

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

12-10-1998

Meeting Notes 1998-12-10 [Part A]

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 1998-12-10 [Part A]" (1998). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 257.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/257

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

**METRO**

- R E V I S E D -

Meeting: **JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

Date: **DECEMBER 10, 1998**

Day: **THURSDAY**

Time: **7:30 a.m.**

Place: **METRO, CONFERENCE ROOM 370A-B**

- *1. MEETING REPORT OF NOVEMBER 12, 1998 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- *2. LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR THE ODOT/WDOT I-5 TRADE CORRIDOR GRANT APPLICATION - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno/Chris Deffebach.
- *3. SOUTH WILLAMETTE RIVER CROSSING STUDY - APPROVAL OF PUBLIC OUTREACH STRATEGY REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno/Chris Deffebach.

*Material enclosed.

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: November 12, 1998

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Ed Washington, Susan McLain and Jon Kvistad, Metro Council; Fred Hansen, Tri-Met; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Don Wagner, WSDOT; Sharron Kelley, Multnomah County; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver; Jim Kight, Cities in Multnomah County; Greg Green (alt.), DEQ; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Kay Van Sickel, ODOT; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Roy Rogers, Washington County; and Karl Rohde, Cities in Clackamas County

Guests: Mike Burton, Executive Officer, Metro; Congressman Earl Blumenauer, Oregon's Third District; Rod Monroe (JPACT alt.) and Patricia McCaig, Metro Councilors; Dean Lookingbill (JPACT alt.), Southwest Washington RTC; Alan Willis, Port of Portland; Dick Springer, Citizen; Lynn Dinger and Diane Linn, Multnomah County; Scott Rice, Cornelius City Councilor; Jim Howell, AORTA; Ray Polani, Citizens for Better Transit; Art Lewellan, LOTI; Nohaud Toulan, George Pernsteiner, and Deborah Murdock, Portland State University (PSU); Kevin Downing, Sellwood Moreland Neighborhood Association; Bill Atherton, Lake Oswego City Councilor; Ethan Seltzer, Institute of Metropolitan Studies, PSU; Rod Park, Metro Councilor-Elect; Mary Legry (JPACT alt.), WSDOT; Dave Williams and Kate Deane, ODOT; George Dock, Southeast Portland Resident; Betty Atteberry, Westside Economic Alliance; John Burger, Tigard Resident; David Raphael, Southeast Portland Resident; John Rosenberger, Washington County; Jason Daughn, Senator Ron Wyden's Office; Jesse VanderZanden, Senator Gordon Smith's Office; Mayor Carolyn Tomei, Dan Bartlett and Dary Michael, City of Milwaukie; Bob Stacey (JPACT alt.), Ron Higbee and G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Karen Schilling, Multnomah County; Larry Bissett, Citizen; Maggie Collins; Consultant; Lynn Peterson, 1000 Friends of Oregon; John Charles, Cascade Policy Institute; Elsa Coleman and Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; Meeky Blizzard, Citizen; Alan Hipolito and Geri Washington, Urban

League; Steve Clark, Community Newspapers; Mel Zucker, Citizen; Len Bergstein, Northwest Strategies; Don Arambula, Crandall-Arambula; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Sybil Merrels, Citizen; and countless others that missed the opportunity to sign the meeting roster

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Mike Hoglund, Bridget Wieghart, Tim Raphael, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Jeanna Cernazanu, Marci LaBerge, John Cullerton, Dave Unsworth and Lois Kaplan, Recording Secretary

Media: Larry Hildebrand and Gordon Oliver, The Oregonian; Dawn Phillips, KXL Radio; Linda McDonnell, Daily Journal of Commerce; and Jim Hyde, Channel 12

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Ed Washington. He announced that the JPACT meeting was not to be regarded as a public hearing and that no testimony was to be given. He noted, however, that there would be an opportunity to hear from the public at an upcoming public hearing.

Chair Washington acknowledged and welcomed Congressman Earl Blumenauer; Milwaukie Mayor Carolyn Tomei and her husband; and Metro Councilors-elect Rod Monroe, David Bragdon and Rod Park.

MEETING REPORT

Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Councilor McLain, to approve the October 8, 1998 JPACT meeting report as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

COMMENTS ON REVISED FHWA AND FTA PROJECTS

Andy Cotugno explained that FHWA/FTA are in the process of developing new rules that would provide guidance for implementation of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). Comments on proposed modifications have been drafted and reviewed by TPAC relating to Congestion Pricing (recently renamed Value Pricing), the Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program (TCSP), Environmental Streamlining, Major Investment Studies, Right-of-way and Corridor Preservation, and statewide planning requirements.

Andy welcomed additional comments from the jurisdictions but indicated there were deadlines to comply with and that the comments would have to be sent in a timely manner.

JPACT

November 12, 1998

Page 3

The region is participating in one of the Congestion Pricing pilot study programs (*Traffic Relief Options Study*). Andy reported that a lot of progress has been made locally in this study. A newsletter on the *Traffic Relief Options Study* was distributed.

SUMMARY OF PROJECT SOLICITATIONS FOR MTIP

Andy Cotugno reported that applications resulting from solicitation for the Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) have been compiled and are in the process of being ranked against the technical criteria. Submitted projects total approximately \$331 million while available resources amount to \$75 million for the four-year period between 2000 and 2003.

BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

Dean Lookingbill, Transportation Director of the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), commented on bi-state issues of major concern to the region. He cited examples relating to the South/North LRT project, the bottleneck at Delta Park, the PDX light rail extension and I-205 considerations, improvements to I-5 to alleviate congestion problems in the corridor, possible replacement of the Interstate Bridge, the lack of improvements to I-5 North in Metro's *Strategic Regional Transportation Plan*, and an opportunity to work together to provide good communication and look at good investment opportunities in the corridor.

Dean reported that the Southwest Washington RTC Board of Directors approved the formation of a Bi-State Transportation Policy Advisory Committee at its meeting in October. The committee would be authorized to consider all projects of bi-state significance and would report back to the RTC and JPACT/Metro. Membership would be comprised of RTC and JPACT representatives from Vancouver, Clark County, C-TRAN, WSDOT, Portland, Multnomah County, Tri-Met and ODOT.

The concept would be to initiate a one to six-year strategy between Oregon and Washington that would focus on the need for bi-state investment on I-5 and I-205 and the funding needed to oversee that process; to develop a financing plan; and to identify what the long-term strategy should be in those corridors. Mayor Pollard of Vancouver indicated his support of the proposal and the need to formalize a structure that can look at the regional issues and its impacts on both the Oregon/Washington areas.

Commissioner Hales was also supportive of the proposal, noting the close working relationship that was experienced during the

closure of the Interstate Bridge. He felt it was a worthwhile proposal.

Mike Burton commented on the cooperation among bi-state entities exhibited during and prior to the Interstate Bridge closure, the ensuing work between WDOT and ODOT as a result of that closure, the need to address freight issues, and that it looked like a good approach to deal with such issues.

Appropriately announced at this time was the November 20 bi-state conference sponsored by the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies of Portland State University and Washington State University of Vancouver. The 1998 annual leadership symposium will take place at the Oregon Convention Center. Presentations will be made by Oregon/Washington Governors John Kitzhaber and Gary Locke, respectively. The purpose of the symposium is to foster new partnerships on behalf of the region's economy, environment and quality of life.

Andy Cotugno suggested that action be deferred on this proposal until the scope of the I-5 Trade Corridor Study is clarified. It would help to define the main focus of this group over the next two years and how decisions would be made. Chair Washington suggested that a future JPACT meeting be scheduled on the I-5 Trade Corridor and asked for an update on the I-5/I-205 corridors.

