 3.2 and 5.2 that functional plan recommendations do not require statewide goal findings, but do require analysis and findings of consistency with RUGGO.

8-24, G, paragraph 1 eliminates language that presumes or requires that any possible resolution of outstanding issues necessarily results in a functional plan amendment.

8-24, G, 2. about past interim progress on the Westside LRT is deleted in favor of previous amendments describing current status.

8-24, G, new 2 describes the LCDC Transportation Rule and Region 2040 as outstanding issues for the next update which further integrate land use and transportation planning consistent with the Objective 13.ii. requirement that the regional transportation plan be consistent with state policy. This issue replaces Outstanding Issue 5 at 8-25.

8-25, 3. updates the Bi-State Transportation Study as a continuing Outstanding Issue consistent with Objective 13.i. requiring a balanced regional transportation system.

8-25, 4. updates I/205, Milwaukie LRT corridors and adds Vancouver for further studies of high capacity transit alternatives which is consistent with Objectives 13.i. and 13.3.2 because LRT reduces reliance on auto and any development of additional LRT corridors would increase the use of transit.

8-25, new 5. updates the Southeast Corridor Study, including the Johnson Creek Boulevard phase, identifying outstanding transportation issues for study in that corridor consistent with Objectives 13.ii. and 13.v. which require development of a regional transportation system with adequate mobility based on local comprehensive plans with environmental impacts minimized.

8-26, new 6. restates the status of Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor studies by ODOT which is consistent with Objective 13.ii. to provide adequate levels of mobility consistent with local comprehensive plans and state policies by reviewing alternative means of meeting projected travel demand in that corridor.

8-26, new 8. updates T.V. Highway Corridor Outstanding Issue of the East-West Arterial which is consistent with Objective 13.ii. to provide adequate levels of mobility consistent with the local comprehensive plan and consistent with Objective 13.3.2 to increase use of transit because of the enhancement of Westside LRT by this proposed arterial.

8-27, new 9. replaces the description of a general approach to land use contingencies with a description of the specific goal exceptions process if improvements under study impact resource lands. This approach of following the Transportation Rule process is consistent with Objective 13.ii. because it follows state policy in the development of the regional transportation plan as required by that Objective.

8-27, new 12. updates Demand Management Outstanding Issues, identifying a new study to reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled, reduce auto emissions, and conserve energy. These activities are consistent with Objectives 13.i., 13.iii., and 13.2.1.

8-28, new 18. updates the 2010 RTP forecast Outstanding Issue, incorporating the LCDC Transportation Rule, Clean Air Act amendments, and RUGGO. This is consistent with Objective 13.ii. which requires the regional transportation plan to follow state and regional policies.

LS/dr
1347



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

Date: January 17, 1992

To: Jessica Marlitt, Council Analyst

From: *LSH*
Larry Shaw, Senior Assistant Counsel

Regarding: ROBERT LIBERTY RTP AMENDMENTS
Our file: 10.§3

Introduction

Amendments to the JPACT-recommended Exhibit A RTP revision were proposed by Robert Liberty at the January 14, 1992, Council Committee meeting. This responds to the Council request for comments on them.

Exhibit A, Page 2

Mr. Liberty's additional sentence would correctly state in the RTP the fact that Metro must conduct its own review of the study's selected alternative to determine appropriate amendments to the RTP. That process is part of the existing Intergovernmental Agreement adopted by Metro. However, that same Agreement makes ODOT's study process the Metro process for public participation in the review of alternatives. As discussed below, commitment in the RTP revision to statewide goal compliance prior to adoption of a regional Transportation Systems Plan (TSP), is premature.

Therefore, an amended version of Mr. Liberty's additional sentence consistent with these comments: "As defined in the Intergovernmental Agreement for decision-making on this project, Metro will conduct an independent review of the selected alternative for appropriate RTP amendments and compliance with RUGGO."

Exhibit A, Page 3

Addition of " * * * complying with Goal 12" in reference to the TSP is redundant, but correct.

Exhibit A, Page 5

Addition of " * * * and other functional plans adopted to implement the RUGGO" is a legally correct amplification.

Exhibit A, Page 15

- 1 - Addition of " * * * or final goal findings for aspects of some projects" is a legally correct amplification.
- 2 - Addition of " * * * as these acknowledged comprehensive plans are amended to comply with Goal 12 and other Metro functional plans" is a legally correct amplification. The emphasized words are added to Mr. Liberty's words for clarity of the addition.

Compliance v. Consistency, Exhibit A, Page 15 (See November 15, 1991, Packet Memo)

The distinction between "consistency" and "compliance" has not been directly ruled upon by the courts. RUGGO uses the concept of "consistency" because that is the undefined term in the statute requiring Metro to do regional goals and objectives. ORS 268.380(1). Metro's position in RUGGO findings was that "consistency" is a more general standard of review against statewide goals because the planning process continues to refine (1) general regional goals to (2) regional policies in functional plans to (3) site specific regulations in city and county comprehensive plans. The law is clear that the comprehensive plan regulations must be supported by findings that demonstrate compliance with statewide goals. The statutes state no requirements for statewide goal findings for regional policies in functional plans.

The RTP is a more developed, special case functional plan. It doubles as the federal Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) regional transportation plan. LCDC's transportation rule requires that it be rewritten or another systems planning document be created for a Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) by 1995. At that time limited statewide goal findings on need, function, mode, and general location may be required for facilities anticipated in the RTP-TSP. OAR 660-12-025. Whether LCDC's rule authorizing statewide goal findings for these system decision parts of complex transportation facility decisions will be approved by the courts will not be known for some time. The RTP Update will be the rewrite to comply with the new LCDC transportation rule.

Therefore, to adopt RTP revisions that move the RTP from the current RUGGO approach that all functional plans are "consistent" with statewide goals to direct RTP "compliance" with all statewide goals moves beyond even the LCDC transportation rule. When the regional TSP is done the RTP-TSP will then be in compliance with Goal 12, according to the LCDC rule. Right now, the entire RTP has not yet been rewritten. So, raising the standard of statewide goal compliance by Mr. Liberty's suggested amendment may subject all RTP facilities not already included in local comprehensive plans to additional grounds for legal challenge during the interim prior to TSP adoption.

Jessica Marlitt
Page 3
January 17, 1992

Exhibit A, Page 22

Adding other functional plans as part of the basis for the RTP Update is legally correct. Mr. Cotugno requests that the sentence should indicate that Region 2040 will be acted upon in the RTP Update regardless of whether other functional plans are completed: "An RTP Update will provide 2015 travel forecasts and will implement functional plans and the Region 2040 transportation and land use recommendations."

dr
1374

cc: Daniel B. Cooper
Andy Cotugno
Mike Hogleund
John Cullerton
Ethan Seltzer

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 92-433 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING REVISIONS TO THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Date: October 22, 1991

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This ordinance would amend the Portland metropolitan area Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to include necessary revisions developed in conjunction with the region's cities, counties and transportation service districts. These updates are relatively minor and are consistent with current RTP policies or are consistent with federal, state and regional actions adopted subsequent to the RTP adoption. These revisions are necessary in order to properly position projects for federal funding and to eliminate inconsistency with the recently adopted policies.

TPAC and JPACT have reviewed the RTP revisions and recommend approval of Ordinance No. 92-433.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

After extensive public review and comment, the RTP was adopted by the Metro Council in 1982 and updated in 1983 and in 1989. The current plan gives the Portland metropolitan area a much needed direction for meeting our transportation needs over the next two decades. The plan provides for a balanced mix of highway, transit and demand management measures for addressing the transportation needs of the growing metropolitan area.

This current revision provides updates to project descriptions that are not currently consistent with recently adopted policy and adds project descriptions for recently adopted projects that are not currently included in the RTP.

The overall policy context of the RTP has changed as a result of federal, state and regional actions. The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, the state LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule and the Regional Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) have all been adopted subsequent to the RTP adoption in 1989. These three documents include policies which must be reflected to varying degrees and on varying timelines within the RTP. The common threads throughout each of these policies are a reduction in single occupant vehicle trips through increased reliance on transit and transportation demand management (TDM) techniques. The Transportation Rule and RUGGO also suggest changes in land use policy to encourage development patterns in which short shopping and personal errand trips can more easily be made by

walking and biking.

The policy and project-related actions which are addressed in this RTP revision include:

Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 -- Chapter 1, Regional Transportation Policy, includes revised goals and objectives which acknowledge that the RTP must conform to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. Other general references to regional air quality policy include reference to the amendments.

LCDC Goal 12 - Transportation Rule -- Chapter 1, Regional Transportation Policy, and Chapter 2, Land Use, Growth and Travel Demand, have been revised to include recognition of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule which requires state, regional and local development of Transportation System Plans (TSPs). The RTP will function as the regional TSP and, as such, it must be consistent with the Oregon Transportation Plan (the state TSP) for statewide needs.

Chapter 8, Implementation, includes the Transportation Rule as an Outstanding Issue. This section discusses the Region 2040 planning process and future RTP updates which will explore the transportation/land use relationship through the analysis of alternative land use and transportation scenarios.

Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives -- Chapter 2, Land Use, Growth and Travel Demand, has been revised to incorporate a description of the relationship of the RTP with local comprehensive plans and RUGGO. In short, the local plans must be consistent with the RTP and the RTP must become consistent with RUGGO which are, in turn, consistent with the statewide planning goals.

The implementation chapter, Chapter 8, has also been revised in order to recognize that the RTP revisions must demonstrate consistency with RUGGO. Other chapters include general reference to RUGGO consistent with the references in these two chapters.

Americans with Disabilities Act -- This act, passed by Congress in 1991, includes requirements that transit districts move toward an entirely accessible bus fleet. Tri-Met is currently developing a revision of the Special Needs Transportation Plan which incorporates the ADA requirements. Metro must approve Tri-Met's plan and find that it is in conformance with the RTP.

In Chapter 1, the reference to the Special Needs Transportation Plan is updated to be consistent with the new ADA.

In Chapter 8, under Handicapped Transit Service, the new ADA is acknowledged and the relationship between the Tri-Met Special Needs Plan and the RTP is clarified.

Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor (Western Bypass Study) -- The Western Bypass was adopted as a contingent recommendation subject to an

analysis of land use issues and its consistency with state land use planning goals. ODOT has initiated a study to resolve the outstanding land use and transportation issues in this corridor. This ODOT study will examine various corridors and mode opportunities such as light rail transit, highway, and improved bus service.

Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 91-1425 on May 9, 1991. This resolution authorized entering into an intergovernmental agreement which defined the study process and recognized that the study would identify strategies which incorporate all feasible modes of transportation.

In the Summary Chapter, the detailed description of the proposed project has been replaced with text describing the new study process which allows for a broad range of transportation alternatives to be considered in the corridor.

In Chapter 5, Recommended Transportation Improvements to the Year 2005, the language referring to the Western Bypass has been changed to indicate that the proposed bypass is but one alternative being considered in the ODOT study.

In Chapter 8, Implementation, the Western Bypass Study is listed as an Outstanding Issue due to the unresolved alignment and land use issues. The text has been changed to more accurately reflect the current ODOT study process.

Westside Corridor Project -- On April 11, 1991, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 91-1424 which endorsed the recommendation of the Long Tunnel with a Zoo Station to 185th Avenue as the Preferred Alternative for the Westside Corridor Project. The Hillsboro Corridor Project is currently in the midst of Preliminary Engineering for the extension of the Westside LRT from 185th to downtown Hillsboro. This RTP revision will amend the RTP to recognize the Locally Preferred Alternative to 185th Avenue and the extension from 185th and Baseline to central Hillsboro.

In the Summary Chapter, language is revised to reflect the current funding situation for the Westside Corridor Project.

In Chapter 4, Policy Implications and the System Concept, the transitway policy is revised to acknowledge the Locally Preferred Alternative decision and the current status of the Hillsboro Corridor Project.

Chapter 5, Recommended Transportation Improvements to the Year 2005, has been revised to include both the Locally Preferred Alternative of the Westside Project to 185th Avenue and the Hillsboro Corridor Project from 185th to Central Hillsboro as committed projects.

In Chapter 6, Evaluation of the Adopted Plan, Sylvan has been deleted as a location for an LRT transit center.

Chapter 8, Implementation, the Transitway Implementation section has been revised to include the Locally Preferred Alternative decision and the Hillsboro Corridor Project status. The Westside Corridor Project has been deleted as an Outstanding Issue.

Regional LRT Priorities -- On June 13, 1991, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 91-1456 which established a strategy for completing High Capacity Transit (HCT) studies to Clackamas County/East Portland and to Clark County, Washington. The resolution calls for a Pre-Alternatives Analysis level study of HCT options between the Portland CBD and Clackamas Town Center via Milwaukie or via I-205; and for a Pre-AA study of HCT options between the Portland CBD and several alternative terminus locations in Clark County.

The Summary Chapter has been revised to include the Pre-AA status in both the southern and northern corridors. References to LRT funding strategies and issues have been updated.

In Chapter 4, Policy Implications and the System Concept, the revised HCT study priorities in the southern and northern corridors are discussed in detail.

Chapter 5, Recommended Transportation Improvements to the year 2005, includes a southern corridor HCT project as a 10-Year Priority Project. This revision clarifies the study process in the corridor.

Chapter 8, Implementation, under Transitway Implementation, is amended to explain the priorities for HCT studies and implementation.

Southeast Corridor Study -- The Metro Council, on October 26, 1989 adopted Resolution No. 89-1108 which adopted the findings and recommendations of the first phase of the Southeast Corridor Study. The study recommended implementation of the Southeast Corridor Transportation Improvement Plan, which included a series of improvements in the Johnson Creek Boulevard/King-Harrison area.

In Chapter 5, the Southeast Corridor Transportation Improvement Plan is included as a 10-Year Priority.

In Chapter 8, the Johnson Creek Boulevard portion of the Southeast Corridor study is eliminated as an Outstanding Issue.

Sunrise Corridor -- ODOT's Preliminary Engineering effort in the Sunrise Corridor has identified an expanded set of highway alternatives between the Rock Creek (Carver) Junction and U.S. 26.

In Chapter 5, the description of the Sunrise Corridor Improvements east of the Rock Creek Junction have been broadened to include all of the alignment alternatives currently being examined by ODOT as part of their study.

Beaverton East-West Arterial -- The East-West arterial is designed to function as an arterial bypass of Canyon Road/T.V. Highway through central Beaverton. This project was included in Chapter 5 of the 1989 update in very general terms which recognized the need for some improvements in the corridor. The text in Chapter 5 has been updated to include the specifics of the project as developed through the City of Beaverton's study process.

The remaining project level revisions included in Exhibit A are primarily minor project status updates and general housekeeping changes.

TPAC reviewed (but did not adopt) the draft RTP revisions at their November 1, 1991 meeting. TPAC members subsequently submitted comments on the revisions to Metro staff. A summary of these comments and the staff response are included as Attachment 1. Metro legal staff also prepared a memo describing the staff response to TPAC comments on Chapter 8 Implementation issues, this memo is included as Attachment 2.

TPAC again considered the RTP revisions (incorporating their new comments) at their meeting on November 27, 1991. This package of RTP revisions was adopted with amendments which are summarized in Attachment 3. Exhibit A has been revised to include these amendments.

An interim RTP update is scheduled for this fiscal year and is included in the Unified Work Program. This process will update the population, employment and travel forecasts to the year 2010; evaluate 20-year needs, costs and projected revenues; and develop in detail the policy direction required to address the Transportation Rule, air quality legislation and RUGGO.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Ordinance No. 92-433.

92-433.ORD
1-22-92
JC:lmk

ATTACHMENT 1

SUMMARY OF TPAC COMMENTS ON RTP REVISION

The TPAC comments on the RTP revision have been placed into three categories based upon staff's interpretation of the issues involved:

Category 1 - Minor editing, wordsmithing and obvious omissions
(All of these recommendations have been incorporated into the revised Exhibit A.)

- a. Several minor edits recommended by Molly O'Reilly relating to the discussion of RUGGO and the Western Bypass.
- b. Minor edits recommended by Clackamas County on the discussion of the HCT study process and LRT funding.
- c. Add 207th Avenue between Sandy and Glisan -- inadvertently omitted from original revision.
- d. Add Birdsdale Bypass/Corridor Study as an Outstanding Issue -- per Gresham's request.
- e. Washington County questioned the Raleigh Hills Transit Center and recommended changing the Tanasbourne Transit Center to 185th Avenue and Baseline Road. (Based on TPAC's recommendation, the RTP will reflect that the Tanasbourne Transit Center will continue to function until the completion of the Westside LRT at which time the transit center function will be relocated to the 185th and Baseline LRT station.)

Category 2 - More significant edits and policy questions with a staff recommendation

- a. Molly O'Reilly recommended a more detailed discussion of the specifics of the Transportation Rule and RUGGO (e.g., VMT reduction and RUGGO (Goal 13) within the context of the Summary Chapter. (Staff recommends against including this much detail within the Summary at this time. A detailed discussion of the Transportation Rule and RUGGO is included under Outstanding Issues in Chapter 8.)
- b. Molly O'Reilly, Greg Oldham and ODOT have all recommended less specific wording in reference to the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor (Western Bypass Study). (Staff recommends using wording proposed by ODOT which eliminates many of the specific project references; such wording is included in the revised Exhibit A.)

- c. Molly O'Reilly recommended minor revisions to the text of Chapter 8 -- Outstanding Issues -- relating to the Transportation Rule and the 2010 RTP Update. (Staff has developed wording which will address the issues raised but will not include a discussion of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 in the context of an Outstanding Issue because the RTP has already been found to conform with the CAAA based on the interim conformity guidelines.)
- d. Greg Oldham questioned the need for the Beaverton east-west arterial and ODOT questioned the financing of the proposed project. (These comments did not address issues directly related to this RTP revision.)
- e. City of Portland recommended retaining Sylvan as an LRT Transit Center in Chapter 6. (Given the context of this section of Chapter 6, staff recommended not to include Sylvan as a major LRT Transit Center. This section refers to economic development opportunities at major LRT transit centers and, as currently structured, it will discuss only the major LRT Transit Centers at Peterkort (Sunset Transit Center), Beaverton Transit Center and Tanasbourne/185th and Baseline. The individual Westside LRT stations are not detailed anywhere in the RTP and, as such, the RTP does not take a position on individual station locations but leaves that to the project development process.)

Category 3 - Broader issues including significant questions relating to Chapter 8. TPAC should be prepared to provide direction/comment where a staff position is not included.

- a. Molly O'Reilly and Greg Oldham both expressed serious reservations regarding the revisions prepared for the Chapter 8 Implementation discussion. They both questioned the propriety of including these revisions within the context of a minor housekeeping revision. (Metro Legal Counsel, which drafted the Chapter 8 Implementation revisions, has formulated a staff response to these questions and it is attached.) Note: ODOT also expressed confusion as to the intent of the revision to Page 8-2, paragraph 2, shown on page 10 of Exhibit A.
- b. Ray Polani raised three major issues in his comments on the RTP revision. The three comments and the staff response to each are as follows:
 - The RTP, at this time, should thoroughly incorporate all aspects of the major changes in policy direction embodied in the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, RUGGO and the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Staff Response: This minor RTP revision is being completed in a relatively short timeframe. The UWP includes a work

element in FY 1992 for the development of an "Interim RTP Update" which will revise the travel forecasts and begin to analyze the impacts of changes in regional transportation policy. The Transportation Rule recognizes the amount of work necessary to fully incorporate these policy changes at a regional level and it gives MPOs until 1994 to include these policy elements in the RTP.

- Citizens for Better Transit call for an immediate freeze on any and all highway capacity-enhancing projects included in the RTP.

Staff Response: It is not appropriate to place a freeze on highway projects which increase capacity at this time. A delay in addressing the highway congestion problems in the region will not benefit the cause of mobility, either transit or auto. Again, a major review of the region's highway strategy will be conducted as part of Rule 12 planning activities in subsequent updates. However, further consideration must be given to developing an appropriate approach to addressing the development of all major projects during this transitional period.

- Support for referring a constitutional amendment to Oregon voters which would free up all auto-related taxes for use on generic transportation projects with the choice of mode to be determined by Alternatives Analysis.

Staff Response: Metro and JPACT have generally supported flexibility in transportation funding at all levels, federal, state and local. The issue of an overall RTP funding strategy is more appropriate within the context of the "Interim RTP Update" scheduled for later in this fiscal year. Action independent of that effort is up to TPAC's discretion.


