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Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: SEPTEMBER 14, 1995
Day: THURSDAY
Time: 7:15 a.m.
Place: METRO, CONFERENCE ROOM 370A-B

*1. MEETING REPORT OF AUGUST 17, 1995 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.


*4. OREGON'S INTERMODAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SURVEY RESULTS - INFORMATIONAL - Dave Lohman.

*5. ENDORSING RUGGO AMENDMENTS FOR ADOPTION OF REGION 2040 GROWTH CONCEPT - APPROVAL REQUESTED - John Fregonese/Mike Burton.

*Material enclosed.
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: August 17, 1995

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

PERSONS ATTENDING:

Members: Chair Rod Monroe, Don Morissette and Patricia McCaig (alt.), Metro Council; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Les White (alt.), C-TRAN; Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Southwest Washington RTC; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; Claudette LaVert, Cities of Multnomah County; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Dan Saltzman (alt.), Multnomah County; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Langdon Marsh, DEQ; Bruce Warner, ODOT; Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland; and Tom Walsh, Tri-Met

Guests: John Rosenberger, Jerry Parmenter and Dennis Mulvihill, Washington County; Kathy Busse, Multnomah County; Rod Sandoz and John Rist, Clackamas County; Greg Green (JPACT alt.), DEQ; Richard Ross, City of Gresham; Elsa Coleman, Steve Dotterrer and Meeky Blizzard, City of Portland; Dave Yaden, G.B. Arrington and Phil Donovan, Tri-Met; Bob Bothman, MCCI; Henry Hewitt, Oregon Transportation Commission; Dave Williams, ODOT; Clark Worth, Barney & Worth, Inc.; Lillian Hames, Pittman & Hames Associates; Jennifer Ball, Conkling, Fiskum & McCormick; Pat Collmeyer, Neil Goldschmidt's Office; Karen Haines, City of Vancouver; and Mary Legry (JPACT alt.), WSDOT

Staff: Andrew Cotugno and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

Media: Greg Nokes, The Oregonian

SUMMARY:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT

Andy Cotugno announced that an "Action Alert" flier was distributed at the meeting relating to a House proposal that would join categories of transportation projects together for allocation of funds as a means of mitigating some of ISTEA's impacts.
This would eliminate some distinctions between funds into one category, remove MPO involvement, and could result in major shifts of funds. It is recommended that letters in opposition be sent to your legislators.

MEETING REPORT

Councilor LaVert noted that comments attributed to Mayor Lomnicki on Page 2, sixth paragraph, and Page 3, fourth paragraph, of the July 13 JPACT meeting report should correctly be attributed to her. The minutes will note the correction.

Bruce Warner moved, seconded by Councilor LaVert, to approve the July 13, 1995 JPACT meeting report as amended. The motion PASSED unanimously.

BRIEFING ON SOUTH/NORTH LIGHT RAIL

Tom Walsh briefed the Committee on the tough and talented efforts that came forth from the business community and transportation leaders around the state to ensure passage of Senate Bill 1156-C for South/North light rail. He felt there were tough agreements made but that the success of the measure could be tied to a cohesive effort.

Tom elaborated on the components of SB 1156-C as outlined in the handout. The funding commitment for the first South/North segment is for $375 million from the state effective July 1, 1999. Lottery funds will be assigned for Phase I for the Clackamas Town Center alignment to the arena area, with $75 million to be sought by the region over a 10-year period as contribution to the Transportation Equity Account. The region would pay $6 million from regional STP funds per fiscal year beginning 1995-2004 and $5 million from 2004-2009.

Tom noted that the intent is for the route to go into Clark County. If Clark County does not become part of a phased project, the agreement also ratifies the commitment that it will go back before a vote of the people.

The region will have to report back during the 97th legislative session of the additional steps needed to offset up to $75 million of the state's $375 million. He cited the need to be creative in seeking offsets for up to $150 million if the 1997 Legislature approves a transportation authority. Also included in the package is the need for Tri-Met to reimburse private utilities for 50 percent of their relocation costs.

An eight-member legislative LRT Oversight Committee will be appointed to study and maintain oversight of all aspects of South/North light rail construction.
Tom felt that the region has been afforded an amazing opportunity and that the mechanisms have been put in place for Clark County to be included in the project. A discussion followed on the likelihood of the South/North project being implemented if Clark County was not included. It was evident from discussion that Clark County's participation would ensure a successful effort.

Tom reviewed the South/North implementation milestones, which included the following:

- Initiate PE - August 1995
- Publish DEIs - October 1996
- ISTEA II - October 1996
- Start PE/FEIS - March 1997
- PE/FEIS Complete - February 1998
- Full-Funding Grant Agreement - September 1999
- Start Construction/Right-of-Way

Tom cited the need to compress the South/North implementation schedule for a federal funding decision by September 1998. An organizational and leadership structure will be proposed and provided for the September 14 JPACT meeting. Tom expressed his appreciation to everyone who participated in the effort.

Bruce Warner asked about the Legislature's expectations for the $75 million committed by the region. Tom responded that he felt it would be achieved through public/private partnerships. He spoke of privatization, joint use of air rights, or some variation of tax incrementation as examples. Dave Yaden also noted that the Legislature is counting on the $75 million but that they must first take action to grant the authorities.

Commissioner Blumenauer and Bruce Warner felt that a partnership with the Legislature would be a constructive step as there are a lot of issues that must be dealt with in a coordinating fashion. As examples, Bruce cited Senate Bill 626 that grants authority to proceed with two toll projects between I-5 and 99W and Congestion Pricing work.

A work plan will be developed for the schedule and how the transportation package will be submitted to the Legislature in 1997. Also to be considered is the Arterial Fund and transportation preservation needs. The Committee agreed on the need to ensure that all programs are part of a coordinated effort.

A discussion followed on concern over the provision requiring Tri-Met to reimburse private utilities for 50 percent of their relocation costs. Tom reported that the provision came about at one of the Senate Transportation Committee worksessions and remained in the bill. He noted that it wasn't possible to remove
it. He pointed out that the utilities operate in this region without benefit of a franchise.

There was also concern discussed that the legislative Light Rail Oversight Committee might overstep the resolve of the South/North Steering Group. Dave Yaden noted that the primary intent of the Oversight Committee is to oversee the expenditure of state funds after the FFGA. The legislation, proposed by Jane Loken, does create clear authority to the Steering Group prior to execution of the Full-Funding Agreement.

Chairman Monroe commented that he hoped the Oversight Committee wouldn't have veto power over the Steering Group. He felt that the bill should be viewed seriously, that it represents an opportunity to work collaboratively with the state, that we give some creative thought to the process, and noted that we have an aggressive plan to follow.

Bruce Warner noted that the shift of regional STP funds will now go directly to the cities and counties statewide.

**URBAN ARTERIAL PROGRAM**

The agenda packet included an outline of the framework for implementing the Regional Arterial Fund. It defined the size, revenue sources, support, and timeframe toward proceeding toward a ballot measure. Andy Cotugno explained that the framework for compiling that list is based over a 10-year period on a $300-500 million amount for regionally significant projects.

Andy noted that the region should view the funding proposal as a step in an ongoing process. If a track record is established, it could be regarded as Step I of a 10-year program. The proposal includes a 25 percent component for bridge and freight needs, and the remaining 75 percent would be targeted for regionally significant local projects with distribution to counties and cities.

Criteria for selection of projects include safety, capacity improvements, regional linkages, critical locations needing service, Region 2040 compatibility, traffic management, jobs/economic development, and major road rehabilitation considerations.

Andy explained that the project lists would be compiled at the local level for JPACT review, noting the dollar in-dollar back distribution. The project selection process and schedule was also reviewed. A May 1996 ballot measure is being considered.

Langdon Marsh reported that, in a recent area survey of concerns for use of CMAQ funds, crime and traffic were cited as major concerns. He felt that air quality concerns might be helpful in
building support for the Regional Arterial Program, emphasizing the importance of packaging the proposal.

A letter from Metro Executive Officer Mike Burton was distributed, indicating Metro's support and commitment in moving forward with this regional effort. It pointed out the formation of a regional business group under the auspices of the Portland Chamber that will study the Regional Arterial Fund issue comprehensively. Their first meeting is scheduled for August 21.

At the August 14 JPACT Finance Committee meeting, concerns were raised about a road maintenance measure initiated in Clackamas County. Commissioner Lindquist noted opposition in Clackamas County to backing these improvements, questioning whether there would be an impact on voter support in March or May. He indicated they would know in September whether they plan to go forward with the road maintenance measure.

Chair Monroe suggested that the region go forward at this point in creating and developing the list of projects that would provide an opportunity for public input. He felt that a decision might later be made to scale down the list. He noted that the JPACT Finance Committee recommendation was not unanimous, but was approved.

Mayor Lomnicki commented that, if there is a lot of campaigning for the Metro Arterial Program before November, it would be detrimental to Clackamas County's effort. Chair Monroe pointed out that the timeline for public hearings on a package would take place after Clackamas County's vote.

Councilor McCaig noted that, while she is sensitive to the needs of Clackamas County, she is supportive of the need for successful passage of a Regional Arterial Fund proposal. She added that the JPACT proposal has long been in the development process. Councilor McCaig encouraged support of the Clackamas County gas tax if they agree to go to the ballot after the regional road measure. It was noted that two cities in Clackamas County, Canby and Lake Oswego, will be going out for bond measures. Mayor Lomnicki noted that there is a sensitivity about who comes first in terms of taxes.

Commissioner Blumenauer noted that we have never had a gas tax approved at the regional level. He spoke of the impact if the cities of Clackamas County measure passed or failed. He noted that he was discouraged at the JPACT Finance Committee meeting but was supportive of moving forward with a realistic strategy and study for consideration by the public. He suggested a date for everyone to go out with their local initiatives, citing the success achieved in Washington County as a good example. He cited the need for a reality check as to whether the policy-
makers are moving in a consolidated effort and to maximize efforts for success.

Mayor Drake commented that, as elected officials, the citizenry expect them to take action. He noted that the needs are still there; that the citizens elected them to manage government collectively in that area; that we need to define the issues very well; that he supported moving forward with this effort; and that quality of life, movement of freight, jobs and the road systems are important considerations in moving people. A discussion followed on the question of feasibility of the Regional Arterial Fund package.

It was noted that there has been little or no progress between the Port and Multnomah County in terms of the regional pool. Commissioner Rogers wasn't certain that we weren't together. The issue in Washington County related to allocation of funds between Multnomah County and the Port. He noted that Washington County has some concerns about the $500 million, emphasizing their support of an ongoing program, that it needs to be tempered, and that it is critical. Commissioner Rogers pointed out that Washington County can't support the package unless the split is kept at 25 percent for bridge/freight needs and 75 percent for regionally significant projects. He didn't seem overly concerned about Clackamas County going forward with their bond measure but cited the need for the region to fund major specific road projects. The recommendation from the Core Group is for a 75/25 split.

Action Taken: Bruce Warner moved, seconded by Councilor LaVert, that there be authorization from JPACT to move forward with developing a list of projects for the Urban Arterial Program. The motion PASSED unanimously.

REGION 2040 UPDATE

Distributed at the meeting was a copy of the draft 2040 Growth Concept Map dated July 1995, a list of proposed map changes, and a revised draft of the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOS). Mark Turpel explained that transportation-related components of the 2040 Growth Concept were adopted in December 1994 followed by a six-month review period. MPAC has reviewed the proposed amendments and the map, and the review process is coming to a conclusion.

Mark reported that the Metro Council had approved by resolution the Region 2040 Growth Concept Map in order to give local jurisdictions additional time to study its implications. A number of changes were made to the RUGGOS and to the maps as a result of recommendations made by the local jurisdictions and the advisory committees.
Some of the RUGGO changes reflect updated language clarifying functional planning for Metro, consideration of HB 2709, use of performance measures, the objective that deals with transportation on page 36 of RUGGO relating to the role and importance of freight movement, the role of jobs/housing balance and some investment guidelines.

Mark spoke of financing public investments and the need to tie it to land use objectives in centers and corridors. Other changes related to definition of pedestrian scale. A final check is being made for consistency prior to Metro Council adoption. There will be a revised version of the RUGGO adopted by ordinance by November. In the interim, public hearings will be scheduled and a final version will be distributed after it's adoption.

The map has about 45 changes. Mark noted that some changes have been made at the regional scale to better enhance the local objectives.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Les White congratulated the Oregon side of the region for its successful efforts to move forward on the South/North light rail. The C-TRAN Board voted to continue with the DEIS phase of the study. He expressed special appreciation to Dave Yaden of TriMet and Andy Cotugno and Richard Brandman of Metro for their efforts. He noted that a citizen process has been initiated to look at internal and intraregional issues and circulation needs and to address some of those shortcomings.

Les noted there are overriding questions such as putting together a plan that addresses issues that not only deals with people commuting but who work within Clark County.

*****

Commissioner Blumenauer commented on issues relating to the Urban Growth Boundary, concerns evolving from HB 2709, and the urgency of adopting our regulations as soon as possible. He didn't feel we are ready to go into any more detail at this time in terms of a 20-year supply of land. Andy Cotugno suggested that this issue and land use-related concerns be more fully discussed at a future JPACT meeting.

Commissioner Blumenauer asked how the regional partners can be helpful in achieving the desired outcome. He didn't feel some of the DEQ questions have been answered and cited the need to work together on such issues.

Chair Monroe asked whether it would be appropriate to have Mike Burton present his recommendations at the next JPACT meeting.
Andy Cotugno felt it would be good timing because the issue is just being introduced. The Committee agreed that it would be timely, would further allow for follow-up meetings, if necessary, and that the presentation be scheduled.

Tom Walsh commented that it is difficult to separate out transportation and land use issues. He felt the region hasn't experienced congestion and, when it does, it will take another direction. He cited the need to make a series of wise policy decisions that will address both joint land use and transportation issues.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
            JPACT Members
STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 95-2196 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE PORTLAND AREA AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR THE FY 96 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND 1995 INTERIM FEDERAL REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Date: August 23, 1995 Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

Adoption of this resolution will approve a regional air quality conformity determination for the recently adopted 1995 Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and for those amendments to the current Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) that are to be consolidated into an FY 96 MTIP update. The final Conformity Determination is included as Exhibit A of the Resolution. The Determination is required under both federal and state regulations and provides assurance that transportation projects planned within the region will not hinder attainment nor maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

BACKGROUND

The federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 stipulate that no transportation project may cause or contribute to violation of the NAAQS. This includes projects that will use federal, state, local and private funds. The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is lead agency for development and implementation of the Oregon State (Air Quality) Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP is the state's collection of strategies for attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. To assure that no project hinders meeting the air quality goals, DEQ recently adopted regulations (DEQ rule) for assuring conformity of planned transportation projects with the SIP.

Metro is the Portland area's designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Whenever Metro approves significant amendments of either the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or the Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), the DEQ rule requires the MPO to prepare and approve both a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the effects of the projects on regional air quality. Together, these analyses comprise a Conformity Determination. Also, under federal regulations, the MTIP must be incorporated into the State TIP (STIP) without change. Therefore, the MTIP acts as the Portland area element of the STIP. The conformity determination is therefore applicable to the RTP, as well as to both the MTIP and STIP.

Metro has both recently adopted an updated 1995 Interim Federal RTP and has amended the FY 95 MTIP to allocate $27 million of funds to new transportation projects; has programmed significant new transit projects and programs including a Major Investment Study for the South/North LRT project; and has approved other
miscellaneous transportation projects since January of 1994. Local governments also propose to approve numerous locally funded transportation projects of potential significance to regional air quality. These programmed projects may not proceed without first being shown to conform with the SIP.

Finally, Metro and all potential affected local jurisdictions have approved a Memorandum of Understanding which expires on September 30, 1995. The MOU specifies that Metro shall demonstrate conformity for transportation projects which lie outside Metro's boundaries but within the Oregon portion of the Portland-Vancouver Interstate AQMA. These projects partly comprise the rural area program of the Region 1 element of the STIP. The conformity determination also permits these projects to advance (although this year, no such projects were declared by ODOT to Metro).

Most of this activity is identical to the previous Conformity Determinations that have been prepared by Metro. A significant difference with this Determination though is that the DEQ rule required Metro to engage in an interagency consultation process as part of its preparation. Pursuant to the Rule, Metro designated the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) as the standing body responsible for interagency consultation. Thereafter, TPAC charged its TIP Subcommittee to prepare a recommendation for TPAC adoption. The TIP subcommittee met on several occasions. It consulted on items specified in the DEQ rule, including the adequacy of the methodology proposed by Metro to conduct the quantitative analysis of regional conformity. At its last meeting, the subcommittee was provided with a draft of the qualitative portion of the conformity determination. The subcommittee moved recommendation of the Determination at that time contingent on incorporation into the draft of appropriate responses to any subsequent comments. Subsequent comments were received from DEQ and these have been responded to and are incorporated in the final Determination. Internal staff review also generated some revision of the document. (The comments are summarized and individual responses are provided in Attachment 1 of this staff report.)

The draft qualitative conformity determination has been available for public review for 30 days and no comments have been received.

At the time of the subcommittee's review of the draft Determination, the quantitative analysis was not yet complete. The committee's recommendation to TPAC to approve the Determination was therefore also contingent on positive outcome of the analysis. Metro staff have since concluded the quantitative analysis and its results demonstrate conformity of the region's planned transportation projects with the SIP. This data is included as Attachment 2 of this staff report (which is also to be included as Table 2 of the Conformity Determination).

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 95-2196.
ATTACHMENT 1

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
DRAFT CONFORMITY DETERMINATION
1995 INTERIM FEDERAL RTP
FY 1996 MTIP

The DEQ rule requires that Metro provide written response to substantive comments received on draft versions of Conformity Determinations. A draft of the current Determination was submitted for review in July to members of the public and to the TIP Subcommittee designated by TPAC to formulate a recommendation for approval. During this interagency review, several agencies made verbal comments regarding minor corrections of the Network Table. The Table has been corrected in response to their observations, with one exception. Several projects listed in the Table duplicate one another. This is because several projects enumerated in the Constrained Network of the RTP represent local versus state costs for the same project (i.e., the single project is listed twice to reflect cost sharing agreements.) The Determination Network Table has replicated this duplication of project listings to aid federal reviewers identify the fiscally constrained basis of the networks that have been modelled for air quality purposes.

The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) provided written comments. These are summarized below.

- The term "interim" conformity regulations should be changed to "state conformity rule". Agreed and done.
- The draft references DEQ provision of "background [air pollution] concentrations" for Mobile 5a model inputs. The Mobile 5a model does not require these inputs and DEQ does not provide them. Agreed and deleted.
- The draft references local agency responsibility to analyze PM10 project impacts. The region is in attainment for PM10 and there is no local responsibility for such analysis. Agreed and deleted.
- DEQ requested that a comment be made in the Determination that the interagency consultation subcommittee has committed to meet periodically to address "off-cycle" projects which arise and make to make determinations regarding their regional significance. It is expected that a "screen" for significance can be developed that would likely include a quantifiable impact on capacity, volume and/or emissions. Agreed and amended. See item vii, page 8.
- The draft failed to mention the procedures for addressing projects located in the Washington State portion of the Portland-Vancouver AQMA and for projects
outside of Metro's boundary but within the AQMA. *Agreed and amended. See item x, page 8.*

- The draft indicates interagency agreement that "project management staff of the state and local operating agencies should be responsible for project-level public involvement activities." No agreement was reached on this question. *Agreed. See item xv, page 9.*

- The draft's quotation of the 1995 RTP Goal 3, Objective 3, Performance Criteria, indicates a need to revise the RTP language. As stated, it implies that only areas which experience high levels of carbon monoxide emissions from transportation-related sources should seek to avoid violation of the federal CO standard. No areas should exceed that standard as a result of any source of emissions. *Agreed. The Determination's "quotation" of this Criteria has been amended in anticipation of the RTP being revised in similar fashion (see page 13).*

- DEQ requested that the off-model methodology for calculation of bicycle project emissions reductions be provided at the earliest opportunity for review by the agency. No comment on the methodology had been received prior to preparation of this response document. Any comments the agency may have will be heard at TPAC and will be available as an amendment to the Resolution staff report forwarded for consideration by JPACT and Metro Council.

Metro's modelling staff also reviewed the draft Determination and made several comments. The bulk of their comments were aimed at improving the Determination's lay interpretation of the methods used by Metro to calculate transportation demand, distribution, system effects and air pollutant emissions. These refinements have been included throughout the document.

The most significant change resulting from these amendments is retraction of the statement that this year's Determination independently calculates heavy truck distribution. This methodology was employed in the prior year's analysis (which was never approved). However, DEQ and Metro staff concurred that the slight increase of precision afforded by the method was not worth the rather dramatic increase in processing and staff time needed to achieve the separate calculation. Therefore, the practice was not used in this year's quantitative analysis as stated in the draft Determination.

One request for the draft Determination was made by persons other than agency personnel. No comments were received by members of the public. A complete record of written comments received by Metro is available at Metro Headquarters.
1995 RTP/TIP Air Quality Conformity Results Summary
Total Mobile Emissions in kilograms per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winter CO Metro Boundary</th>
<th>Summer CO Metro Boundary</th>
<th>Summer HC* AQMA Boundary</th>
<th>Summer NOx AQMA Boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>889,758</td>
<td>434,511</td>
<td>80,602</td>
<td>56,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Action</td>
<td>596,536</td>
<td>371,149</td>
<td>51,994</td>
<td>53,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Baseline</td>
<td>596,547</td>
<td>371,156</td>
<td>51,998</td>
<td>53,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Action</td>
<td>506,816</td>
<td>314,835</td>
<td>39,362</td>
<td>45,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Baseline</td>
<td>537,827</td>
<td>317,837</td>
<td>39,711</td>
<td>45,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Action</td>
<td>549,608</td>
<td>341,135</td>
<td>40,548</td>
<td>46,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Baseline</td>
<td>560,953</td>
<td>348,134</td>
<td>41,297</td>
<td>47,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - includes hot soaks, but not diurnals
08-23-95
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING ) RESOLUTION NO. 95-2196
THE PORTLAND AREA AIR QUALITY ) Introduced by
CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR ) Councilor Rod Monroe,
THE FY 96 TRANSPORTATION ) JPACT Chair
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND 1995 )
INTERIM FEDERAL REGIONAL )
TRANSPORTATION PLAN )

WHEREAS, The federal Clean Air Act as amended stipulates
that no transportation project may cause or contribute to
violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS); and

WHEREAS, The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
(DEQ) is lead agency for development and implementation of the
Oregon State (Air Quality) Implementation Plan (SIP) for
attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS; and

WHEREAS, DEQ has, pursuant to the Clean Air Act, recently
adopted regulations (DEQ rule) for assuring conformity of planned
transportation projects with the SIP; and

WHEREAS, Metro is the Portland area's designated Metropolitan
Planning Organization (MPO); and

WHEREAS, The DEQ rule requires the MPO to prepare and
approve both a qualitative and quantitative analysis of planned
transportation projects' conformity with the SIP (conformity
determination) whenever significant amendments are approved of
either the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Metro
Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP); and

WHEREAS, The MTIP also acts as the Portland area element of
the State TIP (STIP) which must also conform with the SIP; and
WHEREAS, Metro has both recently adopted an updated 1995 Interim Federal RTP and has amended the FY 95 MTIP to allocate $27 million of funds to new transportation projects; has programmed significant new transit projects and programs including a Major Investment Study for the South/North LRT project; and has approved other miscellaneous transportation projects since January of 1994; and

WHEREAS, ODOT is currently updating the STIP to reflect MTIP amendments; and

WHEREAS, Local governments propose to approve numerous locally funded transportation projects of potential significance to regional air quality; and

WHEREAS, Metro and all affected local jurisdictions have approved a Memorandum of Understanding which expires on September 30, 1995, which specifies that Metro shall demonstrate conformity for transportation projects which lie outside of Metro's boundaries but within the Oregon portion of the Portland-Vancouver Interstate Air Quality Maintenance Areas, and being that no such projects were declared to Metro; and

WHEREAS, Metro has designated the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) as the standing body responsible for interagency consultation during preparation of the conformity determinations pursuant to the DEQ rule; and

WHEREAS, TPAC charged its TIP Subcommittee to prepare a recommendation for TPAC adoption; and

WHEREAS, The TIP subcommittee reviewed a draft of the qualitative portion of the conformity determination; consulted on
items specified in the DEQ rule, including the adequacy of the methodology proposed by Metro to conduct the quantitative analysis of regional conformity; and provided comments on the draft determination; and

WHEREAS, Substantive comments of the subcommittee members have been responded to within the qualitative conformity determination, the whole of which determination is attached in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, The draft qualitative conformity determination has been otherwise available for public review for 30 days and no comments have been received; and

WHEREAS, The subcommittee recommended that TPAC adopt the conformity determination provided that the quantitative analysis was satisfactorily concluded; and

WHEREAS, Metro has since concluded the quantitative analysis and its results demonstrate conformity of the region's planned transportation projects with the SIP; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the 1995 Portland area Conformity Determination is adopted by Metro.

2. That TPAC has met its obligation under the DEQ rule to conduct interagency consultation as part of the current conformity determination.

3. That the 1995 Interim Federal RTP conforms with the SIP.

4. That all currently programmed transportation projects declared to Metro, whether they will rely on local, state or federal funds, including non-exempt projects approved by Metro since January 1994, conform with the SIP and are to be
consolidated into an FY 1996 MTIP to the extent required by applicable regulations.

5. That the Region 1 element of the STIP conforms with the SIP insofar as its urban area programming is comprised of the MTIP without change, as specified by federal regulations, and that its rural area programming reflects the scope and design of those projects declared by ODOT to Metro.

6. That staff are directed to forward this conformity determination to ODOT Headquarters staff for approval and to request that ODOT submit the determination for federal review and approval.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ___ day of ______, 1995.

Ruth McFarland, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel
Interim Conformity Determination (Phase II) for the Portland Metropolitan Area 1995 Regional Transportation Plan and FY 1996 Through Post-1999 Transportation Improvement Program

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Basis of Conformity Requirement

The following Conformity Determination is for the Portland Area FY 1996 through Post-1999 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the updated 1995 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). It has been prepared pursuant to the newly adopted State requirements governing Phase II Interim Period conformity determinations.¹

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (the Act) required EPA to promulgate a rule containing criteria and procedures for determining conformity of regional transportation plans (RTP) and transportation improvement programs (TIP) with State Implementation Plans (SIP) for attainment and maintenance of federal air quality standards. This rule was adopted by EPA on November 24, 1993. Among other things, the rule required Oregon's Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to submit a revision of Oregon's SIP detailing new criteria and procedures for assuring conformity of transportation projects and plans with the SIP. DEQ adopted these revisions, which closely mirror the federal rule, as OAR 340-20-710 through 340-20-1080. Both the DEQ and EPA rules require that qualitative and quantitative analyses support Metro's Conformity Determinations.

B. RTP/TIP Relationship

The region's current RTP was adopted in May 1995. It is the "umbrella document" which integrates the various aspects of regional transportation planning into a consistent coordinated process. It identifies the long-range (20-year) regional transportation improvement strategy and 10-year project priorities established by Metro. It defines regional policies, goals, objectives and projects needed to maintain mobility and economic and environmental health of the region through 2015. The Plan must be "constrained" to (i.e., can only rely on) federal, state, local and private revenue sources that are considered "reasonably available" within the 20-year timeframe of the Plan. The Plan must demonstrate dedication of adequate

¹The "interim" refers to the period prior to submission to EPA by DEQ of a SIP revision documenting proposed strategies to maintain air quality standards.
resources to preserve and maintain the system before allocating resources for its expansion.

All projects are retained in the RTP until implemented or until a "no-build" decision is reached, thereby providing a permanent record of proposed improvements. Projects may also be eliminated from the RTP in the course of overall amendment or update of the document. The 1992 RTP was last conformed with the SIP in August 1993 and its conforming status lapsed in May 1995, largely because the prior Plan was not yet fiscally constrained, per ISTEA requirements.

It is from proposed improvements found to be consistent with the RTP that projects appearing in the TIP and its three-year Approved Program are drawn. The TIP relates to the RTP as an implementing document, identifying improvement projects consistent with the RTP that are authorized to spend federal and state funds within a three-year time frame. Projects are allocated funding in the TIP at Metro's initiative and at the request of local jurisdictions, Tri-Met and ODOT. Metro must approve all project additions to the TIP. Among other things, Metro must find that proposed capital improvements are consistent with RTP policies, system element plans and identified criteria in order to be eligible for inclusion in the TIP for funding.

The DEQ Rule also specifies that local projects must be assessed for conformity with the SIP consistent with the Clean Air Act requirement that no transportation project — not simply federally funded ones — may interfere with achieving national air quality goals. Locally funded projects are not included in the TIP. However, local system enhancement projects — including many far smaller in scale than that needed to significantly affect the regional transportation system — are identified in the RTP. Moreover, the Metro's regional transportation model routinely includes projects that fall far below the threshold of those able to significantly affect regional air quality. Therefore, the full model — not a "regionally significant" project subset — is used to analyze transportation system effects on air quality in the Portland region. This breadth of analysis assures conformity of both regional and local project air quality effects with the SIP, even though local projects are not included in the TIP. It also assures that Metro's regional travel demand model is routinely scrutinized by all local jurisdictions for accuracy of both the project list and facility characteristics.

The TIP was last assessed for conformity with the SIP in August 1993 and its conforming status has also since lapsed. Additionally, the TIP has been amended to both include and to delay regionally significant projects scheduled within the Three Year Approved Program period (FY 96 through FY 98) and must therefore be reassessed for conformity with the SIP.
II. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

A. Background

The State Conformity Regulations specify that a qualitative analysis be prepared showing that both the Region's Plan and TIP address four broad planning and technical requirements, including a fiscally constrained basis, reliance on the latest planning assumptions, use of the latest emissions models and estimates and that both the RTP and TIP generally enhance or expedite implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs) identified in the SIP. It must also be documented that preparation of these documents conformed with interagency consultation procedures described in the Rule. The Qualitative Analysis portion of the Determination is provided, below.

B. Analysis


   a. Requirement: The State Rule requires that Conformity Determinations be based “on the most recent planning assumptions” derived from Metro’s approved “estimates of current and future population, employment, travel and congestion.”

   Finding: In the quantitative analysis (see Section E, below), analysis year projections for population and employment are forecast by Metro, the region's designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), from a 1990 base that reflects population and employment estimates calibrated to 1990 Census data. Travel and congestion forecasts in the analysis years of 1995, 2005 and 2015 are derived from this base using Metro's regional travel demand model and the EMME/2 transportation planning software.

   Within subroutines of the model, Metro calculates the bike/walk mode split for calculated travel demand based on variables of trip distance, car per worker relationship, total employment within one mile and a Pedestrian Environmental Factors (PEF) calculated for each of the 1,260 Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ). The PEFs reflect variables of each TAZ including topography, parcel size, intersection density, employment density and other similar objective variables. The 1995 analysis year uses 1990 PEF conditions in each TAZ. The 2005 and 2015 analysis years assume identical PEF conditions. Transit trip making is also affected by the PEFs, though only slightly. Both the population and
employment estimates and the methodology employed by the EMME/2 model have been the subject of extensive interagency consultation and agreement (discussed further in Section C, below).

The resulting estimates of future year travel and congestion are then used with the outputs of the EPA approved MOBILE 5a emissions model to determine regional emissions. In all respects, the model outputs reflect input of the latest approved planning assumptions and estimates of population, employment, travel and congestion.

b. Requirement: The State Rule requires that changes in transit policies and ridership estimates assumed in the previous conformity determination must be discussed.

Finding: The current Determination assumes significant new transit capacity provided by the South/North LRT line and associated feeder bus service starting in 2005. By this time, LRT service is assumed from the Convention Center south to the Clackamas Town Center. By 2015, it is assumed that LRT service will be extended north from the Convention Center to 99th Avenue in Clark County, Washington.

Modelling conducted for FTA as part of the South/North Major Investment Study (MIS) projects approximately 30,000 new riders in the corridor by 2015 due to full project implementation (an approximate one percent increase of total regional transit ridership). The MIS does not project 2005 ridership. The Quantitative Analysis portion of this Determination independently generates a 2005 ridership assumption as part of the regional travel demand and distribution calculations, based on the service assumptions discussed below in item "c." Ridership is less than that calculated in the MIS because: 1) the north half of the LRT line is not assumed to be complete in 2005; and 2) less population and employment is allocated to the corridor in 2005 than in 2015. The Determination's projection of 2015 ridership is also discounted from that developed by the South/North MIS to reflect the RTP's more highly constrained transit system operating revenue assumptions. The MIS assumes a constant

The transit policies which guide modeled implementation of the new South/North service are consistent with previous Conformity modelling of the Westside and Hillsboro LRT service starts: bus resources providing downtown radial service are replaced with LRT service and previous short-haul service between former radial trunk routes is reconfigured to support new LRT stations and surrounding neighborhoods. This represents continuation of existing transit policy and its extension to the expanded LRT system.
c. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations require that reasonable assumptions be used regarding transit service and increases in fares and road and bridge tolls over time.

Finding: There are no road or bridge tolls in place in the metropolitan area and none are assumed in either the TIP, the RTP, or consequently, in the conformity determination, over time. Auto operating costs are factored into the mode choice subroutines of the regional travel model. These costs are held constant to 1985 dollars. Parking costs are assumed to increase one percent above inflation in the Central Business and Lloyd Districts as a reflection of parking control strategies; costs are held to inflation in all other districts. The three zone transit fare structure adopted in 1992 is held constant through 2015. User costs (for both automobile and transit) are assumed to keep pace with inflation and are calculated in 1985 dollars.

Service assumptions (i.e., transit vehicle headways) also affect trip assignment to transit. South/North LRT service increase, and the distribution of supporting bus service, is discussed above. An annual 1.5 percent "usual and customary" service hour increase is assumed for regional bus service until start-up of Phase 1 South/North LRT service. At 2005, this increment of new bus service is slightly reallocated throughout the region and feeder service within the LRT Corridor is reinforced. Thereafter, non-LRT service hours remain flat through 2015, and the Convention Center to Clark County LRT service is added. This increase of transit service levels is consistent with the RTP's constrained revenue assumptions.

d. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations require that the latest existing information be used regarding the effectiveness of TCMs that have already been implemented.

Finding: As is discussed further below, all TCMs identified in the SIP have been implemented. The quantitative analysis discussed below does not assume effectiveness of any of the TCMs as a factor in its computation of non-SOV travel. (See also the last full paragraph on page 18).

