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Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: DECEMBER 8, 1994
Day: THURSDAY
Time: 7:15 a.m.
Place: METRO, CONFERENCE ROOM 370

*1. MEETING REPORT OF NOVEMBER 10, 1994 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.

*2. RESOLUTION NO. 94-1989 - DETERMINING THE SOUTH/NORTH LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES TO ADVANCE INTO THE TIER II DEIS FOR FURTHER STUDY - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Richard Brandman/Leon Skiles.

3. WESTSIDE STATION AREA PLANNING SLIDE PRESENTATION - INFORMATION - Brent Curtis, Washington County.

*Material enclosed.
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: November 10, 1994

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Rod Monroe, Jon Kvistad and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland; John Kowalczyk (alt.), DEQ; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Dave Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver; Bruce Warner, ODOT; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Dave Sturdevant, Clark County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; and Tanya Collier, Multnomah County

Guests: Steve Dotterrer and Meeky Blizzard, City of Portland; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Jim Howell, AORTA; Dave Williams, ODOT; Barbara Katz, Portland Bureau of Realtors; Bev Bergman, Clark County; Molly O'Reilly, Citizen; Les White (JPACT alt.), C-TRAN; Brian Campbell, Port of Portland; Jim Bevily, ITC; Tom Coffee, City of Lake Oswego; G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Brent Curtis, Washington County; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington RTC; Keith Ahola (JPACT alt.), WSDOT; Darin Atteberry, City of Vancouver; Claudette La Vert, City of Gresham; Ed Washington, Metro Councilor; Richard Ross, the Cities of Multnomah County; John Rat, Clackamas County; Bob Bothman, MCCI; Kathy Busse, Multnomah County; and Bob Stacey, Governor Roberts' office

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Richard Brandman, John Fregonese, Ken Gervais, Tom Kloster, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

Media: Gordon Oliver, The Oregonian

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Rod Monroe.

MEETING REPORT

Commissioner Sturdevant moved, seconded by Gerry Smith, to approve the October 13, 1994 Meeting Report as written. The motion PASSED unanimously.
RESOLUTION NO. 94-2039 - AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) REGARDING CONFORMITY OF PORTIONS OF THE AIR QUALITY MAINTENANCE AREA OUTSIDE OF METRO'S BOUNDARIES

Andy Cotugno explained that the region needs to annually demonstrate that the Transportation Improvement Program conforms to air quality requirements. Approval of this resolution would initiate a Memorandum of Understanding for the areas of Banks, Gaston and North Plains that are geographically located outside Metro's boundaries but within the Oregon portion of the AQMA. This resolution would establish procedures that would assure that any project receiving federal assistance would be in compliance with air quality standards. It also establishes Metro's responsibility to consult with those jurisdictions and acknowledges their responsibility as well. Andy noted that federal sanctions can be imposed or the project can become ineligible to receive federal funds if it's not included in the air quality process, even if locally funded.

Andy noted that if the region doesn't conform, those jurisdictions would have to meet to determine how to correct the problem. He pointed out the sunset clause of September 30, 1995 for renewal by all signatories. That date was chosen to coincide with the update of the TIP.

Action Taken: Councilor Kvistad moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 94-2039, authorizing execution of a Memorandum of Understanding regarding conformity of portions of the Air Quality Maintenance Area outside of Metro's boundaries. The motion PASSED unanimously.

REGION 2040 RECOMMENDATIONS

Andy Cotugno reviewed his November 3 memo to JPACT on Region 2040 recommendations relating to roadways, transit, bicycles and pedestrians, freight and intermodal facilities, future analysis and policy issues, and land use. The recommendations reflect TPAC consideration on those issues. Andy noted that MPAC had finalized its recommendations on November 9.

Andy explained that Attachment A represented the JPACT "Consent Agenda" while Attachment B reflected the more substantive comments. The following items were pulled from the Consent Agenda for further discussion: Comment 4 (relating to the RUGGO amendments, submitted by the City of Gresham); Comment 8 (relating to the Western Bypass, submitted by the Greater Hillsboro Chamber); Comments 12, 13 and 14 (relating to HCT extensions, submitted by Clackamas County); Comment 15 (relating to commuter rail for inclusion in the Recommended Alternative, submitted by Tri-Met); and Comment 5 under MTAC comments (relating to "proposed LRT" or
"proposed HCT" links between neighboring cities on the Concept Map, submitted by Jim Zehren) as it was processed by MTAC.

In discussion on Clause 4, it was agreed to change the language to read: "...move people and goods through and around the region, connect regional centers and the Central City, and connect the region to the statewide and interstate transportation system"; and...

Councilor Kvistad felt that the Western Bypass needs to remain on the region's agenda. He asked that Comment 8 be pulled. Andy Cotugno clarified that the principal focus of the 2040 project is primarily land use. He spoke of key areas where transportation and land use are interrelated: the comprehensive set of transportation improvements and the need to define the rest of the transportation system and that which may not be explicitly shown but will be included in the RTP. Andy emphasized the fact that including or excluding a project is not intended to prohibit that project. He noted that connector routes have been included to reflect their relationship to high-density Regional Centers, neighboring communities and freight movement to and from the region. He pointed out that a bypass through the Tualatin Valley is not needed to serve an expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary. He felt that the need for through movement to I-5 from the Tualatin Valley area should be addressed in terms of road improvements, transit and alternative modes. He also recognized a problem with urban traffic on rural roads and the need to address that issue as part of the RTP process.

Mayor Drake noted that the Washington County Mayors feel comfortable that this issue will receive adequate review through the RTP and public review process. He indicated that updates have been received from the Governor's office and ODOT and wanted to be assured that there will be a proper process.

Councilor Kvistad expressed concern that the 2040 process has offered very little for his district.

Regarding Comments 12, 13 and 14, Andy Cotugno noted that they relate to rail components -- where the density is focused around high-capacity transit (HCT). He cited the need for land use to be served or needed connections. Andy reviewed the three types of designated route categories: planned and existing; proposed LRT; and potential HCT.

Relating to Comment 12, Commissioner Lindquist cited difficulty with traffic on Sunnyside Road and wanted it designated as HCT. He noted that the area is growing fast and most of it is within the UGB. Councilor McLain felt this was a serious concern and was discussed at MPAC as it represents the link between Sunnyside and Damascus.
Action Taken: Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Mayor Drake, to include the HCT extension to Damascus from the Clackamas Town Center. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Relating to Comment 13, Andy Cotugno noted that it deals with the Southern Pacific Railroad corridor and is not in the Recommended Alternative for HCT. MPAC did recommend it as a potential HCT corridor. Staff's recommendation is not to include that route.

Andy noted that the bus corridor along Kruse Way and A Street is where the higher densities are called for rather than along the SPRR. He noted, however, that it doesn't preclude us from examining it for potential HCT.

Commissioner Lindquist reported that the City of Lake Oswego feels left out of the LRT process. He indicated their support for LRT in the past and noted that we are not doing anything about that quadrant. Mayor Lomnicki concurred about Lake Oswego's concern about being left out of the future of HCT. Commissioner Lindquist pointed out the freight movement through that area and the options available. He felt we should keep the door open and that a lot of it is in Washington County.

Action Taken: Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Commissioner Rogers, to concur with Clackamas County's and MPAC's recommendation to include the HCT extension from Lake Oswego to Durham Road/I-5 interchange. The motion PASSED unanimously.

With regard to Comment 14 (relating to the inclusion of I-205 HCT from I-84 to the Clackamas Town Center as LRT), it was noted that the option will be studied further by MPAC as a Regional Center. Commissioner Lindquist spoke of the need to tie the Regional Centers together and noted that he is not opposed to HCT as an option. A discussion followed on the history of I-205's construction and the fact that the Multnomah County Commission had designated it a transit corridor. Completed concrete tunnels are in place and most of the required right-of-way is there. Commissioner Lindquist was willing to accept the language but had hoped it would be stronger.

 Commissioner Rogers asked for clarification on the language in Comment 14 relating to "drop airport and Tigard extensions to HCT category for consistency." Andy Cotugno responded that the I-205 Corridor should be treated the same as the Barbur Corridor. Commissioner Rogers felt we should be addressing regional solutions to regional problems and that the language should be reworded.

Relating to Comment 5 under MTAC Comments, Andy Cotugno stated that "neighbor cities of sufficient size should include a transit
connection to the metropolitan area." The two issues to be addressed are: what can be justified and what can be supported. Commissioner Collier reported that the East County Transportation Committee went along with the TPAC recommendation but noted that MPAC took different action. Richard Ross pointed out the concern and importance of the study on the Urban Reserves and the fact that a lot of issues need to be addressed in the next 6-8 months.

**Action Taken:** Councilor McLain moved, seconded by Commissioner Rogers, that language be provided that "neighbor cities of sufficient size should include a transit connection to the metropolitan area on the Concept Map." The motion PASSED unanimously.

**Action Taken:** Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Tom Walsh, to approve the remainder of the Consent Agenda. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Jim Howell, representing AORTA, felt that the Powell/Foster alignment was being overlooked as a good HCT corridor, that it shouldn't be excluded from consideration, and that the model showed a significant amount of ridership from the McLoughlin line. Tom Walsh was supportive of that recommendation. Andy Cotugno responded that, for land use-related reasons, we would be looking at increased densities that are not recommended. It is the major traffic street for this feeder and transit on other streets. Discussion followed with no motion to change the recommendation.

Jim Howell also asked that the word "recommended" precede "Growth Concept" in the first line of the new language to be adopted under Comment 30 on page 9 of the memo. After further discussion, the Committee didn't feel it was appropriate and chose to take no action on that recommendation.

Relating to Comment 15, Mayor Lomnicki cited the need for some guidance for Milwaukie's light rail station area planning. He expressed concern about using transit as a connection instead of auto. Mayor Lomnicki noted that he is the region's representative on V-PACT, citing the need for commuter rail and making connections between the region and the Willamette Valley. He felt there should be discussions on commuter rail as part of the intermodal mix and that MPAC's language is not strong enough. He asked that the rail commuter line between Milwaukie and Newberg be included. Commissioner Lindquist, also represented on V-PACT, stressed the importance for all transportation systems to come together. He cited the need for commuter rail on the Westside to connect to the high-speed rail.

**Action Taken:** Tom Walsh moved, seconded by Mayor Lomnicki, to identify a potential HCT line on the map connecting from Milwaukie/Lake Oswego to Tualatin/Newberg.
Molly O'Reilly and Councilor Kvistad spoke in support of providing access to Newberg and to areas where there is a significant land use connection.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

A discussion was held on the VMT/capita reduction and the fact that it has been analyzed in the modeling at 12.4 VMT/capita. Andy Cotugno noted that the economic system is being cited as another option to be studied.

Bruce Warner commented on the November 1 memo from Jim Sitzman, representing six state agencies, and its recommendations for amendment of the Region 2040 Concept. Bruce indicated he was supportive of their recommendation and noted that, from the state's perspective, LRT and HCT are regarded all the same in terms of determining the kind of transit. They are regarded as potential HCT corridors. The state will await completion of the analysis to determine the best way to provide service.

Councilor McLain referenced the November 3 memo from STOP and its recommendation relating to the number of Regional Centers. She noted that the issue is being studied and that transportation is supposed to be used in that same mix to see what works best.

Andy Cotugno explained that Attachment B provides the status of the transportation system. The map is not intended to show all the projects. He felt the conclusions are appropriate for direction setting and sought Committee approval of the recommendations.

Action Taken: Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Bruce Warner, that the amended language relating to General Comment 1 (Attachment B) be approved. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Action Taken: Bruce Warner moved, seconded by Tom Walsh, that the language relating to General Comment 2 (Attachment B) be amended to read: "Encourage the state to modify state plans, regulations, activities and related funding to enhance implementation of the Regional Framework Plan and functional plans adopted by Metro. Encourage state agencies and regulatory bodies toward promotion and implementation of these goals and objectives and the Regional Framework Plan." The motion PASSED unanimously.

Action Taken: Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Mayor Lomnicki, to recommend approval of TPAC's recommendation relating to Roadways Comment 3 (Attachment B). The motion PASSED unanimously.
Andy Cotugno noted that Roadways Comments Nos. 4 and 5 related to connectivity. TPAC recommends consideration of 8 to 20 through-routes per mile as circumstances dictate.

**Action Taken:** Commissioner Blumenauer moved, seconded by Dave Sturdevant, to approve TPAC's recommendations for Roadways Comments Nos. 4 and 5 (Attachment B). The motion PASSED unanimously.

TPAC's recommendation on Transit Comment 6 was in opposition to ODOT's recommendation (relating to the Regional Centers definition).

**Action Taken:** Mayor Lomnicki moved, seconded by Mayor Drake, to approve TPAC's recommendation on Transit Comment 6 (Attachment B). The motion PASSED unanimously.

Andy Cotugno noted that Transit Comments 7 and 8 represent two routes but the recommendation reflects that only one should be picked. In discussion on this comment, Councilor Kvistad asked at what point in the process the projects will be listed, and it was noted that it's unscheduled.

**Action Taken:** Tom Walsh moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to approve TPAC's recommendation for Transit Comments 7 and 8 (Attachment B). The motion PASSED unanimously.

Commissioner Blumenauer spoke of the lack of vision concerning progress on mode splits, suggesting that the issue be revisited. He referenced correspondence received from the Bicycle Transportation Alliance and STOP regarding this issue. He noted that the bike model is not as artful as it could be but hoped that there is enough vision to make some sense in terms of a bike/pedestrian mode split. Commissioner Blumenauer felt that we do a disservice for a mode split projection that captures that effort and questioned where we want to be in the next 50 years.

In response, Andy Cotugno indicated that some policy language was included on page 5 of Attachment A under the heading of Bicycles and Pedestrians relating to Comment 18 that read as follows: "...The Regional Transportation Plan will establish objectives to substantially increase the share on these modes." While language was provided, Andy didn't feel we have the basis for setting targets yet although TPAC has discussed an 11 percent benchmark. Discussion followed on what the components are for getting us further toward the 20 percent level.

Mayor Drake felt that the City of Beaverton citizens don't want to drive and bike. Portland's Eastside has a better grid system. He wasn't opposed to being aggressive but he worried about too
aggressive an approach. He commented that the City has a Bike Task Force and he has difficulty in getting people to serve on it. He also noted limited dollars for Washington County. He felt the Committee needs to acknowledge that there are different community needs and what may be right for the City of Portland may not be right for Washington County or parts of Clackamas County. Mayor Drake welcomed more input from the bike lobby but it just doesn't happen. He cited his responsibility to respond to the needs of his constituency and the need to maintain a balance.

Molly O'Reilly noted that the most repeated comment on the 17,000 fliers was for more facilities to ride bikes. She pointed out that the region just voted favorably, by a 66 percent majority, for the South/North light rail. She noted good use by strollers and bikes on Scholls Ferry Road when a 12-foot lane was provided. She cited the need to change structure to achieve this target and felt it would come in time. Councilor Kvistad commented that bike lanes are required to be provided in consideration of projects but felt that, due to limited dollars, differences in the communities should also be taken into account.

Commissioner Blumenauer cited the need to do a better job in the bike/pedestrian effort. He pointed out that, while the surveys indicate there is keen interest, facility modification and public education are necessary. He was willing to work with staff to narrow this down. He asked that Molly O'Reilly's memo be reviewed again to see whether some targets could be set that are achievable.

Councilor Kvistad expressed support in moving forward with the bike/pedestrian mode depending on the urban form and resources available. He didn't have a problem changing the mode split if the investment were made.

**Action Taken:** Commissioner Blumenauer moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to recommend approval of TPAC's proposed language on page 5 relating to Comment 18 (Attachment A) Under Bicycles and Pedestrians to read as follows: "...The Regional Transportation Plan will establish objectives to substantially increase the share on these modes." The motion PASSED. Councilor Kvistad and Mayor Drake were opposed.

Commissioner Lindquist felt that this issue should be regarded as a higher priority.

Relating to Future Analysis and Policy Comments 9 and 10, Andy Cotugno cited the need to work out a relationship with the neighbor cities concerning the jobs/housing balance and development along those corridors. No action was taken by the Committee.
Action Taken: Gerry Smith moved, seconded by Mayor Lomnicki, to recommend approval of the staff recommendation on Future Analysis and Policy Comment 11 (relating to the consolidation of air quality activities). The motion PASSED unanimously for item 3 on page 18 of RUGGO to read: "The region, working with the state, shall pursue close collaboration of the Oregon and Clark County Air Quality Management Areas."

Action Taken: Councilor Kvistad moved, seconded by Bruce Warner, to accept TPAC's recommendation on Future Analysis and Policy Comment 12 (relating to CO2 emissions and greenhouse gases). The motion PASSED unanimously.

Andy Cotugno explained that TPAC didn't take action on Comments 13 and 14 because they were land use-oriented. A discussion followed on the concern about the number of Regional Centers and the need to lower the number. Andy noted that the new language is the recognition that it is a priority statement on transportation investments. He cited the need to ensure that market and transportation issues are important considerations.

Commissioner Blumenauer felt that we've reached the point of concentrating our resources and need to be narrowing our choices. He didn't feel the language was helpful. He cited the importance of the study process, that we are headed in the right direction, but emphasized the need to reduce the number of Regional Centers to capitalize on 2040. He suggested the following sentence in addition to that proposed in Land Use Comment 14: "As we finish the 2040 process, an effort be made to reduce the number of Regional Centers to concentrate our regional resources and make the plan more functional."

Tom Walsh proposed that, in the near term, we concentrate our investments, prove the concept and always have the opportunity to expand upon the Regional Centers.

Mayor Lomnicki spoke in favor of Oregon City being designated a Regional Center, citing its historical background as one of the oldest cities in the state, the possibility of light rail being extended to Oregon City and a high-speed train station being located there, and it being the end of the Oregon Trail. He supported it being studied for a Regional Center but was unsure about Gateway. Committee members seemed in agreement about limiting the number of Regional Centers.

Commissioner Blumenauer noted that Gateway was recommended as a Regional Center because it is located at the intersection of two interstate freeways. It would be connected by light rail, nine bus lines, and two interstate freeways and supported by a huge population and existing roadways. He felt it is a potential Regional Center. He cited the need to set criteria for a limited
number of centers. If Gateway doesn't match up, it would drop off the list. He felt that the stricter the criteria, the better, noting that it would make people more objective. It was the consensus of the Committee that there be a fewer number of Regional Centers with tougher criteria. Councilor Kvistad also felt that Gateway needs to be looked at because of its transportation mix and population density. As we move toward the Regional Framework Plan, there will be a gradual narrowing of centers. He hoped that we are not setting up expectations that can't be achieved. The consultants will have to make the case in terms of investment, planning and development, and what local governments are willing to do in terms of investment for housing and transportation.

Andy Cotugno spoke in terms of clarification on MPAC's consideration and the general principle of what is being adopted. He noted there would be further consideration of these components in the future. Approval of 2040 allows us to set this benchmark but enables us to return and revisit our concerns which include the issue surrounding Gateway and Oregon City.

At this time, the map would include eight Regional Centers during the six-month evaluation period. Andy suggested language that proposes that the number of study areas be reduced to three or four by using strict criteria for final selection.

**Action Taken:** Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Mayor Lomnicki, that the following language be incorporated: "As such, the eight Regional Centers should be considered candidates and ultimately the number should be reduced or policy established to phase in certain other Regional Centers earlier than others." The motion PASSED unanimously.