Commissioner Hales felt there's a distinction between the bi-state work related to rail and freight needs versus urban congestion problems. He hoped the opportunity wouldn't be lost due to a study process and was supportive of coordinating the work. The study in question is from the Fremont Bridge to I-205.

Mayor Pollard didn't want to wait too long to form this partnership in view of members' willingness and degree of cooperation.

No action was taken on this agenda item.

STATUS OF SOUTH WILLAMETTE RIVER CROSSING STUDY

A copy of the draft *South Willamette River Crossing Study* options was included in the agenda packet. JPACT had previously recommended study of the options and this draft represents a synopsis of all those alternatives. Andy Cotugno briefly highlighted the retention, rehabilitation and replacement options studied for the Sellwood Bridge and other new crossing options. He commented that it's time to start collecting public and elected official input on preferences and to make decisions. He asked that JPACT take ownership of this proposal, noting that the alternatives involve multi-modal and interjurisdictional issues.

JPACT

November 12, 1998

Page 5

One of the issues is whether or not to proceed with all crossing options identified in the report. Andy spoke of this being a JPACT process and the need for its members to assist with the hearings on the *South Willamette River Crossing Study*. He asked that all the affected jurisdictions provide input, that there be an in-depth discussion on this at a future JPACT meeting, and a decision reached on the type of outreach that should be undertaken.

Commissioner Hales felt that Chris Deffebach had done a great job in preparation of the report, that there were difficult choices to make in working with the communities, but that the document focused too much on traffic, not growth management. He expressed concerns relating to Tacoma Street impacts. He noted that Tacoma Street has been designated as a 2040 Main Street, that it has an adopted neighborhood plan with appropriate zoning, and that the report needs to include a description of how its community members want it to function and the fact that it was crafted as a land use plan. Therefore, transportation should be subservient to land use.

Councilor Rohde was concerned with the ancillary costs of roadways on the Milwaukie or Lake Oswego sides that would provide access to the bridge in addition to the costs of construction of the bridge.

Commissioner Lindquist spoke of I-205 being the only crossing south of the Sellwood Bridge and the need to look at land use plans.

Mike Burton felt that it would be helpful to have Commissioner Hales and Councilor Rohde's comments prior to the next JPACT meeting.

ASSESSMENT ON SOUTH/NORTH LIGHT RAIL

Chair Washington explained there would be no testimony given at this meeting relating to the South/North light rail effort but that opportunity would be given at a December 1 Metro Council Transportation Planning Committee meeting. He asked that members be recognized by the chair in order to have a more efficient meeting.

In addressing the light rail campaign, Chair Washington thanked everyone for their hard work, with particular appreciation extended to Councilor McCaig for doing an excellent job in spearheading the campaign effort under difficult circumstances. He also thanked Tom Walsh for leading the campaign fund-raising effort.

JPACT

November 12, 1998

Page 6

Chair Washington commented that the defeat was not based on the opposition and is clearly a regional issue. He noted that the JPACT members are being asked to work together to solve the region's transportation problems and the implications resulting from failure of the LRT measure.

Fred Hansen spoke of his disappointment of the vote, the need to acknowledge and respect that it was a vote of the people, and to recognize that the transportation problems that brought the proposal forward in the first place will not go away. He commented on the growth of the region and felt that we have the ability to control our future. He cited the need to find ways to address that growth, recognizing the results of this election. He emphasized the need for the region to recommit itself to the 2040 Growth Concept, including a commitment to more compact development, to preserve and protect our neighborhoods as future communities, address air pollution, and ensure neighborhood livability. He pointed out that there wasn't a Plan B.

Fred noted that, in discussions with the Federal Transit Administration this week, it was clear that they were prepared to proceed with a Full-Funding Grant Application for the South/North LRT project. He proposed that JPACT pursue any opportunities or take any steps to recapture some or all of the federal dollars that may bypass this region as a result of the election. He suggested developing a sense of options or alternatives for further analysis; pursuit of capturing any portion or all of the FTA dollars that were committed; and to define what options exist for use of those funds.

Mike Burton expressed concern over the land use implications and the ability to carry out the 2040 Concept Plan as it was based on certain assumptions, those being: the forecasted population growth, movement of people and freight through the region, the two major rivers and railheads, and the ability to move people around in livable communities. Impacted will be Clackamas Regional Center for the lack of transit in that area and Portland State University's future development plans for the same reason. Air quality was another concern noted. Mike asked the JPACT members to return to the table in the next couple of months with some strategies that can be adopted that will help the region implement the adopted 2040 concepts.

Mike Burton pointed out that the \$331 million of MTIP project requests reflected a prudent request. With only \$75 million in resources available, the inability to solve our region's transportation problems will doubly affect the land use issues. A discussion followed on whether the region would be able to sustain the communities within the existing Urban Growth Boundary. Eighteen thousand acres of urban reserves have been

JPACT

November 12, 1998

Page 7

identified. Some of the urban reserves can't move forward because of the lack of transportation infrastructure.

Councilor McCaig expressed her regrets over the failure of the ballot measure, acknowledging the hard work and effort of a lot of people on this 13-week campaign, the fact that it was hard to accept such a loss, but the need to move forward. She noted that the campaign involved extensive phoning, media, and the use of 5,000 lawn signs. The campaign was based on a 65 percent turnout but there was only a 55 percent turnout in the tri-county area.

Councilor McCaig stressed that, in a low voter turnout, when you force the voters to choose among a variety of money measures, you are going to lose some. They didn't apparently see the personal benefit. The issue was one of regional solutions. Patricia cited the need to prioritize what goes on the ballot or we will continue to lose very important measures.

Mayor Drake felt it would be important to poll people to find out exactly what they think will solve the problem. In a recent Beaverton poll, the top three concerns dealt with traffic and the fourth was growth. The need to ascertain how the citizens want to accommodate the growth of 500,000 people was stressed. Key questions being asked in Washington County relate to growth, traffic and transportation issues.

An ongoing problem was discussed with regard to the public's perception that a lot of money already exists for transportation. Mike Burton spoke of the lack of public understanding on what resources are available and how those funds can be used. He felt it was a frustrating issue in that it is difficult to demonstrate to the public what funds are available and how they may be spent. Mike cited the need to address what the region can do in terms of follow-up.

Andy Cotugno indicated that, when the Mt. Hood Freeway funds were canceled and reprogrammed, projects throughout the region were built such as the first light rail transit project and roadway, freeway, bike and bus improvements. Cancellation of plans for the South/North light rail project does not allow for such reprogramming of funds. Federal funding is provided predominantly through formulas and there are few discretionary programs. Discretionary programs are generally small. The only substantial category of discretionary funding is for New Starts. The South/North project has been working through that process for five years. Andy Cotugno spoke of the process of drafting an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in order to be eligible for funding. The FTA is prepared to award approximately \$850 million toward the South/

JPACT

November 12, 1998

Page 8

North LRT project. There are 196 projects in the TEA-21 bill authorized for funding, of which 10-12 might be successful. If these funds are not used for the South/North project, they cannot be reprogrammed for some other regional purpose. Andy also noted that the bond measure was for \$475 million and cannot be used for something else.

Fred Hansen asked about the constraints of the FTA funds. Andy explained that the federal process encompasses a project from the Clackamas Town Center to north of downtown Vancouver. Any project would have to compete well with their criteria. Some of the work from the EIS could be utilized.

