12-8-1988

Meeting Notes 1988-12-08

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: December 8, 1988

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 a.m.

Place: Metro, Conference Room 330

#1. MEETING REPORT OF NOVEMBER 10, 1988 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.

*2. APPROVAL OF REGIONAL POSITION ON THE BI-STATE STUDY - Andy Cotugno.

*3. APPROVAL OF THE JPACT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROPOSAL - Andy Cotugno.

*4. APPROVAL OF TIP AMENDMENT TO ALLOCATE INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS FOR THE JOHNSON CREEK EXTENSION PROJECT - Andy Cotugno.

*5. APPROVAL OF FINAL DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE TO BE RELEASED FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT - Andy Cotugno.


*7. APPROVAL OF 1995 AND 2010 POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT FORECASTS (copies of report mailed to Committee members only; additional copies available at meeting.) - Andy Cotugno.

*8. PORT OF PORTLAND'S POSITION LETTER ON I-205 LRT - INFORMATIONAL.

*Material enclosed.

#Available at meeting.

NEXT JPACT MEETING: JANUARY 12, 1989 (THURSDAY), 7:30 A.M.

NOTE: Overflow parking is available at the City Center parking locations on the attached map, and may be validated at the meeting. Parking on Metro premises in any space other than those marked "Visitors" will result in towing of vehicle.
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: November 10, 1988

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Richard Waker, Chairman; Bob Bothman; Wade Byers; Nick Nikkila (alt.); Ed Lindquist; Jim Cowen; Jim Gardner; Pauline Anderson; Mike Lindberg (alt.); and Carter MacNichol (alt.)

Guests: Bill Stark, JPACT alternate, Cities of Clackamas County; Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer, Metro Council; Lee Hames, Tri-Met; Bebe Rucker, Port of Portland; Lee LaFontaine, Public Transit Division, ODOT; Don Adams and Ted Spence, ODOT; Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland; Roy Priest and Darrell Hayden, Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce; Bruce Warner, Washington County; Bill Barber, Clackamas County; Molly O'Reilly, Forest Park Neighborhood Association; Ray Polani, Citizens for Better Transit; Jim Howell, Oregon ARP; Wink Brooks, City of Hillsboro; Darrel Roby, Standard Insurance Company; and Peter Fry, Central Eastside Industrial Council

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Bob Hart, Richard Brandman, Karen Thackston, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

MEETING REPORT OF OCTOBER 13, 1988

The October 13, 1988 JPACT meeting report was approved as written.

STATUS REPORT ON BI-STATE STUDY

A preliminary scope of work for the bi-state study was reviewed at the October 13 JPACT meeting. Andy Cotugno suggested that JPACT take a position at its December 8 meeting regarding what types of studies we intend pursuing.
Andy then reviewed an issues sheet which addressed potential impacts, benefits and problems on the Oregon side of the river. Possible next steps were also reviewed and feedback was encouraged from the Committee as to concerns and studies to pursue.

Commissioner Lindberg questioned how this study relates to others in the ODOT Six-Year Plan or whether other projects would perhaps not make it if this study were pursued. In response, Andy Cotugno indicated that there is a major agenda laid out for the next 10 years. Concern was expressed by other JPACT members that this project might supersede others.

Chairman Waker noted that the effect on development patterns hasn't been explored very much in the past and that such a study might be beneficial.

Jim Howell suggested the following for inclusion on the issue sheet:

1. The possibility of commuter rail between Oregon and Washington County on the existing tracks.

2. The possibility of freight service across the west hills on existing tracks.

No action was taken on Mr. Howell's proposal.

Mr. Polani pointed out that types of growth must first be identified so as to minimize impact and lessen adverse effects, concurring in the idea to better utilize existing rail facilities and determine needs for future freight service.

Bob Bothman felt that the new re-write of the bi-state study was more project-oriented than the first one and felt that it should first determine need and demand. He thought Andy Cotugno should try to deal with this issue. He spoke further of the lack of financing to undertake a bridge in the next 20-25 years, but cited the importance of preserving a corridor.

Commissioner Anderson felt that, in our effort to be cooperative with Clark County, we are being forced into a situation we are not ready for.

Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland, stated that many people are up in arms over this issue because of possible impacts to Forest Park and wildlife migratory patterns and that resolutions have been passed because of lines drawn on a map.

The Committee agreed that a position declaration be prepared for the next JPACT meeting.
Carter MacNichol indicated that from the Port's perspective, they view the current proposal as project-oriented and not of economic development importance to Portland. He noted that the Port of St. Helens is, however, interested in this project. He indicated that the project could be phased, which could make it more affordable. It was noted that Rivergate would be fully developed in the next 20 years.

Committee members expressed concern over staff, energy and financial resources for this project, citing a determination of need as their foremost concern.

Bob Bothman indicated that the State of Washington has approved the Stage 2 report. He stated that we want to be cooperative because a transit and freight crossing will be needed in the future.

Commissioner Lindquist felt that JPACT needs to be involved with this project and that, if not dealt with locally, the Congressional delegation in Washington, D.C. might do so.

It was the consensus that we must first determine the problem to be solved. Questions to be answered include: Is the objective to promote economic development for other areas or relieve congestion on I-5?

COMMENTS TO TRI-MET BOARD REGARDING WITHDRAWAL FROM THE DISTRICT OF WILSONVILLE, DAMASCUS, AND MOLALLA

At the last legislative session, areas of the Tri-Met district were given the ability to withdraw from the transit district. Petitioners planning to withdraw from the transit district at this time include: Damascus (south of the Multnomah County line); Molalla (south of Clackamas Community College); and the city of Wilsonville.

Concerns expressed by TPAC members related to the need for transit service throughout the UGB and that the service to these areas not be subsidized by Tri-Met district taxpayers.

Andy Cotugno then reviewed the proposed comments for JPACT submittal to the Tri-Met Board as recommended by TPAC.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to submit the comments proposed on page 2 of the JPACT memo concerning "proposed changes to the Tri-Met district" to the Tri-Met Board on behalf of JPACT.

Motion CARRIED unanimously.
INTRODUCTION

Bob Bothman introduced Don Adams, Region I Engineer for ODOT, who has replaced Rick Kuehn.

STATUS REPORT ON SOUTHEAST CORRIDOR STUDY

Richard Brandman reported that we are nearing the end of the process on the Southeast Corridor study. The study evolved out of citizen concerns regarding the Tacoma overpass. One of the stipulations in the resolution required that this study be initiated with the intent that through traffic be discouraged on Johnson Creek Boulevard. The study is also directed to reduce traffic on other east/west streets and examine river crossing issues. Richard indicated that various locations have been looked at for establishment of a new bridge. As soon as the Southeast Corridor study is completed, a bridge study will commence.

Richard reported that the Southeast Citizens Advisory Committee has met once or twice monthly, has had significant involvement from neighborhood groups, and that the public has helped define some of the conceptual alternatives. He emphasized the fact that the study was initiated by citizens, and every effort is being made to give the citizens an opportunity to help define the solution.

Bob Hart then provided the technical data relating to population/employment growth in and around the Southeast study area. In addition, he defined the conceptual alternatives as follows: Maximum Transit; Focus Traffic; Share Traffic and Minimize Traffic. He noted that a workshop had been held with the Citizens Advisory Committee for review of the high-cost and low-cost alternatives.

Richard Brandman reported that the CAC is divided on these alternatives. Despite environmental impacts, the City of Milwaukie is interested in an arterial in the Johnson Creek basin. However, letters of concern over any kind of arterial that would be built in the Johnson Creek basin have been received from elected officials and concerned citizens. The Technical Advisory Committee has been meeting to develop variations of these alternatives that would suit everyone's needs. Richard indicated that presentations of the study's results will be made before neighborhood associations followed by a public hearing before forwarding to TPAC and JPACT.

Commissioner Lindberg stated that there were two premises of the citizens group that initiated this study: 1) the citizens felt there was a lot of through traffic on Johnson Creek Boulevard; and 2) there would be tremendous traffic growth between now and the year 2000. He mentioned that both of these premises were probably
STATUS REPORT ON JPACT FINANCE COMMITTEE

Andy Cotugno briefed the Committee on the funding issues still under discussion by the JPACT Finance Committee (as reflected in the handout).

Asked the status of the Roads Finance Committee schedule, Bob Bothman commented that it is struggling with the funding package proposed by the LOC and AOC in view of the Governor's position not to support a new tax at this time. The AOC/LOC proposal supports: 1) a $10.00 increase in the annual statewide vehicle registration fee (dedicated to roads through the State Highway Trust Fund, with revenues split 50/30/20); 2) a countywide local vehicle registration fee (dedicated to roads); 3) a 2-cent increase in the gas tax and equivalent weight-mile tax on January 1, 1991, 1992 and 1993 (dedicated to roads and split 50/30/20); and 4) retention of the small city allotment at $750,000 beginning in 1991 (to be increased proportionally based on a statewide increase in fuel taxes and/or registration fees). Mr. Bothman emphasized that the state is not a supporter of any new taxes.

