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AGENDA

Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: OCTOBER 14, 1999

Day: THURSDAY

Time: 7:30 A.M. - 9:30 A.M.

Place: METRO, CONFERENCE ROOM 370A & B

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

2. MEETING REPORT OF SEPTEMBER 9, 1999 - APPROVAL REQUESTED

3. CASCADIA METROPOLITAN FORUM – TENTATIVELY APRIL 27-29 OR MAY 4-6 IN SEATTLE

4. ODOT $600 MILLION BOND PROGRAM – APPROVAL REQUESTED OF LIST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT – Andy Cotugno/Dave Williams

5. COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL DEEPENING PROJECT – INFORMATIONAL – Dave Lohman, Sebastian Degens, Port of Portland


7. ADJOURN

* Material enclosed.
# Available at meeting.
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MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: September 9, 1999

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Jon Kvistad, Ed Washington and David Bragdon, Metro Council; Jim Kight, Cities of Multnomah County; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Charlie Hales, City of Portland; Karl Rohde, Cities of Clackamas County; Dave Lohman (alternate), Port of Portland; Bill Kennemer, Clackamas County; Mary Legry (alternate), WSDOT; Royce Pollard, City of Vancouver; Andy Ginsburg (alternate), DEQ; Sharron Kelley, Multnomah County; Kay Van Sickel, ODOT; and Fred Hansen, Tri-Met

Guests: Steve Clark, Traffic Relief Options (TRO) Task Force Vice-Chair; Mark Gorman, Intel (TRO T.F.); Betty Atteberry, Westside Economic Alliance (TRO T.F.); Mike Burton, Metro Executive Officer; Rod Monroe, Metro Presiding Officer; Tony Mendoza, Tri-Met; Ted Spence, Citizen; Ron Papsdorf, City of Gresham; Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Karen Schilling and Beckie Lee, Multnomah County; G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Dave Williams, ODOT; Bob Hart, Southwest Washington RTC; Dan Kaempff, Tualatin TMA; Gary Katsion, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.; Mark Lear, Marc Zolton, Elsa Coleman and Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; Kathy Lehtola, Washington County; Chris Hagerbaumer, Oregon Environmental Council; Scott Rice, Cornelius City Council; Rod Sandoz and John Rist, Clackamas County; Kathy Lehtola, Washington County; and Jack Kloster, Kloster & Associates, Inc.

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Mike Hoglund, Bridget Wieghart, Marci LaBerge, Bill Barber, Lois Kaplan, and Rooney Barker, Recording Secretary

Media: Gretchen Fehrenbacher, Daily Journal of Commerce
SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Jon Kvistad.

Chair Kvistad commented on the background and motivation leading to the memo he had sent to the Bi-State Committee relating to the committee's role and the issues to be addressed. He felt it was an exciting agenda, a challenge to scope out the questions for consideration, and that it was only his intent to move its agenda forward. His comments centered on the fact that it was not intended as a front page article and that the problems noted were not previously put on the front burner because of the lack of funding. He cited a crisis in the I-5 corridor and felt that cost responsibility of roads, congestion, and coordination of transit, bridge and funding issues need to be discussed.

Mayor Pollard of Vancouver cited the need of doing a better job of addressing bi-state issues and was supportive of bi-state cooperation at the local, state and federal level. He indicated support of projects previously agreed to and supported by bi-state leaders but felt it was a disservice to the region when new ideas are directed to one segment of the region without discussion. He felt it detracted from the vision of the region which is to achieve bi-state consensus. He noted that the proposal for a toll fee across the bi-state bridge for Washington residents came as a surprise, without warning, and became an embarrassment to him and other officials of Clark County. He thanked those members of the region who sent him calls of support, namely Mike Burton, Rod Monroe and Serena Cruz, but was disappointed that others had not joined them.

Mayor Pollard indicated that the Clark County Bi-State Committee members remain committed to bi-state relations because they believe it is in the best interest of the citizens of the Metro region and wish to build on past successes.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Andy Cotugno announced that this was Lois Kaplan's last JPACT meeting, having served as recording secretary for the committee for over 19 years. A flyer was distributed commemorating her retirement.

MEETING REPORT

Commissioner Kelly moved, seconded by Councilor Kight, to approve the July 8, 1999 JPACT Meeting Report as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-2830 - ADOPTING THE 2000-03 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

This resolution would adopt the updated Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) that allocates all highway and transit funds to projects in FY 1999 through 2003. It
includes Surface Transportation Program (STP), Transportation Enhancement (TE) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, ODOT programming, and all federal funding sources as well as federal transit funds for Tri-Met. This resolution assigns the funds and the year in which they will be spent. Andy indicated that there would be slippage of about 10 percent of projects over time and that the MTIP will be adjusted as necessary. MTIP funding, however, is contingent upon conformity with federal air quality requirements. The Air Quality Conformity Determination will be up for consideration at the October 14 JPACT meeting.

Andy Cotugno reminded the committee that the FY 2000 MTIP Modernization Program priorities approved by JPACT on May 27, 1999, allocating $75.8 million of federal funds through TEA-21, is reflected in this Transportation Improvement Program.

Fred Hansen commented on the line item approved for Transit Choices for Livability in the amount of $5.72 million and the changes already made on McLoughlin. He noted that most day and night service improvements have already been made along with the provision of more bus shelters and concrete pads. He also noted the installation of kiosks that display maps. Commissioner Kennemer thanked Tri-Met for implementing those changes in Clackamas County in such a quick manner. Fred wanted the committee to recognize that some of the dollars had already been put to work.

Commissioner Kennemer also acknowledged that it was likely the Clackamas County Commission would be approving the administrative transfer of the $2 million from Clackamas County to Tri-Met to meet their past commitment for the South/North Project.

Action Taken: Commissioner Kelley moved, seconded by Mayor Drake, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 99-2830, adopting the FY 2000-03 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 99-2831 - AMENDING THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE TPAC TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Since the TDM Subcommittee's initial establishment in 1992, changes have taken place that necessitate updating the committee's membership through formal amendment and resolution. Andy Cotugno commented that the subcommittee is a hard working group and that the resolution institutionalizes changes that reflect how the committee actually functions. The resolution would remove the DLCD representative from the committee and add representatives from the Port of Portland, Wilsonville/SMART, and a Transportation Management Association (TMA) who have already been active participants. The TMA representative would be appointed by a peer group of TMA directors.
Action Taken: Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Commissioner Kennemer, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 99-2831, amending the membership of the TPAC Transportation Demand Management Subcommittee. The motion PASSED unanimously.

ODOT $600 MILLION BOND PROGRAM

Andy Cotugno explained that the criteria and process were developed to evaluate projects for inclusion in ODOT’s $600 million Bond Program as authorized by the 1999 Legislature through HB 2082. Jurisdictional comments were requested on the criteria that was submitted to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and adopted by that body on September 2, 1999. The OTC will submit its list to the legislative Emergency Board (E-Board) by February 2000.

It is ODOT’s intent to use the list originally submitted to the Legislature to enlist public comment. That list of projects is an oversubscribed list that amounts to $750 million. Any final list will have to fit within a $600 million budget for the bond program. Of that amount, $540 million is for actual construction, with $60 million reserved for right-of-way acquisition. JPACT direction is being sought on whether a supplemental list of projects should be proposed and whether a final project list should also include developmental projects in addition to construction. Andy noted that the Tualatin Expressway and Newberg right-of-way projects are the only development projects included at this time. Should those projects be limited to construction only or should other projects be considered as well? Of the $540 million in question for construction, the region’s share would amount to around $190 million.

Henry Hewitt, Chair of the OTC, commented on the success of Washington County’s MSTIP program and its approach to funding. He cited the need for a connection between the needs and the gap in transportation funding and what constitutes the gap. He noted that the group of projects discussed over the past six years came about through the regional planning processes but acknowledged there are other community needs that would not be constrained by that list. He welcomed thoughtful consideration of other projects.

Dave Williams of ODOT noted that the projects listed for Region 1 are projects that have evolved over a long time and are included in the financially-constrained Regional Transportation Plan. In addition, the projects in question have all been modeled for air quality, including the highway projects associated with Westside light rail. He pointed out that ODOT’s highest priority has been completion of those projects that complement the Westside light rail project. He also noted the resolution passed by JPACT in the spring of 1999 acknowledging the Columbia/Killingsworth project as a JPACT priority.