Councilor Kvistad made a commitment that there wouldn't be anything in the concept that is not viable. He assured the Committee that they would only stick with the Regional Centers that make sense.

Commissioner Blumenauer didn't think it was adequate and expressed concern about the six-month timeframe with particular fairness to Oregon City. He requested that we work on this to get it down to a phasing mechanism. John Fregonese commented that there is no specific criteria for a Regional Center although there are three to four Regional Centers that have already risen to the top that have high density and good accessibility, citing Beaverton, Washington Square, Gresham and the Clackamas Town Center. He cited examples of a second tier below that that might include cities such as Oregon City, Milwaukie and Hillsboro. There is a place inbetween that is ready for transit and performs an important function of jobs/housing balance. The third tier would include the Town Centers and Village Centers.
Action Taken: The Committee agreed to accept TPAC's recommendation for Comments 13 and 14 (as underlined) in addition to language proposed by Andy Cotugno suggesting that the number of study areas for Regional Centers be reduced to three or four by using strict criteria for final selection.

Andy Cotugno thanked all the jurisdictions for their participation and effort in the 2040 planning process.

Councilor Kvistad thanked everyone at Tri-Met for leading a successful light rail bond measure effort.

It was announced that the next JPACT meeting would be held December 8.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan
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JPACT Members
STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF JOINT METRO RESOLUTION NO. 94-1989 AND C-TRAN RESOLUTION NO. 94-010 FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING THE SOUTH/NORTH LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES TO ADVANCE INTO THE TIER II DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR FURTHER STUDY

Date: November 17, 1994
Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution adopts the South/North Transit Corridor light rail transit (LRT) terminus and alignment alternatives that will advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for further study.

TPAC has reviewed this joint C-TRAN/Metro consideration and recommends approval of Resolution No. 94-1989.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

In April 1993, the Metro Council and C-TRAN Board of Directors adopted Resolutions No. 93-1784 and No. BR-93-004, respectively, that established the South/North Transit Corridor as the region’s high-capacity transit (HCT) Priority Corridor to advance into Alternatives Analysis (AA) and the preparation of a DEIS. In June 1993, Metro submitted an application to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to advance the South/North Corridor into AA/DEIS and submitted the South/North Preliminary Work Plan for approval. FTA approved the application and Preliminary Work Plan in October 1993 and issued notification in the Federal Register (October 12, 1994) of its intent to publish an Environmental Impact Statement for HCT improvements within the South/North Corridor.

The Preliminary Work Plan established a two-tiered structure for the South/North Transit Corridor Study as follows:

- Tier I has focused on evaluating modal alternatives, alignment alternatives, design options and terminus alternatives in order to narrow the number of alternatives to be addressed in the DEIS.

- Tier II will focus on preparing a DEIS on the narrowed set of LRT alternatives and a No-Build alternative. Tier II will conclude with the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative.
Tier I started in mid-1993 with the initiation of the federally-mandated Scoping Process. Based on the analysis of busways, river transit, commuter rail and light rail transit and public input provided during Scoping, the high-capacity transit alternatives were narrowed to light rail transit by the South/North Steering Group on December 17, 1993. Further, through Scoping, the Steering Group (as adopted on December 17, 1993 and as amended by the Steering Group in May 1994) identified:

- Four south (Clackamas County) and five north (Clark County) Terminus Alternatives for the LRT.
- Two or more Alignment Alternatives for each of five defined segments of the LRT alignment.
- Detailed Design Options for several of the LRT alignment alternatives.

On December 17, 1993, the South/North Steering Group also adopted the Tier I Evaluation Methodology Report that established the following for the South/North Transit Corridor Study:

- The goal and objectives;
- The organizational structure; and
- The criteria and measures to be used to evaluate the Tier I terminus and alignment alternatives.

After Scoping, staff prepared technical analyses of the terminus and alignment alternatives addressing the established criteria and measures. These analyses are documented in the Tier I Technical Summary Report and the Tier I Briefing Document (Attachment A).

The technical data, methods and assumptions for the Tier I analysis were reviewed by the South/North Expert Review Panel in July 1994. The Panel issued a letter documenting their review and comments on the technical data, methods and assumptions. In summary, the Panel wrote that, "It is the role of the Expert Panel to help assure [oversight agencies] that the assumptions, methodologies and data on which the key project decisions will be based are accurate and form a sound basis for decision-making. We believe this to be the case in this project...The Panel finds that the data developed is sufficient to make the decisions regarding which alternatives should be carried forward for further study. Overall, the project staff continue to provide top-quality, in-depth analysis of the alternatives and associated issues" (August 8, 1994).

In addition, an extensive public involvement process on the data prepared on the terminus and alignment alternatives was conducted. The public process was initiated immediately
following Scoping, with a wide variety of meetings and presentations held with neighborhood organizations, businesses, various interest groups and interested citizens throughout the Corridor. These initial meetings and presentations identified the Tier I study process, the alternatives being considered and the data or measures that would be prepared to compare and evaluate the alternatives. It also provided the public with the opportunity to voice their concerns and preferences.

In July 1994, Metro initiated a 60-day public comment period on the Tier I alternatives and data. The comment period started with four open houses held throughout the Corridor where the Tier I data was presented and the public had the opportunity to discuss the data with staff from Metro, C-TRAN and other participating jurisdictions. Tech Facts, a summary of the Tier I data, was distributed at the open houses and was mailed out upon request throughout the public comment period. In early September 1994, the Steering Group held four meetings to receive oral public comment on the Tier I alternatives and data where citizens were encouraged to state their preferences on the alternatives that should be selected to advance into the Tier II DEIS for further study. The public comment period ended on September 13, 1994. All written comments and a summary of the oral comments received at the public meetings are documented within the Narrowing the Options: A Summary of Tier I Public Meetings and Comments (September 13, 1994).

As noted above, the Evaluation Methodology Report established the South/North Tier I organizational structure illustrated in Appendix C of the attached Briefing Document. The Project Management Group (PMG) prepared a draft recommendation for terminus alternatives on August 25, 1994 and adopted its final recommendation for terminus and alignment alternatives on September 14, 1994, following the conclusion of the public comment period. The South/North Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) adopted its recommendation on September 29, 1994. Both the PMG and CAC recommendations were forwarded to the South/North Steering Group which unanimously adopted its recommendation on October 6, 1994.

The Steering Group recommendation has been forwarded to and considered by the Study’s participating jurisdictions and agencies which have each adopted resolutions recommending the terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into the Tier II DEIS for further study. Those jurisdictions and agencies that have passed recommending resolutions are: Oregon City, the City of Gladstone, the City of Milwaukie, Clackamas County, Multnomah County, the City of Portland, the City of Vancouver, Clark County and Tri-Met. Those resolutions are included in Attachment B.

The Evaluation Methodology Report establishes Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors with the role of making the final determination of the terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into the Tier II DEIS for further study. The Metro Council resolution is to be considered by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Planning Committee prior to
consideration by the Metro Council. The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council and the Joint Regional Policy Committee are to consider the resolution prior to its consideration by the C-TRAN Board of Directors.

Consistent with the Steering Group's final recommendation, the resolution would adopt the Tier I Final Report (Exhibit A) that identifies in detail the alternatives and study approach to be utilized in Tier II and the preparation of the South/North DEIS. The general approach that the resolution would adopt is as follows:

1. The South/North Corridor will be conducted in two study phases:
   a. Phase I will consider a light rail transit project between the Clackamas Town Center area and the 99th Street area in Clark County.
   b. Phase II will consider an extension of the Phase I light rail transit project south to Oregon City and north to the 134th Street/Washington State University branch campus area.

2. These study phases will proceed as follows:
   a. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and funding plan for the Phase I light rail transit alternative will begin immediately.
   b. If light rail transit is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and funding strategy for the Phase II LRT extension will be prepared upon completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Phase I.

3. The following alignments are the alternatives for further study within the South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement:
   a. Between the Portland and Milwaukie central business districts, the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate Streets in the south, and the McLoughlin Boulevard alignment shall be developed for further study within the draft environmental impact statement. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further in order for the Metro Council and C-TRAN Board of Directors to determine whether it should also be included in the South/North Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed further in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
   b. Within the Portland central business district, a surface light rail transit alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be developed, based upon several principles, for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
If at the time the DEIS is initiated it is concluded that a 5th/6th Avenue Surface Alignment cannot be developed that addresses those principles, other alternatives will be developed for further study within the DEIS.

c. Between the Vancouver central business district and the vicinity of 99th Street, the I-5 East Alignment Alternative with station areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

4. Because further discussions and analysis should occur, the selection by the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors of an alternative for further study within the segment between the Portland and Vancouver central business districts shall wait completion of additional technical work and evaluation.

5. The following alignments will be considered for the Phase II extensions:

   a. Following completion of the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report, an analysis of the I-205 alignment from the CTC terminus and the McLoughlin alignment from the Milwaukie CBD will be made to determine which alignment will advance into the Phase II DEIS. The Portland Traction (PTC) right-of-way will not be considered as a Phase II alignment.

   b. Between the vicinity of 99th Street and the area of 134th Street/WSU Branch Campus, the I-5 East alignment will advance into the Phase II DEIS.

The South/North Tier I Briefing Document (Attachment A) summarizes the criteria and measures and compares the advantages and disadvantages of each of the alternatives within each segment. Following is a summary of the Steering Group's rationale in issuing its Tier I Final Recommendation Report:

Two-Phased Implementation

- Ultimately, a South/North LRT line which serves Oregon City, Clackamas Town Center and the 134th Street/WSU area in Clark County would maximize the benefits of the LRT alternative.

- The amount of capital funds potentially available at this time are insufficient to construct a light rail line serving Oregon City, Clackamas Town Center, Milwaukie, Portland, Vancouver and 134th Street/WSU area.

- The phased approach maximizes the likelihood of realizing a South/North LRT project which would ultimately serve the proposed termini.
Phase I Termini

A Clackamas Town Center area to 99th Street area LRT Alternative best meets the Tier I evaluation criteria within the financial threshold as described below.

- An LRT line with termini in the vicinity of the Milwaukie CBD and 39th Street in Vancouver would barely penetrate into Clackamas or Clark Counties, providing insufficient coverage to accomplish land use or transportation objectives.

- The Clackamas Town Center area terminus alternative exhibits lower costs, greater cost-effectiveness and greater consistency with existing regional policy than the Oregon City terminus alternatives.

- The 99th Street area north terminus alternative is consistent with Growth Management Plan objectives and exhibits lower costs and greater cost-effectiveness than the 134th Street/WSU area, 179th Street and Vancouver Mall terminus alternatives.

Phase II and Regional Priorities

When the proposed Phase II extensions to Oregon City and the 134th Street/Washington State University (WSU) branch campus area were discussed at the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) meeting, the issue was raised as to how those Phase II extensions related to other regional transportation priorities. Within the Steering Group’s recommendation and the draft Tier I Final Report, it is stated that:

2.1.1[b] Phase II will consider a future extension of the South/North LRT to the potential end-points in Clackamas and Clark Counties, if LRT is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I. The DEIS and funding plan for the Phase II LRT extension will be prepared upon completion of the Final EIS for Phase I.

2.2.1(1) Metro will consider the incorporation of policies in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Framework Plan which call for a Phase II extension of the South/North LRT Alternative to Oregon City.

As the recommendation and draft Final Report are written, the conclusion of the South/North Study is silent on the Phase II extensions’ priority relative to other high capacity transit or highway proposals within the region. Adoption of this resolution would not amend the Regional or Metropolitan Transportation Plans, but would recommend to Metro and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council to amend those plans when they are updated in the future to include Phase II extensions. Other LRT corridors could also be considered and included in such amendment at that time. The expectation from this resolution is that the proposed South/North Phase II extensions would advance into the environmental process once the Phase I FEIS is completed (scheduled for late 1997).
Some members of TPAC felt that this resolution should be more explicit in its implications for regional priorities; it should state that adoption of the resolution should not give the proposed South/North Phase II extensions a higher priority than other light rail corridors or extensions. Other committee members felt that because the resolution only pertains to the South/North Study and not regional policy, it should be silent on ranking the Phase II extensions in relationship to other regional transportation priorities. Instead, they felt that the Regional and Metropolitan Transportation Planning processes and future priority corridor studies should be used to set regional priorities, including the South/North Phase II extensions.

Following the discussion, it was concluded by TPAC to recommend the attached resolution, but that the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation should discuss this issue of regional priorities in detail before taking action on the proposed resolution.

Portland CBD to Milwaukie CBD Segment and the South Willamette River Crossing Alignment Alternative Recommendation

- The Hawthorne Bridge River Crossing alternative would exhibit substantial reliability and operations problems caused by numerous bridge openings and would not allow direct LRT access to Portland State University and South Downtown Portland.

- The Sellwood Bridge alternative would generally exhibit lower ridership, longer trip times, higher operating costs and a higher cost-effectiveness ratio and would not provide direct LRT access to several Southeast Portland neighborhoods and bus routes.

- While the Ross Island Bridge River Crossing alternative generally exhibits the same costs and transportation benefits as the Caruthers Bridge alternative, the Project Management Group’s and Steering Group’s recommendations to advance the Ross Island Bridge alternative into Tier II were based upon their judgment that a Ross Island crossing exhibits superior land use and development benefits.

- The Citizens Advisory Committee recommended that the Caruthers Bridge alternative be advanced into the DEIS for further study.

- There is a desire to try to serve both the North Macadam area and the Southeast Portland area with LRT, expressed both by the PMG and more strongly by the Citizens Advisory Committee.

- The McLoughlin Boulevard Alignment alternative exhibits less cost, greater ridership, higher cost-effectiveness and less environmental impact than the Portland Traction (PTC) alternative.

Portland CBD Alignment Alternative

- The 5th/6th Avenue Surface Alignment alternative is most consistent with the Downtown Plan.

S/N Metro/C-TRAN Resolution
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• The 5th/6th Avenue Surface Alignment alternative exhibits lower capital costs and operating costs than the Subway alternative.

• Despite its lower ridership, the 5th/6th Avenue Surface Alignment alternative is more cost-effective than the Subway alternative.

Portland CBD to Vancouver CBD Alignment Alternative

The Metro Council and C-TRAN Board of Directors have yet to determine the alignment alternative(s) in this segment to advance into the DEIS for further study for the following reasons:

• While the Interstate Avenue Alignment alternative costs more than the I-5 alternative, further analysis is needed to determine if there are land use and development benefits of the Interstate alignment that outweigh its additional cost.

• Further analysis is needed to identify and evaluate modified alternatives which merge the I-5 alignment with portions of the Interstate alignment.

• Further public input is needed to determine community preferences.

Vancouver CBD to 134th/WSU Area Alignment Alternative

• The I-5 East Alignment alternative is consistent with Growth Management Plans, exhibits less cost, greater ridership and higher cost-effectiveness than the Highway 99 alternative.

• Additional information on the segment between 78th Street and 99th Street is needed to determine the location of stations and park-and-ride lots to be included in the DEIS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 94-1989.
WHEREAS, In April 1993 Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors selected the Milwaukie and I-5 North Corridors as the region’s next high-capacity transit priority for study and combined them into the South/North Transit Corridor to be studied within a federal Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, In October 1993 the Federal Transit Administration approved the South/North application to initiate Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the South/North Preliminary Work Plan, and issued notification of intent in the Federal Register to publish a South/North Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, In December 1993 the South/North Steering Group concluded the federally prescribed Scoping Process, which included a comparative analysis of various high-capacity transit mode alternatives, by selecting the light rail transit mode and various light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into Tier I for further study; and

WHEREAS, The South/North Evaluation Methodology Report, as adopted by the South/North Steering Group in December 1993, prescribes the South/North study organization and process for the conclusion of the Tier I study process and the selection of S/N Metro/C-TRAN Resolution
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the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, The role of the South/North Steering Group in the Tier I study process is to forward its final Tier I recommendation to participating jurisdictions for their consideration, that participating jurisdictions are to forward their recommendations to the C-TRAN Board of Directors and the Metro Council who are to make the final determination of the alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study; and

WHEREAS, The Evaluation Methodology Report further prescribes the criteria and measures to be used to select the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, The alternatives that were selected at the conclusion of Scoping have been developed and evaluated based on the criteria and measures from the Evaluation Methodology Report and documented within various technical memoranda, including the South/North Tier I Technical Summary Report and the South/North Tier I Briefing Document; and

WHEREAS, The technical methodologies, assumptions and results have been reviewed by the South/North Expert Review Panel which found, in summary, that "...the data developed is sufficient to make the decisions regarding which alternatives should be carried forward for further study;" and

WHEREAS, A comprehensive public involvement program was developed and implemented by the South/North Study that included, but was not limited to, numerous community meetings, a 60-day public comment period on the Tier I alternatives and data,
public meetings for the Steering Group to receive oral comment, and an ongoing Citizens Advisory Committee that received staff reports and presentations, provided regular public comment opportunities, and in September 1994 formed an independent Tier I recommendation that was forwarded to the Steering Group for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, In October 1994 the Steering Group considered the Citizens Advisory Committee and Project Management Group recommendations, public comment and the Tier I criteria and measures and issued its own unanimous Tier I recommendation to the participating jurisdictions, C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council for their consideration; and

WHEREAS, The Steering Group's Final Tier I Recommendation identifies the LRT alternatives, described in Exhibit A, that they concluded best meet the project's goal and objectives as adopted in December 1993 by the South/North Steering Group within the Evaluation Methodology Report; and

WHEREAS, Clark, Clackamas and Multnomah Counties; the cities of Portland, Milwaukie, Oregon City, Gladstone and Vancouver; and the Tri-County Metropolitan Transit District have adopted recommendations for the South/North alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, That the following general approach be adopted for the continuation of the South/North Transit Corridor Study:

1. The South/North Corridor will be conducted in two study phases:
   a. Phase I will consider a light rail transit project between the Clackamas Town Center area and the 99th Street area in Clark County.
b. Phase II will consider an extension of the Phase I light rail transit project south to Oregon City and north to the 134th Street/Washington State University branch campus area.

2. These study phases will proceed as follows:

a. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and funding plan for the Phase I light rail transit alternative will begin immediately.

b. If light rail transit is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and funding strategy for the Phase II LRT extension will be prepared upon completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Phase I.

3. The following alignments are the alternatives for further study within the Phase I South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement:

a. Between the Portland and Milwaukie central business districts, the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate streets in the south, and the McLoughlin Boulevard alignment shall be developed for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further in order for the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors to determine whether it should also be included in the South/North Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed further in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

b. Within the Portland central business district, a surface light rail transit
alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be developed based upon several principles, for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. If at the time the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is initiated it is concluded that a 5th/6th Avenue alignment cannot be developed that addresses those principles, other alternatives will be developed for further study in the DEIS.

c. Between the Vancouver central business district and the vicinity of 99th Street, the I-5 East Alignment Alternative with station areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

4. Because further discussions and analysis should occur, the selection by the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors of an alternative for further study within the segment between the Portland and Vancouver central business districts shall wait completion of additional technical work and evaluation.

5. The following alignments will be considered for the Phase II extensions:

a. Following completion of the *Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report*, an analysis of the I-205 alignment from the CTC terminus and the McLoughlin alignment from the Milwaukie CBD will be made to determine which alignment will advance into the Phase II DEIS. The Portland Traction Company (PTC) right-of-way will not be considered as a Phase II alignment.

b. Between the vicinity of 99th Street and the area of 134th Street/WSU Branch Campus, the I-5 East alignment will advance into the Phase II DEIS.
And further,

BE IT RESOLVED, that Exhibit A is adopted as the South/North Transit Corridor Tier I Final Report that identifies in more detail the alternatives and study approach to be utilized in Tier II and the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the South/North Transit Corridor.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council on this ______ day of ____________, 1994.

Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer
Metro Council

ADOPTED by the C-TRAN Board of Directors on this ______ day of ____________, 1994.

Rose Besserman, Chair
C-TRAN Board of Directors
### Summary of Measurement Criteria
#### South Study Terminus Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Milwaukie</th>
<th>Clackamas TC</th>
<th>OC via McLoughlin</th>
<th>OC via I-205</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peak hour accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of Access</strong></td>
<td>Households within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>101,890</td>
<td>103,370</td>
<td>103,720</td>
<td>102,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clackamas Town Center</td>
<td>116,820</td>
<td>105,920</td>
<td>108,520</td>
<td>101,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>60,370</td>
<td>57,460</td>
<td>56,610</td>
<td>54,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>381,350</td>
<td>384,780</td>
<td>380,290</td>
<td>383,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clackamas Town Center</td>
<td>260,300</td>
<td>321,640</td>
<td>199,410</td>
<td>310,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>85,710</td>
<td>80,770</td>
<td>166,270</td>
<td>96,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transferability</strong></td>
<td>Mode of Access (south of Portland CBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk on</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park-and-ride</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time</strong></td>
<td>Total Travel Time, PM Peak Hour (in minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Milwaukie (auto = 27)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Clackamas TC (auto = 37)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Oregon City (auto = 47)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Miles of Reserved or Separate ROW; W of Hawthorne Bridge</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Corridor Passenger-miles on Reserved ROW</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership</strong></td>
<td>Weekday Corridor Transit Trips</td>
<td>129,200</td>
<td>129,800</td>
<td>131,750</td>
<td>131,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday S/N LRT Trips</td>
<td>56,900</td>
<td>59,400</td>
<td>61,900</td>
<td>62,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong></td>
<td>PM Peak Hour, Peak Direction V/C Ratio at:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Use</strong></td>
<td>Milwaukie, S of Monroe (Hwy 224, Lake, McL.)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S of Sunnyside (I-205, 82nd)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Roethe (McL., Oatfield, River)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S of Arlington (I-205, McL.)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Boundary (Corbett, Macadam)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Issues</strong></td>
<td>P&amp;R volumes in Milwaukie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At grade crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left turn restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

South/North Briefing Document  
Appendix A  
August 15, 1994
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Milwaukee</th>
<th>Clackamas TC</th>
<th>OC via McLoughlin</th>
<th>OC via I-205</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Efficiency</td>
<td>Capital Cost (1994 $); Pioneer Square south</td>
<td>$424.0</td>
<td>$711.5</td>
<td>$800.1</td>
<td>$1,062.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Cost (YOE $); Pioneer Square south</td>
<td>$674.2</td>
<td>$1,131.2</td>
<td>$1,272.1</td>
<td>$1,688.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in millions $) Annual LRT Operating and Maintenance Cost (1994 $)</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
<td>$15.60</td>
<td>$16.59</td>
<td>$18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Bus Operating and Maintenance Savings (1994 $)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2.66</td>
<td>$3.24</td>
<td>$2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost per Rider</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
<td>$0.66</td>
<td>$0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Activity Centers Served</th>
<th>Milwaukee CBD</th>
<th>Milwaukee CBD, Clackamas TC</th>
<th>Milwaukee CBD, Oregon City CBD</th>
<th>Milwaukee CBD, Clackamas TC, Oregon City CBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Major Activity Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Bi-State Policies</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All data is for year 2015, unless otherwise noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data assumes LRT from Oregon City via I-205 to 179th St. in Clark County, unless otherwise noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs are in millions $.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus O&amp;M savings represents cost reduction from highest bus cost alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Park-and-Ride capacity may be required to accomodate anticipated demand at a cost of up to the following amounts for the corresponding terminus alternative: Milwaukee CBD $28.3 million; Clackamas TC $13 million; OC via McLoughlin $20.3 million; OC via I-205 $6 million.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Measurement Criteria
### North Study Terminus Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>39th St.</th>
<th>88th St.</th>
<th>134th St.</th>
<th>179th St.</th>
<th>Van Mall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peak Hour Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver CBD</td>
<td>138,440</td>
<td>137,840</td>
<td>138,100</td>
<td>137,020</td>
<td>142,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134th St.</td>
<td>57,280</td>
<td>56,180</td>
<td>87,200</td>
<td>87,110</td>
<td>89,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver Mall</td>
<td>97,210</td>
<td>96,670</td>
<td>99,390</td>
<td>99,390</td>
<td>108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver CBD</td>
<td>307,690</td>
<td>307,020</td>
<td>306,970</td>
<td>295,800</td>
<td>308,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134th St.</td>
<td>68,400</td>
<td>66,280</td>
<td>121,900</td>
<td>119,190</td>
<td>108,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver Mall</td>
<td>120,080</td>
<td>120,280</td>
<td>119,500</td>
<td>119,500</td>
<td>139,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transferability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mode of Access (North of Coliseum TC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk on</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park-and-ride</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Travel Time, PM Peak Hour (in minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Vancouver CBD (auto = 40)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to 88th St. (auto = 45)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to 134th St. (auto = 48)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to 179th St. (auto = 52)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Van Mall (auto = 44)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Miles of Reserved or Separate ROW; north of Coliseum TC</strong></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Corridor Passenger-miles on Reserved ROW</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weekday Corridor Transit Trips</strong></td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>131,150</td>
<td>131,300</td>
<td>131,350</td>
<td>130,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday S/N LRT Trips</td>
<td>60,050</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td>62,200</td>
<td>62,800</td>
<td>62,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong></td>
<td>PM Peak Hour, Peak Direction V/C Ratio at:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Mill Plain (I-5, Main, Broadway, Ft. Van.)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of 39th (15th, Main, I-5)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S of 78th (Hwy 99, Hazel Dell Ave., I-205)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W of Androsen (18th, 40th, 4th Plain, SR 500)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-5 Bridge</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W of I-205 (4th Plain, 63rd, Burton, SR 500)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-205 Bridge</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Traffic Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P&amp;R volumes in</th>
<th>Main St.</th>
<th>Main St.</th>
<th>Main St.</th>
<th>At grade Xings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vancouver</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>39th St.</th>
<th>88th St.</th>
<th>134th St.</th>
<th>179th St.</th>
<th>Van Mall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Efficiency</td>
<td>Capital Cost (1994 $); Pioneer Square north</td>
<td>$753.9</td>
<td>$895.2</td>
<td>$982.9</td>
<td>$1,065.1</td>
<td>$1,044.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Capital Cost (YOE $) Pioneer Square north</td>
<td>$1,198.7</td>
<td>$1,423.4</td>
<td>$1,562.8</td>
<td>$1,693.6</td>
<td>$1,659.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in millions of $)</td>
<td>Annual LRT Operating and Maintenance Cost (1994 $)</td>
<td>$15.27</td>
<td>$16.21</td>
<td>$17.33</td>
<td>$18.20</td>
<td>$17.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Bus Operating and Maintenance Savings (1994 $)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.41</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>$0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost per Rider</td>
<td>$0.78</td>
<td>$0.78</td>
<td>$0.81</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promote Desired Land Use</th>
<th>Major Activity Centers Served</th>
<th>Vancouver CBD</th>
<th>Vancouver CBD</th>
<th>Vancouver CBD, Salmon Creek/ WSU</th>
<th>Vancouver CBD, Salmon Creek/ WSU</th>
<th>Vancouver CBD, Vancouver Mall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Major Activity Centers</td>
<td>Maintain Urban Growth Boundaries</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>May encourage expansion</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- All data is for year 2015, unless otherwise noted.
- Data assumes LRT from Oregon City via I-205 to 179th St. in Clark County, unless otherwise noted.
- Costs are in millions of $.
- Bus O&M savings represents cost reduction from highest bus cost alternative.
- Additional Park-and-Ride capacity may be required to meet anticipated demand at a cost of up to the following amounts for the corresponding terminus alternative: Vancouver CBD/39th Street $44.9 million; 88th Street $29.6 million; 134th Street $23.3 million; 179th Street $4 million; Van Mall/Orchards $5.4 million.
### Summary of Measurement Criteria

**Portland CBD to Milwaukie CBD South River Crossing Alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Hawthorne</th>
<th>Caruthers</th>
<th>Ross Island</th>
<th>Sellwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peak Hour Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of Access</strong></td>
<td>Households within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OMSI</td>
<td>160,400</td>
<td>167,950</td>
<td>169,300</td>
<td>168,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John's Landing</td>
<td>97,700</td>
<td>97,920</td>
<td>99,330</td>
<td>124,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>102,710</td>
<td>106,760</td>
<td>102,440</td>
<td>82,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OMSI</td>
<td>538,450</td>
<td>534,100</td>
<td>495,540</td>
<td>487,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John's Landing</td>
<td>353,570</td>
<td>350,990</td>
<td>350,070</td>
<td>449,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>385,150</td>
<td>393,090</td>
<td>389,130</td>
<td>348,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transferability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mode of Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk on</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park-and-ride</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Travel Time, PM Peak Hour (in minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Milwaukie (auto = 27)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Clackamas TC (auto = 37)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Oregon City (auto = 46)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Miles of Reserved or Separated ROW</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Corridor Passenger-miles on Reserved ROW</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership</strong></td>
<td>Weekday Corridor Transit Trips</td>
<td>131,350</td>
<td>132,200</td>
<td>131,400</td>
<td>130,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday S/N LRT Trips</td>
<td>61,800</td>
<td>62,800</td>
<td>62,300</td>
<td>61,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong></td>
<td><strong>PM Peak Hour, Peak Direction V/C Ratio at:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Use</strong></td>
<td>River Crossings (Fremont - Ross Island)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Crossings (Sellwood Bridge)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Prescott (Denver, I-5, Interstate, MLK, Vancouver)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Boundary (Macadam, Corbett)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Issues</strong></td>
<td>Bridge lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moody St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At grade Xings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Caruthers</td>
<td>Ross Island</td>
<td>Sellwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Efficiency</td>
<td>Capital Cost (1994 $) Pioneer Square to Milwaukie</td>
<td>$424</td>
<td>$465</td>
<td>$461</td>
<td>$465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Cost (YOE $) Pioneer Square to Milwaukie</td>
<td>$674</td>
<td>$739</td>
<td>$733</td>
<td>$739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Bus Operating and Maintenance Savings (1994 $)</td>
<td>$0.27</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost per Rider</td>
<td>$0.87</td>
<td>$0.87</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
<td>$0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Major Activity Centers</td>
<td>Support Bi-State Policies Maintain Urban Growth Boundaries</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sensitivity</td>
<td>Possible Displacements</td>
<td>47, commercial and residential</td>
<td>41, commercial and residential</td>
<td>64, mostly commercial/industrial</td>
<td>27, mostly commercial/industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impact Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moody St., John's Landing Sellwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Millwaukie Xing</td>
<td>Millwaukie Xing</td>
<td>Millwaukie Xing</td>
<td>Millwaukie Xing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and Cultural Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing bridge, Brooklyn Nh.</td>
<td>Brooklyn Nh.</td>
<td>Existing bridge, Brooklyn Nh.</td>
<td>Existing bridge, Sellwood Nh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All data is for year 2015, unless otherwise noted. Data assumes LRT from Oregon City via I-205 to 179th St. in Clark County, unless otherwise noted. Costs are in millions of $. Bus O&M savings represents cost reduction from highest bus cost alternative. Displacement data based on preliminary design without specific efforts to mitigate possible impacts.
### Summary of Measurement Criteria

#### Portland CBD to Milwaukie CBD Eastbank Alignment Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>PTC</th>
<th>McLoughlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peak Hour Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OMSI</td>
<td>153,290</td>
<td>159,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>88,420</td>
<td>102,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clackamas Town Center</td>
<td>92,760</td>
<td>101,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon City CBD</td>
<td>52,020</td>
<td>54,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OMSI</td>
<td>531,860</td>
<td>538,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>368,720</td>
<td>383,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clackamas Town Center</td>
<td>292,500</td>
<td>310,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon City CBD</td>
<td>90,810</td>
<td>96,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of Access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transferability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode of Access; Milwaukie to OMSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk on</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park-and-ride</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Travel Time, PM Peak Hour (in minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Milwaukie (auto = 27)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Clackamas TC (auto = 37)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Oregon City (auto = 46)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Miles of Reserved or Separate ROW</strong></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Corridor Passenger-miles on Reserved ROW</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weekday Corridor Transit Trips</strong></td>
<td>131,050</td>
<td>131,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday S/N LRT Trips</td>
<td>58,250</td>
<td>62,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong></td>
<td><strong>PM Peak Hour, Peak Direction V/C Ratio at:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Crossings (Fremont - Ross Island)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Crossings (Sellwood Bridge)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie, S of Monroe (Hwy 224, Lake, McL)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Roethe (McL., Oatfield, River)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Issues</strong></td>
<td><strong>New freight spur across McLoughlin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Signal coordination on McLoughlin, close some local access to McLoughlin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- August 15, 1994
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I. Introduction

Metro and C-TRAN, in cooperation with twelve state and local jurisdictions and agencies, are studying the South/North Transit Corridor to determine whether proposed light rail transit (LRT) improvements within the Corridor should be designed and constructed.

The South/North Transit Corridor Study was initiated in July 1993 following the region's decision in April 1993 to designate the South/North Corridor as the region's priority corridor within which to conduct the next Alternatives Analysis following the Westside Corridor to Hillsboro.

Because of the size of the South/North Corridor and the complexity of the issues involved, the South/North Alternatives Analysis was divided into two phases, or "tiers."

Tier I

The purpose of Tier I is to define the high capacity transit (HCT) alternative to be studied further within Tier II. Tier I will be used to:

1) select a preferred HCT mode; 2) to determine how far south and how far north within the Corridor to study further; and, 3) to reduce the number of HCT alignment alternatives throughout the corridor to one or two.

At the beginning of Tier I, the Region conducted a "Scoping" process where a wide range of alternative HCT modes (LRT, busway, river transit and commuter rail) were evaluated. Through the analysis prepared within Scoping, the Region determined that only LRT warranted further study within Tier I, in effect determining that the HCT mode that would advance into Tier II would be LRT. Therefore, within Tier I, the only alignment alternatives that have been developed and analyzed are LRT alternatives.

Tier II

The purpose of Tier II will be to evaluate the LRT alternative selected within Tier I and to compare it to a No-Build Alternative and an expansion of the bus system termed the Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Alternative. The performance, costs and impacts of these three alternatives will be documented within a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) which will be used by the Region in selecting a locally preferred alternative. If the selected alternative is the LRT Alternative then the Corridor would advance toward final design and construction.

Narrowing LRT Alternatives: The Choice at Hand

The South/North Study is currently concluding Tier I. The purpose of this document is to summarize the data and information that have been prepared on the various LRT alternatives being studied within Tier I in order to allow the community and decision-makers to come to an informed determination on which alternatives should advance to Tier II for further study.

The Tier I alternatives and this document have been structured to facilitate the understanding of the trade-offs (the benefits and the costs, the advantages and disadvantages) of the various LRT alternatives being considered. Again, because of the size and complexity of the Corridor, the choices have been divided into several groups (described in Section III of this report) where the differences between the alternatives can be isolated and better understood. By selecting the best LRT alternative within each group the region will define the optimum LRT alternative to advance into Tier II.

Other choices concerning the LRT alternatives also face the region but are not addressed within this document nor by the process at this time. They are at a finer level of detail and are called "design options," such as the placement of LRT tracks in the center or on the left or right side of a street. Design options exist for each of the alternatives being evaluated. Many design options have been evaluated within Scoping and Tier I. Throughout Tier I, design options have been screened out or have been developed to solve problems or to take advantage of opportunities. Design options associated with the alternatives selected to advance into Tier II will be further refined and screened before work is initiated on the DEIS. This screening will be conducted by the Steering Group and Project Management Group in consultation with the public and the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Following is a description of the transportation problems within the Corridor and the goal and objectives of the South/North Study that were used to help define and evaluate the LRT Alternatives being considered.
II. Purpose and Need

The purpose of the following two pages is to set a context for the South/North Transit Corridor Study: What area does the Study cover? Why are we studying the South/North Corridor? What purpose will the alternatives being studied serve? How will we evaluate the alternatives?

The South/North Corridor

Figure 1 illustrates the South/North Corridor. It is the travel shed extending north from the Oregon City area in Clackamas County, through downtown Portland and into Clark County beyond Vancouver. The Corridor is defined in this way because it captures the trips that could benefit from the major transit improvements being evaluated, either on LRT exclusively or fed through a system of connecting bus routes or park-and-ride lots.

Key activity centers within the Corridor help to define the points that LRT alternatives should connect to. The first three in the table below are common in all of the alternatives being studied, but the remaining centers present choices and trade-offs between the alternatives in the South and the North.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Activity Centers Within the Corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Milwaukie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Vancouver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Corridor also includes other important centers such as the Central Eastside Industrial Area, OMSI, Portland State University, Johns Landing, Interstate Avenue and Portland Community College. The proposed LRT improvements could serve over twenty Portland neighborhoods, depending upon the alternatives selected.

In all, the South/North Corridor covers almost half of the metropolitan region. It is characterized by high employment and residential growth with the potential for worsening travel conditions. Population and employment growth in Clark and Clackamas Counties is projected be 32% to 48% over the next twenty years, exceeding the overall Regional growth rates.
Transportation Problems and Opportunities

The problems and opportunities that exist within the South/North Corridor set a context for defining and evaluating the transit alternatives.

- **Traffic Problems.** Traffic in the South/North Corridor is exceeding the capacity of many of the roads and intersections within highway system. For example, most of McLoughlin Boulevard is currently highly congested with a level of service of E or F (A is best, F is worst). In the North, traffic across the Columbia River has almost doubled since the opening of the I-205 Bridge with projections for continued growth well into the future, causing demand to exceed capacity during the key commute periods.

- **Transit Problems.** As the highway network becomes congested the bus network, which shares the road with cars and trucks, experiences longer travel times and high levels of unreliability. Deterioration in speed and reliability of buses increases operating costs, deters ridership and costs transit riders thousands of person hours a day through longer bus trips.

- **Regional Plans.** For almost twenty years the Region has shaped its land use and transportation plans based upon the expectation that high capacity transit (HCT) would be provided within the South/North Corridor. Those plans have sized the road network, defined the comprehensive land use plans and implemented a bus network that would be served by and enhance an HCT facility.

- **New State Regulations.** Both Oregon and Washington jurisdictions face tougher state regulations affecting transportation and land use planning. Oregon now requires that the Region plan for a 20% reduction in the per capita vehicle miles traveled and a 10% reduction in the per capita number of parking spaces. In Washington, the Clark County area is required to adopt a commute trip reduction ordinance that would result in a 35% drop in trips to major employers by 1999.

- **Economic Health.** There is growing concern that reduced accessibility within the South/North Corridor may reduce its ability to attract and retain industrial and commercial development in the Corridor. This trend adds to the concern in Clark County regarding the relative loss of per capita income compared to the Region. Further, concurrency requirements within Washington may limit new developments if the transportation system is inadequate to handle new demand.