Mr. Bothman indicated that a presentation would be made soon on the "needs" study, and that the Association of Oregon Industries effort is progressing. He cited the importance for JPACT to conclude its report soon. Chairman Waker concurred that resolution should be made at the December 8 JPACT meeting on the funding proposal issues.

Ray Polani, representing Citizens for Better Transit, expressed his concern that the freedom of using the gas and registration fee for capital improvements for both highways and transit has not been addressed. Commissioner Lindberg noted that the LOC has agreed to open the tax to transit. Bob Bothman commented that the issue has not been ignored and is being debated at these meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
           Dick Engstrom
           JPACT Members
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Bi-State Transportation Study

Findings

1. Bi-state travel is an important aspect of the Portland regional transportation system and it is in the best interest of the region that this part of the system function properly. Of particular note are the following:
   a. Peak-hour travel in the I-5 and I-205 corridors is of comparable importance as the other regional corridors although the severity of the transportation problem is not as great as that existing in other corridors;
   b. Acceptable operation of I-5 during off-peak hours is important to truck operations into surrounding port, distribution and industrial locations;
   c. I-205 is expected to function as an I-5 bypass for through traffic; and
   d. Improved access to and from prospective lower Columbia River port development sites will become more important over time as Port of Portland properties become fully developed.

2. Improvements to I-5 are planned and funded to partially alleviate traffic problems on I-5. Furthermore, I-205 has surplus capacity and is capable of absorbing additional traffic growth. As such, the need for improvements to serve bi-state travel is a long-term rather than a short-term concern.

3. Several transportation issues that would be part of a comprehensive bi-state study merit further investigation irrespective of the scope and schedule of a bi-state study.
   a. Cornelius Pass Road is inadequate to meet growing traffic problems between U.S. 26 and U.S. 30 and should be addressed irrespective of whether a western beltway is pursued.
   b. LRT in the I-5 corridor has been identified as a viable transportation improvement from downtown Portland to Hayden Island or downtown Vancouver. Evaluation of an extension of this route into Clark County should be undertaken to determine whether it improves the viability of the corridor and to identify a potential route.

4. Likely transportation alternatives to serve bi-state travel could have significant impacts and benefits regionwide which
must be carefully evaluated prior to embarking upon the improvement, including:

a. Consideration of whether or not to improve bi-state access raises significant questions regarding future growth patterns of the region that must be addressed in order to adequately determine long-range transportation needs;

- Construction of new facilities through existing developed areas could have significant impact and identification of the need for and location of proposed facilities is important to preserve a right-of-way for future implementation.

- Construction of new facilities through undeveloped areas could have significant impact on wetlands, forest lands, rivers and wildlife which must be carefully considered to avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

5. Insufficient information is available about the nature and volume of bi-state travel as well as the development objectives that would either be hindered by inaction or helped by possible improvements.

Proposed Actions

It is in the interest of the region to address bi-state travel concerns. It is important to better understand the nature of the long-range development and transportation issues in order to properly define the objectives to be met by improvement in bi-state accessibility. After the problems and objectives are properly defined, another decision will be required on whether or not to proceed with a comprehensive evaluation of alternative improvements. Aspects of the bi-state study that should be considered further, subject to the availability of resources, are as follows:

A. Land Use Planning

In order to evaluate the needs for major bi-state transportation improvements, it is important to define the long-range regional objectives for growth and urban form. As such, an evaluation of possible future development areas suitable for urbanization in the next 25-35 years should be identified taking into consideration development constraints, economic development objectives, environmental concerns and the need for public services. In addition, the implication of not significantly improving bi-state accessibility should be evaluated to determine the severity of congestion problems and the long-term effect in these development objectives.

This evaluation should be undertaken as a bi-state concern that includes adequate involvement throughout the Metro region, including Clackamas, Washington and Columbia
Counties.

B. Transportation Planning

Consistent with the annual budget process, the following transportation activities should be undertaken by Metro or the appropriate implementing jurisdiction:

1. Data and forecasts of bi-state travel movements should be improved and coordinated between Metro and Clark County IRC in order to agree on the scope of the problem to be addressed. This should include assessment of intraregional and interstate freight movements.

2. Incremental improvements to the existing transportation system should be identified and the extent to which bi-state travel needs are met should be evaluated, including:

   a. Implementation of planned improvements to I-5 at Portland Boulevard and at Marine Drive;

   b. Implementation of incremental bus service expansion in the I-5 corridor;

   c. Implementation of transportation management programs, including rideshare, vanpool, flextime, etc.

   d. Identification of needed improvements on I-405 and I-5;

   e. Identification of needed improvements to Cornelius Pass Road between U.S. 26 and U.S. 30; and

   f. Determination of the bi-state travel needs of the elderly and handicapped community.

3. Evaluation of the viability of extending the proposed LRT in the I-5 corridor into Clark County should be evaluated.

C. Upon definition of the regional development objectives and transportation problems affecting bi-state travel, alternative transportation improvements to be considered in a further bi-state study should be identified.

D. Financial participation from Oregon in the comprehensive study recommended by Clark County Intergovernmental Resource Center to the Washington Legislative Transportation Committee is not recommended. Instead, an agreement should be reached between Oregon and Washington jurisdictions on the financing of the work elements described above.
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December 6, 1988

JPAC c/o Andy Cotugno
Metropolitan Service District
2000 S.W. First Av.
Portland OR 97201

Dear Mr. Cotugno:

I am writing to share my profound concern over the proposed North phase of the Westside bypass and third Columbia River bridge. After seeing possible alignments at a November 14 meeting for the Linnton Land Use Plan, I have concluded that this project would be a cultural and environmental disaster. This freeway would:

1) provide little, if any, benefit to any of the residents along its route. Instead, it would destroy unique, fragile parklands and wildlife habitats for the sake of connecting Washington and southern Clark counties.

2) encroach on Forest Park, adversely affecting its wild character.

3) block migration routes from the Coast Range into Forest Park.

4) destroy the rural character of lands north of Sunset Highway, in particular the Cornelius Pass area and possibly Sauvie Island.

5) possibly destroy wetland habitat north of the Rivergate industrial area in the vicinity of Kelly Point.

6) traverse the steep north slope of the Tualatin mountains and the narrow south bank of the slough along highway 30, creating an ugly, congested blight on the landscape.

Portland's northwest "wilderness corridor" that extends from the very heart of the city to the Coast Range is a unique, irreplaceable resource that would be destroyed by any extension of the Westside bypass. For the sake of our city's liveability, I hope you will act to ensure that the Westside bypass is never extended beyond the Sunset Highway.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey M. Booth
6460 N. Princeton St.
Portland, OR 97203
Dear Mr. Waker:

Due to the attendance of four Council members at the NLC meeting in Boston, the City will not be represented at the December JPACT meeting. I do want to express support for two very important agenda items.

1. Portland supports the proposed Regional Position on the Bi-State Study. The regional position calls for interstate cooperation without pre-approving new travel corridors whose purpose has not been clearly identified.

   a. The two state region must cooperate, but it must be on a broader basis than simply transportation. Two specific issues immediately come to mind. Both Oregon and Washington have recreational and wildlife habitat areas affected by the contemplated highway corridor whose high value require the development of land use policies before new transportation facilities are proposed. (The attached letter from the Park Bureau discusses this concern more fully.) Recently DEQ reported that carbon monoxide violations in Vancouver may result in EPA's rejection of the entire region's air quality plans. Oregon, and in particular downtown Portland, have worked hard to achieve compliance with air quality standards. Our discussions with Clark Co. and Washington need to address these issues.

   b. The region has already adopted specific projects and plans for the interstate travel corridor. I am particularly concerned that the north transitway line, which is already in the RTP, not be held up because of discussions of possible new highway corridors.

2. I also want to support adoption of the Regional Transportation Funding proposal. Commissioner Lindquist successfully brought our committee to an overall financing strategy which realistically provides for both transit
and highway needs. I urge JPACT to adopt it for presentation to state and federal officials.

On a personal note, I want to thank you for your years of service as chair of JPACT. You have kept JPACT together and moving forward through some difficult issues. Best wishes in your new endeavors.

Sincerely,

Earl Blumenauer

cc: Portland City Council

Attachment
December 5, 1988

Commissioner Earl Blumenauer
City Hall
1220 S.W. 5th Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

Dear Commissioner Blumenauer:

The Portland Bureau of Parks and Recreation supports action taken by TPAC at its November 30th meeting recommending against funding by the State of Oregon for the so-called "Third Bridge Study" proposed by Clark County IRC. We agree with TPAC's conclusion that such a study should not be undertaken until there is better understanding of the nature of the bi-state transportation problem and until alternatives and other issues have been addressed.

Beginning with the Oregonian's September 4th article on the proposed study, the Parks Bureau has been besieged with inquiries from concerned citizens regarding the "proposed extension of the Westside Bypass through Forest Park and Smith & Bybee Lakes". We have since learned that the schematic map published by the Oregonian could be described as a premature illustration of a single alternative to be addressed by the proposed study. However, we have also learned that many question the wisdom of undertaking a costly study that appears to have omitted consideration of alternatives and that could well be contrary to desirable urban development when the full range of values are taken into account.