Andy Cotugno spoke of the JPACT/ODOT public hearings scheduled in late October and early November to enlist public comment. Chair Kvistad emphasized the uncertainty in funding for this program given the potential referendum.
Mayor Drake expressed Washington County's support of the draft criteria and the suggestions noted in the August 30 letter and attachment (draft project list) submitted to Henry Hewitt. He agreed with Mr. Hewitt that Washington County's MSTIP process and projects have been very effective and was appreciative of the kind comments on their behalf.

Commissioner Kennemer raised the question of whether the project cost numbers were current. Dave Williams indicated a need for updating those numbers which were used in a preliminary process. Of the $600 million identified, $400 million were previously developed. Some projects have had little development work. Commissioner Kennemer cited the need to update the numbers and noted that he believes the Legislature is now allocating projects rather than dollars. Dave Williams pointed out that Region 1 allocations in the past have traditionally been 80 percent to the Metro area and 20 percent outside. These projects are based on longstanding commitments, not on a geographical formula.

Commissioner Hales was supportive of submitting a realistic list of projects based on the schedule and set of criteria proposed. He questioned whether the funds would be made available and spoke of the standoff between Triple A and the truckers. He noted that the City of Portland would come forward with a list of recommendations on other state facility improvements within the City of Portland.

Commissioner Kennemer expressed the importance of a comprehensive vision of what the region needs to accomplish and to maintain a pragmatic focus but concurred that it should be realistic. He didn't want to create any illusion about expectations.

Fred Hansen felt that, if there was interest, there should be a process that would enable adding extra dollars to do work on Highway 26 or the I-84 connector to 242nd Avenue. The question was whether they want to take something out for public discussion that was bigger than $271 million. Councilor Rohde had difficulty in going to the public with a list of projects totaling $271 million if he felt that list needed to be pared down. He felt it would be a disservice to the public, wanted the list to be realistic, and saw no benefit in going out with a larger list of projects.

Dave Williams indicated that past actions have shown that if the list is constrained you invite negative comments by not providing choices. Commissioner Hales cited the need to get to a fundable, buildable list. He spoke of the $75 million process, how well the process worked, and the need to get to that level of clarity and credibility. He favored combining the RTP public involvement process with that of ODOT's Bonding Program.

Henry Hewitt noted that ODOT encourages discussions through the STIP process, noting the needed balance between the list and what you hope to achieve. He spoke of the hard choices within the region and the opportunity for debate. He emphasized that this is not an absolute list with regard to statewide needs.
Dave Lohman cited the need for some consistency for a list of projects that are affordable. He also noted JPACT's past support, through resolution, of the Columbia/Killingsworth priority project.

Henry Hewitt commented on the public process for discussion of the project list. He noted the high priority placed on preservation and maintenance and the fact that modernization funding has declined to a small amount. He felt the process shouldn't be limited to the six-year Bonding Program and cited the need to look at the whole transportation picture. He felt the regional preservation priorities and the regular STIP process should be discussed as well.

Fred Hansen felt the opportunity to educate the public during this process should not be overlooked. Discussions should take place on mobility needs, transit, bike/pedestrian improvements, and roads -- all part of the transportation system. While the objective is to gain public input at the public hearings, there is need to educate the public better about the transportation needs of the region. He offered public involvement staff from Tri-Met to participate in the process.

Kay Van Sickel and Commissioner Kelley were supportive of Fred Hansen's proposal and the need to educate the general public on the region's comprehensive transportation needs and the kinds of projects to be funded. Councilor Washington was supportive of going beyond the public hearings in that education process.

Andy Cotugno noted that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) will be up for adoption in the latter part of October. The RTP is all encompassing while ODOT's Bonding Program is very focused and limited to a dozen or so projects. He asked for direction from JPACT on whether they wanted the two incorporated for public process. The suggestion of getting public involvement people from the various jurisdictions to participate in the hearings met with support from committee members. Henry Hewitt was also supportive of an integrated ODOT/Metro public process in holding hearings for the purpose of discussing comprehensive transportation needs.

Metro Presiding Officer Monroe cited the need to discuss politics during the hearing process that would occur in Phase 1 of the campaign. He commented that referral of this matter to the voters, and its possible failure at the polls, would set the region back six or more years before another package is introduced. Rod also spoke of the relationship of transportation to the economic viability of the region. He cited the possible decline of the economy if met with the inability to get places and emphasized the need to communicate how critical those transportation needs are during the hearings process.

Committee members agreed to proceed with an enhanced list of projects but with a cap. JPACT members will be polled for their response in readiness for its October 14 meeting. In addition, there was agreement that the public hearings (Metro/ODOT's) be coordinated with use of public involvement staff from the different jurisdictions. Final decision-making will take place in
October. Fred Hansen noted that, with the issue of developmental projects, a very comprehensive and detailed process should be used to determine what projects will fit. He didn't want to propose anything that would harm the historic process. Andy Cotugno noted that staff will identify how the projects meet the criteria.

Henry Hewitt commented on the importance of the cities and counties deciding how they will spend their 50 percent of the Bonding Program package (5 cents).

TRAFFIC RELIEF OPTIONS FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Steve Clark, Traffic Relief Options (TRO) Vice-Chair, provided an overview of the TRO Task Force recommendations, reporting that the task force concluded its three-year effort in June of this year. It represented a joint Metro/ODOT effort which did not result in a pilot project but a request that the findings be incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan.

The task force was charged to evaluate on a policy basis whether congestion or peak-period pricing could serve as a means of improving congestion and whether one could be implemented as a pilot project. Steve noted that it has proven to be a publicly-sensitive issue.

The Traffic Relief Options Study involved a $1.2 million effort that included analysis, technical information and public outreach. Forty potential locations were initially studied and that list was narrowed to eight. The criteria addressed transportation considerations, equity of tolling, public acceptance, environmental and public impacts and land use considerations. Steve spoke of transportation and livability being a balancing act and that they can be achieved incrementally. By adding capacity and applying tolling, gains can be made.

Mike Hoglund, Transportation Planning Manager at Metro, followed with a slide presentation, highlighting the process and options considered. He noted that the 1991 Congress authorized the pilot program through ISTEA. Mike's presentation included project background, peak period pricing through electronic toll collection, the study process, the evaluation criteria, the public acceptance issue, implementation, and the eight options studied, which included: I-5S Reversible; I-5S Whole; I-5N Corridor; I-84 Whole; US 26 Partial; Highway 217 Partial; McLoughlin Partial; and Highway 43 Spot. Mike pointed out that the concepts were applied for study purposes but could be mixed and matched in any corridor, as appropriate.

Jack Kloster, former mayor of King City and an attendee at the meeting, asked whether the concept of getting truckers a tax rebate if they would consider driving at night was considered. Mike noted that with electronic tolling, various funding structures could be established and that specific user groups could be singled out and given price breaks or rebates.

Steve Clark noted that the TRO Task Force initially wanted to recommend a pilot project but didn't take that action. He cited the need to choose the right option for the right reasons. They
therefore recommended that peak period pricing be considered when major new capacity is added and that one specific project be identified in the next two years where peak period pricing could be applied.

Further discussion dealt with the need to remain active with the Federal Government and the fact that there is limited time, energy, focus and money to work with. Steve felt that, if congestion worsens and growth continues, the public might be more responsive to the pricing concept. It was evident that the public does not believe that existing lanes should be tolled.

Steve identified two major controversies that evolved from the analysis: 1) that it was cheaper and easier to provide tolling on existing lanes but it wouldn't gain public acceptance; and 2) that it is more acceptable to add capacity to relieve congestion but you might increase emissions in the process.

Steve spoke of the committee's frustration is not having a specific recommendation for a pilot project.

Andy Cotugno asked for JPACT direction for the next step in this process. Staff's proposal is to make this issue a distinct item in the Regional Transportation Plan. He spoke of performance and revenue implications on Highway 217, the Sunrise Corridor, and the I-5 Trade Corridor and questioned whether any lanes should be priced. If the task force recommendations are adopted, consideration of pricing will be triggered in a corridor study.

Chair Kvistad thanked Steve Clark and the members of the Traffic Relief Options Task Force for their efforts in this three-year study and presentation. Dave Williams of ODOT noted that the Oregon Transportation Commission has also participated in this study and has continued interest in this as a future concept. The notion of the HOT lane may be a way of providing reliability on the transportation system when the total problem can't be solved. Dave spoke of the treatment of roads as a freeway system and their treatment to something that is less. He felt the OTC will continue to share interest and participate in moving the idea forward.

Andy Ginsburg, the newest alternate on JPACT, representing DEQ, commented that he was one of the original members on the TRO technical committee. He congratulated Bridget Wieghart and the task force on its recommendations and felt they made sense. He asked whether there was a plan to incorporate this through the RTP and the $600 million Bond Program that would further consider this concept.