- **Air Quality.** The Region is currently "marginal" for ozone and "moderate" for carbon monoxide. Transit expansion is a key element of the Region’s proposed Air Quality Maintenance Plan and could save new industry $2 million a year in air quality clean-up costs.

Goal and Objectives

To implement a major transit expansion program in the South/North Corridor which supports bi-state land use goals, optimizes the transportation system, is environmentally sensitive, reflects community values and is fiscally responsive.

1. Provide high quality transit service.
2. Ensure effective transit system operations.
3. Maximize the ability of the transit system to accommodate future growth in travel demand.
4. Minimize traffic congestion and traffic infiltration through neighborhoods.
5. Promote desired land use patterns and development.
6. Provide for a fiscally stable and financially efficient transit system.
7. Maximize the efficiency and environmental sensitivity of the engineering design of the proposed project.

Alternatives were developed that address the problems and opportunities within the Corridor and they are described in the following section of this report. The study’s objectives provide a framework for evaluating the alternatives. Each alternative’s ability to meet the study objectives was measured. Their performance is described in Sections V-X and summarized in a table format in Appendix A.
Tier I LRT Alternatives

The Tier I LRT Alternatives have been divided into six groups in order to isolate and better understand the choices to be made.

A. Study Terminus Alternatives

Study Terminus Alternatives will be used to define how far South and North to study within Tier II. Because of the time and costs associated with the Tier II analysis, it is important that the Region only study improvements that could potentially be funded and that provide adequate benefits in relationship to their costs. A set of Study Terminus Alternatives have been defined for the South and the North. They have been analyzed and are evaluated in sections V and VI separately so that decisions regarding the ultimate termini can be made independently of each other.

While selecting Study Termini short of the furthest points would not remove the furthest points from the Regional Transportation Plan's HCT Corridors, it could remove them from the list of Ten-Year Priorities.

Also, it is important to note that the determination of a Study Terminus in Tier I is different than the minimum operable segment analysis and selection of a locally preferred alternative that will occur in Tier II. The Study Terminus choice will be just that, how far North and South to study in Tier II. The Region may choose to, or the Federal Transit Administration may require us to, evaluate even shorter segments before the selection of the locally preferred alternative following the completion of the draft environmental impact statement. This analysis could also include the possible phasing of improvements with an opening of one segment followed a year or two later by the opening of another segment.

Finally, selection of a Study Terminus will not necessarily define the precise street or location of the terminus. Instead, it is intended to define the general vicinity of the terminus for study in Tier II. Design considerations such as station and park-and-ride lot locations, costs and traffic and environmental impacts may require that a terminus studied in Tier II to be several blocks from its designation as the Study Terminus at the conclusion of Tier I.

Figure 2 Tier I Groups of Alternatives
outh Study Terminus Alternatives
- Milwaukie CBD. This alternative would extend LRT from downtown Portland, across the Willamette River to south or east of the Milwaukie CBD.
- Clackamas Town Center. This alternative would extend LRT from downtown Milwaukie to the Clackamas Town Center and possibly across I-205 to a park-and-ride in the vicinity of Sunnyside Road.
- Oregon City via McLoughlin Boulevard. This alternative would extend LRT south from Milwaukie along McLoughlin Boulevard, through Gladstone and into the old town area of Oregon City.
- Oregon City via I-205 and Clackamas Town Center. This alternative would extend LRT through the Clackamas Town Center, along I-205, through Gladstone and into the old town area of Oregon City.

2. North Study Terminus Alternatives
- Vancouver CBD. This alternative would extend LRT from downtown Portland, across the Steel Bridge and across the Columbia River, through downtown Vancouver to 39th Street.
- 88th Street. This alternative would extend LRT from 39th Street, parallel to I-5, to 88th Street.
- 134th Street. This alternative would extend LRT from 88th Street, parallel to I-5, to 134th Street near the future WSU branch campus.
- 179th Street. This alternative would extend LRT from 134th Street, parallel to I-5, to 179th Street near the Clark County Fairgrounds.
- Vancouver Mall. This alternative would extend LRT east from the Vancouver CBD, parallel to SR-500, to the Vancouver Mall and possibly across I-205 to a park-and-ride lot in Orchards.

B. LRT Alignment Alternatives

Alignment alternatives are the major choices of where LRT improvements should be studied further within Tier II. As opposed to design options described in Section I, alignment alternatives are separated by several blocks or miles. Generally, the differences in alignments are great enough to cause significant differences in costs and ridership. There are four geographic areas within the Corridor that have Alignment Alternatives being evaluated:

3. Portland CBD to Milwaukie CBD
a. Willamette River Crossings:
   - Hawthorne Bridge. This alternative could use the existing Hawthorne Bridge which would be retrofitted for LRT.
   - Caruthers Bridge. This alternative would use a new span under the Marquam Bridge from South Waterfront District to south of OMSI.
   - Ross Island Bridge. This alternative would use a new span just south of the existing Ross Island Bridge.
   - Sellwood Bridge. This alternative would provide service to Johns Landing and would use a new span north of the Sellwood Bridge.

b. Eastbank Alignments
   - McLoughlin Blvd. This alternative would use McLoughlin Blvd. between the three northern river crossings and Sellwood.
   - PTC Alignment. This alternative would use the Portland Traction Company alignment next to the Willamette River between the three northern river crossings and Sellwood.

4. Portland Central Business District
- Surface. This alternative would be on the surface streets of 5th and 6th Avenues on the Transit Mall between the Steel Bridge and connections to the South Willamette River crossings.
- Subway. This alternative would be below ground from Union Station to connections to the South Willamette River crossings. A subway could be under 4th, 5th, 6th or Broadway Avenues but could not be connected to a Hawthorne Bridge crossing.

5. Portland CBD to Vancouver CBD
- Interstate Avenue. This alternative would be within the Interstate Avenue right-of-way between the Kaiser medical facility and Kenton.
- I-5. This alternative would be on the ridge above and parallel to I-5, generally within or adjacent to the Minnesota Avenue right-of-way between Kaiser medical facility and the Kenton neighborhood.

6. Vancouver CBD to 179th Street
- Highway 99. This alternative would be in the median of Highway 99 between the Main Street/I-5 interchange and 179th Street.
- I-5. This alternative would be directly adjacent to I-5 between Main Street/I-5 interchange and 179th Street.
A Few Notes About the Numbers

Following is a description of how many of the measures within this report were developed:

- Comparing the Alternatives. Most important in using the comparative measures within this report is understanding the alternatives and how they have been developed for the purpose of this analysis. Within the grouping of alternatives (e.g., South Study Terminus Alternatives, Portland CBD to Vancouver CBD Alignment Alternatives, etc.) the alternatives have been held constant outside the segment in question. For example, when developing, modeling and comparing South Study Terminus Alternatives, changes were only made within the segment from Milwaukie to Oregon City. Each of the South Study Terminus Alternatives are the same north of Milwaukie: McLoughlin Boulevard, across the Hawthorne Bridge, through downtown Portland using the surface alignment on the Transit Mall, north on Interstate Avenue, through the Vancouver CBD and along I-5 to 179th Street. When evaluating the North Study Terminus Alternatives, the alignments south of Vancouver are similarly held constant terminating in the south in Oregon City via I-205.

This method of analysis was employed to ensure consistency among the alternatives within a given segment or group. It also guarantees that the changes in the data can be attributed to the changes made to the alternatives within the segment in question. Finally, it allowed the number of alternatives developed and analyzed to be kept to a minimum, saving time and money.

There are three important implications that lead from this way of analyzing the alternatives:

1) The differences between the alternatives in ridership and costs are real and are tied directly to the variations in the alternatives;

2) Much of the data from one set of alternatives should not be compared with an alternative from another set; and

3) There are numerous combinations of projects that can be created by mixing and matching the alternatives within each of the segments.

All of those combinations have not been presented or used within this report. However, a matrix of the possible southern and northern terminus combinations is provided in Appendix B. By using add-ons or deductions for each of the alignment alternatives, one can develop a cost estimate for any of the possible combinations.

- Ridership. The light rail ridership forecasts are based upon changes in the LRT and bus networks within the Corridor. The forecasts are for the year 2015 and are based on existing land use plans and allocations developed by Metro and local jurisdictions.

- 1994 Capital Costs. Capital cost estimates for the alternatives have been developed in 1994 dollars by calculating the quantities in sixteen cost categories from conceptual plans for each segment of alignment. Costs include right-of-way, related roadway reconstruction, structures, various trackway treatments, system costs (e.g., signals system), light rail vehicles and maintenance facilities. The cost estimates also include engineering, administration and a contingency allowance to reflect the level of design detail available. The unit rates used to develop these estimates include historic data and recent Westside LRT data, where available.

- Year of Expenditure (YOE) Costs. Because costs generally inflate over time and it would take approximately ten years to finish the planning, engineering and construction of the LRT alternatives, the projected inflated costs of the alternatives have been provided. First, the YOE costs depend upon the assumed inflation rate (6.2%) and the construction schedule (developed consistent with the Westside Project with construction completed by 2003 to 2005 depending upon the alternative). In general, the 1994 costs increase by about 60% to develop the year of expenditure costs. Second, additional items beyond design and construction costs have been added to the factored 1994 capital costs to provide a more accurate prediction of the actual funds that will be needed to complete the alternate projects. Those additional items include a reserve for yet-to-be determined design options, bonding issuance costs, interim borrowing costs and funds for a capital reserve account (CAPRA).

- Operating and Maintenance (O&M) Costs. O&M costs within this report are the costs of operating the LRT alternative. The difference in bus O&M costs between the alternative with the highest bus operating costs and the other alternatives is subtracted from the LRT operating costs. The result is the effective LRT operating costs used in calculating the cost effectiveness.
• **Cost Effectiveness.** Cost effectiveness analysis provides a means of comparing the benefits of each alternative with its costs. The Tier I cost effectiveness analysis focuses on two different costs: 1) Effective Operating Costs; and 2) Total Annualized Costs. Effective Operating Costs are the year 2015 operations and maintenance costs of the LRT minus the bus O&M costs saved by the subject LRT alternative from the highest bus O&M costs among the comparable alternatives. Total Annualized Costs includes annualized LRT capital costs plus the year 2015 Effective Operating Costs (in 1994 dollars). Annualized capital costs are based on the estimated LRT capital costs in 1994 dollars and assume a seven-percent discount rate and a 40-year economic life. The higher the cost effectiveness ratio, the less cost effective the alternative.

• **Environmental Analysis.** The estimates of environmental impacts (e.g. noise and vibrations, displacements, etc.) are based upon sketch-level analysis. While the data is accurate in comparing the alternatives, the actual environmental impacts may change as designs are refined, as more detailed analyses are done and as mitigation measures are developed and incorporated into the design. Tier II, with the preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, will provide a very high level of detail on a much wider array of potential impacts.

**Technical Summary Report**

The *Briefing Document* is in essence an executive summary of the South/North Tier I Technical Summary Report, which can be referred to for more detailed information.

**Appendix A**

At the end of this report in Appendix A are tables for each of the six sets of alternatives that present all of the criteria and measures for each of the alternatives. The tables within the body of the report summarize the ridership, cost and cost effectiveness for the alternatives included within the larger tables. Within the text of this report measures are referred to that are either within the summary table adjacent to the text or within the full tables included within Appendix A.

**Glossary of Terms**

**Terminus:** A terminus is the furthest north or south light rail station.

**LRT Ridership:** Light rail ridership includes any transit trip that would use light rail for a portion of that trip within the South/North Corridor

**Total Transit Ridership:** Total transit ridership is the total number of bus, light rail and combined bus and light rail trips taken within the corridor. They are one-way trips and a trip that involves a transfer is counted as one trip.

**Total Transit Travel Time.** Total Transit Travel Time is the combined time it would take to walk to a bus stop or station, wait for the bus or light rail vehicle, travel within the vehicle, and walk to the destination. Travel times used within this report are for the peak rush hour in the peak direction (traveling away from downtown in the evening).

**C utline.** A cutline is an imaginary line drawn across one or more highways where the total number of cars or passengers crossing that line are added together. By comparing the highway or transit capacity across that line to the cars or passengers that would cross that line under any given alternative, a volume to capacity ratio can be calculated giving an indication of congestion at that location.
South Study Terminus Alternatives

The above map illustrates the four terminus alternatives for the South that could be selected to advance into Tier II. The selection of a Study Terminus will define the southern limits of the Tier II analysis. Within those limits, shorter segments may be studied for either phasing opportunities or as required by the federal government to determine the minimum operable segment.

### 1. Milwaukie Terminus

**Advantages:**
- The least costly of the four alternative southern termini, with a capital cost savings in SYOE of $457 to $1,015 million compared with a terminus at Clackamas Town Center (CTC) or Oregon City.
- The least costly of the alternatives to operate, with annual savings in $1994 of approximately $70,000 (CTC) to $2.7 million (Oregon City via I-205).
- The most cost effective southern terminus alternative.
- Total transit travel time between Milwaukie and Portland CBDs would be less than auto travel times during the peak hour.

**Disadvantages:**
- Lowest LRT and total transit (LRT + bus) ridership, with 2,500 to 5,850 fewer LRT trips and 600 to 2,150 fewer total transit trips.
- Would provide only limited LRT service into Clackamas County and to major activity centers within the County.
- Limited park-and-ride lot opportunities with the highest park-and-ride demand would result in higher capital costs and/or lower ridership estimates with greater traffic impacts than are currently estimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portland CBD to:</th>
<th>Milwaukie CBD</th>
<th>CTC/Sunnyside</th>
<th>Oregon City via McLoughlin</th>
<th>Oregon City via I-205</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure Cost (millions)</td>
<td>$674</td>
<td>$1,131</td>
<td>$1,272</td>
<td>$1,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Weekday Ridership from 179th to:</td>
<td>56,900</td>
<td>59,400</td>
<td>61,900</td>
<td>62,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corridor Transit Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>129,200</td>
<td>129,800</td>
<td>131,750</td>
<td>131,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective LRT Annual Operating Cost (millions) from 179th to:</td>
<td>$12.87</td>
<td>$12.94</td>
<td>$13.35</td>
<td>$15.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional park-and-ride capacity may be required to accommodate forecast demand at the estimated cost (YOE millions) of: $28, $13, $20, $6.
Could leave many of the transportation problems within the segment unaddressed, with slower total transit travel times for Oregon City and Clackamas Town Center to the Portland CBD than for the same trip using an automobile. In addition, volume to capacity ratios (congestion) at several cutlines would be highest among all the alternatives.

- Limited ability to respond to or shape development within the most rapidly growing areas of the segment.
- Would not provide LRT service to CTC or Oregon City.

2. Clackamas Town Center Terminus

**Advantages:**
- The lowest cost (both capital and O&M) and the most cost effective of the alternatives that extend into the urban area of Clackamas County.
- Would provide LRT access to Clackamas Town Center area, a high growth rate area and high intensity use area in Clackamas County.
- Total transit travel times between Clackamas Town Center and the Portland CBD would be one minute faster than the automobile travel times.
- The lowest (same as Oregon City via McLoughlin Boulevard) operating cost per trip of the alternatives.

**Disadvantages:**
- Higher cost (both capital and O&M) than the Milwaukie Terminus.
- Lower LRT and total transit ridership than either extension to Oregon City.
- McLoughlin park-and-ride demand must be accommodated with a lot near or north of the Milwaukie CBD which may result in more local traffic impacts within the downtown Milwaukie area.
- Would not provide LRT service to Oregon City, the county seat.

3. Oregon City via McLoughlin Boulevard Terminus

**Advantages:**
- Highest total transit and second highest LRT ridership of the South terminus alternatives.
- Total transit travel times between Oregon City and downtown Portland would be two minutes faster than the auto travel times.

**Disadvantages:**
- Would provide direct LRT service to the County seat.
- The lowest (same as CTC) operating cost per trip of the alternatives.
- Some opportunities for redevelopment on McLoughlin Boulevard.

**Disadvantages:**
- Second highest capital cost southern terminus alternative, almost $600 million more costly than the Milwaukie Terminus and $140 million more than the CTC Terminus, and second highest O&M costs.
- The second highest cost effectiveness ratio.
- Park-and-ride demand from east of Milwaukie must be accommodated with a lot near or north of the Milwaukie CBD which may result in more local traffic impacts within the downtown Milwaukie area.
- Traffic impacts on McLoughlin Boulevard would include left turns being restricted to intersections and impacts during construction.
- Limited opportunities for new development.
- Would not provide LRT service to CTC.

4. Oregon City via I-205 Terminus

**Advantages:**
- Would have the highest LRT ridership and second highest total transit ridership of the southern terminus alternatives.
- Would provide LRT access to the CTC area, the highest growth rate and highest planned density use area of the County, and to Oregon City, the County seat.

**Disadvantages:**
- Highest cost alternative, with over $1 billion more capital costs than the Milwaukie Terminus and $2.7 million more annually in additional O&M costs.
- Least cost effective of the South Terminus Alternatives, with the highest annualized cost per LRT rider and the highest LRT operating costs per rider.
- Total transit times would remain longer for trips between Oregon City and downtown Portland than for trips taken using an automobile.
- Limited station opportunities between Clackamas Town Center and Gladstone.
North Study Terminus Alternatives

The above map illustrates the five alternative terminus points for the North that could be selected to advance into Tier II. The selection of a Study Terminus will define the northern limits of the Tier II analysis. Within those limits shorter segments may be studied for either phasing opportunities or as required by the federal government to evaluate shorter segments.

1. Vancouver CBD/39th Street Terminus
   **Advantages:**
   - The least costly of the four alternative northern termini, with a capital cost savings in $YOE of $224 (88th Street) to $495 (179th Street) million.
   - The least costly of the alternatives to operate ($530,000 to $2.3 million less annually).
   - The most cost effective northern terminus alternative.

   **Disadvantages:**
   - Lowest LRT and total transit (LRT + bus) ridership, with 1,550 to 2,750 fewer LRT trips and 700 to 1,350 fewer total transit trips.
   - Would provide only limited LRT service into Clark County and to major activity centers within the county.
   - Limited park-and-ride lot opportunities with the high park-and-ride demand would result in higher capital costs and/or lower ridership estimates with greater traffic impacts than currently estimated.
   - Would leave many of the transportation problems within the Clark County segment unaddressed, with slower total transit travel times for north Clark County and Vancouver Mall.
   - LRT would not extend far enough into Clark County to assist in the management of growth within Clark County.

2. 88th Street Terminus
   **Advantages:**
   - The lowest cost (both capital and O&M) and the most cost effective of the alternatives that extend well into Clark County. Total transit ridership is only slightly lower than the further termini but at a substantially lower cost.
   - Would provide LRT access into the north I-5 corridor area, designated within the growth management plan as a high growth area with intense development patterns.
   - Would provide higher transit reliability for patrons than the Vancouver CBD Alternative and the same reliability as the further extensions at a much lower cost (based on the percent of passenger miles within protected ROW).
   - The lowest (same as Vancouver CBD) operating cost per trip.
   - Total transit travel time from Portland CBD to Vancouver CBD and 88th Street would be less than or similar to auto travel times during the peak hour.

   **Disadvantages:**
   - Higher cost (both capital and O&M than the Vancouver CBD Terminus.
   - Lower LRT ridership than extensions north and to Vancouver Mall.
- SR-500 park-and-ride demand would need to be accommodated with a lot near or north of the Vancouver CBD which may result in more local traffic impacts near central Vancouver.