2. Latest Emissions Model (OAR 340-20-820)

a. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations require that the conformity determination must be based on the most current emission estimation model available.
Finding: As discussed in greater detail in item 5(d) of this Section and in Section III of this Determination, Metro employed EPA's recommended Mobile 5a emission estimation model in preparation of this conformity determination. Additionally, Metro uses EPA's recommended EMME/2 transportation planning software to estimate vehicle flows of individual roadway segments. These model elements are fully consistent with the methodologies specified in OAR 340-20-1010.

3. Consultation (OAR 340-20-830)

a. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations require the MPO to consult with the state air quality agency, local transportation agencies, DOT and EPA regarding enumerated items. TPAC is specifically identified as the standing consultative body. (OAR 340-20-760(2)(b).

Finding: Fifteen specific topics are identified in the Regulations which require consultation. TPAC is identified as the Standing Committee for Interagency Consultation. TPAC, as allowed by the Rule, has deferred administration of the consultation requirements to a subcommittee, specifically, the TIP Subcommittee. This committee has met on several occasions since adoption of the Rule and has consulted as required on the enumerated topics. The subcommittee recommendations are reflected within this Determination qualitative analysis -- which has been submitted for full TPAC review and approval -- and address the following issues.

i. Determination of which Minor Arterial and other transportation projects should be deemed "regionally significant."

Metro models virtually all proposed enhancements of the regional transportation network proposed in the TIP, the RTP and by local and state transportation agencies. This level of detail far exceeds the minimum criteria specified in both the State Rule and the Metropolitan Planning Regulations for determination of a regionally significant facility. This detail is provided to ensure the greatest possible accuracy of the region's transportation system predictive capability. The model captures improvements to all principal, major and minor arterial and most major collectors. Left turn pocket and continuous protection projects are also represented. Professional judgement is used to identify and exclude from the model those proposed intersection and signal modifications, and other miscellaneous proposed system modifications, (including bicycle system improvements) whose effects cannot be meaningfully represented in the model.
To ensure accuracy of the model used in preparation of this Conformity Determination, a Project Atlas was compiled of all proposed projects used by Metro to configure modeled networks. Over a period of three months, Metro modelling staff conferred again with ODOT and County and local transportation agency staff for comment and correction. The results of this consultation were used to construct the analysis year networks identified in Appendix A of this Determination. (The final Project Atlas will be prepared in October, 1995. Appendix A of this Determination summarizes the analysis year network assumptions more graphically depicted in the Project Atlas.)

$$ii. \text{ Determine which projects have undergone significant changes in design concept and scope since the regional emissions analysis was performed.}$$

Metro's modelling staff have refined all model links at this time so that all project representations reflect current design concept and scope. ODOT has modified an element of the US 26 improvements currently under construction relating to the Sylvan Interchange off-ramp and associated collector-distributor road system. These changes were reviewed by the Conformity Consultation subcommittee of TPAC and were found to cause an insignificant deviation from the project scope previously conformed as part of the FY 94 TIP, thus clearing the way for advancement of this project prior to completion of the current Determination.

$$iii. \text{ Analysis of projects otherwise exempt from regional analysis.}$$

All projects capable of being modeled have been included in the Conformity Analysis quantitative networks.

$$iv. \text{ Advancement of TCMs.}$$

There are no TCMs identified in the SIP which are not already implemented. (See also, item 4 below.)

$$v. \text{ PM}10 \text{ Issues.}$$

The region is in attainment status for PM10 pollutants.

$$vi. \text{ forecasting vehicle miles traveled and any amendments thereto.}$$

Metro has developed the currently approved forecasts of current and future regional VMT in close consultation with DEQ as part of DEQs Ozone Maintenance Plan development process.
vii. determining whether projects not strictly "included" in the TIP have been included in the regional emission analysis and that their design concept and scope remain unchanged.

As described in item "i" above, Metro’s modelling staff have conferred with all the region’s jurisdictions to ascertain the design concept and scope of all locally funded projects not included in the TIP and to ensure their inclusion within the current Conformity Determination quantitative analysis. During the prescribed quarterly consultation meetings, local jurisdictions are charged with declaration of changes to such projects and the consultation committee will consider the effects thereof on project conformity. It is anticipated that the "regional significance" of such changes, and of any new projects introduced between revisions of the conformity determination, will be determined by the consultation committee on the basis of project changes to existing system volume, capacity and/or emissions thresholds that are yet to be determined by the committee.

viii. project sponsor satisfaction of CO and PM10 "hot-spot" analyses.

The consultation subcommittee noted the absence of MPO expertise concerning project-level quantitative conformity analysis. The committee recommends that TPAC formally approve deference to ODOT staff expertise regarding project-level compliance with localized CO conformity requirements and potential mitigation measures.

ix. evaluation of events that will trigger new conformity determinations other than those specifically enumerated in the rule.

The committee shall review regional activity on a quarterly basis and evaluate whether individual project proposals or revision of planning assumptions and/or methodologies warrant recommendation to TPAC of a revision of the regional emissions analysis for reasons other than those prescribed in the Rule.

x. evaluation of emissions analysis for transportation activities which cross borders of MPOs or nonattainment or maintenance areas or basins.

The Portland-Vancouver Interstate Maintenance Area (ozone) boundaries are geographically isolated from all other MPO and nonattainment and maintenance areas and basins. Emissions assumed to originate within the Portland-area (versus the Washington State) component of the Maintenance Area are independently calculated by Metro.
County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is the designated MPO for the Washington State portion of the Maintenance area. Metro and RTC coordinate in development of the population, employment and VMT assumptions prepared by Metro for the entire Maintenance Area. RTC then performs an independent Conformity Determination for projects originating in the Washington State portion of the Maintenance Area.

Conformity of projects occurring outside the Metro boundary but within the Portland-area portion of the Interstate Maintenance Area are assessed by Metro under terms of a Memorandum of Understanding between Metro and all potentially affected state and local agencies. No projects affecting state facilities nor any local projects in the area's subject to the MOU were declared to the MPO for this determination. The MOU expires at the end of September, 1995 and will require renewal for subsequent Determinations.

xi. disclosure to the MPO of regionally significant projects, or changes to design scope and concept of such projects that are not FHWA/FTA projects.

See item "i" above. Declaration of new projects not identified during update of the Project Atlas for this Conformity Determination shall be made on a quarterly basis to the consultation committee.

xii. the design schedule, and funding of research and data collection efforts and regional transportation model development by the MPO.

This consultation occurs in the course of MPO development and adoption of the Unified Planning Work Program.

xiii. development of the TIP.

TIP development is routinely undertaken and approved by TPAC.

xiv. development of RTPs.

RTP development is routinely undertaken and approved by TPAC.

xv. establishing appropriate public participation opportunities for project level conformity determinations.

The subcommittee has not yet discussed this issue either with respect to current practices, or desirable alternatives, if any. However, Metro and DEQ staff have discussed the issue. Metro staff will raise the topic at the
next subcommittee to ascertain whether any such procedures currently in practice and to define the context, if any, under which such measures would be warranted. In line with other project-level aspects of conformity determinations, it would appear most appropriate that project management staff of the state and local operating agencies be responsible for any public involvement activities that may be deemed necessary in making project-level conformity determinations.


   a. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations require MPO assurance that "the transportation plan, [and] TIP... must provide for the timely implementation of TCMs from the applicable implementation plan."

Finding: Metro and ODOT have reviewed the list of TCMs (listed below) and have determined that all TCMs identified in the SIP have been implemented and that neither the RTP nor TIP will interfere with the TCMs.

Relevant SIP Section: Section 3.4 of the Oregon SIP relates to the Oregon portion of the Portland-Vancouver Interstate Ozone Maintenance Area. Section 4.2 of the Oregon SIP relates to control of Carbon Monoxide. These sections list implemented and committed TCMs and describe their current status.

Metro and ODOT, in consultation and concurrence with DEQ, have reviewed the status of all committed TCMs in the Ozone and CO components of the SIP and have determined all to have been implemented. It should be noted that certain TCMs included in Section 4.3 (Ozone) were included despite being determined at the time not to be required to achieve the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). For Carbon Monoxide (Section 4.2), only the Downtown Portland Air Quality Plan, among the identified additional TCMs, was determined to be necessary for attainment. The status of all required and non-required committed TCMs are described Table 1, below:
TABLE 1
State Implementation Plan TCMs:
Section 4.3.3.4 (Ozone) and Section 4.2.4.2 (CO)

Required Commitments

a. Inspection/Maintenance

b. Improved Public Transit
   • Downtown Transit Mall
   • Bus Purchases
   • Bus Shelters
   • Fareless Square

c. Exclusive Bus and Carpool Lanes

d. Areawide Carpool Programs

e. Long-Range Transit Improvements (Banfield LRT)

f. Park-and-Ride Lots

g. Employer Programs to Encourage Carpooling and Vanpooling

h. Traffic Flow Improvements

i. Bicycle Program

j. I-5 North Rideshare Program

k. Emission Standards for Industrial Sources

All of these required committed TCMs have been implemented.

Section 4.3.3.5 (Ozone) Non-Required Commitments:

a. Transit Improvements

b. Bus Purchases

c. Transit Fare Incentives

d. Ramp Metering

e. Traffic Flow Improvements

f. McLoughlin Corridor Rideshare Program

g. Employee Bicycle Planning Project

h. State Legislation to Encourage Ridesharing

i. Shop-and-Ride Program
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j. City of Portland Bicycle Parking Program  
k. Employee Flexible Working Hours Program  
l. Traffic Signal System Project  
m. Downtown Portland Air Quality Program  
n. City of Portland Employee Travel  

All of these additional TCMs have been implemented.  

Section 4.2.4.3 (Carbon Monoxide) Additional Commitments:  
a. McLoughlin Corridor Rideshare Program  
b. Employee Bicycle Planning Project  
c. State Legislation to Encourage Ridesharing  
d. Shop-and-Ride Program  
e. City of Portland Bicycle Parking Program  
f. Employee Flexible Working Hours Program  
g. Traffic Signal System Project  
h. Downtown Portland Air Quality Plan  
i. City of Portland Employee Travel  

All of these additional TCMs have been implemented.  

Note: Metro, in conjunction with Oregon DEQ began revision of the SIP in FY 94. A formal amendment will be submitted as a Declaration of Attainment and will include a required Long-term Maintenance Plan. That plan will include additional TCM's, or other air quality control measures, as necessary.
5. Other Qualitative Conformity Determinations and Major Assumptions

a. Findings: The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is prepared by Metro. SIP provisions are integrated into the RTP as described below, and by extension into subsequent TIPs which implement the RTP.

The scope of the RTP requires that it possess a guiding vision which recognizes the inter-relationship among (a) encouraging and facilitating economic growth through improved accessibility to services and markets; (b) ensuring that the allocation of increasingly limited fiscal resources is driven by both land use and transportation benefits; and (c) protecting the region's natural environment in all aspects of transportation planning process. As such, the RTP sets forth three major goals:

No. 1 - Provide adequate levels of accessibility within the region;
No. 2 - Provide accessibility at a reasonable cost; and
No. 3 - Provide adequate accessibility with minimal environmental impact and energy consumption.

Three objectives of Goal No. 3 directly support achievement of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS):

1. To ensure consideration of applicable environmental impact analyses and practicable mitigation measures in the federal RTP decision-making process.
2. To minimize, as much as practical, the region's transportation-related energy consumption through improved auto efficiencies resulting from aggressive implementation of Transportation System Management (TSM) measures (including freeway ramp metering, incident response and arterial signal optimization programs) and increased use of transit, carpools, vanpools, bicycles, walking and TDM [Transportation Demand Management] programs such as telecommuting and flexible working hours.
3. To maintain the region's air quality.

Performance Criteria: Emissions of hydrocarbon and oxides of nitrogen by transportation-related sources, in combination with stationary and area source emissions, may not result in the federal ozone standard of .12 ppm being exceeded. Emissions of Carbon Monoxide from transportation-
related sources may not, in combination with other sources, contribute to violation of the federal standard of 9 ppm. The three-year Approved Program Element of the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) should be consistent with the SIP for air quality.

These objectives are achieved through a variety of measures affecting transportation system design and operation. The plan sets forth objectives and performance criteria for the highway and transit systems and for transportation demand management (TDM).

The highway system is functionally classified to ensure a consistent, integrated, regional highway system of principal routes, arterial and collectors. Acceptable level-of-service standards are set for maintaining an efficient flow of traffic. The RTP also identifies regional bicycle and pedestrian systems for accommodation and encouragement of non-vehicular travel. System performance is emphasized in the RTP and priority is established for implementation of transportation system management (TSM) measures.

The transit system is similarly designed in a hierarchical form of regional transitways, radial trunk routes and feeder bus lines. Standards for service accessibility and system performance are set. Park-and-ride lots are emphasized to increase transit use in suburban areas. The RTP also sets forth an aggressive demand management program to reduce the number of automobile and person trips being made during peak travel periods and to help achieve the region's goals of reducing air pollution and conserving energy.

In conclusion, review by Metro and the Oregon Department of Transportation of the 1995 Interim Federal RTP and the ozone and carbon monoxide portions of the SIP, has determined that the RTP is in conformance with the SIP in its support for achieving the NAAQS. Moreover, the RTP provides adequate statements of guiding policies and goals with which to determine whether projects not specifically included in the RTP at this time may be found consistent with the RTP in the future. Conformity of such projects with the SIP would require interagency consultation.

b. Finding: The FY 1994 Conformity Determination estimate of 1990 Baseline summer CO emissions was based on use of a "Reid Vapor Pressure" variable as input to the Mobile 5a emission analysis. Upon further review by DEQ staff, this variable was revised. The effect of the revision is a dramatically lower prediction of expected 1990 summer HC in the FY 96 emission analysis than was reported in the 1994 Determination. No other values were affected by revision of the value.
c. Another change to the FY 1996 modeling methodology is use of EMME/2 to determine the proportion of motor vehicle starts occurring within each of the model's approximately 1,260 zones that are "hot" versus "cold" starts. "Cold" start conditions generate dramatically greater amounts of pollutants, principally within the first 30-40 seconds. Previous practice manually assigned a percentage value for hot versus cold starts to each zone. This revision presumably provides a more precise estimate of actual total regional vehicular emissions.

d. The model used to prepare the emissions forecast for the FY 96 TIP and 1995 RTP differed substantially from that used to forecast emissions for the FY 94 TIP and 1992 RTP. Metro discontinued use of its zone-based travel forecast model and adopted a link-based travel forecast model, as preferred by EPA.

III. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

A. Background

A finding of TIP and RTP conformity under the State Conformity Regulations requires that a quantitative analysis be conducted. The quantitative analysis requires development of baseline and action-year, link-based travel networks in each of three analysis years (1995, 2005 and 2015); calculation of resulting region-wide travel demand and distribution of region-wide travel flows on each of the analysis-year networks; and a subsequent emissions analysis using MOBILE 5a (OAR 340-20-930). The Portland metropolitan area has the capability to perform such a quantitative analysis.

To determine conformity, Metro must show that both the RTP and TIP contribute to annual emissions reductions. During the Phase II Interim period for the proposed TIP, "contributes" means that implementation of those projects derived from the TIP/RTP modeled in the "action" network in each analysis year, will decrease emissions in the analysis years relative to emissions that would result if only those project contained in the "baseline" networks were to be built. All other factors must be held constant in each analysis year including annual predicted increases of population and employment. Predicted travel demand varies on the basis of the differing infrastructure investments that are assumed in each scenario. Emissions under each "action" scenario must also be less than in the 1990 base-year.

B. Analysis

1. Determine Analysis Years.
a. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations require the first analysis year to be no later than 1995 for CO and 1996 for Ozone. The second analysis year must be at least five years beyond the first analysis year, i.e., 2000 or later. The last year of the region's long-range plan (RTP) must also be an analysis year. The 1995 RTP horizon is 2015. Analysis years may not be greater than 10 years apart.

Finding: Pursuant to OAR 340-20-930(2) and after consultation with DEQ and the federal EPA, Metro has adopted analysis years of 1995, 2005 and 2015 for this Conformity Determination. The year 2005 was selected as the second analysis year: it is 10 years after the first analysis year and is not greater than ten years before the final analysis year of 2015, which is the RTP horizon year.

2. Define the Baseline Travel Network

a. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations define the Baseline scenario for each analysis year to be the future transportation system that would result from current programs, comprised of:

1) all in-place regionally significant highway and transit facilities, services and activities;

2) all ongoing travel demand management or transportation system management activities; and

3) completion of regionally significant projects (regardless of funding source) which are currently under construction or are undergoing right-of-way acquisition (except for hardship acquisition and protective buying); come from the first three years of the previously conforming transportation plan and/or TIP [FY 94 TIP]; or have completed the NEPA process.

Finding: Three baseline networks were identified for each of the three analysis years based on the criteria stated above. In essence, these networks are comprised of transportation projects whose implementation is already so well advanced as to be virtually assured of full implementation. It should be noted that the 2005 and 2015 baseline networks are identical, as no projects expected to be operational in the 2006 to 2015 timeframe meet the baseline criteria (i.e., none is "virtually assured" of implementation at this time).

Note: Technically the Farmington Road Widening project (Murray to 172nd) in Washington County did qualify for inclusion in the Baseline network as the full project scope had been conformed in the FY 94 TIP with assumed construction by 2000. Thereafter, funding for the last
project phase slipped and implementation is assumed to occur after 2005. To be conservative, this latter phase was only modeled as part of the Action scenario.


a. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations define that the action networks in each analysis year “shall be the transportation system that will result in each year from implementation of the proposed transportation plan, TIPs adopted under it, and other expected regionally significant projects,” including:

1) all projects from the Baseline scenario (e.g., the 2005 action network must include all projects contained in both the 1995 and 2005 baseline networks, etc.); and

2) all regionally significant projects, including highway and transit projects, and TCM, TDM and TSM activities known to the MPO whether federally or non-federally funded, whether “in” the TIP/RTP or not, and that have clear funding sources or commitments and completion dates consistent with the analysis years. The design concept and scope of all projects must be described in sufficient detail to estimate emissions.

Finding: “Action” networks were developed for each analysis year (1995, 2005 and 2015).² The composition of each network is indicated in Appendix A. The 1995 Action network is nearly identical to the 1995 Baseline network (see footnote 2, as well as Appendix B, below). The 2005 Action network includes: 1) all the 1995 and 2005 Baseline projects; 2) all the 1995 Action network projects; and 3) all other federal, state and locally funded projects with clear funding commitments and that are expected to be operational by the analysis year, but which are not otherwise well advanced. The 2015 Action network represents full buildout of the 1995 RTP Fiscally Constrained system.

² The 1995 action network differs only slightly from the 1995 baseline network. Because the 1995 fiscal year was nearly over at the time of this Determination, most projects were so well advanced as to warrant inclusion in the baseline network. However, five bike projects were only recently identified for construction as part of the Willamette River Bridges Crossing Program previously approved in the 1994 TIP (CMAQ program). While funding for the projects was secured with adoption of the Bridge Program in 1994, the identification of and commitment to proceed with the four projects was only recently made. For this reason the projects warrant inclusion in the action network.

The beneficial effects of the projects though, cannot be represented within the EMME/2 model. Thus the air quality benefit attributable to these five bike projects has been credited as a post-model decrease of action network emissions. The methodology used for this post-model reduction of 1995 Action network emissions is described in Appendix B.
The intent of the action networks is to identify the incremental air quality effect that would result from projects and programs whose implementation -- while probable with respect to availability of reasonably anticipated revenues -- are not at this time well advanced and whose emissions are thus "discretionary" with respect to unavoidable effects on the regional airshed. In short, should emissions modeled from the action network be greater than those from the baseline, action network projects can theoretically be cancelled or modified as needed to achieve emission reductions. In this way they differ from baseline projects whose design -- and consequent emissions -- are assumed to be fixed.

Note: Numerous projects comprising both the action and baseline networks in all analysis years are incapable of representation within the EMME/2 model. The vast majority of these projects are bicycle and pedestrian projects/programs and other TSM activities. (This class of projects is identified in Appendix A with "no" entered in the "Can Be Modeled" column.) Virtually all of these projects would be expected to decrease emissions as they support non-auto and/or non-SOV travel modes, or otherwise marginally enhance the efficiency of the highway network, reducing emissions of CO and Ozone precursor compounds).

Historically, the region has not taken credit for benefits theoretically attributable to this class of projects. This has been mostly because the region's past quantitative analyses have not needed emission reductions in excess of those provided by projects capable of representation within the model. Given the lack of need, and because the ad hoc methodologies for calculating such off-model benefits are very labor intensive, are in most cases not well established and/or accepted and thus are subject to controversy when employed to demonstrate reductions of automotive emissions, Metro has chosen not to seek emission reduction credit for these types of projects. However, in future years, as nation-wide monitoring of CMAQ projects provides more reliable data about benefits of such projects, or should this year's analysis require supplemental emission reductions, the region may take credit for these activities.


Note: The following qualitative discussion was prepared assuming positive outcome of the quantitative analysis. In the event Action scenario emissions exceed Baseline levels, or 1990 emissions, the networks will require revision and/or post-model analysis of projects incapable of representation in the EMME/2. The results of the quantitative analysis will be available prior to TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council consideration of this Determination. All elements of the quantitative analysis which generate the "final numbers" are discussed in this Determination. Metro believes that sufficient...
information is presented within the qualitative analysis portion of this analysis to meaningfully comment regarding those elements of the analysis which may merit modification pertinent to outcome of the actual network simulations. In short, it is not the "final numbers" that count so much as the assumptions which go into their production and these assumptions and methodologies are fully accessible for public consideration at this time.

a. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations defines the analysis as estimating the difference between the TIP and RTP Baseline and Action scenarios in areawide emissions. Analysis is conducted for emissions of Carbon Monoxide (CO) and Ozone (measured as emission of precursor compounds of Oxides of Nitrogen, or NOx and Volatile Organic Compounds, or VOC, which are measured as Hydrocarbons, or HC). For each pollutant, emissions are to be calculated for a 1990 Base and comparative emissions are to be calculated for each analysis year (i.e., 1995, 2005, and 2015) for both the Baseline and Action scenarios.

Finding: Calculations were prepared, pursuant to the methods specified at OAR 340-20-1010, of CO and Ozone precursor pollutant emissions assuming travel in each analysis year on both the baseline and action networks and on the 1990 network, and were compared against each other. A technical summary of the regional travel demand model, the EMME/2 planning software and the Mobile 5a methodologies is available from Metro upon request. The methodologies were reviewed by the consultation subcommittee and are recommended to TPAC for adoption.

During the subcommittee's review, several questions were raised concerning the forecast of regional VMT, allocation of population and employment and assigned Pedestrian Environment Factors. Documentation was distributed to the membership and several PEF factors were amended based on revised data supplied by local jurisdictions.

4. Determine Conformity.

a. Requirement: The State Conformity Regulations state that conformity of the TIP and RTP with the SIP will be established if Action scenario emissions in each analysis year are less than emissions from the Baseline scenario in each analysis year. There also must be a logical basis for expecting less emissions in each intervening year. Finally, it must be shown that both the TIP and RTP do not increase the frequency or severity of existing violations to satisfy requirements of the Act (essentially, both the TIP and RTP must be found to contribute to emission
reductions). This requirement is met if all analysis year Action scenario emissions are less than emissions from the 1990 Baseline network.

Finding: Emissions under the Action scenario in all three analysis-years were less than in 1990 and were less than the same year Baseline emissions. Table 2 provides a summary of these emissions (see also Graphs 1 through 4). Therefore, with respect to predicted emissions, the Table 2 shows that both the TIP and RTP are in conformity with the SIP.

It is logical to assume that these reductions will be consistent between analysis years because the vast bulk of anticipated reductions is attributable to fleet turnover (i.e., older "dirtier" cars are gradually replaced by newer "cleaner" vehicles). No reversal of such trends is realistic. It is therefore reasonable to assume action network emissions will trend downward in all interim years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winter CO</th>
<th>Summer CO</th>
<th>Summer HC*</th>
<th>Summer NOx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro Boundary</td>
<td>Metro Boundary</td>
<td>AQMA Boundary</td>
<td>AQMA Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>889,758</td>
<td>434,511</td>
<td>80,602</td>
<td>56,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Action</td>
<td>596,536</td>
<td>371,149</td>
<td>51,994</td>
<td>53,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Baseline</td>
<td>596,547</td>
<td>371,156</td>
<td>51,998</td>
<td>53,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Action</td>
<td>506,816</td>
<td>314,835</td>
<td>39,362</td>
<td>45,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Baseline</td>
<td>537,827</td>
<td>317,837</td>
<td>39,711</td>
<td>45,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Action</td>
<td>549,608</td>
<td>341,135</td>
<td>40,548</td>
<td>46,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Baseline</td>
<td>560,953</td>
<td>348,134</td>
<td>41,297</td>
<td>47,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - includes hot soaks, but not diurnals
08-23-95
Summer CO Emissions

Kilograms per day

Years


EXHIBIT A
GRAPH 1
Winter CO Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kilograms per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>8000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph:**

- **X-axis:** Year
- **Y-axis:** Kilograms per day
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Summer NOx Emissions