A copy of Building a Case for HOT Lanes -- A New Approach to Reducing Urban Highway Congestion, authored by Robert W. Poole, Jr. and C. Kenneth Orski, was distributed at the meeting.
Members attending from the Traffic Relief Options Task Force, Steve Clark, Mark Gorman, Betty Atteberry and Henry Hewitt, were presented letters of appreciation and plaques of commendation.

ANNUAL ECO REPORT/TMA SOLICITATION

Tony Mendoza, Transportation Demand Management Planner at Tri-Met, distributed a document entitled *Transportation Demand Management in the Portland Metropolitan Region*. He indicated it was the annual ECO report that includes a status report on the strategies that encourage alternative forms of transportation as opposed to drive-alones. Goals of transportation demand management are to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, enhance mobility, and make the existing transportation system more efficient. Strategies employed include employer-offered transit subsidies, carpool matching, guaranteed ride home and transportation fairs.

Tony briefly described the criteria and application process for the Transportation Management Associations (TMAs), noting that he would be back in November and December with a recommendation on which TMAs should be funded.

US 26 MURRAY-HIGHWAY 27 (BARNES ROAD ONRAMP)

Chair Kvistad deferred this agenda item to the November 18, 1999 JPACT meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton
           JPACT Members
Date: October 7, 1999
To: JPACT
From: Jon Kvistad, JPACT Chair
Andy Cotugno, Transportation Director
Re: ODOT Bond Program

As discussed at the September JPACT meeting, the process is under way in cooperation with ODOT to develop the program of projects for the $600 million ODOT Bond Program. The task at hand is to define the projects to take out for public comment. Public meetings are scheduled for later in October to obtain feedback.

To facilitate JPACT's decision-making, TPAC developed the attached list of candidate projects. Section A is the original ODOT list submitted to the Legislature, which will go out for public comment. Section B is a list of potential changes, deletions or additions that JPACT may also want to take out for public comment.

It is recommended that the Section B supplemental list be narrowed by JPACT before asking for public review. To facilitate this, please check the appropriate YES/NO box to indicate your preference of which projects to include or exclude from a supplemental list. Please FAX your response back to Andy Cotugno at 797-1930 (FAX number) by Tuesday, October 12 at 5:00 p.m. and we will compile the results for the JPACT meeting.

AC:rms
Attc.
## ODOT, REGION 1 BOND PROGRAM:
### ODOT LIST AND POTENTIAL JPACT SUPPLEMENTS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

### A. THE FOLLOWING ORIGINAL ODOT LIST WILL BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Buildable in 6 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Published Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Revised Cost (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. US 26: Hwy 217 to Murray Blvd (w/ Barnes Rd Ramp)</td>
<td>Adds lane eastbound and westbound; restores Barnes Rd on-ramp, improves Cedar Hills Interchange.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'06-10</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>$26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hwy 217: TV Hwy to US 26</td>
<td>Widen Hwy, 217 northbound to three lanes; reconstruct ramps at TV Hwy, Walker and US 26 Interchanges; install sound walls.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'11-20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Columbia/Killingsworth/82nd Ave Connection</td>
<td>Provide new connection for Columbia Blvd traffic to access the Columbia/205 Interchange; alleviate current congestion at 92nd/Col./Killingsworth intersection.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>19.0-48.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clackamas Industrial Connection: I-205 to 145th</td>
<td>Sunrise Corridor Unit 1, Phase 1 from I-205 to 145th Ave.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I-5: Greeley - N. Banfield/Lloyd District/Rose Quarter Access Phase 1.</td>
<td>Widen I-5 from 2 lanes in each direction to 3 lanes in each direction from I-84 to Greeley Avenue, modify ramps @ Broadway/Weidler and Rose Quarter; improve freeway to freeway connections.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>'11-20</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway EIS/PE</td>
<td>Conduct EIS for a 4-lane, limited access toll road between I-5 and 99W.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. US 30: Swedetown-Lost Crk</td>
<td>Safety improvement; add left-turn lane, extend climbing lane.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. US 26: Hwy 217 to Camelot (EB)</td>
<td>Add eastbound travel lane on US 26 between Camelot Court and Hwy 217; add ramp meters, soundwalls, and bicycle facilities; reconstruct northbound 217 to eastbound US 26 ramp.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'06-10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 99E (McLoughlin): Hwy 224 to River Rd</td>
<td>Construct Boulevard design thru Milwaukee Central Business District.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Region I Total:** $271.50 - $250.6 - $279.6
B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? JPACT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN. PLEASE INDICATE BELOW WHETHER PROJECT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN A SUPPLEMENTAL LIST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Buildable in 6 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1-5: Greeley - I-84, Phase 1</td>
<td>Drop I-5: Greeley-I-84 construction. See project description #5 on previous page.</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 6 years. No agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>-92.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway DISPE</td>
<td>Revise project to conduct a Major Investment Study (MIS) to define the location alternatives for a toll road between I-5 and 99W.</td>
<td>Must first identify feasible design alternatives for this new road. It would be more cost effective at this point to conduct a Major Investment Study.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 99E (McLaughlin): Hwy 224 to River Rd</td>
<td>Construct Boulevard design through the Milwaukee central business district.</td>
<td>Reduce bond funds from $2.5 million to $1.7 million to supplement partial allocation of WTP funds for Phase I.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sandy Modernization (12th to 57th Avenue)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Sandy to Main Street design guidelines.</td>
<td>Full scope includes 4 RTP projects. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SW CityMarket Reconstruction: Naito Parkway/445</td>
<td>Reconstruct US 26 thru Downtown Portland</td>
<td>Project is primarily a preservation project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>na²</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Powell Blvd.: Central Eastside Southbound Access</td>
<td>Install signal on Powell at SE 8th and realign SE 8th and 7th</td>
<td>ODOT opposes the signal on Powell due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. South Portland Circulation Phase I</td>
<td>Improve local connections to redevelopment area.</td>
<td>There is a lack of agreement on the design of this project.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 1-84/Joy Dist. Access</td>
<td>Conduct EIS to develop I-5 design between I-84 and Greeley Avenue and local street design in adjacent project area.</td>
<td>Project will involve critical transportation issues and bring ODOT, Portland and the community to agreement on improvements.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>na²</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Barbur Modernization (Terwilliger to SW City Link)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Barbur to Main Street design guidelines.</td>
<td>ODOT wants to maintain the ability of this road to meet incident response needs on the parallel freeway. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>90-05</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lombard Modernization: 14 to St. Johns Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruct segments to Main Street design guidelines.</td>
<td>Design needs to continue to accommodate truck traffic. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>06-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 242nd Avenue Connector: I-84 to Stark</td>
<td>Change alignment of 242nd connection to I-84.</td>
<td>EA currently under way. Jointly funded by Multnomah County and ODOT. Multnomah County will fund the segment from Halsey to Stark.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>00-05</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Powell Blvd.: I-205 to Eastman Parkway (Birdsdale)</td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes w/sidewalks and bike lanes</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 6 years. The project will not work effectively without modifying the I-205/Powell Blvd. Interchange and adding expense.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>06-10</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 1-6: Lombard to Expo Center - PE and ROW</td>
<td>Widen I-6 freeway to 3 lanes in each direction.</td>
<td>Overall scope of I-6 Trade Corridor improvements still being defined.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>06-10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 1-6Hwy 217/Kruise Way Interchange - Ph. 2</td>
<td>Complete the next phase of reconstructing this interchange.</td>
<td>This phase of the project is not needed for 10-15 years.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>00-05</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES $84.2

C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Construction is in the RTP Strategic System from 2011 - 2020; PE project not listed separately.
2 Preservation projects are not itemized in the RTP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I-5: Greeley - I-84, Phase 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway EIS/PE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 99E (McLoughlin): Hwy 224 to River Rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sandy Modernization (12th to 57th Avenue)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SW Clay/Market Reconstruction: Naito Parkway/I-405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Powell Blvd.: Central Eastside Southbound Access</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. South Portland Circulation Phase I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I-5: Greeley - I-84/Lloyd Dist. Access</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Barbur Modernization (Terwilliger to SW City Limit)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lombard Modernization: I-5 to St. Johns Bridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 242nd Avenue Connector: I-84 to Stark</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Powell Blvd: I-205 to Eastman Parkway (Birdsdale)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I-5: Lombard to Expo Center - PE and ROW</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I-5/Hwy 217/Kruse Way Interchange - Ph. 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People all across this region share a very important resource: our transportation system. Its health is vital to our economy, our community and our lives. In October, Metro and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) are holding a series of joint meetings around the region seeking public comment on the Regional Transportation Plan, on how to fund the projects in the Regional Transportation Plan and on projects that could receive funding through the Supplemental Statewide Transportation Improvement program with part of the revenue from the increase in gas tax and vehicle registration fee recently approved by the Oregon Legislature.