At this juncture I think that it is important that you know that the Parks Bureau, in keeping with its commitment to preserve the City's investment at Forest Park, is opposed to any action that directly or indirectly threatens the park or the wildlife corridor linking Portland to the Coast Range. We are also committed to preserving Smith and Bybee Lakes in North Portland. At the present time we are working with the Port of Portland, with other property owners, and with many interested citizens to refine and adopt a management plan.
designed to insure natural resource and recreational values at the lakes.

It is my hope that you and the other members of JPACT agree that infrastructure development must support a broad range of needs and values rather than attempt to define them. For this reason and in consideration of our commitments noted above, I ask you to recommend against funding the proposed "Third Bridge Study".

Sincerely,

Cleve Williams, Superintendent
Bureau of Parks and Recreation

cc: Commissioner Mike Lindberg
JPACT, c/o Mr. Andy Cotugno, Metro
December 3, 1988

JPAC c/o Andy Cotugno
Transportation Department of Metro
2000 S.W. 1st
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Mr. Cotugno,

It has come to the attention of the Sauvie Island Grange #840 that a third bridge is being considered from Washington to Oregon. We understand that some of the plans under consideration would come across the island.

After discussion, I was instructed to write voicing our objection to anything touching onto the island. According to LCDC now, the island is suppose to be reserved for farming and wildlife and this plan seems to be hypocritical to the policies they are trying to enforce now.

If such a plan were to be carried out, more than one bridge would have to be constructed which certainly would not be cost effective.

We have a membership of over 200 residents of the island and would appreciate being but on record as opposing this project.

Sincerely,

Jean Fears, Secretary
Sauvie Island Grange #840
Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that your Dec. 8th meeting agenda calls for discussion of a proposal to fund a study of transportation between the Metro and Clark County regions. Further that this proposal might be presented by the Intergovernmental Resource Center of Vancouver.

It is my view, based on opinions expressed by elected officials and private citizens in Clark County, that there is no general support for either undertaking or funding such a study, if it is in any way similar to what was presented to the Clark County Commissioners in October.

Any study that addresses the possibility of a third road crossing for the Columbia River in Clark Co. should not be undertaken prior to full public discussion and consensus in Clark County and the affected areas in Oregon.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert G. Dreyfuss
2104 NW 127th St
Vancouver WA 98685
December 2, 1988
December 3, 1988

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
METRO
2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398

Dear Committee Members,

At a September 9, 1988 Bi-State Policy Advisory Committee meeting at which the Vancouver-based Intergovernmental Resource Center made its presentation concerning the "Third-Bridge Study," Dean Lookingbill (IRC's Transportation Director) said, "It's also important to recognize that in this Phase I study the private sector is a very major issue."

That is precisely the problem. The third-bridge push came about quite suddenly and has gained frightening momentum because a few powerful people, with political clout, want to open up the Vancouver Lake lowlands to industrial development.

As a result, the IRC is spending a lot of energy and taxpayer dollars to try to convince Oregon that a third bridge is needed. In fact, the IRC has become an advocate of a bridge - even before the proposed study.

As it pursues various "studies", the IRC staff ignores Clark County's Comprehensive Landuse Plan. Even before Lookingbill said it, many of us knew that the private sector is the IRC's primary concern. The wishes of the majority of citizens and the livability of our community do not rank high at IRC.

It is my understanding that at your December 8th meeting you will be taking action on IRC's proposal that you support the Third-Bridge Study. I believe the objectives of the study are unclear, confusing the two issues of congestion reduction and creation of new development opportunities. Specifically, into the Vancouver Lake lowlands.

I urge the members of J-PACT to encourage the State of Washington to allocate its study funds to coordinate the Vancouver link with Oregon's light rail plans.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Moser
5600 NE 45 St.
Vancouver, WA 98661
December 3, 1988

J-PACT
Metro
2000 S.W. 1st Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97201-5398

Gentlemen:

According to the J-PACT agenda for the meeting December 8 there are items for approval of a regional position on the Bi-State Study and a funding proposal for it. There is much dismay being expressed by people in Clark County over the speed with which the study is being pushed along without a vital first step that seeks public input in advance. The views of Clark County residents should certainly be heard before a study which includes the possibility of a third bridge into this county is undertaken. Valuable money and time will be saved by focusing the study more precisely after receiving public comment.

Please do not agree to participate in or help fund the study until there has been ample opportunity for affected citizens to be heard.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Clausen

Phyllis Clausen
400 Monterey Way
Vancouver, WA 98661
Dear Sirs,

I am concerned about the third Columbia Bridge and Westside Bypass. Portland has two important resources in Sauvie Island and Forest Park. When choosing this city as a home, my husband and I considered these aspects as most desirable. Now when friends and family visit us from Seattle, they love these special places too, as many tourists and future Oregonians do because they are not duplicated anywhere in the United States.

I urge you to not support this idea of destroying these unique natural resources. Portland and its vicinity will keep its appeal to many if this project is stopped now!

Sincerely,

Bette Jean M. Richards
November 24, 1988

Andy Cotugno, Director
Transportation Planning
Metropolitan Service District
2000 SW 1st
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Mr. Cotugno:

The Board of the Northwest District Association adopted a policy statement on November 21st regarding the "Westside Bypass" and third bridge proposal which JPACT will be discussing on December 8th. Would you be kind enough to distribute this position paper to all the JPACT members in advance of the meeting? We appreciate your help in this. Also, we would like copies given to the members of the Metro Council, except for Hansen and Ragsdale who received their copies with personal letters. The statement is attached.

Any other use you may feel would be helpful for distributing our point of view, which needless to say we consider compatible with good regional planning, would be fine. If our highlighting of points is too sketchy and you feel there are people who need further amplification, please don't hesitate to let me know and we will attempt to talk with these people. My number is 241-9339.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Sincerely,

Steve Fosler, President
Northwest District Association

N.W.D.A., the Community Organization for Northwest Portland, Inc.
1819 N.W. Everett, #205, Portland, Oregon 97209. 233-3331
The Northwest District Association opposes, for the following reasons, funding the bi-state study proposed by the Washington Intergovernmental Resource Center of a third north-south freeway route and a third highway bridge across the Columbia River:

- **Confused Objectives:** The objectives of the study are unclear, confusing the two issues of congestion reduction and creation of new development opportunities. Our metropolitan region has rejected using freeway construction as a tool for promoting urban development of rural lands.

- **Westside Impacts:** A beltline freeway in Northeast Washington County would go through land set aside for agricultural use, creating enormous pressure for development and shifting of the Urban Growth Boundary. Such development would be extremely detrimental to Forest Park, and would generate traffic which would further strain the capacity of already burdened streets in Northwest Portland.

- **Light Rail:** Light rail in the I-5 corridor would add capacity while fostering healthier development within the Urban Growth Boundary. Light rail in the corridor has been evaluated as viable; preliminary engineering should be undertaken immediately. The State of Washington should allocate its study funds to coordinate the Vancouver link with Oregon's light rail plans.

- **Limited Resources:** Resources for transportation planning in the region are limited. If there is money in ODOT for studies, this money should be allocated to relevant problems that Portland has previously identified, such as improving the urban link between the Sunset Highway and I-405.

- **Existing Westside Link:** A means for expediting industrial traffic between Washington County and Clark County already exists in the present Burlington Northern freight line which extends over Cornelius Pass and across the rivers. Planners should focus on exploiting this valuable resource.

- **Freeways:** Adding freeways does not relieve congestion.

- **Oregon's Land Use Laws:** Necessary land use approvals have not been obtained for the segment of the Westside bypass from the Sunset Highway south to I-5 through Washington County.

Our analysis leads us to recommend, "More trains, not more lanes."
Dec. 4, 1988

Joint Policy Advisory
Commission on Taxes
0% Metric
2000 S.W. 1st Ave.,
Portland, Oregon 97201

A. Cataluo, Chairman

Dear Sir:

At a recent meeting of the Clark County Natural Resources Council, it was unanimous that from our findings, a majority did not want to spend millions on a third bridge, that is not needed or wanted, across the Columbia River between Portland and Vancouver.

Our citizens had recently worked hard on a Habitat consortium to keep our lowlands for the
benefit of our people as trails, parks, wildlife, etc.
The industrialist sector imply this new bridge is for moving people, but since this can be handled much better and cheaper by light rail, we surmise they would like to fill in another wetland for industry.
We cannot keep paving over all our open spaces if we want to maintain some semblance of a healthy environment.

A Vancouver Environmentalist,

Burnice Moscroft
203 S.E. 102nd Ave.
Vancouver, WA, 98664
December 6, 1988

Andy Cotugno
Transportation Director
METRO
2000 SW First Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Andy,

The Forest Park Neighborhood Association, at its December 5th meeting, voted overwhelmingly (by 94%) for the following resolution:

The Forest Park Neighborhood Association wishes to go on record opposing the plan to construct a freeway across the west hills north of US 26 and wishes to express its desire to support the plans to study the land use question as a whole prior to committing itself to one specific transportation mode.

Neighbors expressed strong concerns about damage to valuable natural areas and parks, accelerated development of lands planned to remain farm and forest and rural, congestion of arterial roads directly into Portland resulting from such development, little apparent need for such a thoroughfare, and projected high costs of such a freeway.