METRO

 2000 S.W. First Avenue
 Portland, OR 97201-5398
 503/221-1646

Memorandum

Date: November 15, 1991

To: Andy Cotugno, Transportation Director

From: *LS*
Larry Shaw, Senior Assistant Counsel

Regarding: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) REVISION - CHAPTER 8

Introduction

Some TPAC members and your staff have asked for additional explanation of the amendments to Chapter 8. Specifically this is a response to the strong objections from TPAC members Oldham and O'Reilly.

Purposes of Chapter 8 Amendments

Most of the amendments in Chapter 8 are intended as clarifications of current text of Metro's consistent approach that all functional plan provisions are recommendations unless a substantive requirement is indicated. This approach was taken from the RTP Chapter 8 dispute resolution process and made universal in Goal I of RUGGO.

Further, the distinction between "consistency" and "compliance" is not one invented for the purpose of these amendments. Metro's approach to drafting RUGGO and its land use findings for RUGGO use the term "consistency," found in ORS 268.380(1). Consistency is a more general standard of review against the statewide goals than the "compliance" review for comprehensive plans in ORS ch 197.

The reasoning for this approach becomes apparent when attempting to write findings of statewide goal compliance for very general policy goals and objectives like the regional goals and objectives in RUGGO. Regional goals and objectives were added to the statewide land use system after the statewide goals were adopted and the use of comprehensive planning at the city and county level had been selected. Regional goals are supplementary to that process. So, a more general consistency with statewide goals is all that is required of regional goals and objectives, by statute. The reason for this is that once a regional objective and a functional plan to implement that objective are adopted, the specific means of implementing the objective and the functional plan provision must be incorporated into a local comprehensive plan. Metro's authority to "enforce" its functional plan provisions in ORS 268.390(4) does not include the ability to take direct action on a land use proposal. Metro only has the authority to "require" a change in the comprehensive plan. Therefore, at

Andy Cotugno
Page 2
November 15, 1991

the time of amendment of a comprehensive plan by city, county action, or the time of Metro action to "require" such a change is the time for specific "compliance" review for the statewide goals. Metro's consistent position has been that there is no land use action by Metro under current law until such a "requirement" for a change in the comprehensive plan is ordered in a functional plan or by Metro Council action after the dispute resolution process outlined in RUGGO Goal I.

The amendments to Chapter 8, then, reflect the adopted RUGGO, initial response to the statewide transportation rule, and the litigation that has occurred over the 1989 RTP itself. In STOP v. Metro, for example, Metro's approach of recommending action to local government in an RTP provision was held not to be a final land use decision by the Court of Appeals. Therefore, the suggestions in this draft are housekeeping changes based primarily on RUGGO and case law since 1989.

Specific Proposed Amendments

O'Reilly No. 6: What is described as "bureaucratic nonsense" is in fact an important recitation of the principle in Goal I of RUGGO that all RTP provisions are recommendations unless clearly designated as a requirement. This has been Metro's interpretation of Chapter 8 and the position taken in Goal I of adopted RUGGO. To omit this clear statement of how Metro intends to exercise its authority under ORS 268.390(4) nearly adds ammunition for those who might argue that RTP provisions, regardless of the incompleteness of the study on which they are based, should be mandatory requirements of local government prior to completion of further studies.

O'Reilly No. 7-8/Oldham No. 5: This amendment got vociferous response claiming a misrepresentation of the law and a deliberate fudging (Oldham) and confusing the public (O'Reilly). It seems that these comments are based on a disagreement with both the approach in Goal I of RUGGO that all functional plan provisions are recommendations unless clearly stated to be requirements and Metro's legal position that a recommendation, as opposed to a requirement, is not a final land use decision. The amendments at 8-13, -15 go beyond that general position of Metro and applies the principles in the new LCDC rule, as well.

Again, the lack of the use of "consistent terminology" by utilizing "consistency" and "compliance" as distinct and different terms reflects the legal position that Metro has taken in its adoption of RUGGOs explained above. The RTP provisions that are recommendations not "requirements" are to be consistent with statewide planning goals. Local government comprehensive plan provisions, including PFP provisions, must be in "compliance" with statewide goals per ORS ch 197. The RTP is "consistent" with statewide goals per ORS 268.380(1). The RTP, a functional plan, is to be consistent with RUGGO. RTP

Andy Cotugno
Page 3
November 15, 1991

recommendations once converted to the form included in each comprehensive plan must be in "compliance" with statewide goals like all amendments to comprehensive plans.

Ms. O'Reilly's desire to have findings of statewide goal compliance earlier and at the regional level may be possible for certain parts of the RTP in the next update. However, so long as the RTP is both the MPO federal transportation plan and a functional plan under state law, the federal requirement for an MPO plan to demonstrate a complete system may always necessitate the inclusion of projects that are still in an early study stage not yet a final land use decision under state law with complete statewide goal compliance findings.

Conclusion

There may be some better wording suggestions to clarify the Chapter 8 amendments made to bring the RTP up-to-date after RUGGO and case law. However, the wholesale elimination of the amendments to Chapter 8 could lead to a determination that the RTP is not consistent with Goal I of RUGGO.

dr
1352

cc: Rich Carson
John Cullerton
Richard Brandman

ATTACHMENT 3

TPAC AMENDMENTS FOR ORDINANCE NO. 92-433

TPAC adopted the RTP revisions on November 27, 1991 with the following amendments. The amendments have been incorporated into Exhibit A and are referenced by the page number.

1. Clarify the status of the Tanasbourne Transit Center with regard to the Westside LRT station at 185th Avenue and Baseline Road. (Page 12)
2. Add "s" to corridor and mode in the second paragraph on Page 2 in order to clarify that more than one corridor or mode may be recommended by the Western Bypass Study. (Page 2)
3. Clarify that the proposed termini for the NE 207th Avenue arterial are NE Sandy Boulevard and NE Glisan Street. (Page 7)
4. Clarify that the proposed LRT alignment between Milwaukie Transit Center and Clackamas Town Center via Highway 224 is considered a Pre-Alternatives Analysis option and is not considered a "future extension." (Page 6)
5. Add wording describing in more detail the requirements of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule. (Pages 4 and 17)
6. Add "transportation" to the description of the Western Bypass Study discussion which references "an interactive land use/transportation strategy." (Pages 1 and 19)
7. Add as an "Outstanding Issue" that the region must be in conformance with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. (Page 22)
8. Retain original RTP language which stated that the region must be prepared to accept increased reliance on local funding sources for transit. (Page 12)
9. Clarify that future high capacity transit (HCT) corridor studies will utilize the results of the Regional HCT Study to help determine which alternatives are appropriate to carry into Alternatives Analysis. (Page 14)
10. Clarify that the HCT alternatives to be considered for I-205 between Gateway and Clark County will not include LRT within the next 20 years but may be considered beyond 20 years. (Page 18)

11. Reword the first paragraph on Page 15 in order to clarify the relationship of RTP projects and the state planning goals. (Page 15)
12. Adopt the revisions included in Addendum 1 (which have been incorporated into Exhibit A) relating to the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor and the Bi-State Study. (Pages 9, 10, 17, 18 and 19)

The following amendments were requested and considered but were not approved by TPAC:

- . Remove 112th Avenue improvements from the Regional Transportation Plan.
- . Prepare an RTP which thoroughly addresses the state's Transportation Rule 12, Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO), and Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) at this time.
- . Freeze all funding for highway projects which result in increased capacity due to likely VMT increases which would violate the state's Transportation Rule 12.

RTPADDEN.ATT
JC:lmk
1-22-92

TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

ORDINANCE NO. 92-433, For the Purpose of Adopting Revisions to the Regional Transportation Plan

Date: January 22, 1992

Presented by: Councilor Devlin

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: At the January 21, 1992 Special Meeting of the Transportation and Planning Committee, Councilors Bauer, Buchanan, Gardner, McLain and myself voted unanimously to recommend Council adopt Ordinance No. 92-433 as amended.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/ISSUES: The Committee first considered Ordinance No. 92-433 at its regular meeting January 14, 1992. At that meeting, Robert Liberty testified and described seven amendments to Exhibit A, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Committee wanted Metro Transportation staff and Legal Counsel to review Mr. Liberty's amendments, but did not want to delay Council action on the ordinance, due to the federal January 26 deadline for ADA certification and related RTP amendments. The Committee agreed to hold a special committee meeting, prior to the January 23 Council meeting, to consider Mr. Liberty's amendments in light of Metro staff review and to take final action on Ordinance No. 92-433.

1. Regular Meeting of January 14, 1992: Mike Hoglund, Transportation Department, presented Ordinance No. 92-433 which updates Metro's RTP for the following three reasons:

A) to incorporate adopted local projects and studies to meet federal funding requirements;

B) to include new or revised projects or studies which have been recommended by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and adopted by the Council since the 1989 RTP update (e.g. the Western Bypass Study, I-5 Vancouver and I-205/Milwaukie pre-Alternatives Analysis studies);

C) to revise language to reflect the changing planning environment under which Metro is and will be operating, such as the Regional Urban Growth Goals & Objectives (RUGGO), the 1991 Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA), the 1991 Clean Air Act.

Mr. Hoglund emphasized this RTP update does not add any new analysis by Metro staff; its primary purposed is to position projects for federal funding. He said the language changes relate to amending project descriptions based on local plans or to reflecting provisions of new legislation and regulations. He noted the full interim update of the RTP, to begin later this year, will incorporate new Metro analyses and will examine all aspects of the new State Transportation Rule, except land use, which will come from the Region 2040 study.

The Committee discussed the Westside light rail (LRT) Sylvan Station deletion in Chapter 6 of the RTP and the reasons for not including LRT stations as RTP projects. Mr. Hoglund recalled the TPAC (Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee) discussion of this issue: Chapter 6 addresses projects with economic development opportunities and the Sylvan Station was viewed as solely for transportation purposes. Councilor Gardner took exception to the TPAC logic, noting the Tanasbourne and Petercourt stations were included, contradicting

the idea of the Sylvan Station being only for transportation. It was noted the Sylvan Station planning would still occur under Tri-Met's obligation to the Westside LRT final plan.

The Committee also discussed the relationship of the RTP, as a functional plan, to Metro's Regional Urban Growth Goals & Objectives (RUGGO), the 2040 study, and the State Transportation Rule. This discussion took place around the following public testimony.

2. January 14, 1992 Public Testimony:

A. Molly O'Reilly, TPAC citizen member, testified the RTP is very much a highway plan, and although Ordinance No. 92-433 amendments are a definite improvement, it is unclear how the RTP will address old highway projects, which contradict the RTP's new planning direction under RUGGO and the State Transportation Rule. She noted the 1995 deadline for implementing Transportation Rule provisions is not that far away and "a lot of asphalt can be laid between now and then."

B. Robert Liberty, expressed disappointment that functional planning would not begin until completion of the Region 2040 Study in 2 to 3 years and recommended functional plan development occur concurrent with Region 2040. He identified 7 RTP amendments (Attachment A hereto) to address functional plans and how they flow from RUGGO.

3. Special Meeting of January 21, 1992: The Committee received the following public testimony first and then proceeded with discussion:

A. Ray Polani, TPAC citizen member, Citizens for Better Transit (CBT) Chair, testified CBT objected to this minor revision of the RTP in face of major policy and planning changes per RUGGO, the Transportation Rule, Clean Air Act, etc. He said CBT recommended 2 amendments to TPAC, both of which were rejected: (1) to impose an immediate freeze on all highway improvements adding system capacity, (2) to refer to voters as soon as possible a State constitutional amendment to change the Highway Fund to a State Transportation Fund.

Mr. Polani also recommended the RTP include an analysis of a transit/rail alternative for circumferential movement in the Portland area. He said a December 17 Oregonian article said Southern Pacific wanted to sell or lease 300 miles of rail lines, providing a perfect opportunity for the region and the State to develop a public rail system and alleviate pressure for road construction.

B. Robert Liberty, reviewed his proposed amendments and Metro Legal Counsel Shaw's comments and made the following points:

1) Regarding Exhibit A, page 2 - He felt Mr. Shaw's rewrite missed his point that Metro needs to conduct an independent study for State Goal compliance because the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) will not.

2) Re: Exhibit A, page 3 - He noted the "redundancy" cited by Mr. Shaw was intentional because the original sentence was unclear.

3) Re: Exhibit A, page 15 - He said in examining "consistency" vs. "compliance" the operative word in State Statute, ORS Chapter 197, was compliance. He said the term compliance inferred a certain burden of

proof to show plans meet the intent of State goals.

4) Re: Exhibit A, page 22 - He said the implementation of RUGGO was very unclear and he expressed concern over the lack of a specific timetable, staffing plan, and funding to implement RUGGO. He recommended the Committee and Council go over the RTP in detail and determine how RUGGO will be implemented.

In further discussion with the Committee, Mr. Liberty said the RTP was the most logical place to address functional planning because of its interrelationship to future land uses. He expressed frustration about the lack of implementation direction for RUGGO which had previously been characterized as the foundation for functional plans. He said more recently, emphasis had shifted towards the 2040 Plan even though it is not intended to initiate specific functional plans. He said functional plans were the only regulatory implementing tool available and if they were not linked specifically Region 2040, then Metro should not fund the study.

Councilor Gardner agreed with Mr. Liberty that the Council must clearly understand how RUGGO will be implemented, but he noted the RTP is only one functional plan and questioned if it would be appropriate to discuss other functional plans in the RTP. It was recalled the 2040 Plan should lead to amendments in the RTP and possible changes in other functional plans; therefore, action now would be premature.

Metro Transportation Department Director Andy Cotugno said from the RTP perspective, there is no certainty about what functional plans will come in the future. He said it was important to follow the Region 2040 timeline because if future functional plans are limited, the Region 2040 RTP update will ensure land use issues are still addressed.

Legal Counsel Shaw spoke to "compliance vs. consistency" and said Mr. Liberty's "hierarchical" approach to land use litigation, based on ORS Chapter 197, was exactly opposite of Metro's approach, based on ORS Chapter 268. ORS Chapter 197 legislates how local jurisdictions must comply with State land use goals, but ORS 268, Metro's enabling legislation, describes Metro's obligation to ensure plans are consistent with State goals. RUGGO's, like all Metro functional plans, have their base in ORS Chapter 268.

Councilor McLain questioned if Metro would have a stronger leadership role using the term "compliance" in the RTP and other functional plans. Mr. Shaw noted changing to "compliance" would contradict Metro's legislative history and would limit Metro's flexibility to implement RUGGO. He said functional plans were not Metro's only tool to implement RUGGO and noted intergovernmental agreements with local jurisdictions were being pursued to implement certain provisions.

The Committee unanimously recommended adoption of four of Mr. Liberty's amendments, with some revisions as recommended by Mr. Shaw (Attachment B hereto).

Original amendments as proposed by Robert Liberty at the January 14, 1992 meeting of the Transportation and Planning Committee.

Proposed Amendments to the March 9, 1989 Regional Transportation Plan

Exhibit A provides a line-by-line description of the deletions (lined-out material) and additions (underlined material) included in the 1991 RTP revision.

Summary Chapter

Page S-1, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

After extensive public review and comment, the RTP was adopted by the Metro Council in 1982 and ~~last~~ updated in 1983. The plan, incorporating the 1989 update and the current ~~(1989)~~(1991) update revision, give the Portland metropolitan region a much needed direction for meeting our transportation needs over the next two decades...

Page S-1, following paragraph 4, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the 1991 revision, the RTP recognizes and begins to incorporate the policy direction laid out by the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO). A full examination of alternative transportation and land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule will coincide with and follow the Region 2040 plan, which is an outgrowth of the RUGGO process.

Page S-6, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor -- Consider constructing ~~construct~~ a new four-lane limited access facility from I-5 to Tualatin Valley Highway and an five-lane arterial from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 ~~(Proceed with I-5 to the Highway 99W segment and arterial segment from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 as a 10-year priority.)~~ as one of several corridors and mode opportunities, such as light rail transit, highway and bus service, to be analyzed through ODOT's Western Bypass study. Alternatives to be studied will include transit and transit/highway combinations with and without a new highway facility and an interactive land use/transportation strategy (If the 1000 Friends of Oregon LUTRAQ Study produces a viable land use/transportation strategy, it would be folded into the Western Bypass Study). A corridor-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative modes and corridors to meet project goals and objectives and to consider their environmental impacts. Through this effort, one alternative will be selected and advanced to a second phase of study.

The second phase will include a design EIS or Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify specific alignments within the selected corridor(s) for the selected mode(s). This effort will examine a range of alignments for analysis in the EIS, and conclude with selection of the alternative that best meets study goals and objectives. Metro will be participating in an independent review of the selected alternative for compliance with the state wide Goals and RUGGOs.

Page S-6, paragraph 5, amend as follows:

Mt. Hood Parkway I-84/U.S.26 Connector

2. Light Rail Transit (Figure S-2)

Priority 1: Westside Light Rail -- Begin the preliminary engineering final design work and pursue finalize discretionary funding for the project from through the federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA).

Page S-8, paragraph 1 and 2, amend as follows:

I-205/Milwaukie HCT and I-5 North/I-205 North HCT Studies -- Conduct Pre-Alternatives Analysis level studies geared toward selecting priority corridors for advancement to full alternatives analysis. An action plan will be developed for the corridors not selected as the priority corridors for alternatives analysis.

~~I-205 Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering work using funds from bus lanes withdrawn from the Interstate system.~~

~~Milwaukie Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering as soon as allowable after Westside light rail. Pursue funding from UMTA after receiving funding for the Westside light rail.~~

Page S-11, paragraphs 3 and 4, amend to read:

Funding for 50 to 75 percent of the Westside and Milwaukie light rail and up to 50 percent for the next priority corridor can be sought has been committed from UMTA through a national competitive process. A strategy incorporating federal, state and local funds must be developed for corridors beyond the Westside. However, local matching funds must be obtained first.

A unique opportunity exists to fund the initial stages of work toward an I-205 light rail line. Through the Federal-Aid Interstate program, \$16.6 million ~~is was originally~~ available for bus lane construction. However, with the approval of FHWA and UMTA, this money ~~can and would be shifted to~~ is available for light rail construction.

One amendment
this page

Introduction Chapter

Page I-1, amend the second bullet under A. THE CONTEXT OF THE PLAN as follows:

- serves as a regional framework for the coordination of the transportation and land use elements of local comprehensive plans consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO);

Page I-3, add a paragraph following the final paragraph of Section B which will read as follows:

The amendments contained in the 1991 RTP revision have been found to be consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives. Future updates will reflect consistency with the Region 2040 Planning Process, the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the new Surface Transportation Act. Future RTP updates will have to reflect RUGGO and local comprehensive plans may have to change to meet RUGGO.

Page I-7, final paragraph under Federal Planning Requirements, amend as follows:

In addition to the requirements of FHWA and UMTA, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (~~carried-out~~ administered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)) requires each urbanized area to meet federal standards for clean air.

Page I-7, under State Planning Requirements, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the adoption of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, Metro must adopt a Transportation System Plan (TSP), which is consistent with the State TSP. In the case of the State, the TSP is the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and, in the case of Metro, the TSP is the RTP. Metro is working with ODOT to ensure consistency between the OTP and the RTP (see also Chapter 8).

complying with Goal 12

Chapter 1

Page 1-3, add as final paragraph under Section B. History

1991 LCDC adopts the Goal 12 Transportation Rule requiring a reduction in the reliance on single occupant vehicles and requiring local actions which encourage the development and use of reasonable alternatives such as transit and ridesharing. The Transportation Rule also requires the development of Transportation System Plans to be completed consistent with the state requirements within four years

for the RTP and within five years for local jurisdictions. The plans must include methods to achieve reductions in per capita vehicle miles traveled, increases in peak-hour auto occupancy rates and examinations of alternative land use scenarios to address transportation needs.

1991 Metro Council adopts the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives which provide a set of land use planning goals and objectives, which are consistent with statewide planning goals, for purposes of planning coordination in the region.