Regional Transportation Plan

Metro has spent the past several years working with our local partners as well as citizens, community groups, and businesses to update the Regional Transportation Plan. That plan lays out the priority projects for roads as well as alternative transportation options such as bicycling, transit, and walking. It also works to ensure that all layers of the region’s transportation system work together in the most effective way possible. In addition to discussion on individual projects, citizens are encouraged to talk about ways to help finance these long-term transportation needs.

Supplemental Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

The 1999 Legislature recently passed a 5-cent increase in the state gas tax and a $5 increase in the annual vehicle registration fee. Part of these gas tax and registration fee increases will fund a program to pay for highway projects statewide. In Clackamas, Columbia, Hood River, Multnomah and Washington counties, there is $189 million available over a six-year period for highway projects. An initial list of projects and project selection criteria is available by calling 731-8245. The complete list of projects, with additions by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, will be available on October 15, 1999.

HOW TO GET INVOLVED

Use the public meetings to learn more and provide input on both the RTP and STIP:

Submit comments on RTP to:

Mail: Metro—RTP Comments
      600 NE Grand Avenue
      Portland, OR  97232

Fax:  (503) 797-1794
E-mail: arthurc@metro.dst.or.us
Call:  (503) 797-1900

Submit comments on Supplemental STIP to:

Mail: ODOT—Supplemental STIP Comments
      123 NW Flanders
      Portland, OR  97209

Fax:  (503) 731-8259
Call:  (503) 731-8245
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greeters</td>
<td>Marilyn Matteson, Marci La Berge, Jane Estes</td>
<td>Marilyn Matteson, Beth Anne Steele, Jane Estes</td>
<td>Emily Kaplan, Jane Estes, ODOT</td>
<td>Tim Collins, Jane Estes, Liz Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public comment managers</td>
<td>Emily Kaplan, Christie Holgren</td>
<td>Marci La Berge, Kathy Conrad</td>
<td>Marci La Berge, Kathy Conrad</td>
<td>Beth Anne Steele, Christie Holmgren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info room Technical</td>
<td>Bill Barber, Tom Kloster</td>
<td>Tom Kloster</td>
<td>Bill Barber, Chris Deffebach</td>
<td>Bill Barber, Tom Kloster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Tim Wilson, Ron Scheele, Dan Layden</td>
<td>Ross Kevlin, Ron Scheele, Dan Layden</td>
<td>Ted Leybold, Ron Scheele, Dan Layden</td>
<td>Ted Leybold, Thomas Picco, Ron Scheele, Dan Layden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment Recorders</td>
<td>Tamira Clark, Michelle Thom</td>
<td>Cheryl Grant, Michelle Thom</td>
<td>Cheryl Grant, Rooney Barker</td>
<td>Rooney Barker, Michelle Thom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Dave Williams, Kate Deane, Andy Cotugno, Kim White</td>
<td>Dave Williams, Kate Deane, Andy Cotugno, Mike Hoglund</td>
<td>Dave Williams, Kate Deane, Andy Cotugno, Kim White</td>
<td>Dave Williams, Kate Deane, Andy Cotugno, Mike Hoglund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPACT/Metro Councilors</td>
<td>Karl Rohde, Bob Stacy, Susan McLain</td>
<td>Jim Kight, Karl Rohde, Sharron Kelley, Rod Park</td>
<td>Rob Drake, Karl Rohde, David Bragdon</td>
<td>Bill Kennemer, Karl Rohde, Susan McLain, David Bragdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTC Members</td>
<td>Henry Hewitt, Dave Williams</td>
<td>Henry Hewitt, Dave Williams</td>
<td>John Russell, Kay Van Sickel</td>
<td>John Russell, Kay Van Sickel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floaters</td>
<td>Mike Hoglund, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Steve Harry</td>
<td>Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Steve Harry</td>
<td>Mike Hoglund, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Steve Harry</td>
<td>Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Steve Harry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 13, 1999
JPACT Discussion Draft:

Project Descriptions – ODOT and Other Proposed Projects for Funding with the $600 Million Bonding Program
Proposed Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong> US 26: OR 217 to Murray Blvd. with Barnes Road Ramp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description:** This project is located in Washington County on the US 26, also known as the Sunset Highway. US 26 is a Statewide Highway. It is also part of the National Highway System.

**Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:** Significant congestion occurs in this section of Sunset Highway, the primary transportation and freight route between the western suburbs, downtown Portland, the region’s air, rail and marine port facilities, and other highways of statewide and regional significance such as I-5, I-84, and I-405. Congestion is primarily due to high traffic volumes, however they are made worse by the short distance between the Highway 217 entrance ramp and the Cedar Hills exit ramp. Vehicles attempting to enter the Sunset from Highway 217 must compete for space with vehicles attempting to exit the Sunset onto Cedar Hills Boulevard. The construction of the new separated ramps will improve traffic flow in this congested segment of highway and allow ODOT to safely restore the Barnes Road on-ramp to US 26 which was eliminated during construction of Westside MAX. The environmental impact statement for the Westside Corridor Project envisioned the Barnes Road on-ramp to continue to access US 26.

**Key elements of the project:**
- Widen Sunset Highway from 2-lanes in each direction to 3-lanes in each direction between the Murray Blvd. interchange and Hwy 217 interchange.
- Restore the Barnes Road on-ramp to Sunset Highway.
- Provide a separated westbound entrance ramp for traffic entering the Sunset Highway from Highway 217.
- Provide a separated exit ramp for traffic exiting Sunset Highway onto Cedar Hills Boulevard in the westbound direction.

**Project History:** This project has been identified by Washington County and the City of Beaverton as a high-priority project.

The project is in the Washington County Transportation System Plan (TSP). It is also listed in the 1995 Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on the Financially Constrained Projects funding list, and the Portland to Cannon Beach Junction (US 26) Corridor Plan (1999). The Washington County Board of County Commissioners recommended consideration of funding of this project through the regional MTIP/STIP process in December, 1998. (Resolution No. 98-228)

**Estimated Project Cost:** Initial estimate: $20,000,000. Revised estimate: $24,000,000 – new estimate based on a recalculation of project elements.
US 26: OR 217 – MURRAY BLVD.
Project Name: Hwy 217: Tualatin Valley Hwy to US 26

Project Description: This project is located in Washington County on Highway 217. Highway 217 is a Statewide Highway; it is also part of the National Highway System.

Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing: Significant congestion occurs in this section of Hwy 217, a primary transportation and freight route between the western suburbs and downtown Portland, air, rail and marine port facilities. Congestion is due primarily to high traffic volumes. The congestion problems are made worse by substandard ramp locations and designs that cause back-ups and merging problems at US 26. Associated with congestion problems are related safety issues.

Key elements of the project:
- Complete widening of Hwy 217 to 6-lanes between Tualatin Valley Highway and US 26 interchange by constructing an additional northbound travel lane.
- Reconstruct ramps at Tualatin Valley Hwy, Walker Road, and US 26 interchanges.
- Install soundwalls where needed.

Project History: This project is part of the combined highway/light rail Westside Corridor Project. The 1991 Westside Corridor Project Environmental Impact Statement identified the region’s preference for development of a light rail route from downtown Portland to Beaverton and Hillsboro, with related highway improvements to US 26 and Hwy 217. Completion of the Westside projects has been a long-standing priority for ODOT, Washington County, and Beaverton.

This project is identified in the Washington County Transportation System Plan (TSP It is listed in the 1995 Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on the Financially-Constrained Projects funding list), and the Portland to Cannon Beach Junction (US 26) Corridor Plan.(1999). The Washington County Board of County Commissioners recommended consideration for funding of this project through the regional MTIP/STIP process in December, 1998 (Washington County Resolution No. 98-228).

Estimated Project Cost: Initial estimate: $40,000,000. Revised estimate: $21,000,000 - new estimate based on recalculation of project elements.
Project Number 1.3

Project Name: US 30B: Columbia/Killingsworth/87th Ave. Connector

**Project Description:** This project is located in the City of Portland and would involve work on Killingsworth and 87th Avenue, state roads, and Columbia Boulevard, a city street. Killingsworth is also known as OR 30 Bypass; it is a Statewide Highway. Both Killingsworth and Columbia Blvd are on the National Highway System and the statewide freight network.

**Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:** Significant congestion occurs in this corridor, primarily due to a severe bottleneck that exists at the Columbia Blvd./Killingsworth St. intersection for eastbound Columbia Blvd. traffic trying to access I-205. This corridor is a primary distribution center for international and national trade, yet freight movements are impeded by the high volume of truck and auto trips during the peak hours of the day. This congestion forces traffic to use 82nd Ave/Airport Way as an access route to I-205. This traffic diversion creates congestion along Airport Way and the under-construction Airport MAX light rail/Portland International Center mixed use development. Associated with congestion problems are related safety issues. Furthermore, connectivity of other modes of travel in the area is minimal and could be created/enhanced through improvements to the corridor.

**Elements of the proposed project:** Further project development work, including a possible environmental assessment, will be needed to determine the exact improvements that will be completed in the corridor. Three specific improvement alternatives have been identified which will be further evaluated and a preferred solution selected. The likely components of the project, however, include the following:

- Provide a new connection for traffic on Columbia Blvd. to reach the Columbia Blvd./I-205 Interchange that will alleviate current congestion at the 92nd Ave. intersection of Columbia and Killingsworth, and reduce traffic constraints under the Union Pacific Railroad overcrossing near 92nd Ave.
- The proposed improvements will also be coordinated with ODOT ramp metering plans for the I-205 interchange, and enhancing bike and pedestrian movements in the corridor.

**Project History:** The need for this project has been recognized by the City of Portland, Port of Portland, and ODOT for some time. The scale, complexity, and estimated costs have prevented substantive improvements to date. The project was identified in the City of Portland Columbia Corridor Transportation Study (1999). The project took on new urgency in the past year, as the Airport MAX light rail project, connecting Portland International Airport (PDX) with the existing Eastside MAX light rail at Gateway, recently began construction. Associated with construction of light rail to the airport, is development of the Portland International Center (PIC), a mixed-use office/commercial development near the airport, with light rail transit stations on Airport Way. Truck and automobile traffic currently diverting to the Airport Way/I-205 Interchange will adversely impact the pedestrian/transit-oriented plans for this major employment center. The need for these improvements are noted in the ODOT study Freight Draft 10/13/1999 Page 3
Moves the Oregon Economy (1999). It is listed in the Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on the Strategic Projects funding list.

The Metro Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) recommended this project for the highest priority funding following completion of the Sunset Highway and I-5/Hwy 217 improvements in April, 1999. (Resolution No. 99-2773)

**Estimated Project Cost:** Initial Estimate: $29,000,000 - based on earlier studies. Revised estimate: $24,500,000 - this new estimate is based on recalculation of project elements.
Alternative Two: 87th Avenue Grade-Separated Connector (3B)

Combines the construction of a new connector, near 87th Avenue including new railroad underpass, with a grade-separated intersection at Killingsworth Street. This alternative would involve closing Columbia Boulevard to all eastbound traffic, east of 87th Avenue, all the way to the intersection with Killingsworth Street.

Advantages:
- Grade-separated intersection on Killingsworth increases capacity, reduces delay.
- Improved safety due to improved geometrics and increased sight distances.
- Higher capacity railroad underpass than existing on Columbia at 92nd Avenue, therefore providing much improved connectivity between Columbia Boulevard and Killingsworth Street.
- Eliminates the need for the existing Columbia / Killingsworth signal when existing underpass is converted to one-way, access from Killingsworth WB only.
- Improved LOS due to signal down-grading to pedestrian-only at Columbia / Killingsworth.
- Minimal traffic disruption with staged construction outside existing roadway.

Disadvantages:
- High-standard temporary railroad detour required for duration of construction.
- Entire acquisition of six privately owned tax lots; partial acquisition of one additional tax lot.
- High cost.
- Does not address congestion at I-205 ramp terminal signals.
- Close access to 87th Avenue south of Killingsworth.
Project Name: Clackamas Industrial Connection – I-205 to 145th

Project Description:
This project is located in Clackamas County. The Clackamas Industrial Connector represents Phase I of Unit I of the Sunrise Corridor. This project will extend the Milwaukie Expressway (Hwy 224) across I-205 at the 82nd Avenue overpass and will join Highway 212/224 at approximately 145th Avenue.

Problem the proposed project is directed at addressing:
The Milwaukie Expressway (Hwy 224) provides the main east-west connection between Portland, Milwaukie and Clackamas. The Expressway currently ends where the road meets I-205. At this point eastbound traffic must use either I-205 or 82nd Drive, two southbound roads, for approximately one mile, and then continue east on the Clackamas Highway. Similarly, westbound traffic on the Clackamas Highway must either use 82nd Drive or I-205 north for approximately one mile to pick up the Milwaukie Expressway. Because of the limited east-west routes in this area, significant congestion occurs on I-205, 82nd Drive, the Clackamas Highway.

The lack of direct east-west connections is particularly a problem in this area because it is also home to the Clackamas Industrial Area, which includes thirteen major warehouse/distribution facilities, encompassing approximately 4.9 million sq. ft. on 269 acres. The Clackamas Industrial Connector will improve freight connections by providing more direct east-west movements and relieving congestion on the surrounding road system.

Key elements of the project:
• Extend the Milwaukie Expressway (Hwy 224) across I-205 at the 82nd Avenue overpass and transition the new road into the existing Highway 212/224 at approximately 145th Avenue.

Project History: There has been long-standing interest in Clackamas County, and the larger metro region, for transportation improvements along the Sunrise Corridor (OR 212/224). This project is represents Phase 1, of Unit one of the Sunrise Corridor project. It will allow for better connections to the Clackamas Industrial Area and better east-west connections between Portland and Clackamas.

In 1988, The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) designated the Sunrise Corridor as one of fifteen (15) Access Oregon Highway (AOH) routes, in recognition of its role in enhancing economic development in the region by providing an efficient highway link between major geographic and economic centers. In 1989, Clackamas County amended its Comprehensive Plan to include construction of the Sunrise Corridor. Metro has included this project in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as a Regional Highway Corridor. In 1993, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) of the Sunrise Corridor was completed by ODOT. In 1996, the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners approved the recommended alignment of the Sunrise Corridor. (Order No. 96-736). A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is near completion. This project is identified in the draft Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP) (1999).
Estimated Project Cost: Initial estimate: $65,000,000. Revised estimate: $72,500,000 – new estimate based on recalculation of project elements.
Sunrise Corridor
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Clackamas Industrial Connector: I-205 to 145th Avenue
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**Project Name:** I-5: Greeley – N. Banfield

**Project Description:** This project is located in Multnomah County on Interstate 5, an Interstate Highway which is also part of the National Highway System.

**Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:** This section of I-5, a designated State Freight Route, experiences extreme delay due to limited through capacity and several merges with on and off ramps in close proximity. It currently provides through interstate travel; serves as an interchange between the designated State Freight Routes of I-84 and I-405; and, serves the local areas through access to city streets. Congestion also contributes to high accident rates.

**Key elements of the proposed project:** An environmental impact statement will need to be conducted to determine the exact improvements that would be associated with this project. Key elements of this project are expected to include:
- Add one lane in each direction to I-5 from I-84 to Greeley Avenue.
- Separate southbound I-5 traffic exiting to I-84 from traffic entering I-5 at the Rose Quarter.
- Separate northbound I-5 traffic exiting at Broadway/Weidler from traffic entering I-5 from I-84.
- Construct local access road between Broadway and the Steel Bridge.

**Project History:** This project has been examined, on and off, since 1979. The scale, complexity, potential impacts on adjacent properties, and estimated costs have prevented substantive improvements to date. The project has been a long-standing priority for ODOT and the City of Portland. It is listed in the Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on the Strategic Projects funding list.

**Estimated Project Cost:** $92,000,000
I-5: Greeley – North Banfield

Project Vicinity
Project Number 1.6

Project Name: Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway: Environmental Statement

Project Description: This project is located in Washington County. Funding would be used to conduct an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway, a proposed new roadway between I-5 and 99W.

Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing: Regional through-traffic overburdens existing local arterials in that service Town Centers in Sherwood, Tualatin, Tigard, and King City. Widening of these local arterials to accommodate regional through-trips would diminish planned efforts to make these facilities less congested and more pedestrian/bike/transit friendly. The Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway would improve access to regional population and employment centers in Washington, Clackamas, and Multnomah counties, as well as provide linkages to Yamhill County and Oregon Coast. Environmental impacts with new alignment will be assessed through this project.

Key elements of the project: Conduct EIS for 4-travel lane, limited access Expressway between I-5 and OR 99W.