Councilor McLain noted that the MTIP/STIP projects are being built on the assumption there would be a complete light rail system. She felt the public needs to have a better understanding and that it would be irresponsible not to complete the system as the voters do not wish to deal with congestion. She cited the importance of knowing what the public's vote meant.

Mike Burton spoke of the road improvements that were connected in the South/North light rail project corridor. There were road-related projects that were included that would need to be funded separately. Some opportunities will be lost for some of those projects.

Commissioner Lindquist indicated he was deeply hurt that the light rail measure failed, noting that planning for the project has been in the works since the 70's. He emphasized the fact that land use and transportation are tied together and that, if we don't resolve this, the land use plan will be in jeopardy. Commissioner Lindquist spoke of the Portland region being the model for the nation. He noted that 60 percent of the Clackamas County residents now go outside the county to work and there's need to change that pattern. Sixty percent of the land for urban expansion is in Clackamas County. The need for resolution of the transportation/land use issues was stressed. Commissioner Lindquist pointed out that you can't build enough highways or provide enough bus lines to take care of the problem. He urged JPACT to find the answer to the problem and not to lose sight of the objective.

In further discussion, it was noted that the air quality problem actually starts in Columbia and Clark Counties. Commissioner Lindquist also saw need to do what we can to relate to the public and urged everyone to stay the course.

Councilor Monroe expressed a debt of gratitude to Councilor McCaig for her professionalism and judgment used in the light rail campaign effort. He felt the public couldn't relate to the

terminus in Oregon City and Vancouver and that it was considered a bi-state problem. Councilor Monroe cited the importance of resolving the problem north of the river and felt it would be more successful if it were a bi-state project. Apparently, the public didn't perceive that the project would solve the major problems we face.

Councilor Rohde did not feel that this was a roads versus transit issue and felt that the voters believe the solution is through rail. Half of the people who voted still firmly believe that we need to address a transit issue along with alternative modes. The public was not supportive of the rail option but, in the Transit Choices for Livability process, there was evidence of support for alternative modes. Councilor Rohde commented that this was an attempt on our part to construct the South/North light rail project to address a coming problem and the voters did not see the problem as clearly as we did. In a recent poll, 48 percent of the respondents felt that congestion was not a problem in the metro area. The region needs to be able to demonstrate why we need to be proactive, how it will be more cost-effective, and why we will spend fewer dollars if we act now. Councilor Rohde did not regard this vote as a message to find monies to expand freeways.

Congressman Earl Blumenauer commented that he is committed to being a federal partner with this region in trying to implement the regional plan. He noted that there is no region in the country that has done the job this region has in involving its citizenry. The Federal Government was prepared to sign a big contract because the region has done an outstanding job. He noted that he will continue to work with the region to see if we can hold onto some of those funds.

Congressman Blumenauer reported that there are 196 different projects requesting funds through TEA-21. It is because of the success of this region that they have looked at the patterns we have. He felt we would ultimately be successful. \$2 billion has already been invested in the rail component. He felt the public's motto must be "we will build no line before its time." He noted that there is no comprehensive approach to people in this region as we are talking about a 100-year project. In his judgment, that can't be said about any road or bridge. Congressman Blumenauer felt we would have been in construction by this time if the Clark County voters had been supportive of the project in 1997.

Elements he stressed were: to make sure we keep faith with the public who made the plan possible; the fundamental change in how financing is taking place; and the fact that people like light rail. He noted that the state has been "asleep at the switch" on

infrastructure for six years. He reinforced his commitment to work with the region for those corridors and that the people not be left behind.

Metro Council Presiding Officer Kvistad noted that he had the opportunity to go to King City following the vote. This was not a referendum on land use planning. They were specific about the fact that their transportation doesn't work, that this was such a massive ballot, and concerned about the extent of the measure. He felt the region shouldn't read too much into it.

Councilor Kelley cited the need to underscore the lessons learned before making plans for the next election. She noted that the South/North light rail measure didn't pass to the extent expected in Multnomah County. She felt that the cities and counties are competing with each other on funding measures and was surprised at how many of the ballot measures went down in Multnomah County.

Mike Burton reminded the committee that there has never been a silver bullet for transportation issues. The region has worked on a multi-modal basis over the years to consider all aspects of transportation but the missing component of a complete light rail system puts the whole planning process in harm's way. Mike emphasized the need to ensure the 2040 land use plans are maintained. He felt the committee should reconvene to examine the meaning of the vote and to discuss the strategies that are falling out -- a time for retrospect.

Fred Hansen agreed with the need for that analysis and that it would be helpful to focus on whether there is any reasonable way of recapturing some portion of the \$866 million of FTA dollars and whether there are some additional, logical steps that we can take that will allow us to achieve some of the goals (citing examples such as congestion, air quality and Transit Choices for Livability).

Mayor Drake expressed regret about the outcome of the light rail vote but sensed that it was a question of priorities after looking at all the possibilities. He noted that Washington County is still looking at commuter rail. He commented on a contract with Tri-Met in regard to Transit Choices for Livability. Mayor Drake noted that there's a healthy economy in the region and the number 1 issue is jobs. He noted, however, that things are cyclical and that that could change. He also commented about freight being a critical issue, noting that the AOI supports a 6-cent gas tax increase at the Legislature. He felt that citizens perceive there are other solutions to be explored but he was not about to give up.

Jesse VanderZanden of Senator Gordon Smith's office reported that Congress worked hard to obtain the authorization language under TEA-21. The Oregon delegation worked well together to ensure

JPACT

November 12, 1998

Page 11

that the South/North LRT project was placed on the list. He noted the New Starts authorization funds for multi-modal needs in that corridor.

Commissioner Rogers appreciated the comments made on behalf of Washington County. He noted that there were a number of money measures on the ballot, some of which failed. He cited the importance of discussing alternatives or options in the South/North corridor that might be explored. He was resentful that comments were made about Washington County not being supportive of the South/North light rail project.

The linkage between benefits and costs was also addressed. Commissioner Rogers noted that no part of the South/North light rail route touches Washington County but that many there supported it. He emphasized the importance of better public education and the need for options. He commented that the Washington County Coordinating Committee wants to be proactive and is looking at a multitude of solutions. The need to have contingency plans and to be good stewards of government run as a business was also stressed. Commissioner Rogers indicated that Washington County will continue to share the region's resolve, its pain, and be supportive. Washington County believes that commuter rail is a fine alternative. They are discussing a commuter rail program that encompasses 18 miles and will cost approximately \$81 million. In addition, Washington County will be pressing forward with many of its programs as well.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Chair Washington announced that a public hearing would be scheduled on the South/North light rail bond measure on Tuesday, December 1, by Metro Council's Transportation Planning Committee. He encouraged public comments at that time. He noted that four years ago, there wasn't the national competition for such funds that there is today and agreed with Mayor Drake on the need to look at this more extensively and consider more options.

In closing, Chair Washington thanked Andy Cotugno and Richard Brandman and all the staff for their hard work toward the South/North LRT effort.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
JPACT Members



METRO

December 10, 1998

Kenneth R. Wykle
Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
400 7th Street SW
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Wykle:

On behalf of Metro and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), I would like to express our support for the Oregon Department of Transportation's application to the National Corridor Planning and Development Program for the I-5 Trade Corridor Study. The Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation jointly will conduct this study as a bi-state effort. Metro is the directly elected regional government that serves more than 1.3 million residents in the Portland metropolitan area. JPACT provides a forum at Metro for local and regional elected officials and representatives of agencies involved in transportation to resolve transportation needs in this region.