As a result the Board of the Forest Park Neighborhood Association strongly urges you to reject funding the comprehensive study proposed by the IRC at the J-PACT meeting later this week. If one of the most frequently mentioned options to be studied is unacceptable before the examination process begins, the purpose of such a study becomes highly questionable. We are also concerned about undertaking a major study having the specific goal of siting a bridge and its connecting arterials.
Instead, we encourage you to focus energy and study funds as recommended by T-PACT. We also urge you to examine a known problem: I-5 congestion to Vancouver. This is a problem of concern to all metro area residents. Light rail in that corridor is feasible and would be an effective means of moving large numbers of people in an established transit corridor.

Regards,

Molly O'Reilly

Molly O'Reilly
President
TO: Metro

from: Thom McConathy
Conservation Chairman, Sucksdorfe Chapter, Washington Native Plant Society
Secretary, Carter Park Neighborhood Association, Vancouver, Washington

RE: Third Bridge Over Columbia River

The decision of need for a third bridge is, in my mind, falsely predicated on a perceived though non-popularly held conviction that such a bridge would fulfill some mutual (Vancouver-Portland) need for growth.

Without such a bridge destroying the environment to the East and West of Vancouver, I believe Vancouver will develop into a balanced community employing more of our own people within our community rather than being subjugated to a second class bedroom community of Portland. Presently in Clark County there is a crisis in the non-incorporated urban area of a lack of infrastructure and planning to support further urban development. Clark County has not provided services necessary and vital to an urban area, yet has opposed annexation of these areas to the city of Vancouver while relying on the city to provide haphazard infrastructure outside the city’s boundaries without the necessary planning that is vital to such development.

A joint city-county planning agreement for the non-incorporated urban area has just been entered into this month, but if Metro could look back upon its own beginnings, it would realize that this agreement will be many years in arriving at the many particulars necessary to provide for the needs of this growing urban area.

It is popularly believed that the primary impetus driving the growth (commercial and residential) of Vancouver and Clark County has been the quantity and quality of those aspects associated with quality of life; i.e., Vancouver was selected as a 1977-78 All American City.

High on the list of such amenities, in Portland as well as in Vancouver, would be the Columbia River Gorge to our East and the immensely productive Wetland Open Space Agriculture Land to our West. The Washington Native Plant Society and the Carter Park Neighborhood Association, along with many others, are vitally interested in maintaining and enhancing these quality of life aspects and issues, and would oppose a third bridge impacting either of these areas.

We would recommend a third bridge only after alternatives have been exhausted and under the condition that it be located to the North of us in Kalama or Longview so as to cause the least environmental impact to Washington or Oregon.
Governmental and developmental entities that have so far advanced the idea of a third bridge would not do so publicly since constituent sentiment greatly opposes this concept.

By far, the greatest burdened thoroughfare is the I-5 corridor. It is our belief that through enhancing of this existing corridor and pursual of light rail and other obvious alternatives, our community interests would be best served.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
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December 5, 1988

JPAK

c/o Mr. Andy Cotugno
Transportation Dept. of Metro
2000 S. W. 1st
Portland, OR 97201

Dear Mr. Cotugno:

As an architect and a graduate of The School of Urban Studies at Boston University and a student of urban planning at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, I would like to go on record as being very much opposed to the concept of a beltway linking Hillsboro with Vancouver.

Perhaps the Portland metropolitan area's greatest "livability" asset is the proximity of a highly developed urban environment to that of the open spaces of rural, semi-rural and forested lands. Sadly, in the last two decades we have seen urban sprawl push these two very different environments further and further apart with strip development and often times poorly conceived commercial, industrial and retail "parks", all designed specifically to respond to the requirements of the automobile. When there is so much inner-urban land underused and misused it is tragic to see our magnificent countryside for which our state is so well known, paved over for automobile storage. (Roads, parking lots, driveways and garages cover more land than any other use in the developed suburban metro area.)

The area to the northwest of our city is the last area left unscathed in this way. Mostly due to the existence of Forest Park, this is the city's last uninterrupted link to the wilderness. It is a life line that allows Oregon native flora and fauna to come directly into our city. It is unique. It is something no other major city in America can claim.

To sever this life line with a beltway will not only end the world's only inner urban wilderness but will urbanize the city's last tract of inner-urban countryside.

Furthermore a beltway will further encourage the "livability confounding" practice of commuting allowing people to live in one place and work a long ways off, the downfall of the once "oasis paradise" which has become Los Angeles.
A freeway would further decentralize the metropolitan area, further deteriorate air quality, further indebt the state, further diminish an urban environment's most valuable amenity, "open space" and destroy Portland's last inner urban rurality.

A good city grows upward not outward. People go where access is easy. A freeway connecting Hillsboro to Vancouver will only further disperse urban dwellers and encourage the patchwork development of our most pristine suburban sector.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeffrey L. Miller

JLM:ts
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro
2000 SW 1rst Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
Attn: Mr. A. Cotugna

Gentlemen:

You should know that not everyone in Clark County supports the study of a possible third bridge which the Intergovernmental Resource Center is proposing. Up to now, there has been little in the way of public participation in the decision to go forth with this study. In fact, to many of us, it appears that the study – and project – may be railroaded through with little thought given to consequences or reasonable alternatives.

My concerns are several. The route that is most discussed for this third bridge is one that would cut through the Vancouver Lake lowlands. This area has what is probably the most valuable wildlife habitat in Clark County. Any discussion of the use of public transportation to relieve the congestion on the I-5 bridge has been little and late. I fear that a third bridge in this vicinity would increase development and destroy the wildlife habitat. I ask you to not approve funding of this study at this time.

Should you decide to fund it, please attach several conditions to it. Insist on extensive public participation. Insist that public transportation and a light rail system be given at least equal, if not more, weight than a highway through the Vancouver Lake lowlands. Insist that the wetlands and wildlife habitat be protected. Insist that secondary effects and development pressure be thoroughly studied.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Starke
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation  
2000 S. W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201

Re: Item on agenda for 12-8-88 meeting regarding approval of regional position on bi-state study of a third bridge over the Columbia River

Gentlemen:

It is my sincere hope that those appointed to make the bi-state study of a third river crossing will do very thorough research into all aspects of such a crossing and that the study will not be dominated by any special interest groups.

Hopefully, there will be a citizens' advisory committee made up of a widely diverse group of people. Also, an open invitation to the public should be extended in order that anyone who is interested may be included in the citizens' advisory group.

There are many alternatives to consider such as light rail and the possibility of a new by-pass freeway leading from Woodburn extending northward on the west side of Beaverton and crossing the river near Longview to connect with I-5 north of Longview.

My deep concern is that there is a special interest group in Vancouver which is seeking a third river bridge with its northern end located in the Vancouver Lake lowlands to facilitate industrialization of that area. I firmly believe that the wetlands in that area should be preserved and the beauty and tranquility of Vancouver Lake be preserved. A bridge in that area would certainly impact these sensitive areas contained therein.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. Rosalee MacRae

Mrs. Rosalee MacRae

cc: IRC of Clark County
November 29, 1988

Joint Policy Advisory Committee  
On Transportation  
c/o Mr. Andy Catagno  
Metro Transportation  
2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Committee:

The communities of Linnton, Sauvies Island, Forest Park and the Skyline Ridge are very concerned about the proposed North leg of the West Side Bypass and a third Columbia River Bridge.

These communities contain wetlands which would be adversely affected and are protected by Oregon's Comprehensive Plan. The wildlife corridor from the coastal ridge to Forest Park is unique and should not be disturbed.

Highway 30 is the third most heavily traveled road in Oregon. Additional traffic congestion could not be tolerated. Putting in a bypass for the convenience of Clark and Washington counties will have disastrous consequences for Linnton, Sauvies Island, Forest Park and the Skyline Ridge.

We urge you to consider other possibilities such as light rail. Don't fund a study for this project; rather fund a study that will examine alternatives to this proposal. Protect Oregon's scenic beauty, wildlife corridor and Highway 30 from total congestion.

Very truly yours,

Linnton Community Center
Board of Directors

By Joan Chase
Executive Director

JC:bsd014c
November 29, 1988

Joint Policy Advisory Committee
On Transportation
c/o Mr. Andy Catagno
Metro Transportation
2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Committee:

The communities of Linnton, Sauvies Island, Forest Park and the Skyline Ridge are very concerned about the proposed North leg of the West Side Bypass and a third Columbia River Bridge.

These communities contain wetlands which would be adversely affected and are protected by Oregon's Comprehensive Plan. The wild life corridor from the coastal ridge to Forest Park is unique and should not be disturbed.

Highway 30 is the third most heavily traveled road in Oregon. Additional traffic congestion could not be tolerated. Putting in a bypass for the convenience of Clark and Washington counties will have disastrous consequences for Linnton, Sauvies Island, Forest Park and the Skyline Ridge.

We urge you to consider other possibilities such as light rail. Don't fund a study for this project; rather fund a study that will examine alternatives to this proposal. Protect Oregon's scenic beauty, wild life corridor and Highway 30 from total congestion.