Page 1-7, under 3. Objective: To maintain the region's air quality. Amend paragraph 3 as follows:

The Annual Element of the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) should must be consistent with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality and must conform with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Page 1-15, item 6 is amended to read as follows:

~~6. Elderly and Handicapped Service -- Based on the Special Needs Transportation Plan adopted by Tri-Met, the transit system will:~~

~~• Continue to provide accessible service at all LRT stations.~~

~~• Continue to specify lifts on all new buses until at least 50 percent of the bus fleet is accessible.~~

~~• Continue to work with local jurisdictions to make as many transit stops as possible accessible.~~

~~• Continue to provide door-to-door demand responsive service to individuals who are unable to use Tri-Met buses due to physical or mental disabilities.~~

6. Service to the Disabled -- Based on the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Tri-Met will offer services which address the special needs of the disabled population:

• Continue to develop complementary paratransit services which comply with the ADA.

• Continue to specify lifts on all new transit vehicles until 100 percent of the fleet is accessible.

• Continue to work with local jurisdictions to make transit stops accessible.

- Continue to develop other facilities and services which are accessible to the disabled as required by the ADA.

Chapter 2

Page 2-1 under A. Overview, amend the second paragraph as follows:

- The regional land use pattern defined by the local jurisdictional comprehensive plans developed under the LCDC Statewide Planning Goals that will determine in large part the location of future development in the region. (These land use patterns, upon which the RTP travel forecasts are based, will be subject to change based upon the policies included in the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule.) These changes in residential distribution and density will be incorporated into the travel forecasts in future RTP updates);

→ and other functional plans adopted to implement the RUGGOs.

Chapter 4

Page 4-1, amend paragraph 4 as follows:

The region has taken a strong policy position to promote orderly urban development. Metro adopted the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) and administers a the regional Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). RUGGO provides a policy framework for Metro's functional plans and, through these adopted functional plans, for land use planning in the region consistent with the statewide planning goals. ~~that~~ The UGB clearly identifies the extent of the area in which urban development will occur in the Oregon portion of the region over the next 20 years....

Page 4-20 through 4-22, Transitways, amend as follows:

- In the Western Corridor, ~~the Sunset LRT with a long tunnel and a zoo station~~ has been selected as the preferred alternative to connect downtown Portland and Beaverton Hillsboro. The LRT corridor west of Beaverton would will follow the ~~185th east/west alignment~~ Burlington Northern ROW to 185th Avenue. The extension to Central Hillsboro will follow the BN ROW into Hillsboro or an alternative alignment identified through the Alternatives Analysis process. The ~~Sunset Westside~~ LRT is the top regional priority for LRT implementation (see Chapter 8).
- In the ~~Southern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland to Milwaukie via the Portland Traction Company or McLoughlin alignments is called for in this Plan.~~ Southeastern Sector, two alternative transitway corridors

will be examined in a preliminary alternatives analysis to be conducted by Metro. The study will examine alternative high capacity transit (HCT) alternatives between downtown Portland and Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Milwaukie and in the I-205 Corridor between Portland International Airport (PIA) and CTC. As a result of this study, one corridor will be recommended for advancement to the Alternatives Analysis phase and an action plan and recommendation on the other corridor will be developed.

The alternatives to be considered in the Milwaukie corridor include a Portland Traction Company (PTC) alignment, McLoughlin alignment and a Johns Landing/Sellwood Bridge alignment. Alternatives in the Highway 224 corridor include a Railroad/Harmony alignment and a Highway 224 alignment. The I-205 alternative includes a major portion of existing reserved ROW although there are alternative access options in the vicinity of both termini.

~~In the I-205 circumferential corridor, an LRT line connecting Portland International Airport (PIA) and the Clackamas Town Center (CTC) is called for in the RTP.~~

In the Northern Corridor a locally funded Preliminary Alternatives Analysis will examine HCT options connecting Vancouver with the Portland CBD. Alternative alignments which will be analyzed include I-5 and Interstate Ave. Possible connections across the I-205 bridge into east Clark County will also be examined in this study.

Beyond these four corridors, the long-term (beyond 2005) regional transitway system includes ~~two additional LRT corridors:~~

~~In the Northern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland and Vancouver via either I-5 or Interstate Avenue, and~~

~~In the Southwestern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland with Tigard via Barbur Boulevard. or I-5.~~

Possible extensions and future branches of the identified LRT corridors include those to Hillsboro (via ~~Sunset or 185th extension~~), Oregon City (via McLoughlin or I-205 extension), Lake Oswego (via the Jefferson Street Branch) and Tualatin (via Milwaukie extension through Lake Oswego, Barbur extension, or Highway 217 circumferential extension through Tigard).

~~The adopted RTP also recommends acquiring the abandoned SPRR right-of-way connecting downtown Portland and Lake Oswego to protect the resource and allow future consideration of this alignment for rail transit in the Macadam/Lake Oswego radial corridor.~~

make determinations that the statewide goals do not apply to a particular land use decision. Such a decision is considered a land use decision and is itself appealable and, as such, must still demonstrate compliance with any applicable comprehensive plan policies and with RTP requirements.

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 2, is amended to read as follows:

Complete ^{original} goal findings for ^{aspects of} some projects, however, will require detailed impact information not typically available until preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In these cases, jurisdictions should adopt as full a set of findings as can be made upon the information available at the time the project is included in the PFP regarding the need, mode, and general location. ~~and to identify~~ at the time the PFP is adopted whether the need for additional project level goal findings will be made when at the time the EIS is prepared shall be identified. In addition the what issues these findings will address, and what form and when this latter decision will be made shall be determined."

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 3, is amended to read as follows:

Local comprehensive plans and the RTP are intended to identify projects needed to serve development land uses identified in the acknowledged comprehensive plans over the long term, *as these plans are amended to comply with Goal 12 and other functional plans.*

Page 8-14, E.2.c., 2) is amended to read as follows:

At the time the projects are included in the PFPs, All RTP projects all projects recommended in the RTP to meet the long-term needs of the region, must satisfy all the applicable state planning goals regarding need, mode, and general location of the project requirements

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 7) is amended to change "Section D" to "Section C."

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 8) is amended to read as follows:

In general, ^{compliance} compliance consistency of the RTP with all applicable state planning goals is achieved through the procedures described in this chapter. ~~These procedures assure that RTP policies comply directly with the goals, and that RTP projects are in turn consistent with RTP projects. These amendments to the RTP (November 1991) are consistent with Regional Growth Goals and Objectives which are, in turn, consistent with statewide goals, as well as with the Local comprehensive plans and local findings of goal compliance when needed shall generally establish~~

Three amendments, this page.

statewide goal compliance for RTP projects. Exceptions to this occur when:

Page 8-15, 8-16, F.1, paragraph 1, first sentence, is amended to read as follows:

1. RTP Policy, System Plan and Consistency Criteria When Metro amends RTP policies (Chapter 1, 4 and 8), system plan elements (Figures 4-1, 4-4, 4-5 and 4-7) or compliance criteria (Chapter 8), it will evaluate and adopt findings regarding consistency with Regional Growth Goals and Objectives.

Page 8-16, F.1., paragraph 2, is amended to read:

In addition, in those cases where an RTP goal, policy or system plan element implies a particular improvement to such an extent that the goal, policy or system plan element would change as the result of a 'no build' project decision later in the process due to goal compliance issues, Metro will prepare findings to address an analysis of the broad regional interest in the statewide planning goals based on the information used in the RTP consistency review (Chapter 8, Section F.2.). and Metro will identify as part of its goal findings analysis related to the RTP amendment any and all goals it believes must be addressed by the local jurisdiction before a project decision to implement the system plan can be finalized. If the local jurisdiction determines that the project cannot comply with the statewide planning goals, the RTP will be amended as needed to eliminate reliance on such a project and initiate a cooperative analysis to develop an alternative solution.

Page 8-24, G, paragraph 1, is amended to read as follows:

Major outstanding issues to be resolved at a later date and which may be included as amendments to the Plan are as follows:

Page 8-24, G2, is deleted:

~~2. Westside Corridor Project — The process to complete preliminary engineering, develop a final EIS and alignment selection, and prepare a financial plan are currently underway. The engineering of the Westside LRT is being undertaken in a manner designed to complement the Sunset Highway improvements recommended in this plan.~~

Page 8-24, G2, added as follows:

2. Transportation Rule/Region 2040 -- The next major update of the RTP will reflect requirements of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule and follow the direction and guidelines

established as part of the Region 2040 planning process. The Transportation Rule requires that regional and local planning bodies develop policies and implementation measures which avoid a principal reliance on a single mode of transportation.

Both the Transportation Rule and the Region 2040 planning process will require the region to better understand the transportation/land use relationship as the region grows to the level allowed in local comprehensive plans. The RTP will be developed as the region's Transportation System Plan (TSP) as called out in the Transportation Rule. As such, it must be consistent with the state TSP (the Oregon Transportation Plan) and will guide local TSPs. As a TSP, the RTP will also be designed to meet state requirements for per capita VMT reductions, increased peak-hour auto occupancy rates, and will examine alternative land use scenarios to address transportation needs.

As part of the Region 2040 planning process, alternative land use and transportation scenarios will be evaluated consistent with RUGGO in an effort to formulate a vision for how and where the region should develop as it approaches build-out of the current comprehensive plans over the next 50 years. To evaluate those scenarios and develop the vision, Metro has begun a three to four-year study. The RTP will be updated as necessary consistent with results of the study and findings of consistency with RUGGO will be developed for the entire document.

gramm

Both the Region 2040 process and Rule 12 implementation will utilize updated employment, population, and travel forecasts.

Page 8-25, under 3. Bi-State Transportation Study, amend as follows:

~~In conjunction with the Bi-State Policy Advisory Committee, Metro may participate in a study designed to address the long-range land use plans and the associated concerns that have been raised regarding future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington. Metro and the Intergovernmental Resource Center of Clark County (IRC) initiated the Bi-State Transportation Study in the summer of 1990 to address the future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington based on anticipated growth to 2010 and an RTP level of improvements. The study is also examining the economic inter-relationships between the two sides of the river and is developing a methodology for evaluating the impact of major transportation investments in the corridor on land use. The study is scheduled for completion in late 1991.~~

grammatical change

A decision must be made on whether to proceed with further evaluation of Bi-State alternatives which would include the alternative land use scenarios and the evaluation of urban form resulting from the Region 2040 Plan process.

Page 8-25, items 4, 5 and 6 are amended to read as follows:

4. I-205 LRT/Milwaukie LRT/Vancouver LRT -- These, in addition to the Westside Corridor (discussed above), have been identified by JPACT as the region's priority corridors for the next 10 years. For the I-205 LRT, the region may withdraw the federal Interstate Funds for the I-205 Buslanes and initiate the preliminary engineering/EIS effort on the I-205 LRT (with the specific process subject to UMTA approval). The Milwaukie LRT will require an alternatives analysis (see also No. 5) and DEIS process and will consider alignments east and west of the Willamette River. This analysis will be coordinated with the river crossing aspects of the Southeast Corridor Study (see No. 5). Two Preliminary Alternatives Analysis studies will be conducted concurrently examining high capacity transit (HCT) alternatives in travel corridors serving north Clackamas County and serving south Clark County, Washington. The I-205/Milwaukie HCT study will select either the Portland CBD to Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Milwaukie corridor or the I-205 corridor between the Portland International Airport (PIA) and CTC (connecting east Portland and north Clackamas County with Gateway and the Portland CBD via the Banfield LRT) for advancement to a full scale Alternatives Analysis. The study will also select a set of promising alternatives to be carried into the AA and develop an action plan for the corridor not selected for Alternatives Analysis.

The I-5/I-205 Portland-Vancouver HCT study will make a decision on the preferred corridor for HCT development to connect downtown Portland with Clark County. The alternatives are the I-5 corridor connecting the Portland CBD with central Vancouver and the I-205 corridor connecting east Clark County with Gateway (and the Portland CBD via the Banfield LRT). (The I-205 corridor north to Clark County will not be considered for LRT development within the next 20 years but may be considered for LRT development beyond twenty years.) This study will recommend a priority corridor to pursue through an Alternatives Analysis. The timing of the AA for the priority corridor to Clark County will be dependent on the overall funding strategy developed in conjunction with the I-205/Milwaukie study.

- ~~5. Build-Out Analysis -- The local comprehensive plans are designed to accommodate more growth than will be realized by the year 2005 (the scope of the RTP). As such it is~~

transportation system plan (TSP) (i.e., the RTP and local comprehensive plans) shall, at a minimum, decide need, mode, function and general location for the proposed facility or improvement. The finding of need must show that the transportation need cannot be accommodated through alternative modes, TSM measures or improvements to existing facilities.

Studies are underway in each of these three corridors to determine whether the transportation needs in those corridors warrant a finding of exception to Goal 14.

Page 8-27, items 4, 5 and 6 are renumbered, retitled, or amended as follows:

12-10. Goods Movement

13-11. Five-Year Transit Development Plan

14-12. Demand Management Planning -- ~~The Rideshare Advisory Subcommittee will examine the candidate demand management strategies identified in the Policy Framework and develop recommendations on which are the most promising to pursue.~~ The FY 92 Unified Work Program identifies a number of air quality planning activities, including a regional demand management planning study. The study will evaluate and adopt demand management programs for inclusion in the RTP to, in part, reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce automobile-related emissions, conserve energy, and generally assist other objectives related to congestion and mobility. Study recommendations will reflect both RTP and Oregon Transportation Plan demand management policies. The study process will coordinate with the Portland Area Demand Management Working Group.

15-13. Access Control Plans

16-14. Light Rail Analyses

Page 8-28, renumber and amend as follows:

17-15. Development Impacts

18-16. U.S. 26/I-405/I-5 Connection

19-17. Cornell and W. Burnside

20. ~~Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) -- Periodic Review -- The modification of the UGB as a result of the periodic review process would require the development of a new series of population and employment projections to reflect such amendments.~~

18. Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 -- The region must comply with the provisions of the CAAA which include a requirement that the projects included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) demonstrate conformity by reducing regional VMT when compared with a No-Build condition.

~~21-19. 2010 RTP Update -- After the completion of a regional 2010 population and employment forecast, the travel demand associated with this level of growth will be developed and used as the basis for a 2010 RTP Update. The Interim RTP update scheduled for next year will begin to address the changing policy issues brought about by the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments and RUGGO. This will involve updating the population and employment forecasts and analyzing a new series of travel forecasts for the year 2010. This interim update will provide the opportunity to address alternative transportation strategies consistent with RUGGO but will stop short of thoroughly addressing the analysis of alternative land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule. An RTP update will provide 2015 travel forecasts and will implement Region 2040 transportation and land use recommendations.~~

~~22. I-5 North/N. Kerby Avenue Off-Ramp -- Based on the results of the privately funded studies called for in Chapter 5 of the Plan, determine if sufficient justification exists for the project to pursue further planning and public involvement efforts (such as an EIS).~~

functional plans base on the

Page 8-29, delete and add as follows:

- ~~.. Gladstone Bridge~~
- .. I-5 North/N. Kerby Avenue Off-Ramp
- .. Birdsdale Bypass/Corridor Study

JC:lmk
91-433.ATT
12-11-91

one amendment


METRO

 2000 S.W. First Avenue
 Portland, OR 97201-5398
 503/221-1646

Memorandum

★ = Amendments recommended by
 TRANSPORTATION & PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: January 17, 1992

To: Jessica Marlitt, Council Analyst

From: ^{LSH} Larry Shaw, Senior Assistant Counsel

Regarding: ROBERT LIBERTY RTP AMENDMENTS
 Our file: 10.§3

Introduction

Amendments to the JPACT-recommended Exhibit A RTP revision were proposed by Robert Liberty at the January 14, 1992, Council Committee meeting. This responds to the Council request for comments on them.

Exhibit A, Page 2

Mr. Liberty's additional sentence would correctly state in the RTP the fact that Metro must conduct its own review of the study's selected alternative to determine appropriate amendments to the RTP. That process is part of the existing Intergovernmental Agreement adopted by Metro. However, that same Agreement makes ODOT's study process the Metro process for public participation in the review of alternatives. As discussed below, commitment in the RTP revision to statewide goal compliance prior to adoption of a regional Transportation Systems Plan (TSP), is premature.

★ { Therefore, an amended version of Mr. Liberty's additional sentence consistent with these comments: "As defined in the Intergovernmental Agreement for decision-making on this project, Metro will conduct an independent review of the selected alternative for appropriate RTP amendments and ~~compliance~~ with RUGGO."

CONSISTENCY

Exhibit A, Page 3

★ Addition of " * * * complying with Goal 12" in reference to the TSP is redundant, but correct.

Exhibit A, Page 5

★ Addition of " * * * and other functional plans adopted to implement the RUGGO" is a legally correct amplification.

Exhibit A, Page 15

- ★ 1 - Addition of " * * * or final goal findings for aspects of some projects" is a legally correct amplification.
- ★ 2 - Addition of " * * * as these acknowledged comprehensive plans are amended to comply with Goal 12 and other Metro functional plans" is a legally correct amplification. The emphasized words are added to Mr. Liberty's words for clarity of the addition.

Compliance v. Consistency, Exhibit A, Page 15 (See November 15, 1991, Packet Memo)

The distinction between "consistency" and "compliance" has not been directly ruled upon by the courts. RUGGO uses the concept of "consistency" because that is the undefined term in the statute requiring Metro to do regional goals and objectives. ORS 268.380(1). Metro's position in RUGGO findings was that "consistency" is a more general standard of review against statewide goals because the planning process continues to refine (1) general regional goals to (2) regional policies in functional plans to (3) site specific regulations in city and county comprehensive plans. The law is clear that the comprehensive plan regulations must be supported by findings that demonstrate compliance with statewide goals. The statutes state no requirements for statewide goal findings for regional policies in functional plans.

The RTP is a more developed, special case functional plan. It doubles as the federal Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) regional transportation plan. LCDC's transportation rule requires that it be rewritten or another systems planning document be created for a Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) by 1995. At that time limited statewide goal findings on need, function, mode, and general location may be required for facilities anticipated in the RTP-TSP. OAR 660-12-025. Whether LCDC's rule authorizing statewide goal findings for these system decision parts of complex transportation facility decisions will be approved by the courts will not be known for some time. The RTP Update will be the rewrite to comply with the new LCDC transportation rule.

Therefore, to adopt RTP revisions that move the RTP from the current RUGGO approach that all functional plans are "consistent" with statewide goals to direct RTP "compliance" with all statewide goals moves beyond even the LCDC transportation rule. When the regional TSP is done the RTP-TSP will then be in compliance with Goal 12, according to the LCDC rule. Right now, the entire RTP has not yet been rewritten. So, raising the standard of statewide goal compliance by Mr. Liberty's suggested amendment may subject all RTP facilities not already included in local comprehensive plans to additional grounds for legal challenge during the interim prior to TSP adoption.

Jessica Marlitt
Page 3
January 17, 1992

Exhibit A, Page 22

* Adding other functional plans as part of the basis for the RTP Update is legally correct. Mr. Cotugno requests that the sentence should indicate that Region 2040 will be acted upon in the RTP Update regardless of whether other functional plans are completed: "An RTP Update will provide 2015 travel forecasts and will implement functional plans and the Region 2040 transportation and land use recommendations."

dr
1374

cc: Daniel B. Cooper
Andy Cotugno
Mike Hogle
John Cullerton
Ethan Seltzer

Amendments to Exhibit A

RTP amendments adopted by Metro Transportation and Planning Committee 1/21/92 (Amendments are bold and italicized)

Exhibit A, Page 2

Page S-6, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor -- Consider constructing a new four-lane limited access facility from I-5 to Tualatin Valley Highway and an five-lane arterial from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 as one of several corridors and mode opportunities, such as light rail transit, highway and bus service, to be analyzed through ODOT's Western Bypass study. Alternatives to be studied will include transit and transit/highway combinations with and without a new highway facility and an interactive land use/transportation strategy (If the 1000 Friends of Oregon LUTRAQ Study produces a viable transportation strategy it would be folded into the Western Bypass Study). A corridor-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative modes and corridors to meet project goals and objectives and to consider their environmental impacts. Through this effort, one alternative will be selected and advanced to a second phase of study.

The second phase will include a design EIS or Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify specific alignments within the selected corridors for the selected modes. This effort will examine a range of alignments for analysis in the EIS, and conclude with selection of the alternative that best meets study goals and objectives. ***As defined in the Intergovernmental Agreement for decision-making on this project, Metro will conduct an independent review of the selected alternative for appropriate RTP amendments and consistency with RUGGO.***

Exhibit A, Page 3

Page I-7, under State Planning Requirements, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the adoption of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, Metro must adopt a Transportation System Plan (TSP), ***complying with Goal 12,*** which is consistent with the State TSP. In the case of the State, the TSP is the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and, in the case of Metro, the TSP is the RTP. Metro is working with ODOT to ensure consistency between the OTP and the RTP (see also Chapter 8).