3. 134th Street Terminus

**Advantages:**
- Second highest total transit ridership of the North terminus alternatives.
- Would provide LRT access to the 134th Street area with possible shuttle access to WSU Campus. This area has been designated as a major growth and activity center. Would forward growth management planning goals.

**Disadvantages:**
- Third highest capital cost of the northern terminus alternatives, $364 million more costly than the Vancouver CBD Terminus and $140 million more than the 88th Street Terminus.
- SR-500 park-and-ride demand would need to be accommodated with a lot near or north of the Vancouver CBD which may result in more local traffic impacts near central Vancouver.
- Total transit travel times would remain longer than the auto travel times for trips from 134th Street, 179th Street and Vancouver Mall to Portland CBD.

4. Vancouver Mall/Orchards Terminus

**Advantages:**
- Would have the second highest LRT ridership of the northern termini.
- Would provide LRT access to the Vancouver Mall area, a high growth rate and high intensity use area within Clark County.

**Disadvantages:**
- Highest LRT operating costs per rider.
- Total transit travel times would remain longer than auto travel times from Vancouver Mall, 134th Street and 179th Street to downtown Portland.
- 1-5 park-and-ride demand would need to be accommodated with a lot near the Vancouver CBD which may result in local traffic impacts near central Vancouver.
The above map illustrates the alignment alternatives between the Portland CBD and downtown Milwaukie that could be selected to advance into Tier II for further study. Within this segment there are two different sets of alternatives being compared. First are the alternate locations for a crossing of the Willamette River south of the Portland CBD.

Second, for the Hawthorne, Caruthers and Ross Island Bridge Crossing alternatives, two Eastbank routes south are being compared: either the Portland Traction Company rail right-of-way or an alignment adjacent to McLoughlin Boulevard.

Note that the capital cost estimates include both the cost of the bridge and the alignment from the Portland CBD to the Milwaukie CBD. This is done to be able to account for the full costs of using a part crossing location. A lower cost bridge may require a higher cost alignment in order to reach that location.

A. South Willamette River Crossings

1. Hawthorne Bridge Alternative

**Advantages:**
- The least costly of the four alternatives with a cost savings in $YOE of $59 to $65 million.
- Would provide the best LRT access to the Central Eastside and OMSI.
- May provide better opportunity for SE bus connections to LRT.
- Would provide LRT access to inner SE neighborhoods (Brooklyn and Moreland).

**Disadvantages:**
- Would provide the least LRT access to the southern portions of the Portland Central City including PSU, and no access to the North Macadam area and to the South Waterfront District.
- Frequent bridge openings for river traffic would cause LRT reliability problems, decrease LRT ridership and increase operating expenses by approximately $500,000 per year (included within the ridership and O&M cost estimates). Because of the bridge's age, direct bridge operating costs would be higher.
- Difficult to bring the existing Hawthorne Bridge up to seismic and operational standards and a new span would increase costs and would significantly impact the Portland CBD.
- Total transit ridership would be lower than the Caruthers Bridge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio CBD to Milwaukee via:</th>
<th>Hawthorne Bridge</th>
<th>Caruthers Bridge</th>
<th>Ross Island Bridge</th>
<th>Sellwood Bridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure Cost (millions)</td>
<td>$674</td>
<td>$739</td>
<td>$733</td>
<td>$739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Weekday Ridership 179th to Oregon City</td>
<td>61,400</td>
<td>62,800</td>
<td>62,300</td>
<td>61,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corridor Transit Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>131,350</td>
<td>132,200</td>
<td>131,400</td>
<td>130,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost (millions) Oregon City to 179th</td>
<td>$18.43</td>
<td>$17.93</td>
<td>$17.93</td>
<td>$19.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Impacts of bridge reconstruction on the Willamette River ecosystem. Using the McLoughlin alignment on the eastside south to Sellwood would displace approximately 50 structures and could adversely impact historic structures. Use of the PTC alignment could have significant impacts upon the adjacent wildlife habitat and natural environment. (See Disadvantages for the McLoughlin and PTC alignments).

2. Caruthers Bridge

**Advantages:**
- Highest total transit and LRT ridership.
- Would provide LRT access to the South Central City area including PSU, Riverplace and the South Waterfront Development.
- Would provide LRT access to OMSI, inner SE neighborhoods (Brooklyn and Moreland).
- The lowest (same as Ross Island Bridge) operating cost per trip and the lowest cost effectiveness ratio.

**Disadvantages:**
- Highest cost (similar to Sellwood) Willamette River crossing ($65 million more than the Hawthorne Bridge).
- Severe design constraints due to the close proximity of the Marquam Bridge may increase costs.
- Known and possibly unknown hazardous material sites.
- Impacts of bridge construction to the Willamette River ecosystem.
- Using the McLoughlin alignment on the eastside south to Sellwood would displace approximately 40 structures and could adversely impact historic structures. Use of the PTC alignment could have significant impacts upon the adjacent wildlife habitat and natural environment. (See Disadvantages below for the McLoughlin and PTC alignments).
- Possible impact on design of future development in South Waterfront Development.

3. Ross Island Bridge

**Advantages:**
- Second highest total transit ridership.
- Would provide LRT access to the north Macadam redevelopment area and the South Central City area including PSU, Riverplace and the South Waterfront Development.
- Would provide LRT access to inner SE neighborhoods (Brooklyn and Moreland).
- Low operating costs, moderate operating cost per trip, capital costs and cost effectiveness ratio, and lowest capital costs of the fixed span alternatives.
- May provide the opportunity to use a portion of the Shoreline right-of-way.
Disadvantages:
- Capital costs would be $59 million more than Hawthorne Bridge.
- Impacts of bridge construction to the Willamette River ecosystem.
- Using the McLoughlin alignment on the eastside south to Sellwood would displace approximately 60 structures and could adversely impact historic structures. Use of the PTC alignment could have significant impacts upon the adjacent wildlife habitat and natural environment. (See Disadvantages for the McLoughlin and PTC alignments).
- Possible impact on design of future development in South Waterfront and North Macadam Development areas.
- Would not provide direct LRT service to OMSI.

4. Sellwood Bridge

Advantages:
- Would provide LRT access to the North Macadam redevelopment area, the South Central City area including PSU, Riverplace, the South Waterfront Development and Johns Landing.
- May provide the opportunity to reduce total transportation costs and impacts by combining highway and transit river crossing.
- May provide the opportunity to use a portion of the Shoreline right-of-way.

Disadvantages:
1. Highest cost (similar to Caruthers Bridge) Willamette river crossing alternative ($65 million more than Hawthorne and similar to Ross Island).
- Lowest LRT ridership and total transit ridership.
- Highest operating costs, highest operating costs per rider and highest cost effectiveness ratio.
- Local neighborhood and social impacts (e.g. noise and vibration) in the Johns Landing area.
- Impacts due to bridge construction to the Willamette River ecosystem.
- Slowest travel times between Clackamas County and downtown Portland (approximately 5 minutes slower).
- Would not provide LRT access to Brooklyn and Moreland neighborhoods or OMSI.

B. Eastbank Alignments

The map below illustrates the Portland Traction Company Alignment Alternative and the McLoughlin Boulevard Alignment Alternative. The costs within the following analysis assume a Hawthorne Bridge crossing but the cost differential would apply to either the Hawthorne, Caruthers or Ross Island crossing.
Portland Traction Company Alignment

Advantages:
- Would have fewer residential displacements and fewer construction impacts on local neighborhoods and businesses.

Disadvantages:
- Higher O&M and higher capital costs than the McLoughlin Boulevard Alignment Alternative.
- Lower ridership due to longer travel times, fewer transfer opportunities and less access to eastside neighborhoods.
- Higher LRT operating costs per ride and highest cost effectiveness ratio.
- Possible significant environmental impacts due to the alignment’s proximity to wildlife habitat which could lead to higher costs in order to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts.
- Because of the restrictions placed on much of the land adjacent to the alignment it would have relatively little ability to shape and support transit supportive land use patterns and urban redevelopment.
- Would relocate active freight rail service and approximately 20 commercial or industrial structures.

6. McLoughlin Boulevard Alignment

Advantages:
- Would have higher LRT and higher total transit ridership than the PTC Alignment Alternative due to shorter travel times and better access to eastside neighborhoods.
- Would have lower capital and O&M costs due in part to the shorter alignment length.
- Exhibits the lowest operating cost per rider and the lowest cost effectiveness ratio.
- Would provide the best opportunity to support and shape transit supportive and more intense urban development.
- Would have fewer significant environmental impacts, especially on wildlife habitat and the natural environment.

Disadvantages:
- Would displace approximately 50 residences/businesses along McLoughlin with potential impact on historical and cultural resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North River Crossings to Milwaukie Via:</th>
<th>PTC</th>
<th>McLoughlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure Cost (millions)</td>
<td>$695</td>
<td>$674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Weekday Ridership from Oregon City to 179th</td>
<td>58,250</td>
<td>62,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corridor Weekday Transit Ridership</td>
<td>131,050</td>
<td>131,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost (millions) from Oregon City to 179th</td>
<td>$18.76</td>
<td>$18.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Costs assume a Hawthorne Bridge crossing, but the cost differential between alternatives would generally hold constant for the Ross Island or Caruthers bridge crossings as well.
The above map illustrates the alignment alternatives within the Portland Central Business District (CBD) from the Steel Bridge in the north to Riverplace in the south. Within this segment there are two different sets of alternatives being compared.

First is the Surface Alternative which would use the existing Transit Mall on 5th and 6th Avenues. Several options for the Surface Alternative have been developed and will be refined before Tier II is initiated.

Second is the Subway Alternative that could be built under one of four north/south streets: 4th, 5th, 6th, or Broadway Avenues. The subway would be built using tunnel boring and cut and cover techniques. For this analysis a dual tube subway (see Subway Cross-Section on page 17) under Broadway Avenue (and 5th Avenue for additional cost analyses) has been assumed. If a subway is selected for further study within Tier II then further refinement of the subway options would be made prior to initiating the DEIS.

If a subway is selected for further study, the surface alignment will also advance into the DEIS, because of the high costs associated with a subway and the need to have intermediate cost alternatives within a DEIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown Portland via:</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Subway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure Cost (millions)</td>
<td>$288 - $309</td>
<td>$551 - $584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Weekday Ridership from Oregon City to 179th</td>
<td>61,400</td>
<td>64,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corridor Transit Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>130,750</td>
<td>132,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost (millions) from Oregon City to 179th</td>
<td>$19.12</td>
<td>$20.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Surface Alignment Alternative

Advantages:
- The least costly of the alternatives to build and operate, with a capital cost savings in $YOE of approximately $263 to $275 million and O&M cost savings in $1994 of $1.8 million.
- Would have adequate operational capacity to accommodate additional South/North Corridor demand beyond the forecast year of 2015.
- Would have lower operating costs per rider and would be the most cost effective Portland CBD alternative.
- Would provide more visible and direct access from LRT to bus connections and to adjacent retail, commercial and residential properties.
1. Surface Alignment Alternative

Advantages:
- Would have lower LRT and total transit ridership.
- Spatial constraints on the Transit Mall will require some trade-offs between capacity for buses, LRT, pedestrian movements and general purpose auto access.
- Travel time through downtown Portland is approximately four minutes slower than with the subway alternative.
- Construction activities on the Transit Mall would affect bus and auto operations and pedestrian movements.

2. Subway Alignment Alternative

Advantages:
- Highest total transit and LRT ridership due to faster travel times (by four minutes) through downtown Portland.
- Would minimize changes to Transit Mall auto, pedestrian and bus travel patterns and existing auto capacity on the Mall could be maintained.
- Ultimate capacity would exceed the surface alignment.

Disadvantages:
- Highest capital and O&M costs with approximately $263 to $275 million ($1994) in additional capital costs and $1.8 million ($1994) in additional annual operating costs.
- Would have the highest operating cost per rider and the highest cost effectiveness ratio of the Portland CBD Alternatives.
- Traffic, displacements and other impacts during construction associated with the subway portals and stations would be significant.
- Would have a lower visibility and less direct access to bus connections and to adjacent retail, commercial and residential properties adjacent to the alignment.

- Total transportation costs and constructions impacts may be higher than projected due to the planned Transit Mall reconstruction would not be incurred with the Surface alignment alternative.

Subway Cross-Section
The above map illustrates the alignment alternatives between the Portland CBD in the south and the Vancouver CBD in the North. Within this segment there are two different sets of alternatives being compared. Appendix D includes cross-section drawings of the two alternatives.

First is the Interstate Avenue Alternative that would use an alignment generally within the center of Interstate Avenue. Several options for the Interstate Avenue Alternative have been developed for this analysis. First is a two-lane option that would use two general purpose lanes from Interstate Avenue to accommodate LRT, leaving two lanes, one in each direction. Second, the four-lane option would expand the Interstate Avenue right-of-way to accommodate both LRT within a median strip and four lanes of general purpose auto traffic, two in each direction. A third option, a two-lane configuration with four-lane expansion at the key intersections has also been developed and costed. In general, its costs fall between the less-expensive two-lane option and the higher cost four-lane option and are used below for comparison with the I-5 Alternative. It would also reduce impacts (e.g. displacement) associated with the four-lane option while generally providing adequate roadway capacity for auto use.

Second is the I-5 Alternative that would be located just west of the existing I-5 freeway, up at the level of the neighborhood generally within or adjacent to the Minnesota Avenue right-of-way and generally separated from the neighborhood with noise walls. Pedestrian access improvements across I-5 would be included within the I-5 Alignment Alternative. There are no significant design options for the I-5 Alignment Alternative assumed within this analysis. However, design options could be developed for the I-5 Alternative which would provide direct LRT service to the Kenton business and neighborhood areas.

1. Interstate Avenue Alignment Alternative

**Advantages:**
- Would have higher LRT visibility and provide more direct LRT access to retail, commercial and residential properties on Interstate Avenue and within the Kenton area.
- Would provide good (and similar to the I-5 alignment) access to the planned mixed use and higher density housing between Interstate Avenue and I-5 designated within the Albina Community Plan.
- Would provide more direct LRT access to the residential areas west of Interstate Avenue.

**Disadvantages:**
- Would have lower LRT (1,400 fewer) and lower total transit ridership (1,450 fewer) than the I-5 Alignment Alternative.
- Would be more costly to construct (by $114 million in SYOE) and more costly to operate (by about $120,000 a year in 1994 dollars).
- LRT travel time in this segment would be two minutes slower than the I-5 Alignment due to a longer alignment and a lower maximum operating speed.
could have higher operating costs per rider and a higher cost effectiveness ratio than the I-5 Alignment Alternative.

- Would require approximately 40 residential/business displacements for a two-lane option and up to 120 residential/business displacements for the four-lane option. The combined two-lane/four-lane would require approximately 65 residential/commercial displacements.

- Potential noise impacts on Interstate Avenue would be more difficult to mitigate due to the difficulty of constructing noise walls within the median strip, where LRT would be located.

- Traffic impacts on Interstate Avenue would include left turns being restricted to intersections and the removal of parking near intersections.

- Construction impacts on local traffic using Interstate Avenue would be significant and construction impacts through the middle of the established neighborhoods would be more significant than with the I-5 Alternative which is on the edge of the neighborhoods.

2. I-5 Alignment Alternative

Advantages:
- Higher total transit (by 1,450 daily) and higher LRT (by 1,400 daily) ridership than the Interstate Alignment Alternative. Increased transit ridership would be generated both within Clark County and within north Portland.

- Lower capital costs (by $114 million in $YOE) and lower annual O&M costs (by $120,000 annually in $1994).

- Would have lower operating costs per rider and a lower cost effectiveness ratio than the Interstate Avenue Alternative.

- LRT travel times would be two minutes quicker through this segment because of the higher maximum LRT operating speeds between stations and the shorter alignment length.

- Would provide better access to the PCC campus on N.E. Killingsworth and neighborhoods east of I-5.

- Would provide good (and similar to the Interstate Avenue alignment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Portland CBD to</th>
<th>Interstate Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver CBD via</td>
<td>2-Lane/4-Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure Cost (millions)</td>
<td>$1,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Weekday Ridership from Oregon City to 179th</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weekday Corridor Transit Ridership</td>
<td>131,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost (millions) from Oregon City to 179th</td>
<td>$18.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

access to the planned mixed use and higher density housing between Interstate Avenue and I-5 designated within the Albina Community Plan.

- Noise impacts caused by LRT could be more easily mitigated through noise walls west of the proposed LRT alignment. Those noise walls could have the added benefit of reducing existing freeway-generated noise to some of the neighborhoods west of the I-5 freeway.

Disadvantages:
- Would provide less LRT visibility and access to the properties along Interstate Avenue.

- The current design of the I-5 Alternative would provide only limited LRT access to the Kenton neighborhood and no LRT access to the Kenton business district.

- Would provide less LRT visibility and access to the neighborhoods west of Interstate Avenue.

- Physical constraints may make it more difficult to provide station sites and layouts that maximize development potential around the LRT station areas.

- Would require approximately 70, mostly residential, displacements.
The map to the left illustrates the alignment alternatives between the Vancouver CBD in the south and 179th Street in the north. Within this segment there are two different alternatives being compared. Both alternatives would use the same alignment south of the Main Street/I-5 interchange. The 88th Street, 134th Street and 179th Street North Study Terminus Alternatives are affected by these Alignment Alternatives.

First, the Highway 99 Alternative would use an alignment generally within the center of Highway 99.

Second, the I-5 Alternative would be located just west or east of the existing I-5 freeway.

1. Highway 99 Alignment Alternative

Advantages:
- Would have higher LRT visibility and provide more direct LRT access to retail, commercial and residential properties along Highway 99. Both alternatives would support the proposed transit overlay district (TOD) for this portion of the corridor.

Disadvantages:
- Would have lower LRT (1,150 fewer) and lower total transit ridership (1,250 fewer).
- Would be more costly to construct (by $79 million $YOE to 88th Street and by $167 million $YOE to 134th or 179th St) and more costly to operate by about $110,000 a year in 1994 dollars.

- Travel time through this segment would be three minutes slower than with the I-5 Alignment.
- Would have the highest operating costs per rider and the highest cost effectiveness ratio of the two north Clark County alignment alternatives.
- Would require approximately 106 displacements, most of which would be commercial displacements.
- Traffic impacts on Highway 99 would include left turns being restricted to intersections and capacity reductions at intersections that are currently nearing capacity and significant traffic impacts would be caused by construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Vancouver CBD to 134th via:</th>
<th>Highway 99</th>
<th>I-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure Cost (millions)</td>
<td>$531</td>
<td>$379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Weekday Ridership from Oregon City to 179th</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td>62,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corridor Weekday Transit Ridership</td>
<td>130,100</td>
<td>131,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost (millions) from Oregon City to 179th</td>
<td>$18.31</td>
<td>$18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Alignment Alternative

**Advantages:**
- Higher LRT ridership (by 1,150 daily) and higher total transit ridership (by 1,250 daily).
- Lower capital costs (by $79 million YOE to 88th Street and by $167 million YOE to 134th or 179th Streets) and lower annual operating costs (by $110,000 annually).
- Would have lower operating costs per rider and a lower cost effectiveness ratio.
- LRT travel times would be three minutes quicker through this segment because of the higher maximum LRT operating speeds between stations and the shorter alignment length.
- Noise impacts would be less and mitigation of noise impacts would be easier to design and implement.
- Would provide greater LRT visibility and would provide more direct LRT access to residential area west of I-5. Both alternatives would support the proposed transit overlay district (TOD) for this portion of the corridor.