Congress has designated Interstate-5 as a High Priority Corridor. As the only continuous freeway on the west coast linking Mexico to Canada, the corridor is critical to national and international trade. I-5 is also important to the state and regional economies along the freeway. In the Portland/Vancouver area, I-5 serves interstate trade and provides access to the region's largest industrial areas and to intermodal facilities including the Ports of Vancouver and Portland, Portland International Airport and the intermodal yards for Burlington Northern/Sante Fe and Union Pacific railroads. This trade activity occurs within the context of a rapidly growing bi-state urban area. Further, the twin I-5 Bridges across the Columbia River in this corridor are two of the oldest lift-span bridges on the Interstate System (1917 and 1958). Bridge capacity limitations and maintenance requirements affect goods moved by air, rail, barge and truck and passenger travel.

On behalf of JPACT, I urge the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to allocate TEA-21 funds from the National Corridor Planning and Development Program to the I-5 Trade Corridor Study. JPACT is committed to working with the Departments of Transportation in Oregon and Washington and others in the region in the I-5 Trade

Mr. Kenneth R. Wykle
Page 2
December 10, 1998

Corridor Study to examine the multi-modal, bi-state and land use and growth management issues necessary to identify trade corridor improvements.

Federal funding, coupled with our local funding commitments, will establish the resources necessary to tackle this problem. JPACT believes that the I-5 Trade Corridor in the Portland/Vancouver area is a valuable investment for federal funds.

Sincerely,

Ed Washington
JPACT Chair

EW:CD:lmk

Portland-Vancouver Interstate 5 Trade Corridor Study

Purpose Statement:

The Portland-Vancouver Interstate 5 Trade Corridor Study will evaluate strategies to assure I-5 adequately serves interstate freight movements, provides access to the ports in Portland and Vancouver, and provides access to critical waterside industrial property. The study will develop a strategy to address these needs with an understanding of existing environmental and fiscal constraints. The project will:

- provide a forum for discussion of the Interstate Bridge and its role in the regional economy;
- quantify the impact of I-5 congestion on trade activities;
- engage a Blue Ribbon Committee of business and civic leaders in a discussion of the issues surrounding potential improvements to the I-5 corridor; and
- identify a range of improvements to I-5 to improve access to waterside freight and industrial properties.

A Policy Committee made up of high level representatives from the project partners will guide the project. The project partners are the Washington and Oregon Departments of Transportation, RTC and Metro, the Ports of Vancouver and Portland, and the cities of Vancouver and Portland. The Policy Committee will appoint a Blue Ribbon Committee of business and civic leaders to review study work products and develop recommendations.

Work Plan:

Phase One: Analyze corridor conditions and reach agreement on a range of solutions to be studied in Phase Two. The products of Phase One are:

- (a) A planning grant application for the National Corridor Planning and Development Program in TEA-21. The grant will be used to fund Phase Two of the study.
- (b) A detailed analysis of the existing conditions in the corridor for surface and freeway transportation, rail transportation and transit.
- (c) An analysis of critical factors in the region's economy influenced by I-5.
- (d) An analysis of future conditions in the corridor for transportation and economics.
- (e) Identification and analysis of a range of possible solutions to improve freight mobility in the corridor.
- (f) Blue Ribbon Committee recommendations on the next steps the project should pursue.

Phase Two: Refine, locate, and analyze improvement alternatives developed in Phase One.

- (a) Engineering of each alternative at a broad level of detail. Some areas of more specific detail may be required where environmental impacts or clearances are critical.
- (b) Comparative analysis of environmental, economic, traffic, land use, etc., effects of each feasible alternative.
- (c) A program of stakeholder involvement to inform and obtain feedback on merits and viability of alternatives considered.
- (d) An analysis of financing strategies to implement selected alternative.

Study Funding: The first phase of the study is funded through the Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation. In addition, Metro has applied for \$500,000 for MTIP funds.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED ACTION TO NARROW THE OPTIONS FOR THE NEXT STEPS IN THE SOUTH WILLAMETTE RIVER CROSSING STUDY

Date: December 10, 1998

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action recommends narrowing options for the next steps for the South Willamette River Crossing Study. The next step in the study is to get public comments on the study findings. JPACT will use public comments to develop a recommendation on a multi-modal river crossing strategy for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan. The Project Management Group for the South Willamette River Crossing Study has recommended a proposed action for JPACT, as described in Attachment A.

This action represents a commitment by JPACT to support the 2040 Growth Concept by addressing the river crossing problems in the corridor between the Marquam and I-205 bridges and to develop regional support for a crossing strategy to include in the Regional Transportation Plan.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Study Background

The Sellwood Bridge is safe today but it is nearing the end of its life-span. Built in 1925, the bridge is considered structurally old and the lanes and sidewalks are narrow. For safety and service levels, the Sellwood Bridge needs to be upgraded or replaced. Due to its age the bridge requires more and more maintenance, raising questions of cost-effectiveness compared to the cost of bridge replacement.

The Sellwood Bridge serves the cities of Portland, Milwaukie, Lake Oswego, West Linn, Oregon City and Gladstone. In the past 73 years, growth in these areas has created a greater demand for river crossing than the bridge can accommodate, resulting in delays on the bridge and increasing traffic through the Sellwood neighborhood. The combination of its Multnomah County ownership, Portland, Clackamas and Washington County use and location in the City of Portland, makes the Sellwood Bridge a regional issue.

Metro's role in the study is to bring jurisdictions together to agree on a strategy for crossing the river that supports regional and local land use and growth management strategies. Metro initiated the South Willamette River Crossing Study in 1994 with public meetings and workshops to solicit comments on the nature of the crossing problem and potential improvement options. The public identified over 20 crossing options for consideration in the study.

At the same time, the region was evaluating alternative land use scenarios and growth management strategies. By 1995, the region adopted the 2040 Growth Concept and began the process of implementing the land use and transportation changes that are needed to support the concept. Among other land use designations, the 2040 Growth Concept designates Tacoma Street as a Main Street in the Sellwood neighborhood, Lake Oswego and West Linn as Town Centers, and Milwaukie and Oregon City as Regional Centers. The 2040 Growth Concept results in increased demand for crossing the river while also calling for increasing the pedestrian-friendly and mixed use nature of Main Streets, Town Centers and Regional Centers.

In 1997, JPACT and Metro Council adopted a short list of options for evaluation in the South Willamette River Crossing study. The options reflect a range of strategies that could accommodate travel demand and help support the 2040 Growth Concept. These options are:

- Modifications to the west end of the Ross Island Bridge with and without a new bridge parallel to the Ross Island Bridge to add capacity.
- Preservation of the existing Sellwood Bridge: 1) in its current configuration; 2) upgraded to meet seismic, bike and pedestrian standards; or 3) close to traffic but leave it open as a bicycle and pedestrian-only facility.
- Replacement of the Sellwood Bridge as a two or four-lane facility.
- A new crossing in Clackamas County in Milwaukie, North Lake Oswego or near Marylhurst College as a two or four-lane facility.
- Additional transit services and programs that reduce travel demand.

In addition to JPACT and Metro Council action, the City of Portland also approved the options for consideration in the study. Other jurisdictions in the corridor reviewed the options at their council or commission workshops.

Study Findings

In order to assess how well the options could support the 2040 Growth Concept, the evaluation produced travel demand forecasts and assessed the effect of this traffic in supporting land use and growth management strategies. In addition to the 2040 Growth Concept, the evaluation considered the effect of the crossing and the traffic generated by the crossing on local plans and policies. In the corridor, these plans include the Sellwood – Moreland Neighborhood Plan, the North Macadam development plan in Portland, the Mary’s Woods plan in Lake Oswego, the Milwaukie Waterfront plan and the Lake Oswego Town Center plans. The evaluation also identified the impacts to existing communities on both sides of the river.