Exhibit A, Page 5

Page 2-1 under A. Overview, amend the second paragraph as follows:

The regional land use pattern defined by the local jurisdictional comprehensive plans developed under the LCDC Statewide Planning Goals ~~that~~ will determine in large part the location of future development in the region. (These land use patterns, upon which the RTP travel forecasts are based, will be subject to change based upon the policies included in the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, and other functional plans adopted to implement RUGGO. These changes in residential distribution and density will be incorporated into the travel forecasts in future RTP updates);

Exhibit A, Page 15

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraphs 2 and 3, are amended to read as follows:

Complete or final goal findings for aspects of some projects, however, will require detailed impact information not typically available until preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In these cases, jurisdictions should adopt as full a set of findings as can be made upon the information available at the time the project is included in the PFP regarding the need, mode, and general location. and to identify ~~at the time the PFP is adopted whether the need for additional project level goal findings will be made when~~ at the time the EIS is prepared shall be identified. In addition the ~~what~~ issues these findings will address, and what form and when this latter decision will be made shall be determined.

Local comprehensive plans and the RTP are intended to identify projects needed to serve development land uses identified in the acknowledged comprehensive plans over the long term, as these acknowledged comprehensive plans are amended to comply with Goal 12 and other Metro functional plans.

Exhibit A, Page 22

Page 8-28, renumber and amend as follows:

19. 2010 RTP Update -- After the completion of a regional 2010 population and employment forecast, the travel demand associated with this level of growth will be developed and used as the basis for a 2010 RTP Update. The Interim RTP update scheduled for next year will begin to address the changing policy issues brought about by the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments and RUGGO. This will involve updating the population and employment forecasts and analyzing a new series of travel forecasts for the year 2010. This interim update will provide the opportunity to address alternative transportation strategies consistent with RUGGO but will stop short of thoroughly addressing the analysis of alternative land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule. An RTP update will provide 2015 travel forecasts and will implement **functional plans and the** Region 2040 transportation and land use recommendations.

JFC
RTP.amexA
1-22-92



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

Date: January 15, 1992

To: Transportation & Planning Committee
Interested Parties

From: Jessica Marlitt, Council Analyst

Re: CONTINUED TRANSPORTATION & PLANNING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF
ORDINANCE NO. 92-433, ADOPTING REVISIONS TO THE REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)

Per the Committee's direction on January 14, 1992, consideration of Ordinance No. 92-433 will be continued to a special Transportation and Planning Committee meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 21, 4:30 p.m. Action was deferred on Ordinance No. 92-433 in order to give Metro Transportation Department staff and Legal Counsel an opportunity to review ordinance amendments proposed by Mr. Robert Liberty during public testimony January 14. Mr. Liberty's proposed amendments are attached to this memo as Attachment A.

The Committee requested Metro staff and Legal Counsel comments be prepared by this Friday, January 17. Comments will be distributed to Committee members and copies will be available in the Council Office for all other interested parties.

Given final Committee action on Ordinance No. 92-433 next Tuesday, the ordinance will receive its second hearing and full Council consideration Thursday, January 23. A Committee Report will be issued Wednesday, January 22.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at ext. 136.

H:92433.mem

FROM ROBERT LIBERTY
(ORIG. COPY) 1-14-92

ATTACHMENT A
PROPOSED
Amendments on
pages 2, 3, 5, 15, 22

EXHIBIT A

* Three amendments.

Proposed Amendments to the March 9, 1989 Regional Transportation Plan

Exhibit A provides a line-by-line description of the deletions (lined-out material) and additions (underlined material) included in the 1991 RTP revision.

Summary Chapter

Page S-1, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

After extensive public review and comment, the RTP was adopted by the Metro Council in 1982 and last updated in 1983. The plan, incorporating the 1989 update and the current (1989)(1991) update revision, give the Portland metropolitan region a much needed direction for meeting our transportation needs over the next two decades...

Page S-1, following paragraph 4, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the 1991 revision, the RTP recognizes and begins to incorporate the policy direction laid out by the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO). A full examination of alternative transportation and land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule will coincide with and follow the Region 2040 plan, which is an outgrowth of the RUGGO process.

Page S-6, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor -- Consider constructing construct a new four-lane limited access facility from I-5 to Tualatin Valley Highway and an five-lane arterial from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 (Proceed with I-5 to the Highway 99W segment and arterial segment from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 as a 10-year priority.) as one of several corridors and mode opportunities, such as light rail transit, highway and bus service, to be analyzed through ODOT's Western Bypass study. Alternatives to be studied will include transit and transit/highway combinations with and without a new highway facility and an interactive land use/transportation strategy (If the 1000 Friends of Oregon LUTRAQ Study produces a viable land use/transportation strategy, it would be folded into the Western Bypass Study). A corridor-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative modes and corridors to meet project goals and objectives and to consider their environmental impacts. Through this effort, one alternative will be selected and advanced to a second phase of study.

The second phase will include a design EIS or Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify specific alignments within the selected corridor(s) for the selected mode(s). This effort will examine a range of alignments for analysis in the EIS, and conclude with selection of the alternative that best meets study goals and objectives. Metro will be participating in an independent review of the selected alternative for compliance with the statewide Goals and RUGGOs.

Mt. Hood Parkway I-84/U.S.26 Connector

2. Light Rail Transit (Figure S-2)

Priority 1: Westside Light Rail -- Begin the preliminary engineering final design work and pursue finalize discretionary funding for the project from through the federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA).

Page S-8, paragraph 1 and 2, amend as follows:

I-205/Milwaukie HCT and I-5 North/I-205 North HCT Studies -- Conduct Pre-Alternatives Analysis level studies geared toward selecting priority corridors for advancement to full alternatives analysis. An action plan will be developed for the corridors not selected as the priority corridors for alternatives analysis.

~~I-205 Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering work using funds from bus lanes withdrawn from the Interstate system.~~

~~Milwaukie Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering as soon as allowable after Westside light rail. Pursue funding from UMTA after receiving funding for the Westside light rail.~~

Page S-11, paragraphs 3 and 4, amend to read:

~~Funding for 50 to 75 percent of the Westside and Milwaukie light rail and up to 50 percent for the next priority corridor can be sought has been committed from UMTA through a national competitive process. A strategy incorporating federal, state and local funds must be developed for corridors beyond the Westside. However, local matching funds must be obtained first.~~

A unique opportunity exists to fund the initial stages of work toward an I-205 light rail line. Through the Federal-Aid Interstate program, \$16.6 million ~~is was originally~~ available for bus lane construction. However, with the approval of FHWA and UMTA, this money ~~can and would be shifted to~~ is available for light rail construction.

One amendment
this page

Introduction Chapter

Page I-1, amend the second bullet under A. THE CONTEXT OF THE PLAN as follows:

- serves as a regional framework for the coordination of the transportation and land use elements of local comprehensive plans consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO);

Page I-3, add a paragraph following the final paragraph of Section B which will read as follows:

The amendments contained in the 1991 RTP revision have been found to be consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives. Future updates will reflect consistency with the Region 2040 Planning Process, the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the new Surface Transportation Act. Future RTP updates will have to reflect RUGGO and local comprehensive plans may have to change to meet RUGGO.

Page I-7, final paragraph under Federal Planning Requirements, amend as follows:

In addition to the requirements of FHWA and UMTA, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (~~carried out~~ administered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)) requires each urbanized area to meet federal standards for clean air.

Page I-7, under State Planning Requirements, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the adoption of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, Metro must adopt a Transportation System Plan (TSP), which is consistent with the State TSP. In the case of the State, the TSP is the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and, in the case of Metro, the TSP is the RTP. Metro is working with ODOT to ensure consistency between the OTP and the RTP (see also Chapter 8).

Complying with Goal 12,

Chapter 1

Page 1-3, add as final paragraph under Section B. History

1991 LCDC adopts the Goal 12 Transportation Rule requiring a reduction in the reliance on single occupant vehicles and requiring local actions which encourage the development and use of reasonable alternatives such as transit and ridesharing. The Transportation Rule also requires the development of Transportation System Plans to be completed consistent with the state requirements within four years

- Continue to develop other facilities and services which are accessible to the disabled as required by the ADA.

Chapter 2

Page 2-1 under A. Overview, amend the second paragraph as follows:

- The regional land use pattern defined by the local jurisdictional comprehensive plans developed under the LCDC Statewide Planning Goals that will determine in large part the location of future development in the region. (These land use patterns, upon which the RTP travel forecasts are based, will be subject to change based upon the policies included in the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule.) These changes in residential distribution and density will be incorporated into the travel forecasts in future RTP updates);

→ and other functional plans adopted to implement the RUGGOs.

Chapter 4

Page 4-1, amend paragraph 4 as follows:

The region has taken a strong policy position to promote orderly urban development. Metro adopted the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) and administers a the regional Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). RUGGO provides a policy framework for Metro's functional plans and, through these adopted functional plans, for land use planning in the region consistent with the statewide planning goals. ~~that~~ The UGB clearly identifies the extent of the area in which urban development will occur in the Oregon portion of the region over the next 20 years....

Page 4-20 through 4-22, Transitways, amend as follows:

- In the Western Corridor, ~~the Sunset LRT with a long tunnel and a zoo station~~ has been selected as the preferred alternative to connect downtown Portland and Beaverton Hillsboro. The LRT corridor west of Beaverton ~~would will~~ follow the ~~185th east/west alignment~~ Burlington Northern ROW to 185th Avenue. The extension to Central Hillsboro will follow the BN ROW into Hillsboro or an alternative alignment identified through the Alternatives Analysis process. The ~~Sunset Westside~~ LRT is the top regional priority for LRT implementation (see Chapter 8).
- In the ~~Southern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland to Milwaukie via the Portland Traction Company or McLoughlin alignments is called for in this Plan.~~ Southeastern Sector, two alternative transitway corridors

make determinations that the statewide goals do not apply to a particular land use decision. Such a decision is considered a land use decision and is itself appealable and, as such, must still demonstrate compliance with any applicable comprehensive plan policies and with RTP requirements.

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 2, is amended to read as follows:

Complete ^{original} goal findings for ^{aspects of} some projects, however, will require detailed impact information not typically available until preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In these cases, jurisdictions should adopt as full a set of findings as can be made upon the information available at the time the project is included in the PFP regarding the need, mode, and general location, and to identify at the time the PFP is adopted whether the need for additional project level goal findings will be made when at the time the EIS is prepared shall be identified. In addition the what issues these findings will address, and what form and when this latter decision will be made shall be determined."

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 3, is amended to read as follows:

Local comprehensive plans and the RTP are intended to identify projects needed to serve development land uses identified in the acknowledged comprehensive plans over the long term, *as these plans are amended to comply with Goal 12*

Page 8-14, E.2.c., 2) is amended to read as follows:

At the time the projects are included in the PFPs, All RTP projects all projects recommended in the RTP to meet the long-term needs of the region, must satisfy all the applicable state planning goals regarding need, mode, and general location of the project requirements

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 7) is amended to change "Section D" to "Section C."

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 8) is amended to read as follows:

In general, ^{compliance} compliance consistency of the RTP with all applicable state planning goals is achieved through the procedures described in this chapter. ~~These procedures assure that RTP policies comply directly with the goals, and that RTP projects are in turn consistent with RTP projects. These amendments to the RTP (November 1991) are consistent with Regional Growth Goals and Objectives which are, in turn, consistent with statewide goals, as well as with the Local comprehensive plans and local findings of goal compliance when needed shall generally establish~~

Three amendments, this page.

established as part of the Region 2040 planning process. The Transportation Rule requires that regional and local planning bodies develop policies and implementation measures which avoid a principal reliance on a single mode of transportation.

Both the Transportation Rule and the Region 2040 planning process will require the region to better understand the transportation/land use relationship as the region grows to the level allowed in local comprehensive plans. The RTP will be developed as the region's Transportation System Plan (TSP) as called out in the Transportation Rule. As such, it must be consistent with the state TSP (the Oregon Transportation Plan) and will guide local TSPs. As a TSP, the RTP will also be designed to meet state requirements for per capita VMT reductions, increased peak-hour auto occupancy rates, and will examine alternative land use scenarios to address transportation needs.

As part of the Region 2040 planning process, alternative land use (and) transportation scenarios will be evaluated consistent with RUGGO in an effort to formulate a vision for how and where the region should develop as it approaches build-out of the current comprehensive plans over the next 50 years. To evaluate those scenarios and develop the vision, Metro has begun a three to four-year study. The RTP will be updated as necessary consistent with results of the study and findings of consistency with RUGGO will be developed for the entire document.

gramma

Both the Region 2040 process and Rule 12 implementation will utilize updated employment, population, and travel forecasts.

Page 8-25, under 3. Bi-State Transportation Study, amend as follows:

~~— In conjunction with the Bi-State Policy Advisory Committee, Metro may participate in a study designed to address the long-range land use plans and the associated concerns that have been raised regarding future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington. Metro and the Intergovernmental Resource Center of Clark County (IRC) initiated the Bi-State Transportation Study in the summer of 1990 to address the future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington based on anticipated growth to 2010 and an RTP level of improvements. The study is also examining the economic inter-relationships between the two sides of the river and is developing a methodology for evaluating the impact of major transportation investments in the corridor on land use. The study is scheduled for completion in late 1991.~~

grammatical change

18. Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 -- The region must comply with the provisions of the CAAA which include a requirement that the projects included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) demonstrate conformity by reducing regional VMT when compared with a No-Build condition.

~~21.19. 2010 RTP Update -- After the completion of a regional 2010 population and employment forecast, the travel demand associated with this level of growth will be developed and used as the basis for a 2010 RTP Update. The Interim RTP update scheduled for next year will begin to address the changing policy issues brought about by the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments and RUGGO. This will involve updating the population and employment forecasts and analyzing a new series of travel forecasts for the year 2010. This interim update will provide the opportunity to address alternative transportation strategies consistent with RUGGO but will stop short of thoroughly addressing the analysis of alternative land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule. An RTP update will provide 2015 travel forecasts and will implement Region 2040 transportation and land use recommendations.~~

22. ~~I-5 North/N. Kerby Avenue Off-Ramp -- Based on the results of the privately funded studies called for in Chapter 5 of the Plan, determine if sufficient justification exists for the project to pursue further planning and public involvement efforts (such as an EIS).~~

functional plans 02& on the

Page 8-29, delete and add as follows:

- ~~— Gladstone Bridge~~
- . I-5 North/N. Kerby Avenue Off-Ramp
- . Birdsdale Bypass/Corridor Study

JC:lmk
91-433.ATT
12-11-91

One amendment

ATTACHMENT 3

TPAC AMENDMENTS FOR ORDINANCE NO. 91-433

TPAC adopted the RTP revisions on November 27, 1991 with the following amendments. The amendments have been incorporated into Exhibit A and are referenced by the page number.

1. Clarify the status of the Tanasbourne Transit Center with regard to the Westside LRT station at 185th Avenue and Baseline Road. (Page 12)
2. Add "s" to corridor and mode in the second paragraph on Page 2 in order to clarify that more than one corridor or mode may be recommended by the Western Bypass Study. (Page 2)
3. Clarify that the proposed termini for the NE 207th Avenue arterial is NE Sandy Boulevard and NE Glisan Street. (Page 7)
4. Clarify that the proposed LRT alignment between Milwaukie Transit Center and Clackamas Town Center via Highway 224 is considered a Pre-Alternatives Analysis option and is not considered a "future extension." (Page 6)
5. Add wording describing in more detail the requirements of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule. (Pages 4 and 20)
6. Add "transportation" to the description of the Western Bypass Study discussion which references "an interactive land use/transportation strategy." (Pages 1 and 19)
7. Add as an "Outstanding Issue" that the region must be in conformance with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. (Page 21)
8. Retain original RTP language which stated that the region must be prepared to accept increased reliance on local funding sources for transit. (Page 12)
9. Clarify that future high capacity transit (HCT) corridor studies will utilize the results of the Regional HCT Study to help determine which alternatives are appropriate to carry into Alternatives Analysis. (Page 14)
10. Clarify that the HCT alternatives to be considered for I-205 between Gateway and Clark County will not include LRT within the next 20 years but may be considered beyond 20 years. (Page 18)

11. Reword the first paragraph on Page 18 in order to clarify the relationship of RTP projects and the state planning goals. (Page 15)
12. Adopt the revisions included in Addendum 1 (which have been incorporated into Exhibit A) relating to the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor and the Bi-State Study. (Pages 9, 10, 17, 18 and 19)

The following amendments were requested and considered but were not approved by TPAC:

- . Remove 112th Avenue improvements from the Regional Transportation Plan.
- . Prepare an RTP which thoroughly addresses the state's Transportation Rule 12, Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO), and Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) at this time.
- . Freeze all funding for highway projects which result in increased capacity due to likely VMT increases which would violate the state's Transportation Rule 12.

RTPADDEN.ATT
JC:lmk
12-4-91

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 91-433 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING REVISIONS TO THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Date: October 22, 1991

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This ordinance would amend the Portland metropolitan area Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to include necessary revisions developed in conjunction with the region's cities, counties and transportation service districts. These updates are relatively minor and are consistent with current RTP policies or are consistent with federal, state and regional actions adopted subsequent to the RTP adoption. These revisions are necessary in order to properly position projects for federal funding and to eliminate inconsistency with the recently adopted policies.

TPAC has reviewed the RTP revisions and recommends approval of Ordinance No. 91-433.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

After extensive public review and comment, the RTP was adopted by the Metro Council in 1982 and updated in 1983 and in 1989. The current plan gives the Portland metropolitan area a much needed direction for meeting our transportation needs over the next two decades. The plan provides for a balanced mix of highway, transit and demand management measures for addressing the transportation needs of the growing metropolitan area.

This current revision provides updates to project descriptions that are not currently consistent with recently adopted policy and adds project descriptions for recently adopted projects that are not currently included in the RTP.

The overall policy context of the RTP has changed as a result of federal, state and regional actions. The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, the state LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule and the Regional Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) have all been adopted subsequent to the RTP adoption in 1989. These three documents include policies which must be reflected to varying degrees and on varying timelines within the RTP. The common threads throughout each of these policies are a reduction in single occupant vehicle trips through increased reliance on transit and transportation demand management (TDM) techniques. The Transportation Rule and RUGGO also suggest changes in land use policy to encourage development patterns in which short shopping and personal errand trips can more easily be made by walking and biking.

The policy and project-related actions which are addressed in this RTP revision include:

Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 -- Chapter 1, Regional Transportation Policy, includes revised goals and objectives which acknowledge that the RTP must conform to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. Other general references to regional air quality policy include reference to the amendments.

LCDC Goal 12 - Transportation Rule -- Chapter 1, Regional Transportation Policy, and Chapter 2, Land Use, Growth and Travel Demand, have been revised to include recognition of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule which requires state, regional and local development of Transportation System Plans (TSPs). The RTP will function as the regional TSP and, as such, it must be consistent with the Oregon Transportation Plan (the state TSP) for statewide needs.

Chapter 8, Implementation, includes the Transportation Rule as an Outstanding Issue. This section discusses the Region 2040 planning process and future RTP updates which will explore the transportation/land use relationship through the analysis of alternative land use and transportation scenarios.

Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives -- Chapter 2, Land Use, Growth and Travel Demand, has been revised to incorporate a description of the relationship of the RTP with local comprehensive plans and RUGGO. In short, the local plans must be consistent with the RTP and the RTP must become consistent with RUGGO which are, in turn, consistent with the statewide planning goals.

The implementation chapter, Chapter 8, has also been revised in order to recognize that the RTP revisions must demonstrate consistency with RUGGO. Other chapters include general reference to RUGGO consistent with the references in these two chapters.

Americans with Disabilities Act -- This act, passed by Congress in 1991, includes requirements that transit districts move toward an entirely accessible bus fleet. Tri-Met is currently developing a revision of the Special Needs Transportation Plan which incorporates the ADA requirements. Metro must approve Tri-Met's plan and find that it is in conformance with the RTP.