**Disadvantages:**
- Would cause a variety of local traffic impacts due to park-and-ride lot access.
- Less direct LRT access to the properties along Highway 99.
- Would require approximately 80 residential/commercial displacements.
Appendix A

Summary Tables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>PTC</th>
<th>McLoughlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Efficiency</td>
<td>Capital Cost (1994 $); Pioneer Square to Milwaukie</td>
<td>$437.20</td>
<td>$424.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Cost (YOE $); Pioneer Square to Milwaukie</td>
<td>$695.20</td>
<td>$674.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in millions of $)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual LRT Operating and Maintenance Cost (1994 $)</td>
<td>$18.76</td>
<td>$18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Bus Operating and Maintenance Savings (1994 $)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost per Rider</td>
<td>$0.98</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Desired</td>
<td>Major Activity Centers Served</td>
<td>Milwaukie CBD</td>
<td>SE Neighborhoods,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Bi-State Policies</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain Urban Growth Boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Possible Displacements (Residential/Commercial)</td>
<td>20+ commercial/indust.</td>
<td>50+, commercial and residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing freight line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>Greater risks due to lower existing noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecosystem Impacts</td>
<td>Wetlands &amp; wildlife habitat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and Cultural Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater risk due to more displacements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- All data is for year 2015, unless otherwise noted.
- Data assumes LRT from Oregon City via I-205 to 179th St. in Clark County, unless otherwise noted.
- Costs are in millions of $.
- Bus O&M savings represents cost reduction from highest bus cost alternative.
- Displacement data based on preliminary design without specific efforts to mitigate possible impacts.
# Summary of Measurement Criteria

## Portland CBD Alignment Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Subway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peak Hour Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of Access</strong></td>
<td>Households within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver CBD</td>
<td>114,750</td>
<td>143,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland CBD</td>
<td>219,150</td>
<td>234,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie CBD</td>
<td>82,410</td>
<td>103,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver CBD</td>
<td>306,970</td>
<td>344,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland CBD</td>
<td>579,600</td>
<td>598,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milwaukie CBD</td>
<td>348,490</td>
<td>382,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Travel Time, PM Peak Hour (in minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Milwaukie (auto = 27)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Vancouver CBD (auto = 39)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Miles of Reserved or Separate ROW</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Corridor Passenger-miles on Reserved ROW</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership</strong></td>
<td>Weekday Corridor Transit Trips</td>
<td>130,750</td>
<td>132,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday S/N LRT Trips</td>
<td>61,400</td>
<td>64,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong></td>
<td>PM Peak Hour, Peak Direction V/C Ratio at:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Use</strong></td>
<td>River Crossings (Fremont - Ross Island)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Crossings (Sellwood Bridge)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Prescott (Denver, I-5, Interstate, MLK Blvd., Vancouver)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Boundary (Macadam, Corbett)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Issues</strong></td>
<td>At grade crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portal impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Subway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Efficiency</td>
<td>Capital Cost (1994 $); South Waterfront to Union Station</td>
<td>$180.8 - $194.4</td>
<td>$353.2 - $367.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Cost (YOE $); South Waterfront to Union Station</td>
<td>$287.5 - $309.1</td>
<td>$551.0 - $584.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in millions $)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual LRT Operating and Maintenance Cost (1994 $)</td>
<td>$19.12</td>
<td>$20.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Bus Operating and Maintenance Savings (1994 $)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost per Rider</td>
<td>$0.95</td>
<td>$0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Annualized LRT Cost per Rider</td>
<td>$8.90</td>
<td>$9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Desired</td>
<td>Major Activity Centers Served</td>
<td>Portland CBD</td>
<td>Portland CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Support Major Activity Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain Urban Growth Boundaries</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support BI-State Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Possible Displacements (Residential/Commercial)</td>
<td>Potential at mall connections</td>
<td>Potential at portals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>Possible vibrations</td>
<td>Potential at portals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem Impacts</td>
<td>No significant impacts</td>
<td>No significant impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and Cultural Impacts</td>
<td>Potential impacts</td>
<td>Potential at portals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All data is for year 2015, unless otherwise noted. Data assumes LRT from Oregon City via I-205 to 179th St. in Clark County, unless otherwise noted. Costs are in millions of $. Bus O&M savings represents cost reduction from highest bus cost alternative.
# Summary of Measurement Criteria

## Portland CBD to Vancouver CBD Alignment Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Interstate Ave.</th>
<th>I-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Service</strong></td>
<td>Peak Hour Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of Access</strong></td>
<td>Households within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swan Island</td>
<td>126,840</td>
<td>131,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenton</td>
<td>178,050</td>
<td>184,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayden Island</td>
<td>163,300</td>
<td>170,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver CBD</td>
<td>138,650</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment within 45 minutes by transit to:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swan Island</td>
<td>369,490</td>
<td>377,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenton</td>
<td>450,430</td>
<td>472,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayden Island</td>
<td>402,300</td>
<td>408,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver CBD</td>
<td>310,400</td>
<td>337,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transferability</strong></td>
<td>Mode of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk on</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park-and-ride</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time</strong></td>
<td>Total Travel Time, PM Peak Hour (in minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Swan Island (auto = 17)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Kenton (auto = 20)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Hayden Island (auto = 28)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Vancouver CBD (auto = 40)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Miles of Reserved or Separated ROW</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Corridor Passenger-miles on Reserved ROW</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership</strong></td>
<td>Weekday Corridor Transit Trips</td>
<td>131,350</td>
<td>132,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday S/N LRT Trips</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>65,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour, Peak Direction V/C Ratio at:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Use</strong></td>
<td>Columbia River Crossing (I-5 Bridge)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Columbia (I-5, Interstate, MLK Blvd.)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Prescott (Denver, I-5, Interstate, MLK Blvd., Vancouver)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Crossings (Fremont - Ross Island)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Traffic</strong></td>
<td>At grade crossings</td>
<td>At grade crossings</td>
<td>At grade crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes street design</td>
<td>Ramp impacts</td>
<td>Changes street design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Removes some parking</td>
<td>Removes some parking</td>
<td>Removes some parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Interstate Ave.</th>
<th>I-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Efficiency</td>
<td>Capital Cost (1994 $)</td>
<td>$753.9</td>
<td>$692.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Capital Cost (YOE $)</td>
<td>$1,198.7</td>
<td>$1,084.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in millions of $)</td>
<td>Annual LRT Operating and Maintenance Cost (1994 $)</td>
<td>$18.20</td>
<td>$18.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Bus Operating and Maintenance Savings (1994 $)</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost per Rider</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
<td>$0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Desired</td>
<td>Major Activity Centers Served</td>
<td>Coliseum, N/NE</td>
<td>Coliseum, N/NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Support Major Activity Centers</td>
<td>neighbood, N/NE</td>
<td>Neighbourhoods, Vancouver CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Bi-State Policies</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain Urban Growth Boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sensitivity</td>
<td>Possible Displacements (Residential/Commercial)</td>
<td>65+, mostly commercial</td>
<td>65+, almost all residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>More difficult to mitigate</td>
<td>Replace existing and new noise wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecosystem Impacts</td>
<td>Columbia Slough and River Xing</td>
<td>Columbia Slough and River Xing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical and Cultural Impacts</td>
<td>Slightly higher risk of impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All data is for year 2015, unless otherwise noted. Data represents build out from Oregon City via I-205 to 179th St. in Clark County, unless otherwise noted. Costs are in millions of $. Bus O&M savings represents cost reduction from highest bus cost alternative. Displacement data based on preliminary design without specific efforts to mitigate possible impacts. Note capital costs and cost effectiveness for Interstate Avenue are for the two-lane/four-lane hybrid option.
Summary of Measurement Criteria
39th to 179th Street Alignment Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Highway 99</th>
<th>I-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peak Hour Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of Access</strong></td>
<td>Households within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver CBD</td>
<td>136,040</td>
<td>137,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134th St.</td>
<td>80,240</td>
<td>87,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver Mall</td>
<td>97,010</td>
<td>99,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment within 45 minutes by transit to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver CBD</td>
<td>304,760</td>
<td>295,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134th St.</td>
<td>103,560</td>
<td>119,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver Mall</td>
<td>117,290</td>
<td>119,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transferability</strong></td>
<td>Mode of Access; Vancouver CBD to 179th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk on</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park-and-ride</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time</strong></td>
<td>Total Travel Time, PM Peak Hour (in minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Vancouver CBD (auto = 39)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to 88th St. (auto = 44)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to 134th St. (auto = 48)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to 179th St. (auto = 52)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit from Portland CBD to Vancouver Mall (auto = 44)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Miles of Reserved or Separate ROW</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Corridor Passenger-miles on Reserved ROW</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership</strong></td>
<td>Weekday Corridor Transit Trips</td>
<td>130,100</td>
<td>131,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday S/N LRT Trips</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td>62,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong></td>
<td>PM Peak Hour, Peak Direction V/C Ratio at:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Use</strong></td>
<td>Between Mill &amp; 4th Plain (I-5, Main, Broadway, Ft. Van.)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of 39th (15th, Main, I-5)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S of 78th (Hwy 99, Hazel Dell Ave., I-205)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Johns/Andreson (18th, 40th, 4th Plain, SR 500)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted left turns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Highway 99</td>
<td>I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Efficiency</td>
<td>Capital Cost (1994 $); 39th to 134th</td>
<td>$334</td>
<td>$229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual LRT Operating and Maintenance Cost (1994 $)</td>
<td>$18.59</td>
<td>$18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Bus Operating and Maintenance Savings (1994 $)</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Effective LRT Operating Cost per Rider</td>
<td>$0.91</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness Ratio</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Desired Land Use</td>
<td>Major Activity Centers Served</td>
<td>Vancouver CBD, Salmon Creek/WSU</td>
<td>Vancouver CBD, Salmon Creek/WSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Major Activity Centers</td>
<td>Maintain Urban Growth Boundaries</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sensitivity</td>
<td>Possible Displacements (Residential/Commercial)</td>
<td>100+, mostly commercial</td>
<td>80+, commercial and residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>More difficult to mitigate</td>
<td>Can mitigate with noise walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecosystem Impacts</td>
<td>Salmon Creek Xing</td>
<td>Salmon Creek Xing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and Cultural Impacts</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All data is for year 2015, unless otherwise noted.
Data assumes LRT from Oregon City via I-205 to 179th St. in Clark County, unless otherwise noted.
Costs are in millions of $.
I-5 data assumes an east of I-5 alignment.
Bus O&M savings represents cost reduction from highest bus cost alternative.
Displacement data based on preliminary design without specific efforts to mitigate possible impacts.
Appendix B

Summary of Year of Expenditure
Capital Costs
North/North Corridor Year of Expenditure Costs

I. Termini Alternative Costs
($Millions in Year of Expenditure)

By using the following table the various costs of the Tier I alternatives can be calculated. Select the cell that corresponds to the particular South and North Termini and then adjust that cost up or down according to the Adjustment provided.

Note: These termini costs are based on the Order of Magnitude (OOM) cost estimate ($1994) of the generic representative alignment factored to year of expenditure through proto-typical construction schedules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminus Alternatives</th>
<th>39th St</th>
<th>88th St</th>
<th>134th St</th>
<th>179th St</th>
<th>Vancouver Mall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie CBD</td>
<td>$2,108</td>
<td>$2,333</td>
<td>$2,472</td>
<td>$2,603</td>
<td>$2,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas Town Center</td>
<td>$2,565</td>
<td>$2,790</td>
<td>$2,929</td>
<td>$3,060</td>
<td>$3,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City via McLoughlin</td>
<td>$2,706</td>
<td>$2,930</td>
<td>$3,070</td>
<td>$3,201</td>
<td>$3,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City via I-205</td>
<td>$3,122</td>
<td>$3,347</td>
<td>$3,486</td>
<td>$3,617</td>
<td>$3,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Adjustments for Alignment Alternatives (YOE $millions)

Add (if a positive number) or subtract (if a negative number) these factors to any of the terminus alternatives above to determine year of expenditure capital cost of any combination of terminus and alignment alternatives. Costs are in millions of year of expenditure dollars.

1. South Willamette River Crossings
   Hawthorne          $ 0
   Caruthers          $ 65
   Ross Island        $ 59
   Sellwood           $ 64

2. Eastbank Alternatives
   McLoughlin         $ 0
   PTC                $ 21

3. CBD Alternatives
   Surface            $ 0
   Subway             $275

4. Portland CBD - Vancouver
   I-5                -$114
   Interstate Avenue  $ 0

5. Vancouver - 179th Alternatives
   I-5 (east)          $ 0
   I-5 (west)          $15
   Highway 99          $167

Note: YOE costs reflect a final design and construction schedule, adjustments for inflation, reserve for yet-to-be determined design options, bonding issuance costs, interim borrowing costs and CAPRA.
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Tier I Process
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Sample Cross-Section Drawings
NORTH PORTLAND ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES
TYPICAL CROSS SECTIONS

1-5 TYPICAL SECTION

1-5 SECTION AT STATION

NORTH INTERSTATE 2 LANE AT MID-BLOCK WITH Z-CROSSING

NORTH INTERSTATE 2 LANE AT INTERSECTION WITH STATION
SOUTH MCLoughlin 4 LANE AT MID-BLOCK WITH Z-CROSSING

SOUTH MCLoughlin 4 LANE AT INTERSECTION WITH STATION

SOUTH MCLoughlin ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES
TYPICAL CROSS SECTIONS
RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTH/NORTH PARTICIPATING JURISDICTIONS

• Clackamas County
• City of Gladstone
• City of Milwaukie
• Multnomah County
• Oregon City
• City of Portland
• Tri-Met
• Clark County
• City of Vancouver
Tier I Alternative Selection Process

Project Management Group
Final Recommendation
September 14

Citizen Advisory Committee
Recommendation
September 29

Steering Group Recommendation
October 6

Briefings for Participating Jurisdictions

Recommendations by Participating Jurisdictions
- Clackamas County 12/1
- Gladstone 11/8
- Milwaukie 12/5
- Multnomah County 12/1
- Oregon City 11/16
- Portland 12/7
- Tri-Met 11/23
- Clark County 11/15
- Vancouver 11/14

Oregon
- TPAC 11/23
- JPACT 12/8
- Metro P.C. 12/15
- Metro Council 12/22

Washington
- RTC 12/6
- JRPC 12/13
- C-TRAN Board 12/13

Draft PMG Terminus Recommendation
August 25

Conceptual Definition of Alternatives Report for DEIS

Summary of Technical Data

South/North Transit Corridor Study

November 15, 1994
BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CLACKAMAS COUNTY, STATE OF OREGON

DEC 9-1994

JOHN F. KAUFMAN, County Ctr

BOARD ORDER NO.: 94-1297
Page 1 of 4

Matter of Supporting
The South/North Tier I Final
Recommendation Report describing
Light Rail Alternatives to Advance
into the Tier II Draft Environmental
Impact Statement for further study.

WHEREAS, in April 1993 Metro Council and the
C-TRAN Board of Directors selected the Milwaukie and I-5 North Corridors as
the region's next high capacity transit priority for study and combined them
into the South/North Corridor to be studied within a federal Alternatives
Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and

WHEREAS, in October 1993 the Federal Transit
Administration approved the South/North application to initiate Alternative
Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the South/North
Preliminary Work Plan, and issued notification of intent in the Federal
Register to publish a South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in December 1993 the South/North
Steering Group concluded the federally prescribed Scoping Process, which
included a comparative analysis of various high capacity transit mode
Alternatives, by selecting the light rail transit and various light rail
Bus and alignment alternatives to advance into Tier I for further
study; and

WHEREAS, the South/North Evaluation
Methodology Report, as adopted by the South/North Steering Group in December
1993, prescribes the South/North study organization and process for the
Conclusions of the Tier I study process and the selection of the alternatives
to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the role of the South/North Steering
Group in the Tier I study process is to forward its final Tier I
Recommendation to participating jurisdictions for their consideration, that
participating jurisdictions are to forward their recommendations to the C-
TRAN Board of Directors and the Metro Council who are to make the final
Determination of the alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft
Environmental Impact Statement for further study; and

WHEREAS, the Evaluation Methodology Report,
therefore specifies the criteria and measures to be used to select the
alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact
Statement; and

WHEREAS, the alternatives that were selected
at the conclusion of Scoping have been developed and the criteria and
assumptions from the Evaluation Methodology Report have been developed and
calculated within various technical memoranda, including the South/North
Tier I Technical Summary Report and the South/North Tier I Briefing
Document; and
BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF CLACKAMAS COUNTY, STATE OF OREGON

In the Matter of Supporting
the South/North Tier 1 Final
Recommendation Report describing
Light Rail Alternatives to Advance
into the Tier II Draft Environmental
Impact Statement for further study.

BOARD ORDER NO.: 94-1297
Page 2 of 4

WHEREAS, the technical methodologies,
assumptions and results have been reviewed by the South/North Expert Review
Panel which found, in summary, that, "The Panel finds that the data
developed is sufficient to make the decisions regarding which alternatives
should be carried forward for further study," and

WHEREAS, a comprehensive public involvement
program was developed and implemented by the South/North Study that included
but was not limited to a variety of community meetings, a 60-day public
comment period on the Tier I alternatives and data, meetings for the
Steering Group to receive oral public comment, and an ongoing Citizens
Advisory Committee that received staff reports and presentations, provided
regular public comment opportunities, and in September 1994 formed an
independent Tier I recommendation that was forwarded to the Steering Group
for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, in October 1994 the Steering Group
considered the Citizens Advisory Committee and Project Management Group
recommendations, public comment and the Tier I criteria and measures and
issued its own unanimous Tier I recommendation to the participating
jurisdictions, C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council for their
consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Steering Group’s Final Tier I
recommendation identifies the LRT alternatives that they concluded best meet
the project’s goal and objectives as adopted in December 1993 by the
South/North Steering Group within the Evaluation Methodology Report; now
therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Clackamas County
Board of Commissioners recommends to the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board
of Directors the following approach to continuation of the South/North
Transit Corridor Study:

1. To pursue the South/North Corridor in two study phases:

   a. Phase I would consider a Light Rail Transit project between the
      Clackamas Town Center area (CTC) and the 99th Street area in
      Clark County.

   b. Phase II would consider an extension of the Phase I LRT Project
      south to Oregon City and north to the 134th Street/WSU area.
These study phases would proceed as follows:

a. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and funding plan for the Phase I LRT alternative would begin immediately.

b. If LRT is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a DEIS and funding strategy for the Phase II LRT extension would be prepared upon completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Phase I.

The following alignments are alternatives for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:

a. Between the Portland and Milwaukie CBDs, that the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate streets in the south, and the McLoughlin Boulevard alignment shall be developed for further study within the DEIS. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further in order to determine whether it should also be included in the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed further in the DEIS.

b. Within the Portland CBD that a Surface LRT Alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be developed based upon several principles for further study within the DEIS.

c. Between the Vancouver CBD and the 134th/Washington State University branch campus area for both the Phase I and Phase II termini, the I-5 East Alignment Alternative with station areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the DEIS.

Because it has found that further discussions and analysis should occur, a recommendation for the segment between the Portland and Vancouver CBDs shall wait completion of additional technical work and evaluation.

and further,
BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
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BE IT RESOLVED, that the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners recommends that the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors adopt the South/North Steering Group Tier I Final Recommendation Report describing the light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study.