Kilograms per day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kilograms per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>9000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT A
GRAPH 4
## APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reg. Facilities Preservation</td>
<td>throughout Clack, Co</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beaver Creek Road</td>
<td>Beaver Creek/Mallory Instruct'n</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Highway 212</td>
<td>52nd to 156th frontage</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-205 Frontage Road</td>
<td>Sunnyside to 52nd east of I-205</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monterey overpass</td>
<td>Over I-205 to frontage road</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Johnson Creek Boulevard</td>
<td>Johnson Creek/Linwood Instruct'n</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2/900</td>
<td>3/1000</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sunnybrook extension</td>
<td>93rd (I-205) to Sunnyside@108th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>5/1800</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Road Rehab Program</td>
<td>County-wide</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Signal Rehab Program</td>
<td>County-wide</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92nd Avenue</td>
<td>Idledan to Multnomah Co. line</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2/700</td>
<td>3/900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>122nd Avenue</td>
<td>Sunnyside to Hubbard</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2/700</td>
<td>3/900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stafford Road</td>
<td>Stafford/Borland Road Instruct'n</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2/1000</td>
<td>4/1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Johnson Creek Blvd</td>
<td>45th to 82nd Avenue</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2/900</td>
<td>3/1000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sunnyside Road</td>
<td>122nd to 152nd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3/900</td>
<td>5/1800</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sunnyside Road</td>
<td>108th to 122nd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3/900</td>
<td>5/1800</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>122nd/129th Avenue</td>
<td>Sunnyside to King Road</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2/700</td>
<td>3/900</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Linwood Ave, Bike Lanes</td>
<td>King Road to County Line</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>CTC Connector</td>
<td>Clack, Reg. Park to Mather Road</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82nd Drive Bikeway</td>
<td>Hwy 212/224 to Jennifer St.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>SE Johnson Creek Blvd.</td>
<td>SE.3to to 45th</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kruse Way Instruct'n Imp.</td>
<td>Westlake</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Boones Ferry Slg. Interconct</td>
<td>I-5 to Country Club</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 50</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Signal Interconnect</td>
<td>Terwilliger to McVey</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 50</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Instruct'n Imp.</td>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1000/180</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Instruct'n Imp.</td>
<td>Terwilliger Instruct'n - 50%</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2/1200</td>
<td>3/1300</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Instruct'n Imp.</td>
<td>A' Avenue Instruct'n - 50%</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Instruct'n Imp.</td>
<td>McVey/Green St Instruct'n - 50%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Realignment Imp.</td>
<td>West A' Street Realign - 50%</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1200/180/180</td>
<td>1300/180</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Imp.</td>
<td>Failing Street - 50%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Imp.</td>
<td>Pimlico Street - 50%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Imp.</td>
<td>Jolie Point Traffic Signal - 50%</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Boones Ferry Road</td>
<td>Jean to Madrona</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1400/180</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Evelyn Overpass</td>
<td>82nd to Evelyn/Jennifer St</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0/900</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>King Rd/Linwood Ave</td>
<td>add lanes, reduce from 4 to 3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sunnyside Rd/132nd Ave</td>
<td>signalize, add turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Sunnyside Rd</td>
<td>Stevens to I-205 NB ramp</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82nd Drive</td>
<td>Gladstone Instruct'g - Evelyn/Jennifer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2/900</td>
<td>3/1200</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system
## APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>82nd Drive</td>
<td>Evelyn/Jennifer to Hwy 212</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2, 900</td>
<td>3, 1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>I-205/Sunnybrook</td>
<td>Split diamond Intrchg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Webster/Thelsen</td>
<td>add turn lane to Webster Street</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2, 900</td>
<td>3, 1100</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system.
## APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NE Halsey St</td>
<td>207th Ave to 223rd Ave</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 900 5 1800 1995</td>
<td>RTP 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stark St</td>
<td>257th Ave. to Trouthdale Rd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0 0 0 1800 1996</td>
<td>TIP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>207th Ave Connector</td>
<td>Halsey St to Glisan St/223rd Ave</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 900 5 1800 1996</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NE Halsey St</td>
<td>190th Ave to 207th Ave</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 900 5 1800 1996</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glisan St to Halsey St</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 900 5 1800 1996</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Road Rehab Program</td>
<td>County-wide</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Signal Rehab Program</td>
<td>County-wide</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a n/a</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jerre Rd</td>
<td>2050' N of Foster/600' S of Powell</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 700 2 750 1997</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cherry Park Rd</td>
<td>242nd Dr. to 257th Ave</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 1000 5 1800 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Division Street</td>
<td>198th Avenue to Wallula Avenue</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Civic N'th Central Collector</td>
<td>Burnside to Division</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0 0 2 500</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Civic N'th Station Plaza</td>
<td>Bayview City Hall LRT Station</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>181st to I-84 Intrchng Impvments</td>
<td>Improve ramps</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0 0 3 1200 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>181st Widening</td>
<td>I-84 EB ramp to Halsey Street</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 1800 3 2400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>181st Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>San Rafael Street</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>181st Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Halsey Street: add turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 100 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>181st Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Glisan Street: add turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 200 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>181st Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Burnside Street: trn ins/sig upgrade</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 150 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>181st Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Stark Street: add turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 100 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>182nd Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Division Street: add turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 100 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>185th Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Sandy Boulevard: realign/R R OXing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 100 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>202nd/Birdsde Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Powell Boulevard: add left turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 100 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>223rd/Ave In Multi Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Glisan Street: add turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 300 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>202nd/Birdsde Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Roberts Avenue: add turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 100 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>202nd/Birdsde Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Division Street: add right turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 100 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>202nd/Birdsde Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Division Street: add turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 100 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>202nd/Birdsde Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Palmetto Road: signal interconnect</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 50 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>202nd/Birdsde Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Stark Street: add turn lanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 100 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>202nd/Birdsde Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Powell Valley Rd: signal intercon'ct</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 50 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>202nd/Birdsde Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>Orient Drive</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>202nd/Birdsde Intrsecn Impvmnt</td>
<td>238th Ave: trn Ins on all approaches</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>900/1400 1200/1600 1997</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Traffic signal optimization</td>
<td>181st: I-84 to Glisan</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 50 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Traffic signal optimization</td>
<td>Burnside: Eastman Pkwy/Powell</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 50 capacity</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Traffic signal optimization</td>
<td>Division: 60th to 174th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 50 capacity</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Traffic signal optimization</td>
<td>Sandy: Burnside to 62nd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 50 capacity</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Traffic signal optimization</td>
<td>Powell: 11th to 98th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 50 capacity</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Traffic signal optimization</td>
<td>Division: 182nd to 257th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 50 capacity</td>
<td>RTP 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system
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## APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Mult</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>US 26</td>
<td>Palmquist/Orient Instruct'n realign</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 700</td>
<td>3 900</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Orient Drive &amp; 282nd</td>
<td>turn lanes on approaches</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 700</td>
<td>3 900</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>257th/1st (Bull Run) Instruct'n</td>
<td>lift turn lanes on 3 approaches</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 900</td>
<td>3 1000</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Cherry Park Road</td>
<td>242nd to 257th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 700</td>
<td>3 900</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Columbia Hwy</td>
<td>Halsey to east of Kibling</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 700</td>
<td>3 900</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1st (Bull Run)</td>
<td>Burnside to 257th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 700</td>
<td>3 900</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Halsey/223rd Instruct'n</td>
<td>left turn lanes on approaches</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 900</td>
<td>3 1000</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Orient/Kane (257th) Instruct'n</td>
<td>add SB left turn lane on Kane</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 700</td>
<td>3 800</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sellwood Bridge</td>
<td>Sellwood to Highway 43</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mult Co Bridges - Seismic</td>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mult Co Bridges - Preservation</td>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hawthorne Bridge Sidewalks &amp; Phase</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Willamette River Bridges Accessibility</td>
<td>SYRACUSE/Philadelphia Instruct'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>St. John's Bridge</td>
<td>St. Helens/Bridge Ave Instruct'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>St. John's Bridge</td>
<td>St. Helens Bridge Ave Instruct'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Broadway Bridge</td>
<td>Broadway/Flint/Wheeler Instruct'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Broadway Bridge</td>
<td>Broadway/Flint/Wheeler Instruct'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Broadway Bridge</td>
<td>Broadway/Flint/Wheeler Instruct'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Broadway Bridge</td>
<td>Broadway Viaduct Bikelanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 1400</td>
<td>1 700</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Broadway Bridge</td>
<td>Broadway Viaduct Bikelanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 1400</td>
<td>1 700</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Broadway Bridge</td>
<td>Ped Xing at Lovejoy/10th Ave</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 1400</td>
<td>1 700</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Broadway Bridge</td>
<td>Lovejoy Viaduct Bikelanes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 1400</td>
<td>1 700</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Burnside Bridge</td>
<td>Bikelanes from MLK to 6th Ave</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2/3 2100/270</td>
<td>1/2 1400/1800</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Burnside Bridge</td>
<td>Burnside/MLK Instruct'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Burnside Bridge</td>
<td>WB Bikelane West of MLK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Burnside Bridge</td>
<td>EB Bikelane East of 2nd Avenue</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Burnside Bridge</td>
<td>Burnside/2nd Avenue Instruct'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Morrison Bridge</td>
<td>Water Avenue/Yamhill Instruct'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Morrison Bridge</td>
<td>Front Avenue Ramp Sidewalk</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Morrison Bridge</td>
<td>2nd Avenue Crosswalks</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Hawthorne Bridge</td>
<td>Hawthorne Viaduct</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 2100</td>
<td>2 1400</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Hawthorne Bridge</td>
<td>Clay Ramp Sidewalk</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Hawthorne Bridge</td>
<td>Westside Improvements</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Hawthorne Bridge</td>
<td>Madison Viaduct Sidewalk</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Ross Island Bridge</td>
<td>Kelly Ramp Modification</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Ross Island Bridge</td>
<td>Ped, Xing at Front Ave Ramp</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Co</td>
<td>Sellwood Bridge</td>
<td>Greenway Trail Crossing</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system.
### APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Mode</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Preserve Exsiting Reg. Facilities</td>
<td>Reg. Facilities Throughout Region</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Mult</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>US 25 (realign/ remove near Orient)</td>
<td>Palinqust/Orient Intrsect'N</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997 as per Mult. Co</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I-5 Ramp Metering</td>
<td>Metro area</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-5 Intrchng Recon.</td>
<td>Wilsonville Intrchng (Unit 2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1800/2200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-5 Exit Improvmt</td>
<td>Northbound I-205 exit</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1 (1W) 2000</td>
<td>2 (1W) 3700</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-5 Ramp Reconstruction</td>
<td>At Hwy 217 (Unit 2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies + 1000</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I-5 Wildening &amp; Recon.</td>
<td>Greeley to N. Banfield</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>I-84 Ramp Metering</td>
<td>East Portland</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I-84 Wildening</td>
<td>Troudale Intchg-Jordan Intchg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 (1W)</td>
<td>2 + aux + 1000</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>I-205 Ramp Metering</td>
<td>East Portland</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I-205 / Hwy 224</td>
<td>Clackamas (Sunrise) Intchng</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>I-205 Auxiliary Lanes</td>
<td>Powell to Foster</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 6600 3 + aux 7600</td>
<td>2005 RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Interstate-205</td>
<td>I-205 Trill (several crossings)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>I-405 Ramp Metering</td>
<td>Central City</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sunset Ramp Metering</td>
<td>Jefferson to Cornelius Pass Rd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Sunset Interconnect</td>
<td>Cornell to Bethany</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sunset Wildening/Ramps</td>
<td>Murray Road to Hwy 217</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 4500/440 3 (1W) 6000/7000</td>
<td>2005 TIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sunset Wildening/Recon.</td>
<td>Highway 217 to Camelot</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 (EB) 4100</td>
<td>3(EB) 6600</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Sunset Reconstruction</td>
<td>Camelot to Sylvan (Phase 3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>EB/VB 6600/600 6000+cd/4</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>US 30 Bypass Realignment</td>
<td>NE 60th Avenue realignment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>US 30 Bypass Widening</td>
<td>Killingsworth at Columbia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Canyon Road Bicycle Imp.</td>
<td>110th to Canyon Dr.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>TV Hwy Interconnect</td>
<td>209th to Brookwood</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Wash</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>TV Highway</td>
<td>209th/219th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Wash</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>NH Hwy Bike/Fed Imp.</td>
<td>65th to Hwy 217</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Wash</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>NH Highway</td>
<td>Scholls Ferry/Oleson</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Wash</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Farmington Road Widening</td>
<td>209th Ave to 172nd Ave</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 900 3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Interconnect</td>
<td>Cedar Oak to Hidden Spring</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Intrsect'n</td>
<td>Terwilligger Intrsect'n</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 1200 3</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Intrsect'n</td>
<td>A' Avenue Intrsect'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Intrsect'n</td>
<td>McVey/Green Street Intrsect'n</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>NB/SB 1200/180 NB/SB 1300/1850</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Realignment</td>
<td>West A' Street Realignment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Hwy 43</td>
<td>Willamette Falls Drive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Hwy 43</td>
<td>Falling Street</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Hwy 43</td>
<td>Pimlico Street</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Clack</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Hwy 43 Signal Imp.</td>
<td>Jolie Point Traffic Signal</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>McLoughlin Pedestrian Imp.</td>
<td>Harrison St to Oregon City</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Barbur Bikr/Ped Improv.</td>
<td>Front to Hamilton St.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system
## APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Barber Bike/Ped Improv.</td>
<td>Terwilliger to Multnomah St.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5 (1W) 5500</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Hwy 217 Widening, Ramps</td>
<td>Sunset to TV Hwy. NB (Canyon)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 (1W) 5500</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Hwy 217 Widening, Aux.</td>
<td>TV Hwy to 72nd Ave Intrchng</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 (1W) 4500</td>
<td>3 + aux 6000/7000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Hwy 217 Ramp Meter</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 (1W) 1400</td>
<td>3 1600</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Hwy 217 Ramp Improv.</td>
<td>Hwy 217 NB off-ramp at Scholls</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 (1W) 1400</td>
<td>3 1600</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Hwy 217 Ramp Meter</td>
<td>Greenburg</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 (1W) 1400</td>
<td>3 1600</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Hall Bike/Ped Improv.</td>
<td>Oak St to Pacific Hwy West</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 (1W) 4500</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Hardware &amp; Software</td>
<td>Traffic Mngt Ops Center</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 (1W) 4500</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Enhance</td>
<td>Traffic Mngt Ops Center</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 (1W) 4500</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>TSO&amp;TDM, 170th, Surf.St.</td>
<td>Metro region</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 (1W) 4500</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>Metro region</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 (1W) 4500</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* 140</td>
<td>95W Signal Interconnect</td>
<td>I-5 to Durham Road</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* 99E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clatsop to Hwy 224</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* 207th Connector</td>
<td></td>
<td>Halsey to Sandy</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* 110th to 117th</td>
<td></td>
<td>110th to 117th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* US 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cedar Hills/Sunset Intrchng</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* Farmington Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>172nd to Murray</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* I-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multnomah to Terwilliger</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* I-5/Stafford Intrchng</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-5/Stafford Intrchng</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* I-84</td>
<td></td>
<td>181st to 223rd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* Sunset Hwy</td>
<td>Zoo Intrchng/Vista Rdg Tunnel</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* Sunset Hwy</td>
<td>Zoo to Scholls</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* Sunset Hwy - braided ramps</td>
<td>Zoo to Scholls</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* Tacoma St</td>
<td></td>
<td>17th to 32nd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* TV Hwy</td>
<td>Shute Park to 21st (Hillsboro)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>* Forest Grove N. Arterial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hwy 47 to Quince</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>Old Scholls</td>
<td>New Scholls to 175th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>3 + aux 7200</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system
### APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Preserve Exis. Reg Facilites</td>
<td>Reg. Facilities</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Marine Dr</td>
<td>North Rivergate Section</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Marine Drive</td>
<td>T-5 Entrance</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Going Street</td>
<td>Going Street Rail Crossing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Airport Way eastbound</td>
<td>PDX to I-205 Phase I</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alderwood Street</td>
<td>Alderwood Street to Clark Road</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hayden Is Bridge</td>
<td>Rivergate to Hayden Island</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Airport Way Westbound</td>
<td>PDX to I-205 Phase 2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Industrial area TMA's</td>
<td>Swan Island</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland/Portland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Burgard/Columbia</td>
<td>Intsect'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland/Portland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Columbia Blvd</td>
<td>Alderwood Dr Intsect'n</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland/Portland</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Columbia/Lambord</td>
<td>South Rivergate Rail O'Xing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland/Portland</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>PDX Explaining Roadway</td>
<td>PDX Terminal</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland/Portland</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Columbia Blvd Signal Improvement</td>
<td>South Rivergate to I-5 Interlce</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland/Portland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0 Reg. Facilities Preservation</td>
<td>Throughout City</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>St. John's Business District</td>
<td>Burlington to</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NE 148th Marine Dr to Sandy</td>
<td>Marine Dr to Sandy</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>SE Foster Blvd</td>
<td>130th to City Limits</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SE Lents Business District</td>
<td>NE 39th to 62nd Ave</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>S/Sw/Clty Blvd</td>
<td>NE Sandy to Lombard</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NE Sandy Blvd</td>
<td>NE 39th to 82nd Ave</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NE Sandy Blvd</td>
<td>NE 12th to 35th Ave</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Broadway/Weidler Corridor</td>
<td>I-5 to NE 28th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lower Albina RR Xing</td>
<td>Intersate to Russell</td>
<td>under re</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>River Dist/LOvejoy Ramp</td>
<td>Broadway Br to NW 14th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>SW Front Avenue</td>
<td>Steel Br to I-405</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Water Avenue Extension</td>
<td>SE Division Place to CMSI</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>SE 11th/12th SP Rail Xing</td>
<td>SE Division to Milwaukee</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hillsdale Town Ctr Ped Dist</td>
<td>SW Capital Hwy Bertha/Sunset</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>SW Garden Home Rd</td>
<td>SW Multnomah to Capital Hwy</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>SW Garden Home Signal</td>
<td>Garden Home at Multnomah</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Capital Hwy</td>
<td>SW Bertha br to Barbur</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17th-Milwaukie Connector</td>
<td>S. McLoughlin/17th-Milwaukie</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Woodstock Business Dist</td>
<td>SE 39th to SE 50th</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>SE Tacoma</td>
<td>SE 28th to 32nd</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Road Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>City wide</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Signal Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>City wide</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system
# APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Burnside Bike Lanes</td>
<td>33rd St. to 74th Ave.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41st-42nd Bicycle Blvd</td>
<td>Columbia Blvd./Springwater Trail</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Greeley/Interstate Bikeway</td>
<td>Killingsworth to Broadway Bridge</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Bertha Blvd. Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Vermont St. to Capital Hwy.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Cornell Road Bike Lanes</td>
<td>NW 30th Ave to NW 53rd Ave.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Division Corridor Bikeway</td>
<td>SE 39th Ave. to SE 82nd Ave.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Holgate Corridor Bikeway</td>
<td>SE 39th Ave. to SE 92nd Ave.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>112th Corridor Bikeway</td>
<td>Springwater Trail to Sandy Blvd</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Halsey Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Sandy Blvd. to 148th St.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Central City TMA</td>
<td>Central City employment dist.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems</td>
<td>Not yet determined</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Vancouver/Williams Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Broadway to MLK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Seaverton-Hillsdale Hwy</td>
<td>Barbur Blvd to Terwilliger</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>WB 1400 WB</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Lombard/Burgard</td>
<td>Philadelphia to Columbia Blvd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3 900 3 or 5** 900/1800</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>River District Access</td>
<td>Northwest Triangle</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>South Waterfront Access</td>
<td>Harrison-Moody connect'n</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system (PAGE 8)
### APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds Base Year</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reg. Facilities Preservation</td>
<td>Throughout Wash Co</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112th</td>
<td>Cedar Hills Intrchg to Cornell</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>143rd</td>
<td>West Union to Kaiser</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>124th</td>
<td>99W to Tualatin-Sherwood</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Old Scholls Ferry</td>
<td>Murray to Beef Bend</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900/1800</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>179th to Bethany</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cornelius Pass</td>
<td>Sunset Hwy. to West Union</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900/1200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Millikan to Terman</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Arrington to Baseline/Main</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>185th to Shute</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Hwy. 217 to 117th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 (1w)</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>3(2w)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Miller to Mult. Co. Line</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>216th</td>
<td>Baseline to Cornell</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Saltzman @ Cornell/New 119th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brookwood</td>
<td>Airport to Baseline</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/1200</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>900/1800</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td>Miller to Leahy</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Saltzman to Mult. Co. Line</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>Murray to 158th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>177th to 231st</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Lisa to 216th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Hwy. 26 to Saltzman</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Science Park Drive to Cornell</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Beef Bend Ext</td>
<td>Scholls Ferry to 99W</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500/700/9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>219th</td>
<td>TV Highway to Baseline</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>Bronson to W. Union</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Murray to 185th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Murray to Saltzman</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1158th</td>
<td>Jenkins to Baseline</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>217 to Western</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Greenway/Hall</td>
<td>Greenway/Hall Intrsect'n</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Menlo to Main</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Murray to Menlo</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>E&amp;W Arterial</td>
<td>117th to 110th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>E&amp;W Arterial</td>
<td>Hall to 117th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Greenburg</td>
<td>Shady Lane to Locust</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>E&amp;W Arterial</td>
<td>Hooken to Murray</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Hall Intrsect'n Impvmt</td>
<td>95W</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>E&amp;W Arterial</td>
<td>Cedar Hills to Watson/Hall</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system
### A. APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Millikan Extension</td>
<td>Cedar Hills to Hocken</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td>Cedar Hills to Murray</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>185th</td>
<td>T.V. Hwy, to Farmington</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>170th Avenue</td>
<td>Rigert to Alexander</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>900/1800</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Martin/Cornellius Schefflin</td>
<td>realignment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>25th to Glencoe</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Glencoe</td>
<td>Lincoln to Evergreen</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>170th</td>
<td>Alexander to Baseline</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Wilsonville/Sunset Ext.</td>
<td>Hwy. 99 to Murdock</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Sunset Drive (Hwy 47)</td>
<td>University to Beal</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Tualatin Rd Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Hwy 99 to Boones Ferry Rd.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Farmington Rd. Bike Lanes</td>
<td>OR217 to Murray Blvd</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Ground Level Retail space</td>
<td>Hillsboro Criminal Justice Fac.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Beaverton Creek TOD</td>
<td>&quot;SW 153rd, Murray to Jenkins&quot;</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>Shute to 25th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Walker Road Bike/Ped imp</td>
<td>173rd to 185th</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Oleson Road Bike/Ped imp</td>
<td>Fanho Creek to Garden Home</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Oleson Road Bike/Ped imp</td>
<td>Garden Home to Hall Blvd</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Tualatin</td>
<td>Teton to 115th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>TV Hwy Signals</td>
<td>Locations in Cornellius</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Millikan Way</td>
<td>Purchase and Development</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Signal Interconnections</td>
<td>Barnes, Cornell, Scholls Ferry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>777</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Westfield to Murray</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>SPA Easement Bike/Ped imp</td>
<td>East of 158th, Division/Laidlaw</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Scholls Ferry Ped imp</td>
<td>Hall to BH Hwy</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>185th</td>
<td>West Union to Springville</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Wash</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>TV Highway</td>
<td>209th/219th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Wash</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>BH Highway</td>
<td>Scholls Ferry/Oleson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT/Wash</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Farmington Road Widening</td>
<td>209th to 172nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Barnes Road Extension</td>
<td>117th to Future 119th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Brookwood to 231st</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Hall to Boones Ferry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Lombard</td>
<td>Broadway to Farmington Rd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>229th/231st</td>
<td>Evergreen to Cornell</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>700/900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Cornell Rd</td>
<td>158th to Bethany Blvd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Davis Rd</td>
<td>Murray to 170th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Hart Rd</td>
<td>Murray to 165th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lombard</td>
<td>Canyon to Center Street</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>CIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system
## APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Nora</td>
<td>155th to Weir</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Taylors Ferry</td>
<td>Oleson to Washington Drive</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>170th/173rd</td>
<td>Baseline to Walker Rd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>500/700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Amberlyn Pkwy</td>
<td>Quamatia/206th to Stucki</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Beef Bend Road</td>
<td>131st to 150th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Beef Bend Road</td>
<td>King Arthur to 131st</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>West Union to Kaiser</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>MSTIP 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>East Main</td>
<td>10th to Brookwood</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>MSTIP 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Evergreen Pk Ext.</td>
<td>Cornelius Pass to Shute Road</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>MSTIP 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>1 Laidlaw Rd Extension</td>
<td>west from Kaiser Rd to 168th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Sexton Mountain Drive</td>
<td>155th to Murray</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Springville Rd</td>
<td>185th to PCC access</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Tuительн Rd</td>
<td>Boones Ferry to 115th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>500/700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Millikan Extension</td>
<td>Cedar Hills to Hocken</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Nyberg Road Extension</td>
<td>65th to 50th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>MSTIP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Ibach</td>
<td>Boones Ferry/Graham Ferry Rds</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Boones Ferry Rd</td>
<td>at Alsens/Blake</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Davies Extension</td>
<td>Scholls to Old Scholls</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>CIP 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Lombard</td>
<td>Broadway to Canyon</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>CIP 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>Oregon Street</td>
<td>Tuительн Sherwood to Murdock</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>CIP 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td><em>W</em></td>
<td>121st to 135th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>CIP 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Cornelius Pass Rd. Bike Lanes</td>
<td>West Union Rd. to Sunset Hwy</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>165th Ave. Bike Lanes</td>
<td>TV Hwy. to Farmington Rd.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Oleson Rd.Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Vermont St. to Hall St.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Garden Home Rd.Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Scholls Ferry Rd. to MCL</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Barnes Rd.Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Miller Rd. to U.S. 26</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>159th Ave. Bike Lanes</td>
<td>U.S. 26 to West Union Rd.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Cornell Rd.Bike Lanes</td>
<td>158th Ave. to 185th Ave.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Scholls Fy. Interconnect</td>
<td>Nimbus to Highway 217</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>+ 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Barnes Rd Interconnect</td>
<td>Suntek to Miller</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>+ 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Murray Blvd Signal Interconnect</td>
<td>Hwy 26 to Cornell</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>+ 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Murray Blvd Signal Interconnect</td>
<td>Farmington to Millikan</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>+ 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>Traffic signal optimization</td>
<td>TV Hwy: BV W Limit/Baseline</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>add 50 capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system (PAGE 11)
## APPENDIX A: BASE AND ACTION YEAR NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>RTP NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>In Model</th>
<th>EXISTING LANES</th>
<th>PROPOSED LANES</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>BASE YEAR</th>
<th>ACTION YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Added Bus/LRT Srvce (1.5% to 2005)</td>
<td>Throughout Tri-Met service area</td>
<td>tr yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Added Bus/LRT Srvce (.5% 05 to 15)</td>
<td>Throughout Tri-Met service area</td>
<td>tr yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>South/North LRT capital costs</td>
<td>Clack Co., to Clark Co., WA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Civic N’hd MAX Station</td>
<td>New LRT Station @ Civic N’hd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>170th to 177th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Westside LRT</td>
<td></td>
<td>tr yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TOD Fund Program</td>
<td>Purchase TOD develop. sites</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Major Ped Upgrade (33 mi)</td>
<td>Central City/Regional Centers</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Major Ped Upgrade (13 mi)</td>
<td>Town Centers</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Major Ped Upgrade (53 mi)</td>
<td>Corridors &amp; Staff’ns Communities</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Major Ped Upgrade (9 mi)</td>
<td>Main Streets</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>TDM Education/Promotion</td>
<td>Metro region</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Regional Center TMAs</td>
<td>Gresham/Hills/Milw/O.C.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional/Telecommute Proj</td>
<td>Employers in region</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TIP funded projects not in RTP; ** Part of larger Program; *** Not in RTP - insignificant to regional system
APPENDIX B
OF EXHIBIT A

OFF-MODEL METHODOLOGY
FOR
COMPUTATION OF 1995 ANALYSIS YEAR
BICYCLE PROJECT EMISSIONS EFFECTS

INTRODUCTION SUMMARY

Four projects were identified for implementation as part of the Willamette River Bridge Crossing Program approved in the 1994 TIP. The project declarations to Metro occurred late in local FY 95 — i.e., after the July 1 "cut date" for project completion "by 1995" but within the 1995 calendar year. Therefore, the projects qualify for inclusion in only the 1995 Action scenario. Emission reductions attributable to implementation of these projects generate a positive difference between the 1995 Baseline and Action scenarios (i.e., the Action scenario emissions will be less than that of the Baseline scenario as required by the State Conformity Rule). The projects yield a net reduction of 3.59 kg/day of Hydrocarbon emissions; 17.85 kg/day of Carbon Monoxide emissions; and 4.83 kg/day of Oxides of Nitrogen emissions. The projects include:

1. **Lovejoy Viaduct.** Reduce from three travel lanes to two lanes and provide bike lane from Broadway to 14th.

2. **10th Avenue Viaduct.** Remove two travel lanes and provide bike lanes.

3. **E. Burnside.** Remove westbound travel lane from 6th to MLK and provide bike lane.

4. **Hawthorne Viaduct.** Remove eastbound lane and provide bike lane and buffer.

Each of the four projects entail conversion of existing vehicle travel lanes to bicycle lanes. The calculation of emission effects of the projects therefore entailed a two step process. First, it was necessary to determine whether elimination of the vehicle lanes resulted in an increase of automotive emissions due to changes in travel time and speed on the affected links. The second step was to calculate emissions reductions attributable to project conversion of auto trips to bike trips.

CALCULATE PROJECT EFFECTS ON AUTOMOTIVE EMISSIONS

The Bridge project selection process was supported by traffic engineering analysis of potential delay and volume/capacity impacts (CH2M Hill/Kittleson Associates, Inc., August 1994). This project-scale analysis of local transportation system impacts was reviewed by Metro's modelling staff. It was determined that the analytic results were superior to what could be generated using Metro's regional demand and distribution model. In each case, the modeled effects of the lane conversions was insignificant, as
CALCULATE EMission Benefit of BIKE/WALK MODE ENHANCEMENTS

The second step of the analysis required computation of emission reductions attributable to provision of the new bike facilities. This first required determination of the number of trips that would divert from automobiles to a bike mode due to provision of the bridge crossing improvement of downtown access and egress. Metro adopted elements of the Stuart Goldsmith methodology employed to calculate travel mode diversion in Seattle (Goldsmith, 1994). The principle assumption drawn from the methodology is that baseline bicycle mode share will increase 26 percent — on average — with provision of enhanced bicycle travel lanes.

All day counts were obtained of auto travel across the three bridges affected by the projects:

1) Broadway Bridge = 29,241 (average weekday)
2) Burnside Bridge = 39,346 (average weekday)
3) Hawthorne Bridge = 27,588 (average weekday)

Also, Metro has developed calibrated mode share information for travel to and from the downtown from modelling conducted for the 2040 planning process: approximately 3.3

These system effects would generate only insignificant differences in average link speeds and trip durations and would cause no meaningful increase of automotive emissions of either Carbon Monoxide, Hydrocarbons, or Oxides of Nitrogen. Therefore, no post-model, upward adjustment of regional automotive emissions is warranted as a consequence of implementing these projects.

CALCULATE EMISSION BENEFIT OF BIKE/WALK MODE ENHANCEMENTS

The second step of the analysis required computation of emission reductions attributable to provision of the new bike facilities. This first required determination of the number of trips that would divert from automobiles to a bike mode due to provision of the bridge crossing improvement of downtown access and egress. Metro adopted elements of the Stuart Goldsmith methodology employed to calculate travel mode diversion in Seattle (Goldsmith, 1994). The principle assumption drawn from the methodology is that baseline bicycle mode share will increase 26 percent — on average — with provision of enhanced bicycle travel lanes.

All day counts were obtained of auto travel across the three bridges affected by the projects:

1) Broadway Bridge = 29,241 (average weekday)
2) Burnside Bridge = 39,346 (average weekday)
3) Hawthorne Bridge = 27,588 (average weekday)

Also, Metro has developed calibrated mode share information for travel to and from the downtown from modelling conducted for the 2040 planning process: approximately 3.3

These system effects would generate only insignificant differences in average link speeds and trip durations and would cause no meaningful increase of automotive emissions of either Carbon Monoxide, Hydrocarbons, or Oxides of Nitrogen. Therefore, no post-model, upward adjustment of regional automotive emissions is warranted as a consequence of implementing these projects.

CALCULATE EMISSION BENEFIT OF BIKE/WALK MODE ENHANCEMENTS

The second step of the analysis required computation of emission reductions attributable to provision of the new bike facilities. This first required determination of the number of trips that would divert from automobiles to a bike mode due to provision of the bridge crossing improvement of downtown access and egress. Metro adopted elements of the Stuart Goldsmith methodology employed to calculate travel mode diversion in Seattle (Goldsmith, 1994). The principle assumption drawn from the methodology is that baseline bicycle mode share will increase 26 percent — on average — with provision of enhanced bicycle travel lanes.

All day counts were obtained of auto travel across the three bridges affected by the projects:

1) Broadway Bridge = 29,241 (average weekday)
2) Burnside Bridge = 39,346 (average weekday)
3) Hawthorne Bridge = 27,588 (average weekday)

Also, Metro has developed calibrated mode share information for travel to and from the downtown from modelling conducted for the 2040 planning process: approximately 3.3

These system effects would generate only insignificant differences in average link speeds and trip durations and would cause no meaningful increase of automotive emissions of either Carbon Monoxide, Hydrocarbons, or Oxides of Nitrogen. Therefore, no post-model, upward adjustment of regional automotive emissions is warranted as a consequence of implementing these projects.
percent of trips in the Inner Portland neighborhoods (inner eastside and downtown districts) are made by bike; 14.6 percent by walking; 6.2 percent by transit and 75.9 percent by auto. Factoring the vehicle counts (weekday count/75.9 percent) to reflect the auto mode share of total travel yields the number of trips crossing the bridge by all modes. This number multiplied by the bike mode percentage (3.3 percent) yields the number of daily bike mode trips. This baseline number of existing bike trips was then multiplied by 0.26 to yield the net increase of daily bike trips across each of the three bridges that could be expected by implementation of the project facility enhancements.

Next, the total of new bike trips was multiplied by the auto mode share factor of 75.9 percent (i.e., new bike trips are assumed to divert from auto travel in proportion to the auto mode share of all trips. This implies that some new bike trips will represent diversion from transit and walk modes). The resulting figure represents the total assumed diversion of auto trips to the bicycle mode.

The Regional CMAQ Program methodology was then used to calculated emissions reductions attributable to this increased bicycle mode share. This methodology has been previously approved by FHWA/FTA and EPA. The results of these calculations are shown in Table Be, below. It shows that the four projects represent a credit of 17.85 kilograms per day (kg/day) of CO; 3.59 kg/day of Hydrocarbon; and 4.83 kg/day of NOx. This indicates that the 1995 Action scenario reduces emission below the Baseline condition.
### DEFAULT PARAMETERS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of work days per year</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of bikeable days per year</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average regionwide bike trip length (miles)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average regionwide auto trip length (miles)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average auto occupancy (AO)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Emission factor (HC) (g/mile) | 1.341  |
| Emission factor (CO) (g/mile) | 5.66   |
| Emission factor (NOx) (g/mile) | 1.803  |
| Natl Ambient Air Quality Std: Ozone (mg/m^3) | 0.225  |
| Natl Ambient Air Quality Std: CO (mg/m^3) | 10.00  |

### PROJECT DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Broadway Bridge</th>
<th>Burnside Bridge</th>
<th>Hawthorne Bridge</th>
<th>PROJECT DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of facility (miles)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of users per day</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VMT CALCULATIONS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New bike trips per day</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike trips per year</td>
<td>411,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equiv. auto VMT per year (miles)</td>
<td>670,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EMISSIONS/COST CALCULATIONS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC reduced (kg/day)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO reduced (kg/day)</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx reduced (kg/day)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted annual cost factor ($/kg of pollutant reduced)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 95-2213 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE FY 1995-96 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM TO INCLUDE A TRI-MET-SPONSORED TRANSIT FINANCE TASK FORCE

Date: September 13, 1995 Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

Approval of this resolution would authorize amendment of the Unified Work Program (UWP) to include convocation by Tri-Met of a blue ribbon Transit Finance Task Force. Metro Resolution No. 95-2176B, approved in July, allocated $320,000 of Regional STP funds to be matched by Tri-Met local funds to support this project.

BACKGROUND

Tri-Met's strategic plan calls for transit service levels in excess of that which can be supported by existing and anticipated revenue. Tri-Met requested and was awarded $320,000 of Region 2040 Implementation Program funds (i.e., the $27 million) to convene a blue-ribbon task force that would review transit expansion plans and recommend a package of funding recommendations for regional and state consideration and implementation. The UPWP amendment is shown in Exhibit A of the Resolution. While funds to support this project were approved as part of the Metro TIP Amendment which authorized allocation of the $27 million Region 2040 Reserve dollars, a UPWP amendment is also required to access these funds.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Metro Resolution No. 95-2213.
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING ) RESOLUTION NO. 95-2213
THE FY 1995-96 UNIFIED WORK ) Introduced by
PROGRAM TO INCLUDE A TRI-MET- ) Councilor Rod Monroe, Chair
SPONSORED TRANSIT FINANCE ) JPACT
TASK FORCE )

WHEREAS, Metro has previously allocated $320,000 of Regional
STP funds to support a Tri-Met-sponsored blue ribbon Transit
Finance Task Force; and

WHEREAS, Funding for the Task Force must be approved in the
region's Unified Work Program (UWP); and

WHEREAS, The duties of the Task Force are described in
Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met will provide the required local match for
the project; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

That Metro approves the UWP amendment described in Ex-
hibit A needed to support the selection and work of a Transit
Finance Task Force.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ___ day of ________,
1995.

J. Ruth McFarland, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel
EXHIBIT A: Proposed Amendment of the UWP

TRANSIT FINANCE TASK FORCE

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this project is to convene a blue ribbon task force to review plans for transit expansion, assess performance of the existing system, measure community attitudes, examine options for new funding and prepare a package of recommendations and obtain public input on the package.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program Prior to FY 1995-96

Tri-Met has adopted a long-term strategic plan which envisions service increases above what can be supported with existing and anticipated revenues. The task force will work to identify the funding for implementation of the strategic plan initiatives. There is no direct relationship of this project with prior UWP activity.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 1995-96

Select and convene the task force membership. Provide administrative and staff support to carry out the tasks described for the project. Analyze funding recommendations technically and with respect to public acceptance and support.

PRODUCT

Package of feasible recommendations to secure local, regional and statewide transit funding increases consistent with implementation of strategic plan service levels.

EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be determined $320,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$356,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$356,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96 Metro STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OREGON'S INTERMODAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The purpose of Oregon's Intermodal Management System (IMS) is to improve intermodal transportation movements in the statewide system. This includes identifying intermodal bottlenecks and improving coordination in transportation planning and project selection.

For Oregon's IMS, intermodalism refers to connecting different modes of transportation and/or transferring people or freight from one mode to another. Oregon's IMS focuses on facilities that are involved in intermodal movements and connections between intermodal facilities and main routes in the transportation system. Intermodal needs and improvements for the main routes in the transportation system are addressed in modal and corridor plans that are being developed on a statewide basis.

Oregon's IMS is being developed in two phases. The key objectives of Phase One were:

- describe policy implications of the IMS
- develop a preliminary inventory
- establish general measures of performance
- identify data requirements

Criteria for designating intermodal facilities identified the following:

- all intercity scheduled-service bus stations
- all Amtrak depots
- all airports with scheduled commercial service
- all major lumber truck/train reload yards
- all grain elevators at a port facility or on a rail line and exceeding 500,000 bushels of capacity
- all truck/rail centers involving trailers on flat car (TOFC) and containers on flat car (COFC)
- intermodal terminals at all marine ports shipping freight
- all pipeline terminals

There are four elements of Phase Two which is currently underway:

- conduct stakeholder interviews to identify intermodal problems and needs
- develop performance measures
- develop a database structure and collect data
• identify strategies and actions for improving intermodal transportation movements

Interviews were conducted with 114 stakeholders around the state, representing the full range of passenger and freight intermodal facilities. The key factors affecting performance were time, reliability, safety, cost, and connectivity.

The performance measures will be used to compare the measured performance of system elements with specified thresholds of acceptable performance. A trend over time, a future projection, or an actual measured performance can all be indicators of needs at a facility or connection. To do this, the system requires overall objectives, performance measures, and performance data. The objectives being used are:

• satisfaction of customers’ transportation needs
• transportation safety
• economic costs

Examples of performance measures are:

• percent of on-time performance
• percent of capacity utilized
• accidents/fatalities per year
• costs of delays

The database will be used for system analysis, needs identification, and needs ranking. It is being developed in a user-friendly "windows" format and will be used by ODOT, the Port of Portland, and four Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). It will include detailed information on the characteristics of each system facility/connection.

Decision science methodology may be utilized to "normalize" performance at the facilities and connections (allows comparison of the value of the movement of a container to the value of a passenger enplanement, etc.). This methodology also allows for different weights to be applied to the performance measures. By using this method, the IMS may establish needs priorities that would be one element of the future project decision-making process.

Oregon’s IMS is intended to be a working tool to aid in making future strategic decisions about improvements to the transportation system. To be useful, the IMS must be integrated into Oregon’s transportation planning and programming efforts. Especially important for the IMS will be consistency with modal plans and corridor planning efforts.