Very truly yours,

Linnton Community Center
Board of Directors

By Joan Chase
Executive Director
December 8, 1988

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation Metropolitan Service District
2000 S.W.First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5396

We wish to record our opposition to any Oregon funding of the proposed Bi-State study of the Willamette and Columbia river bridges and highways linking the Washington County Westside bypass with Vancouver and Clark County Washington.

Our opposition to the Westside bypass was recorded earlier at various hearings; it is primarily based on economics since we are aware that there are sizable funding shortfalls for various transportation projects in this Metro Area with much higher, more reasonable priorities.

We also base our opposition on reasonable indications that, very likely, these projects are in conflict with Oregon Senate Bill 100, our state-wide land use planning law.

We finally oppose the spending of study moneys on them because we are convinced that low-cost, low-impact alternatives do exist which ought to be pursued instead at this time.

Accordingly we recommend that a Federal Alternative Analysis study be immediately funded and initiated for the Interstate Light Rail corridor, parallel to the I-5 freeway North corridor. This project, coupled with the Railbus alternative project to both the East and Westside highway bypasses, is indeed a low-cost, low-negative-impact alternative to the study now being proposed by the Washington State Intergovernmental Research Center.

R.J.Polani
Chairperson
Date: November 30, 1988

To: JPACT

From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Regarding: JPACT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROPOSAL

Attached is the transportation funding proposal as recommended by the JPACT Finance Committee and TPAC. It is recommended that JPACT approve the principles of this funding proposal in order to proceed with the seeking of legislative review and action.
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JPACT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROPOSAL

AREAS OF CONSENSUS

I. General Principles

A. There is consensus on the transportation priorities and funding target for the next 10 years in the following major categories (see Attachment A):

- Regional Highway Corridors
- Urban Arterials
- LRT Corridors
- Transit Operations and Routine Capital

B. The region should link together the planning for the funding of highway and transit improvements.

II. Regional Highway Corridors

A. The region should seek state highway funding for the full cost of priority interstate and regional highway corridors (from IA above).

B. The region endorses increased state and federal funding programs in order to obtain the improvements being sought, including increasing the state gas tax in increments of 2¢ per year and an increase in the state vehicle registration fee.

C. The state should convert its vehicle registration fee to one imposed on the basis of value rather than the current flat fee.

III. Urban Arterials

A. A vehicle registration fee, at a level up to that collected by the state, is favored as the first source of funding for a regional urban road preservation and improvement program. The fee should be imposed by Metro with the allocation to projects by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). There should be a minimum allocation guaranteed to local governments and the balance allocated on the basis of regional priorities through JPACT. Implementation procedures are outlined in Attachment B.

B. The vehicle registration fee should include a truck fee to maintain cost responsibility.

C. If the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) arterials are included in a regional arterial program (in addition to city and county roads), sufficient revenues
should be sought to fund the extra cost. Consideration should be given to seeking state funding toward the urban arterial program or a higher level Metro vehicle registration fee as alternative sources.

IV. Transit

Transit financing requirements for the region deal with the need for increased annual revenues for routine capital purposes and expanded operations as well as for the capital cost for new LRT corridors. In the long term, a fundamental change to transportation finance in the region is required to allow needed regional highway and transit facilities to be funded through the same source. In the short term, a variety of incremental extensions of existing approaches are recommended.

A. Constitutional Amendment

A state constitutional amendment should be sought to allow the region the flexibility to use currently restricted transportation-related sources (i.e., gas taxes and vehicle registration fees) for transit purposes. Such an amendment should be targeted at giving the region the flexibility to use its resources for either highway or transit purposes. As such, a constitutional amendment that is permissive rather than mandatory is proposed and one that only affects local or regional funding sources.

B. LRT Funding

The region should pursue three LRT corridors during the next decade as the next major step toward a regional LRT system: Westside, Milwaukie and I-205. The Westside and Milwaukie will be implemented through the use of UMTA Section 3 funds (federal) with a proposed partnership between the state, region and private sector for the local match. The I-205 corridor cannot use UMTA Section 3 funds but does have the advantage of using Interstate funds now set aside for completion of bus lanes and funding may be available for vehicles. State and regional funds for I-205 are also proposed but the level of funding has not been finalized pending further study.

1. The first priority for UMTA Section 3 funding is Westside LRT; thereafter, Milwaukie LRT. Up to 75 percent UMTA funding should be sought. UMTA Section 3 funding will not be sought for the I-205 LRT project.

2. Local matching funds for the three LRT corridors should come from the following sources:

   a. A new regional transit funding source (see Section C.2. below) should be adopted to provide the regional share toward all three corridors.
b. State matching funds should be sought for all three corridors over a 3-6 biennium period.

c. Private sector funding should be committed toward construction commensurate with benefits received.

Specific methods are recommended as follows:

- To include LRT capital funding in various tax increment funding programs in place or under consideration in the Central City, along the I-205 LRT and along the Westside LRT.

- To establish a special transit assessment district around all LRT stations to reflect the private sector benefits realized from these major transportation investments.

- To negotiate LRT station cost-sharing where the station is located with direct connection to private developments.

- Public acquisition of land will be sought around existing and planned LRT stations to be leased out for private development; long-term lease revenues will assist in reducing or eliminating operating costs of LRT.

Preliminary estimates are that these mechanisms would yield 10-20 percent toward the capital cost of the proposed projects.

3. Prior to adopting the proposed new regional transit funding source, it will be necessary to complete the "preliminary engineering" for the Westside LRT project and the "alternatives analysis" for the I-205 and Milwaukie LRT projects in order to determine the scope, cost and timing of these projects. This will, in turn, provide the basis for finalizing the funding level to be adopted for the new regional funding source.

4. LRT construction will not proceed without an increased source of operating funds.

C. Transit Operations and Routine Capital

1. An increased source of funds should be established for routine capital, and the incremental expansion of LRT operations and bus service. Preliminary costs (as of March 1) are as follows:
2. Funding sources to pay for increased ongoing operations and routine capital, as well as for a capital fund for the regional share of LRT match, are recommended as follows:

   a. Increased UMTA Section 3 and Section 9 funding.

   b. Continuation of state funding toward routine capital at $3.3 million a year.

   c. Increase cigarette tax of 1¢ ($1.2 million/year) toward special needs transit.

   d. After implementation of a $10 million a year Arterial Fund (such as through a vehicle registration fee), $3 million in FAU funds will be dedicated to transit capital.

   e. The payroll tax should be extended to include all employers including local governments and private, nonprofit corporations. However, in order to minimize impacts on local budgets and tax bases, it should be phased in over a five-year period. This will raise up to $5.2 million at full implementation (0.6 percent) on all employers.

   f. Increased transit revenues through a payroll tax to be paid by employees rather than employers.
**Attachment A**

**JPACT Regional Transportation**

**10-Year Priorities**

**Cost vs. Revenues**

### I. Regional Highway Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interstate</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of 10-Year Priorities (including inflation)</td>
<td>$489 m.</td>
<td>$439 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less project funding currently committed</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less state and federal funding likely to be available</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfunded Balance

$201 m.  

$483 million

### II. LRT Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Westside</th>
<th>Milwaukee</th>
<th>I-205</th>
<th>Mall LRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of 10-Year Priorities</td>
<td>$300 m.</td>
<td>$88 m.</td>
<td>$89 m.</td>
<td>$75 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less anticipated federal funds</td>
<td>150-225</td>
<td>44-66</td>
<td>17-25</td>
<td>38-56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfunded Balance

$75-150 m.  

$22-44 m.  

$64-72 m.  

$19-38 m.  

$180-304 million

### III. Urban Arterials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City/County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of 10-Year Priorities (including inflation)</td>
<td>$203 m.</td>
<td>$335 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less project funding currently committed</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less federal, state and local funding likely to be available*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfunded Balance

$126 m.  

$195 m.  

$321 million

*These federal highway funds could alternatively be committed to transit capital if a replacement arterial funding source is adopted.
### IV. Transit Operations and Routine Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased Annual Funds Required</th>
<th>Pre-LRT Expansion</th>
<th>Post-LRT Expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine Capital</td>
<td>$8.0 m.</td>
<td>$9.6 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded LRT Operations</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Bus Operations</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Retirement</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unfunded Balance**: $10.7 m./yr. $19.9 m./yr.

### V. Road Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County Annual Needs</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>5-Year</th>
<th>10-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds Available</td>
<td>$92.6 m.</td>
<td>$112.6 m.</td>
<td>$137 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unfunded Balance**: $29 m./yr. $33 m./yr. $55 m./yr.
Attachment B

Urban Arterial Fund

OBJECTIVE: To implement a local option vehicle registration fee to create a regional Urban Arterial Fund for the Portland region for modernization and preservation capital improvements. Allocation of funding is proposed as a cooperative process through JPACT.

State Legislation Required

As part of a bill allowing counties throughout Oregon to impose a local option vehicle registration fee, include additional language to:

Authorize imposing of a local option vehicle registration fee up to the level collected by the state for Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington Counties by ordinance of the Metropolitan Service District upon request of the three county commissions with annual allocation of the funds to projects within the cities and counties of the Metro district by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and distribution of the funds attributable to the area outside the Metro district to the county commissions on the basis of estimated registered vehicles.