DATED this 1st day of December, 1994

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Ed Lindquist, Chairperson

Judie Hammerstad, Commissioner

Darlene Hooley, Commissioner

cc/rs/1115:jb
RESOLUTION NO. 730

RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY OF GLADSTONE IN SUPPORT OF THE SOUTH/NORTH STEERING GROUP TIER I FINAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT DESCRIBING THE LIGHT RAIL ALTERNATIVES TO ADVANCE INTO THE TIER II DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR FURTHER STUDY.

WHEREAS, in April 1993 Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors selected the Milwaukie and I-5 North Corridors as the region's next high capacity transit priority for study and combined them into the South/North Corridor to be studied with a federal Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in October 1993 the Federal Transit Administration approved the South/North application to initiate Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the South/North Preliminary Work Plan, and issued notification of intent in the Federal Register to publish a South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in December 1993 the South/North Steering Group concluded the federally prescribed Scoping Process, which included a comparative analysis of various high capacity transit mode alternatives, by selecting the light rail transit and various light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into Tier I for further study; and

WHEREAS, the South/North Evaluation Methodology Report, as adopted by the South/North Steering Group in December 1993, prescribes the South/North study organization and process for the conclusion of the Tier I study process and the selection of the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the role of the South/North Steering Group in the Tier I study process is to forward its final Tier I recommendation to participating jurisdictions for their consideration, that participating jurisdictions are to forward their recommendations to the C-TRAN Board of Directors and the Metro Council who are to make the final determination of the alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study; and

WHEREAS, the Evaluation Methodology Report, further prescribes the criteria and measures to be used to select the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the alternatives that were selected at the conclusion of Scoping have been developed and the criteria and measures from the Evaluation Methodology Report have been developed and documented within various technical memoranda, including the South/North Tier I Technical Summary Report and the South/North Tier I Briefing Document; and

WHEREAS, the technical methodologies, assumptions and results have been reviewed by the South/North Expert Review Panel which found, in summary, that, "The Panel finds that the data developed is sufficient to make the decisions regarding which alternatives should be carried forward for further study;" and

WHEREAS, a comprehensive involvement program was developed and implemented by the South/North Study that included but was not limited to a variety of community meetings, a 60-day public comment period on the Tier I alternatives and data, meetings for the Steering Group to receive oral public comment, and an on-going Citizens Advisory Committee that received staff reports and presentations, provided regular public comment opportunities, and in
RESOLUTION NO. 730
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September 1994 formed an independent Tier I recommendation that was forwarded to the Steering
Group for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, in October 1994 the Steering Group considered the Citizens Advisory Committee and
Project Management Group recommendations, public comment and the Tier I criteria and measures
and issued its own unanimous Tier I recommendation to the participating jurisdictions, C-TRAN
Board of Directors and Metro Council for their consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Steering Group's Final Tier I Recommendation identified the LRT alternatives that
they concluded best meet the project's goal and objectives as adopted in December 1993 by the
South/North Steering Group within the Evaluation Methodology Report.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GLADSTONE
recommends to the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors the following approach to
continuation of the South/North Transit Corridor Study:

1. To pursue the South/North Corridor in two study phases:
   a. Phase I would consider a Light Rail Transit project between the Clackamas Town Center
      area (CTC) and the 99th Street area in Clark County.
   b. Phase II would consider an extension of the Phase I LRT Project south through Gladstone
to Oregon City and north to the 134th Street/WSU area.

2. These study phases would proceed as follows:
   a. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and funding plan for the
      Phase I LRT alternative would begin immediately.
   b. If LRT is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a DEIS and funding
      strategy for the Phase II LRT extension would be prepared upon completion of the Final
      Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Phase I.

3. The following alignments are alternatives for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact
   Statement:
   a. Between the Portland and Milwaukie CBDs, that the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally
      between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate Streets in the south,
      and the McLoughlin Boulevard alignment shall be developed for further study within the
      DEIS. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further in order to determine whether
      it should also be included in the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed
      further in the DEIS.
   b. Within the Portland CBD that a Surface LRT Alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be
      developed based upon several principles for further study within the DEIS.
   c. Between the Vancouver CBD and the 134th/Washington State University branch campus area
      for both the Phase I and Phase II termini, the I-5 East Alignment Alternative with station
      areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the DEIS;
4. Because it has found that further discussions and analysis should occur, a recommendation for the segment between the Portland and Vancouver CBDs shall await completion of additional technical work and evaluation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GLADSTONE recommends that the C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council adopt the South/North Steering Group Tier I Final Recommendation Report describing the light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study.

This Resolution adopted by the Gladstone City Council and approved by the Mayor this ____ day of ________________, 1994.

Attest:

[Signature]
Wade Byers, Mayor

[Signature]
Verna Howell, CMC, City Recorder
RESOLUTION NO. 51-1994

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE, OREGON, IN SUPPORT OF THE SOUTH/NORTH STEERING GROUP TIER I FINAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT DESCRIBING THE LIGHT RAIL ALTERNATIVES TO ADVANCE INTO THE TIER II DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR FURTHER STUDY.

WHEREAS, in April, 1993, Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors selected the Milwaukie and I-5 North Corridors as the region's next high capacity transit priority for study and combined them into the South/North Corridor to be studied with a federal Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in October, 1993, the Federal Transit Administration approved the South/North application to initiate Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the South/North Preliminary Work Plan, and issued notification of intent in the Federal Register to publish a South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in December, 1993, the South/North Steering Group concluded the federally prescribed Scoping Process, which included a comparative analysis of various high capacity transit mode alternatives, by selecting the light rail transit and various light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into Tier I for further study; and

WHEREAS, the South/North Evaluation Methodology Report, as adopted by the South/North Steering Group in December, 1993, prescribes the South/North study organization and process for the conclusion of the Tier I study process and the selection of the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the role of the South/North Steering Group in the Tier I study process is to forward its final Tier I recommendation to participating jurisdictions for their consideration, that participating jurisdictions are to forward their recommendations to the C-TRAN Board of Directors and the Metro Council who are to make the final determination of the alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study; and

WHEREAS, the Evaluation Methodology Report further prescribes the criteria and measures to be used to select the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the alternatives that were selected at the conclusion of scoping have been developed and the criteria and measures from the Evaluation Methodology Report have been developed and documented within the various technical memoranda, including the South/North Tier I Technical Summary Report and the South/North Tier I Briefing Document; and

WHEREAS, the technical methodologies, assumptions and results have been reviewed by the South/North Expert Review Panel which found, in summary, that "....the data developed is sufficient to make the decisions regarding which alternatives should be carried forward for further study;" and

WHEREAS, a comprehensive involvement program was developed and implemented by the South/North Study that included but was not limited to a variety of community meetings, a 60-day public comment period on the Tier I alternatives and data, meetings for the Steering Group to receive oral public comment, and an on-going Citizens Advisory Committee that received staff reports and presentations, provided regular public comment opportunities, and in September 1994 formed an independent Tier I recommendation that was forwarded to the Steering Group for its consideration; and
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WHEREAS, in October 1994 the Steering Group considered the Citizens Advisory Committee and Project Management Group recommendations, public comment and the Tier I criteria and measures and issued its own unanimous Tier I recommendation to the participating jurisdictions, C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council for their consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Steering Group's Final Tier I Recommendation identified the LRT alternatives that they concluded best meet the project's goal and objectives as adopted in December, 1993, by the South/North Steering Group within the Evaluation Methodology Report.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKIE:

Section 1. That the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors adopt the following approach to continuation of the South/North Transit Corridor Study:

A. To pursue the South/North Corridor in two phases:

1. Phase I would consider a Light Rail Transit project between the Clackamas Town Center area (CTC) and the 99th Street area in Clark County.

2. Phase II would consider an extension of the Phase I LRT Project south to Oregon City via I-205 or McLoughlin Blvd. and north to the 134th Street/WSU area.

B. These study phases would proceed as follows:

1. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and funding plan for the Phase I LRT alternative would begin immediately.

2. If LRT is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a DEIS and funding strategy for the Phase II LRT extension would be prepared upon completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Phase I.

C. The following alignments are alternatives for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:

1. Between the Portland and Milwaukie CBDs, that the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate Streets in the south, and the McLoughlin Boulevard alignment shall be developed for further study within the DEIS. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further in order to determine whether it should also be included in the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed further in the DEIS.

2. Within the Portland CBD that a surface LRT Alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be developed based upon several principles for further study within the DEIS. If at the time the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is initiated it is concluded that a 5th/6th Avenue alignment cannot be developed that addresses those principles, other alternatives will be studied for further study in the DEIS.

3. Between the Vancouver CBD and the 134th/Washington State University branch campus area for both the Phase I and Phase II termini, the I-5 East Alignment Alternative with station areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the DEIS;
D. Because it has been found that further discussions and analysis should occur, a recommendation for the segment between the Portland and Vancouver CBDs shall wait for completion of additional technical work and evaluation.

E. The following alignments will be considered for the Phase II extensions:

1. Following completion of the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report, an analysis of the I-205 alignment from the CTC terminus and the McLoughlin alignment from the Milwaukie CBD to Oregon City will be made to determine which alignment will advance into the Phase II DEIS. The Portland Traction Company (PTC) right-of-way will not be considered as a Phase II alignment.

2. Between the vicinity of 99th Street and the area of 134th Street/WSU Branch Campus, the I-5 East alignment will advance into the Phase II DEIS.

Section 2. That the C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council adopt the South/North Steering Group Tier I Final Recommendation Report describing the light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study.

Introduced and adopted by the City Council on December 6, 1994.

Craig LonWicfci, Mayor

ATTEST:

Pat DuVal, City Recorder

Approved as to form:

O'Donnell Ramis Crew Corrigan & Bachrach
WHEREAS, in April 1993 Metro Council and the C-Tran Board of Directors selected the Milwaukie and I-5 North Corridors as the region’s next high capacity transit priority for study, and combined them into the South/North Corridor to be studied within a federal Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in October 1993 the Federal Transit Administration approved the South/North Preliminary Work Plan, and issued notification of intent in the Federal Register to publish a South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS); and

WHEREAS, in December 1993 the South/North Steering Group including Multnomah County representation, concluded the federally prescribed Scoping Process, which included a comparative analysis of various high capacity transit mode alternatives, by selecting the light rail transit and various light rail terminus and alignment alternatives into Tier I for further study; and

WHEREAS, the South/North Evaluation Methodology Report, as adopted by the South/North Steering Group in December 1993, prescribes the South/North Study organization and process for the conclusion of the Tier I study process, and the selection of the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the role of the South/North Steering Group in the Tier I study process is to forward its final Tier I recommendation to Multnomah County and the other participating jurisdictions for their consideration, so that the County and other participating jurisdictions may forward their recommendations to the C-Tran Board of Directors and the Metro Council who are to make the final determination of the alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study; and

WHEREAS, the Evaluation Methodology Report further prescribes the criteria and measures to be used to select the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the alternatives that were selected at the conclusion of the Scoping Process have been developed, and the criteria and measures from the Evaluation Methodology Report have been developed and documented within various technical memoranda, including the South/North Tier I Technical Summary Report and the South/North Tier I Briefing Document; and

WHEREAS, the technical methodologies, assumptions, and results have been reviewed by the South/North Expert Review Panel which found, in summary, that "The Panel finds that the data developed is sufficient to make the decisions regarding which alternatives should be carried forward for further study," and
WHEREAS, a comprehensive public involvement program was developed and implemented by the South/North Study that included but was not limited to a variety of community meetings, a 60-day public comment period on the Tier I alternatives and data, meetings for the Steering Group to receive oral public comment, and an ongoing Citizens Advisory Committee including representation from Multnomah County, that received staff reports and presentations, provided regular public comment opportunities, and in September 1994, formed an independent Tier I recommendation that was forwarded to the Steering Group for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, in October 1994 the Steering Group considered Citizens Advisory Committee and Project Management Group recommendations, public comment, and the Tier I criteria and measures and issued its own unanimous Tier I recommendation to the participating jurisdictions, C-Tran Board of Directors, and Metro Council for their consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Steering Group's Final Tier I Recommendation identifies LRT alternatives that they concluded best meet the project's goal and objectives as adopted in December 1993 by the South/North Steering Group within the Evaluation Methodology Report;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners recommends to the Metro Council and the C-Tran Board of Directors the following approach to continuation of the South/North Transit Corridor Study:

1. To pursue the South/North Corridor in two study phases:
   A. Phase I would consider a Light Rail Transit project between the Clackamas Town Center (CTC) area and the 99th Street area in Clark County.
   B. Phase II would consider an extension of the Phase I LRT project south to Oregon City and north to the 134th Street/WSU area.

2. These study phases would proceed as follows:
   A. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and funding plan for Phase I LRT alternative would begin immediately.
   B. If LRT is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a DEIS and funding strategy for the Phase II LRT extension would be prepared upon completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Phase I.

3. The following alignments are alternatives for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:
   A. Between the Portland and Milwaukie CBDs, that the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate Streets in the south, and the McLoughlin Blvd. alignment shall be developed for further study within the DEIS. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further to determine whether it should also be included in the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed further in the DEIS.
B. Within the Portland CBD, a Surface LRT Alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be developed based upon several principles for further study within the DEIS.

C. Between the Vancouver CBD and the 134th Street/Washington State University branch campus area for both Phase I and Phase II termini, the I-5 east Alignment Alternative with station areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the DEIS.

4. Because it has been found that further discussions and analysis should occur, a recommendation for the segment between the Portland and Vancouver CBDs shall be made following completion of additional technical work and evaluation;

And further,

BE IT RESOLVED, that Multnomah County Board of Commissioners recommends that the C-Tran Board of Directors and Metro Council adopt the South/North Steering Group Tier I Final Recommendation Report describing the light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study.

DATED this 1st day of December, 1994.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

Beverly Stein, Chair

LAURENCE KRESSEL, COUNTY COUNSEL
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

By
Assistant County Counsel
RESOLUTION NO. 94-56

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING CITY COMMISSION SUPPORT OF TIER 1, SOUTH/NORTH LIGHT RAIL RECOMMENDATIONS

WHEREAS, on October 19, 1994, the Oregon City Urban Renewal Agency met in work session to review and comment on the final Tier 1 Final Recommendations adopted by the South/North Steering Committee; and

WHEREAS, on October 26, 1994, the Oregon City Commission met in work session to review and comment on the final Tier 1 Final Recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon City Commission believes that the South/North Light Rail (LRT) line is an essential element in addressing long range transportation needs in Oregon City, Clackamas County and the Region; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon City Commission believes that the South/North LRT project will reduce the dependency on the automobile, will provide better service to existing and future transit users, will support the End of the Oregon Trail Center and mixed-use development at Clackamette Cove, and will enhance revitalization efforts now underway in downtown Oregon City; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon City Commission is committed to a strong regional partnership which the Commission feels is necessary in order to advance future light rail projects in all parts of the Metro area.

Now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the City Commission of Oregon City, Oregon, supports of the Tier 1 Final Recommendations adopted by the South/North Steering Committee on October 6, 1994, which call for an ultimate Phase II South Terminus of the LRT Alternative in Oregon City; and

That the City Commission supports the Tier 1 Final Recommendations which identify the Clackamas Town Center as the Phase I South Terminus of the S/NLRT Alternative; and

That the City Commission commits the City to actively participate in all Phase I and II activities outlined in the Tier 1 Final Recommendations, and in coordination and advocacy activities involving Clackamas County and the cities in the County; and

That the Oregon City Commission recommends a "yes" vote on Measure No. 26-13, which will authorize Tri-Met to issue general obligation bonds to match federal funds to build the South/North LRT line.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Oregon City Commission will request a joint meeting or meetings with the Clackamas County Commission to discuss and obtain County Commission support for several actions which will strengthen the prospects for extending LRT to Oregon City, and to formulate a joint City-County resolution in support of the project; and

That copies of the resolution be forwarded to the Clackamas County Commission.

Adopted, signed and approved this 2nd day of November, 1994.

[Signatures of Mayor and Commissioners]

Comprising the City Commission of Oregon City, Oregon

RESOLUTION NO. 94-56
SUPPORT THE SOUTH/NORTH STEERING GROUP TIER I FINAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT DESCRIBING THE LIGHT RAIL ALTERNATIVES TO ADVANCE INTO THE TIER II DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR FURTHER STUDY

WHEREAS, in April 1993 Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors selected the Milwaukie and I-5 North Corridors as the region's next high capacity transit priority for study and combined them into the South/North Corridor to be studied within a federal Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in October 1993 the Federal Transit Administration approved the South/North application to initiate Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the South/North Preliminary Work Plan, and issued notification of intent in the Federal Register to publish a South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in December 1993 the South/North Steering Group concluded the federally prescribed Scoping Process, which included a comparative analysis of various high capacity transit mode alternatives by selecting the light rail transit and various light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into Tier I for further study; and

WHEREAS, the South/North Evaluation Methodology Report, as adopted by the South/North Steering Group in December 1993, prescribes the South/North study organization and process for the conclusion of the Tier I study process and selection of the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the role of the South/North Steering Group in the Tier I study process is to forward its final Tier I recommendation to participating jurisdictions for their consideration, that participating jurisdictions are to forward their recommendations to the C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council who are to make the final determination of the alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study; and

WHEREAS, the Evaluation Methodology Report, further prescribes the criteria and measures to be used to select the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the alternatives that were selected at the conclusion of Scoping have been developed and the criteria and measures from the Evaluation Methodology Report have been developed and documented within various technical memoranda, including the South/North Tier I Technical Summary Report and the South/North Tier I Briefing Document, and

WHEREAS, the technical methodologies, assumptions and results have been reviewed by the South/North Expert Review Panel which found, in summary, the "The Panel finds that the data developed is sufficient to make the decisions regarding which alternatives should be carried forward for further study," and

WHEREAS, a comprehensive public involvement program was developed and implemented by the south/north study that included but was not limited to a variety of community meetings, a 60-day public comment period on the Tier I alternatives and data, meeting for the Steering Group to receive oral public comment, and an on-going Citizens Advisory Committee that received staff reports and presentations, provided regular public
comment opportunities, and in September 1994 formed an independent Tier I recommendation that was forwarded to the Steering Group for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, in October 1994 the Steering Group considered the Citizens Advisory Committee and Project Management Group recommendations, public comment and the Tier I criteria and measures and issued its own unanimous Tier I recommendation to the participating jurisdictions, C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council for their consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Steering Group's Final Tier I Recommendation identifies the LRT alternatives that they concluded best meet the project's goal and objectives as adopted in December 1993 by the South/North Steering Group within the Evaluation Methodology Report; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Portland City Council recommends to the Metro Council the following approach to continuation of the South/North Transit Corridor Study:

1. To pursue the South/North Corridor in two study phases:
   a. Phase I would consider a light Rail Transit project between the Clackamas Town Center area (CTC) and the 99th Street area in Clark County.
   b. Phase II would consider an extension of the Phase I LRT Project south to Oregon City and north to the 134th Street/WSU area.

2. These study phases would proceed as follows:
   a. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and funding plan for the Phase I LRT alternative would begin immediately.
   b. If LRT is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a DEIS and funding strategy for the Phase II LRT extension would be prepared upon completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Phase I.