THE JPACT BRIEFING ON 9/14/95 WILL COVER ONLY THE FINDINGS OF THE INTERVIEWS THAT WERE CONDUCTED AS PART OF THIS PROJECT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Interview Type</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Union Pacific</td>
<td>Darryl Conrad, 2745 N. Interstate Ave, Portland, OR 97227 249-2418</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Greg Chiodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albina Yards</td>
<td>2. Southern Pacific</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Yards</td>
<td>Jack Gauthier, Terminal Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Burlington Northern</td>
<td>Read Fay, 1313 W 11th St., Vancouver 98660 (360) 418-6371</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal Hub</td>
<td>4. Portland Terminal Rail</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Dave Mathison, 3500 NW Yeon Ave, Portland 97210 241-9898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. T-6 Port of Portland</td>
<td>John Hachey, General Manager, Marine Operations (503) 731-2001</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Port Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hall Buck</td>
<td>Brad Clinefelter, Terminal Manager; Wanda McCaeney, Rail Car Coordinator (503) 285-2990</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293-3333</td>
<td>9. Lakeside Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonestar NW</td>
<td>Gary Madson, 931 N. River St., Portland 97227</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Toyota</td>
<td>Mgr. Richard Alvarez 10400 N Lombard St., 97203 286-5881</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>VZM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Evergreen</td>
<td>Philip Wong, 111 SW 5th Ave., Ste. 1050, 97204. Phone (503) 243-540</td>
<td>VZM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Tokai Line</td>
<td>Capt. Nojima, 10805 Holder St., Ste. 220, Cypress, CA 90630. Phone (714) 229-3484</td>
<td>VZM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. IMT Line</td>
<td>Phillip Orchard, NW Sales Mgr. 1750 NW Front Ave., Ste 104, Portland, 97209. Phone 227-2101</td>
<td>VZM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Romar</td>
<td>Pete Manson, VP 240-7115, Dan DePaola, Transportation Mgr. 9333 N Time Oil Rd., Portland, OR 97203 286-3259</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Morgan</td>
<td>Ken Michalek, 12220 N. Portland Rd., OR 97217 289-3808</td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tidewater Barge Lines</td>
<td>Skip Hart, 6 Beach Dr. Vancouver, WA 98661. Phone (503)281-0081</td>
<td>VZM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Delta Airlines</td>
<td>Erik Fugllov, Cargo Mkt'g Mgr. 249-4064</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Emery World Wide</td>
<td>Mary Taylor, Sales Mgr 7790 NE Airport Way, Portland, 97218 288-9550</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Yellow Freight System</td>
<td>Jerry Martin, Terminal Mgr. 735-2233</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Consolidated Freightways</td>
<td>John Klavano, Terminal Mgr. 286-4002</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. TNT Reddaway Truck Line</td>
<td>Ted Kinoshita, Terminal Mgr. 12250 SE Ford St. Clackamas, OR 97015 557-6200</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Fred Meyers</td>
<td>Mike Bletko, PO Box 42121 Portland, 97242 557-2409</td>
<td>Port Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Payless</td>
<td>Ken Giering, Traffic/Trans. Mgr., 9275 SW Peyton Ln, Willsonville, OR 97070 685-6042</td>
<td>Port Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Freightliner</td>
<td>Forrest Abel, Mgr. Traffic Analysis/Negotiation 735-3849</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Warn Industries</td>
<td>Dropped from process</td>
<td>Port Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Focus Systems Inc.</td>
<td>Dropped from process</td>
<td>Port Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. UPS</td>
<td>Ron Correnti, Rich Boehm</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Oregon Transfer Co</td>
<td>Gary Eichmann, PO Box 2804, Portland, OR 97208 653-2660</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Rudie Wilhelm Warehouse</td>
<td>Norm Unrein, Vice President Finance and Traffic</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Chevron USA -- Willbridge Plant Pier</td>
<td>Jerry Holms, Terminal Mgr. 221-7714</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Unocal -- Portland Terminal Wharf</td>
<td>Peter Schneiders, Mgr. of NW Op. 5528 NW Doane Ave, Portland, OR 97210 (503) 248-1530</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Interview Type</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Union Pacific Yard -- Hinkle</td>
<td>Jim Nave, 2745 N. Interstate Ave., Portland 97227-1607, 249-9678</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Port of Coos Bay</td>
<td>Allen Rumbaugh, Dir., PO Box 1215, Coos Bay, OR 97420 Martin Callery (503) 267-7678</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Greg Chiodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Port of Morrow</td>
<td>Kent Goodyear, Ass. Dir., PO Box 200. 1 Marine Dr, Boardman. OR 97818 (503) 481-7678</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Greg Chiodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pendleton Grain Growers</td>
<td>Bill Caplinger, Grain Div. Mgr., PO Box 1248, Pendleton, OR 97801 (503) 276-7611</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Greg Chiodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cargill</td>
<td>Fred Oelschlager, Sector Mgr., PO Box 761, Pasco, WA 99301 (509) 547-2461</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Greg Chiodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Glen Brook Nickel -- Coos Bay</td>
<td>Art Schweizer, VP/Gen. Mgr., PO Box 85, Riddle, OR 97469 (503) 824-3171</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cascade Warehouse -- Salem</td>
<td>Possibly in Group Interview with MPO</td>
<td>Group Interview</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Timber Products Company -- Medford</td>
<td>Greg Quimby, Transportation Mgr. (503) 747-4577</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A &amp; M Reload -- Eugene</td>
<td>Brad Ashberry, Owner (503) 686-2610</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. WL May</td>
<td>David Daniels, Exec. Vice President</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. JB Hunt</td>
<td>Tammy Mumm, Portland Fleet Manager</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Roadway/RPS</td>
<td>Nolan Mecuwsen, Relay Manager</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Willamette &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>Bob Melbo, General Manager (503) 924-6560</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Bill Burgel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Les Schwab</td>
<td>Mike Ervin, Distribution Mgr.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. JR Simplot</td>
<td>Terry Threfall, NW Regional Transportation Mgr., P.O. Box 850 Hermiston, OR</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Gene Leverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Longview Fibre</td>
<td>Ivan Olson, VP Trans., End of Fibre Way, Longview, WA 98362 (360) 425-1550</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Greg Chiodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Weyerhauser</td>
<td>Bill Brazelton, Mktg. Mgr, CH3H35, Tacoma, WA 98477 (206) 924-2775</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Greg Chiodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Unocal Dock -- Coos Bay</td>
<td>Marv Nicholson, Terminal Mgr., PO Box 630 (2395 Bayshore Dr.) Coos Bay, OR 97420</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Greg Chiodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sante Fe Pipeline -- Albany &amp; Eugene</td>
<td>Sid Carr, Area Supervisor P.O. Box 2533, Eugene, OR 97402</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Greg Chiodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Name</td>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Interview Type</td>
<td>Interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Portland International Airport</td>
<td>Oscar Cuoto, Manager Air Cargo 7000 NE Airport Way Portland, OR 97218</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Port Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Eugene Airport</td>
<td>Ann Crook, Operations Analyst, 28855 Lockheed Dr., Eugene, OR 97402</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rogue Valley International Airport</td>
<td>Beerne Scase, 3650 Biddle Rd., Medford, OR, 97504</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Klamath Falls Airport</td>
<td>Jerry Zimmer, Airport Mgr. 6801 Rand Way, Klamath Falls, OR, 97603</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pendleton Airport</td>
<td>Larry Dalrymple, Airport Mgr. 2016 Airport Rd., Pendleton, OR 97801</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. North Bend Airport</td>
<td>Ron Stillmaker, Airport Mgr., PO Box B, N. Bend, OR 97459</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Redmond Airport</td>
<td>Carrie Novick, Airport Mng. PO Box 726, Redmond, OR 97756</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Greyhound</td>
<td>Jim Camp, District Mgr. 550 NW 5th Ave., Portland, OR 97209</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Valley Retriever</td>
<td>Dennis Dick 956 SW 10th St. Newport, OR 97365</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Chris Deftebach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Amtrak</td>
<td>Tony Buscemi, 800 NW 6th St., Portland, OR 97209 (503) 273-4860</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Chris Deftebach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. United Airlines</td>
<td>Charlie Dunwebber, Station Manager 7000 NE Airport Way Portland, OR 97218</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Chris Deftebach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Horizon Airlines</td>
<td>Gloria Kowalski, PO Box 48309, Seattle, WA 89148</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Name</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Interview Type</td>
<td>Interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. IMS Passenger Task Force</td>
<td>Art Poole, 1450 Evergreen Dr., Coos Bay, OR 97420 (503) 396-3121</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Chris Deffebach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Medford Area Transportation Advocates</td>
<td>Jennifer Lee, 155 S. 2nd St., PO Box 3275, Central Point, OR 97502 (503) 664-6674</td>
<td>Not complete</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Region officers of the Oregon Economic Development Department</td>
<td>Keith Leavitt, 775 Sumner St. NE, Salem, OR 97310 (503) 986-0143</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Chris Deffebach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goods Movement Advisory Committee of the Mid Willamette Valley COG</td>
<td>Barry Hennelly, 105 High St., Salem, OR 97301 (503) 588-6177</td>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>Jeanne Lawson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Port Shipper Meeting Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>May 22/July 6, 10, 11</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Air Express</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97218</td>
<td>Paul Pfeifer</td>
<td>284-3298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danzas Corp.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Bob Miller</td>
<td>256-5204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon Fast Freight</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97077</td>
<td>Fred Ray</td>
<td>682-0462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery Worldwide</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97218</td>
<td>Mary Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expeditors International</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Scott Pietrok</td>
<td>254-3707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Express</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97218</td>
<td>John Shanky</td>
<td>280-8422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Meyer</td>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97242</td>
<td>Ann Wyatt</td>
<td>650-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz Companies</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97230</td>
<td>Jim Bailey</td>
<td>251-2230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George S. Bush Co.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Lon Conner</td>
<td>228-6501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97211</td>
<td>Jack Rock</td>
<td>696-3391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Dispatch</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97232</td>
<td>Mike Robertson</td>
<td>285-4251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Freight Systems</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97222</td>
<td>Bill Woodward</td>
<td>223-9136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertrans</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Dave Palmer</td>
<td>257-9486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inway Landstar</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97203</td>
<td>Duane Fritz</td>
<td>285-1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet Delivery Service</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Lee Johnson</td>
<td>256-3682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamino World Transport</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Bob Henry</td>
<td>257-7584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manna Pro/Land O'Lakes</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97203</td>
<td>Randy Rugg</td>
<td>286-7179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 7 Delivery Service</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Bruce Kangas</td>
<td>255-3636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Transport</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Brian Fitzgerald</td>
<td>283-2405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nations Way Transport Service</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97217</td>
<td>Ken Harmon</td>
<td>285-3050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97203</td>
<td>Chrish Rugsdt</td>
<td>648-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Warehousing</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97203</td>
<td>Gary Belles</td>
<td>299-7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Air Cargo Assoc.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Greg Smith</td>
<td>284-9051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Castparts</td>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>777-3881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romar Transportation</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97203</td>
<td>Peter Manson</td>
<td>286-3259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider National</td>
<td>Wilsonville</td>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>97077</td>
<td>Paul Gianotti</td>
<td>598-8494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequent Computer Systems</td>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Karen McMahon</td>
<td>626-4520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smurfit Newprint</td>
<td>Oregon City</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Karen O'Keefe</td>
<td>650-2444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tektronix</td>
<td>Beavon</td>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>97077</td>
<td>John Moore</td>
<td>627-1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Airlines</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97220</td>
<td>Sally Alkzian</td>
<td>249-4305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanport Manufacturing</td>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>97009</td>
<td>Wayne geist</td>
<td>663-2610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur Ellis Co.</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>97210</td>
<td>Al Zimmer</td>
<td>227-2661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Businesses Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freightliner Corporation</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Forrest Abel</td>
<td>735-8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warn Industries</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>Bryan Vtsbinder</td>
<td>669-8750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intermodal Management System
Project Update

TPAC Briefing: August 25, 1995

Stakeholder Interviews

- 80 interviews
- Statewide (about 50% Portland)
  - Rail yard and container facility operators
  - Bulk facility operators
  - Auto loading facility operators
  - Freight handling companies
  - Truck line/barge line/air cargo operators
  - Large freight generators
  - Passenger service (bus, train, air) operators
Port Shipper Survey

- 34 businesses involved in freight movement
  - Manufacturers
  - Freight forwarders
  - Drayage haulers
  - Distributors
  - Warehousers
  - Carriers
  - Integrated Carriers

Interview Findings

- Key factors affecting intermodal facility and freight mobility performance:
  - Time
  - Reliability
  - Safety
  - Cost
  - Connectivity
Interview Findings (continued)

- Needs were identified in relation to:
  - Operations deficiencies
  - Policy/regulatory issues
  - Infrastructure
- Study focus is on infrastructure
  - Major driver of other factors
  - Best opportunity for public sector intervention
- Consideration of both passenger and freight needs

Passenger Needs/Suggested Solutions
Seamless Transfers

◆ Needs:
  – Air, rail and city bus services to connect smoothly and frequently
  – Ticketing/baggage services to support intermodal transfers
  – Rail and bus stations to be closer
  – Facilities that promote intermodal mass transit at PDX

Seamless Transfers (Continued)

◆ Suggested solutions:
  – Co-locate rail and bus stations, and air terminals to extent possible
  – Facilitate connection to mass transit at PDX
  – Provide “managed” stations/terminals with shared common areas and costs
  – Provide adequate parking areas
  – Provide through ticketing for all intermodal carriers
Seamless Transfers (Continued)

- Develop agreements to handle baggage from one mode/carrier to another
- Coordinate schedules of intermodal carriers

Improved Passenger Station Security and Parking

◆ Suggested solutions:
  - Area revitalization and station “image” projects
Improved Access to Passenger Facilities

◆ Suggested solutions:
  - Joint planning between carriers and state/local planners (siting, design, etc.)
  - Locate hubs to avoid out-of-direction travel to and from mainlines
  - 30 minute parking zones and drop off points near bus stations

Improved Communication

◆ Suggested solutions:
  - Improve schedule coordination among carriers to help customers to make connections
  - Enable consumers to get schedule/cost information for all modes in one place
  - Make information about intermodal opportunities available at passenger stations
Freight Problems/Suggested Solutions

Stakeholder Perspectives

• Market pressure to reduce cost and improve reliability

• Freight generators:
  – Require reliable transportation to succeed

• Transportation providers:
  – Increase number of “turns” per day
  – Increase throughput
  – Reduce miles traveled
Location Patterns Affect System Performance

- Transportation providers, consolidators, and major intermodal facilities are located in northern metro area
- Economic vitality of entire metro area depends on efficiency of transportation access to this portion of the area

Freight Movement Diagram

[Diagram showing connections between Local Distribution, Terminals, Consolidation Facilities, Shippers, and Out of Region]
Types of Transportation
Problems Identified

- Congestion
- Inadequate geometrics
- Limited access to facilities

Congestion

- Causes delays, reductions in productivity
- Limits truckers ability to meet cut-off times
- Encourages circuitous travel, sometimes on non-designated routes
- Suggested solutions:
  - Provide new central eastside access to I-5
  - Provide freight lanes on I-5, I-84, U.S. 26 and I-205
  - Connect I-5 at Columbia Blvd. with Lombard around 10th
Congestion (Continued)

- Develop interchange with no signals at I-205/212
- Faster accident removal
- Groove pavement, reduce speeds on I-5 Terwilliger curves
- Increase ramp metering
- Create east-west highway to take pressure off I-84 and Highway 26
- Retime signals to facilitate east-west movement on Lombard between I-5 and 33rd

Congestion (Continued)

- Extend 224 east to reduce reliance on I-205
- Eliminate bottleneck on I-5 between Slough Bridge and Lombard
- Allow triple trailers on Tualatin Sherwood, Highway 42, and Highway 6
- Retime signals on MLK Blvd. for loaded truck progression
Limited Roadway Geometrics for Truck Movements

◆ Suggested solutions:
  – Widen turning radius from Ross Island Bridge to Arthur Street
  – Widen curve radius on I-5 at Terwilliger curves
  – Widen turning radius from MLK Blvd. to Lombard

Roadway Geometrics (Continued)

  – Improve signal progression on Columbia Blvd. and McLoughlin
  – Widen turning radius across St. John's Bridge for access from BN Hub to T-6
  – Improve geometrics on NE Marine Drive and on interchange to I-5 northbound
Limited Capacity at T-6

- Limited hours of operation (especially lunch break)
- Insufficient berthing space, crane size and availability for barges
- Inadequate channel depth
- Delays in processing containers
- Inconvenient cut-off times

(Continued)

- Suggested solutions:
  - Extend hours of operation/add personnel
  - Improve coordination between Port and RR operations
  - Retrofit or replace cranes
  - Permit to dredge 43’ minimum
  - New technologies for gate and dock operations
  - Turn lanes and signal at Marine Drive/T-6 intersection
Inadequate PDX Access

- Poor access/internal circulation at north air cargo area
- Inadequate capacity/internal circulation at south air cargo complex
- Poor access to AirTrans via Cornfoot and Alderwood

Suggested solutions:
- Improve cargo loading space/equipment
- Provide signal at Alderwood and Columbia

Inadequate Rivergate Access

- Lack of access by SP to T-6
- BN delays to UP at North Portland Junction and on Seattle mainline
- Switching delays and interchange problems

Suggested solutions:
- Regional rail coordination
- Improve direct mainline access to T-6 for SP and UP
Restricted South-North Rail
(Portland to Tacoma)

- BN/UP operating agreement results in delays in T-6 access
- Amtrak schedules adversely impact services
- Suggested solutions:
  - Provide additional north-south tracks between Portland and Tacoma
  - Establish common use corridor to limit user restrictions
  - Remove passenger traffic from freight corridor

Inadequate Intermodal Yard Access (SP, BN, UP)

- Tight turning radii
- Delays for left turns into yards
- Limited roadway capacity on access roads
- Limited storage space and railroad track length within yards
- Delays in movements between yards
Inadequate Intermodal Yard Access (Continued)

◆ Suggested solutions:
  - Change access to Brooklyn Yard from McLoughlin and Holgate
  - Eliminate on-street parking near Brooklyn Yard to facilitate truck turns
  - Provide new signal at Yeon for left turns from BN Hub yard
  - Provide new traffic signal for left turns to UP
  - Construct internal yard improvements

At-Grade Rail Crossing Barriers

◆ Affects truck routings in SE Portland
◆ Suggested solutions:
  - Close at-grade railroad crossings in SE Portland, including Macrum Road at entrance to Barnes Yard and Randolph Street at entrance to Albina Yard
Next Steps

- Database development
- Need identification procedures
- Need ranking procedures
- High priority, short-term needs
- Proposed solutions for those needs
To: JPACT Members and Interested Parties
From: Andrew C. Cotugno, TPAC Chair
Subject: Region 2040 Concept Map Revisions

On August 25, TPAC considered the attached package of revisions to the December 8, 1994 Region 2040 Growth Concept map and RUGGOs. TPAC recommends that they be endorsed by JPACT for Council approval. The recommended revisions are as follows:

Attachment A Executive Officer recommendation to the Metro Council.

Attachment B Proposed transportation-oriented revisions to the Growth Concept map: these revisions reflect the final round of comments received from local jurisdictions and other agencies over the past few months regarding transportation facilities and land use elements that are particularly tied to transportation (i.e., main streets, corridors).

Attachment C Proposed growth management-oriented revisions to the Growth Concept map: these revisions also reflect comments from local jurisdictions and other agencies regarding all other aspects of the concept map. These revisions are being reviewed by MPAC.

Attachment D Proposed additional RUGGO and 2040 Map amendments recommended by TPAC.

Attachment E Proposed additional 2040 Map amendments recommended by MTAC to MPAC.

Attachment F Engrossed RUGGO amendments: this attached document shows revisions to the December 8, 1994 RUGGO language, with proposed additions highlighted and deletions shown with a strikethru.

Attachment G Revised 2040 Growth Concept map: an updated version of the December 8, 1994 map that reflects the revisions detailed in Attachments A and B was provided to local jurisdictions through their TPAC representative; additional copies will be available at the JPACT meeting, or by request.

In addition, TPAC recommends that the work program for the next phase of the Framework Plan include development of an infrastructure policy that would guide capital improvements within phased expansion areas of the Urban Growth Boundary and for Urban Reserves.
September 7, 1995
Executive Officer recommendations to the Metro Council

Introduction

Since 1992 Metro has led the region -- indeed the nation -- on a quest for a commitment to community that maintains and enhances the quality of life in the face of a growing population.

In that quest Metro has worked closely with the people and their elected representatives in achieving consensus on the values and visions we cherish and for using those values when deciding how to use our land.

As Councilors you are very familiar with the often difficult decisions that must be made to carry out an innovative strategy that no other government has even attempted. And now you are setting the course for the next important steps that will make that innovative strategy become a reality.

Setting the stage

As you know, within two weeks MPAC (Metro Policy Advisory Committee) and JPACT (Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation) will forward to you their recommendations for adopting the 2040 growth concept and revised RUGGO's. The region has been working with great success to arrive at consensus on a growth concept, and we have much of which we can be proud.

I strongly believe it is essential that we move to implement the growth concept as soon as possible. There are two new and important reasons for this. The first is the incredible rate of population growth we are seeing in this region. Every day 75 more people are living here. During the last four years an additional 110,000 people are living in the four-county area. Every day that we delay implementing the growth concept we are foregoing options and losing control of our future.

A second major reason is the passage of House Bill 2709. This recently-passed bill requires that when amending the urban growth boundary, instead of using the last 20 years to determine housing market projections, Metro must use the “immediate past history” (defined as the last five years). Using the last five years would force us to add 26,000 acres to the UGB if it were amended under currently adopted plans and policies. To prevent that sprawling expansion, we must demonstrate the adopted plans and policies that will alter the pattern of the past five
years' consumption of land. We can do this through early implementation of the land-use elements of the growth concept.

That means we should implement, as soon as possible, the land-use elements of the Regional Framework Plan. Specifically, we should adopt urban reserves and a 2015 urban growth boundary. Even more important than drawing lines on a map, however, is making comprehensive changes in the way growth is managed inside the boundary today. This is critical for increasing the efficiency of the way we use our land, and preserving -- even enhancing -- our livability.

Initial Steps

For the Council to move forward with this adoption there are three key decisions that must be made. While we can provide you with the technical work, in the final analysis the Council faces three specific policy decisions to be made. The three key decisions I recommend are:

1. The Council should adopt official population, housing and employment forecasts. These form the basis for all the other work that needs to be done. We soon will be able to present to you our most comprehensive forecasts for the years 2015 and 2040.

2. The Council should adopt a housing needs analysis, as required by state law. This analysis involves looking at the 2015 population forecasts, projecting how many households will be coming and what income levels those households are likely to have. Next we will project the rent or purchase price those households can afford to pay. Finally, that information will be converted to housing types appropriate to the income levels of the people in this region. This data can be presented to you at the same time as the population forecast.

3. The Council should adopt the official buildable land inventory for the region. As you know, we have an excellent method for analyzing the buildable land inventory. We are in that process now. We will prepare a report on the buildable lands inventory that you should review and adopt, after hearing public comment.

These three policy decisions will project the housing types needed for the region and the land that is needed to build them. The next step is the most difficult and most challenging.

The challenge and how we can meet it

The next step is taking these identified needs and finding a way to respond to them using the land that is currently available. HB 2709 lists the options that are available to us to meet these needs. The options that are identified in HB 2709, are exactly what we need to implement the growth concepts. They include:

- Increases in the permitted density on existing residential land
- Financial incentives for higher density housing
• Provisions permitting additional density beyond that generally allowed in the zoning district in exchange for amenities and features provided by the developer
• Removal or easing of approval standards or procedures
• Minimum density ranges
• Redevelopment and infill strategies
• Authorization of housing types not previously allowed by the plan or regulations
• Adoption of an average residential density standard

Additionally, there are other actions to create a greater efficiency of land that have been discussed among Metro and its local partners and the public throughout the Region 2040 process. They include:

• **Reduce average new lot size from 8,000 square feet to 6,000 square feet.** This is the most important action we can take to dramatically affect the rate of our land consumption.

• **Increase the number of “town house” types of developments.** This section of the housing market could immediately jump from 5 percent to 10 percent. The market demand exceeds the supply but the zoning, permitting and ability to build these types of housing need to be put into place throughout the region.

• **Locate new multi-family residential development in areas that are pedestrian-friendly and have easy access to transit.** There already is enough multi-family development to meet the goals of 2040 -- the problem is that their location is not always conducive to pedestrian and transit access.

• **There must be increased incentives to build more mixed-use developments.** Mixed use does not have to be residential stacked on top of retail; it can be any kind of combination of uses within a short walking distance. It is one of the most efficient ways to decrease parking, increase pedestrian traffic, reduce single trip vehicle miles traveled, and revitalize neighborhoods.

• **Even with all the changes that have been proposed in the 2040 growth concept, 70 percent of existing neighborhoods will remain relatively unchanged from the way they are today.**

I am confident that these measures can be undertaken and implemented. There is demonstrated support for the concepts in 2040 from the public, local governments and the business and development community. I am greatly encouraged by the market trends towards “2040” types of developments already occurring in every corner of the region.

Some of those examples from throughout the region include:

*Pac Trust’s Orenco Plan*
This is a master planned mixed-use community that has gained local government and private support. Traditionally this area would have been developed into sprawling single family and business park areas. This community in Washington County, however, is committed to doing it differently. The area is located between the new westside light rail and the new Intel plant. This is a prime example of how public dollars can be leveraged in the private sector to benefit the whole community -- and make business work better and more efficiently.

**Gresham Civic Neighborhood**
This area is being redeveloped using a combination of private and public investment. Already the city and developers have reached agreement about improvements that will be made in this neighborhood community, including a pedestrian-oriented development with a highly innovative mixed-use plan designed around a transit center.

**Hillsboro**
Hillsboro has been a leader in “station community planning,” in which areas around light rail stations are planned so that they fulfill many of the needs people have in their daily lives. Focusing on a half-mile area around planned stations, Hillsboro’s planners, community leaders and citizens are rewriting codes and setting new design standards. Those standards will promote walking, bicycling and transit use rather than use of the car and will provide residential, shopping and recreational opportunities for people who use light rail.

**Portland**
The city of Portland’s City Life project is a model of how to make urban compactness attractive and desirable to a considerable portion of the housing market. City Light includes 18 owner-occupied residences -- 10 courtyard homes, six rowhouses and a duplex -- that are set within one city block. The key to the project’s success was ensuring that the homes were well-designed and attractive.

These are just a few examples of regional success stories. Still, there will be skeptics. Many were skeptical that we could adopt a growth concept. I’m happy to say that this region has proved them wrong. And I believe we will prove them wrong again.

**The Goal**

There had been a time when I had hoped for no expansion of the urban growth boundary. Certainly under the previous forecast (1990 census data) this was a conceivable option. However, our new population forecasts, coupled with the requirements of HB 2709, make it difficult to realistically expect that we can continue to manage growth in this region and meet state law without some expansion of the urban growth boundary. I want that expansion to be as minimal as possible.

Several real factors, however, complicate matters: the length of time to fully implement 2040, the aspects of “under build” in the region, and farm assessed property within the urban growth boundary.
• The length of time to fully implement the concepts of 2040 is a variable that will affect the final outcome of needed land. Local governments are here to tell you that they are, in many cases, already implementing aspects of 2040. Undoubtedly many new activities need to be initiated to fully implement the growth concept. But to assume that all jurisdictions can make necessary code or zone changes overnight is unrealistic.

• The issue of “under build” throughout the region is a highly debatable factor. There is some land that — due to the history of our current zoning code requirements, established platting patterns, or environmental and natural area exclusions — simply cannot be developed. In addition, HB 2709 specifically excludes certain slopes and natural areas from being counted in the inventory. I firmly recommend that if we cannot count the land because of environmental issues or slopes, we cannot build on it.

• And finally there is the question of farm-assessed properties. As you are well aware, there are approximately 13,000 acres presently within the urban growth boundary that are farm-assessed. Some of these are privately held working farms or nurseries that add value to our community both aesthetically and economically. Farming in the three counties contributes $426 million in gross farm sales. In addition, the region accounts for 42 percent of the value-added food processing for the entire state. Technically they are zoned for purposes other than farming and could be accounted for as “buildable”. When they actually become available is another question, and some may never be converted. If 20 percent of existing farm lands are preserved it would have an effect on the urban growth boundary of about 2,600 acres.

Even with these factors in mind, I believe we can realistically meet the requirements of HB 2709 with an urban growth boundary expansion between 4,000 and 9,000 acres. That represents only a 2 - 4 percent expansion of the boundary. Based on current market trends and the willingness of local governments to implement these concepts, I believe that is an achievable goal. However, we should not “pick” a final number until all these issues have been thoroughly analyzed, debated and resolved.

A 2 - 4 percent expansion represents enough land to accommodate a vastly increased population base to the year 2015. As we move forward in examining the final data, we may find that we can do better than a 4,000 - 9,000-acre expansion. But regardless of the expansion acreage, we must be guided by the goals and values which are firmly established in this region.

I believe we can reach a number in that range, or even less, if we work with local governments, the development community and our citizens to vigorously implement the 2040 growth concept.
That will not be easy. There are some who believe that we can somehow just stop growth. Others simply do not understand -- or have misinterpreted -- the growth concepts. I believe, though, that there are many more Oregonians in this region who would rather make the difficult but critical decisions that ultimately will benefit us all.

We can look to other metropolitan areas that have failed to make the difficult livability decisions. In Phoenix the present consumption of land has been one acre an hour. The city of Chicago has had no net increase in population, while the size of that city has expanded by 40 percent. Even in our region we have been consuming more than 1,000 acres a year.

While numbers are interesting and tend to dominate the discussion it is the concepts that should drive the debate.

I believe that my recommendations are entirely feasible. I fully expect to be successful in our goal to begin implementing the land-use elements of the 2040 growth concept in six months. I hope that a few months from now we will have a list that includes specific measures from every local government in this region that describe how they can -- and perhaps already are -- making sure it is implemented effectively and quickly.

**Urban Reserves**

Along with determining how many acres of land we should add to the urban growth boundary, we need also to determine how many acres of land should be included in the urban reserves -- our long-term land supply. These two determinations are closely linked.

If the decision is made that our UGB needs are small, a smaller urban reserve will follow. If we accept 26,000 acres as our urban growth boundary, our urban reserve needs will escalate to 60,000 or more. We have been examining the urban reserve study areas, and it is clear that we have two categories of land: areas that clearly should be included in urban reserves and areas that are more doubtful.

I recommend that you include within the urban reserves those areas that can be urbanized, that the remainder be held over for further study, and that some new potential areas be added for comparison. A major consideration in all potential areas is that we learn more about the costs and consequences of their development.

**The link between transportation and land use**

An important component of our future livability is transportation mobility. The Regional Transportation Plan provides a full range of transportation systems needed to support the 2040 growth concept. Land use and transportation decisions are inextricably linked -- whether that means building light rail to focus growth in centers and corridors, or providing truck and freight access to industrial areas. It also means being able to move around conveniently and safely within neighborhoods and to ensure that access into and out of the region is efficient.
We need to invest in our transportation system -- both to help make the 2040 land-use pattern occur and to carry the resulting travel flow. We should target our transportation investments to leverage higher levels of employment in downtown Portland, in regional centers and around light rail stations. We should make all of these areas pedestrian and transit friendly to reduce the level of traffic growth that otherwise would accompany a more compact urban area. We also should build the needed roads to accommodate more traffic throughout the region and move freight, and we should make it safer and more convenient so that people can choose to bike or take transit rather than being forced to drive everywhere.

Regional standards

Perhaps no greater point should be made than the importance of using and adhering to Region 2040 as a standard by which all other regional decisions are made. Regardless of the number of acres added to expand the boundary, we must ensure that their development achieves the goals of the growth concept. I propose that once we decide on specific areas, they not be annexed to the UGB until there has been thorough master planning for land use and transportation mobility, that schools sites and parks be identified, that open spaces be protected, and that generally we be assured that the goals of the growth concept can be realized. Clearly expansion on farm and forest land must be avoided if at all possible.

We have many tools to use for early implementation of 2040, and we need to ensure that all of our resources are brought to bear. Every program at Metro will be scrutinized for how it potentially could affect land-use decisions. The growth concept must be a regional standard by which all other decisions are based. For example, our transportation systems should focus on areas that are key to increasing the efficiency of using our land, fostering compact urban development and ensuring mobility for people and freight. All Metro sponsored transportation projects should be consistent with the 2040 growth concept. Transportation funding in all cases should facilitate rather than detract from the growth concept objectives.

As another example, the open space funds approved by the region's voters must complement the goals of 2040. Open space acquisitions should be made to offset the adverse impacts of accommodating growth and to ensure that regional parks and natural areas are distributed throughout the communities and where significant growth is expected.

Conclusion

In summary, these are the four specific recommendations that I would ask the council to consider as soon as possible.

• Adopt the growth concept and RUGGOs.
• Establish a process for the adoption of population forecasts, housing needs analysis, and the buildable lands inventory.
• Develop a list of measures to ensure we've done our absolute best to limit the expansion of the urban growth boundary.
• Adopt the urban reserves and amend the urban growth boundary.

The work that has been done throughout the region by the Metro Council, local governments and citizens has been evolving for several years. Everyone involved must be commended for bringing us to the point where we are today.

I strongly urge everyone in this region to keep the debate about the UGB expansion numbers to a minimum. We instead should focus our collective energy and commitment on the measures to reduce an urban growth boundary expansion. Without those measures, we’re looking at a dismal scene ... and the most prominent feature in that scene is 26,000 acres of reduced livability. We have a long way to go, but I’m confident we can get there.

What stands today before this Council and this region is a clear choice ... to do what has never been done before in this country ... or to fall into the abyss that every other metropolitan area has faced when confronted with the issues of growth. I say that we fiercely fight to protect what makes this place so unique.
OVERVIEW OF HB 2709

Requires provision of 20 year supply of buildable land within urban growth boundary (UGB) at next periodic review.

Clarifies buildable land includes both vacant and developed land likely to be redeveloped.

Requires inventory of supply of buildable land and analysis of needed housing by type and density.

Requires a local government (or in this case Metro) that finds it does not have sufficient buildable land for 20 years based on immediate past experience:
- to amend UGB to include sufficient buildable land; or
- amend comprehensive plan, functional plan or land use regulations to include measures to increase likelihood that the land supply will be sufficient; or
- adopt a combination of these two measures.

Provides examples of actions or measures, such as:
- Increases in the permitted density on existing residential land;
- Financial incentives for higher density housing;
- Provisions permitting additional density beyond that generally allowed in the zoning district in exchange for amenities and features provided by the developer;
- Removal or easing of approval standards or procedures;
- Minimum density ranges;
- Redevelopment and infill strategies;
- Authorization of housing types not previously allowed by the plan or regulations; and
- Adoption of an average residential density standard.

Provides priorities for including land in UGB if insufficient land available, starting with urban reserves. If reserves are inadequate, then land adjacent to UGB acknowledged in comprehensive plan as exception or non-resource. Then, marginal land followed by ag-forest, or both.

Requires coordinating body to establish and maintain population forecast for entire area within its boundary.

“Right to farm” continues to exist if farm land incorporated into UGB until a change to a nonfarm use.
Clackamas County (also see #15, 16 and 36)

3. Revise the 82nd Drive to be shown as a Corridor from I-205 and Hwy 224 to Gladstone city limits

Washington County

5. 221/234th Corridor removed

6. Evergreen/Brookwood Corridor removed.

8. Bethany Corridor relocated to Springville Road.

9. Delete Mainstreets (but not Corridors) on Farmington Road, west of Murray Blvd.

11. Delete Corridors (but not Mainstreets) on Oleson Road. (This is a change to the July 1995 map and leaving the December 8 map as is)

Cornelius

13. The Main street should be shown over the Potential Light Rail alignment along Hwy 8.

Damascus Area

16. Corridor alignment in Damascus Urban Reserve Study area changed from Foster Road to 172nd. (Location not meant to be specific at this time.)

Forest Grove


Gladstone

21. Removed nodes along proposed LRT alignment at Johnson City and Gladstone.

Hillsboro

24. The Light Rail station locations are not correct. Delete the LRT stations at 10th, 18th and 25th Avenues. Add a station at 12th Avenue. Move the Orenco and Elam Young Parkway stations to the west.