The evaluation estimated the capital cost for the crossing and the crossing approaches. On other facilities approaching the crossing, such as Highway 43, Highway 224, Highway 99E, and other arterial roads the evaluation identified the need to address the additional traffic generated by the options if JPACT recommends the option for further consideration. Identifying costs to accommodate additional travel on these approach facilities will require an analysis of a range of options and public policy choices which would be undertaken if the JPACT wants to begin the environmental process on any of the options. The study also developed costs to preserve the existing Sellwood Bridge in today's dollars over 100 years, which is the estimated life of a new bridge and is used for comparison to the cost of replacing the existing bridge with a new bridge.

The draft newsletter, attached as Attachment B, summarizes some of the key study findings. This newsletter was distributed to JPACT in November and will be revised pending the JPACT recommendation for the next steps in the study.

Recommended Next Steps for Study

With the technical evaluation complete, the next step is for JPACT to share the findings with the public and develop a crossing recommendation for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan. JPACT faces several approaches to this next step:

A. Share the findings for all options with conclusions but not recommendations.

This presents all of the options for public comment. JPACT would take public comment on all options, develop recommendations and hold public hearings on the recommendations.

B. Identify the most promising options for public comment. This identifies the options that JPACT recommends as most promising and those they recommend be set aside for public comment. JPACT would take public comment, develop a recommendation and hold public hearings on the recommendation.

C. Develop a recommendation for a specific option. This presents a recommendation for public comment. JPACT would develop a recommendation and hold a public hearing on the recommendation.

The Project Management Group (PMG) has developed a recommendation for the next steps in the study for JPACT consideration. The PMG recommendation is attached as Attachment A.

To: JPACT

From: South Willamette River Crossing Study Project Management Group
Andy Cotugno, Metro
Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County
Harold Lasley, Multnomah County
Steve Dotterer, City of Portland
Tom Coffee, City of Lake Oswego
Dan Drentlaw, City of West Linn
Susan Heiser, City of Milwaukie
Dave Williams, Oregon Department of Transportation
Ron Higbee, Tri-Met

Subject: Recommended Next Steps for Narrowing the Options in the South
Willamette River Crossing Study

Date: December 10, 1998

Background

The Project Management Group (PMG) has been meeting for several years to guide the direction of the South Willamette River Crossing Study. The purpose of the study is to identify and prioritize multi-modal crossing improvements over the next 20 years for the Willamette River Corridor between the Marquam and I-205 bridges that should be recommended in the Regional Transportation Plan. Metro's role in the study is to bring jurisdictions together to agree on a crossing strategy that best supports the 2040 Growth Concept. JPACT and Metro Council adopted the options for evaluation in the study in 1997.

With the completion of the technical analysis, JPACT is now at an important juncture. To assist JPACT, the PMG has met and provides the following proposed recommendation:

Proposed Recommendation

After reviewing the study findings, the PMG recommends that JPACT seek public comment on the most promising options rather than on all of the options or on a specific recommended action. The advantage of narrowing the list for public comment is that it will focus the discussion on the most technically viable and promising choices.

Of the options, the PMG recommends that JPACT recognize that there are four areas of consideration:

1. Options that the region should consider further but not in the context of the Sellwood Bridge:

- *Improvements to the Ross Island Bridge.* The technical analysis showed that improvements to the Ross Island Bridge would not reduce travel demand on the Sellwood Bridge and should not be considered in the context of meeting that need. Ross Island Bridge improvements could support other land use plans in that area and should be considered separately in that context.
- *Improvements to the I-205 corridor and the Oregon City Bridge.* Technical analysis showed that improvements to the I-205 and Oregon City bridges would not reduce travel demand on the Sellwood Bridge. However, these improvements should be considered in the context of meeting other needs in Oregon City, West Linn and the I-205 corridor.

2. Options that the region should set aside as they do not address South Willamette River Crossing or other needs:

- *A crossing at North Lake Oswego and near Marylhurst as either two or four-lane bridges.* The technical analysis showed that a crossing at these locations would have little impact on reducing traffic on the Sellwood Bridge or meeting study objectives. In addition, while improving access between the east and west sides of Clackamas County, these crossings would not support the 2040 growth concept. Additional travel across the river would increase traffic on Hwy 43 and 99E and on other roads through Town Centers and Neighborhoods to reach the crossing. The effect of this travel would be to create a conflict with adopted land use and transportation plans and policies on both sides of the river.
- *A full rehabilitation of the existing Sellwood Bridge to bring it to current design standards.* Technical analysis showed that full rehabilitation of the existing bridge could cost more than to replace it as a two-lane bridge.
- *Use of the existing Sellwood Bridge for bicycles and pedestrians only.* Eliminating vehicular access on the existing bridge would not help meet the river crossing travel needs that the 2040 Growth Management concept creates.

3. Options that the region should consider further to meet the South Willamette River crossing needs:

The PMG identifies two options for JPACT consideration to meet South Willamette River crossing needs:

EITHER

Further consideration of additional roadway capacity and alternative modes (bicycle, pedestrian and bus) across the river with consideration of a two or four lane crossing at Sellwood and in Milwaukie. This option recognizes that the 2040 Growth Concept creates travel demands across the river and that adding capacity could support the 2040 Growth Concept with appropriate design and mitigation. Unlike the other crossings in Clackamas County, the crossing at Milwaukie could significantly reduce traffic on the Sellwood Bridge and the Tacoma Main Street.

OR

Consideration of not adding roadway capacity and, instead, focusing investments on maintaining the existing Sellwood Bridge and improving its ability to serve pedestrian and bicycle travel. Though the 2040 Growth Concept will increase river crossing demands, this option recognizes that the environmental impacts of adding capacity would outweigh the benefits and that adding capacity is not the most effective means to support the land use and growth management strategies in the 2040 Growth Concept. Instead, efforts should focus on mitigating the negative effects of traffic and developing alternatives.

4. Options that the region should consider further to meet the South Willamette River crossing needs in conjunction with adding or not adding roadway capacity:

The PMG recommends that JPACT consider programs that would reduce vehicular demand across the river. The technical analysis showed that, while not relieving congestion, such programs could be effective in improving mobility. These programs include:

- Additional bus service, including new east-west routes across the river
- Commuter rail from McMinnville or Newburg to Milwaukie and between Lake Oswego and Portland.
- Additional travel demand management programs that reduce auto use for work trips
- Additional Transit Pass programs that reduce transit fares for riders.
- Improved bicycle and pedestrian connections across the river.

Next Steps

Once JPACT identifies the preferred option to present to the public, a recommendation for appropriate outreach will be developed. Chief among the decisions before JPACT is the determination as to whether a recommended crossing strategy should include adding roadway capacity across the river or not.

If JPACT recommends that meeting the goals of the 2040 Growth Concept could be best accomplished without adding capacity, then JPACT would not forward options for

consideration in an environmental impact statement. If JPACT's recommendation is to preserve the existing Sellwood Bridge to meet the river crossing needs and support the 2040 Growth Concept, then the future efforts would focus on financing the needed maintenance and rehabilitation projects.