In Chapter 1, the reference to the Special Needs Transportation Plan is updated to be consistent with the new ADA.

In Chapter 8, under Handicapped Transit Service, the new ADA is acknowledged and the relationship between the Tri-Met Special Needs Plan and the RTP is clarified.

Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor (Western Bypass Study) -- The Western Bypass was adopted as a contingent recommendation subject to an analysis of land use issues and its consistency with state land use planning goals. ODOT has initiated a study to resolve the

outstanding land use and transportation issues in this corridor. This ODOT study will examine various corridors and mode opportunities such as light rail transit, highway, and improved bus service.

Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 91-1425 on May 9, 1991. This resolution authorized entering into an intergovernmental agreement which defined the study process and recognized that the study would identify strategies which incorporate all feasible modes of transportation.

In the Summary Chapter, the detailed description of the proposed project has been replaced with text describing the new study process which allows for a broad range of transportation alternatives to be considered in the corridor.

In Chapter 5, Recommended Transportation Improvements to the Year 2005, the language referring to the Western Bypass has been changed to indicate that the proposed bypass is but one alternative being considered in the ODOT study.

In Chapter 8, Implementation, the Western Bypass Study is listed as an Outstanding Issue due to the unresolved alignment and land use issues. The text has been changed to more accurately reflect the current ODOT study process.

Westside Corridor Project -- On April 11, 1991, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 91-1424 which endorsed the recommendation of the Long Tunnel with a Zoo Station to 185th Avenue as the Preferred Alternative for the Westside Corridor Project. The Hillsboro Corridor Project is currently in the midst of Preliminary Engineering for the extension of the Westside LRT from 185th to downtown Hillsboro. This RTP revision will amend the RTP to recognize the Locally Preferred Alternative to 185th Avenue and the extension from 185th and Baseline to central Hillsboro.

In the Summary Chapter, language is revised to reflect the current funding situation for the Westside Corridor Project.

In Chapter 4, Policy Implications and the System Concept, the transitway policy is revised to acknowledge the Locally Preferred Alternative decision and the current status of the Hillsboro Corridor Project.

Chapter 5, Recommended Transportation Improvements to the Year 2005, has been revised to include both the Locally Preferred Alternative of the Westside Project to 185th Avenue and the Hillsboro Corridor Project from 185th to Central Hillsboro as committed projects.

In Chapter 6, Evaluation of the Adopted Plan, Sylvan has been deleted as a location for an LRT transit center.

Chapter 8, Implementation, the Transitway Implementation section has been revised to include the Locally Preferred Alternative

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE)	ORDINANCE NO. 91-422
METRO CODE TO CLARIFY AND SUPPLE-)	
MENT EXISTING PROVISIONS RELATED)	Introduced by Rena Cusma,
TO THE MANAGEMENT OF PETROLEUM)	Executive Officer
CONTAMINATED SOILS, AND DECLARING)	
AN EMERGENCY)	

WHEREAS, Petroleum contaminated soil removed from its site of origin is a solid waste subject to Metropolitan Service District regulatory authority under ORS 268.317; and

WHEREAS, The Regional Solid Waste Management Plan classifies contaminated soil as a "special waste," and states, in part, that "Solutions to special waste management shall be developed as a component of the Solid Waste Management Plan"; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary to amend the Metro Code to more clearly describe Metro's role in regulating disposal and processing of petroleum contaminated soils; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Code amendments described in this Ordinance are necessary to further the health, safety and welfare of District residents; now, therefore,

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT HEREBY ORDAINS:

Section 1. Metro Code Section 5.01.010 is amended to read:

"5.01.010 Definitions: As used in this chapter, unless the context requires otherwise:

(a) "Certificate" means a written certificate issued by or a written agreement with the District dated prior to the effective date of this chapter.

(b) "Code" means the Code of the Metropolitan Service District.

(c) "Council" has the same meaning as in Code Section 1.01.040.

(d) "DEQ" means the Department of Environmental Quality of the State of Oregon.

(e) "Disposal Site" means the land and facilities used for the disposal of solid wastes whether or not open to the public, but does not include transfer stations or processing facilities.

(f) "District" has the same meaning as in Code Section 1.01.040.

EXHIBIT A

Proposed Amendments to the March 9, 1989 Regional Transportation Plan

Exhibit A provides a line-by-line description of the deletions (lined-out material) and additions (underlined material) included in the 1991 RTP revision.

Summary Chapter

Page S-1, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

After extensive public review and comment, the RTP was adopted by the Metro Council in 1982 and last updated in 1983. The plan, incorporating the 1989 update and the current (1989)(1991) update revision, give the Portland metropolitan region a much needed direction for meeting our transportation needs over the next two decades...

Page S-1, following paragraph 4, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the 1991 revision, the RTP recognizes and begins to incorporate the policy direction laid out by the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO). A full examination of alternative transportation and land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule will coincide with and follow the Region 2040 plan, which is an outgrowth of the RUGGO process.

Page S-6, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor -- Consider constructing construct a new four-lane limited access facility from I-5 to Tualatin Valley Highway and an five-lane arterial from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 (Proceed with I-5 to the Highway 99W segment and arterial segment from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 as a 10-year priority.) as one of several corridors and mode opportunities, such as light rail transit, highway and bus service, to be analyzed through ODOT's Western Bypass study. Alternatives to be studied will include transit and transit/highway combinations with and without a new highway facility and an interactive land use/transportation strategy (If the 1000 Friends of Oregon LUTRAO Study produces a viable land use/transportation strategy, it would be folded into the Western Bypass Study). A corridor-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative modes and corridors to meet project goals and objectives and to consider their environmental impacts. Through this effort, one alternative will be selected and advanced to a second phase of study.

The second phase will include a design EIS or Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify specific alignments within the selected corridor(s) for the selected mode(s). This effort will examine a range of alignments for analysis in the EIS, and conclude with selection of the alternative that best meets study goals and objectives.

Page S-6, paragraph 5, amend as follows:

Mt. Hood Parkway I-84/U.S.26 Connector

2. Light Rail Transit (Figure S-2)

Priority 1: Westside Light Rail -- Begin the preliminary engineering final design work and pursue finalize discretionary funding for the project from through the federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA).

Page S-8, paragraph 1 and 2, amend as follows:

I-205/Milwaukie HCT and I-5 North/I-205 North HCT Studies -- Conduct Pre-Alternatives Analysis level studies geared toward selecting priority corridors for advancement to full alternatives analysis. An action plan will be developed for the corridors not selected as the priority corridors for alternatives analysis.

~~I205 Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering work using funds from bus lanes withdrawn from the Interstate system.~~

~~Milwaukie Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering as soon as allowable after Westside light rail. Pursue funding from UMTA after receiving funding for the Westside light rail.~~

Page S-11, paragraphs 3 and 4, amend to read:

Funding for 50 to 75 percent of the Westside and Milwaukie light rail and up to 50 percent for the next priority corridor can be sought has been committed from UMTA through a national competitive process. A strategy incorporating federal, state and local funds must be developed for corridors beyond the Westside. However, local matching funds must be obtained first.

A unique opportunity exists to fund the initial stages of work toward an I-205 light rail line. Through the Federal-Aid Interstate program, \$16.6 million is was originally available for bus lane construction. However, with the approval of FHWA and UMTA, this money ~~can and would be shifted to~~ is available for light rail construction.

Introduction Chapter

Page I-1, amend the second bullet under A. THE CONTEXT OF THE PLAN as follows:-

- serves as a regional framework for the coordination of the transportation and land use elements of local comprehensive plans consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO);

Page I-3, add a paragraph following the final paragraph of Section B which will read as follows:

The amendments contained in the 1991 RTP revision have been found to be consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives. Future updates will reflect consistency with the Region 2040 Planning Process, the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the new Surface Transportation Act. Future RTP updates will have to reflect RUGGO and local comprehensive plans may have to change to meet RUGGO.

Page I-7, final paragraph under Federal Planning Requirements, amend as follows:

In addition to the requirements of FHWA and UMTA, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (~~carried-out~~ administered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)) requires each urbanized area to meet federal standards for clean air.

Page I-7, under State Planning Requirements, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the adoption of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, Metro must adopt a Transportation System Plan (TSP) which is consistent with the State TSP. In the case of the State, the TSP is the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and, in the case of Metro, the TSP is the RTP. Metro is working with ODOT to ensure consistency between the OTP and the RTP (see also Chapter 8).

Chapter 1

Page 1-3, add as final paragraph under Section B. History

1991 LCDC adopts the Goal 12 Transportation Rule requiring a reduction in the reliance on single occupant vehicles and requiring local actions which encourage the development and use of reasonable alternatives such as transit and ridesharing. The Transportation Rule also requires the development of Transportation System Plans to be completed consistent with the state requirements within four years

for the RTP and within five years for local jurisdictions. The plans must include methods to achieve reductions in per capita vehicle miles traveled, increases in peak-hour auto occupancy rates and examinations of alternative land use scenarios to address transportation needs.

1991 Metro Council adopts the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives which provide a set of land use planning goals and objectives, which are consistent with statewide planning goals, for purposes of planning coordination in the region.

Page 1-7, under 3. Objective: To maintain the region's air quality. Amend paragraph 3 as follows:

The Annual Element of the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) should must be consistent with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality and must conform with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Page 1-15, item 6 is amended to read as follows:

~~6. Elderly and Handicapped Service -- Based on the Special Needs Transportation Plan adopted by Tri-Met, the transit system will:~~

~~. Continue to provide accessible service at all LRT stations.~~

~~. Continue to specify lifts on all new buses until at least 50 percent of the bus fleet is accessible.~~

~~. Continue to work with local jurisdictions to make as many transit stops as possible accessible.~~

~~. Continue to provide door to door demand responsive service to individuals who are unable to use Tri-Met buses due to physical or mental disabilities.~~

6. Service to the Disabled -- Based on the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Tri-Met will offer services which address the special needs of the disabled population:

. Continue to develop complementary paratransit services which comply with the ADA.

. Continue to specify lifts on all new transit vehicles until 100 percent of the fleet is accessible.

. Continue to work with local jurisdictions to make transit stops accessible.

- . Continue to develop other facilities and services which are accessible to the disabled as required by the ADA.

Chapter 2

Page 2-1 under A. Overview, amend the second paragraph as follows:

- . The regional land use pattern defined by the local jurisdictional comprehensive plans developed under the LCDC Statewide Planning Goals that will determine in large part the location of future development in the region. (These land use patterns, upon which the RTP travel forecasts are based, will be subject to change based upon the policies included in the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule. These changes in residential distribution and density will be incorporated into the travel forecasts in future RTP updates);

Chapter 4

Page 4-1, amend paragraph 4 as follows:

The region has taken a strong policy position to promote orderly urban development. Metro adopted the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) and administers a the regional Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). RUGGO provides a policy framework for Metro's functional plans and, through these adopted functional plans, for land use planning in the region consistent with the statewide planning goals. ~~that~~ The UGB clearly identifies the extent of the area in which urban development will occur in the Oregon portion of the region over the next 20 years....

Page 4-20 through 4-22, Transitways, amend as follows:

- . In the Western Corridor, the Sunset LRT with a long tunnel and a zoo station has been selected as the preferred alternative to connect downtown Portland and Beaverton Hillsboro. The LRT corridor west of Beaverton will follow the 185th east/west alignment Burlington Northern ROW to 185th Avenue. The extension to Central Hillsboro will follow the BN ROW into Hillsboro or an alternative alignment identified through the Alternatives Analysis process. The Sunset Westside LRT is the top regional priority for LRT implementation (see Chapter 8).
- . In the Southern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland to Milwaukie via the Portland Traction Company or McLoughlin alignments is called for in this Plan. Southeastern Sector, two alternative transitway corridors

will be examined in a preliminary alternatives analysis to be conducted by Metro. The study will examine alternative high capacity transit (HCT) alternatives between downtown Portland and Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Milwaukie and in the I-205 Corridor between Portland International Airport (PIA) and CTC. As a result of this study, one corridor will be recommended for advancement to the Alternatives Analysis phase and an action plan and recommendation on the other corridor will be developed.

The alternatives to be considered in the Milwaukie corridor include a Portland Traction Company (PTC) alignment, McLoughlin alignment and a Johns Landing/Sellwood Bridge alignment. Alternatives in the Highway 224 corridor include a Railroad/Harmony alignment and a Highway 224 alignment. The I-205 alternative includes a major portion of existing reserved ROW although there are alternative access options in the vicinity of both termini.

~~In the I-205 circumferential corridor, an LRT line connecting Portland International Airport (PIA) and the Clackamas Town Center (CTC) is called for in the RTP.~~

In the Northern Corridor a locally funded Preliminary Alternatives Analysis will examine HCT options connecting Vancouver with the Portland CBD. Alternative alignments which will be analyzed include I-5 and Interstate Ave. Possible connections across the I-205 bridge into east Clark County will also be examined in this study.

Beyond these four corridors, the long-term (beyond 2005) regional transitway system includes ~~two additional LRT corridors:~~

~~In the Northern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland and Vancouver via either I-5 or Interstate Avenue; and~~

~~In the Southwestern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland with Tigard via Barbur Boulevard. or I-5.~~

Possible extensions and future branches of the identified LRT corridors include those to Hillsboro (via Sunset or 185th extension), Oregon City (via McLoughlin or I-205 extension), Lake Oswego (via the Jefferson Street Branch) and Tualatin (via Milwaukie extension through Lake Oswego, Barbur extension, or Highway 217 circumferential extension through Tigard).

~~The adopted RTP also recommends acquiring the abandoned SPRR right-of-way connecting downtown Portland and Lake Oswego to protect the resource and allow future consideration of this alignment for rail transit in the Macadam/Lake Oswego radial corridor.~~

Add a bullet at the end of Section c. Land Use Decisions as follows:

- Other land use actions consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives or resulting from the Region 2040 planning process.

Chapter 5

Page 5-2, amend as follows:

City of Portland Downtown Carpool Parking Program: A cooperative program between Tri-Met and the City of Portland whereby carpools of three or more can purchase monthly parking permits ~~for \$25/~~ month and receive unlimited parking at ~~any of 1,400 six-hour~~ long-term meters in downtown Portland. The City of Portland has also designated approximately 200 parking meters in Portland as "carpool only" before 9:00 a.m. on weekdays.

Page 5-9, under "improve transit service in the sector by:" Amend the 10-Year Priority Projects as follows:

- consider pursuing the implementation of LRT and other HCT alternatives in the I-205 Corridor from Portland International Airport (PIA) to Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Gateway (Figure 5-3). The decision to proceed to construction of LRT, however is subject to: 1) an assessment of impacts associated with the project and selection of a preferred alternative and alignment; and 2) the development of a funding strategy for the project. the results of the I-205/Milwaukie Preliminary Alternatives Analysis which will recommend one of the two corridors to proceed to full alternatives analysis and will develop an action plan for the other corridor.

Page 5-10, under "improve connectivity and access in East County by:" Amend the 10-Year Priority Projects as follows:

- Constructing all or part of the Mt. Hood Parkway, a new principal arterial connection between I-84 and U.S. 26 (134)
- Constructing all or part of a new NE 207th Avenue arterial between Sandy Boulevard and Glisan.

Page 5-12, move "- Widening Graham Road structure (165)" from 10-Year Priority to Committed Project.

Page 5-16, under "10-Year Priority Projects," amend as follows:

consider pursuing the implementation of LRT and other HCT alternatives in the McLoughlin Milwaukie Corridor from downtown Portland to Milwaukie (Figure 5-3). The decision to proceed to construction, however, is subject to: 1) a final assessment of impacts associated with the facility and a selection of a preferred alternative and alignment; and 2) the development of a funding strategy for the project the results of the I-205/Milwaukie Preliminary Alternatives Analysis which will recommend one of the two corridors to proceed to full alternatives analysis and will develop an action plan for the other corridor.

Page 5-17, under "remove traffic from local streets by:" Amend 10-year Priority Project as follows:

~~implementing improvements recommended as a result of examination of identified in the Southeast Corridor Transportation Improvement Plan for resolving east/west traffic problems east of McLoughlin (Metro's Southeast Corridor Study).~~

Page 5-17, under "increase east/west access in the sector by:" Delete as follows:

~~10-Year Priority Project~~

~~improving Thiessen Road (215 between Oatfield Road and Johnson Road~~

Page 5-18, under "10-Year Priority Projects," amend as follows:

~~constructing a Sunnybrook Road arterial from 92nd to 108th or Valley View Road at Sunnyside Road (108)~~

Page 5-19, under "improve the Highway 212 portion of the Sunrise Corridor from Rock Creek Junction to U.S. 26 by:" Amend as follows:

10-Year Priority Projects

~~constructing a climbing lane on Highway 212 east of Rock Creek Junction (130)~~

~~widening Highway 212 from Rock Creek Junction to Chitwood (131)~~

~~widening Highway 212 through Damascus (132) and Boring (133)~~

~~completing other operations and safety improvements in this section~~

10-20 Year Projects

~~widening and realignment of Highway 212 from Royer to School Road (310, 311) and from Lani Lane to U.S. 26 (312)~~

~~improving the intersection of Highway 212 with U.S. 26 (313)~~

Widening and realigning Highway 212 from Rock Creek Junction through Damascus and Boring to the interchange at Highway 26; or construct an expressway on a new alignment between Rock Creek Junction and Highway 26 at the existing Highway 212 interchange.

Page 5-24, 1st paragraph, amend as follows:

consider constructing the first phase of the a limited access facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor from I-5 to Highway 99W including the interchanges at I-205 and Boones Ferry Road (123) and a three-lane widening of Boones Ferry Road to I-5/Stafford (122) or other alternatives as identified in the ODOT Western Bypass Study.

Page 5-24, under 10-20 Year Projects amend as follows:

- widening Boones Ferry Road to five lanes between the proposed bypass facility and I-5/Stafford (122) (The proposed bypass is contingent upon the recommendations of ODOT's Western Bypass Study. If a decision is made to not build the bypass facility then the need for this improvement will be re-evaluated)
- adding a southbound climbing lane on I-5 from Hood Avenue to Terwilliger (304)
- constructing interchanges on the proposed bypass facility at Highway 99W and Tualatin-Sherwood/Edy Roads (The proposed bypass is contingent upon the recommendations of ODOT's Western Bypass Study. If a decision is made to not build the bypass facility, then the need for these improvements will be re-evaluated)

Page 5-25, top of the page, amend as follows:

- ~~conducting Preliminary Engineering on the second phase of the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor facility from Highway 99W to the Sunset Highway (124)~~
- Consider constructing facility improvements in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor from Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway and from Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset Highway, or other highway, transit or land use alternatives as identified in ODOT's Western Bypass Study.

~~10-20 Year Projects~~

~~constructing the second (Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway - 124) and third (Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset - 125) phases of the bypass facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor. Actual construction of Phase II of the Western Bypass is subject to: 1) a determination that the facility is consistent with local comprehensive plans and state land use policies; and 2) a detailed assessment of the impacts associated with such a facility provided through the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. If at the conclusion of either of these processes, a decision is made to not build this portion of the Western Bypass, a planning study will be initiated to address the circumferential travel problem in some other manner.~~

- ~~as warranted, constructing the second phase of a Highway 217 widening to include six lanes from the Sunset Highway to the Hall Boulevard Overcrossing (117, 119)~~

Page 5-27, under 10-Year Priority Projects, amend as follows:

- constructing an interchange at I-5/I-205 and the proposed bypass facility (103) (The proposed bypass is contingent upon the recommendations of ODOT's Western Bypass Study. If a decision is made to not build the bypass facility then the need for this improvement will be re-evaluated)

Page 5-30, under "reduce congestion in the circumferential corridors by:" amend as follows:

~~conducting Preliminary Engineering on the second (Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway - 124) and third (Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset - 125) phases of the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor bypass facility~~

Consider constructing facility improvements in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor from Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway and from Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset Highway, or other highway, transit or land use alternatives as identified in ODOT's Western Bypass Study.