Process

1. State Legislature adopts local option registration fee authority.

2. Metro defines ordinance to impose and administer the vehicle registration fee and circulates to local jurisdictions.

3. Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington County Commissions adopt resolutions requesting Metro to impose a three-county vehicle registration fee. (This is especially important for the area outside the Metro boundary.)


5. DMV establishes procedures, collects the fee and disburses revenues to Metro.

6. Metro Council adopts annual budget including capital appropriation of the amount of revenue available for arterial improvements.

7. Revenues disbursed directly to counties for portion of fee attributable to area outside Metro boundary; county commissions administer.
8. JPACT adopts "minimum allocation" for urban portions of three counties and Portland (recommend 75 percent minimum).

9. County Transportation Coordinating Committees and Portland define projects using "minimum allocation" and candidates for "regional allocation."

10. JPACT approves projects using "minimum allocation" and allocates regional portion of funds and authorizes disbursement of current fiscal year funds.

11. Funds disbursed to implementing jurisdiction by Metro.

12. Audit sent to JPACT at close of fiscal year documenting amount of funds spent on the authorized project and amount carried forward to next fiscal year.
November 29, 1988

JPACT
Richard Waker, Chairman
c/o Metro
2000 S.W. 1st Ave.
Portland, OR 97201-5398

RE: Regional Transportation Funding Proposal

Dear Mr. Waker:

We are pleased that the region is pursuing a funding proposal for transportation projects. We have some concerns about the proposal we'd like you to consider.

We agree that State highway corridors and urban arterials should have an increased funding source. We are concerned about the method of allocation however. It is possible that local jurisdictions may contribute to but not receive the benefit (road improvements) of the additional funding.

Most importantly, we support the Transit-LRT funding proposals. It is important to amend the constitution to allow vehicle registration fees to be used for LRT funding. People who drive vehicles contribute to traffic congestion and should help pay for part of the solution.

The McLoughlin LRT Corridor is important for several reasons:

- It will increase access and trips to downtown Portland without using valuable parking space or increasing air pollution,
- relieve congestion on McLoughlin,
- reduce travel time for commuter, truck, and business trips,
- improve transit service to S.E. Portland, Milwaukie, and surrounding areas (through use of park and ride lots and feeder bus service),
- "it is essential to have a significant increase in transit in the Milwaukie Corridor by the mid-1990s to ensure that McLoughlin Boulevard operates at an acceptable level of service and to avoid traffic infiltration into local neighborhoods . . . . and, found LRT to be the most promising transit alternative." (March 1987 memorandum from Metro), and
- it is an integral part of Milwaukie's riverfront and downtown renewal plan.
Letter to JPACT
RE: Regional Transportation Funding Proposal
November 29, 1988

We agree that the Westside and McLoughlin LRT corridors are the region's first and second priorities. We believe these projects are critical for the transportation benefits they produce. Because funding for LRT operations is limited, it should be secured for all the corridors before proceeding with construction of any LRT corridor. The I-205 LRT should not disrupt the regional priority list. It should not proceed ahead of the other two corridors, especially if there is an operational cost concern.

We believe that the McLoughlin LRT should go to the DEIS and P.E. stage. The "alternatives analysis" was completed in 1984 (by Metro and Tri-Met). We encourage Metro and Tri-Met to start the DEIS process as soon as possible. We need to establish the corridor alignment and begin planning for it.

Lastly, the list of needs are many and the potential funding sources small. The region may not be successful in securing all the needed sources. If that occurs, we suggest that the LRT corridors be maintained as priorities. They are essential to the safe operation of the adjacent roadways. Building more or wider highways without LRT will only create more air pollution, more noise, more neighborhood disruption, a less than optimal transportation system, and a less attractive metropolitan area.

You and the subcommittees are to be commended for your far-sighted funding proposals. If we can be of help in your efforts, let us know.

Sincerely yours,

Roger A. Hall
Mayor, City of Milwaukie
for the City Council

RH/mgh

cc: JPACT members
Andy Cotugno, Metro Transportation Director
CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 88-1020 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO ALLOCATE INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS FOR THE JOHNSON CREEK EXTENSION PROJECT

Date: November 29, 1988
Presented by: Andy Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would transfer $600,000 of Interstate Transfer funds from Beavercreek Road construction to the Johnson Creek Extension portion of the Lester interchange project.

TPAC has reviewed this TIP amendment and recommends approval of Resolution No. 88-1020.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Clackamas County has requested that $600,000 of Interstate Transfer funds be transferred from its Beavercreek Road project to the Johnson Creek portion of the Lester interchange project.

The purpose behind the transfer is to supplement state modernization funds currently programmed for the segment of Johnson Creek Boulevard from 82nd Avenue to I-205 and for adjacent street connections in the immediate project area.

The balance remaining in the Beavercreek Road project will be applied to Phase 1 intersection and roadway improvements to accommodate traffic on Beavercreek Road on an interim and near-term basis. The future phases of the project will depend on development of the area (which has not occurred as planned) and will be defined at a later date as development occurs.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 88-1020.
BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING ) RESOLUTION NO. 88-1020
THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT ) Introduced by Richard Waker,
PROGRAM TO ALLOCATE INTERSTATE ) Chair, Joint Policy Advisory
TRANSFER FUNDS FOR THE JOHNSON ) Committee on Transportation
CREEK EXTENSION PROJECT

WHEREAS, Clackamas County has requested that $600,000 be transferred from its Beavercreek Road project to the Johnson Creek portion (Johnson Creek Extension from I-205 to 82nd Avenue) of the Lester interchange project; and

WHEREAS, The noted amount will supplement state modernization funds currently assigned to the Johnson Creek portion; and

WHEREAS, Clackamas County has provided assurances that construction of Beavercreek Road will be accomplished for Phase 1 consisting of intersection and roadway improvements using the remaining balance; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District authorizes the transfer of $600,000 from Beavercreek Road construction to the Johnson Creek Extension.

2. That the Transportation Improvement Program be amended to incorporate this action.

3. That the action is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan Update and Affirmative Intergovernmental Project Review is hereby given.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this _____ day of ____________, 1988.

Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer
PROPOSED ACTION

To release the draft Regional Transportation Plan Update for public information and comment and a public hearing as described in Attachment A. The results of the public comment process will be brought before TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council prior to formal adoption of the plan update. This action has been approved by TPAC.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

In July 1982, Metro adopted, by ordinance, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The adopted RTP provides for the Metro Council to formally update the RTP on a regular basis to incorporate as appropriate:

1. the findings, recommendations and/or decisions arising from major transportation planning studies;

2. new highway, transit, bicycle and/or pedestrian improvements or programs necessary to meet the objectives of the adopted RTP;

3. significant new information regarding transportation-related conditions/choices, new federal and state laws, and/or the population and employment forecasts used in the RTP; and

4. additional or revised policies, strategies or expressions of regional intent regarding the transportation system or its implementation, including the identification of additional outstanding issues to be addressed.

The RTP was last updated by Metro Council in 1983. By adopting Ordinance No. _____, Council recognizes the significant actions that have taken place regarding the region's transportation system in the past five years and amends the adopted RTP to include the 1988 Update (itemized in Staff Report B, attached), the highlights of which are as follows:

1. includes the recommendations and improvements associated with the final report of the Southwest Corridor Study previously adopted by Council Resolution No. 87-763, which (among other improvements)
identifies the need for a new highway facility in the Tualatin-Hillsboro corridor subject to findings of consistency with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals;

2. includes the recommendations and improvements associated with the Multnomah County Transportation Master Plan Update Phase I, which (among other improvements) identifies the need for a new or improved principal arterial connection from I-84 to U.S. 26 in the Gresham area subject to the selection of a preferred corridor alignment and findings of consistency with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals;

3. includes the recommendations and improvements associated with the Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT) Highway 224/212 Sunrise Corridor reconnaissance, which identifies the need for improvements on existing and new rights-of-way in the Sunrise Corridor between McLoughlin Boulevard and U.S. 26 subject to the selection of a facility design, (freeway vs. expressway) and findings of consistency with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals;

4. includes the decision to pursue the McLoughlin (to Milwaukie) and I-205 (from Portland International Airport to Clackamas Town Center) light rail transit improvements in addition to the Sunset LRT over the next 10 years;

5. includes the initial list adopted by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) of 10-year priority improvements (as well as other improvements demonstrated by analysis to be needed within the next decade), which will serve as a guide in the development of new transportation funding resources;

6. commits the region to pursue additional funding resources for capital improvements and operations and maintenance in four specific areas of the overall transportation system: major regional highway corridors; light rail transit lines; urban arterials; and bus service expansion.