If JPACT concludes that, to meet the travel demands associated with the 2040 Growth Concept, additional river crossing capacity is needed, then JPACT could identify which of the options should be considered in an environmental impact statement. Following the completion of the environmental process, JPACT would then decide whether or not to build the additional capacity

South Willamette River Crossing Study options for review

Draft

November 1998

Willamette River Crossing Study

Metro's role in this project is to bring jurisdictions together to agree on a strategy for crossing the river that supports regional and local land use and growth management strategies. Metro has been working with interested citizens and local jurisdictions to recommend a long-term bridge strategy for the Regional Transportation Plan. The Willamette River Crossing Study is evaluating the 20-year crossing needs for the Willamette, between the Marquam Bridge in Portland and the I-205 Bridge in Oregon City. The primary concern in this area is the age and condition of the Sellwood Bridge and accessibility and mobility needs of study area residents and businesses. Metro Council adopted options for evaluation in the study in 1997.

Sellwood Bridge background

The Sellwood Bridge is safe today, but it is nearing the end of its lifespan. Built in 1925, the bridge is considered structurally old and the lanes and sidewalks are too narrow. For safety and service levels, the Sellwood Bridge needs to be upgraded or replaced. Due to its age, the bridge requires more and more maintenance. This raises the question of whether the cost to maintain the bridge will become more expensive in the long-term than the cost to replace it.

The Sellwood Bridge serves the cities of Portland, Gladstone, Milwaukie, Oregon City, West Linn and Lake Oswego, which have all grown significantly in the past 73 years. Bridge congestion has grown as the population has increased.

In 1930, five years after the Sellwood Bridge was built, the population of Multnomah County was 338,241 and Clackamas County had just 46,205 people. By 1997, Multnomah County had almost doubled to 639,000 and Clackamas County soared to 317,700. The forecast for 2015 estimates Multnomah County growing to 741,690 people. Clackamas County is expected to grow to 460,166 people – a 10-fold increase from 1930.

Decisions to be made

Multnomah County owns the Sellwood Bridge. The county, the public and other jurisdictions need to make a decision about the Sellwood Bridge. Should it be upgraded and maintained, or replaced with another bridge? If it is replaced, where should a new bridge be built: in Multnomah County or fast-growing Clackamas County? How wide

should it be? Which bridge designs are best and how do they differ in cost? How would the community be affected? What is the region willing to spend on the crossing solution(s)? How will service be provided for bicycles and pedestrians? The option, or package of options, selected by the public and involved governments, will be studied further in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS will analyze the benefits, costs and impacts of the proposed river crossing options. Following public review of the EIS, funding will need to be found for construction.

How decisions will be made

The next step in the process will be a public workshop to review study information and findings. Following public review, decision-making committees will review the choices and public comments and make recommendations to the Metro Council. The decision-making committees are: the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC), a senior staff level policy committee, and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). JPACT is a committee of local elected officials, Metro Councilors and other officials who coordinate transportation decisions for the region. Formal public hearings will be held by the Metro Council. The Council is expected to hold the public hearing and make a final decision on the South Willamette bridge crossing in early to mid-1999.

The problem

There are five areas of concern that make up the overall bridge crossing problem:

1. Population and employment growth occurred without adequate investment in bridges crossing the Willamette River.
2. Willamette River crossing travel demand exceeds capacity in the peak travel hours.
3. Bicycle and pedestrian crossing options are inadequate.
4. The Sellwood Bridge is approaching the end of its expected life span
5. The region faces conflicting views about crossing options (for example, drivers want less congestion but neighborhoods don't want more traffic).

Evaluating the options

Various options were identified for addressing the Willamette River crossing. The options have been evaluated on how well they:

- Balance land use and travel needs in support of 2040 regional growth concept and local plans and policies.
- Move people across the river and improve access
- Reduce travel demand (provide more car, bus, bicycle and pedestrian choices)
- Reduce traffic congestion
- Minimize neighborhood impacts
- Lessen environmental impacts
- Address cost effectiveness

How to get involved

Opportunities to participate in this study include the following:

- Attend public workshops and hearings
- Request a speaker for your neighborhood, civic or business group
- Contact your elected officials at one of the involved jurisdictions
- Check the Transportation web site at www.metro-region.org
- Call the Transportation Hotline (797-1900) for information or to leave a message
- Call 797-1857 to speak with a staff member

Options for review

There are three general areas being considered for a variety of different bridge options: Sellwood Bridge, Ross Island Bridge and several locations in Clackamas County (see map). The bridge options may be selected individually or in combination. The study horizon year is 2015 and the crossing options are balanced with improvements to alternative modes of travel and demand management programs that encourage people to carpool, bike, walk or use transit instead of driving. The goal is to minimize travel demand in the corridor prior to adding new capacity. The bridge options below include estimated 1988 costs to build and maintain a bridge over the next 100 years. This is the typical life span of a bridge.

Sellwood Bridge options

Five Sellwood Bridge options either replace or preserve the existing bridge.

PRESERVE

Preserve existing Sellwood Bridge under three different scenarios.

Each option would require repair and funding (between \$23 million to \$72 million).

- **Retain existing function** – retain same level of bridge standards. Improvements would be made to the structure, including limited seismic retrofits, replacing several approach ramps and painting to keep the bridge in service.

Cost: \$40 million

Trade-offs: Least disruptive option, but it would not reduce traffic congestion or improve bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Existing load limits would remain in effect. Risk of bridge failure would remain in case of an earthquake or accident.

- **Rehabilitate to current standards** – includes additional seismic retrofits, replacing more approach ramps, widening existing lanes, adding pedestrian and bicycle facilities, reinforcing the structure to allow a return to standard load limits.

Cost: \$72 million

Trade-offs: This option would not affect traffic congestion but would improve pedestrian and bicycle access.

- **Close Sellwood Bridge to vehicle use** – maintain for bicycles and pedestrians to use the bridge.

Cost: \$23 million

Trade-offs: This option would improve service for bikes and walkers at low cost. Fewer total people would cross the river, and business and neighborhood access would be reduced. This option would increase the use of remaining bridges.

REPLACE

There are two replacement options: a two-lane or four-lane bridge with a full interchange at Hwy. 43 similar to existing bridge.

Replace the Sellwood Bridge with a new two-lane span

Cost: \$45 million to \$59 million, depending on design

Trade-offs: A two-lane bridge would cost \$5 million to \$19 million more than preserving the bridge in its existing function. It would improve bicycle and pedestrian conditions but would not relieve traffic congestion on the bridge. Traffic volumes forecast for Tacoma Street with the two-lane bridge would conflict with community goals to develop Tacoma for pedestrian access and mixed-use development.

Replace the Sellwood Bridge with a new four-lane span

Cost: \$59 million to \$81 million, depending on design and changes to Hwy. 43 and Tacoma Street.

Impacts: A four-lane span would increase traffic by 15 percent on the bridge and on Tacoma Street. The additional lanes and improvements would reduce bridge congestion and improve conditions for bicycles and pedestrians. Additional traffic in the Sellwood neighborhood would conflict with community goals to improve pedestrian access and encourage mixed-use land development. Turn restrictions and/or widening to allow left turns on Tacoma is one possible option to accommodate additional traffic but increases to allow more autos to use Tacoma further conflicts with goals to increase pedestrian access. There would be additional costs associated with improving Tacoma Street to handle forecast

traffic volumes and address policy and design standards. The order of magnitude costs are still being developed.

(Insert “Who Uses the Sellwood Bridge” pie chart here)

Three new bridge options in Clackamas County

There are three possible new bridge crossings in Clackamas County: Milwaukie, North Lake Oswego and Marylhurst. They reduce demand on the Sellwood and I-205 bridges and serve Clackamas County travel needs.