28. Delete the Main street on 206th Avenue north of the LRT station. (The Main Street along Cornell Road in this vicinity is under study and could be moved at a later date)

30. Main Street added to Hillsboro Town Center.

31. Evergreen/Brookwood Corridor removed.
Maywood Park
35. Moved Main Street north of Maywood Park.

Portland
37. Delete Mainstreet on 42nd Avenue
38. Add Mainstreet on Fremont between 40th and 50th streets.
41. A Corridor was added on Johnson Creek Boulevard east of 45th Avenue.
42. Addition of Marine Terminal T-6 near Hayden Island.
43. Add Main Street designation to parts of Lombard.
45. Add Corridor and Main Street on Alberta.
46. Remove Corridor from Prescott.
47. Add Main Street of Fremont from 41st Avenue to 52nd Avenue.
48. Add Main Street of Thurman from 23rd Avenue to 29th Avenue.

Sherwood
55. Addition of two Main Streets in Sherwood.

Tigard
56. Delete corridor along Hunziker Street

Tualatin
71. Corridor along Boones Ferry south of Tualatin Town Center removed.
72. The potential High Capacity Transit alignment at the south end of Tualatin has been rerouted.

Vancouver, Clark County
75. Change map legend “Potential HCT lines facilities”.
76. Add potential HCT along I-205 from I-5 south to the Gateway area in Portland.
77. Revise the potential HCT on SR 500 from I-5 to St. Johns Road instead of the alignment show along Ft. Vancouver way.
78. Revise the LRT alignment from Mill Plain Blvd to McLoughlin Blvd and then westward to I-5 and delete stations along Main.
79. Delete the station at I-5/Burnt Bridge Creek/Hwy 99 location.
80. Add LRT stations along I-5 at 78th, 88th and 99th streets.

**Port of Portland**

88. Show the new complete alignment of roads which serve Port properties and which loop around Smith and Bybee Lakes. Remove Reeder Road in Sauvie Island.

**ODOT**

89. Change the way that regional highways are shown on the map. First, call them "Proposed Regional Throughways" and have them look more conceptual than actual alignments.

90. Revise the alignment of the railroads to reflect the actual location of the mainlines.

**Metro Greenspaces**

92. Recognize that some regionally significant natural areas and trails are located within proposed or planned Highway or light rail alignments. Maintaining connections between open spaces and identifying opportunities for trail development are high priorities in creating a regional greenspaces system. For example, the Boring Lava Domes (#3), are located on either side of the Sunrise Corridor. Other significant natural areas and trail systems include, but are not limited to: Rock/Sieben Creek, (#42), Deep Creek Canyon (#15), Bluffs Trail (#15), Scouter Mountain Trail (#79), North Fork Trail (#72), Cazadero Line Trail (#62), Clackamas River Greenway (#87).

97. Incorporate the Metro Regional Trails Map.

100. Add Skyline Drive (street alignment) for a reference point.

**Metro**

101. q. Proposed language for inclusion in RUGGOs/Growth Concept at line 2226:

   The proposed throughways shown on the Growth Concept map are all under study at a corridor level. The indications on the map demonstrate the commitment to transportation access improvements between the beginning and ending points of the line shown. The map does not indicate an approved or preferred alignment. In some cases, a definitive corridor has not yet been developed. Once appropriate improvements have been identified and any alignment selected, amendments to the map will be required based on those decisions. If an improvement is located outside the adopted UGB, appropriate land use findings will be made at that time.

Following are the changes in the map from the Metro 2040 Growth Concept Map adopted by resolution by the Metro Council on December 8, 1994:

**Other General Map Changes**

102. Corridors were narrowed from 720 feet either side of a road centerline to 360 feet.

104. The nodes along Proposed Light Rail alignments were deleted. (Modeling will account for possible station areas, however)

106. Map legend was revised so that "Railyards" changed to "Intermodal Railyards."

*Attachment B
2040 Concept Map Amendments
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2040 Concept Map

Growth Management Amendments

Clackamas County (also see #15, 16 and 36)

1. Delete the Oak Grove town center.

2. Sunnyside Village should be changed from Outer Neighborhood to Inner Neighborhood.

4. Clackamas Town Center Regional Center should be moved slightly to straddle I-205.

Washington County

7. Bethany Town Center moved south.

10. Delete Opens space northwest of the Peterkort (Leaving December 8 Map as is) (further refinement should be done at the Analysis Map level when available)

Beaverton

12. Town Center at Farmington Road moved east.

Cornelius

14. There is a concern that there are not enough Urban Reserve Study Areas shown on the map and that there may be better locations than those now shown.

Damascus Area

15. Employment area added along Highway 212 in Damascus Urban Reserve Study Area.

Fairview

17. Fairview Town Center added.

Forest Grove

19. Forest Grove Town Center moved east.

Gladstone

20. The riverfront property in Gladstone downstream from the 99–E bridge, about 1 1/4 miles, is public park and should be so designated on the map.

Gresham

22. All Outer neighborhoods in Gresham were changed to Inner Neighborhoods.
Hillsboro

25. Do not show development in the approach zones of the Hillsboro Airport. Specifically between the Elam Young Parkway and the Fairgrounds LRT stations.

26. Change the Employment Area designation on Ronler Acres and Jones Farm Intel campuses to Industrial.

27. Change from Industrial Area to Employment Area a portion of the SW quadrant of the Sunset Highway/Cornelius Pass Road interchange.

29. There are issues which remain, but which are more appropriate to the Analysis Map discussion. These include: consistency with the Station Area Interim Protection Ordinance, airport clear zones, publicly owned sites, the specific location of the Tanasbourne Town Center and consistency with the city’s Airport Impact Zone.

Lake Grove

32. Lake Grove Town Center moved east.

Lake Oswego

33. Move Lake Grove Town Center from position centered on Boones Ferry and Kruse Way to position with the top of Town Center designation at the intersection (i.e., move it south).

34. Added Employment area to Kruse Way area.

Pleasant Valley Area

36. The Town Center on Foster has been relocated to the Foster, 172nd intersection.

Portland

39. The open space adjacent to Lents should be an employment area.

40. The small pockets of open space east of 122nd between Foster and Powell should be replaced with the Inner Neighborhood designation.

44. Add both Inner and Outer Neighborhoods near I-5 and Marine Drive.

Sherwood

49. Delete a small area of employment area in the extreme southwest corner of the UGB in Sherwood. This is developed as residential.

50. Delete an area of Industrial on the north side the UGB in Sherwood (outside the UGB)

51. Delete an area of Employment area on the north side of the UGB in Sherwood (outside the UGB). (This is a change to the July, 1995 map – the December 8, 1994 map is correct as adopted)

52. Open Space designation added to Sherwood.

53. Town Center designation added to Sherwood.
54. Inner and Outer neighborhoods have been reshaped in Sherwood.

Tigard

57. Delete Inner Neighborhood designation on land west of I-5, south of Hwy 217, east of 72nd Avenue and north of an extension of SW Tech Center Drive.

58. The Tigard Triangle was redesignated as an Employment Area.

Troutdale

59. Some Open Space had been removed from the Troutdale Town Center)

60. Inner Neighborhood has been added east of Beavercreek near Troutdale.

Tualatin

61. Confirm that the Town Center circle size and location are not intended to be specific, such as a zoning district, rather they are intended to be general.

62. The small rectangle of Inner Neighborhood to the west southwest of the Town Center circle, bounded by the arc of the circle on the east, the High Capacity Transit (HCT) Burlington Northern RR on the south, the blue Industrial Area designation on the west and Tualatin–Sherwood Road on the north, should be Industrial.

63. To the north of the small rectangle noted above, is a small square of Inner Neighborhood. This small square to the west northwest of the circle, bounded by the arc of the circle on the east, Tualatin–Sherwood Road on the south, blue Industrial Area on the west and Open Space on the north, should be Employment Area.

64. To the north of the small square noted above is a large area of Open Space. This area to the west northwest, northwest and north northwest of the circle, bounded by the arc of the circle on the east and the HCT Southern Pacific RR on the north should be Employment Area.

65. At the 1 o’clock position on the Town Center circle is a small dark green Public Parks designation bounded on the west by the HCT Burlington Northern RR, on the north by the HCT Southern Pacific RR and the Tualatin River, on the east by Open Space and on the south by Boones Ferry Road. This designation is partially correct. The south approximately 1/2 of this Public Park area (from Boones Ferry Road on the south to about 250 north) should be Employment Area.

66. To the east of the dark blue Public Parks designation noted above as small square of light green Open Space designation. It is bounded on the south and east by Boones Ferry Road and on the north by the HCT Southern Pacific RR. The approximately 250 foot deep Employment area designation mentioned above should be extended east into this area of Open Space to Boones Ferry on the east.

67. The area of Open Space designation to the northeast and east of the circle, bounded by the arc of the circle, Martinazzi Avenue and Boones Ferry Road on the west, the Tualatin River on the north, I-5 on the east and Warm Springs Street on the south (it appears Warm Springs is the southern edge of the Open Space) should be Employment area.

68. The area of Inner Neighborhood to the east and south east of the circle, bounded by the arc of the circle on the west, Sagert Street on the south, I-5 on the east and Warm Springs on the north, should be Employment Area.
69. The designations east of I-5 bounded by Sagert Street on the south, The Tualatin River on the north and 65th Avenue (roughly) on the east are problematic and require further discussion. Pending further discussion, Employment Area may be more appropriate.

70. The Grahams Ferry corridor between Wilsonville and Tualatin should be Open Space.

Wood Village

73. An area immediately to the east of 223rd Avenue should be shown as Employment area, as it is currently zoned light industrial and is the location of the Multnomah Greyhound Park. The remainder of the area is a golf course and is appropriate for the Open Space designation the map shows.

74. An area south of the railroad tracks, north of Sandy Boulevard and north of the Mt. Hood Parkway alignment shown as inner neighborhood should be Industrial – consistent with its current zoning.

Vancouver, Clark County

81. Downtown Vancouver should be shown as a circle the same color as Downtown Portland and identified as “Vancouver City Center”.

82. The Van Mall and Salmon Creek/WSU centers should be shown as a circle the same color as regional centers and labeled “Activity Centers”.

83. Highlight the Urban Growth Areas with a black lines. (Vancouver’s, Camas’, Washougal’s.)

84. Shown the bounds of industrial areas

85. Show the urban reserves.

86. Include a Southwest Washington legend for Vancouver, Clark County, Camas, and Washougal nomenclature.

87. Add Resource designation outside the urban growth areas and urban reserves.

Metro Greenspaces

91. Recognize that greenspaces can be compatible with urban development including LRT station development, town centers, corridors, etc. Some regionally significant greenspaces identified in the Greenspaces Master Plan are located within 1/2 mile of LRT station areas. Development of these areas should not preclude protection of regionally significant natural areas or trail systems. These include, but are not limited to Johnson Creek (identified as location #30 in the Greenspaces Master Plan Map), Rock Creek, (#43), Fanno Creek Greenway (#66), Cedar Mill (#7), Tualatin Hill Nature Park addition (#54), Milwaukie Waterfront (#34), Heron Lakes (#25) and Columbia Slough River Trail (#88). Town centers like Fairview and Troutdale should not preclude natural area protection for areas such as Fairview Creek Ponds (#16) or Sandy River Gorge Trail (#78). Employment areas should be cognizant of natural areas such as the Rock/Sieben Creek natural area (#42). Corridor should be developed to protect natural areas. For example, the Johnson Creek Canyon (#28) should be protected even though it is part of the Johnson Creek Blvd corridor. Neighborhood development should be developed consistent with protection of riparian areas. For example, the Sandy River Gorge Trail (#78) and the Beaver Creek Canyon Trail/Greenway (#58) should be protected. Policy language applying to the urban design types (centers, corridors, station areas) should not preclude open space and trail preservation.
93. Protect the regionally significant concentration of natural areas in the Tualatin area including Tualatin River access points (#55), Hedges Creek Wetland (#24), Tonquin Geological Area (#52).

94. Lands in Urban Reserve Study areas should be considered for their natural features and protected. For example, in the Carver urban reserve study area, the Clackamas River Greenway should be protected if the area is brought into the urban growth boundary and urban development permitted.

95. Some open space has been removed from the area south of Gresham Regional Center in the area of the Boring Lava Domes (#3). Please confirm that this change reflects existing development only, as this is a Measure 26-26 Bond Measure target.

96. Change the area between Blue Lake and Fairview Lake from Open Space to Outer Neighborhood.

98. Confirm that the 57 regionally significant natural areas on the Greenspaces Master Plan are included.

99. Please add the following public lands: Oxbow Regional Park, Chinook Landing Marine Park, Indian John Island, Gary and Flagg Islands, Gleason Boat Ramp, Broughton Beach, Howell Territorial Park, Bell View Point, Burlington boat ramp, Glendover golf course, Smith and Bybee Lakes (small correction), Mason Hill Park Larch Mountain Corridor, Beggars Tick Wildlife Refuge.

Following are the changes in the map from the Metro 2040 Growth Concept Map adopted by resolution by the Metro Council on December 8, 1994:

Other General Map Changes

103. One-half mile LRT station areas were added.

105. Urban Growth Boundary line changed from heavy solid line to dotted line and correct map legend.

107. Map legend changed from “Mixed Use Employment Centers” changed to “Employment Centers.”

108. Minor Urban Reserve Study Area corrections:
   a. Lake Oswego (approximately one acre)
   b. Carver
   c. Wilsonville (Day Road map error corrected)
Attachment D

Additional TPAC Amendments

2040 Concept Map

Metro Region

125. Amend map to more clearly identify potential LRT lines and stations, including potential additional stations on existing east and west side MAX lines.

126. Language between map and RUGGOs should be made consistent with regard to “regional through-routes” vs. “regional throughways.” The term “through-routes” has been adopted in the interim Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Portland

127. Union Station should be shown as an intermodal facility on the map.

Clackamas

128. The Clackamas Regional LRT termini should be located at I-205 (further east from its current location near 82nd Avenue).

RUGGO Text

129. Page 36 of the RUGGOs should indicate that pedestrian travel is the preferred travel mode for “short” trips in order to be consistent with the interim RTP.
Attachment E
2040 Concept Map
Additional MTAC Amendments

Clark County/Vancouver

109. Adjust station areas in the Vancouver regional center
   • Add station at VA Hospital
   • Add station at 7th Street
   • Add station at 12th Street
   • Move Mill Plain station up to 17th street south of where alignment turns east from CBD

110. Make all neighborhood designations within Vancouver city limits Inner Neighborhood design type.

111. Add broad band of Rural Reserves beyond the UGA in Clark County, diagonally NW to SE, some distance from UGA/reserve areas

112. Delete Town Center at Mill Plain

113. Add title indicating location of Battleground

Washington County

114. Make Oleson a corridor between SW Hall and Garden Home Rd.

Lake Oswego

115. Take off the Main Street designation on Kruse Way, replace with a Corridor. Keep Main Street along Boones Ferry in the Town Center area as shown.

Portland

116. Make changes to Columbia South Shore area, as submitted on maps by the City. Including revised open space coverage near 33rd Ave.; delete Open Space and add Industrial Area in same vicinity; replace Open Space with Park for golf course west of I-5; switch a tract from Industrial to Employment Area near 182nd.

117. Reflect change to Marine Drive alignment at North Portland Rd., extend Marine Drive to be continuous.

Clackamas County

118. Extend LRT from 82nd and Sunnyside to station shown at or beyond I-205.

119. Revision to 82nd Drive between Hwy 224 and Gladstone (corridor, proposed LRT, ?? - talk to Rod Sandoz)

Sandy

120. Pull back Rural Reserves west of City to meet their urban reserve coverage.
Metro

121. Realign I-5 to 99W dotted freeway connection to be inside the current UGB instead of outside the UGB. (Advice of legal counsel.)

Metro Greenspaces

122. Not all map changes have been made as requested, double check map and make corrections. See #93, #98 & #99, which includes Tualatin River access, 57 regionally significant natural areas, and public lands (parks and other uses).

123. Confirm whether a separate map is going to be incorporated with the Growth Concept showing Regional Trails.

124. Confirm riparian buffers and show. Is there a buffer for Columbia River?
To: Mayor Gussie McRobert, MPAC members and interested persons

From: John Fregonese, Director, Growth Management

Date: July 20, 1995

Subject: Revised draft of RUGGO

Enclosed please find a copy of the RUGGO with all of the recommended changes adopted by MPAC.

The RUGGO changes are shown by deletions and additions notations as compared with the December 8, 1994 version adopted by the Metro Council by resolution 94-2040. Accordingly, there are changes to changes that MPAC has made as it deliberated. Only the final version in comparison with the December 1994 version are shown.

We would also like to ask that MPAC consider the following changes which indicated in the draft as follows:

Lines 52-97 Re: Future Vision Summary - This is the summary of Future Vision as adopted by the Metro Council by Ordinance #95-604A.

Line 703 Re: Future Vision completion - The Future Vision will be prepared.... Staff recommends that this change occur as the Future Vision project has now been completed.

Line 1798 Re: North Plains. North Plains has requested that they be included when citing neighbor cities.

Lines 2022-2028 Re: Corridors configuration alternative as a series of centers or nodes. There has been a discussion about the ways that corridors may actually be built and function. The existing RUGGO language indicate a continuous bands of higher density development. But, an alternative could be to have nodes or centers along an arterial, and the same type of capacity and performance could be achieved. This language was recommended by MTAC for MPAC consideration and we failed to forward this to MPAC.

Lines 2456-2457 Re: Definition of Persons per acre. This definition was also recommended by MTAC to MPAC and inadvertently left out.
We request that MPAC consider the revised RUGGO and the above changes. We would encourage the MPAC to conclude its recommendations about the RUGGO and forward them to the Metro Council at your earliest convenience.

Thank you.
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Introduction

The Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) have been developed to:

1. guide efforts to maintain and enhance the ecological integrity, economic viability, and social equity and overall quality of life of the urban region;

2. respond to the direction given to Metro by the legislature through ORS ch 268.380 to develop land use goals and objectives for the region which would replace those adopted by the Columbia Region Association of Governments;

3. provide a policy framework for guiding Metro's regional planning program, principally its development of functional plans and management of the region's urban growth boundary the development of the elements of Metro's regional framework plan, and its implementation of individual functional plans; and

4. provide a process for coordinating planning in the metropolitan area to maintain metropolitan livability.

The RUGGO's are envisioned not as a final plan for the region, but as a starting point for developing a more focused vision for the future growth and development of the Portland area not directly applicable to local plans and local land use decisions. However, they state regional policy as Metro develops plans for the region with all of its partners. Hence, the RUGGO's are the building blocks with which the local governments, citizens, the business community and other interests can begin to develop a shared view of the region's future.

This document begins with the broad outlines of that vision Future Vision Summary. This document is a summary of the Future Vision for the metropolitan region, developed consistent with the Metro Charter. The Future Vision, is not a regulatory document. Rather, it is a statement of aspiration. The regional framework plan, when adopted, must describe its relationship to the Future Vision. The RUGGO's follow next and are presented through two principal goals, the first dealing with the planning process and the second outlining substantive concerns related to urban form. The "subgoals" (in Goal II) and objectives provide clarification for the goals. The planning activities reflect priority actions that need to be taken to refine and clarify the goals and objectives further.

Metro's regional goals and objectives required by ORS 268.380(1) are in RUGGO
Goals I and II and Objectives 1-23 only. RUGGO planning activities contain implementation ideas for future study in various stages of development that may or may not lead to RUGGO amendments, new functional plans, functional plan amendments, or regional framework plan elements. The regional framework plan, functional plans and functional plan amendments shall be consistent with Metro's regional goals and objectives and the Growth Concept, not RUGGO planning activities.
FUTURE VISION

Our ecological and economic region goes beyond Metro's boundaries and stretches from the Cascades to the Coast Range, and from Longview to Salem. Any vision for a territory as large and diverse as this must be regarded as both ambitious and a work-in-progress. It is a first step in developing policies, plans, and actions that serve our bi-state region and all its people.

While Metro recognizes that it has no control over surrounding jurisdictions and is not responsible for the provision of public safety and other social services, the ability to successfully manage growth within this region is dependent on and impacts each of these.

Future Vision is mandated by Metro's 1992 Charter. It is not a regulatory document; rather it is a standard against which to gauge progress toward maintaining a livable region. It is based on a number of core values essential to shaping our future. As a region:

- We value taking purposeful action to advance our aspirations for this region, realizing that we should act to meet our needs today in a manner that does not limit or eliminate the ability of future generations to meet their needs and enjoy this landscape we are privileged to inhabit.

- We value the greatest possible individual liberty in politics, economics, lifestyle, belief, and conscience, with the understanding that this liberty cannot be fully realized unless accompanied by shared commitments for community, civic involvement, and a healthy environment.

- We value our regional identity and sense of place, and celebrate the identity and accomplishments of our urban neighborhoods and suburban and rural communities.

- We value vibrant cities that are an inspiration and a crucial resource for commerce, cultural activities, politics, and community building.

- We value a healthy economy that provides stable family-wage jobs. We recognize that our economic well-being depends on unimpaired and sustainable natural ecosystems, and suitable social mechanisms to insure dignity and equity for all and compassion for those in need.

- We value the conservation, restoration, and preservation of natural and historic landscapes.

- We value a life close to nature incorporated in the urban landscape.

- We value nature for its own sake, and recognize our responsibility as stewards of the region's natural resources.

- We value meeting the needs of our communities through grass-roots efforts in
harmony with the collective interest of our regional community.

- We value participatory decision making which harnesses the creativity inherent in a wide range of views.
- We value a cultural atmosphere and public policies that will insure that every child in every community enjoys the greatest possible opportunities to fulfill his or her potential in life.

(For a full text of the Metro Council adopted Future Vision, see Ordinance #95-604A).
Planning for and managing the effects of urban growth in this metropolitan region involves 24 cities, three counties, and more than 130 special service districts and school districts, including Metro. In addition, the State of Oregon, Tri-Met, the Port of Portland, and the Boundary Commission all make decisions which affect and respond to regional urban growth. Each of these jurisdictions and agencies has specific duties and powers which apply directly to the tasks of urban growth management.

However, the issues of metropolitan growth are complex and inter-related. Consequently, the planning and growth management activities of many jurisdictions are both affected by and directly affect the actions of other jurisdictions in the region. In this region, as in others throughout the country, coordination of planning and management activities is a central issue for urban growth management.

Nonetheless, few models exist for coordinating growth management efforts in a metropolitan region. Further, although the legislature charged Metro with certain coordinating responsibilities, and gave it powers to accomplish that coordination, a participatory and cooperative structure for responding to that charge has never been stated.

As urban growth in the region generates issues requiring a multi-jurisdictional response, a "blueprint" for regional planning and coordination is critically needed. Although most would agree that there is a need for coordination, there is a wide range of opinion regarding how regional planning to address issues of regional significance should occur, and under what circumstances Metro should exercise its coordination powers.

Goal I addresses this coordination issue in the region for the first time by providing the process that Metro will use to address areas and activities of metropolitan significance. The process is intended to be responsive to the challenges of urban growth while respecting the powers and responsibilities of a wide range of interests, jurisdictions, and agencies.

Goal II recognizes that this region is changing as growth occurs, and that change is challenging our assumptions about how urban growth will affect quality of life. For example:

- overall, the number of vehicle miles traveled in the region has been increasing at a
rate far in excess of the rate of population and employment-growth;

• the greatest growth in traffic and movement is within suburban areas, rather than between suburban areas and the central downtown district;

• in the year 2010 Metro projects that 70% of all "trips" made daily in the region will occur within suburban areas;

• currently transit moves about 3% of the travelers in the region on an average workday;

• to this point the region has accommodated most forecasted growth on vacant land within the urban growth boundary, with redevelopment expected to accommodate very little of this growth;

• single family residential construction is occurring at less than maximum planned density;

• rural residential development in rural exception areas is occurring in a manner and at a rate that may result in forcing the expansion of the urban growth boundary on important agricultural and forest resource lands in the future;

• a recent study of urban infrastructure needs in the state has found that only about half of the funding needed in the future to build needed facilities can be identified.

Add to this list growing citizen concern about rising housing costs, vanishing open space, and increasing frustration with traffic congestion, and the issues associated with the growth of this region are not at all different from those encountered in other west coast metropolitan areas such as the Puget Sound region or cities in California. The lesson in these observations is that the "quilt" of 27 separate comprehensive plans together with the region's urban-growth boundary is not enough to effectively deal with the dynamics of regional growth and maintain quality of life.

The challenge is clear: if the Portland metropolitan area is going to be different than other places, and if it is to preserve its vaunted quality of life as an additional 485,000 people move into the urban area in the next 20 years, then a cooperative and participatory effort to address the issues of growth must begin now. Further, that effort needs to deal with the issues accompanying growth—increasing traffic congestion, vanishing open space, speculative pressure on rural farm lands, rising housing costs, diminishing environmental quality—in a common framework. Ignoring vital links
between these issues will limit the scope and effectiveness of our approach to managing urban growth.

Goal II provides that broad framework needed to address the issues accompanying urban growth.
Planning for a Vision of Growth in the Portland Metropolitan Area

As the metropolitan area changes, the importance of coordinated and balanced planning programs to protect the environment and guide development becomes increasingly evident.

By encouraging efficient placement of jobs and housing near each other, along with supportive commercial, cultural and recreational uses, a more efficient development pattern will result.

An important step toward achieving this planned pattern of regional growth is the integration of land uses with transportation planning, including mass transit, which will link together mixed-use urban centers of higher density residential and commercial development.

The region must strive to protect and enhance its natural environment and significant natural resources. This can best be achieved by integrating the important aspects of the natural environment into a regional system of natural areas, open space and trails for wildlife and people. Special attention should be given to the development of infrastructure and public services in a manner that complements the natural environment.

A clear distinction must be created between the urbanizing areas and rural lands. Emphasis should be placed upon the balance between new development and infill within the region's urban growth boundary and the need for future urban growth boundary expansion. This regional vision recognizes the pivotal role played by a healthy and active central city, while at the same time providing for the growth of other communities of the region.

Finally, the regional planning program must be one that is based on a cooperative process that involves the residents of the metropolitan area, as well as the many public and private interests. Particular attention must be given to the need for effective partnerships with local governments because they will have a major responsibility in implementing the vision. It is important to consider the diversity of the region's communities when integrating local comprehensive plans into the pattern of regional growth.
GOAL I: REGIONAL PLANNING PROCESS

Regional planning in the metropolitan area shall:

1. Fully implement the regional planning functions of the 1992 Metro Charter;
2. Identify and designate other areas and activities of metropolitan concern through a participatory process involving the Metro Policy Advisory Committee, cities, counties, special districts, school districts, and state and regional agencies such as Tri-Met, the Metropolitan Arts Commission Regional Arts and Culture Council and the Port of Portland; and
3. Occur in a cooperative manner in order to avoid creating duplicative processes, standards, and/or governmental roles.

These goals and objectives shall only apply to acknowledged comprehensive plans of cities and counties when implemented through the regional framework plan, functional plans, or the acknowledged urban growth boundary plan.

Objective 1. Citizen Participation

Metro shall develop and implement an ongoing program for citizen participation in all aspects of the regional planning program. Such a program shall be coordinated with local programs for supporting citizen involvement in planning processes, and shall not duplicate those programs.

1.1. Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (Metro CCI)

Metro shall establish a Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement to assist with the development, implementation and evaluation of its citizen involvement program and to advise the Metro Policy Advisory Committee regarding ways to best involve citizens in regional planning activities.

1.2. Notification. Metro shall develop programs for public notification, especially for (but not limited to) proposed legislative actions, that ensure a high level of awareness of potential consequences as well as opportunities for involvement on the part of affected citizens, both inside and outside of its district boundaries.

Objective 2. Metro Policy Advisory Committee
The 1992 Metro Charter has established the Metro Policy Advisory Committee to:

2.1 assist with the development and review of Metro's regional planning activities pertaining to land use and growth management, including review and implementation of these goals and objectives, development and implementation of the regional framework plan, present and prospective functional planning, and management and review of the region's urban growth boundary;

2.2. serve as a forum for identifying and discussing areas and activities of metropolitan or subregional significance; and

2.3. provide an avenue for involving all cities and counties and other interests in the development and implementation of growth management strategies.

2.1. Metro Policy Advisory Committee Composition. The initial Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) shall be chosen according to the Metro Charter and, thereafter, according to any changes approved by majorities of MPAC and the Metro Council. The composition of the Committee shall reflect the partnership that must exist among implementing jurisdictions in order to effectively address areas and activities of metropolitan concern. The voting membership shall include elected and appointed officials and citizens of Metro, cities, counties and states consistent with section 27 of the 1992 Metro Charter.

2.2. Advisory Committees. The Metro Council, or the Metro Policy Advisory Committee consistent with the MPAC by-laws, shall appoint technical advisory committees as the Council or the Metro Policy Advisory Committee determine a need for such bodies.

2.3. Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT). JPACT with the Metro Council shall continue to perform the functions of the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization as required by federal transportation planning regulations. JPACT and the Metro Policy Advisory Committee shall develop a coordinated process, to be approved by the Metro Council, to assure that regional land use and transportation planning remains consistent with these goals and objectives and with each other.

Objective 3. Applicability of Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives

These Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives have been developed pursuant to ORS 268.380(1). Therefore, they comprise neither a comprehensive plan under ORS 197.015(5) nor a functional plan under ORS 268.390(2). The regional framework plan
and all functional plans prepared by Metro shall be consistent with these goals and objectives. Metro's management of the Urban Growth Boundary shall be guided by standards and procedures which must be consistent with these goals and objectives. These goals and objectives shall not apply directly to site-specific land use actions, including amendments of the urban growth boundary.

3.1 These Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives shall apply to adopted and acknowledged comprehensive land use plans as follows:

3.1.1 Components of the regional framework plan that are adopted as functional plans, or other functional plans, shall be consistent with these goals and objectives, and they may recommend or require amendments to adopted and acknowledged comprehensive land use plans; and

3.1.2 The management and periodic review of Metro's acknowledged Urban Growth Boundary Plan, itself shall be consistent with these goals and objectives, may require changes in adopted and acknowledged land use plans; and

3.1.3 The Metro Policy Advisory Committee may identify and propose issues of regional concern, related to or derived from these goals and objectives, for consideration by cities and counties at the time of periodic review of their adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plans.

3.2 Periodic Updates of the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives. The Metro Policy Advisory Committee shall consider the regular updates of these goals and objectives and recommend a periodic review process for adoption by the Metro Council.

4. Objective 4. Urban Growth Boundary Plan. The Urban Growth Boundary Plan has two components:

4.1 The acknowledged urban growth boundary line; and

4.2 Acknowledged procedures and standards for amending the urban growth boundary line. Metro's Urban Growth Boundary Plan is not a regional comprehensive plan but a provision of the comprehensive plans of the local governments within its boundaries. The urban growth boundary line plan shall be in compliance with applicable statewide planning goals and consistent with these goals and objectives. Amendments to the urban growth
boundary line shall demonstrate consistency only with the acknowledged procedures and standards. Changes of Metro’s acknowledged Urban Growth Boundary Plan may require changes in adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plans.

3.2. Objective 5. Functional Plans. Metro-functional plans containing recommendations for comprehensive planning by cities and counties may or may not involve land use decisions. Functional plans are not required by the enabling statute to include findings of consistency with statewide land use planning goals. If provisions in a functional plan, or actions implementing a functional plan require changes in an adopted and acknowledged comprehensive land use plan, then that action may be a land use action required to be consistent with the statewide planning goals.

Functional plans are limited purpose plans, consistent with these goals and objectives, which address designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern. Functional plans are established in state law as the way Metro may recommend or require changes in local plans.

Those functional plans or plan provisions containing recommendations for comprehensive planning by cities and counties may not be final land use decisions. If a provision in a functional plan, or an action implementing a functional plan require changes in an adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plan, then adoption of provision or action will be a final land use decision. If a provision in a functional plan, or an action implementing a functional plan require changes in an adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plan, then that provision or action will be adopted by Metro as a final land use action required to be consistent with statewide planning goals.

In addition, regional framework plan components will be adopted as functional plans if they contain recommendations or requirements for changes in comprehensive plans. These functional plans, which are adopted as part of the regional framework plan, will be submitted along with other parts of the regional framework plan to LCDC for acknowledgment of their compliance with the statewide planning goals. Because functional plans are the way Metro recommends or requires local plan changes, most regional framework plan components will probably be functional plans. Until regional framework plan components are adopted, existing or new functional plans will continue to recommend or require changes in comprehensive plans.

3.3 Regional Framework Plan. (Relocated to Objective 6) The regional framework plan adopted by Metro shall be consistent with these goals and objectives. Provisions of the regional framework plan that establish performance standards, and that may
require changes in local comprehensive plans shall be adopted as functional plans;
and shall meet all requirements for functional plans contained in these goals and
objectives.

3.4. Periodic Review of Comprehensive Land Use Plans. (Relocated to Objective 7)—At
the time of periodic review for comprehensive land use plans in the region the Metro
Policy Advisory Committee:

3.4.1. Shall assist Metro with the identification of regional framework plan
elements, functional plan provisions or changes in functional plans adopted
since the last periodic review for inclusion in periodic review notices as changes
in law; and

3.4.2. May provide comments during the periodic review of adopted and
acknowledged comprehensive plans on issues of regional concern.

3.5. Periodic Review of the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives. The Metro
Policy Advisory Committee shall consider the periodic review notice for these goals and
objectives and recommend a periodic review process for adoption by the Metro
Council.

Objective 4. Implementation Roles

Regional planning and the implementation of these Regional Urban Growth Goals and
Objectives shall recognize the inter-relationships between cities, counties, special
districts, Metro, regional agencies, and the State, and their unique capabilities and
roles:

4.1. Metro Role. Metro shall:

4.1.1. Identify and designate areas and activities of metropolitan concern;

4.1.2. Provide staff and technical resources to support the activities of the Metro
Policy Advisory Committee;

4.1.3. Serve as a technical resource for cities, counties, and other jurisdictions
and agencies;

4.1.4. Facilitate a broad-based regional discussion to identify appropriate
strategies for responding to those issues of metropolitan concern;

4.1.5. Adopt functional plans necessary and appropriate for the implementation
of these regional urban growth goals and objectives, and the regional framework
plan;

4.1.6. Coordinate the efforts of cities, counties, special districts, and the state to
implement adopted strategies; and

4.1.7. Adopt and periodically review and amend a Future Vision for the region,
consistent with Objective 6.

4.2. Role of Cities:

4.2.1. Adopt and amend comprehensive plans to conform to functional plans
adopted by Metro;

4.2.2. Identify potential areas and activities of metropolitan concern;

4.2.3. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and
activities of metropolitan concern;

4.2.4. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

4.3. Role of Counties:

4.3.1. Adopt and amend comprehensive plans to conform functional plans
adopted by Metro;

4.3.2. Identify potential areas and activities of metropolitan concern;

4.3.3. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and
activities of metropolitan concern;

4.3.4. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

4.4. Role of Special Service Districts. Assist Metro with the identification of areas and
activities of metropolitan concern and the development of strategies to address them,
and participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.
4.5. Role of the State of Oregon

4.5.1. Advise Metro regarding the identification of areas and activities of metropolitan concern;

4.5.2. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern;

4.5.3. Modify state plans, regulations, activities and related funding to enhance implementation of the regional framework plan and functional plans adopted by Metro; and employ state agencies and programs and regulatory bodies to promote and implement these goals and objectives and the regional framework plan;

4.5.4. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

Objective 5: Functional Planning Process

Functional plans are limited purpose plans, consistent with these goals and objectives, which address designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern. These shall include all sections of the regional framework plan that establish performance standards for local plans.