7. Includes a variety of other improvements to the existing transportation system identified as needed since the last update;

8. sets forth a refined process for consistency among the RTP, local land use plans, and Statewide Land Use Planning Goals, which ensures that consideration of other values (environmental, land use) in addition to transportation-related needs occurs in the RTP decision-making process;

9. presents a current estimate of the transportation-related financing situation in light of the cost associated with meeting the estimated need and the committed and anticipated revenues available to fund the RTP; and

10. includes the adoption of the year 2005 population and employment forecast (soon to be updated to 2010) contained in A Regional
Population and Employment Forecast to 1990 and 2005 (and subsequent updates) which represents Technical Appendix A of the RTP.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends release of the draft document for public information and comment and a public hearing.

JG/sm
RTP.1
**Proposed RTP update adoption schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Event/Action Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 30</td>
<td>TPAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment on chapters 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 21</td>
<td>TPAC mailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 7; Introduction; Draft public involvement process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 28</td>
<td>TPAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment on mailed materials; distribution of chapters 3 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 29-Nov. 15</td>
<td>Final draft of document; incorporate jurisdictional comments, final graphics; prepare summary document and staff report part A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 16</td>
<td>TPAC mailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTP summary; final document review; staff report part A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 23</td>
<td>TPAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment on summary/full document and staff report part A; forward summary and document to JPACT for public release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1</td>
<td>JPACT mailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTP document/summary/staff report part A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 8</td>
<td>JPACT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTP document/summary/staff report part A release for review and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 10-Jan. 24</td>
<td>Notification of public hearing and open houses (see Jan. 15-23) and review period of material (stand-alone RTP summary, highlights of 1988 update. Send press packets to media and material to CPOs and to local jurisdictions for their distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 27</td>
<td>To executive management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinance, full document, supportive materials, staff report parts A and B, findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 3</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinance, full document, supportive materials, staff report mailing parts A and B, findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 12</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First reading; assigned to Intergovernmental Relations Committee for public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 15-23</td>
<td>Open house(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invite CPOs, etc. from distribution list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 24</td>
<td>Public hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergovernmental Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 27</td>
<td>TPAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of public testimony, ordinance, etc., forwarded to JPACT for adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 7</td>
<td>IRC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of public testimony, if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 9</td>
<td>JPACT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 9</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: JPACT
FROM: Dick Bolen, Regional Planning Supervisor
DATE: November 30, 1988

Attached for approval is the draft 1995 & 2010 forecast of population, housing and employment for the region, its four counties and 20 county subareas.

Also included in this mailing is a copy of the complete forecast document, describing the process used to develop the forecast. This report includes census tract detail which JPACT is not being asked to adopt as part of the 1995 & 2010 forecast. The ongoing policy has been to adopt the forecast for the larger geographic areas (20 county subareas) and to permit jurisdictions to periodically make adjustments to the tract and traffic zone levels, provided that the subarea control totals are maintained.

This document has been reviewed by the member jurisdictions and is forwarded by TPAC with a recommendation for approval.
### 1995/2010 SUBAREA FORECAST

#### POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>562203</td>
<td>553919</td>
<td>590869</td>
<td>629102</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>27659</td>
<td>30433</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>7.24%</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>241903</td>
<td>253404</td>
<td>299317</td>
<td>367907</td>
<td>11501</td>
<td>45913</td>
<td>60590</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
<td>18.12%</td>
<td>22.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>245593</td>
<td>278307</td>
<td>340358</td>
<td>439352</td>
<td>32724</td>
<td>62051</td>
<td>98994</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>192206</td>
<td>208697</td>
<td>259499</td>
<td>353067</td>
<td>16491</td>
<td>50832</td>
<td>93568</td>
<td>8.58%</td>
<td>24.34%</td>
<td>36.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1241895</td>
<td>1303427</td>
<td>1489843</td>
<td>1789420</td>
<td>61532</td>
<td>186416</td>
<td>295985</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>20.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1995/2010 Subarea Forecast

### Single Family Dwelling Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multnomah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clackamas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Washington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 - 87</td>
<td>1987 - 95</td>
<td>1995 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1995/2010 Subarea Forecast

#### Multiple Family Dwelling Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>86081</td>
<td>91080</td>
<td>97424</td>
<td>110285</td>
<td>4199</td>
<td>6344</td>
<td>12661</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
<td>6.97%</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>15989</td>
<td>19430</td>
<td>26216</td>
<td>33476</td>
<td>3341</td>
<td>6786</td>
<td>7260</td>
<td>21.52%</td>
<td>34.93%</td>
<td>27.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>31444</td>
<td>38281</td>
<td>50006</td>
<td>71534</td>
<td>6887</td>
<td>11725</td>
<td>21526</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>30.63%</td>
<td>43.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>15999</td>
<td>19857</td>
<td>25025</td>
<td>40414</td>
<td>3650</td>
<td>5168</td>
<td>15389</td>
<td>24.11%</td>
<td>26.03%</td>
<td>61.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>150325</td>
<td>168448</td>
<td>190671</td>
<td>255709</td>
<td>18325</td>
<td>30023</td>
<td>57038</td>
<td>12.15%</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
<td>28.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1995/2010 Subarea Forecast

#### Total Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>62140</td>
<td>94391</td>
<td>94074</td>
<td>115772</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>9683</td>
<td>21698</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>11.47%</td>
<td>23.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>175560</td>
<td>166049</td>
<td>175649</td>
<td>199101</td>
<td>-9520</td>
<td>102099</td>
<td>22052</td>
<td>-5.42%</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
<td>12.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70160</td>
<td>66444</td>
<td>69403</td>
<td>73148</td>
<td>-3716</td>
<td>2959</td>
<td>3742</td>
<td>-5.30%</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18360</td>
<td>18075</td>
<td>19531</td>
<td>21461</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
<td>9.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25890</td>
<td>25460</td>
<td>29496</td>
<td>42239</td>
<td>-430</td>
<td>4036</td>
<td>12743</td>
<td>-1.66%</td>
<td>15.95%</td>
<td>43.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>-480</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-6.00%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>372910</td>
<td>361530</td>
<td>389146</td>
<td>422682</td>
<td>-11300</td>
<td>27616</td>
<td>62936</td>
<td>-3.05%</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
<td>16.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26990</td>
<td>26085</td>
<td>28413</td>
<td>32095</td>
<td>-905</td>
<td>2328</td>
<td>3682</td>
<td>-3.35%</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13410</td>
<td>14503</td>
<td>20104</td>
<td>31171</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>5595</td>
<td>11067</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>38.56%</td>
<td>55.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10250</td>
<td>11529</td>
<td>13984</td>
<td>16745</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>2373</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>12.04%</td>
<td>20.60%</td>
<td>20.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10120</td>
<td>11977</td>
<td>13452</td>
<td>17331</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>3909</td>
<td>18.35%</td>
<td>12.32%</td>
<td>29.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>30273</td>
<td>13658</td>
<td>21520</td>
<td>3473</td>
<td>2665</td>
<td>7962</td>
<td>46.93%</td>
<td>24.63%</td>
<td>58.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11100</td>
<td>11489</td>
<td>12655</td>
<td>15688</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>3033</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
<td>23.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Clackamas

| 11      | 7650   | 8643  | 12257 | 22091  | 1193          | 3624          | 9024             | 16.01%                 | 41.33%                 | 80.08%                 |
| 12      | 21350  | 22299 | 26279 | 31778  | 949           | 3980          | 5499             | 4.44%                  | 17.85%                 | 20.93%                 |
| 13      | 48330  | 53452 | 62323 | 72945  | 5122          | 8871          | 10622            | 10.60%                 | 16.60%                 | 17.04%                 |
| 14      | 10040  | 12540 | 21592 | 48354  | 2500          | 9052          | 26762            | 24.90%                 | 72.19%                 | 123.94%                |
| 15      | 11790  | 16470 | 20970 | 37294  | 4257          | 4923          | 16324            | 36.11%                 | 30.68%                 | 77.84%                 |
| 18      | 2970   | 4172  | 5180  | 6801    | 1202          | 1008          | 1621             | 40.47%                 | 24.16%                 | 31.29%                 |

#### Washington

| 17      | 59139  | 64451 | 79474 | 113005 | 5312          | 15023         | 33531            | 8.96%                  | 23.31%                 | 42.19%                 |

#### Region

| 1       | 618819 | 635579 | 726429 | 924390 | 16760         | 90850         | 202961           | 2.71%                  | 14.29%                 | 27.94%                 |
Date: November 28, 1988

To: JPACT

From: Richard Brandman, Transportation Planning Manager

Regarding: Springwater (Bellrose) Line Acquisition

Attached to this memo is a draft letter from JPACT to the Portland City Council which endorses the City's entering into an agreement with ODOT and the Portland Traction Company to acquire the PTC's Springwater line (commonly referred to as Bellrose) at their December 14 meeting. This line commences at McLoughlin Boulevard just inside the Milwaukie city boundary and extends through southeast Portland and beyond to Gresham and Boring. While the line crosses through several jurisdictions, Portland has agreed to simplify matters by holding title to the entire line in the short term.

The Springwater line is currently an operating rail corridor. In 1987, approximately 150 carloads traveled east of McLoughlin Boulevard. If the railroad continues to operate, the railroad overcrossing at McLoughlin Boulevard would have to be reconstructed when the McLoughlin widening project takes place in 1991. If this agreement is entered into, the PTC will initiate abandonment proceedings with the Interstate Commerce Commission which would allow them to discontinue service on the line if the application is successful.