Milwaukie Crossing – Two new bridge crossing options between Riverwood and Milwaukie are:

- New two-lane bridge between Riverwood and Milwaukie with a signal intersection at Hwy. 43 and either a signal intersection at SE 17th Street or direct access to Hwy. 224.

Cost: \$42 million to \$97 million depending on design and Hwy. 224 connections

- New four-lane bridge between Riverwood and Milwaukie with a full interchange at Hwy. 43, direct ramp access to Hwy. 224 and signal access to SE 17th Avenue.

Cost: \$114 million to \$157 million depending on bridge design and connections to Hwy. 224.

Trade-offs: The new Milwaukie crossing, especially the four-lane option, would reduce congestion on the Sellwood Bridge by shifting much of the Clackamas County travel that currently uses the Sellwood Bridge to the new bridge. It would be easier to get to Milwaukie but would impact existing and planned development along the west side of the river. Additional traffic would add congestion to other roads and would conflict with local travel. The two-lane option would not meet demand and would become congested. Seventy-eight percent of the bridge traffic would start and/or end in Clackamas County

North Lake Oswego Crossing – New bridge crossing options between North Lake Oswego and Hwy. 99E via Courtney Road are:

- A new two-lane bridge between North Lake Oswego and Hwy. 99E via Courtney Road with signal intersections at Hwy 43 and the new bridge at River Road and Courtney Road.

Cost: \$71 million to \$81 million depending on design.

- A new four-lane bridge between North Lake Oswego with a full interchange north of Terwilliger Boulevard on Hwy 43 and at Hwy. 99E and Courtney Road.

Cost: \$122 million to \$145 million depending on design.

Trade-offs: The North Lake Oswego crossing meets travel needs missed by other possible bridges. It takes less traffic from existing bridges and attracts more new bridge traffic than other options. It adds traffic to existing roads leading to the bridge, which would increase congestion and conflict with adopted community goals. A new bridge would impact existing development on both sides of the river. The two-lane option would not offer enough capacity and would become overly congested. About 89 percent of the bridge traffic would start and/or end in Clackamas County.

Marylhurst crossing – There are two bridge crossing options between Hwy. 43 near Marylhurst College and Hwy. 99E via Concord Road:

- New two-lane bridge between Willamette Drive (Hwy 43) to Hwy. 99E via Concord Road. Hwy. 43 would be widened to four lanes at the bridge approach.

Cost: \$58 million to \$72 million depending on design.

- New four-lane bridge between Willamette Drive (Hwy. 43) to Hwy. 99E via Courtney Road.

Cost: \$119 million to \$137 million depending on design.

Trade-offs: A Marylhurst crossing would be used mostly by people traveling within Clackamas County. It would have little effect on the Sellwood Bridge but would reduce traffic on the I-205 bridge. The new crossing would impact existing and planned development on both sides of the river. The bridge would increase traffic on roads on both sides of the river, which would not meet community goals. About 99 percent of bridge traffic would start and/or end in Clackamas County.

Ross Island Bridge options

Two Ross Island Bridge options are included to determine whether improving bottlenecks in crossings at the north end of the region could reduce crossing traffic in the rest of the area. The two options for the Ross Island are as follows:

PRESERVE

Keep existing Ross Island Bridge – Use existing Ross Island Bridge with modified ramps at west end. This option replaces the ramp between the Ross Island Bridge and Barbur Boulevard and shifts traffic to Kelly Avenue.

Cost: \$11 million for road changes, more depending on neighborhood improvements.

Trade-offs: The modified bridge ramps would reduce traffic in Corbett/Lair Hill neighborhoods but would not reduce traffic on the existing Sellwood Bridge.

BUILD PARALLEL BRIDGE

Build new Ross Island bridge – Build a new three-lane bridge north of the Ross Island Bridge for use together with the old bridge; three lanes of traffic on each bridge. New ramps would connect directly from I-405 to the bridge. Both bridges would have bike and pedestrian facilities.

Cost: \$115 million to \$132 million.

Trade-offs: A new Ross Island Bridge next to the existing bridge would reduce demand on downtown bridges but has little effect on the Sellwood Bridge. It would increase traffic delays on I-405. It would remove some traffic from Corbett/Lair Hill neighborhoods. Existing communities would be impacted, reducing development opportunities at the east and west ends of the bridge.

Increased transit options

This option focuses on additional transit service and transportation demand management (TDM). Transit service would be increased throughout the region, assuming more east-west transit service between Clackamas County, Washington County and Portland, plus new commuter rail service. Transportation management associations would encourage transit use to reduce the number of trips to work.

Costs: Cost to purchase buses and operate additional service throughout the region could be approximately \$45 million per year.

Trade-offs: Additional transit service would increase ridership by ten percent. It would reduce traffic congestion at some locations but not on bridges. It would not improve bike or pedestrian access across the river.

Choices to be made

Improving access across the Willamette River does not have a single easy answer. A new four-lane bridge would provide better auto access but would impact neighborhoods more. A two-lane bridge would impact neighborhoods less, but would not address traffic congestion problems. Location and design of the bridge are also important. As we develop a recommendation, here are some of the questions and community values to consider.

What are the overall trade-offs and choices?

Would it be better to preserve an existing bridge or build a new one?

Build a two-lane or four-lane bridge? What are the trade-offs and costs?

What is the best location and how is the neighborhood affected?

Is more than one choice possible? What options would work best together?

What is the region willing to finance?

**Population growth and forecast
affecting the Sellwood Bridge
(To be made into a chart)**

1930

Multnomah County	338,241
Clackamas County	<u>46,205</u>
Total	384,446

1997

Multnomah County	639,000
Clackamas County	<u>317,700</u>
Total	956,700

2015 forecast

Multnomah County	741,690
Clackamas County	<u>460,166</u>
Total	1,201,856

Population figures from Metro's Data Resource Center
for Multnomah and Clackamas Counties

(Sellwood Bridge was built in 1925)

Who uses the Sellwood Bridge? (To be made into a pie chart)

50% trips between Clackamas County and Portland

17% trips between the east and west side of Portland

7% trips between east and west Clackamas County

13% trips between Clackamas County and Washington County

13% trips between Portland and Washington County


SOUTH WILLAMETTE RIVER CROSSING STUDY



METRO

STUDY OPTIONS

- A** Improved Approach to the West End of Ross Island Bridge.
- B** Additional Ross Island Bridge Capacity with a New Bridge.
- C** Replacing or Rehabilitating the Existing Sellwood Bridge.
- D** New Crossing between Hwy 43 and Hwy 99E at Milwaukie.
- E** New Crossing North of Lake Oswego between Hwy 43 and Hwy 99E via Courtney.
- F** New Crossing Near Marylhurst between Hwy 43 and Hwy 99E via Concord.
- G** Transportation Demand Management/Additional Transit Service (not shown).



South Willamette River Crossing Study

Findings and Conclusions

December, 1998

Metro

Findings and Conclusions

- Study Purpose
- Options Evaluated
- Major Findings
- Conclusions

Reasons for Crossing Study

- Increasing population and employment without additional transportation investment
- Crossing demand exceeds capacity
- Inadequate bike/ped crossing facilities
- Aging Sellwood Bridge
- Competing goals: Support Centers and Main Streets vs. reduce congestion

Study Options Adopted by JPACT/Metro Resolution (8/97)

- Sellwood Bridge replacement and preservation options
- New crossings in Clackamas County
- Ross Island Bridge ramp modifications and new capacity with parallel bridge
- Demand management and additional transit service

SOUTH WILLAMETTE RIVER CROSSING STUDY



METRO
Creating Livable Communities

STUDY OPTIONS

- A** Improved Approach to the West End of Ross Island Bridge.
- B** Additional Ross Island Bridge Capacity with a New Bridge.
- C** Replacing or Rehabilitating the Existing Sellwood Bridge.
- D** New Crossing between Hwy 43 and Hwy 99E at Milwaukie.
- E** New Crossing North of Lake Oswego between Hwy 43 and Hwy 99E via Courtney.
- F** New Crossing Near Marylhurst between Hwy 43 and Hwy 99E via Concord.
- G** Transportation Demand Management/Additional Transit Service (not shown).