5.1. Existing Functional Plans. Metro shall continue to develop, amend, and implement, with the assistance of cities, counties, special districts, and the state, statutorily required functional plans for air, water, and transportation, as directed by ORS 268.390(1), and for solid waste as mandated by ORS ch 459.

5.2. New Functional Plans. New functional plans shall be proposed from one of two sources:

5.2.1. The Metro Policy Advisory Committee may recommend that the Metro Council designate an area or activity of metropolitan concern for which a functional plan should be prepared; or

5.2.2. The Metro Council may propose the preparation of a functional plan to designate an area or activity of metropolitan concern, and refer that proposal to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee.
The matters required by the Charter to be addressed in the regional framework plan shall constitute sufficient factual reasons for the development of a functional plan under ORS 268.390.

Upon the Metro Council adopting factual reasons for the development of a new functional plan, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee shall participate in the preparation of the plan, consistent with these goals and objectives and the reasons cited by the Metro Council. After preparation of the plan and seeking broad public and local government consensus, using existing citizen involvement processes established by cities, counties, and Metro, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee shall review the plan and make a recommendation to the Metro Council. The Metro Council may act to resolve conflicts or problems impeding the development of a new functional plan and may complete the plan the Metro Policy Advisory Committee is unable to complete its review in a timely manner.

The Metro Council shall hold a public hearing on the proposed plan and afterwards shall:

5.2.A. Adopt the proposed functional plan; or

5.2.B. Refer the proposed functional plan to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee in order to consider amendments to the proposed plan prior to adoption; or

5.2.C. Amend and adopt the proposed functional plan; or

5.2.D. Reject the proposed functional plan.

The proposed functional plan shall be adopted by ordinance, and shall include findings of consistency with these goals and objectives.

5.3. Functional Plan Implementation and Conflict Resolution. Adopted functional plans shall be regionally coordinated policies, facilities, and/or approaches to addressing a designated area or activity of metropolitan concern, to be considered by cities and counties for incorporation in their comprehensive land use plans. If a city or county determines that a functional plan requirement should not or cannot be incorporated into its comprehensive plan, then Metro shall review any apparent inconsistencies by the following process:
5.3.1. Metro and affected local governments shall notify each other of apparent or potential comprehensive plan inconsistencies.

5.3.2. After Metro staff review, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee shall consult the affected jurisdictions and attempt to resolve any apparent or potential inconsistencies.

5.3.3. The Metro Policy Advisory Committee shall conduct a public hearing and make a report to the Metro Council regarding instances and reasons why a city or county has not adopted changes consistent with requirements in a regional functional plan.

5.3.4. The Metro Council shall review the Metro Policy Advisory Committee report and hold a public hearing on any unresolved issues. The Council may decide to:

   5.3.4.a. Amend the adopted regional functional plan; or

   5.3.4.b. Initiate proceedings to require a comprehensive plan change; or

   5.3.4.c. Find there is no inconsistency between the comprehensive plan(s) and the functional plan.

Objective 6. Regional Framework Plan. The regional framework plan required by the 1992 Metro Charter shall be consistent with these goals and objectives. Provisions of the regional framework plan that establish performance standards, and that recommend or require changes in local comprehensive plans shall be adopted as functional plans, and shall meet all requirements for functional plans contained in these goals and objectives. The Charter requires that all mandatory subjects be addressed in the regional framework plan. It does not require that all subjects be addressed to recommend or require changes in current comprehensive plans. Therefore, most, but not all regional framework plan components are likely to be functional plans because some changes in comprehensive plans may be needed. All regional framework plan components will be submitted to LCDC for acknowledgment of their compliance with the statewide planning goals. Until regional framework plan components are adopted, existing or new regional functional plans will continue to recommend or require changes in comprehensive plans.
Objective 7. Periodic Review of Comprehensive Land Use Plans. At the time of periodic review for comprehensive land use plans in the region the Metro Policy Advisory Committee:

7.1. Shall assist Metro with the identification of regional framework plan elements, functional plan provisions or changes in functional plans adopted since the last periodic review for inclusion in periodic review notices as changes in law, and

7.2. May provide comments during the periodic review of adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plans on issues of regional concern.

Objective 8. Implementation Roles:

Regional planning and the implementation of these Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives shall recognize the inter-relationships between cities, counties, special districts, Metro, regional agencies, and the State, and their unique capabilities and roles.

8.1. Metro Role. Metro shall:

8.1.1. Identify and designate areas and activities of metropolitan concern;

8.1.2. Provide staff and technical resources to support the activities of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee;

8.1.3. Serve as a technical resource for cities, counties, school districts and other jurisdictions and agencies;

8.1.4. Facilitate a broad-based regional discussion to identify appropriate strategies for responding to those issues of metropolitan concern;

8.1.5. Adopt functional plans necessary and appropriate for the implementation of these regional urban growth goals and objectives, and the regional framework plan;

¹ Whole section relocated. No change except for section numbering.

² Whole section relocated, same except for addition of 8.17
8.1.6. Coordinate the efforts of cities, counties, special districts, and the state to implement adopted strategies; and

8.1.7. Adopt and periodically review and amend a Future Vision for the region, consistent with Objective 9.

8.2. Role of Cities.

8.2.1. Adopt and amend comprehensive plans to conform to functional plans adopted by Metro;

8.2.2. Identify potential areas and activities of metropolitan concern through a broad-based local discussion;

8.2.3. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern;

8.2.4. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

8.3. Role of Counties.

8.3.1. Adopt and amend comprehensive plans to conform to functional plans adopted by Metro;

8.3.2. Identify potential areas and activities of metropolitan concern through a broad-based local discussion;

8.3.3. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern;

8.3.4. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

8.4. Role of Special Service Districts. Assist Metro, through a broad-based local discussion, with the identification of areas and activities of metropolitan concern and the development of strategies to address them, and participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

8.5. Role of School Districts

8.5.1. Advise Metro regarding the identification of areas and activities of school district
8.5.2 Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and activities of school district concern;

8.5.3 Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

8.6. Role of the State of Oregon

8.6.1. Advise Metro regarding the identification of areas and activities of metropolitan concern;

8.6.2. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas
and activities of metropolitan concern;

8.6.3. Review state plans, regulations, activities and related funding to consider changes in order to enhance implementation of the regional framework plan and functional plans adopted by Metro, and employ state agencies and programs and regulatory bodies to promote and implement these goals and objectives and the regional framework plan;

8.6.4. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives

Objective 6.9 Future Vision and the Future Vision Commission

By Charter, approved by the voters in 1992, Metro must adopt a Future Vision for the metropolitan area. The Future Vision is:

"a conceptual statement that indicates population levels and settlement patterns that the region can accommodate within the carrying capacity of the land, water, and air resources of the region, and its educational and economic resources, and that achieves a desired quality of life. The Future Vision is a long-term, visionary outlook for at least a 50-year period...The matters addressed by the Future Vision include but are not limited to: (1) use, restoration, and preservation of regional land and natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations, (2) how and where to accommodate the population growth for the region while maintaining a desired quality of life for its residents, and (3) how to develop new communities and additions to the existing urban areas in well-planned ways...The Future Vision is not a regulatory document. It is the intent of this charter that the Future Vision have no effect that would allow court or agency review of it."

The Future Vision will be prepared by a broadly representative commission, appointed by the Metro council, and will be reviewed and amended as needed, and comprehensively reviewed and, if need be, revised every 15 years. Metro is required by the Charter to describe the relationship of components of the Regional Framework Plan, and the Regional Framework Plan as a whole, to the Future Vision.
Objective 10. Amendments to the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives

Performance Measures

Metro, in consultation with MPAC and the public, will develop performance measures designed for considering RUGGO objectives. The term "performance measure" refers to the best practice which, if engaged in, holds the greatest promise for achieving these regional goals and objectives. Unlike a simple indicator, performance measures are intended to be quantifiable.

Performance measures for Goal I, Regional Planning Process, will use state benchmarks to the extent possible or be developed by Metro in consultation with MPAC and the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement. Performance measures for Goal II, Urban Form, will be derived from state benchmarks or the detailed technical analysis that underlies Metro's Regional Framework Plan, functional plans, and Growth Concept Map.

(As performance measures are adopted, either by resolution or ordinance, they will be included in an appendix.)

Objective 811. Periodic Review Monitoring and Updating

The Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives, regional framework plan, and all Metro functional plans shall be reviewed at regular intervals every seven years, or at other times in between as determined by the Metro Council after consultation with or upon the suggestion of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee. Any review and amendment process shall involve a broad cross-section of citizen and jurisdictional interests, and shall involve the Metro Policy Advisory Committee consistent with Goal 1: Regional Planning Process. Proposals for amendments shall receive broad public and local government review prior to final Metro Council action.

811.1. Impact of Amendments. At the time of adoption of amendments to these goals and objectives, the Metro Council shall determine whether amendments to adopted regional framework plan, functional plans or the acknowledged regional urban growth boundary are necessary. If amendments to the above are necessary, the Metro Council shall act on amendments to applicable functional plans. The Council shall request recommendations from the Metro Policy Advisory Committee before taking action. All amendment proposals will include the date and method through which they may become effective, should they be adopted. Amendments to the acknowledged
If changes to the regional framework plan or functional plans are adopted, affected cities and counties shall be informed in writing of those changes which are advisory in nature, those which recommend changes in comprehensive land use plans, and those which require changes in comprehensive plans. This notice shall specify the effective date of particular amendment provisions.
GOAL II: URBAN FORM

The livability of the communities of the region should be maintained and enhanced through initiatives which preserve access to nature and result in a metropolitan area recognized for its:

- preservation of environmental quality;
- coordination of the development of jobs, housing, and public services and facilities;
- redevelopment and reuse of land already committed to urban use; and
- inter-relationship of the benefits and consequences of growth in one community with the benefits and consequences of growth in others.

The quality of life and the urban form of our region are closely linked. The Growth Concept is based on the belief that we can continue to grow and enhance the region's livability by making the right choices for how we grow. The region's growth will be balanced by:

- Maintaining a compact urban form, with easy access to nature;
- Preserving existing stable and distinct neighborhoods by focusing commercial and residential growth in mixed use centers and corridors at a pedestrian scale;
- Assuring affordability and maintaining a variety of housing choices with good access to jobs and assuring that market-based preferences are not eliminated by regulation;
- Targeting public investments to reinforce a compact urban form.

II.1: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Preservation, use, and modification of the natural environment of the region should maintain and enhance environmental quality while striving for the wise-use stewardship and preservation of a broad range of natural resources.
Planning and management of water resources should be coordinated in order to improve the quality and ensure sufficient quantity of surface water and groundwater available to the region.

9.12.1 Formulate Strategy. Metro will develop a long-term regional strategy for total comprehensive water resources management, created in partnership with the jurisdictions and agencies charged with planning and managing water resources and aquatic habitats, shall be developed. The regional strategy shall meet state and federal water quality standards and complement, but not duplicate, local integrated watershed plans. It shall: to comply with state and federal requirements for drinking water, to sustain beneficial water uses, and to accommodate growth:

9.12.1.1 manage watersheds to protect, restore and manage ensure to the maximum extent practicable the integrity of streams, wetlands, and floodplains and their multiple biological, physical, and social values;

9.12.1.2 comply with state and federal water quality requirements for drinking water;

9.12.1.3 sustain designated beneficial water uses; and

9.12.1.4 accommodate growth promote multi-objective management of the region's watersheds to the maximum extent practicable; and

9.12.1.5 encourage the use of techniques relying on natural processes to address flood control, storm water management, abnormally high winter and low summer stream flows and nonpoint pollution reduction.

Planning Activities:

Planning programs for water resources management shall be evaluated to determine the ability of current efforts to accomplish the following, and recommendations for changes in these programs will be made if they are found to be inadequate:

- Identify the future resource needs and carrying capacities of the region for designated beneficial uses of water resources which recognizes the multiple values of rural and urban watersheds, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation, fisheries, recreation, wildlife, environmental
Monitor regional water quality and quantity trends vis-a-vis beneficial use standards adopted by federal, state, regional, and local governments for specific water resources important to the region, and use the results to initiate change in water management planning activities to accomplish the watershed management and regional water resources quality objectives.

Integrate urban and rural watershed management in coordination with local water quality agencies.

Evaluate the cost-effectiveness of alternative water resource management practices, including conservation, scenarios, and the use of conservation for both cost-containment and resource management, and

Preserve, restore, create and enhance water bodies especially urban creeks and rivers to maintain their beneficial uses.

Utilize public and/or private partnerships to promote multi-objective management, education, and stewardship of the region's watersheds.

Objective 13: Urban Water Supply

The regional planning process shall be used to coordinate the development of a regional strategy and plan to meet future needs for water supply to accommodate growth.

13.1 A regional strategy and plan for the Regional Framework element linking demand management, water supply sources and storage shall be developed to address future growth in cooperation with the region's water providers.

13.2 The regional strategy and plan element shall be based upon the adopted Regional Water Supply Plan which will contain integrated regional strategies for demand management, new water sources, and storage/transmission linkages. Metro shall evaluate their future role in encouraging conservation on a regional basis to promote the efficient use of water resources and develop any necessary regional plans/programs to address Metro's future role in coordination with the region's water providers.
Planning Activities:

- Actively participate as a member of the Regional Water Supply Planning Study (RWSPS) and provide regional growth projections and other relevant data to ensure coordination between Region 2040 planning program and the RWSPS.

The RWSPS will:

- Identify the future resource needs of the region for municipal and industrial water supply.
- Identify the transmission and storage needs and capabilities for water supply to accommodate future growth.
- Identify water conservation technologies, practices and incentives for demand management as part of the regional water supply planning activities.

- Adopt Regional Framework Plan elements for water supply and storage based on the results of the RWSPS which provide for the development of new sources, efficient transfer and storage of water, including water conservation strategies, which allows for the efficient and economical use of water to meet future growth.

Objective 914. Air Quality

Air quality shall be protected and enhanced so that as growth occurs, human health and the visibility of the Cascades and the Coast Range from within the region should be maintained.

14.1. Strategies for planning and managing air quality in the regional airshed shall be included in the State Implementation Plan for the Portland-Vancouver air quality maintenance area as required by the Federal Clean Air Act.

14.2. New regional strategies shall be developed to comply with Federal Clean Air Act requirements and provide capacity for future growth.

14.3. The region, working with the state, shall pursue close collaboration of the Oregon and Clark County Air Quality Management Areas.
14.4. All functional plans, when taken in the aggregate, shall be consistent with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality.

Planning Activities:

An air quality management plan should be developed for the regional airshed which:

- Outlines existing and forecast air quality problems; identifies prudent and equitable market based and regulatory strategies for addressing present and probable air quality problems throughout the region; evaluates standards for visibility; and implements an air quality monitoring program to assess compliance with local, state, and federal air quality requirements.

Objective 10. Natural Areas, Parks, Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Sufficient open space in the urban region shall be acquired, or otherwise protected, and managed to provide reasonable and convenient access to sites for passive and active recreation. An open space system capable of sustaining or enhancing native wildlife and plant populations should be established.

15.1. Quantifiable targets for setting aside certain amounts and types of open space shall be identified.

15.2. Corridor Systems - The regional planning process shall be used to coordinate the development of interconnected recreational and wildlife corridors within the metropolitan region.

15.2.1. A region-wide system of trails should be developed to link public and private open space resources within and between jurisdictions.

15.2.2. A region-wide system of linked significant wildlife habitats should be developed. This system should be preserved, restored where appropriate, and managed to maintain the region's biodiversity (number of species and plants and animals).

15.2.3. A Willamette River Greenway Plan for the region should be
Planning Activities:

1. Inventory existing open space and open space opportunities to determine areas within the region where open space deficiencies exist now, or will in the future, given adopted land use plans and growth trends. Identify areas within the region where open space deficiencies exist now, or will in the future, given adopted land use plans and growth trends, and act to meet those future needs. Target acreage should be developed for neighborhood, community, and regional parks, as well as for other types of open space in order to meet local needs while sharing responsibility for meeting metropolitan open space demands.

2. Assess current and future active recreational land needs. Target acreage should be developed for neighborhood, community, and regional parks, as well as for other types of open space in order to meet local needs while sharing responsibility for meeting metropolitan open space demands. Develop multi-jurisdictional tools for planning and financing the protection and maintenance of open space resources. Particular attention will be paid to using the land use planning and permitting process and to the possible development of a land-banking program.

3. Conduct a detailed biological field inventory of the region to establish an accurate baseline of native wildlife and plant populations. Target population goals for native species will be established through a public process which will include an analysis of amounts of habitat necessary to sustain native populations at target levels.

4. The natural areas, parks, and open space identified on the Growth Concept Map should be acquired where possible, from willing sellers and be removed from any regional inventories of buildable land.

5. Populations of native plants and animals will be inventoried, utilizing tools such as Metro’s GIS and Parks and Greenspaces program, Oregon Natural Heritage Database, Oregon’s GAP Analysis Program and other relevant programs, to develop strategies to maintain the region’s biodiversity (or biological diversity).

6. Utilizing strategies which are included in Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Wildlife Diversity Program and working with state and federal fish and wildlife personnel, develop a strategy to maintain the region’s biodiversity.
Objective 16. Protection of Agriculture and Forest Resource Lands

Agricultural and forest resource land outside the urban growth boundary shall be protected from urbanization, and accounted for in regional economic and development plans.

16.1. Rural Resource Lands. Rural resource lands outside the urban growth boundary which have significant resource value should actively be protected from urbanization.

16.2. Urban Expansion. Expansion of the urban growth boundary shall occur in urban reserves, established consistent with the Urban Rural Transition Objective.

16.3. Farm and Forest Practices. Protect and support the ability for farm and forest practices to continue through the designation and management of rural reserves, established consistent with the Growth Concept.

Planning Activities:

A regional economic opportunities analysis shall include consideration of the agricultural and forest products economy associated with lands adjacent to or near the urban area.
II.2. BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Development in the region should occur in a coordinated and balanced fashion as evidenced by:

II.2.i. a regional "fair-share" approach to meeting the housing needs of the urban population;

II.2.ii. the provision of infrastructure and critical public services concurrent with the pace of urban growth and which supports the 2040 Growth Concept and furthers a sense of community;

II.2.iii. the integration of land use planning and economic development programs the continued growth of regional economic opportunity, balanced so as to provide an equitable distribution of jobs, income, investment, and tax capacity throughout the region and to support other regional goals and objectives;

II.2.iv. the coordination of public investment with local comprehensive and regional functional plans; and

II.2.v. the continued evolution of regional economic opportunity; and

II.2.v. the creation of a balanced transportation system, less dependent on the private automobile, supported by both the use of emerging technology and the collocation of jobs, housing, commercial activity, parks and open space.

Objective 12 17. Housing

Metro shall adopt a "fair share" strategy for meeting the housing needs of the urban population in cities and counties based on a subregional analysis which provides for:

14.1 Diversity. There shall be a diverse range of housing types available within cities and counties jurisdictions and subregions inside the urban growth boundary (UGB);

14.2 Affordability specific goals for low and moderate income and market rate
housing shall be adopted for each jurisdiction to ensure that sufficient and affordable housing is available to households of all income levels that live or have a member working in the each jurisdiction;

1068 4.4.3 Coordination housing densities and costs shall be supportive of adopted public policy for the development of the regional transportation system and designated centers and corridors;

1069 a balance of jobs and housing within the region and subregions.

Planning Activities:

The Metropolitan Housing Rule (OAR 660, Division 7) has effectively resulted in the preparation of local comprehensive plans in the urban region that:

• provide for the sharing of regional housing supply responsibilities by ensuring the presence of single and multiple family zoning in every jurisdiction; and

• plan for local residential housing densities that support net residential housing density assumptions underlying the regional urban growth boundary.

However, it is now time to develop a new regional housing policy that directly addresses the requirements of Statewide Planning Goal 10, in particular. Since Metro’s Regional Framework Plan has to address the requirements of statewide planning Goal 10, we should develop:

1. Strategies should be developed to preserve the region’s supply of special needs and existing low and moderate income housing.

2. Diverse Housing Needs. The diverse housing needs of the present and projected population of the region shall be correlated with the available and prospective housing supply. Upon identification of unmet housing needs, a region wide strategy shall be developed which takes into account subregional opportunities and constraints, and the relationship of market dynamics to the management of the overall supply of housing. In addition, that strategy shall address the “fair-share” distribution of housing responsibilities among the jurisdictions of the region, including the provision of supporting social services.

3. Housing Affordability. Multnomah, Clackamas, Clark and Washington Counties have completed Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategies (CHAS) which have demonstrated the lack of affordable housing for certain income groups in locations...
throughout the metropolitan area. They also demonstrate the regional nature of the
housing market. Therefore, the regional framework plan shall include an element on
housing affordability which includes development density, housing mix, and a menu of
alternative actions (zoning tools, programs, financial incentives, etc.) for use by local
jurisdictions to address affordable housing needs. Each jurisdiction should participate
in providing affordable housing including but not limiting to housing that is affordable to
people who work in that jurisdiction. Affordable housing goals shall be developed with
each jurisdiction to facilitate their participation in meeting regional and subregional
needs for affordable housing.

4. The uses of public policy and investment to encourage the development of housing
in locations near employment that is affordable to employees in those enterprises shall
be evaluated and where feasible, implemented. The transportation system's ability to
provide accessibility shall also be evaluated. The region is committed to seeking a
balance of jobs and housing balance in communities and centers throughout the
region. The uses of public policy and investment shall to encourage the development
of housing in locations near trade, services, and employment that is affordable to wage
earners in each subregion and jurisdiction. The transportation system's ability to
provide accessibility shall also be evaluated, and, if necessary, modifications will be
made in transportation policy and the transportation system itself to improve
accessibility for residents to jobs and services in proximity to affordable housing.

Objective 13: 18. Public Services and Facilities

Public services and facilities including but not limited to public safety, schools, water
and sewage systems, energy transmission and distribution systems, parks, libraries,
historic or cultural facilities, the solid waste management system, storm water
management facilities, community centers and transportation should be planned and
developed to:

18.i. minimize cost;
18.ii. maximize service efficiencies and coordination;
18.iii. result in net improvements in maintained or enhanced environmental quality
and the conservation of natural resources;
18.iv. keep pace with growth while preventing any loss of existing service levels
and achieving planned service levels;
18.v. use energy efficiently; and

17.vi. shape and direct growth to meet local and regional objectives.

18.1. Planning Area. The long-term geographical planning area for the provision of urban services shall be the area described by the adopted and acknowledged urban growth boundary and the designated urban reserves.

18.2. Forecast Need. Public service and facility development shall be planned to accommodate the rate of urban growth forecast in the adopted regional growth forecast, including anticipated expansions into urban reserve areas.

18.3. Timing. The region should seek the provision of public facilities and services at the time of new urban growth.

Planning Activities:

Inventory current and projected public facilities and services needs throughout the region, as described in adopted and acknowledged public facilities plans. Identify opportunities for and barriers to achieving concurrency in the region. Develop financial tools and techniques to enable cities, counties, school districts, special districts, Metro and the State to secure the funds necessary to achieve concurrency. Develop tools and strategies for better linking planning for school, library, recreational and cultural and park facilities to the land use planning process.

Objective 19. Transportation

A regional transportation system shall be developed which:

19.i. reduces reliance on a single mode of transportation through development of a balanced transportation system which employs highways, transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and system and demand management.

19.ii. recognizes the importance of freight movement within and through the region and the road, rail, air, waterway and pipeline facilities needed to facilitate this movement.

19.iii. provides adequate levels of mobility consistent with local comprehensive plans and state and regional policies and plans;
19.iv. encourages energy efficiency;

19.v. Supports a balance of jobs and housing as well as the community identity of neighboring cities;

19.vi. recognizes financial constraints and provides public investment guidance for achieving the desired urban form; and

19.vii. minimizes the environmental impacts of system development, operations, and maintenance.

19.viii. rewards and reinforces pedestrian activity as the mode of choice.

19.1. System Priorities. In developing new regional transportation system infrastructure, the highest priority should be meeting the mobility needs of mixed-use urban the city center and regional centers, when designated. Such needs, associated with ensuring access to jobs, housing, cultural and recreational opportunities and shopping within and among those centers, should be assessed and met through a combination of intensifying land uses and increasing transportation system capacity so as to minimize negative impacts on environmental quality and where and how people live, work and play—urban form, and urban design.

19.2. Environmental Considerations. Planning for the regional transportation system should seek to:

19.2.1. reduce the region’s transportation-related energy consumption through increased use of transit, telecommuting, car pools, vanpools, bicycles and walking;

19.2.2. maintain the region’s air and water quality (see Objective 12 Watershed Management and Regional Water Quality and Objective 14. Air Quality); and

19.2.3. reduce negative impacts on parks, public open space, wetlands, and negative effects on communities and neighborhoods arising from noise, visual impacts, and physical segmentation.

19.3. Transportation Balance. Although the predominant form of transportation is the private automobile, planning for and development of the regional transportation system should seek to:

19.3.1. reduce automobile dependency, especially the use of single-occupancy
vehicles;

19.3.2. increase the use of transit through both expanding transit service and addressing a broad range of requirements for making transit competitive with the private automobile; and

19.3.3. encourage bicycle and pedestrian movement through the location and design of land uses.

19.3.4 encourage telecommuting as a means of reducing trips to and from work.

Planning Activities:

1. Metro shall develop a new Regional Transportation Plan as an element of its Regional Framework Plan that, at a minimum:

   a) Builds on existing mechanisms for coordinating transportation planning in the region by:

   - identifies the role for local transportation system improvements and relationship between local, regional, and state transportation system improvements in regional transportation plans;

   - clarifies institutional roles, especially for plan implementation, in local, regional, and state transportation plans; and

   - includes plans and policies for the inter-regional movement of people and goods by rail, ship, barge, and air in regional transportation plans.

   - Identifies and addresses needs for freight movement through a coordinated program of transportation system improvements and actions to affect the location of trip generating activities

   - Identifies and incorporates demand management strategies to ensure that the region meets the objectives of the Transportation Planning Rule for transportation system function and VMT reduction

   - Includes strategies for improving connectivity and the environment
2. Structural barriers to mobility for transportation disadvantaged populations should be assessed in the current and planned regional transportation system and addressed through a comprehensive program of transportation and other actions.

a) Supports the implementation of the pattern of uses in relation to the transportation system shown on the Growth Concept Map, and achieves the performance measures as may be included in the appendix and established through the regional planning process.

b) Identifies and addresses structural barriers to mobility for transportation disadvantaged populations.

3. The needs for movement of goods via freight, rail, and barge should be assessed and addressed through a coordinated program of transportation system improvements and actions to affect the location of trip-generating activities.

4. Transportation-related guidelines and standards for designating mixed-use urban centers shall be developed.

Objective 45 20. Economic Opportunity

Public policy should encourage the development of a diverse and sufficient supply of jobs, especially family wage jobs, in appropriate locations throughout the region.

Expansions of the urban growth boundary for industrial or commercial purposes shall occur in locations consistent with these regional urban growth goals and objectives and assess the type, mix and wages of existing and anticipated jobs within subregions. The number and wage level of jobs within each subregion should be balanced with housing cost and availability within that subregion. Strategies should be developed to coordinate the planning and implementation activities of this element with Objective 17: Housing, and Objective 22: Developed Urban Land.

In coordination with affected agencies, encourage the redevelopment and reuse of lands used in the past or already used for commercial or industrial purposes wherever economically viable and environmentally sound.
Planning Activities:

1. Regional and subregional economic opportunities analyses, as described in OAR 660 Division 9, should be conducted to:
   
   • assess the adequacy and, if necessary, propose modifications to the supply of vacant and redevelopable land inventories designated for a broad range of employment activities;
   
   • identify regional and subregional target industries. Economic subregions will be developed which reflect a functional relationship between locational characteristics and the locational requirements of target industries. Enterprises identified for recruitment, retention, and expansion should be basic industries that broaden and diversify the region’s economic base while providing jobs that pay at family wage levels or better; and
   
   • link job development efforts with an active and comprehensive program of training and education to improve the overall quality of the region’s labor force. In particular, new strategies to provide labor training and education should focus on the needs of economically disadvantaged, minority, and elderly populations.

2. An assessment shall be made of the potential for redevelopment and/or intensification of use of existing commercial and industrial land resources in the region.

3. Metro shall establish an on-going program to compile and analyze data and to prepare maps and reports which describe the geographic distribution of jobs, income, investment, and tax capacity throughout the region.
II.3: GROWTH MANAGEMENT

The management of the urban land supply shall occur in a manner which encourages:

II.3.i. encourages the evolution of an efficient urban growth form which reduces sprawl;

II.3.ii. provides a clear distinction between urban and rural lands;

II.3.iii. supports interconnected but distinct communities in the urban region;

II.3.iv. recognition of recognizes the inter-relationship between development of vacant land and redevelopment objectives in all parts of the urban region; and

II.3.iv. is consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept Map, and helps attain the region's objectives.

Objective 46.21 Urban/Rural Transition

There should be a clear transition between urban and rural land that makes best use of natural and built landscape features and which recognizes the likely long-term prospects for regional urban growth.

21.1. Boundary Features. The Metro urban growth boundary should be located using natural and built features, including roads, drainage divides, floodplains, power lines, major topographic features, and historic patterns of land use or settlement.

21.2. Sense of Place. Historic, cultural, topographic, and biological features of the regional landscape which contribute significantly to this region's identity and "sense of place", shall be identified. Management of the total urban land supply should occur in a manner that supports the preservation of those features, when designated, as growth occurs.

21.3. Urban Reserves. Thirty-year "Urban reserves areas", adopted designated pursuant to LCDC's Urban Reserve Rule for purposes of coordinating planning and estimating areas for future urban expansion, should be identified consistent with these goals and objectives, and reviewed by Metro at least every 15 years.

21.3.1. Inclusion of land within an urban reserve area shall generally be based upon
the locational factors of Goal 14. Lands adjacent to the urban growth boundary shall
be studied for suitability for inclusion within urban reserves as measured by factors 3
through 7 of Goal 14 and by the requirements of OAR 680-04-010.

21.3.2 Lands of lower priority in the LCDC rule priorities may be included in urban
reserves if specific types of land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher
priority lands, after options inside the urban growth boundary have been considered,
such as land needed to bring jobs and housing into close proximity to each other.

21.3.3 Lands of lower priority in the LCDC Rule priorities may be included in urban
reserves if needed for physical separation of communities inside or outside the urban
growth boundary to preserve separate community identities.

16.3.1. Establishment of additions to urban reserves will be designated on the
Growth Concept Map and will take into account:

16.3.1.a. The efficiency with which the proposed reserve can be provided with
urban services in the future;

16.3.1.b. The unique land needs of specific urban activities assessed from a
regional perspective;

16.3.1.c. The provision of green spaces between communities;

16.3.1.d. The efficiency with which the proposed reserve can be urbanized;

16.3.1.e. The proximity of jobs and housing to each other;

16.3.1.f. The balance of growth opportunities throughout the region so that the
costs and benefits can be shared;

16.3.1.g. The impact on the regional transportation system; and

16.3.1.h. The protection of farm and forest resource lands from urbanization.

Inclusion of land in an urban reserve shall be preceded by consideration of all of
the above factors:

16.3.2 In addressing 20.3.1(h), the following hierarchy should be used for
identifying priority sites for urban reserves:
16.3.2.a. First, propose such reserves on rural lands excepted from Statewide Planning goals 3 and 4 in adopted and acknowledged county comprehensive plans. This recognizes that small amounts of rural resource land adjacent to or surrounded by those "exception lands" may be necessary for inclusion in the proposal to improve the efficiency of the future urban growth boundary.

16.3.2.b. Second, consider agricultural or forest lands completely surrounded by rural lands excepted from Statewide Planning goals 3 and 4 in adopted and acknowledged county comprehensive plans and/or land within an urban growth boundary.

16.3.2.c. Third, consider secondary forest resource lands, or equivalent, as defined by the state.

16.3.2.d. Fourth, consider secondary agricultural resource lands, or equivalent, as defined by the state.

16.3.2.e. Fifth, consider primary forest resource lands, or equivalent, as defined by the state.

16.3.2.f. Finally, when all other options are exhausted, consider primary agricultural lands, or equivalent, as defined by the state.

21.3.4. Expansion of the urban growth boundary shall occur consistent with the Urban/Rural Transition, Developed Urban Land, Urban Growth Boundary and Neighbor City Objectives 18, 19, and 22. Where urban land is adjacent to rural lands outside of an urban reserve, Metro will work with affected cities and counties to ensure that urban uses do not significantly affect the use or condition of the rural land. Where urban land is adjacent to lands within an urban reserve that may someday be included within the urban growth boundary, Metro will work with affected cities and counties to ensure that rural development does not create obstacles to efficient urbanization in the future.

Planning Activities:

1. Identification of urban reserves adjacent to the urban growth boundary shall be accompanied by the development of a generalized future land use plan. The planning effort will primarily be concerned with identifying and protecting future
open space resources and the development of short-term strategies needed to preserve future urbanization potential. Ultimate providers of urban services within those areas should be designated and charged with incorporating the reserve area(s) in their public facility plans in conjunction with the next periodic review. Changes in the location of the urban growth boundary should occur so as to ensure that plans exist for key public facilities and services.

2. The prospect of creating transportation and other links between the urban economy within the Metro Urban Growth Boundary and other urban areas in the state should be investigated as a means for better utilizing Oregon's urban land and human resources. The use of greenbelts for creating a clear distinction between urban and rural lands, and for creating linkages between communities, should be explored. The region, working with the state and other urban communities in the northern Willamette Valley, should evaluate the opportunities for accommodating forecasted urban growth in urban areas outside of and not adjacent to the present urban growth boundary.