Project History: There has been long-standing interest in Washington County for a Western By-Pass to facilitate circumferential travel in the SW Portland metro area. In 1987, Metro completed the Southwest Corridor Study. The Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was amended to include the Western By-Pass Corridor. In 1988, Washington County amended its Transportation System Plan (TSP) to include a bypass for further study. In 1989, Metro updated its RTP to recommend the bypass contingent on compliance with local comprehensive plans and state land-use policies. In 1989, ODOT initiated the Western By-Pass Study (WBS) Major Investment Study (MIS). In June 1996, the WBS/MIS recommended that due to adverse environmental, land-use, and planning issues, a combination of improvements to existing facilities, in conjunction with selected new facilities, be pursued. The principal new facility improvement recommended was the Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway.

In 1995, Oregon Legislature passed SB 626, which authorized the building, operation, and maintenance of tollways. The Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway was one of two projects specifically identified for evaluation. In October, 1996 the Oregon Transportation Commission approved proceeding with siting studies, land-use, and environmental feasibility of this tollway project. In early 1997, the Metro Council amended the RTP to add the Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway project. In December, 1997 ODOT, in partnership with Washington County and the cities of Tualatin and Sherwood, completed the I-5/99W Connector Fatal Flaws Analysis, that evaluated a range of feasible alternatives, from a land-use, engineering and environmental standpoint, and determined that proceeding with an EIS was a reasonable course of action. This study project is identified in the Washington County TSP. It is listed in the Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on the Strategic Projects funding list.

Estimated Project Cost: $3,000,000
Project Name: US 30: Swedetown - Lost Creek

**Project Description:** This project is located in Columbia County on US 30, also known as the Lower Columbia River Highway. This is a Statewide Highway that is also part of the National Highway System.

**Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:** This section of OR 30, located between the Cities of Rainier and Clatskanie, is a designated State Freight Route, which experiences heavy truck traffic. It traverses a varied terrain, with narrow shoulders, steep slopes, and open drainage ditches. A portion of this section includes a relatively steep grade that presents a number of safety hazards, due to an incomplete climbing lane. An existing eastbound climbing ends prematurely before reaching the crest of the hill, causing a hazardous condition for merging traffic. The steep incline and narrow shoulders, create a hazardous condition for vehicles, including school buses, required to wait in the travel lane while attempting to make a westbound left-turn at Lindberg Rd.

**Elements of the project:**
- Extend existing eastbound climbing lane to crest of hill.
- Widen shoulders.
- Construct left-turn pocket at Lindberg Rd.

**Project History:** Discussions between ODOT and Columbia County were initiated in 1991 to address deteriorating pavement conditions and fix safety deficiencies along this section of US 30. Changes in design standards occurred during that time period, such that Preservation projects funded with federal highway funds, required upgrading of highway conditions to 3R conditions, including widening of shoulders. ODOT was not able to accomplish these standards, or additional safety improvements that were identified, because sufficient funding was not available at the time. Therefore, by agreement with the FHWA, this section of highway received only an asphalt overlay in 1994, along with new guardrails, with full 3R design standards deferred to a later date. This project is identified in the Columbia County Rural Transportation System Plan (TSP) (1998), and the Portland – Astoria (US30) Corridor Plan (1999).

**Estimated Project Cost:** Initial estimate: $7,000,000. Revised estimate: $9,000,000 – new estimate based on recalculation of project elements. Estimate continues to be under review.
Project Number 1.8

Project Name: US 26: OR 217 to Camelot Court

Project Description: This project is located in Washington County on US 26, also known as the Sunset Highway. US 26 is a Statewide Highway; it is also a part of the National Highway System.

Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing: Significant congestion occurs in this section of Sunset Highway, the primary transportation and freight route between the western suburbs, downtown Portland, the region's air, rail and marine port facilities, and other highways of statewide and regional significance such as I-5, I-84, and I-405. Congestion is due primarily to high traffic volumes. The congestion problems are made worse by substandard ramp locations and design that cause back-ups and merging problems. Associated with congestion problems are related safety issues.

Key elements of this project:
- Complete widening of Sunset Hwy to 6-lanes between Camelot Court and Hwy 217 interchanges, by adding an eastbound travel lane.
- Add ramp meters, soundwalls, and bike facilities from Camelot Court to Hwy 217.
- Close local accesses to Sunset Highway
- Reconstruct the northbound Hwy 217 to eastbound Sunset Hwy ramp to improve merging and to add a bus bypass lane.

Project History: This project is part of the combined highway/light rail Westside Corridor Project. The 1991 Westside Corridor Project Environmental Impact Study (EIS) identified the region's preference for development of a light rail route from downtown Portland to Beaverton and Hillsboro, with related highway improvements to US 26 and Hwy 217. Completion of the Westside projects has been a long-standing priority for ODOT, Washington County, and Beaverton.

This project is identified in the Washington County Transportation System Plan (TSP) and Beaverton TSP. It is listed in the 1995 Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on the Financially Constrained Projects funding list, and in the Portland to Cannon Beach Junction (US 26) Corridor Plan (1999). The Washington County Board of County Commissioners recommended consideration for funding of this project through the regional MTIP/STIP process in December, 1998. (Washington County Resolution No. 98-228)

Estimated Project Cost: Initial estimate: $13,000,000. Revised estimate: $11,500,000 -- new estimate based on a recalculation of project elements.
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Project Number 1.9

**Project Name:** OR 99E: Hwy 224 to River Road

**Project Description:** This project is located in the City of Milwaukie on OR 99E, also known as McLoughlin Boulevard. OR 99E is a District Highway.

**Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:** Limited signalized intersections, and extensive roadway width, prevent safe and convenient crossing opportunities for pedestrians, and poor access to riverfront properties. The highway presents barrier to more pedestrian/bicycle-friendly circulation within the proposed Milwaukie Town Center, and connection to riverfront recreational amenities. Existing signal and circulation systems are not coordinated with major east-west collectors.

**Key elements of the project:** The project will implement Metro Regional Blvd. Street Designs. It will:
- Resurface McLoughlin Blvd. from Harrison Street to the River Road.
- Establish two-block spacing between traffic signals through downtown section, as follows: retain existing signal at Harrison St.; add new signals at Monroe and Washington Streets; remove existing signal at Jefferson St.
- Relocate access to existing sanitary sewage treatment plant.
- Install raised, landscaped medians at selected locations.
- Widen and extend sidewalks.
- Provide landscaping.
- Designate bike lanes on both sides of highway.

**Project History:** Improvements to McLoughlin Blvd. were first proposed by the City in 1991 as an urban renewal project. McLoughlin Blvd. has increasingly been seen as a pedestrian unfriendly roadway that was a barrier to safe and convenient access to the riverfront park area. The City’s growing recognition of the desirability of facilitating a connection from the downtown to the Willamette Riverfront was refined through a series of public visioning and planning efforts during the 1990’s, including the Milwaukie Visual Preference Survey (1994), Milwaukie Vision Project Final Summary (1995), Milwaukie Riverfront Concept Plan (1997), Milwaukie Transportation System Plan (TSP) (1997), and Milwaukie Regional Center Master Plan (1997).

This project is identified in the Milwaukie’s Transportation System Plan (TSP) and their Regional Center Plan. It is listed in the Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on the Strategic Projects funding list. It has been selected as one of the Governor’s Community Solutions Team (CST) project.

**Estimated Project Cost:** Initial estimate: $2,500,000. Revised estimate: $1,700,000 – based on recalculation of project elements.
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Project Number J.4

Project Name: Sandy Modernization (12th to 57th Avenue)

Project Description: This project is located in the City of Portland on Sandy Boulevard. Sandy is a District Highway. This project would provide for reconstruction of Sandy as a Main Street and transfer jurisdiction of the street to the City of Portland.

Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing: Sandy Blvd., between 12th and 57th, faces a number of challenges in providing safe and efficient transportation for all modes. This is of particular importance since Sandy is a Main Street in a Town Center. The confluence of modes and modal demands combined with geographic elements add to this problem. The project would improve the Sandy corridor for auto, transit, and pedestrian uses. Project improvements include ITS improvements to improve traffic and transit operations and pedestrian improvements to facilitate safe access to adjacent neighborhoods.

Key elements of the project:
- Project improvements include new signalization to improve pedestrian crossing opportunities and access to adjacent neighborhoods.
- ITS improvements to improve transit and traffic operations include, variable message signage at 43rd and 45th, transit kiosks and real time information services, pedestrian enhancements (infrared detectors) and parking information.
- Additional improvements include curb extensions, signalized crosswalks and selected street closures to reduce pedestrian crossing distances and create on-street parking.
- Streetscape improvements at selected commercial nodes - 20th, 28th, 33rd, 42nd, and 52nd will create a more attractive and functional pedestrian and transit realm.