~~10-20 Year Projects~~

~~constructing the second (Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway - 124) and third (Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset - 125) phases of the bypass facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor. Actual construction of Phase II of the Western Bypass is subject to: 1) a determination that the facility is consistent with local comprehensive plans and state land use policies; and 2) a detailed assessment of the impacts associated with such a facility provided through the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.~~

~~If at the conclusion of either of these processes, a decision is made to not build this portion of the Western Bypass, a planning study will be initiated to address the circumferential travel problem in some other manner.~~

~~as traffic demand warrants, upgrading the intersections to interchanges on the bypass facility~~

~~as warranted, constructing the second phase of a Highway 217 widening to include six lanes from the Sunset Highway to the Hall Boulevard Overcrossing (117, 119)~~

Page 5-31, under 10-Year Priority Projects, amend as follows:

~~constructing some portion of a to-be-designed improvement the East-West Arterial from Murray Blvd to S.W. 110th as a bypass to Tualatin Valley Highway and parallel facilities in the central Beaverton area (137) with the construction timed to accommodate and facilitate the construction of the Westside LRT~~

Page 5-33, amend as follows:

~~proceed with preliminary engineering construction on the region's next priority LRT corridor -- the Sunset Westside LRT (Figure 5-3) -- to provide the major transit trunk service connecting downtown Portland with central Washington County, and Beaverton (to 185th) and Hillsboro. The decision to proceed to construction, however, is subject to: 1) an analysis of the facility in relation to updated population and employment forecasts and changes in travel patterns; 2) a final assessment of impacts associated with the facility; 3) an evaluation of the operation of the Banfield LRT; and 4) the development of a funding strategy for the project~~

Chapter 6

Page 6-1, paragraph 2, last sentence, amend as follows:

~~...with transit's share of the peak-hour travel market increasing from 6 percent in 1985 to 9 percent by the year 2005.~~

Page 6-16, paragraph 4, amend as follows:

~~improvements to I-84 and the Gresham Mt. Hood Parkway in Gresham...~~

Page 6-17, third bullet under Southwestern Corridor, amend as follows:

. the new Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor facility and improvements to Highway 217 resulting from the Western Bypass Study will provide increased access between rapidly growing portions of Washington County.

Page 6-17, fourth item under "Western Sector," amend to read as follows:

major LRT investments in the corridor and transit stations in the Peterkort, Beaverton, ~~Sylvan~~, Raleigh Hills and Tanasbourne (The Tanasbourne Transit Center will be relocated to 185th and Baseline upon completion of the Westside LRT to 185th Avenue) areas...

Page 6-17, fifth bullet under Western Sector, amend as follows:

. the new ~~facility improvements~~ in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor and ~~improvements to Highway 217~~ resulting from the Western Bypass Study will provide greater north/south mobility connecting developing areas in the Southwestern and Western Sectors.

Page 6-18, under "Downtown Portland Sector," amend as follows:

...2) increased transit capacity (Banfield LRT, ~~Sunset Westside LRT~~, ~~Meloughlin~~ Milwaukie LRT, Vancouver LRT, Mall LRT, transit mall extension);...

Chapter 7

Page 7-18, last paragraph under 2. Evaluation, amend as follows:

The region has taken positive steps toward the implementation of the transit elements of this plan through the successful region-wide vote in November 1990 approving a \$125 million bond measure to provide half of the 25 percent local match for the Westside LRT and to provide funding for planning, engineering and ROW acquisition for an East Portland/Clackamas County LRT project. In addition, the State Legislature approved state funding to cover the remaining one-half of the 25 percent Westside local match.

If the region ~~intends is~~ to pursue implementation of the recommended transportation plan, ~~it is apparent that several steps efforts~~ must be taken to increase transit funding. First, the region must continue to aggressively seek congressional action to assure the continuance of federal capital grants, argue against the phasing out of federal operating assistance and ensure a continuance of state matching funds for federal capital grants. Secondly, the region, must be prepared to accept an increased reliance on local funding sources in order to construct and operate the recommended transit system. Failure to secure

the necessary funding to expand the transit system would require a reexamination of the RTP to expand the recommended highway system or a reexamination of land use plans to reduce planned levels of development.

Chapter 8

Page 8-2, paragraph 2, sentences 1 and 2 are amended to read:

While all RTP provisions are recommendations unless clearly designated as a requirement of local government comprehensive plans, all local comprehensive plans and future amendments to local plans shall be consistent with all adopted RTP policies and guidelines for highway and transit system improvements and demand management programs as described in detail in as explained in Section C. For inconsistencies, local governments or Metro may initiate the dispute resolution process in Section F prior to action by Metro to require an amendment to a local comprehensive plan.

Page 8-8 under Transitway Implementation, amend as follows:

...The next priority for transitway construction is the Westside Corridor, where the ~~Sunset~~ Westside LRT (long tunnel with Zoo station) alignment has been selected as the preferred alternative to connect downtown Portland and Beaverton (to 185th) Hillsboro. The decision to proceed to construction of the Sunset LRT, however, will not be made until after the preparation of an FEIS on the project and an evaluation of the operation of the Banfield LRT. JPACT has identified A Preliminary Alternative Analysis study will result in a decision between the Milwaukie LRT or I-205 LRT as the next priority after ~~Sunset Westside~~ for UMTA Section 3 or other regional, state or federal funding, and I-205 LRT for development concurrent with the Westside LRT with non-Section 3 funds. A similar Pre-AA study will be conducted for high capacity transit alternatives designed to serve Clark County, Washington in either the I-5 North corridor or in the I-205 corridor. Implementation of a transitway in the remaining radial corridors (and potential extensions and branches) will be pursued in a phased manner, as follows: The purpose and scope of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and the full Alternatives Analysis studies are described in the following:

Phase I Preliminary Alternative Analysis studies will be initiated to identify the next priority corridor which warrants consideration of a transitway investment and identify a set of alternatives to be examined in more detail which set of promising alternatives in a corridor warrant further consideration. The Phase I Pre-AA study

will consider the short and long-term ridership potential, capital and operating costs, existing or planned transit-supportive land uses and right-of-way availability.

~~Phase II~~ The full Alternatives Analysis will be initiated to examine alternatives in detail and select the one that is most cost-effective. The ~~Phase II~~ study will conclude with an Environmental Impact Statement presenting costs, benefits and impacts of the alternatives, ~~and identifying leading to the identification of the preferred alternative for implementation.~~

The implementation of high capacity transitway alternatives in additional corridors will utilize the results of a Regional HCT Study which will identify promising HCT alternatives within the study corridors for advancement to Alternatives Analysis.

Page 8-9, Section 8. Handicapped Transit Service is amended as follows:

Tri-Met is responsible for providing handicapped transit accessibility including coordination of special transit services provided by social service agencies. In addition, Tri-Met conducts the detailed special handicapped transit planning necessary to identify required service improvements and adopt a plan for meeting federal requirements for handicapped accessibility consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991 (ADA). ~~Metro must endorse Tri-Met's plan for handicapped accessibility (Appendix B), Metro must certify that Tri-Met's Paratransit Plan conforms to the RTP and include expected uses of federal funding in the TIP.~~ In addition to Tri-Met's handicapped service, private, nonprofit agencies provide handicapped services and may apply for federal funding for equipment (through the UMTA Section 16(b)(2) program). Use of this equipment must be consistent with Tri-Met's plan, be included in Metro's TIP and be endorsed by the ODOT - Transit Division to be funded. ~~(Note: The currently adopted plan for handicapped accessibility may be revised due to changes in federal regulations).~~

Page 8-12, E.2.a. is amended to add a new second paragraph as follows:

OAR 660, Division 12, requires development of MPO Transportation System Plans (TSP) by 1995 for development of local TSPs which include public facilities plan provisions for transportation facilities.

Page 8-13, E.2.a., paragraph 4, is amended to read as follows:

In addition, OAR 660-18-022(1) allows local governments to

make determinations that the statewide goals do not apply to a particular land use decision. Such a decision is considered a land use decision and is itself appealable and, as such, must still demonstrate compliance with any applicable comprehensive plan policies and with RTP requirements.

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 2, is amended to read as follows:

Complete goal findings for some projects, however, will require detailed impact information not typically available until preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In these cases, jurisdictions should adopt as full a set of findings as can be made upon the information available at the time the project is included in the PFP regarding the need, mode, and general location, and to identify at the time the PFP is adopted whether the need for additional project level goal findings will be made when at the time the EIS is prepared shall be identified. In addition the what issues these findings will address, and what form and when this latter decision will be made shall be determined."

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 3, is amended to read as follows:

Local comprehensive plans and the RTP are intended to identify projects needed to serve development land uses identified in the acknowledged comprehensive plans over the long term.

Page 8-14, E.2.c., 2) is amended to read as follows:

At the time the projects are included in the PFPs, All RTP projects all projects recommended in the RTP to meet the long-term needs of the region, must satisfy all the applicable state planning goals regarding need, mode, and general location of the project requirements

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 7) is amended to change "Section D" to "Section C."

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 8) is amended to read as follows:

In general, compliance consistency of the RTP with all applicable state planning goals is achieved through the procedures described in this chapter. These procedures assure that RTP policies comply directly with the goals, and that RTP projects are in turn consistent with RTP projects. These amendments to the RTP (November 1991) are consistent with Regional Growth Goals and Objectives which are, in turn, consistent with statewide goals. as well as with the Local comprehensive plans and local findings of goal compliance when needed shall generally establish

statewide goal compliance for RTP projects. Exceptions to this occur when:

Page 8-15, 8-16, F.1, paragraph 1, first sentence, is amended to read as follows:

1. RTP Policy, System Plan and Consistency Criteria When Metro amends RTP policies (Chapter 1, 4 and 8), system plan elements (Figures 4-1, 4-4, 4-5 and 4-7) or compliance criteria (Chapter 8), it will evaluate and adopt findings regarding consistency with Regional Growth Goals and Objectives.

Page 8-16, F.1., paragraph 2, is amended to read:

In addition, in those cases where an RTP goal, policy or system plan element implies a particular improvement to such an extent that the goal, policy or system plan element would change as the result of a 'no build' project decision later in the process due to goal compliance issues, Metro will prepare findings ~~to address~~ an analysis of the broad regional interest in the statewide planning goals based on the information used in the RTP consistency review (Chapter 8, Section F.2.). ~~and Metro will identify as part of its goal findings analysis~~ related to the RTP amendment any and all goals it believes must be addressed by the local jurisdiction before a project decision to implement the system plan can be finalized. If the local jurisdiction determines that the project cannot comply with the statewide planning goals, the RTP will be amended as needed to eliminate reliance on such a project and initiate a cooperative analysis to develop an alternative solution.

Page 8-24, G, paragraph 1, is amended to read as follows:

Major outstanding issues to be resolved at a later date and which may be included as amendments to the Plan are as follows:

Page 8-24, G2, is deleted:

~~2. Westside Corridor Project -- The process to complete preliminary engineering, develop a final EIS and alignment selection, and prepare a financial plan are currently underway. The engineering of the Westside LRT is being undertaken in a manner designed to complement the Sunset Highway improvements recommended in this plan.~~

Page 8-24, G2, added as follows:

2. Transportation Rule/Region 2040 -- The next major update of the RTP will reflect requirements of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule and follow the direction and guidelines

established as part of the Region 2040 planning process. The Transportation Rule requires that regional and local planning bodies develop policies and implementation measures which avoid a principal reliance on a single mode of transportation.

Both the Transportation Rule and the Region 2040 planning process will require the region to better understand the transportation/land use relationship as the region grows to the level allowed in local comprehensive plans. The RTP will be developed as the region's Transportation System Plan (TSP) as called out in the Transportation Rule. As such, it must be consistent with the state TSP (the Oregon Transportation Plan) and will guide local TSPs. As a TSP, the RTP will also be designed to meet state requirements for per capita VMT reductions, increased peak-hour auto occupancy rates, and will examine alternative land use scenarios to address transportation needs.

As part of the Region 2040 planning process, alternative land use and transportation scenarios will be evaluated consistent with RUGGO in an effort to formulate a vision for how and where the region should develop as it approaches build-out of the current comprehensive plans over the next 50 years. To evaluate those scenarios and develop the vision, Metro has begun a three to four-year study. The RTP will be updated as necessary consistent with results of the study and findings of consistency with RUGGO will be developed for the entire document.

Both the Region 2040 process and Rule 12 implementation will utilize updated employment, population, and travel forecasts.

Page 8-25, under 3. Bi-State Transportation Study, amend as follows:

~~— In conjunction with the Bi-State Policy Advisory Committee, Metro may participate in a study designed to address the long-range land use plans and the associated concerns that have been raised regarding future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington. Metro and the Intergovernmental Resource Center of Clark County (IRC) initiated the Bi-State Transportation Study in the summer of 1990 to address the future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington based on anticipated growth to 2010 and an RTP level of improvements. The study is also examining the economic inter-relationships between the two sides of the river and is developing a methodology for evaluating the impact of major transportation investments in the corridor on land use. The study is scheduled for completion in late 1991.~~

A decision must be made on whether to proceed with further evaluation of Bi-State alternatives which would include the alternative land use scenarios and the evaluation of urban form resulting from the Region 2040 Plan process.

Page 8-25, items 4, 5 and 6 are amended to read as follows:

4. I-205 LRT/Milwaukie LRT/Vancouver LRT -- These, in addition to the Westside Corridor (discussed above), have been identified by JPACT as the region's priority corridors for the next 10 years. For the I-205 LRT, the region may withdraw the federal Interstate Funds for the I-205 Buslanes and initiate the preliminary engineering/EIS effort on the I-205 LRT (with the specific process subject to UMTA approval). The Milwaukie LRT will require an alternatives analysis (see also No. 5) and DEIS process and will consider alignments east and west of the Willamette River. This analysis will be coordinated with the river crossing aspects of the Southeast Corridor Study (see No. 5). Two Preliminary Alternatives Analysis studies will be conducted concurrently examining high capacity transit (HCT) alternatives in travel corridors serving north Clackamas County and serving south Clark County, Washington. The I-205/Milwaukie HCT study will select either the Portland CBD to Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Milwaukie corridor or the I-205 corridor between the Portland International Airport (PIA) and CTC (connecting east Portland and north Clackamas County with Gateway and the Portland CBD via the Banfield LRT) for advancement to a full scale Alternatives Analysis. The study will also select a set of promising alternatives to be carried into the AA and develop an action plan for the corridor not selected for Alternatives Analysis.

The I-5/I-205 Portland-Vancouver HCT study will make a decision on the preferred corridor for HCT development to connect downtown Portland with Clark County. The alternatives are the I-5 corridor connecting the Portland CBD with central Vancouver and the I-205 corridor connecting east Clark County with Gateway (and the Portland CBD via the Banfield LRT). (The I-205 corridor north to Clark County will not be considered for LRT development within the next 20 years but may be considered for LRT development beyond twenty years.) This study will recommend a priority corridor to pursue through an Alternatives Analysis. The timing of the AA for the priority corridor to Clark County will be dependent on the overall funding strategy developed in conjunction with the I-205/Milwaukie study.

- ~~5. Build Out Analysis -- The local comprehensive plans are designed to accommodate more growth than will be realized by the year 2005 (the scope of the RTP). As such it is~~

~~necessary for long range planning purposes to identify the travel demand associated with the full build-out of the local plans and examine the effects of this level of development on the transportation system beyond the year 2005.~~

- 6.5. Southeast Corridor Study -- The initial phase of the Southeast Corridor Study has been completed. The first phase examined a series of transportation alternatives for minimizing traffic impacts on Johnson Creek Boulevard and recommended an action plan. Several other outstanding transportation issues which exist in the Southeast Corridor extending from the I-5/I-405 loop to U.S. 26 in Boring include: Among the issues being addressed in this corridor are: a) an analysis of transportation alternatives to minimize excessive traffic impacts on Johnson Creek Boulevard; ba) an evaluation of the adequacy of Willamette River crossing capacity needs; and eb) the engineering and definition of improvements to Highways 224 and 212 in the Sunrise Corridor from McLoughlin Boulevard to U.S. 26 (including the alternative designs of expressway or freeway). Portions of the Sunrise Corridor improvement as currently defined may impact resources protected by Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues).

Page 8-26, amend and renumber as follows:

- 7.6. Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor -- The alignment for the proposed highway improvement in the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor must be determined through preliminary engineering and the EIS process. The Western Bypass was adopted as a contingent recommendation subject to the findings of a land use and environmental analysis. ODOT has begun a study of the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor evaluating the need for transportation improvements in the corridor and assessing the land use consequences of a range of reasonable alternatives. The ODOT Western Bypass Study will incorporate the results of the 1000 Friends of Oregon LUTRAQ Study if that study produces a viable land use/ transportation strategy. This process will need to address the nature and scope of the 216th/219th corridor improvement north of T.V. Highway (arterial or limited access facility) and land use issues related to resources protected by Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues).

- 8.7. I-84 to U.S. 26 Connector Mt. Hood Parkway

9. East Bank Freeway Relocation -- Options for relocating the I-5 Freeway on the east bank of the Willamette River are currently being examined. If a decision is reached to significantly alter the nature and scope of improvements to

~~this section of the facility from those previously adopted in the RTP, the RTP must be amended to delete the existing improvements and include the revised project. Relocating the freeway may impact resources protected by the Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues).~~

~~10.8. T.V. Highway Corridor -- The adopted RTP recognizes the need for improvements in the T.V. Highway Corridor west of Highway 217. Two study efforts are currently underway in the corridor to determine the nature and scope of required improvements: the City of Beaverton's Central Beaverton Study (Highway 217-Murray) and ODOT's T.V. Highway Reconnaissance (Murray Hillsboro). Some of the alternatives being evaluated in the Beaverton Study would necessitate a change to the RTP Principal Arterial System and would probably impact resources protected by Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues). The east-west arterial north of T.V. Highway will construct a five-lane arterial between 110th and Murray Road. The route will parallel Center Street and then utilize the existing Milikan Way between Hocken and Murray Road. The major outstanding issue with this project is the proposed arterial's interface with Highway 217. The city and ODOT must decide whether a new interchange will be developed or whether the arterial will simply cross over Highway 217 with no direct access.~~

~~ODOT's T.V. Highway Reconnaissance Study will examine issues in the segment of T.V. Highway between Murray Blvd. and Hillsboro.~~

11.9. Land Use Issues

Page 8-27, under "Land Use Issues," amend as follows:

~~As a result, consistency with the Statewide Land Use Planning Goals must be demonstrated prior to a "build" decision and a final RTP decision. Metro and Washington County have ratified a working agreement and scope of work to provide the information necessary to address the land use issues associated with the proposed facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor (as required by the adoption of the Southwest Corridor Study recommendations). Similar efforts may be required in the other two corridors.~~

~~In addition, several planning studies currently underway to address outstanding transportation issues are evaluating alternatives that would likely impact Goal-protected resources.~~

~~The Goal 12 Transportation Rule details the criteria for "Exceptions for Transportation Improvements on Rural Land". It requires that an exception adopted as part of a~~

transportation system plan (TSP) (i.e., the RTP and local comprehensive plans) shall, at a minimum, decide need, mode, function and general location for the proposed facility or improvement. The finding of need must show that the transportation need cannot be accommodated through alternative modes, TSM measures or improvements to existing facilities.

Studies are underway in each of these three corridors to determine whether the transportation needs in those corridors warrant a finding of exception to Goal 14.

Page 8-27, items 4, 5 and 6 are renumbered, retitled, or amended as follows:

12-10. Goods Movement

13.11. Five-Year Transit Development Plan

14-12. Demand Management Planning -- The Rideshare Advisory Subcommittee will examine the candidate demand management strategies identified in the Policy Framework and develop recommendations on which are the most promising to pursue. The FY 92 Unified Work Program identifies a number of air quality planning activities, including a regional demand management planning study. The study will evaluate and adopt demand management programs for inclusion in the RTP to, in part, reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce automobile-related emissions, conserve energy, and generally assist other objectives related to congestion and mobility. Study recommendations will reflect both RTP and Oregon Transportation Plan demand management policies. The study process will coordinate with the Portland Area Demand Management Working Group.

15-13. Access Control Plans

16-14. Light Rail Analyses

Page 8-28, renumber and amend as follows:

17-15. Development Impacts

18-16. U.S. 26/I-405/I-5 Connection

19-17. Cornell and W. Burnside

20. Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) -- Periodic Review -- The modification of the UGB as a result of the periodic review process would require the development of a new series of population and employment projections to reflect such amendments.

18. Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 -- The region must comply with the provisions of the CAAA which include a requirement that the projects included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) demonstrate conformity by reducing regional VMT when compared with a No-Build condition.
- ~~21-19.~~ 2010 RTP Update -- After the completion of a regional 2010 population and employment forecast, the travel demand associated with this level of growth will be developed and used as the basis for a 2010 RTP Update. The Interim RTP update scheduled for next year will begin to address the changing policy issues brought about by the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments and RUGGO. This will involve updating the population and employment forecasts and analyzing a new series of travel forecasts for the year 2010. This interim update will provide the opportunity to address alternative transportation strategies consistent with RUGGO but will stop short of thoroughly addressing the analysis of alternative land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule. An RTP update will provide 2015 travel forecasts and will implement Region 2040 transportation and land use recommendations.
- ~~22.~~ I-5 North/N. Kerby Avenue Off Ramp -- Based on the results of the privately funded studies called for in Chapter 5 of the Plan, determine if sufficient justification exists for the project to pursue further planning and public involvement efforts (such as an EIS).

Page 8-29, delete and add as follows:

- ~~• Gladstone Bridge~~
- I-5 North/N. Kerby Avenue Off-Ramp
- Birdsdale Bypass/Corridor Study

JC:lmk
91-433.ATT
12-11-91

FROM ROBERT LIBERTY
(ORIG. COPY) 1-14-92

PROPOSED
Amendments on
pages 2, 3, 5, 15, 22

EXHIBIT A

* Three amendments.

Proposed Amendments to the March 9, 1989 Regional Transportation Plan

Exhibit A provides a line-by-line description of the deletions (lined-out material) and additions (underlined material) included in the 1991 RTP revision.

Summary Chapter

Page S-1, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

After extensive public review and comment, the RTP was adopted by the Metro Council in 1982 and ~~last~~ updated in 1983. The plan, incorporating the 1989 update and the current (1989)(1991) update revision, give the Portland metropolitan region a much needed direction for meeting our transportation needs over the next two decades...

Page S-1, following paragraph 4, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the 1991 revision, the RTP recognizes and begins to incorporate the policy direction laid out by the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO). A full examination of alternative transportation and land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule will coincide with and follow the Region 2040 plan, which is an outgrowth of the RUGGO process.

Page S-6, paragraph 2, amend as follows:

Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor -- Consider constructing ~~construct~~ a new four-lane limited access facility from I-5 to Tualatin Valley Highway and an five-lane arterial from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 (Proceed with I-5 to the Highway 99W segment and arterial segment from Tualatin Valley Highway to U.S. 26 as a 10-year priority.) as one of several corridors and mode opportunities, such as light rail transit, highway and bus service, to be analyzed through ODOT's Western Bypass study. Alternatives to be studied will include transit and transit/highway combinations with and without a new highway facility and an interactive land use/transportation strategy (If the 1000 Friends of Oregon LUTRAQ Study produces a viable land use/transportation strategy, it would be folded into the Western Bypass Study). A corridor-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative modes and corridors to meet project goals and objectives and to consider their environmental impacts. Through this effort, one alternative will be selected and advanced to a second phase of study.

The second phase will include a design EIS or Environmental Assessment (EA) to identify specific alignments within the selected corridor(s) for the selected mode(s). This effort will examine a range of alignments for analysis in the EIS, and conclude with selection of the alternative that best meets study goals and objectives. Metro will be participating in an independent review of the selected alternative for compliance with the statewide Goals and RUGGOs.

Page S-6, paragraph 5, amend as follows:
Mt. Hood Parkway I-84/U.S.26 Connector

2. Light Rail Transit (Figure S-2)

Priority 1: Westside Light Rail -- Begin the preliminary engineering final design work and pursue finalize discretionary funding for the project from through the federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA).

Page S-8, paragraph 1 and 2, amend as follows:

I-205/Milwaukie HCT and I-5 North/I-205 North HCT Studies -- Conduct Pre-Alternatives Analysis level studies geared toward selecting priority corridors for advancement to full alternatives analysis. An action plan will be developed for the corridors not selected as the priority corridors for alternatives analysis.

~~I205 Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering work using funds from bus lanes withdrawn from the Interstate system.~~

~~Milwaukie Light Rail -- Begin preliminary engineering as soon as allowable after Westside light rail. Pursue funding from UMTA after receiving funding for the Westside light rail.~~

Page S-11, paragraphs 3 and 4, amend to read:

Funding for 50 to 75 percent of the Westside and Milwaukie light rail and up to 50 percent for the next priority corridor can be sought has been committed from UMTA through a national competitive process. A strategy incorporating federal, state and local funds must be developed for corridors beyond the Westside. However, local matching funds must be obtained first.

A unique opportunity exists to fund the initial stages of work toward an I-205 light rail line. Through the Federal-Aid Interstate program, \$16.6 million ~~is was originally~~ available for bus lane construction. However, with the approval of FHWA and UMTA, this money ~~can and would be shifted to~~ is available for light rail construction.

Introduction Chapter

Page I-1, amend the second bullet under A. THE CONTEXT OF THE PLAN as follows:

- serves as a regional framework for the coordination of the transportation and land use elements of local comprehensive plans consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO);

Page I-3, add a paragraph following the final paragraph of Section B which will read as follows:

The amendments contained in the 1991 RTP revision have been found to be consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives. Future updates will reflect consistency with the Region 2040 Planning Process, the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the new Surface Transportation Act. Future RTP updates will have to reflect RUGGO and local comprehensive plans may have to change to meet RUGGO.

Page I-7, final paragraph under Federal Planning Requirements, amend as follows:

In addition to the requirements of FHWA and UMTA, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (~~carried out~~ administered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)) requires each urbanized area to meet federal standards for clean air.

Page I-7, under State Planning Requirements, add a new paragraph as follows:

With the adoption of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, Metro must adopt a Transportation System Plan (TSP) which is consistent with the State TSP. In the case of the State, the TSP is the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and, in the case of Metro, the TSP is the RTP. Metro is working with ODOT to ensure consistency between the OTP and the RTP (see also Chapter 8).

complying with Goal 12

Chapter 1

Page 1-3, add as final paragraph under Section B. History

1991 LCDC adopts the Goal 12 Transportation Rule requiring a reduction in the reliance on single occupant vehicles and requiring local actions which encourage the development and use of reasonable alternatives such as transit and ridesharing. The Transportation Rule also requires the development of Transportation System Plans to be completed consistent with the state requirements within four years

for the RTP and within five years for local jurisdictions. The plans must include methods to achieve reductions in per capita vehicle miles traveled, increases in peak-hour auto occupancy rates and examinations of alternative land use scenarios to address transportation needs.

1991 Metro Council adopts the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives which provide a set of land use planning goals and objectives, which are consistent with statewide planning goals, for purposes of planning coordination in the region.

Page 1-7, under 3. Objective: To maintain the region's air quality. Amend paragraph 3 as follows:

The Annual Element of the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) should must be consistent with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality and must conform with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Page 1-15, item 6 is amended to read as follows:

- ~~6. Elderly and Handicapped Service -- Based on the Special Needs Transportation Plan adopted by Tri-Met, the transit system will:~~
- ~~• Continue to provide accessible service at all LRT stations.~~
 - ~~• Continue to specify lifts on all new buses until at least 50 percent of the bus fleet is accessible.~~
 - ~~• Continue to work with local jurisdictions to make as many transit stops as possible accessible.~~
 - ~~• Continue to provide door-to-door demand responsive service to individuals who are unable to use Tri-Met buses due to physical or mental disabilities.~~
6. Service to the Disabled -- Based on the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Tri-Met will offer services which address the special needs of the disabled population:
- Continue to develop complementary paratransit services which comply with the ADA.
 - Continue to specify lifts on all new transit vehicles until 100 percent of the fleet is accessible.
 - Continue to work with local jurisdictions to make transit stops accessible.

- . Continue to develop other facilities and services which are accessible to the disabled as required by the ADA.

Chapter 2

Page 2-1 under A. Overview, amend the second paragraph as follows:

- . The regional land use pattern defined by the local jurisdictional comprehensive plans developed under the LCDC Statewide Planning Goals that will determine in large part the location of future development in the region. (These land use patterns, upon which the RTP travel forecasts are based, will be subject to change based upon the policies included in the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Rule.) These changes in residential distribution and density will be incorporated into the travel forecasts in future RTP updates);

→ and other functional plans adopted to implement the RUGGOs.

Chapter 4

Page 4-1, amend paragraph 4 as follows:

The region has taken a strong policy position to promote orderly urban development. Metro adopted the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) and administers a the regional Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). RUGGO provides a policy framework for Metro's functional plans and, through these adopted functional plans, for land use planning in the region consistent with the statewide planning goals. ~~that~~ The UGB clearly identifies the extent of the area in which urban development will occur in the Oregon portion of the region over the next 20 years....

Page 4-20 through 4-22, Transitways, amend as follows:

- . In the Western Corridor, ~~the Sunset LRT with a long tunnel and a zoo station~~ has been selected as the preferred alternative to connect downtown Portland and ~~Beaverton Hillsboro~~. The LRT corridor west of Beaverton ~~would will~~ follow the ~~185th east/west alignment~~ Burlington Northern ROW to 185th Avenue. The extension to Central Hillsboro will follow the BN ROW into Hillsboro or an alternative alignment identified through the Alternatives Analysis process. The ~~Sunset Westside~~ LRT is the top regional priority for LRT implementation (see Chapter 8).
- . In the ~~Southern Corridor~~, ~~an LRT line connecting downtown Portland to Milwaukie via the Portland Traction Company or McLoughlin alignments is called for in this Plan.~~ Southeastern Sector, two alternative transitway corridors

will be examined in a preliminary alternatives analysis to be conducted by Metro. The study will examine alternative high capacity transit (HCT) alternatives between downtown Portland and Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Milwaukie and in the I-205 Corridor between Portland International Airport (PIA) and CTC. As a result of this study, one corridor will be recommended for advancement to the Alternatives Analysis phase and an action plan and recommendation on the other corridor will be developed.

The alternatives to be considered in the Milwaukie corridor include a Portland Traction Company (PTC) alignment, McLoughlin alignment and a Johns Landing/Sellwood Bridge alignment. Alternatives in the Highway 224 corridor include a Railroad/Harmony alignment and a Highway 224 alignment. The I-205 alternative includes a major portion of existing reserved ROW although there are alternative access options in the vicinity of both termini.

~~In the I-205 circumferential corridor, an LRT line connecting Portland International Airport (PIA) and the Clackamas Town Center (CTC) is called for in the RTP.~~

In the Northern Corridor a locally funded Preliminary Alternatives Analysis will examine HCT options connecting Vancouver with the Portland CBD. Alternative alignments which will be analyzed include I-5 and Interstate Ave. Possible connections across the I-205 bridge into east Clark County will also be examined in this study.

Beyond these four corridors, the long-term (beyond 2005) regional transitway system includes ~~two additional LRT corridors:~~

- ~~In the Northern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland and Vancouver via either I-5 or Interstate Avenue, and~~
- ~~In the Southwestern Corridor, an LRT line connecting downtown Portland with Tigard via Barbur Boulevard. or I-5.~~

Possible extensions and future branches of the identified LRT corridors include those to Hillsboro (via Sunset or 185th extension), Oregon City (via McLoughlin or I-205 extension), Lake Oswego (via the Jefferson Street Branch) and Tualatin (via Milwaukie extension through Lake Oswego, Barbur extension, or Highway 217 circumferential extension through Tigard).

~~The adopted RTP also recommends acquiring the abandoned SPRR right-of-way connecting downtown Portland and Lake Oswego to protect the resource and allow future consideration of this alignment for rail transit in the Macadam/Lake Oswego radial corridor.~~

Add a bullet at the end of Section c. Land Use Decisions as follows:

- Other land use actions consistent with the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives or resulting from the Region 2040 planning process.

Chapter 5

Page 5-2, amend as follows:

City of Portland Downtown Carpool Parking Program: A cooperative program between Tri-Met and the City of Portland whereby carpools of three or more can purchase monthly parking permits for ~~\$25/~~ month and receive unlimited parking at any of ~~1,400~~ six-hour long-term meters in downtown Portland. The City of Portland has also designated approximately 200 parking meters in Portland as "carpool only" before 9:00 a.m. on weekdays.

Page 5-9, under "improve transit service in the sector by:" Amend the 10-Year Priority Projects as follows:

- consider pursuing the implementation of LRT and other HCT alternatives in the I-205 Corridor from Portland International Airport (PIA) to Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Gateway (Figure 5-3). The decision to proceed to construction of LRT, however is subject to: 1) an assessment of impacts associated with the project and selection of a preferred alternative and alignment; and 2) the development of a funding strategy for the project. the results of the I-205/Milwaukie Preliminary Alternatives Analysis which will recommend one of the two corridors to proceed to full alternatives analysis and will develop an action plan for the other corridor.

Page 5-10, under "improve connectivity and access in East County by:" Amend the 10-Year Priority Projects as follows:

- Constructing all or part of the Mt. Hood Parkway, a new principal arterial connection between I-84 and U.S. 26 (134)
- Constructing all or part of a new NE 207th Avenue arterial between Sandy Boulevard and Glisan.

Page 5-12, move "- Widening Graham Road structure (165)" from 10-Year Priority to Committed Project.

Page 5-16, under "10-Year Priority Projects," amend as follows:

consider pursuing the implementation of LRT and other HCT alternatives in the McLoughlin Milwaukie Corridor from downtown Portland to Milwaukie (Figure 5-3). The decision to proceed to construction, however, is subject to: 1) a final assessment of impacts associated with the facility and a selection of a preferred alternative and alignment; and 2) the development of a funding strategy for the project the results of the I-205/Milwaukie Preliminary Alternatives Analysis which will recommend one of the two corridors to proceed to full alternatives analysis and will develop an action plan for the other corridor.

Page 5-17, under "remove traffic from local streets by:" Amend 10-year Priority Project as follows:

~~implementing improvements recommended as a result of examination of identified in the Southeast Corridor Transportation Improvement Plan for resolving east/west traffic problems east of McLoughlin (Metro's Southeast Corridor Study).~~

Page 5-17, under "increase east/west access in the sector by:" Delete as follows:

~~10-Year Priority Project~~

~~—improving Thiessen Road (215 between Oatfield Road and Johnson Road~~

Page 5-18, under "10-Year Priority Projects," amend as follows:

~~constructing a Sunnybrook Road arterial from 92nd to 108th or Valley View Road at Sunnyside Road (108)~~

Page 5-19, under "improve the Highway 212 portion of the Sunrise Corridor from Rock Creek Junction to U.S. 26 by:" Amend as follows:

10-Year Priority Projects

~~constructing a climbing lane on Highway 212 east of Rock Creek Junction (130)~~

~~widening Highway 212 from Rock Creek Junction to Chitwood (131)~~

~~widening Highway 212 through Damascus (132) and Boring (133)~~

~~completing other operations and safety improvements in this section~~

10-20 Year Projects

~~widening and realignment of Highway 212 from Royer to School Road (310, 311) and from Lani Lane to U.S. 26 (312)~~

~~improving the intersection of Highway 212 with U.S. 26 (313)~~

Widening and realigning Highway 212 from Rock Creek Junction through Damascus and Boring to the interchange at Highway 26; or construct an expressway on a new alignment between Rock Creek Junction and Highway 26 at the existing Highway 212 interchange.

Page 5-24, 1st paragraph, amend as follows:

consider constructing the first phase of the a limited access facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor from I-5 to Highway 99W including the interchanges at I-205 and Boones Ferry Road (123) and a three lane widening of Boones Ferry Road to I-5/Stafford (122) or other alternatives as identified in the ODOT Western Bypass Study.

Page 5-24, under 10-20 Year Projects amend as follows:

- widening Boones Ferry Road to five lanes between the proposed bypass facility and I-5/Stafford (122) (The proposed bypass is contingent upon the recommendations of ODOT's Western Bypass Study. If a decision is made to not build the bypass facility then the need for this improvement will be re-evaluated)
- adding a southbound climbing lane on I-5 from Hood Avenue to Terwilliger (304)
- constructing interchanges on the proposed bypass facility at Highway 99W and Tualatin-Sherwood/Edy Roads (The proposed bypass is contingent upon the recommendations of ODOT's Western Bypass Study. If a decision is made to not build the bypass facility, then the need for these improvements will be re-evaluated)

Page 5-25, top of the page, amend as follows:

- ~~conducting Preliminary Engineering on the second phase of the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor facility from Highway 99W to the Sunset Highway (124)~~
- Consider constructing facility improvements in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor from Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway and from Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset Highway, or other highway, transit or land use alternatives as identified in ODOT's Western Bypass Study.

~~10-20 Year Projects~~

~~constructing the second (Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway 124) and third (Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset 125) phases of the bypass facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor. Actual construction of Phase II of the Western Bypass is subject to: 1) a determination that the facility is consistent with local comprehensive plans and state land use policies; and 2) a detailed assessment of the impacts associated with such a facility provided through the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. If at the conclusion of either of these processes, a decision is made to not build this portion of the Western Bypass, a planning study will be initiated to address the circumferential travel problem in some other manner.~~

- ~~as warranted, constructing the second phase of a Highway 217 widening to include six lanes from the Sunset Highway to the Hall Boulevard Overcrossing (117, 119)~~

Page 5-27, under 10-Year Priority Projects, amend as follows:

- constructing an interchange at I-5/I-205 and the proposed bypass facility (103) (The proposed bypass is contingent upon the recommendations of ODOT's Western Bypass Study. If a decision is made to not build the bypass facility then the need for this improvement will be re-evaluated)

Page 5-30, under "reduce congestion in the circumferential corridors by:" amend as follows:

~~conducting Preliminary Engineering on the second (Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway 124) and third (Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset 125) phases of the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor bypass facility~~

Consider constructing facility improvements in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor from Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway and from Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset Highway, or other highway, transit or land use alternatives as identified in ODOT's Western Bypass Study.

~~10-20 Year Projects~~

~~constructing the second (Highway 99W to Tualatin Valley Highway 124) and third (Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset 125) phases of the bypass facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor. Actual construction of Phase II of the Western Bypass is subject to: 1) a determination that the facility is consistent with local comprehensive plans and state land use policies; and 2) a detailed assessment of the impacts associated with such a facility provided through the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.~~

~~If at the conclusion of either of these processes, a decision is made to not build this portion of the Western Bypass, a planning study will be initiated to address the circumferential travel problem in some other manner.~~

~~as traffic demand warrants, upgrading the intersections to interchanges on the bypass facility~~

~~as warranted, constructing the second phase of a Highway 217 widening to include six lanes from the Sunset Highway to the Hall Boulevard Overcrossing (117, 119)~~

Page 5-31, under 10-Year Priority Projects, amend as follows:

~~constructing some portion of a to-be-designed improvement the East-West Arterial from Murray Blvd to S.W. 110th as a bypass to Tualatin Valley Highway and parallel facilities in the central Beaverton area (137) with the construction timed to accommodate and facilitate the construction of the Westside LRT~~

Page 5-33, amend as follows:

~~proceed with preliminary engineering construction on the region's next priority LRT corridor -- the Sunset Westside LRT (Figure 5-3) -- to provide the major transit trunk service connecting downtown Portland with central Washington County, and Beaverton (to 185th) and Hillsboro. The decision to proceed to construction, however, is subject to: 1) an analysis of the facility in relation to updated population and employment forecasts and changes in travel patterns; 2) a final assessment of impacts associated with the facility; 3) an evaluation of the operation of the Banfield LRT; and 4) the development of a funding strategy for the project~~

Chapter 6

Page 6-1, paragraph 2, last sentence, amend as follows:

...with transit's share of the peak-hour travel market increasing from 6 percent in 1985 to 9 percent by the year 2005.

Page 6-16, paragraph 4, amend as follows:

improvements to I-84 and the Gresham Mt. Hood Parkway in Gresham...

Page 6-17, third bullet under Southwestern Corridor, amend as follows:

. the new Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor facility and improvements to Highway 217 resulting from the Western Bypass Study will provide increased access between rapidly growing portions of Washington County.

Page 6-17, fourth item under "Western Sector," amend to read as follows:

major LRT investments in the corridor and transit stations in the Peterkort, Beaverton, ~~Sylvan, Raleigh Hills~~ and Tanasbourne (The Tanasbourne Transit Center will be relocated to 185th and Baseline upon completion of the Westside LRT to 185th Avenue) areas...

Page 6-17, fifth bullet under Western Sector, amend as follows:

. the new ~~facility improvements~~ in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor and ~~improvements to Highway 217 resulting from the Western Bypass Study~~ will provide greater north/south mobility connecting developing areas in the Southwestern and Western Sectors.