Objective 47.22. Developed Urban Land

Opportunities for and obstacles to the continued development and redevelopment of existing urban land shall be identified and actively addressed. A combination of regulations and incentives shall be employed to ensure that the prospect of living, working, and doing business in those locations remains attractive to a wide range of households and employers.

22.1. Redevelopment & Infill. When Metro examines whether additional urban land is needed within the urban growth boundary, it shall assess redevelopment and infill potential in the region. The potential for redevelopment and infill on existing urban land will be included as an element when calculating the buildable land supply in the region, where it can be demonstrated that the infill and redevelopment can be reasonably expected to occur during the next 20 years.

Metro will work with jurisdictions in the region to determine the extent to which redevelopment and infill can be relied on to meet the identified need for additional urban land. After this analysis and review, Metro will initiate an amendment of the urban growth boundary to meet that portion of the identified need for land not met through commitments for redevelopment and infill.

47.2 Portland Central City. The Central City area of Portland is an area of regional and
1494 state concern for commercial, economic, cultural, tourism, government, and transportation functions. State and regional policy and public investment should continue to recognize this special significance.

1498 17.3 Mixed Use Urban Centers. The region shall evaluate and designate mixed use urban centers. A "mixed use urban center" is a mixed use node of relatively high density, supportive of non-auto based transportation modes, and supported by sufficient public facilities and serves, parks, open space, and other urban amenities. Upon identification of mixed use urban centers, state, regional, and local policy and investment shall be coordinated to achieve development objectives for those places. Minimum targets for transit:highway mode split, job:housing balance, and minimum housing density may be associated with those public investments. New mixed use urban centers shall be sited with respect to a system of such centers in the region, and shall not significantly affect regional goals for existing centers, the transportation system, and other public services and facilities.

Planning Activities:

1. Metro's assessment of redevelopment and infill potential in the region shall include but not be limited to:

   a. An inventory of parcels where the assessed value of improvements is less than the assessed value of the land such that it can reasonably be expected to redevelop or intensity in the planning period.

   b. An analysis of the difference between comprehensive plan development densities and actual development densities for all parcels as a first step towards determining the efficiency with which urban land is being used. In this case, efficiency is a function of land development densities incorporated in local comprehensive plans.

   c. An assessment of the impacts on the cost of housing of by redevelopment versus expansion of the urban growth boundary.

   d. An assessment of the impediments to redevelopment and infill posed by existing urban land uses or conditions and the capacity of urban service providers such as water, sewer, transportation, schools, etc. to serve.

2. Financial incentives to encourage redevelopment and infill consistent with adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plans should be pursued to make redevelopment
and infill attractive alternatives to raw land conversion for investors and buyers.

3. Cities and their neighborhoods should be recognized as the focal points for this region's urban diversity. Actions should be identified to reinforce the role of existing downtowns in maintaining the strength of urban communities.

3. Tools will be developed to address regional economic equity issues stemming from the fact that not all jurisdictions will serve as a site for an economic activity center. Such tools may include off-site linkage programs to meet housing or other needs or a program of fiscal tax equity.

5. Criteria shall be developed to guide the potential designation of mixed-use urban centers. The development and application of such criteria will address the specific area to be included in the center, the type and amount of uses it is to eventually contain, the steps to be taken to encourage public and private investment. Existing and possible future mixed use centers will be evaluated as to their current functions, potentials, and need for future public and private investment. Strategies to meet the needs of the individual centers will be developed. The implications of both limiting and not limiting the location of large scale office and retail development in mixed-use urban centers shall be evaluated.

4. The success of centers, main streets, station communities, and other land classifications will depend on targeting public investments, encouraging complementary public/private partnerships, and committing time and attention to the redesign and redevelopment of these areas. Metro shall conduct an analysis of proposed centers and other land classifications identified on the Growth Concept Map, and others in the future, to determine what mix of uses, densities, building design and orientation standards, transit improvements, pedestrian improvements, bicycle improvements, and other infrastructure changes are needed for their success. Those with a high probability for success will be retained on the Growth Concept Map and targeted for public investment and attention.

Objective 48. 23 Urban Growth Boundary

The regional urban growth boundary, a long-term planning tool, shall separate urbanizable from rural land, be based in aggregate on the region's 20-year projected need for urban land, and be located consistent with statewide planning goals and these Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives and adopted Metro procedures for urban growth boundary amendment. In the location, amendment, and management of the...
regional urban growth boundary, Metro shall seek to improve the functional value of the boundary.

23.1. Expansion into Urban Reserves. Upon demonstrating a need for additional urban land, major and legislative urban growth boundary amendments shall only occur within urban reserves if adopted, unless urban reserves are found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed for one or more of the following reasons:

a) Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on urban reserve lands;

b) Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to urban reserves due to topographical or other physical constraints; or

c) Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority lands other than urban reserves in order to include or provide services to urban reserves, unless it can be demonstrated that Statewide Planning Goal 14 cannot be met for the urban region through use of urban reserve lands.

23.2. Urban Growth Boundary Amendment Process. Criteria for amending the urban growth boundary shall be derived from statewide planning goals 2 and 14, other applicable state planning goals and relevant portions of these Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives.

23.2.1. Major Amendments. Proposals for major amendment of the UGB shall be made through a legislative process in conjunction with the development and adoption of regional forecasts for population and employment growth. The amendment process will be initiated by a Metro finding of need, and involve local governments, special districts, citizens, and other interests.

23.2.2. Locational Adjustments. Locational adjustments of the UGB shall be brought to Metro by cities, counties, and/or property owners based on public facility plans in adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plans.

Objective 49. 24 Urban Design

The identity and functioning of communities in the region shall be supported through:

24.i. the recognition and protection of critical open space features in the region;
24.ii. public policies which encourage diversity and excellence in the design and
development of settlement patterns, landscapes, and structures; and

24.iii. ensuring that incentives and regulations guiding the development and
redevelopment of the urban area promote a settlement pattern which:

24.iii.a. is pedestrian "friendly", encourages transit use and reduces auto
dependence;

24.iii.b. encourages transit use provides access to neighborhood and community
parks, trails and walkways, and other recreation and cultural areas and public
facilities;

24.iii.c. reinforces nodal, mixed use, neighborhood oriented design;

24.iii.d. includes concentrated, high density, mixed use urban centers developed
in relation to the region's transit system;

24.iii.e. is responsive to needs for privacy, community, sense of place and
personal safety in an urban setting; and

24.iii.f. facilitates the development and preservation of mixed-income
neighborhoods.

24.1. Pedestrian and transit supportive building patterns will be encouraged in
order to minimize the need for auto trips and to create a development pattern
conducive to face-to-face community interaction.

Planning Activities:

1. A regional landscape analysis shall be undertaken to inventory and analyze the
relationship between the built and natural environments and to identify key open
space, topographic, natural resource, cultural, and architectural features which
should be protected or provided as urban growth occurs.

2. Model guidelines and standards shall be developed which expand the range of
tools available to jurisdictions for accommodating change in ways compatible
with neighborhoods and communities while addressing this objective.

3. Light rail transit stops, bus stops, transit routes, and transit centers leading to
and within mixed-use urban centers shall be planned to encourage pedestrian
use and the creation of mixed use, high density residential development.

Objective 25. Neighbor Cities

Growth in cities outside the Metro urban growth boundary, occurring in conjunction with the overall population and employment growth in the region, should be coordinated with Metro's growth management activities through cooperative agreements which provide for:

25.1 Separation. The communities within the Metro urban growth boundary, in neighbor cities, and in the rural areas in between will all benefit from maintaining the separation between these places as growth occurs. Coordination between neighboring cities, counties, and Metro about the location of rural reserves and policies to maintain separation should be pursued.

25.2 Jobs Housing Balance. To minimize the generation of new automobile trips, a balance of sufficient number of jobs at wages consistent with housing prices in communities both within the Metro urban growth boundary and in neighboring cities should be pursued.

25.3 Green Corridors. The "green corridor" is a transportation facility through a rural reserve that serves as a link between the metropolitan area and a neighbor city which also limits access to the farms and forests of the rural reserve. The intent is to keep urban to urban accessibility high to encourage a balance of jobs and housing, but limit any adverse effect on the surrounding rural areas.

Planning Activities:

1) Metro will work with the state, neighbor cities, and counties to create intergovernmental agreements which implement neighbor city objectives. Metro will seek to link regional and state investment in public facilities and services to efforts to implement neighbor city agreements.

2) Metro will undertake a study of the green corridor concept to determine the consequences might be of initiatives which enhance urban to urban accessibility in the metropolitan market area.
II.4: Metro 2040 Growth Concept

Description of the Metro 2040 Growth Concept

This Growth Concept states the preferred form of regional growth and development adopted in the Region 2040 planning process including the 2040 Growth Concept Map. This Concept is adopted for the long term growth management of the region including a general approach to approximately where and how much the urban growth boundary should be ultimately expanded, what ranges of density are estimated to accommodate projected growth within the boundary, and which areas should be protected as open space.

This Growth Concept is designed to accommodate approximately 720,000 additional residents and 350,000 additional jobs. The total population served within this plan is 1.8 million residents within the Metro boundary.

The basic philosophy of the Growth Concept is: preserve our access to nature and build better communities for the people who live here today and who will live here in the future. It combines the goals of RUGGO The Growth Concept applies Goal II Objectives with the analysis of the Region 2040 project to guide growth for the next 50 years. The Growth Concept is an integrated set of Objectives subject to Goal I and Objectives 1-11.

The conceptual description of the preferred urban form of region in 2040 is in the Concept Map and this text. This Growth Concept sets the direction for development of implementing policies in Metro's existing functional plans and the Charter-required regional framework plan. This direction will be refined, as well as implemented, in subsequent functional plan amendments and framework plan components. Additional planning will be done to test the Growth Concept and to determine implementation actions. Amendments to the Growth Concept and some RUGGO Objectives may be needed to reflect the results of additional planning to maintain the consistency of implementation actions with RUGGO.

Fundamental to the Growth Concept is a multi-modal transportation system which assures mobility of people and goods throughout the region, consistent with Objective 19, Transportation. By coordinating land uses and this transportation system, the region embraces its existing locational advantage as a relatively uncongested hub for trade.
The basic principles of the Growth Concept directly apply Growth Management Goals and Objectives 21-25. RUGGO. An urban to rural transition to reduce sprawl, keeping a clear distinction between urban and rural lands and balancing re-development is needed. Separation of urbanizable land from rural land shall be accomplished by the urban growth boundary for the region's 20-year projected need for urban land. That boundary will be expanded only into designated urban reserves areas when a need for additional urban land is demonstrated. For its long-term urban land supply, The Metro Council decision about the Growth Concept will determine the land need for urban reserves. Estimates that about 14,500 acres will be needed to accommodate projected growth. These lands will be selected from a About 22,000 acres of Urban Reserve Study Area shown on the Concept Map will be studied before urban reserve areas are designated. This assumes cooperative agreements with neighboring cities to coordinate planning for the proportion of projected growth in the Metro region expected to locate within their urban growth boundaries and urban reserve areas.

The Metro UGB would only expand into urban reserves when need for additional urban land is demonstrated. Rural reserves are intended to assure that Metro and neighboring cities remain separate. The result is intended to be a compact urban form for the region coordinated with nearby cities to retain the region's sense of place.

Mixed use urban centers inside the urban growth boundary are one key to the Growth Concept. Creating higher density centers of employment and housing and transit service with compact development, retail, cultural and recreational activities, in a walkable environment is intended to provide efficient access to goods and services and enhance multi-modal transportation and create vital, attractive neighborhoods and communities. The Growth Concept uses interrelated types of centers. The Central City is the largest market area, the region's employment and cultural hub. Regional Centers serve large market areas outside the central city, connected to it by high capacity transit and highways. Connected to each Regional Center, by road and transit, are smaller Town Centers with local shopping and employment opportunities within a local market area. Planning for all of these centers will seek a balance between jobs and housing and unique blends of urban amenities so that more transportation trips are likely to remain local and become more multi-modal.

In keeping with the jobs housing balance in centers, a jobs housing balance by regional sub-areas can and should also be a goal. This would account for the housing and employment outside centers, and direct policy to adjust for better jobs housing ratios around the region.

Recognition and protection of open spaces both inside the UGB and in rural reserves outside urban reserves are reflected in the Growth Concept. Open spaces, including important natural features and parks, are important to the capacity of the urban growth
boundary and the ability of the region to accommodate housing and employment. 

Green areas on the Concept Map may be designated as regional open space. That would remove these lands from the inventory of urban land available for development. Rural reserves, already designated for farms, forestry, natural areas or rural-residential use, would remain and be further protected from development pressures.

The Concept Map shows some transportation facilities to illustrate new concepts, like "green corridors," and how land use areas, such as centers, may be served. Neither the current regional system nor final alignment choices for future facilities are intended to be represented on the Concept Map.

The percentages and density targets used in the Growth Concept to describe the relationship between centers and areas are estimates based on modeling analysis of one possible configuration of the Growth Concept. Implementation actions that vary from these estimates indicate a need to balance other parts of the Growth Concept to retain the compact urban form contained in the Growth Concept. Land use definitions and numerical targets as mapped, are intended as targets and will be refined in the Regional Framework Plan. Each jurisdiction will certainly adopt a unique mix of characteristics consistent with each locality and the overall Growth Concept.

Neighbor Cities

The Growth Concept recognizes that neighboring cities surrounding the region's metropolitan area are likely to grow rapidly. Communities such as Sandy, Canby, North Plains and Newberg will be affected by the Metro Council's decisions about managing the region's growth. A significant number of people would be accommodated in these neighboring cities, and cooperation between Metro and these communities is necessary to address common transportation and land-use issues.

There are three key concepts for cooperative agreements with neighbor cities:

1) There shall be a separation of rural land between each neighboring city and the metropolitan area. If the region grows together, the transportation system would suffer and the cities would lose their sense of community identity.

2) There should be a strong balance between jobs and housing in the neighbor cities. The more a city retains a balance of jobs and households, the more trips will remain local.

3) Each neighboring city should have its own identity through its unique mix of commercial, retail, cultural and recreational opportunities which support the concentration of jobs and housing.

4) The "green corridor," transportation facility through a rural reserve that serves as a
link between the metropolitan area and a neighbor city without limited access to
the farms and forests of the rural reserve. This would keep accessibility high, which
courages employment growth but limits the adverse affect on the surrounding
rural areas. Metro will seek limitations in access to these facilities and will seek
intergovernmental agreements with ODOT, the appropriate counties and neighbor
cities to establish mutually acceptable growth management strategies. Metro will link
transportation improvements to neighbor cities to successful implementation of these
intergovernmental agreements.

**Green Corridors**

These transportation corridors connect the region's UGB to the neighboring cities' UGB's. Facilities should be designed to reduce urban influence and to avoid increasing access to the farms and forests of the rural reserves they pass through. The intent is to keep urban to urban accessibility high to encourage employment growth, but limit any adverse effect on the surrounding rural areas. Cooperative agreements among Metro, neighbor cities, affected counties and state agencies will be needed.

**Rural Reserves**

Some rural lands adjacent to and nearby the regional urban growth boundary and not designated as urban reserves will be designated as rural reserves. This designation is intended as a policy statement by Metro to not extend its urban growth boundary into these areas and to support neighboring cities efforts not to expand their urban growth boundaries into these areas. The objectives for rural land planning in the region will be to maintain the rural character of the landscape, avoid or eliminate conflicts with farm and forest practices, help meet regional needs for open space and wildlife habitat, and help to clearly separate urban from rural land. This will be pursued by not expanding the urban growth boundary into these areas and supporting rural zoning designations. These rural reserves keep adjacent urban areas separate. These rural lands are not needed or planned for development but are more likely to experience development pressures than are areas farther away.

These lands will not be developed in urban uses in the foreseeable future, an idea that requires agreement among local, regional and state agencies. They are areas outside the present urban growth boundary and along highways that connect the region to neighboring cities.

New rural commercial or industrial development would be restricted. Some areas would receive priority status as potential areas for park and open space acquisition.
Road improvements would specifically exclude interchanges or other highway access to the rural road system, as would any nearby extensions of urban services. Zoning would be for resource protection on farm and forestry land, and very low density residential (no greater density less than one unit for five acres) for exception land.

These rural reserves would support and protect farm and forestry operations. The reserves also would include some purchase of natural areas adjacent to rivers, streams and lakes to make sure the water quality is protected and wildlife habitat enhanced. Large natural features, such as hills and buttes, also would be included as rural reserves because they buffer developed areas and are poor candidates for compact urban development.

Rural reserves are designated in areas that are most threatened by new development, that separate communities, or exist as special resource areas.

Rural reserves also would be retained to separate cities within the Metro boundary. Cornelius, Hillsboro, Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville all have existing areas of rural land that provide a break in urban patterns. New areas of urban reserve study areas, that are indicated on the Concept Map are also separated by rural reserves, such as the Damascus-Pleasant Valley areas from Happy Valley.

The primary means of achieving rural reserves would be through the regional framework plan for areas within the Metro boundary, and voluntary agreements among Metro, the counties, neighboring cities, and the state for those areas outside the Metro boundary. These agreements would prohibit extending urban growth into the rural reserves and require that state agency actions are consistent with the rural reserve designation.
Open Spaces and Trail Corridors

The areas designated open space on the Concept map are parks, stream and trail corridors, wetlands and floodplains, largely undeveloped upland areas, and areas of compatible very low density residential development. Many of these natural features already have significant land set aside as open space. The Tualatin Mountains, for example, contain major parks such as Forest Park and Tryon Creek State Park and numerous smaller parks such as Gabriel Park in Portland and Wilderness Park in West Linn. Other areas are oriented toward wetlands and streams, with Fanno Creek in Washington County having one of the best systems of parks and open space in the region.

Local jurisdictions are encouraged to establish acres of open space per capita goals based on rates at least as great as current rates, in order to keep up with current conditions.

Designating these areas as open spaces would have several effects. First, it would remove these land from the category of urban land that is available for development. The capacity of the urban growth boundary would have to be calculated without these, and plans to accommodate housing and employment would have to be made without them. Secondly, these natural areas, along with key rural reserve areas, would receive a high priority for purchase as parks and open space, such as Metro's Greenspaces program. Finally, regulations could be developed to protect these critical natural areas that would not conflict with housing and economic goals, thereby having the benefit of regulatory protection of critical creek areas, compatible low-density development, and transfer of development rights to other lands better suited for development.

About 35,000 acres of land and water inside today's urban growth boundary are included as open spaces in the Growth Concept Map. Preservation of these Open Spaces could be achieved by a combination of ways. Some areas could be purchased by public entities, such as Metro's Greenspaces program or local park departments. Others may be donated by private citizens or by developers of adjacent properties to reduce the impact of development. Some could be protected by environmental zoning which allows very low-density residential development through the clustering of housing on portions of the land while leaving important features as common open space.
Creating higher density centers of employment and housing is advantageous for several reasons. These centers provide access to a variety of goods and services in a relatively small geographic area, creating a intense business climate. Having centers also makes sense from a transportation perspective, since most centers have an accessibility level that is conducive to transit, bicycling and walking. Centers also act as social gathering places and community centers, where people would find the cultural and recreational activities and "small town atmosphere" they cherish.

The major benefits of centers in the marketplace are accessibility and the ability to concentrate goods and services in a relatively small area. The problem in developing centers, however, is that most of the existing centers are already developed and any increase in the density must be made through redeveloping existing land and buildings. Emphasizing redevelopment in centers over development of new areas of undeveloped land is a key strategy in the Growth Concept. Areas of high unemployment and low property values should be specially considered to encourage reinvestment and redevelopment. Incentives and tools to facilitate redevelopment in centers should be identified.

There are three types of centers, distinguished by size and accessibility. The "central city" is downtown Portland and is accessible to millions of people. "Regional centers" are accessible to hundreds of thousands of people, and "town centers" are accessible to tens of thousands.

The Central City

Downtown Portland serves as our major regional center and functions quite well as an employment and cultural hub for the metropolitan area. It provides accessibility to the many businesses that require access to a large market area and also serves as the location for cultural and social functions that draw the region together. It is the center for local, regional, state, and federal governments, financial institutions, commerce, the center for arts and culture, and for visitors to the region.

In addition, downtown Portland has a high percentage of travel other than by car — three times higher than the next most successful area. Jobs and housing are be readily available there, without the need for a car. Maintaining and improving upon the strengths of our regional downtown shall remain a high priority.

Today, about 20 percent of all employment in the region is in downtown Portland. Under the Growth Concept, downtown Portland would grow at about the same rate as the rest
of the region, and would remain the location of about 20 percent of regional employment.
To do this, downtown Portland's 1990 density of 150 people per acre would increase to about
250 people per acre. Improvements to the transit system network, development of a multi-modal
street system and maintenance of regional through routes (the highway system) would
provide additional mobility to and from the city center.

Regional Centers

There are nine regional centers, serving four market areas (outside of the Central City
market area). Hillsboro serves that western portion of the region, and Gresham the
eastern. The Central city and Gateway serve most of the Portland area as a regional
center. Downtown Beaverton and Washington Square serve the Washington County
area, and downtown Oregon City, Clackamas Town Center and Milwaukie together
serve Clackamas County and portions of outer south east Portland.

These Regional Centers would become the focus of compact development, redevelopment,
and high-quality transit service, multi-modal street networks and act as major nodes along
regional through routes. The Growth Concept estimates that about 3 percent
of new household growth and 11 percent of new employment growth would be
accommodated in these regional centers. From the current 24 people per acre, the Growth
Concept would allow up to an average of about 60 people per acre.

Transit improvements would include light-rail connecting all regional centers to the
Central City. A dense network of multi-modal arterial and collector streets would tie
regional centers to surrounding neighborhoods and other centers. Regional through-
routes would be designed to serve connect regional centers and ensure that these
centers are attractive places to conduct business. The relatively small number of
centers reflects not only the limited market for new development at this density but also
the limited transportation funding for the high-quality transit and roadway improvements
envisioned in these areas. As such the nine regional centers should be considered
candidates and ultimately the number should be reduced or policies established to
phase-in certain regional centers earlier than others.

Town Centers

Smaller than regional centers and serving populations of tens of thousands of people,
town centers are the third type of center with compact development and transit service.
Town centers would accommodate about 3 percent of new households and more than
7 percent of new employment. The 1990 density of an average of 23 people per acre
would nearly double — to about 40 persons per acre, the current densities of
development along Hawthorne Boulevard and in downtown Hillsboro.

Town centers would provide local shopping and employment and cultural recreational opportunities within a local market area. They are designed to provide local retail and services, at a minimum. They also would vary greatly in character. Some would become traditional town centers, such as Lake Oswego, Oregon City, and Forest Grove, while others would change from an auto-oriented development into a more complete community, such as Hillsdale. Many would also have regional specialties, such as office centers envisioned for the Cedar Mill town center. Several new town centers are designated, such as in Happy Valley and Damascus, to accommodate the retail and service needs of a growing population while reducing auto travel. Others would combine a town center within a regional center, offering the amenities and advantages of each type of center.

Corridors

Corridors are not as dense as centers but also are located along good quality transit lines. They provide a place for densities that are somewhat higher than today and feature a high-quality pedestrian environment and convenient access to transit. Typical new developments would include rowhouses, duplexes, and one to three story office and retail buildings, and average about 25 persons per acre. While some corridors may be continuous, narrow bands of higher intensity development along arterial roads, others may be more 'nodal', that is, a series of smaller centers at major intersections or other locations along the arterial which have high quality pedestrian environments, good connections to adjacent neighborhoods and good transit service. So long as the average target densities and uses are allowed and encouraged along the corridor, many different development patterns - nodal or linear - may meet the corridor objective.

Station Communities

Station communities are nodes of development centered around a light rail or high capacity transit station which feature a high-quality pedestrian environment. They provide for the highest density outside centers. The station communities would encompass an area approximately one-half mile from a station stop. The densities of new development would average about 45 persons per acre. Zoning ordinances now set minimum densities for most Eastside and Westside MAX station communities. An extensive station community planning program is now under way for each of the Westside station communities, and similar work is envisioned for the proposed South/North line. It is expected that the station community planning process will result in specific strategies and plan changes to implement the station communities concept.
Because the Growth Concept calls for many corridors and station communities throughout the region, they would together they are estimated to accommodate 27 percent of the new households of the region and nearly 15 percent of new employment.

Main Streets and Neighborhood Centers

During the early decades of this century, main streets served by transit and characterized by a strong business and civic community were a major land-use pattern throughout the region. Examples remain in Hillsboro, Milwaukie, Oregon City and Gresham as well as the Westmoreland neighborhood and Hawthorne Boulevard. Today, these areas are undergoing a revival and provide an efficient and effective land-use and transportation alternative. The Growth Concept calls for main streets to grow from 1990 levels of 36 people per acre to about 39 per acre. Main streets would accommodate nearly 2 percent of housing growth.

Main streets typically will serve neighborhoods and may develop a regional specialization — such as antiques, fine dining, entertainment or specialty clothing — that draws people from other parts of the region. Main Streets form neighborhood centers as areas that provide the retail and service development at other intersections at the focus of a neighborhood areas and around MAX light rail stations. When several main streets occur within a few blocks of one another, they may also serve as a dispersed town center, such as the main street areas of Belmont, Hawthorne and Division that form a town center for inner southeast Portland.

Neighborhoods

Residential neighborhoods would remain a key component of the Growth Concept and would fall into two basic categories. Inner neighborhoods are include areas such as Portland and the older suburbs of Beaverton, Milwaukie and Lake Oswego, and would include primarily residential areas that are accessible to employment. Lot sizes would be smaller to accommodate densities increasing from 1990 levels of about 11 people per acre to about 14 per acre. Inner neighborhoods would trade smaller lot sizes for better access to jobs and shopping. They would accommodate about 28 percent of new households and 15 percent of new employment (some of the employment would be home occupations and the balance would be neighborhood-based employment such as schools, daycare and some neighborhood businesses).

Outer neighborhoods would be farther away from large employment centers and would
have larger lot sizes and lower densities. Examples include outer suburbs cities such as Forest Grove, Sherwood and Oregon City, and any additions to the urban growth boundary. From 1990 levels of nearly 10 people per acre, outer neighborhoods would increase to about 13 per acre. These areas would accommodate about 28 percent of new households and 10 percent of new employment.

One of the most significant problems in some newer neighborhoods is the lack of street connections, a recent phenomenon that has occurred in the last 25 years. It is one of the primary causes of increased congestion in new suburbs. Traditional neighborhoods contained a grid pattern with up to 20 through streets per mile. But in new areas, one to two through streets per mile is the norm. Combined with large scale single-use zoning and low densities, it is the major cause of increasing auto dependency in neighborhoods. To improve local connectivity throughout the region, all areas shall develop master street plans that include from 8 to 20 local streets connections per mile, which would improve access for all modes of travel.

Employment Areas

The Portland metropolitan area economy is heavily dependant upon wholesale trade and the flow of commodities to national and international markets. The high quality of our freight transportation system, and in particular our intermodal freight facilities are essential to continued growth in trade. The intermodal facilities (air and marine terminals, freight rail yards and common carrier truck terminals) are an area of regional concern, and the regional framework plan will identify and protect lands needed to meet their current and projected space requirements.

Industrial areas would be set aside primarily for industrial activities. Other supporting uses, including some retail uses, may be allowed if limited to sizes and locations intended to serve the primary industrial uses. They include land-intensive employers, such as those around the Portland International Airport, the Hillsboro Airport and some areas along Highway 212/224. Industrial areas are expected to accommodate 10 percent of regional employment and no households. Retail uses whose market area is substantially larger than the employment area shall not be considered supporting uses.

Other employment centers would be designated as mixed-use employment areas, mixing various types of employment and including some residential development as well. These mixed-use employment areas would provide for about five percent of new households and 14 percent of new employment within the region. Densities would rise substantially from 1990 levels of about 11 people per acre to about 20 people per acre.
Employment areas would be expected to include some limited retail commercial uses sized to serve the needs of people working and living in the immediate employment areas, not larger market areas outside the employment area. Exceptions to this general policy can be made for low traffic generating land consumptive commercial uses which have a community or region-wide market.

The siting and development of new industrial areas would consider the proximity of housing for all income ranges provided by employment in the projected industrial center, as well as accessibility to convenient and inexpensive non-auto transportation. The continued development of existing industrial areas would include attention to these two issues as well.

Urban Reserves

One important feature of the Growth Concept is that it would accommodate all 50 years of forecasted growth through a relatively small amount of urban reserves. Urban reserves consist of land set aside outside the present urban growth boundary for future growth. The Growth Concept contains approximately 22,000 acres of Urban Reserve Study Areas shown on the Concept Map. Less than 15,000 of these the full Study Area may be needed for urban reserve area designation growth if the other density goals of the Growth Concept are met. Over 75 percent of these lands are currently zoned for rural housing and the remainder are zoned for farm or forestry uses. These areas shall be refined to the 14,500 acres for designation of urban reserves required by the Growth Concept for designation of urban reserves areas under the LCDC Urban Reserve Rule and inclusion in the regional framework plan.

Transportation Facilities

In undertaking the Region 2040 process, the region has shown a strong commitment to developing a regional plan that is based on greater land use efficiencies and a truly multi-modal transportation system. However, the transportation system defined in the Growth Concept Analysis serves as a theoretical definition (construct) of the transportation system needed to serve the land uses in the Growth Concept (Recommended Alternative urban form). The modeled system reflects only one of many possible configurations that might be used to serve future needs, consistent with the policy direction called for in the Growth Concept (amendment to RUGGO).

As such, the Growth Concept (Recommended Alternative) transportation map provides only general direction for development of an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and does not prescribe or limit what the RTP will ultimately include in the regional system. Instead, the RTP will build upon the broader land use and
The transportation elements needed to create a successful growth management policy are those that support the Growth Concept. Traditionally, streets have been defined by their traffic-carrying potential, and transit service according to its ability to draw commuters. Other travel modes have not been viewed as important elements of the transportation system. The Growth Concept establishes a new framework for planning in the region by linking urban form to transportation. In this new relationship, transportation is viewed as a range of travel modes and options that reinforce the region's growth management goals.

Within the framework of the Growth Concept is a network of multi-modal corridors and regional through-routes that connect major urban centers and destinations. Through-routes provide for high-volume auto and transit travel at a regional scale, and ensure efficient movement of freight. Within multi-modal corridors, the transportation system will provide a broader range of travel mode options, including auto, transit, bicycle and pedestrian networks, that allow choices of how to travel in the region. These travel options will encourage the use of alternative modes to the auto, a shift that has clear benefits for the environment and the quality of neighborhoods and urban centers and address the needs of those without access to automobiles.

In addition to the traditional emphasis on road and transit facilities, the development of networks for freight travel and intermodal facilities, for bicycle and pedestrian travel and the efficient use of capacity on all streets through access management and congestion management and/or pricing will be part of a successful transportation system.

While the Concept Map shows only major transit facilities and corridors, all areas within the UGB have transit access. Transit service in the Growth Concept included both fixed-route and demand responsive systems. The RTP shall further define the type and extent of transit service available throughout the region.

Intermodal Facilities

The region's continued strength as a national and international distribution center is dependent upon adequate intermodal facilities and access to them. Intermodal facilities include marine terminals, railroad intermodal points, such as the Union Pacific's Albina Yard, the airports and the Union Station/inter-city bus station area. The Regional Transportation Plan will identify these areas and their transportation requirements and will identify programs to provide adequate freight capacity.
Regional Through-routes

These are the routes that move people and goods through and around the region, connect regional centers to each other and to the Central City, and connect the region to the statewide and interstate transportation system. They include freeways, limited access highways, and heavily traveled arterials, and usually function as through-routes. As such, they are important not only because of the movement of people, but as one of the region's major freight systems. Since much of our regional economy depends on the movement of goods and services, it is essential to keep congestion on these roads at manageable levels. These major routes frequently serve as transit corridors but are seldom conducive to bicycles or pedestrians because of the volume of auto and freight traffic that they carry.

With their heavy traffic, and high visibility, these routes are attractive to business. However, when they serve as a location for auto-oriented businesses, the primary function of these routes, to move regional and statewide traffic, can be eroded. While they serve as an appropriate location for auto-oriented businesses, they are poor locations for businesses that are designed to serve neighborhoods or sub-regions. These are better located on multi-modal arterials. They need the highest levels of access control. In addition, it is important that they not become barriers to movements across them by other forms of travel, auto, pedestrian, transit, or bicycle. They shall focus on providing access to centers and neighbor cities, rather than access to the lands that front them.

Multi-modal Arterials

These represent most of the region's arterials. They include a variety of design styles and speeds, and are the backbone for a system of multi-modal travel options. Older sections of the region are better designed for multi-modal travel than new areas. Although these streets often smaller than suburban arterials, they carry a great deal of traffic (up to 30,000 vehicles a day), experience heavy bus ridership along their routes and are constructed in dense networks that encourage bicycle and pedestrian travel. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) shall identify these multi-modal streets and develop a plan to further encourage alternative travel modes within these corridors.

Many new streets, however, are designed to accommodate heavy auto and freight traffic at the expense of other travel modes. Multiple, wide lanes, dedicated turning lanes, narrow sidewalks exposed to moving traffic, and widely-spaced intersections and street crossings create an environment that is difficult and dangerous to negotiate.
without a car. The RTP shall identify these potential multi-modal corridors and establish design standards that encourage other modes of travel along these routes.

Some multi-modal arterials also carry significant volumes of freight. The RTP will ensure that freight mobility on these routes is adequately protected by considering freight needs when identifying multi-modal routes, and in establishing design standards intended to encourage alternative modes of passenger travel.

Collectors and Local Streets

These streets become a regional priority when a lack of adequate connections forces neighborhood traffic onto arterials. New suburban development increasingly depends on arterial streets to carry trips to local destinations, since most new local streets systems a specifically designed with curves and cul-de-sacs to discourage local through travel by any mode. The RTP should consider a standard of 8 to 20 through streets per mile, applied to both developed and developing to reduce local travel on arterials. There should also be established standard bicycle and pedestrian through-routes (via easements, greenways, fire lanes, etc.) in existing neighborhoods where changes to the street system are not a reasonable alternative.
Light Rail

Light rail transit (LRT) daily travel capacity measures in tens of thousands of riders, and provides a critical travel option to major destinations. The primary function of light rail in the Growth Concept is to link regional centers and the Central City, where concentrations of housing and employment reach a level that can justify the cost of developing a fixed transit system. In addition to their role in developing regional centers, LRT lines can also support significant concentrations of housing and employment at individual station areas along their routes.