Cost and Forecast Methods

- Bridge costs reflect:
 - feasible location for 2 and 4-lane crossings
 - bridge type (box-girder, cable-stayed)
 - directly related street improvement needs between Hwy 99E and Hwy 43
- Travel forecasts reflect:
 - induced traffic due to bridge improvements
 - road improvements that go with new crossings
 - transit service increases for each bridge option

Demand Management and Transit Service Option

- Increases transit use by 10%
- Reduces VMT by .9% per capita
- Supports 2040 Growth Concept by improving transit access to Centers and Main Streets
- Doesn't change congestion or improve bike/ped access on Sellwood Bridge

No New Capacity Across the River

	Effect on Daily River Crossings	Effect on VMT per Capita	Auto Access to 2040 Growth Concept Areas Targeted for Growth	Effect on Community and Development Plans	Effect on Sellwood Bridge Traffic	Other Traffic Impacts	Preservation or Replacement Costs
Sellwood Bridge for Bike/Ped Use Only	Reduces river crossings by 5%	Increases VMT/capita by .48%	Reduces access to Tacoma Main Street and Macadam Main Street	Lower traffic levels may affect Sellwood development	No cars on bridge; reduces traffic on Tacoma Street to 82% of existing traffic; Improves bike/ped access	Increases traffic at other crossings	\$23 Million
Preserve Sellwood Bridge to Maintain Current Use	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change	\$40 Million
Improve Sellwood Bridge to Current Standards	No change	No change	No change	No change	Allows truck use; Improves bike/ped access	No change	\$72 Million
Replace Sellwood Bridge with 2-lane Bridge	No change	No change	No change	Affects community at east and west bridge ends; No change on Tacoma Main Street	Allows truck use; Improves bike/ped access	No change	\$45 to \$59 Million
Modify West-end Ramps at Ross Island Bridge (No Sellwood Bridge Changes)	No change	No change	No change	Supports plans for Corbett/Lair Hill Terwilliger Neighborhood; No change on Tacoma Main Street	No change	No change	\$11 Million

New Capacity at the Ross Island Bridge and in Clackamas County


	Effect on Daily River Crossings (all modes)	Effect on VMT per Capita	Auto Access to 2040 Growth Concept Areas Targeted for Growth	Effect on Community and Development plans	Effect on Sellwood Bridge Traffic	Other Traffic Impacts	Capital Costs for Different Bridge Types and Approaches
6-lane Ross Island Bridge	Increases daily crossings by 2%	Increases VMT/capita by .4%	Serves Central Eastside Industrial Area and Central City	Conflicts with North Macadam plans; Supports Corbett /Lair Hill Plans	Reduces traffic by 2%	I-405; Powell Blvd	\$113 to \$131 Million
4-lane Sellwood Bridge	Increases daily crossings by less than 1%	Increases VMT/capita by .1%	Serves Tacoma and Macadam Main Street	Conflicts with Sellwood-Moreland plans for Tacoma Street and impacts existing neighborhoods on east and some businesses on west	Increases traffic 15% but reduces delay on bridge from 44% of vehicle hours to 6%	Tacoma Street; Hwy 43	\$59 to \$106 Million
4-lane Milwaukie Crossing	Increases daily crossings by 3%	Increases VMT/capita By .7%	Serves Milwaukie Regional Center; Supports Tacoma Main Street	Conflicts with Milwaukie TSP policies and Waterfront plan, depending on design Impacts existing east and west neighborhoods	Reduces traffic by 44%	Hwy 224; Hwy 43; Hwy 99E; Taylors Ferry Rd; A Ave; Reduces traffic on Tacoma and SE 17th	\$114 to \$157 Million
4-lane North Lake Oswego Crossing	Increases daily crossings by 5%	Increases VMT/capita by .4%	Serves Lake Oswego Town Center on West; Serves areas not targeted for growth in 2040 on East	Conflicts with Lake Oswego Town Center Plans and Tryon Creek State Park policies; Impacts existing east and west neighborhoods	Reduces traffic by 16%	Courtney Rd; River Rd; Hwy 99E; A Ave; B Ave; Country Club; Terwilliger Blvd	\$122 to \$145 Million
4-lane Marylhurst Crossing	Increases daily crossings by 3%	No change	Serves Lake Oswego and West Linn Town Centers on West; Serves areas not targeted for growth in 2040 on East	Conflicts with Mary's Woods Plans; Impacts existing east and west neighborhoods	Reduces traffic by 6%	Concord Rd; River Rd; Hwy 99E; Hwy 43; A Ave	\$119 to \$137 Million

Conclusions

1. Improvements to the Ross Island Bridge and to the I-205 and Oregon City bridges need further consideration but not in the context of the Sellwood Bridge.
2. The North Lake Oswego and Marylhurst crossings do not address South Willamette River Crossing or other needs.

Conclusions

3. Options with and without new capacity in the Sellwood/Milwaukie area have trade-offs between access and community livability.
4. Additional transit services and demand management help but do not solve the problems.



Diane Linn, Multnomah County Commissioner

DISTRICT ONE

December 9, 1998

Ed Washington, Metro Councilor
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97232-2736

Dear Ed:

On Thursday, December 10, 1998 Metro's Joint Policy Advisory Committee (JPACT) will consider the South Willamette River Crossing Study. As elected officials of Multnomah County, the custodians of a majority of the urban area Willamette River Bridges, we are fully aware of the key role river crossings play in the regional transportation system. In addition, we are fully aware of the physical condition of these bridges. We have the ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of these public assets. However, we also represent the communities through which traffic passes to and from the bridges.

The South Willamette River Crossing Study focused on the cost of replacing a bridge or building a new bridge and the capacity impact of various crossing options. This is necessary information but only a small part of the policy equation for the southern Metro region transportation picture. We do not believe that it is in the interest of the region to identify specific options without considering all the impacts of those options. Land use and transportation system values and neighborhood impact must all be incorporated into any decision as to place, mode or means of crossing the Willamette River South of the Ross Island Bridge.

To date there has been no focused policy level discussion about a south river crossing that dealt with these competing values. The elected officials from the directly impacted areas within the metropolitan region need to provide leadership on this issue. Consequently, we recommend a deliberative process that involves elected officials from the impacted jurisdictions and engaged citizens.

- We request that Metro convene a meeting or meetings of elected officials and engaged citizens (representing the most directly impacted districts) from Metro, Multnomah County, Clackamas County, Portland, Milwaukie, and Lake Oswego. The objective is to have a clear, unambiguous discussion among involved elected officials and directly impacted citizens on the subject of their communities and a river crossing strategy. The product would be a short document that will focus future community



December 9, 1998


discussions on values and strategies for supporting the area's land use and transportation issues.

We request this process become a formal recommendation from JPACT to the METRO Council.


Sincerely,



Diane Linn
Multnomah County Commissioner District 1



Beverly Stein
Chair, Multnomah County Commission



Sharon Kelley
Multnomah County Commissioner District 4



Lisa Naito
Multnomah County Commissioner District 3