Public benefits resulting from acquisition of this railroad would be a substantial savings to the McLoughlin Boulevard highway project, as well as preservation of an important corridor for future recreational and transportation uses. The actual savings to the McLoughlin project resulting from not constructing the overcrossing and salvaging fill material is estimated at $2,385,800. The negotiated agreement that the Oregon State Highway Department would pay the Portland Traction Company is $1.5 million, resulting in a net savings of $885,800 in project costs.

In addition to saving costs for the McLoughlin Boulevard project, acquisition of the Springwater line will result in public ownership of a corridor which is a significant portion of the 40-mile loop. Both Portland and Gresham are committed to trail development if the line is acquired. In the long term, this corridor may also have potential as a transitway. The Southeast Corridor Citizens Advisory Committee is currently exploring that issue.

Attachment
December 8, 1988

The Honorable J.E. "Bud" Clark
Mayor, City of Portland
1220 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

Dear Bud:

Metro's Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) would like to take this opportunity to strongly endorse the agreement before you to take title to the Portland Traction Company's Springwater line. This line, which runs from east of McLoughlin Boulevard in the city of Milwaukie, through southeast Portland and out to Gresham and Boring represents a tremendous opportunity to preserve an existing transportation corridor for future recreational and/or transportation uses.

As you know, acquisition of this line, together with planned trail development by Portland and Gresham, would go a long way towards completion of the 40-mile loop. In addition, preservation of the corridor would allow future consideration of rail transit, should that become a viable option at some point in the future.

JPACT understands that this agreement became possible only through a truly cooperative effort of the Oregon Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, the City of Portland and Metro. The result is preservation of a valuable resource and an estimated savings of almost $900,000 to the McLoughlin Boulevard highway project. For these reasons, we urge you to pass the resolution before you.

Sincerely,

Richard Waker, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

RW:lmk

CC: Portland City Council
   Don Adams
December 7, 1988

Commissioner Mike Lindberg
City of Portland
1220 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

RE: Acquisition of Portland Traction Co. Right of Way
(McLoughlin Blvd. to Boring)

Dear Mike:

I understand that Portland is ready to adopt an acquisition agreement with Oregon Department of Transportation and the Portland Traction Company. As was stated in my earlier letter of April 18, 1988, the City of Gresham has a strong interest in the proposed public acquisition of the Portland Traction Co. line, between Portland and Boring, across South Gresham, since it is proposed for re-use as part of the 40-Mile Loop trail in Gresham's Comprehensive Plan of 1988.

Gresham has taken several important steps in 1988 to support this proposal.

1. The Gresham Parks Bond Measure, passed in November 1988, funds Phase I trail development in Gresham of the "Johnson Creek Trail" section of the 40-Mile Loop from Main City Park, west to the Portland city limits (2.4 miles).

2. The 1988 Parks Master Plan, which has been incorporated in our 1988 Comprehensive Plan update, calls for development of the entire Traction Company right-of-way in Gresham (from the west City limits to SE Palmblad Road - 4.5 miles) as part of the 40 mile loop.


4. Gresham has acquired key pieces of linear greenway along Johnson Creek, parallel to the Portland Traction Co. line, in the past decade. The 1988 amendments to the Comprehensive Plan will be adopted by the Council on December 20.
December 7, 1988
Commissioner Mike Lindberg
Page 2

We recognize that a detailed recreational trail plan, based on broad public involvement, must be prepared by Portland and Gresham, to address trail management and compatibility issues, before formal trail development and public use occur. Properly managed and developed, the South Gresham segment of the 40 mile loop holds great promise to become an attractive, first class, regional recreation facility. Cities, such as Boston, have long used regional trails along greenways as attractive parts of regional bicycle routes, for both recreation and commuting. Outside of Airport Way, the 40-Mile Loop will be the first of many new transportation/recreation linkages that will join our cities in the future.

City transportation and parks staff have worked closely with your office and Portland Parks, for the past two years, on the acquisition issue. Richard Ross, Transportation Planner is the lead on this project until the Portland Traction Co. line is formally abandoned. Then, Jean Keating, Parks Coordinator, will head up our efforts to actually plan and implement trail development. Please let us know if there is anything further that Gresham can do to assure the successful acquisition of this line. We look forward to working further with Portland, and other interested jurisdictions, in building this exciting recreation link between our cities.

Sincerely yours,

Larry Deyo
Mayor

LD:RR:se

Enclosure: Parks Master Plan Map, 1988

cc: F. Wallace Douthwaite, City Manager
    Diane Jones, CED Director
    John Andersen, Community Dev. Director
    Richard Ross, Transportation Planner
    Jean Keating, Parks Coordinator
    City Council
    Andy Cotugno, METRO
    Mary Ann Cassin, Portland Parks Bureau
    Don Zinzer, Clackamas Co. Parks
    Paul Yarborough, Multnomah County DES
November 28, 1988

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation Metropolitan Service District 2000 S.W. First Avenue Portland, OR 97201

JPACT Members:

There has been extensive discussion of the I-205 Light Rail Transit Corridor over past months by various regional committees. There has also been discussion concerning a lead agency for various transportation financing proposals. The Port has analyzed the proposed project from the standpoint of its aviation and real estate interests, its role as a regional player in transportation planning, and has discussed the project with Port Commission members. The Port wishes to take this opportunity to comment on the proposed project.

The Port feels there are many unanswered questions about this proposed line. Future discussion of the line will benefit from more detailed study of the costs and feasibility of the project. Of particular interest are capital and operating cost calculations, ridership estimates, alternative revenue projections, analysis of funding mechanisms, and segmenting the line.

Without answers to these questions and others, it is very difficult for the Port to make major commitments. The Port wishes to assist in determining the feasibility of this portion of the community's light rail system.

We believe that the I-205 Light Rail Corridor should be in the regional package. The I-205 Line has merit as a transportation and economic development project. I-205 traffic volumes are increasing much more rapidly than projected, particularly south of Gateway, with much land yet to develop or redevelop. Capacity problems are already being experienced at I-205 freeway interchanges.

We support moving ahead with the "Alternatives Analysis/Preliminary Engineering" phase of the process. Further, we support use of the I-205 busway federal funds or interstate transfer funds as the federal share of the cost of alternatives analysis. Withdrawal of the busway
funds should occur only if the study shows that a light rail line is appropriate. The Port will commit to fund 30 percent of the necessary local match in an amount not to exceed $135,000 to complete this analysis phase.

We are committed to working with other regional players to determine the feasibility of the project and the various funding mechanisms. The Port wishes to be an active partner in identifying and seeking answers to the tough questions that must be asked.

We will participate in the planning of the proposed transportation system as a partner, but we have no interest in serving as the lead agency on any piece of this or other transportation projects. Additionally, the Port has no desire to be an issuing agency for bonds nor the collector of assessments for transportation projects. These activities are not consistent with the Port's role in the community.

We will defer commitment to capital funding of the system until the alternatives analysis is complete and the feasibility, cost, and phasing issues are resolved. Once the project costs and other funding sources are more clearly defined, the level of our financial participation will be measured against other Port transportation and economic development priorities.

The Port looks forward to working with the region on these challenging transportation issues.

Yours very truly,

Robert L. Woodell
Executive Director
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ragsdale</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Van Buren</td>
<td>Cities of Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Byers</td>
<td>1DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Lemly</td>
<td>Clark Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Dolman</td>
<td>Vancouver City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern Varragon</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnie Hyer</td>
<td>Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Hansen</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gardner</td>
<td>Jackmanas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Finkenoust</td>
<td>TRI-MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Post</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Cohen</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Waker</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Ann Anderson</td>
<td>Washington C.o. cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Bier</td>
<td>Cities of Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majorie D. Schmuck</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebe Rucker</td>
<td>Northwest District Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wrench</td>
<td>NORTHWEST EXAMINER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Keltner</td>
<td>Cities of MULT. Co/GRESRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Abola</td>
<td>Audubon Society of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McRoss</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael C. Houck</td>
<td>Clark Co. Natural Resources Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Green</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lou Moser</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert G. Dryfuss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kinnard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Bill Stark</td>
<td>Clackamas Cities (a/t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - James R. Emerson</td>
<td>N.W. Multnomah County Reps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Karen F. Hunt</td>
<td>W.E. Multnomah Soil Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - George Lowder</td>
<td>CPSR/Skyline Neighborhood Ass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Di Maddox</td>
<td>Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S - Richard Brandman</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Molly O'Deely</td>
<td>Forest Park Neighborhood Ass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Merle Perlmutter</td>
<td>Wn. County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Bruce Warner</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Howard Harris</td>
<td>Pdx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Grace Crunican</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Steve D'orsey</td>
<td>CBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Ray Poleni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Tom Van Zandenh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD Hampel, Hildaband</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Phie Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Ted Higson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Sue Hanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Bob Steven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S - Karen Hackston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Dick Feehney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S - BANJ STA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Ken McFarling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Charles Vessinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Jim Sjolin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Dick Feehney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S - Portland Parks</td>
<td>Wn. County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>