Project History:

Estimated Project Cost: $20 million
Project Name: SW Clay/Market Reconstruction

Project Description: This project is located in the City of Portland on Clay and Market Streets.

Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:
The Clay/Market couplet is a critical central city transportation link. Current pavement surface maintenance activities have become ineffective in extending the life of this facility. In addition, traffic signals and pedestrian crossing are not up to modern standards. The link crosses eleven Central City Walkways between I-405 and the Willamette River.

Key elements of the project:
The Clay/Market couplet’s proposed classification in the Region 2040 Growth Concept is a “Collector of Regional Significance,” and a “Community Boulevard.” Funding allows reconstruction of the couplet to urban standards. Current pavement surface maintenance activities have become ineffective in extending the life of this critical central city link. Full depth pavement reconstruction, including reconstruction of the stormwater drainage facilities and replacement of traffic signal loops, will allow at least 20 years of useful life and serve us well into the 21st Century.

Project History:

Estimated Project Cost: $5 million
Project Number J.6

Project Name: SE Powell Blvd.: Central Eastside Southbound Access

Project Description: This project is located in the City of Portland on Powell Boulevard.

Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:
The problem being addressed is inadequate access to Portland’s Central Eastside Industrial Area. The proposed project provides a cost-effective solution to this problem. The Powell-Milwaukie intersection creates a significant barrier for connecting the Central Eastside to the Milwaukie Main Street – including transit access.

Key elements of the project: Construct new street connection from SE 7th Ave to the SE 8th / Division intersection, modify existing local street intersections and revise signal to improve access and route continuity in the Central Eastside Industrial District.

Project improvements include a new traffic signal at the SE 8th/Powell intersection, along an upgraded street segment of SE 8th Avenue between the new signal and SE Division St., and an interconnection of SE 8th to SE 7th north of Division. These improvements collectively provide a new access route from the Central Eastside Industrial District to Powell Blvd. and I-5 Southbound as a cost effective alternative to building the East Marquam on-ramp project at Water Avenue. This project also includes improvements to the Milwaukie/Powell Intersection which focus on pedestrian, transit stop and transit operations enhancements.

Project History:

Estimated Project Cost: $6.5 million
Project Number J.7

Project Name: South Portland Circulation Phase I

Project Description: This project is located in the City of Portland on Naito Parkway.

Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:
Currently, Naito Parkway and other regional transportation facilities bisect the Lair Hill community -- a high density innercity neighborhood. Naito Parkway’s current design, as a limited access facility, is no longer compatible with Region’s 2040 multi-modal objectives.

Key elements of the project:
Sets groundwork for new regional connection between US-26 E/W and at I-405/I-5 crossroads. When completed the project provides a critical link to housing and job creation in North Macadam estimated to generate 8,500 to 10,000 jobs and 1,500 to 3,000 housing units. The South Portland Circulation Study includes the reconstruction of SW Front Ave from I-405 to Barbur Blvd. and the removal of the west end Ross Island Bridge Ramps to attain the goal of removing non-local traffic from the Lair Hill neighborhood and reconnecting the grid system. Creates significant opportunities for redevelopment of housing and commercial uses.

Project History:

Estimated Project Cost: $22 million
South Portland Circulation, Phase I
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Project Number J.8

Project Name: I-5/Lloyd District Access

Project Description: This project is in the City of Portland on I-5 between and the surrounding local street network in the project area. I-5 is a Statewide Highway. It is also part of the National Highway System and is a designated freight route in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP).

Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:
Freeway Problems:
I-5 between the I-84 and Greeley Avenue interchanges experiences extreme delay due to limited through capacity and several merges with on and off ramps in close proximity. The freeway provides through interstate travel; serves as an interchange between the designated State Freight Routes of I-84 and I-405; and, serves the local areas through access to city streets. Congestion on the freeway also contributes to high accident rates.

Local Street Network Problems:
The project area is well served by transit but lacks a high-quality pedestrian and bicycling environment to encourage the use of these modes. The existing street layout creates barriers that the project would address, including access by all modes to the Broadway Bridge. The freeway and high levels of traffic in the vicinity of the interchange ramps also create barriers that affect the efficient and safe movement of pedestrians and bicyclists. The project will address these deficiencies and result in more efficient access for all modes to this emerging mixed-use area in close proximity to the downtown.

Key elements of the project:
An environmental impact statement (EIS) will be conducted for the project area. The EIS will include development of design concepts, engineering feasibility analysis and selection of a preferred design for the highway and arterial system in the project area. Project design will consider prior preliminary engineering activities conducted in this area as well as new concepts. The proposed project will support regional destinations in the Lloyd District, such as the Oregon Convention Center, the Rose Garden, the Lloyd Center and numerous office buildings with significant levels of employment. New project concepts will be developed that also support the emerging pedestrian corridor and commercial activities along Broadway, provide improved access to the Broadway Bridge and minimize the barrier effect of the freeway and the high levels of traffic in the vicinity of the interchange ramps.

Project History:

Estimated Project Cost: $5 million
I-5: Greeley – North Banfield

Project Vicinity

[Map of the area around Greeley and North Banfield, showing major streets, roads, and landmarks.]
Project Number J.9

Project Name: Barbur Modernization (Terwilliger to Southwest City Limit)

Project Description: This project is located in the City of Portland on Barbur Boulevard. The project extends 5.5 miles from SW Naito Parkway to SW 65th Avenue (the City boundary).

Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:
Despite Barbur's multi-modal function the existing streetscape primarily encourages and supports fast moving automobiles and trucks. Sidewalks end abruptly and signalized intersections are far apart, making it hard to walk along or cross Barbur. Very little landscaping or street trees exist. Driveways are not delineated. Bicycle travel is difficult. Sidewalks connecting to transit stops are missing, and amenities at the stops are not inviting. There is lack of safe connecting routes between Barbur Boulevard lacks any appealing visual character.

Key elements of the project: The project recommends the following types of improvements:

- Adding missing sidewalks segments to promote pedestrian access and safety;
- Subtraction of pavement and additional landscaping to reduce the impact of adding new impervious sidewalks in other areas and to enhance the visual aspect;
- Adding sidewalks connecting Barbur into neighborhoods to promote pedestrian access and safety;
- Realigning intersections to be perpendicular to Barbur to promote pedestrian and driver safety, and;
- Introducing bus stop shelter improvements to promote transit user safety, comfort and convenience.

Project History:

Estimated Project Cost: $13 million
**Project Number J.10**

**Project Name:** Lombard Modernization: I-5 to the St. Johns Bridge

**Project Description:** This project is located in the City of Portland on Lombard Boulevard. The limits of the project are from I-5 to the St. Johns Bridge.

**Problem that the proposed project is directed at addressing:** It is currently a challenge for Lombard to function as a safe, efficient facility for all modes – the age of the facility is adding to conflicts and inefficiencies. The current design does not meet the regions Main Street objectives.

**Key elements of the project:**
- Project improvements include new signalization to improve pedestrian crossing opportunities and access to adjacent neighborhoods.
- ITS improvements to improve transit and traffic operations include, variable message signage, transit kiosks and real time information services, pedestrian enhancements (infrared detectors) and parking information.
- Additional improvements include curb extensions, signalized crosswalks and selected street closures to reduce pedestrian crossing distances and create on-street parking.
- Streetscape improvements at selected commercial nodes will create a more attractive and functional pedestrian and transit realm.

**Project History:**

**Estimated Project Cost:** $20 million
Project Number J.11

Project Name: 242nd Avenue Connector: I-84 to Stark Street

Project Description:
This project is located in Multnomah County. It will connect I-84 east of the 238th Avenue interchange at I-84 to the new 242nd Avenue at Halsey Street. A new 242nd Avenue will be constructed south from Halsey Street and connect with existing 242nd Avenue near Glisan Street. 242nd Avenue will be reconstructed between Glisan Street and Stark Street.

The jurisdiction of the connector is shared between ODOT and Multnomah County; I-84 to Halsey Street is ODOT's and Halsey Street to Stark Street is the County's jurisdiction. The 242nd Avenue Connector is Phase One (of 3 phases) of the Hogan Corridor improvements. The full Hogan Corridor improvements will continue a principal arterial connection between I-84 and US 26.