Page 6-18, under "Downtown Portland Sector," amend as follows:

...2) increased transit capacity (Banfield LRT, ~~Sunset Westside~~ LRT, ~~Meloughlin~~ Milwaukie LRT, Vancouver LRT, Mall LRT, transit mall extension);...

Chapter 7

Page 7-18, last paragraph under 2. Evaluation, amend as follows:

The region has taken positive steps toward the implementation of the transit elements of this plan through the successful region-wide vote in November 1990 approving a \$125 million bond measure to provide half of the 25 percent local match for the Westside LRT and to provide funding for planning, engineering and ROW acquisition for an East Portland/Clackamas County LRT project. In addition, the State Legislature approved state funding to cover the remaining one-half of the 25 percent Westside local match.

If the region ~~intends~~ is to pursue implementation of the recommended transportation plan, ~~it is apparent that several steps~~ efforts must be taken to increase transit funding. First, the region must continue to aggressively seek congressional action to assure the continuance of federal capital grants, argue against the phasing out of federal operating assistance and ensure a continuance of state matching funds for federal capital grants. Secondly, the region, must be prepared to accept an increased reliance on local funding sources in order to construct and operate the recommended transit system. Failure to secure

the necessary funding to expand the transit system would require a reexamination of the RTP to expand the recommended highway system or a reexamination of land use plans to reduce planned levels of development.

Chapter 8

Page 8-2, paragraph 2, sentences 1 and 2 are amended to read:

While all RTP provisions are recommendations unless clearly designated as a requirement of local government comprehensive plans, all local comprehensive plans and future amendments to local plans should shall be consistent with all adopted RTP policies and guidelines for highway and transit system improvements and demand management programs as described in detail in as explained in Section C. For inconsistencies, local governments or Metro may initiate the dispute resolution process in Section F prior to action by Metro to require an amendment to a local comprehensive plan.

Page 8-8 under Transitway Implementation, amend as follows:

...The next priority for transitway construction is the Westside Corridor, where the Sunset Westside LRT (long tunnel with Zoo station) alignment has been selected as the preferred alternative to connect downtown Portland and Beaverton (to 185th) Hillsboro. The decision to proceed to construction of the Sunset LRT, however, will not be made until after the preparation of an FEIS on the project and an evaluation of the operation of the Banfield LRT. JPACT has identified A Preliminary Alternative Analysis study will result in a decision between the Milwaukie LRT or I-205 LRT as the next priority after Sunset Westside for UMTA Section 3 or other regional, state or federal funding, and I-205 LRT for development concurrent with the Westside LRT with non-Section 3 funds. A similar Pre-AA study will be conducted for high capacity transit alternatives designed to serve Clark County, Washington in either the I-5 North corridor or in the I-205 corridor. Implementation of a transitway in the remaining radial corridors (and potential extensions and branches) will be pursued in a phased manner, as follows: The purpose and scope of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and the full Alternatives Analysis studies are described in the following:

Phase I Preliminary Alternative Analysis studies will be initiated to identify the next priority corridor which warrants consideration of a transitway investment and identify a set of alternatives to be examined in more detail which set of promising alternatives in a corridor warrant further consideration. The Phase I Pre-AA study

will consider the short and long-term ridership potential, capital and operating costs, existing or planned transit-supportive land uses and right-of-way availability.

~~Phase II~~ The full Alternatives Analysis will be initiated to examine alternatives in detail and select the one that is most cost-effective. The ~~Phase II~~ study will conclude with an Environmental Impact Statement presenting costs, benefits and impacts of the alternatives, ~~and identifying leading to the identification of the preferred alternative for implementation.~~

The implementation of high capacity transitway alternatives in additional corridors will utilize the results of a Regional HCT Study which will identify promising HCT alternatives within the study corridors for advancement to Alternatives Analysis.

Page 8-9, Section 8. Handicapped Transit Service is amended as follows:

Tri-Met is responsible for providing handicapped transit accessibility including coordination of special transit services provided by social service agencies. In addition, Tri-Met conducts the detailed special handicapped transit planning necessary to identify required service improvements and adopt a plan for meeting federal requirements for handicapped accessibility consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991 (ADA). ~~Metro must endorse Tri-Met's plan for handicapped accessibility (Appendix B), Metro must certify that Tri-Met's Paratransit Plan conforms to the RTP and include expected uses of federal funding in the TIP. In addition to Tri-Met's handicapped service, private, nonprofit agencies provide handicapped services and may apply for federal funding for equipment (through the UMTA Section 16(b)(2) program). Use of this equipment must be consistent with Tri-Met's plan, be included in Metro's TIP and be endorsed by the ODOT - Transit Division to be funded. (Note: The currently adopted plan for handicapped accessibility may be revised due to changes in federal regulations).~~

Page 8-12, E.2.a. is amended to add a new second paragraph as follows:

OAR 660, Division 12, requires development of MPO Transportation System Plans (TSP) by 1995 for development of local TSPs which include public facilities plan provisions for transportation facilities.

Page 8-13, E.2.a., paragraph 4, is amended to read as follows:

In addition, OAR 660-18-022(1) allows local governments to

make determinations that the statewide goals do not apply to a particular land use decision. Such a decision is considered a land use decision and is itself appealable and, as such, must still demonstrate compliance with any applicable comprehensive plan policies and with RTP requirements.

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 2, is amended to read as follows:

Complete ^{original} goal findings for ^{aspects of} some projects, however, will require detailed impact information not typically available until preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In these cases, jurisdictions should adopt as full a set of findings as can be made upon the information available at the time the project is included in the PFP regarding the need, mode, and general location, and to identify ~~at the time the PFP is adopted whether the need for additional project level goal findings will be made when at the time the EIS is prepared shall be identified.~~ In addition the what issues these findings will address, and what form and when this latter decision will be made shall be determined."

Page 8-13, E.2.b., paragraph 3, is amended to read as follows:

Local comprehensive plans and the RTP are intended to identify projects needed to serve development land uses identified in the acknowledged comprehensive plans over the long term, *as these plans are amended to comply with Goal 12 and other functional plans.*

Page 8-14, E.2.c., 2) is amended to read as follows:

At the time the projects are included in the PFPs, All RTP projects all projects recommended in the RTP to meet the long-term needs of the region, must satisfy all the applicable state planning goals regarding need, mode, and general location of the project requirements

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 7) is amended to change "Section D" to "Section C."

Page 8-15, E.2.c., 8) is amended to read as follows:

In general, ^{compliance} ~~compliance~~ consistency of the RTP with all applicable state planning goals is achieved through the procedures described in this chapter. ~~These procedures assure that RTP policies comply directly with the goals, and that RTP projects are in turn consistent with RTP projects. These amendments to the RTP (November 1991) are consistent with Regional Growth Goals and Objectives which are, in turn, consistent with statewide goals, as well as with the Local comprehensive plans and local findings of goal compliance when needed shall generally establish~~

Three amendments, this page.

statewide goal compliance for RTP projects. Exceptions to this occur when:

Page 8-15, 8-16, F.1, paragraph 1, first sentence, is amended to read as follows:

1. RTP Policy, System Plan and Consistency Criteria
When Metro amends RTP policies (Chapter 1, 4 and 8), system plan elements (Figures 4-1, 4-4, 4-5 and 4-7) or compliance criteria (Chapter 8), it will evaluate and adopt findings regarding consistency with Regional Growth Goals and Objectives.

Page 8-16, F.1., paragraph 2, is amended to read:

In addition, in those cases where an RTP goal, policy or system plan element implies a particular improvement to such an extent that the goal, policy or system plan element would change as the result of a 'no build' project decision later in the process due to goal compliance issues, Metro will prepare ~~findings to address an analysis of~~ the broad regional interest in the statewide planning goals based on the information used in the RTP consistency review (Chapter 8, Section F.2.). ~~and Metro will identify as part of its goal findings analysis~~ related to the RTP amendment any and all goals it believes must be addressed by the local jurisdiction before a project decision to implement the system plan can be finalized. If the local jurisdiction determines that the project cannot comply with the statewide planning goals, the RTP will be amended as needed to eliminate reliance on such a project and initiate a cooperative analysis to develop an alternative solution.

Page 8-24, G, paragraph 1, is amended to read as follows:

Major outstanding issues to be resolved at a later date and which may be included as amendments to the Plan are as follows:

Page 8-24, G2, is deleted:

~~2. Westside Corridor Project -- The process to complete preliminary engineering, develop a final EIS and alignment selection, and prepare a financial plan are currently underway. The engineering of the Westside LRT is being undertaken in a manner designed to complement the Sunset Highway improvements recommended in this plan.~~

Page 8-24, G2, added as follows:

2. Transportation Rule/Region 2040 -- The next major update of the RTP will reflect requirements of the Goal 12 Transportation Rule and follow the direction and guidelines

established as part of the Region 2040 planning process. The Transportation Rule requires that regional and local planning bodies develop policies and implementation measures which avoid a principal reliance on a single mode of transportation.

Both the Transportation Rule and the Region 2040 planning process will require the region to better understand the transportation/land use relationship as the region grows to the level allowed in local comprehensive plans. The RTP will be developed as the region's Transportation System Plan (TSP) as called out in the Transportation Rule. As such, it must be consistent with the state TSP (the Oregon Transportation Plan) and will guide local TSPs. As a TSP, the RTP will also be designed to meet state requirements for per capita VMT reductions, increased peak-hour auto occupancy rates, and will examine alternative land use scenarios to address transportation needs.

As part of the Region 2040 planning process, alternative land use and transportation scenarios will be evaluated consistent with RUGGO in an effort to formulate a vision for how and where the region should develop as it approaches build-out of the current comprehensive plans over the next 50 years. To evaluate those scenarios and develop the vision, Metro has begun a three to four-year study. The RTP will be updated as necessary consistent with results of the study and findings of consistency with RUGGO will be developed for the entire document.

grammar

Both the Region 2040 process and Rule 12 implementation will utilize updated employment, population, and travel forecasts.

Page 8-25, under 3. Bi-State Transportation Study, amend as follows:

~~— In conjunction with the Bi-State Policy Advisory Committee, Metro may participate in a study designed to address the long-range land use plans and the associated concerns that have been raised regarding future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington. Metro and the Intergovernmental Resource Center of Clark County (IRC) initiated the Bi-State Transportation Study in the summer of 1990 to address the future capacity deficiencies across the Columbia River between Portland and Clark County, Washington based on anticipated growth to 2010 and an RTP level of improvements. The study is also examining the economic inter-relationships between the two sides of the river and is developing a methodology for evaluating the impact of major transportation investments in the corridor on land use. The study is scheduled for completion in late 1991.~~

grammatical change

A decision must be made on whether to proceed with further evaluation of Bi-State alternatives which would include the alternative land use scenarios and the evaluation of urban form resulting from the Region 2040 Plan process.

Page 8-25, items 4, 5 and 6 are amended to read as follows:

4. I-205 LRT/Milwaukie LRT/Vancouver LRT -- These, in addition to the Westside Corridor (discussed above), have been identified by JPACT as the region's priority corridors for the next 10 years. For the I-205 LRT, the region may withdraw the federal Interstate Funds for the I-205 Buslanes and initiate the preliminary engineering/EIS effort on the I-205 LRT (with the specific process subject to UMTA approval). The Milwaukie LRT will require an alternatives analysis (see also No. 5) and DEIS process and will consider alignments east and west of the Willamette River. This analysis will be coordinated with the river crossing aspects of the Southeast Corridor Study (see No. 5). Two Preliminary Alternatives Analysis studies will be conducted concurrently examining high capacity transit (HCT) alternatives in travel corridors serving north Clackamas County and serving south Clark County, Washington. The I-205/Milwaukie HCT study will select either the Portland CBD to Clackamas Town Center (CTC) via Milwaukie corridor or the I-205 corridor between the Portland International Airport (PIA) and CTC (connecting east Portland and north Clackamas County with Gateway and the Portland CBD via the Banfield LRT) for advancement to a full scale Alternatives Analysis. The study will also select a set of promising alternatives to be carried into the AA and develop an action plan for the corridor not selected for Alternatives Analysis.

The I-5/I-205 Portland-Vancouver HCT study will make a decision on the preferred corridor for HCT development to connect downtown Portland with Clark County. The alternatives are the I-5 corridor connecting the Portland CBD with central Vancouver and the I-205 corridor connecting east Clark County with Gateway (and the Portland CBD via the Banfield LRT). (The I-205 corridor north to Clark County will not be considered for LRT development within the next 20 years but may be considered for LRT development beyond twenty years.) This study will recommend a priority corridor to pursue through an Alternatives Analysis. The timing of the AA for the priority corridor to Clark County will be dependent on the overall funding strategy developed in conjunction with the I-205/Milwaukie study.

5. Build Out Analysis -- The local comprehensive plans are designed to accommodate more growth than will be realized by the year 2005 (the scope of the RTP). As such it is

~~necessary for long-range planning purposes to identify the travel demand associated with the full build-out of the local plans and examine the effects of this level of development on the transportation system beyond the year 2005.~~

- 6-5. Southeast Corridor Study -- The initial phase of the Southeast Corridor Study has been completed. The first phase examined a series of transportation alternatives for minimizing traffic impacts on Johnson Creek Boulevard and recommended an action plan. Several other outstanding transportation issues which exist in the Southeast Corridor extending from the I-5/I-405 loop to U.S. 26 in Boring include: Among the issues being addressed in this corridor are: a) an analysis of transportation alternatives to minimize excessive traffic impacts on Johnson Creek Boulevard; b) an evaluation of the adequacy of Willamette River crossing capacity needs; and c) the engineering and definition of improvements to Highways 224 and 212 in the Sunrise Corridor from McLoughlin Boulevard to U.S. 26 (including the alternative designs of expressway or freeway). Portions of the Sunrise Corridor improvement as currently defined may impact resources protected by Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues).

Page 8-26, amend and renumber as follows:

- 7-6. Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor -- The alignment for the proposed highway improvement in the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor must be determined through preliminary engineering and the EIS process. The Western Bypass was adopted as a contingent recommendation subject to the findings of a land use and environmental analysis. ODOT has begun a study of the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor evaluating the need for transportation improvements in the corridor and assessing the land use consequences of a range of reasonable alternatives. The ODOT Western Bypass Study will incorporate the results of the 1000 Friends of Oregon LUTRAQ Study if that study produces a viable land use/transportation strategy. This process will need to address the nature and scope of the 216th/219th corridor improvement north of T.V. Highway (arterial or limited access facility) and land use issues related to resources protected by Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues).
- 8-7. I-84 to U.S. 26 Connector Mt. Hood Parkway
9. East Bank Freeway Relocation -- Options for relocating the I-5 Freeway on the east bank of the Willamette River are currently being examined. If a decision is reached to significantly alter the nature and scope of improvements to

~~this section of the facility from those previously adopted in the RTP, the RTP must be amended to delete the existing improvements and include the revised project. Relocating the freeway may impact resources protected by the Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues).~~

~~10.8. T.V. Highway Corridor -- The adopted RTP recognizes the need for improvements in the T.V. Highway Corridor west of Highway 217. Two study efforts are currently underway in the corridor to determine the nature and scope of required improvements: the City of Beaverton's Central Beaverton Study (Highway 217-Murray) and ODOT's T.V. Highway Reconnaissance (Murray-Hillsboro). Some of the alternatives being evaluated in the Beaverton Study would necessitate a change to the RTP Principal Arterial System and would probably impact resources protected by Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (see also Land Use Issues). The east-west arterial north of T.V. Highway will construct a five-lane arterial between 110th and Murray Road. The route will parallel Center Street and then utilize the existing Milikan Way between Hocken and Murray Road. The major outstanding issue with this project is the proposed arterial's interface with Highway 217. The city and ODOT must decide whether a new interchange will be developed or whether the arterial will simply cross over Highway 217 with no direct access.~~

ODOT's T.V. Highway Reconnaissance Study will examine issues in the segment of T.V. Highway between Murray Blvd. and Hillsboro.

11.9. Land Use Issues

Page 8-27, under "Land Use Issues," amend as follows:

~~As a result, consistency with the Statewide Land Use Planning Goals must be demonstrated prior to a "build" decision and a final RTP decision. Metro and Washington County have ratified a working agreement and scope of work to provide the information necessary to address the land use issues associated with the proposed facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor (as required by the adoption of the Southwest Corridor Study recommendations). Similar efforts may be required in the other two corridors.~~

~~In addition, several planning studies currently underway to address outstanding transportation issues are evaluating alternatives that would likely impact Goal-protected resources.~~

The Goal 12 Transportation Rule details the criteria for "Exceptions for Transportation Improvements on Rural Land". It requires that an exception adopted as part of a

transportation system plan (TSP) (i.e., the RTP and local comprehensive plans) shall, at a minimum, decide need, mode, function and general location for the proposed facility or improvement. The finding of need must show that the transportation need cannot be accommodated through alternative modes, TSM measures or improvements to existing facilities.

Studies are underway in each of these three corridors to determine whether the transportation needs in those corridors warrant a finding of exception to Goal 14.

Page 8-27, items 4, 5 and 6 are renumbered, retitled, or amended as follows:

12-10. Goods Movement

13-11. Five-Year Transit Development Plan

14-12. Demand Management Planning -- The Rideshare Advisory Subcommittee will examine the candidate demand management strategies identified in the Policy Framework and develop recommendations on which are the most promising to pursue. The FY 92 Unified Work Program identifies a number of air quality planning activities, including a regional demand management planning study. The study will evaluate and adopt demand management programs for inclusion in the RTP to, in part, reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce automobile-related emissions, conserve energy, and generally assist other objectives related to congestion and mobility. Study recommendations will reflect both RTP and Oregon Transportation Plan demand management policies. The study process will coordinate with the Portland Area Demand Management Working Group.

15-13. Access Control Plans

16-14. Light Rail Analyses

Page 8-28, renumber and amend as follows:

17-15. Development Impacts

18-16. U.S. 26/I-405/I-5 Connection

19-17. Cornell and W. Burnside

20. Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) -- Periodic Review -- The modification of the UGB as a result of the periodic review process would require the development of a new series of population and employment projections to reflect such amendments.

18. Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 -- The region must comply with the provisions of the CAAA which include a requirement that the projects included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) demonstrate conformity by reducing regional VMT when compared with a No-Build condition.

21.19. 2010 RTP Update -- After the completion of a regional 2010 population and employment forecast, the travel demand associated with this level of growth will be developed and used as the basis for a 2010 RTP Update. The Interim RTP update scheduled for next year will begin to address the changing policy issues brought about by the Goal 12 Transportation Rule, the Clean Air Act Amendments and RUGGO. This will involve updating the population and employment forecasts and analyzing a new series of travel forecasts for the year 2010. This interim update will provide the opportunity to address alternative transportation strategies consistent with RUGGO but will stop short of thoroughly addressing the analysis of alternative land use scenarios called for in the Transportation Rule. An RTP update will provide 2015 travel forecasts and will implement Region 2040 transportation and land use recommendations.

22. I-5 North/N. Kerby Avenue Off-Ramp -- Based on the results of the privately funded studies called for in Chapter 5 of the Plan, determine if sufficient justification exists for the project to pursue further planning and public involvement efforts (such as an EIS).

functional plans based on the

Page 8-29, delete and add as follows:

- . Gladstone Bridge
- . I-5 North/N.Kerby Avenue Off-Ramp
- . Birdsdale Bypass/Corridor Study

JC:lmk
91-433.ATT
12-11-91

one amendment



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

DATE: January 23, 1992
TO: Rena Cusma, Executive Officer
FROM: Paulette Allen, Clerk of the Council *PA*
RE: TRANSMITTAL OF ORDINANCE NOS. 92-442, 92-446, 92-447 AND
92-433

Attached for your consideration are true copies of the ordinances referenced above adopted by the Council on January 23, 1992.

If you wish to veto any of the ordinances referenced above, I must receive a signed and dated written veto message from you no later than 5:00 p.m., Thursday, January 30, 1992. The veto message, if submitted, will become part of the permanent record. If no veto message is received by the time and date stated above, these ordinances will be considered finally adopted.

I, *Walter Harley*, received this memo and true copies of Ordinance Nos. 92-442, 92-446, 92-447 and 92-433 from the Clerk of the Council on *1-24-92 - 10:46 AM*

ORD.MEM