3. The following alignments are alternatives for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:
   a. Between the Portland and Milwaukie CBDs, that the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate streets in the south, and the McLoughlin Boulevard alignment shall be developed for further study within the DEIS. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further in order to determine whether it should also be included in the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed further in the DEIS.

   b. Within the Portland CBD that a Surface LRT Alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be developed based upon several principles, for further study within the DEIS. If at that time it is not concluded that a 5th/6th Avenue Surface Alignment can be developed that addresses the principles identified in the Tier I Final Recommendation, other alternatives would be developed for further study within the DEIS.
c. Between the Vancouver CBD and the 134th/Washington State University branch campus area for both the Phase I and Phase II termini, the I-5 East Alignment Alternative with station areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the DEIS:

4. Because it has found that further discussions and analysis should occur, a recommendation for the segment between the Portland and Vancouver CBDs shall wait completion of additional technical work and evaluation; and further

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Portland City Council recommends that the C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council adopt the South/North Steering Group Tier I Final Recommendation Report describing the light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study.

Adopted by the Council:  NOV 3 0 1994
Commissioner Blumenauer
Barrow Emerson
Nov. 20, 1994

BARBARA CLARK
Auditor of the City of Portland
Deputy
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November 25, 1994
December 1, 1994

Councillor Rod Monroe, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232-2736

Dear Councillor Monroe:


Our Board appreciates the effort and leadership you and the Steering Committee have contributed in advancing the S/N project thus far.

Two recommendations in your report, referenced in our resolution, need special comment:

1. On the Willamette River crossing south of downtown, we expect that both the Ross Island options and the Caruthers option will be given equal consideration during the next phase of study scheduled to be completed in April.

2. On the downtown alignment we expect a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the 5th and 6th Avenue surface alignment to be completed by April. If the analysis is unable to demonstrate that the 5th and 6th Avenue surface alignment is capable of handling future service levels anticipated over the next 30 years we would then expect that other options (including tunnel) would be introduced into the process.

Our support of the attached resolution is conditioned upon the above stated expectations. We request that project staff report findings on these two alignment options to our Board prior to commencement of the DEIS phase of the project in April, 1995.

Sincerely,

William D. Robertson, Jr.
President, Board of Directors
RESOLUTION 94-11-91

RESOLUTION OF THE TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TRI-MET) BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN SUPPORT OF THE SOUTH/NORTH STEERING GROUP TIER I FINAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT.

WHEREAS, in April 1993 Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors selected the Milwaukie and I-5 North Corridors as the region's next high capacity transit priority for study and combined them into the South/North Corridor to be studied within a federal Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in October 1993 the Federal Transit Administration approved the South/North application to initiate Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the South/North Preliminary Work Plan, and issued notification of intent in the Federal Register to publish a South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in December 1993 the South/North Steering Group concluded the federally prescribed Scoping Process, which included a comparative analysis of various high capacity transit mode alternatives, by selecting the light rail transit and various light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into Tier I for further study; and

WHEREAS, the South/North Evaluation Methodology Report, as adopted by the South/North Steering Group in December 1993, prescribes the South/North study organization and process for the conclusion of the Tier I study process and the selection of the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the role of the South/North Steering Group in the Tier I study process is to forward its final Tier I recommendation to participating jurisdictions for their consideration, that participating jurisdictions are to forward their recommendations to the C-TRAN Board of Directors and the Metro Council who are to make the final determination of the alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study; and

WHEREAS, the Evaluation Methodology Report, further prescribes the criteria and measures to be used to select the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the alternatives that were selected at the conclusion of Scoping have been developed and the criteria and measures from the Evaluation Methodology Report have been developed and documented within various technical memoranda, including the South/North Tier I Technical Summary Report and the South/North Tier I Briefing Document; and
WHEREAS, the technical methodologies, assumptions and results have been reviewed by the South/North Expert Review Panel which found, in summary, that, "The Panel finds that the data developed is sufficient to make the decisions regarding which alternatives should be carried forward for further study;" and

WHEREAS, a comprehensive public involvement program was developed and implemented by the South/North Study that included but was not limited to a variety of community meetings, a 60-day public comment period on the Tier I alternatives and data, meetings for the Steering Group to receive oral public comment, and an on-going Citizens Advisory Committee that received staff reports and presentations, provided regular public comment opportunities, and in September 1994 formed an independent Tier I recommendation that was forwarded to the Steering Group for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, in October 1994 the Steering Group considered the Citizens Advisory Committee and Project Management Group recommendations, public comment and the Tier I criteria and measures and issued its own unanimous Tier I recommendation to the participating jurisdictions, C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council for their consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Steering Group's Final Tier I Recommendation identifies the LRT alternatives that they concluded best meet the project's goal and objectives as adopted in December 1993 by the South/North Steering Group within the Evaluation Methodology Report;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the Tri-Met Board of Directors recommends to the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors the following approach to continue the South/North Transit Corridor Study:

   A. Pursue the South/North Corridor in two study phases:

      1.) Phase I would consider a Light Rail Transit project between the Clackamas Town Center area (CTC) and the 99th Street area in Clark County.

      2.) Phase II would consider an extension of the Phase I LRT Project south to Oregon City and north to the 134th Street/WSU area.
B. These study phases would proceed as follows:

1.) Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and funding plan for the Phase I LRT alternative would begin immediately.

2.) If LRT is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a DEIS and funding strategy for the Phase II LRT extension would be prepared upon completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Phase I.

C. The following alignments are alternatives for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:

1.) Between the Portland and Milwaukie CBDs, that the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate streets in the south, and the McLoughlin Boulevard alignment shall be developed for further study within the DEIS. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further to determine whether it also should be included in the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed further in the DEIS.

2.) Within the Portland CBD that a Surface LRT Alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be developed based upon several principles for further study within the DEIS.

3.) Between the Vancouver CBD and the 134th/Washington State University branch campus area for both the Phase I and Phase II termini, the I-5 East Alignment Alternative with station areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the DEIS.

D. Because it has found that further discussions and analysis should occur, a recommendation for the segment between the Portland and Vancouver CBDs should wait completion of additional technical work and evaluation.
Resolution 94-11-91
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2. That the Tri-Met Board of Directors recommends that the
C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council adopt the
South/North Steering Group Tier I Final Recommendation
Report describing the light rail terminus and alignment
alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft
Environmental Impact Statement for further study.

Dated: November 30, 1994

[Signature]
Presiding Officer

Attest:

[Signature]
Recording Secretary

Approved as to Legal Sufficiency:

[Signature]
Legal Department
WHEREAS, in the April 1993 Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors selected the
Milwaukie and I-5 North Corridors as the region’s next high capacity transit priority for study.
These corridors were identified as the South/North Corridor for further study within the federal Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement. In October 1993, the Federal Transit Administration approved the South/North application to initiate the Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement and a South/North Preliminary Work Plan. In addition, the Federal Transit Administration issued a notification of intent in the Federal Register to publish a South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

In December 1993, the South/North Steering Group concluded the federally prescribed Scoping Process, which included a comparative analysis of various high capacity transit mode alternatives. Based on this analysis, the light rail transit and various light rail terminus and alignment alternatives were advanced into the Tier I phase for further study. In addition, the South/North Steering Group adopted the South/North Evaluation Methodology Report prescribing the South/North study organization and process for the conclusion of the Tier I study process and selection of the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. From the completed work of Tier I, the South/North Steering Group developed a set of recommendations for consideration from participating jurisdictions. These jurisdictions will forward their recommendations on to the C-TRAN Board of Directors and the Metro Council who will make the final determination of the alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Evaluation Methodology Report describes the criteria and measures to be used to select the alternatives into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The alternatives that were selected at the conclusion of Scoping have been developed and the criteria and measures from the Evaluation Methodology Report have been developed and documented within various technical memorandum, including the South/North Tier I Technical Summary Report and the South/North Tier I Briefing Document.

These recommendations of the Steering Group were developed with input from the South/North Expert Review Panel, Citizen Advisory Committee, and the general public. A comprehensive public involvement program was developed which yielded many opportunities for citizens to participate through community meetings, and a 60-day comment period on Tier I alternatives and data. In addition, the Citizen Advisory Committee in September 1994 formed an independent Tier I recommendation that was forwarded to the Steering Group for its consideration.

In October 1994 the Steering Group considered the Citizen Advisory Committee and Project Management Group recommendations, public comment and the Tier I criteria and measures...
and issued its own unanimous Tier I recommendation to the participating jurisdictions, C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council for their consideration. In addition, the Growth Management planning process supports these recommendations throughout the Clark County region. Moreover, the Steering Group's Final Tier I Recommendation identifies the Light Rail Transit alternatives that they concluded best meeting the project's goal and objectives as adopted in December 1993 by the South/North Steering Group within the Evaluation Methodology Report.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CLARK COUNTY, STATE OF WASHINGTON, recommends to the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors the following approach to continuation of the South/North Transit Corridor Study:

1. To pursue the South/North Corridor in two study phases:
   a. Phase I would consider a Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project between the Clackamas Town Center area (CTC) and the 99th Street area in Clark County.
   b. Phase II would consider an extension of the Phase I LRT south to Oregon City and north to the 134th Street/WSU area.

2. These study phases would proceed as follows:
   a. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and funding plan for the Phase I LRT alternative would begin immediately.
   b. IF LRT is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a DEIS and funding strategy for the Phase II LRT extension would be prepared upon completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Phase I.

3. The following alignments are alternatives for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:
   a. Between the Portland and Milwaukie CBDs, the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate streets in the south, and the McLoughlin Boulevard alignment shall be developed for further study within the DEIS. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further in order to determine whether it should also be included in the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed further in the DEIS.
   b. Within the Portland CBD that a Surface LRT Alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be developed based upon several principles for further study within DEIS.
   c. Between the Vancouver CBD and the 134th/Washington State University branch campus area for both the Phase I and Phase II termini, the I-5 East Alignment Alternative with station areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the DEIS.

4. Because it has been found that further discussions and analysis should occur, a recommendation for the segment between the Portland and Vancouver CBDs shall wait completion of additional technical work and evaluation.
FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County recommends that the C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council adopt the South/North Steering Group Tier I Final Recommendations Report describing the light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study.

ADOPTED by the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County, Washington, at a regular open public meeting thereof, this 15th day of November 1994.

ATTEST:

By John Richards
Clerk to the Board

Approved as to Form Only

ARTHUR D. CURTIS
Prosecuting Attorney

By

By Richard S. Lowry, Chief Civil Deputy
Prosecuting Attorney

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

By

JOHN C. MAGNANO, Chair of the Board

By

BUSSE NUTLEY, Commissioner

By

DAVID W. STURDEVANT, Commissioner
BACKGROUND: Because of the size and complexity, the Alternative Analysis and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the South/North Transit Corridor Study are being undertaken in two steps (Tier I and II). Work for Tier I has been completed through a collaborative effort by staff from affected jurisdictions in the Clark County region and Oregon. On the basis of this work, the Regional Steering Group for this study has brought forward a set of recommendations for approval by local jurisdictions, and final adoption by the C-TRAN Board and Metro. Tier II will focus on preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement on a narrowed set of Light Rail Transit alternatives, a No-Build alternative and a Transportation Systems Management alternative. Tier II will conclude with the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative.

Tier I included the examination of four major issues in order to narrow the number of alternatives to be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. These issues included the evaluation of 1) modal alternatives (busways, river transit, commuter and light rail), 2) alignment alternatives, 3) terminus alternatives and 4) design options. The following summary details the recommendations directly impacting the Clark County region.

- The examination of the modal alternatives of Tier I started about one year ago with the initiation of the federally-mandated Scoping process. Based on analyses and public input provided during Scoping, the high capacity transit alternatives were narrowed to one mode — light rail transit.

- With regard to the analysis of terminus alternatives, the Steering Group has recommended that the South/North Project be pursued in two phases. Phase I would consider a project which best meets the evaluation criteria established for Tier I and is also constrained by current estimates of potential funding. Work on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Phase I alternative would begin immediately. Phase II would consider a future extension of the South/North Light Transit Rail to endpoints farther into Clark County, if Light Rail Transit is the locally preferred alternative. Based on these premises, the Steering Group has recommended that the 99th Street area serve as the Phase I terminus while the 134th Street/WSU area is recommended as the Phase II terminus. A phased approach allows any Phase II projects to be included in the Regional Transportation Plans and Growth Management Policies of local jurisdictions.
The examination of the alignment alternatives has led the Steering Group to recommend the I-5 East alignment alternative for the segment from the Vancouver Central Business District to the vicinity of 99th Street for Phase I. The I-5 East Alignment Alternative is also the recommended alignment between 99th Street and the 134th Street/WSU area for Phase II.

Finally, within the alignment alternatives recommended above, the following more detailed "Design Options" will remain under study and will be addressed in the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report (which will serve as a basis for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement):

a) The alignment through the Vancouver Central Business District

b) The Columbia River Crossing (high bridge, lift span, or tunnel).

c) The locations of park-and-ride lots, transit centers, stations and maintenance facilities.

d) Other design options as required.

The timing of local jurisdiction's approval and the C-TRAN/Metro adoption of these recommendations is directly related to the funding opportunities available for this project. It is essential that the C-TRAN Board and Metro adopt these recommendations by the end of this year. Approval of these recommendations by local jurisdictions will assist in expediting this process in a timely manner.

ACTION REQUESTED/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS: It is requested that the Board of County Commissioners approve, by signature, the attached resolution. The attached resolution does not have direct budget implications to the County at this time.

DISTRIBUTION: Return an approved copy of this Staff Report and the resolution to the Department of Public Works/Transportation Division.

Paul S. Haines, County Engineer

Ron S. Bergman, Director of Public Works

APPROVED: 11-15-94

CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Attachments: Tier I Final Recommendation Report
South/North Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. M-2930

A RESOLUTION recommending that the C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council adopt the Tier I Final Recommendation Report which describes the light rail terminal and alignment alternatives and recommends that the process advance to the Tier II, Draft Environmental Impact Statement stage.

WHEREAS, in April 1993 Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors selected the Milwaukie and I-5 North Corridors as the region's next high capacity transit priority for study and combined them into the South/North Corridor to be studied within a federal Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in October 1993 the Federal Transit Administration approved the South/North application to initiate Alternative Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the South/North Preliminary Work Plan, and issued notification of intent in the Federal Register to publish a South/North Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, in December 1993 the South/North Steering Group concluded the federally prescribed Scoping Process, which included a comparative analysis of various high capacity transit mode alternatives, by selecting the light rail transit and various light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into Tier I for further study; and

WHEREAS, the South/North Evaluation Methodology Report, as adopted by the South/North Steering Group in December 1993, prescribes the South/North study organization and process for the conclusion of the Tier I study process and the selection of the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the role of the South/North Steering Group in the Tier I study process is to forward its final Tier I recommendation to participating jurisdictions for their consideration, that participating jurisdictions are to forward their recommendations to the C-
TRAN Board of Directors and the Metro Council who are to make the final determination of the alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study; and

WHEREAS, the Evaluation Methodology Report, further prescribes the criteria and measures to be used to select the alternatives to advance into Tier II and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and

WHEREAS, the alternatives that were selected at the conclusion of Scoping have been developed and the criteria and measures from the Evaluation Methodology Report have been developed and documented within various technical memoranda, including the South/North Tier I Technical Summary Report and the South/North Tier I Briefing Document; and

WHEREAS, the technical methodologies, assumptions and results have been reviewed by the South/North Expert Review Panel which found, in summary, that, "The Panel finds that the data developed is sufficient to make the decisions regarding which alternatives should be carried forward for further study;" and

WHEREAS, a comprehensive public involvement program was developed and implemented by the South/North Study that included but was not limited to a variety of community meetings, a 60-day public comment period on the Tier I alternatives and data, meetings for the Steering Group to receive oral public comment, and an on-going Citizens Advisory Committee that received staff reports and presentations, provided regular public comment opportunities, and in September 1994 formed an independent Tier I recommendation that was forwarded to the Steering Group for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, in October 1994 the Steering Group considered the Citizens Advisory Committee and Project Management Group recommendations, public comment and the Tier I criteria and measures and issued its own unanimous Tier I recommendation to the participating jurisdictions, C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council for their consideration; and
WHEREAS, the Steering Group's Final Tier I Recommendation identifies the LRT alternatives that they concluded best meet the project's goal and objectives as adopted in December 1993 by the South/North Steering Group within the Evaluation Methodology Report; and

WHEREAS, on November 7, 1994 the Vancouver City Council adopted the Vancouver Urban Area Comprehensive Plan which strongly emphasizes alternative modes of transportation, including light rail transit,

NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF VANCOUVER:

Section 1. That the City of Vancouver recommends to the Metro Council and the C-TRAN Board of Directors the following approach to continuation of the South/North Transit Corridor Study:

1. To pursue the South/North Corridor in two study phases:
   a. Phase I would consider a Light Rail Transit project between the Clackamas Town Center area (CTC) and the 99th Street area in Clark County.
   b. Phase II would consider an extension of the Phase I LRT Project south to Oregon City and north to the 134th Street/WSU area.

2. These study phases would proceed as follows:
   a. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and funding plan for the Phase I LRT alternative would begin immediately.
   b. If LRT is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative in Phase I, a DEIS and funding strategy for the Phase II LRT extension would be prepared upon completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Phase I.
3. The following alignments are alternatives for further study within the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:
   a. Between the Portland and Milwaukie CBDs, that the Ross Island Bridge Crossing, generally between the Ross Island Bridge in the north and Bancroft and Holgate streets in the south, and the McLoughlin Boulevard alignment shall be developed for further study within the DEIS. The Caruthers area crossing will be evaluated further in order to determine whether it should also be included in the Detailed Definition of Alternatives Report and developed further in the DEIS.
   b. Within the Portland CBD that a Surface LRT Alternative on 5th and 6th Avenues shall be developed based upon several principles for further study within the DEIS.
   c. Between the Vancouver CBD and the 134th/Washington State University branch campus area for both the Phase I and Phase II termini, the I-5 East Alignment Alternative with station areas between I-5 and Highway 99 shall be developed for further study within the DEIS.

4. Because it has found that further discussions and analysis should occur, a recommendation for the segment between the Portland and Vancouver CBDs shall wait completion of additional technical work and evaluation.

   and further, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF VANCOUVER:

   Section 2. That the City of Vancouver recommends that the C-TRAN Board of Directors and Metro Council adopt the South/North Steering Group Tier I Final Recommendation Report describing the light rail terminus and alignment alternatives to advance into the Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further study.

RESOLUTION - 4
ADOPTED at regular session of the Council of the City of Vancouver, at
14th day of November, 1994.

Attest:

H. K. Shorthill, City Clerk

Approved as to form:

Ted H. Gathe, City Attorney
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<tr>
<td>David Rasmussen</td>
<td>CWG #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Howell</td>
<td>AORTA</td>
</tr>
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<td>Mike Burton</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Harrison</td>
<td>OMSI Board</td>
</tr>
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<td>Tom Greenfield</td>
<td>SELC Board</td>
</tr>
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<td>Grant Curtis</td>
<td>WashCo</td>
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<td>Timothy Baskay</td>
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<td>Chuck Steenwinkel</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Rod Stangl</td>
<td>CLACKAMAS COUNTY</td>
</tr>
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<td>√ Steve Dotterrer</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tri Met</td>
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<td>Earl Blumenauer's Staff</td>
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</tr>
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<td>MCCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Unsworth</td>
<td>Metro</td>
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<tr>
<td>Molly O'Reilly</td>
<td>STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Nelson</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Collmeyer</td>
<td>Neil Goldschmidt, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Reifley</td>
<td>SE2RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Oliver</td>
<td>Oregonia xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Whitehill-Brazik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
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Peter Z Fong