In addition, neighbor cities of sufficient size should also include a transit connection to the metropolitan area to provide a full-range of transportation alternatives.

"Planned and Existing Light Rail Lines" on the Concept Map represent some locations shown on the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which were selected for initial analysis. "Proposed Light Rail Alignments" show some appropriate new light rail locations consistent with serving the Growth Concept. "Potential HCT lines" highlight locations for some concentrated form of transit, possibly including light rail. These facilities demonstrate the general direction for development of an updated RTP which will be based on further study. The Concept Map transportation facilities do not prescribe or limit the existing of updated RTP.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Networks

Bicycling and walking should play an important part in the regional transportation system especially within neighborhoods and centers and for other shorter trips. They are also essential to the success of an effective transit system. In addition to the arrangement of land uses and site design, route continuity and the design of rights-of-way in a manner friendly to bicyclists and pedestrians are necessary. The Regional Transportation Plan will establish targets which substantially increase the share on these modes.

Demand Management/Pricing

The land uses and facilities in the Growth Concept cannot, by themselves, meet the region's transportation objectives. Demand Management (carpooling, parking management and pricing strategies) and system management will be necessary to achieve the transportation system operation described in the Growth Concept.

Additional actions will be need to resolve the significant remaining areas of congestion
and the high VMT/capita which it causes. The Regional Transportation Plan will identify explicit targets for these programs in various areas of the region.
GLOSSARY

Areas and Activities of Metropolitan Concern. A program, area or activity, having significant impact upon the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area that can benefit from a coordinated multi-jurisdictional response.

Beneficial Use Standards. Under Oregon law, specific uses of water within a drainage basin deemed to be important to the ecology of that basin as well as to the needs of local communities are designated as "beneficial uses". Hence, "beneficial use standards" are adopted to preserve water quality or quantity necessary to sustain the identified beneficial uses.

Center City. The downtown and adjacent portions of the city of Portland. See the Growth Concept map and text.

Economic Opportunities Analysis. An "economic opportunities analysis" is a strategic assessment of the likely trends for growth of local economies in the state consistent with OAR 660-09-015. Such an analysis is critical for economic planning and for ensuring that the land supply in an urban area will meet long-term employment growth needs.

Exception. An "exception" is taken for land when either commitments for use, current uses, or other reasons make it impossible to meet the requirements of one or a number of the statewide planning goals. Hence, lands "excepted" from statewide planning goals 3 (Agricultural Lands) and 4 (Forest Lands) have been determined to be unable to comply with the strict resource protection requirements of those goals, and are thereby able to be used for other than rural resource production purposes. Lands not excepted from statewide planning goals 3 and 4 are to be used for agricultural or forest product purposes, and other, adjacent uses must support their continued resource productivity.

Exclusive farm use. Land zoned primarily for farming, and restricting many uses that are incompatible with farming, such as rural housing. Some portions of rural reserves also may be zoned as exclusive farm use.

Family Wage Job. A permanent job with an annual income greater than or equal to the average annual covered wage in the region. The most current average annual covered wage information from the Oregon Employment Division shall be used to determine the family wage job rate for the region or for counties within the region.
Fiscal Tax Equity. The process by which inter-jurisdictional fiscal disparities can be addressed through a partial redistribution of the revenue gained from economic wealth, particularly the increment gained through economic growth.

Freight Mobility. The efficient movement of goods from point of origin to destination.

Functional Plan. A limited purpose multi-jurisdictional plan for an area or activity having significant district-wide impact upon the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area that serves as a guideline for local comprehensive plans consistent with ORS 268.390.

Growth Concept. A concept for the long-term growth management of our region, stating the preferred form of the regional growth and development, including where and how much the urban growth boundary should be expanded, what densities should characterize different areas, and which areas should be protected as open space.

High capacity transit. Transit routes that may be either a road designated for frequent bus service or for a light-rail line.

Housing Affordability. The availability of housing such that no more than 30 percent (an index derived from federal, state, and local housing agencies) of the monthly income of the household need be spent on shelter.

Industrial areas. Large tracts of land set aside for industrial use.

Infill. New development on a parcel or parcels of less than one contiguous acre located within the urban growth boundary.

Infrastructure. Roads, water systems, sewage systems, systems for storm drainage, bridges, transportation facilities, parks schools and public facilities developed to support the functioning of the developed portions of the environment. Areas of the undeveloped portions of the environment such as floodplains, riparian and wetland zones, groundwater recharge and discharge areas and Greenspaces that provide important functions related to maintaining the region's air and water quality, reduce the need for infrastructure expenses and contribute to the region's quality of life.

Inner neighborhoods. Areas in Portland and the older suburbs that are primarily residential, close to employment and shopping areas, and have slightly smaller lot sizes and higher population densities than in outer neighborhoods.
Intermodal Facility. A transportation element that accommodates and interconnects different modes of transportation and serves the statewide, interstate and international movement of people and goods.

Jobs Housing Balance. The relationship between the number, type, mix and wages of existing and anticipated jobs balanced with housing costs and availability so that non-auto trips are optimized in every part of the region.

Key or Critical Public Facilities and Services. Basic facilities that are primarily planned for by local government but which also may be provided by private enterprise and are essential to the support of more intensive development, including transportation, water supply, sewage, parks, and solid waste disposal.

Local Comprehensive Plan. A generalized, coordinated land use map and policy statement of the governing body of a city or county that inter-relates all functional and natural systems and activities related to the use of land, consistent with state law.

Major Amendment A proposal made to the Metro Council for expansion of the urban growth boundary of 20 acres or more, consistent with the provisions of the Metro code.

Metropolitan Housing Rule. A rule (OAR 660, Division 7) adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission to assure opportunity for the provision of adequate numbers of needed housing units and the efficient use of land within the Metro Urban Growth Boundary. This rule establishes minimum overall net residential densities for all cities and counties within the urban growth boundary, and specifies that 50 percent of the land set aside for new residential development be zoned for multifamily housing.

Main streets. Neighborhood shopping areas along a main street or at an intersection, sometimes having a unique character that draws people from outside the area. NW 23rd Avenue and SE Hawthorne Boulevard are current examples of main streets.

Mixed-use Employment areas. Areas of mixed employment, manufacturing and warehousing uses and limited retail and residential development, that include various types of commercial and retail development as well as some residences.

Neighborhood centers. Retail and service development that surrounds major MAX stations and other major intersections, extending out for one-quarter to one-half mile.
Neighboring cities. Cities such as Sandy, Canby, and Newberg that are outside Metro’s jurisdiction but will be affected by the growth policies adopted by the Metro Council.

Open space. Publicly and privately-owned areas of land, including parks, natural areas, and areas of very low density development inside the urban growth boundary.

Outer neighborhoods. Areas in the outlying suburbs that are primarily residential, farther from employment and shopping areas, and have slightly larger lot sizes and lower population densities than inner neighborhoods.

Pedestrian Scale. An urban development pattern where walking is a safe, convenient and interesting travel mode. It is an area where walking is at least as attractive as any other mode to all destinations within the area. The following elements are not cited as requirements, but illustrate examples of pedestrian scale: continuous, smooth and wide walking surfaces; easily visible from streets and buildings and safe for walking; minimal points where high speed automobile traffic and pedestrians mix; frequent crossings; storefronts, trees, bollards, on-street parking, awnings, outdoor seating, signs, doorways and lighting designed to serve those on foot; well integrated into the transit system, and having uses which cater to people on foot.

Persons per acre. This is a term expressing the intensity of building development by combining residents per net acre and employees per net acre.

Regional centers. Areas of mixed residential and commercial use that serve hundreds of thousands of people and are easily accessible by different types of transit. Examples include traditional centers such as downtown Gresham and new centers such as Clackamas Town Center.

Rural reserves. Areas that are a combination of public and private lands outside the urban growth boundary, used primarily for farms and forestry. They are protected from development by very low-density zoning and serve as buffers between urban areas.

State Implementation Plan. A plan for ensuring that all parts of Oregon remain in compliance with Federal air quality standards.

Subregion. An area of analysis used by Metro centered on each regional center and used for analyzing jobs/housing balance.
Town centers. Areas of mixed residential and commercial use that serve tens of thousands of people. Examples include the downtowns of Forest Grove and Lake Oswego.

Transit Station Community. That area generally within a 1/4 to 1/2 mile radius of light rail stations which is planned as a multi-modal community of mixed uses and substantial pedestrian accessibility improvements.

Transportation corridors. Residential and retail development concentrated along major arterials and bus lines.

Urban Form. The net result of efforts to preserve environmental quality, coordinate the development of jobs, housing, and public services and facilities, and inter-relate the benefits and consequences of growth in one part of the region with the benefits and consequences of growth in another. Urban form, therefore, describes an overall framework within which regional urban growth management can occur. Clearly stating objectives for urban form, and pursuing them comprehensively provides the focal strategy for rising to the challenges posed by the growth trends present in the region today.

Urban Growth Boundary. A boundary which identifies urban and urbanizable lands needed during the 20-year planning period to be planned and serviced to support urban development densities, and which separates urban and urbanizable lands from rural land.

Urban Reserve Area. An area adjacent to the present urban growth boundary defined to be a priority location for any future urban growth boundary amendments when needed. Urban reserves are intended to provide cities, counties, other service providers, and both urban and rural land owners with a greater degree of certainty regarding future regional urban form. Whereas the urban growth boundary describes an area needed to accommodate the urban growth forecasted over a twenty year period, the urban reserves plus the area inside the urban growth boundary estimate the area capable of accommodating the growth expected for 50 years.
2040 Growth Concept Review/Approval Schedule

December 8, 1994  Metro Council adopts 2040 Growth Concept by resolution. Grants request by cities and counties for additional time to consider Growth Concept before Metro adoption by ordinance.

January 6, 1995  Adopted map and text distributed to cities and counties of the region and interested persons. (Approximately 3,000)

March 15, 1995  First deadline request to planning directors for map and text changes.

April 17, 1995  2040 Framework Newsletter distributed. (45,000+ copies mailed)

April - June  MTAC review of RUGGO amendments

April - July  MPAC review of RUGGO amendments

May 25, 1995  Extended deadline for local government map comments

June 24, 1995  Open House - Metro offices (80+ in attendance)

June 26, 1995  Open House - Milwaukie (100+ in attendance)

June 27, 1995  Open House - Gresham (100+ in attendance)

June 29, 1995  Open House - Beaverton (125+ in attendance)

July 20, 1995  Open House - Damascus

July 12, 1995  Revised RUGGO recommendations approved by MPAC

July 26, 1995  Presentation of draft Concept Map to MPAC

July 27, 1995  Discussion of Concept Map with MTAC, planning directors of the region

August 9, 1995  Discussion of Concept Map at MPAC

August 10, 1995  MTAC Concept Map recommendation vote

August 23, 1995  MPAC Concept Map recommendation vote

September 7, 1995  Presentation of Growth Concept and Map to Metro Council, referral to Planning and Land Use Committee

September 21, 1995  Requested date for Planning and Land Use committee public hearing

October 5, 1995  Requested date for continuation of public hearing

October 19, 1995  Requested date for Planning and Land Use Committee recommendation

November 2, 1995  Requested date for Metro Council public hearing

November 16, 1995  Requested date for Metro Council decision

****
GOVERNOR JOHN KITZHABER TALKING POINTS
OREGON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
August 16, 1995

- We face unprecedented growth in Oregon. The challenge to protect our resource lands while accommodating growth, particularly in the Willamette Valley, will require state government to be prepared in all quarters. Some of the things I say today may sound somewhat disturbing in terms of my view of this agency's role. I hope you will accept them in the spirit in which they are offered—a realistic assessment of this agency's role in meeting the challenges of the 21st century. I believe you have made some excellent strides in re-engineering the way the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) works and, it is my hope, we can build on that work in making the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and ODOT key players in our growth management program.

- Many attempts have been made to coordinate the activities of state agencies as they relate to our land use planning program. The growth council, the livable communities team, and other efforts have served to highlight growth issues. But we have yet to really deliver on an integrated strategy where agency actions and activities occur in concert to accomplish a shared mission in growth management.

- The Region 2040 Plan in the Metro area is a good example of where there was good coordination between the agency and a region. But now we must take an interagency approach to implement that plan to make the region function as it has been planned. Corridor Planning is an opportunity to work with local governments to demonstrate and implement the virtues of sound growth management. The Transportation/Growth Management joint Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) ODOT program holds a great deal of promise in assisting local government through an integrated state response and should, in my opinion, be enhanced. I want to encourage more opportunities for interaction between LCDC and OTC. Your October joint meeting will be a good beginning for this and I have asked my growth management advisor, Greg Wolf, to work with Don Forbes and Dick Benner in shaping a constructive agenda. I have
A matter that is high on your agenda, as well as mine, is the critical financial condition of the state's highway program. I know that you have recently taken steps to examine alternative financing approaches, and I applaud your efforts. We do not have sufficient resources to meet Oregon's maintenance and construction needs. An adequate infrastructure is absolutely critical, not only to our economy, but to our quality of life. For two legislative sessions we have failed to obtain sufficient funds for our transportation program. Now we hear talk of regions and cities finding their own methods of transportation financing, given the state's inability to contribute. I believe this signals a threat to the state's transportation system. We cannot afford a fractionalized system. In order to make the case for a financing package we must build a broad consensus for it. We cannot repeat failed strategies in our quest for a financing package and we must broaden our base of support beyond those traditionally involved in infrastructure financing to those who care about the economy of the state, public safety, growth management and livability and even education. Inadequate infrastructure affects all segments of our community. Today I want to challenge the Commission and the staff to develop a transportation financing plan. Not just a plan that reflects what the state perceives to be answers to our needs, not just a plan that satisfies special interests, but a plan that expands its base across Oregon communities and develops a consensus for action by the legislature in 1997. The consensus should not be only among those who have been our allies, but also among those segments of Oregon who have not been a part of your constituency in the past. We must think creatively and outside the box to develop a consensus for action. I ask that you provide me with a method for developing an integrated strategy and time frame for a successful financing package by November 1. I am ready to stand as your partner in a well-conceived effort.

I look forward to working with the Commission and the Department as we prepare ourselves for the challenges that growth will bring us. It is my expectation that the OTC and ODOT will emerge with the leadership required to meet this growth challenge and focus our efforts to produce the kind of state we can be proud to live in.
Date: September 13, 1995
To: JPACT/MPAC
From: Mike Burton, Executive Officer
Re: Arterial Program -- Region 2040 Compatibility

Attached is a letter I received from Mayor Rob Drake suggesting a stronger emphasis in the proposed Regional Arterial Program for projects to "jump-start" the Region 2040 Growth Concept. I wholeheartedly support this principle and feel that this is very consistent with the direction already set by JPACT. As we move forward on selecting projects and deciding whether to proceed with a ballot measure, it will be important to have further discussions with JPACT to strike the proper balance between improvements to the existing arterial system and targeting projects which jump-start key Region 2040 target areas, particularly high density areas like Regional Centers, LRT Station Areas, Town Centers and Main Streets.
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CITY of BEAVERTON
4755 S.W. Griffith Drive. P.O. Box 4755. Beaverton, OR 97076 TEL: (503) 526-2481 V/TDD FAX: (503) 526-2571

ROB DRAKE
MAYOR

September 12, 1995

Mr. Mike Burton
Metro Executive
600 N.E. Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Mike:

This letter is a follow-up to the points I made during yesterday’s Washington County Coordinating Committee (WCCC) meeting. I appreciate that you were in attendance and taking part in the discussion regarding the proposed Washington County road improvements to be funded by the Regional Arterial Program. The discussion highlighted some very significant decisions which will need to be made regarding the region’s commitment to the 2040 Concept and maintaining our high quality of life.

I support the Regional Arterial Program proposal to improve the existing road grid system in the metro area. We have regional road improvement needs which can’t wait to be constructed. However, if the region is going to make the 2040 Concept work, we need to invest by improving the road infrastructure projects which enhance the 2040 Concept opportunities.

It is apparent to me that the region needs to put its money where we can have the best opportunities to make the 2040 Concept work. Instead of having a “B” projects list for road improvements of a general nature, I’m recommending that a new list which enhances only 2040 concept opportunities be planned for and created. This list would be submitted to the region’s voters as part of the Regional Arterial Program. This additional list would supplement the Regional and “A” projects already being created.

The benefits are obvious. We would help provide the necessary road infrastructure in areas which meet the 2040 Concept criteria. The money would be allocated to those developments which need help to get 2040 Concept types of projects jump-started. We know that our citizens and market demand are asking for these kinds of new developments. We can take the initiative to modify the Regional Arterial Program process now and assist Metro in its earlier implementation of the 2040 Concept.

Mike, it is my intention to request that Mayor Gussie McRobert allow some discussion of this idea at tomorrow’s MPAC meeting. In addition, I would like your assistance in requesting that JPACT discuss this idea at Thursday morning’s meeting. I hope these requests meet with your approval. If there is interest, this could be advanced to the Metro Council and the local governments for discussion and modification. There is still plenty of time to implement these changes and increase the likelihood of the successful passage of the Regional Arterial Program. Please let me know your thoughts.

Sincerely,

Rob Drake
Mayor

c: Mayor Gussie McRobert, City of Gresham
September 13, 1995

The Honorable Rob Drake
Mayor of Beaverton
P.O. Box 4755
Beaverton, OR 97204

Dear Rob:

Thank you for your letter of September 12, 1995 following the Washington County Coordinating Committee's discussion of the proposed projects to be funded by the Regional Arterial Program. I wholeheartedly concur with your observation that this program should include both projects to upgrade the existing road infrastructure as well as projects to jump-start some of the high density target areas in the 2040 Growth Concept. I believe the program can meet both of these objectives and was pleased with the action taken by JPACT last month which identifies "Region 2040 Compatibility" among the criteria for developing the project list (see Attachment A).

In addition, the subsequent transmittal to local governments asking for project nominations provided further definition of "Region 2040 Compatibility." As you can see in Attachment B, the "Minimum Threshold" covers traditional projects needed on the existing arterial network while the "Preferred Threshold" represents those 2040 target areas that you referred to. In addition, I felt the criteria used to evaluate the candidate projects for the $27 million Region 2040 Reserve (see Attachment C) was a useful tool in articulating which projects are most important to leverage the 2040 Growth Concept objectives.

As JPACT proceeds to develop the proposal for a Regional Arterial Fund, it will be important to find the right balance between these "traditional" road projects and projects that emphasize implementation of the Region 2040 Growth Concept.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

Mike Burton
Executive Officer

MB:lmk
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CC: JPACT
   MPAC
REGIONAL ARTERIAL PROGRAM:

Funds Earmarked For Regional Projects And Local Jurisdictions

Criteria:
- safety
- city improvements
- regional linkages
- critical locations needing service
- Region 2040 compatibility
- traffic management
- jobs/economic development
- major road rehabilitation

Regionally Significant Projects = 75%
$225.0 million - $375 million

Local Projects = 25%
$75.0 million - $125 million
- Bridges
- Freight projects

$300 to $500 Million Over 10 Years

Regional Arterial Program:
75% targeted for distribution to counties and cities for regionally significant local projects, and 25% targeted for regional bridge and freight projects.
REGIONAL ARTERIAL PROGRAM

REGION 2040 COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS

Minimum Threshold

Projects that meet the minimum threshold include:

♦ A project that widens a facility from three lanes to five lanes, and bases the capacity increase on traffic projections in the Region 2040 Plan. (A seven lane project on this facility would not be compatible with Region 2040.)

♦ A road project that includes bike lanes, when the Regional Transportation Plan calls for bike lanes on that facility.

♦ A road project that includes sidewalks, when the Regional Transportation Plan calls for pedestrian facilities in that area.

♦ A road project that includes bus pullouts and other transit amenities based on the facility’s designation as a transit corridor in the Region 2040 Plan.

 Preferred Threshold

Projects that meet the preferred threshold include:

♦ A transportation project that provides the needed additional access into a Regional Center, thus leveraging the high density land use aspects called for in Region 2040.

♦ A project that provides needed additional freight access to an area designated as an industrial sanctuary in the RTP and Region 2040.

♦ A project that improves bicycle, pedestrian, and road circulation within a Regional Center, Town Center, or along a bus corridor, thus helping to achieve higher densities in the area.

♦ A project that provides needed access to, and circulation within, a Light Rail Station Area, thus helping to achieve higher densities in the area.

Not Compatible

Projects that are not compatible with Region 2040 include all projects that fail to meet the minimum or preferred thresholds (described above).

♦ A project that widens a facility beyond the capacity required to meet Region 2040 projections.

♦ A road improvement project that does not incorporate the bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities called for by the Regional Transportation Plan on designated routes.

Rev. 8/14/95
## 2040 Transportation Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Types</th>
<th>Central Cities Regional Centers</th>
<th>Industrial Sanctuaries</th>
<th>Main Streets Transit Ctrs., LRT Stations, Bus Corridors</th>
<th>Neo-trad. Single-Family</th>
<th>Mixed Employ. &amp; Single-Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeways &amp; Arterials (to &amp; within)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Facilities (to &amp; within)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bike Routes (to &amp; within)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets, Pedways, Bike Paths (within)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High = 25 points  
Medium = 10 points  
Low = 0 points
LEGEND:
- Funded Grid Projects
- Regional/Arterial Fund Project (East/West Circulation)
- Regional Arterial Fund Downtown Grid Alignment Alternative
Date: September 6, 1995

To: JPACT

From: Michael Hoglund, Transportation Planning Manager

Subject: FY 96-97 Transportation Growth Management Program

Attached for your review is a proposed schedule for adoption of the Metro area portion of the ODOT/LCDC Transportation Growth Management (TGM) program for the FY 96-97 biennium. Also attached is a listing of TGM projects submitted within ODOT Region 1. The Region 1 list totals over $4 million, with approximately $2.1 million in funding available.

The purpose of the program is to assist agencies and local jurisdictions to implement the Transportation Planning Rule and examine land use alternatives to address transportation needs. As established through the grant program, JPACT, MPAC, and the Metro Council are responsible for recommending to ODOT and LCDC those projects we support for funding. As you can see in the schedule, JPACT will be asked to endorse a program of TGM projects at their October 12 meeting. Included in your information packet for that meeting will be additional information on each application, its technical score and rank, and a TPAC/MTAC recommendation for a grant package.

Feel free to call me 797-1743 if you would like additional or early information on the program.

MH
Transportation Growth Management Planning Grants
Region 1
Metro Decision Process 1995

September 5, 1995 to September 20, 1995
Metro/DLCD/ODOT Staff Review and Recommendations on Grant Awards

September 21, 1995
Action by Executive Officer
Recommendation on Grant Awards

September 28, 1995
Action by MTAC
Recommendation on Grant Awards

September 29, 1995
Action by TPAC
Recommendation on Grant Awards

October 5, 1995
Briefing for Metro Council
Cotugno/Fregonese/ODOT/DLCD

October 11, 1995
Action by MPAC
Fregonese/ODOT/DLCD

October 12, 1995
Action by JPACT
Cotugno/ODOT/DLCD

to be determined
Action by Metro Land Use/Planning Committee
Recommendation on Grant Awards
Cotugno/Fregonese/DLCD/ODOT

October 26, 1995
Action by Metro Council
Endorsement of Grant Awards

October 28, 1995
DLCD/ODOT Announcement of Grant Awards

8/30/95 1:03:42MMMTG/TGM95.SCH
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
<td>Property Redevelopment Alternatives for Beaverton's Automobile-Dependent</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$72,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
<td>South Tektronix Neighborhood Plan</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
<td>Transportation System Plan Update</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$49,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>City of Cascade Locks</td>
<td>Cascade Locks Comprehensive Street &amp; Transportation Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$39,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>City of Cornelius</td>
<td>Cornelius Main Street District Plan</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$142,205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>City of Estacada</td>
<td>City of Estacada's Transportation System Plan Update</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>City of Forest Grove</td>
<td>Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>City of Forest Grove</td>
<td>Forest Grove Town Center Development Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$49,975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>Gresham Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>Land Use Alternatives Public Outreach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>Central Rockwood Focused Public Investment Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$49,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>Downtown Gresham Central Rockwood Parking Master Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>City of Happy Valley</td>
<td>Happy Valley Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>Hillsboro Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>Downtown Hillsboro Station community Plan (Regional Center) Traffic and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>Tanasbourne/Amberglen Town Center Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>Mainstreets/Neighborhood Commercial Implementation Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>Orenco and Quatama LRT Station Area Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>City of Hood River</td>
<td>Urban Area Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$84,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>City of Lake Oswego</td>
<td>Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$49,925.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td>Regional Center Management Plan</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$119,797.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td>Lake Road Multimodal Connection Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td>Riverfront To Springwater Trails Connection Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$17,448.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>City of Oregon City</td>
<td>Regional Center Management Plan</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$94,092.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>West Burnside Corridor Study</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$29,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>TPR Parking Plan Phase II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13,459.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Pedestrian Plan Project Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Model Bicycle and Walk to School Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGM Code</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Broadway Weidler Corridor Demonstration Development Projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$47,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Lents Town Center: Strategy for Transition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Gateway Regional Center vision &amp; Strategy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>City of Portland Bureau of Planning</td>
<td>West Portland Town Center</td>
<td>1&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>City of Portland (PDC)</td>
<td>Transit Supportive Development Resource Manual</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>City of Portland (PDC)</td>
<td>Collins Circle Redevelopment Strategy, Goose Hollow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>City of Portland (PDC)</td>
<td>Collins Circle Redevelopment Strategy: Goose Hollow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>City of Portland (PDC)</td>
<td>Albina Mixed-Use Project Handbook</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$44,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>City of Portland, Transportation Pl</td>
<td>2040 Centers Transportation Descriptors and Alternative Mode Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>City of Sandy</td>
<td>City of Sandy Public Facility Policies and Capital Improvement Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$62,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>City of St. Helens</td>
<td>St. Helens Transportation Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>City of Tigard</td>
<td>Urban Service Provision Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>City of Troutdale</td>
<td>257th Ave. Enhancement Study</td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$36,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>City of Troutdale</td>
<td>Troutdale Edgefield Station</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$49,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>City of Troutdale</td>
<td>Troutdale Town Center Plan</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$68,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>City of West Linn</td>
<td>Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$49,587.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
<td>Transportation Efficient Visual Design Standards</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
<td>Transportation-Efficient Land Use</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
<td>Transportation Master Plan Update</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>Damascus Urban reserve Study, Phase II</td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>Local Streets Traffic Calming and Skinny Street Standards for Clackamas Co</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>TPR Design guidelines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$48,310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>Clackamas County Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>North Clackamas Urban Service Agreement Project Phase II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>Columbia County</td>
<td>Transportation System Plan Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$29,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Shared Parking Project</td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Regional Street Design Study</td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$94,846.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Accessibility Measures Project</td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$47,494.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Category Region</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>TOD Implementation - Phase II, Continuing Program Definition</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Regional Parking Management Program - Phase II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$37,243.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Bicycle Use Forecasting Improvements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Growth management and Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$58,848.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>Design Standards Revision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$47,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>Bikeways Master Plan Update</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$29,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>UGM Grant Project for Rockwood Water PUD et al</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>North Plains/Metro</td>
<td>North Plains/Metro Neighboring City Study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$69,776.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td>PDX Transportation Management Association Feasibility assessment and Im</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41,365.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>Primary Transit Network/Phase II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Design Criteria for Park, Recreation, and Open Space Areas in Light Rail Sta</td>
<td>1&amp;3</td>
<td>$49,163.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Implementation of Narrower Local Street Standards and Neighborhood Traffi</td>
<td>1&amp;3</td>
<td>$17,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Expedited Development Review Procedures for Light Rail Station Areas</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>$23,555.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Cedar Mill Town Center Plan</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>$59,234.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial Implementation Plan</td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>$19,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>Parking Standards for Light Rail Station Area</td>
<td>1&amp;3</td>
<td>$22,305.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>Consideration of New Landscaping Standards in Transit corridors and Statio</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>$43,386.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>Implementation of HB 3133</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>$14,256.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>Urban Collector System Study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$49,317.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>SB 122 Public Involvement Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$58,324.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>SB 122 Technical Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$59,186.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>Western Advocates, Inc.</td>
<td>Negotiation of Urban Services Agreements for the Special Districts Serving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$94,684.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Benton County</td>
<td>Preparation of Benton County Revised Transportation Plan -- Phase II Activit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td>Albany Local Street Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td>Albany Square Specific Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$52,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>City of Corvallis</td>
<td>Corvallis transit Master Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$27,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>City of Corvallis</td>
<td>South Corvallis Area Refinement Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$53,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>UCM Grant Project for Rockwood Water PUD et al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lake Oswego</td>
<td>Transportation System Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Pedestrian Plan Project Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Modal, Bicycle, and Walk to School Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>2040 Centers Transportation Descriptors and Alternative Mode Pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Albina Mixed-Use Project Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Collins Circle Redevelopment Strategy; Goose Hollow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>TPR Parking Plan Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Broadway Wesley Corridor Demonstration Development Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>North Clackamas Urban Service Agreement Project Phase II</td>
<td>3 23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
<td>Transportation-efficient Land Use</td>
<td>2A3 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
<td>Transportation Master Plan Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
<td>Transportation Efficient visual Design Standards</td>
<td>2A3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>Design Standards Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>Bikeways Master Plan Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Lofts Town Center: Strategy for Transition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Gateway Regional Center vision &amp; Strategy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>West Burnside Corridor Study</td>
<td>2A3 7/10/11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
<td>Lake Road Multimodal Connection Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milwaukie</td>
<td>Riverfront To Springwater Trails Connection Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>Downtown Gresham Central Rockwood Parking Master Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland (PDC)</td>
<td>Collins Circle Redevelopment Strategy; Goose Hollow</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland (PDC)</td>
<td>Transit Supportive Development Resource Manual</td>
<td>2A3 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Troutdale</td>
<td>Trudgill Edgefield Station</td>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>Central Rockwood Focused Public Investment Plan</td>
<td>3 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>Damascus Urban Plan Study, Phase II</td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>Clackamas County Transportation System Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>Local Streets Traffic Calming and Skinny Street Standards for City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>TPR Design guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
<td>Property Redevelopment Alternatives for Beaverton's Automobile</td>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
<td>Transportation System Plan Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Assigned to</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 122 Technical Work</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>$59,186.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 122 Public Involvement Work</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>$38,324.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>$19,650.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Criteria for Park, Recreational, and Open Space Areas in Li</td>
<td>Washington County DLUT</td>
<td>$49,163.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of New Landscaping Standards in Transit corridors</td>
<td>City of Forest Grove</td>
<td>$43,856.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Grove Town Center Development Plan</td>
<td>City of Forest Grove</td>
<td>$49,973.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Alternatives Public Outreach</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>$25,025.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257th Ave. Enhancement Study</td>
<td>City of Troutdale</td>
<td>$36,300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial Implementation Plan</td>
<td>City of Troutdale</td>
<td>$36,300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Center Management Plan</td>
<td>City of Oregon City</td>
<td>$94,092.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>City of Forest Grove</td>
<td>$41,175.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Center Management Plan</td>
<td>City of Milwaukie</td>
<td>$119,797.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>City of Troutdale</td>
<td>$64,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Grove Town Center Development Plan</td>
<td>City of Troutdale</td>
<td>$62,900.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Center Management Plan</td>
<td>City of Oregon City</td>
<td>$41,165.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Association Feasibility assessment</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Service Provision Plan</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceaan Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>City of Troutdale</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Telcomrux Neighborhood Plan</td>
<td>City of Oregon City</td>
<td>$41,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Estacada's Transportation System Plan Update</td>
<td>City of Estacada</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Locks Comprehensive Street &amp; Transportation Plan</td>
<td>City of Estacada</td>
<td>$39,926.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Plan Development</td>
<td>Columbia County</td>
<td>$39,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helens Transportation Plan</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Valley Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>City of Happy Valley</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Hillsboro Station Community Plan (Regional Center)</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon and Quatama LRT Station Area Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandbourse/Amberglen Town Center Plan</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured/Neighborhood Commercial Implementation Program</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Use Forecasting Improvements</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parking Management Program - Phase II</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$37,243.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Street Design Study</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$94,846.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Measures Project</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$47,494.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Vendor/Recipient</td>
<td>City/County</td>
<td>PAC #</td>
<td>Project Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plains/Metro Neighboring City Study</td>
<td>9001</td>
<td>North Plains/Metro</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth management and Schools</td>
<td>9002</td>
<td>North Plains/Metro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Parking Project</td>
<td>9003</td>
<td>North Plains/Metro</td>
<td>1&amp;2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Implementation - Phase II, Continuing Program Definition</td>
<td>9004</td>
<td>North Plains/Metro</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Plan</td>
<td>9005</td>
<td>North Plains/Metro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Linn</td>
<td>9006</td>
<td>West Linn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Growth management and Schools</td>
<td>9007</td>
<td>West Linn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Parking Project</td>
<td>9008</td>
<td>West Linn</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro TOD Transportation - Phase II, Continuing Program Definition</td>
<td>9009</td>
<td>West Linn</td>
<td>2&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cornelius</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>Cornelius</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Main Street District Plan</td>
<td>9011</td>
<td>Cornelius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Cedar Mill Town Center Plan</td>
<td>9012</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td>9013</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Implementation of Narrower Local Street Standards and Neighbor</td>
<td>9014</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>1&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Implementation of Narrower Local Street Standards and Neighbor</td>
<td>9015</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>1&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td>9016</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>1&amp;3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troutdale Town Center Plan</td>
<td>9017</td>
<td>Troutdale</td>
<td>1/2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE: JPACT

DATE: 9-14-95

NAME | AFFILIATION
---|---
Susan Miley | Metro
Cynthia LaPorte | Clackamas County
DAN SALZBACH | Mult. Co.
Andy Stypniewski | Metro
LP Monroe | Metro Council
Mike Burton | Metro Exec
ROB DRAKE | CITIES OF WASH. CO.
DON MORISSETTE | METRO
Dave Lehman | Port of Portland
Dean Longfellow | RTA
Bob Post | TRI-MET
Claudette de Vert | Cities of Mult. Co.
Linda Peters | WSDOT
Cree Green | cities of Clackamas Co.
Mary Leggey | Citizen
Craig Tomich | Clackamas Co
Bob安卓 | citizend
MAUREEN MURPHY | metro
Terry Whitley | Mult. Co.
Kathy Buerke | City of Happy Valley
Bill Brandon | MCCCI
Bob Bethman | Pat Callmeyer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GB Arrington</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dotterrer</td>
<td>City of Portland Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeky Blizzard</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Bollam</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Sandblast</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>