Problem the proposed project is directed at addressing:
Significant congestion occurs in the north/south corridors (181st Avenue to 257th Avenue) between I-84 and US 26. Regional through-traffic overburdens existing local arterials that serve Gresham, Troutdale and Wood Village. Recreational traffic between the Portland Metropolitan area and Mt Hood, and heavy truck traffic compete for limited available capacity. The National Highway System (NHS) truck traffic is currently routed through the Gresham Regional Center and the Rockwood Town Center on streets that parallel the MAX line. MAX stations and major transit center compete with high volumes of through truck traffic. The 242nd Avenue Connector is proposed to be the designated NHS route through the area relieving the pedestrian districts from the divisiveness of a principal arterial bisecting the Gresham Regional Center and Rockwood Town Center.

Key elements of the project:
• Phase one of the Hogan Corridor improvements will provide a new principal arterial connection between I-84 and Stark Street.
• The Environmental Assessment, jointly funded by ODOT and the Multnomah County, is currently underway.
• Multnomah County will leverage $5,000,000 for the construction of the section between Halsey Street and Stark Street.

Project History:
For more than 15 years Multnomah County, local, state and regional agencies have identified a need for improved access through east Multnomah County to provide a direct connection between I-84 and US 26. The connection has been identified in the RTP for several years and has been a long-standing priority for ODOT, Multnomah County, and the East County cities.

The project was originally identified to be a limited access highway between I-84 to US 26, known as the Mt. Hood Parkway. Alternative alignments were being studied in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement when work was stopped due to a lack of development funding for such a major undertaking. After the Mt. Hood Parkway project was dropped, the subsequent
Major Investment Study (MIS) selected the Hogan Road/242nd Avenue alignment for arterial improvements to meet growing demand for access and north-south arterial capacity. This project, Phase One, includes construction of a new principal arterial between I-84 and Stark Street.

The project ranks number one in the Multnomah County Transportation Capital Improvement Plan and Program and is identified in the City of Troutdale TSP and the City of Gresham draft TSP. It is also listed in the Existing Resource Concept and Strategic System project funding list in the Metro Regional Transportation Plan.

**Estimated Project Cost:** $25 million (cost estimate is still under review)
Project Number 1.12

Project Name: Powell Boulevard (US 26): I-205 to Birdsdale

Project Description:
This project is located in Multnomah County. The project will widen Powell Boulevard to five lanes and add sidewalks and bike lanes between I-205 in the west and Birdsdale to the east. The road widening between I-205 and Birdsdale will make it a consistent 5-lane street between Portland and Gresham.

Problem the proposed project is directed at addressing:
Powell Boulevard shifts between five, three, and two lanes as it heads west into Portland. Bike lanes and sidewalks are intermittent at best. These unsafe conditions are worsened by the significant traffic congestion currently experienced on Powell Boulevard as commuters use it for a major east/west route. Truck traffic also uses Powell Boulevard to travel east which further congests this route. Moreover, future development slated for southeast Gresham on lands recently included in the Urban Growth Boundary, will place additional transportation pressures on Powell Boulevard.

Key elements of the project:
This project will design and construct the widening of Powell Boulevard from I-205 to Birdsdale. Bike lanes and sidewalks will be included.

Project History:
Widening Powell Boulevard has been an identified local, regional, and state need. The project is included in the draft Regional Transportation Plan Strategic System.

Estimated Project Cost: $21,000,000
Project Name: I-5: Delta Park to Lombard

Project Description: This project is located in the City of Portland on I-5. I-5 is a Statewide Highway. It is also on the National Highway System and it is part of the state freight system.

Problem the proposed project is directed at addressing: This segment of I-5 south of Delta Park is one of the most congested highway segments in the entire Portland metropolitan area. Congestion results in this section due to the fact that the freeway between the Delta Park and Lombard interchanges is two-lanes in each direction. The freeway leading to and following this section is three-lanes in each direction.

Key elements of the project: This project would widen a small segment of I-5 south of Delta Park to Lombard Street to partially relieve a long standing bottleneck on I-5 during the morning peak period commute. The key element of this project would be to widen an existing structure on I-5 to three lanes in the southbound direction.

Project History:
Reducing congestion in the I-5 corridor has been a long recognized need in both Oregon and Washington since the late 1970's. The high cost of projects along I-5 have prohibited major improvements. A key bottleneck is that segment of I-5 south of Delta Park. Removing this bottleneck is relatively low cost compared with other projects in this corridor. Although the I-5 Trade Corridor Study is now beginning to assess a variety of alternatives that might reduce congestion in the corridor it is likely that any proposed solutions will include widening this segment of I-5. This project would widen I-5 to six lanes between the Interstate Bridge and the proposed Greely-N. Banfield project, provided the additional northbound lane currently used as an HOV lane continues to operate. The need to widen this specific segment is one of most common public comments that the Southwest Region of the Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) receive regarding bi-state transportation needs in variety of public forums. For example, the 1996 Transportation Futures Committee Report by RTC recommended that the I-5 corridor be recognized as the priority corridor for capacity improvements to bi-state transportation facilities. The need for this project was most recently expressed repeatedly by Clark County commuters at the transportation booth staffed by WSDOT and RTC at the 1999 Clark County Fair.

Estimated Project Cost: $13,000,000
# ODOT, REGION 1 BOND PROGRAM:

ODOT LIST AND POTENTIAL JPACT SUPPLEMENTS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

A. THE FOLLOWING ORIGINAL ODOT LIST WILL BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Buildable in 6 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Published Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Revised Cost (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. US 26: Hwy 217 to Murray Blvd (w/ Barnes Rd Ramp)</td>
<td>Adds lane eastbound and westbound; restores Barnes Rd. on-ramp, improves Cedar Hills Interchange.</td>
<td>Begin Environmental Assessment 1/00. ODOT and Tri-Met have agreed to construct the Barnes on-ramp by 2005. Washington County and City of Beaverton have prioritized this project.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'06-10</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>$26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hwy 217: TV Hwy to US 26</td>
<td>Widen Hwy. 217 northbound to three lanes; reconstruct ramps at TV Hwy, Walker and US 26 Interchanges; install sound walls.</td>
<td>EIS Complete; Deferred element of Westside Corridor Project</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'11-20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Columbia/Killingsworth/82nd Ave Connection</td>
<td>Provide new connection for Columbia Blvd traffic to access the Columbia/I-205 Interchange; alleviate current congestion at 92nd/Col./Killingsworth intersection.</td>
<td>Three alternatives are now out for public review. Environmental documentation to start Jan '00. May narrow to one alternative following public outreach in early October.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>19.0-48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clackamas Industrial Connection: I-205 to 145th</td>
<td>Sunset Corridor Unit 1, Phase 1 from I-205 to 145th Ave.</td>
<td>EIS Awaiting Resource Agency Sign-off</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I-5: Greeley - N. Banfield/Lloyd District/Rose Quarter Access Phase 1.</td>
<td>Widen I-5 from 2 lanes in each direction to 3 lanes in each direction from I-54 to Greeley Avenue, modify ramps @ Broadway/Wiedler and Rose Quarter; improve freeway to freeway connections.</td>
<td>Project cannot be constructed in six years. No agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>'11-20</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway EIS/FE</td>
<td>Conduct EIS for a 4-lane, limited access toll road between I-5 and 99W.</td>
<td>Must first identify feasible design alternatives for this new road. It would be more cost effective at this point to conduct a Major Investment Study.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. US 30: Swedetown-Lost Crk</td>
<td>Safety improvement; add left-turn lane, extend climbing lane.</td>
<td>Rural project outside Metro boundary</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. US 26: Hwy 217 to Camelot (EB)</td>
<td>Add eastbound travel lane on US 26 between Camelot Court and Hwy 217; add ramp meters, soundwalls, and bicycle facilities, reconstruct northbound 217 to eastbound US 26 ramp.</td>
<td>EIS Complete; Deferred element of Westside Corridor Project</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'06-10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 99E (McLoughlin): Hwy 224 to River Rd</td>
<td>Construct Boulevard design thru Milwaukie Central Business District.</td>
<td>Partially funded through MTIP Priorities 2000</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region I Total: $271.50 $250.6 - $279.6
### B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? JPACT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1-5: Greeley - I-584, Phase 1</td>
<td>Drop I-5: Greeley-84 construction. See project description #5 on previous page.</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 6 years. No agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway EIS/PE</td>
<td>Revise project to conduct a Major Investment Study (MIS) to define the location alternatives for a toll road between 1-5 and 99W. Must first identify feasible design alternatives for this new road. It would be more cost effective at this point to conduct a Major Investment Study.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 99E (McLoughlin): Hwy 224 to River Rd</td>
<td>Construct Boulevard design through the Milwaukie central business district. Reduce bond funds from $2.5 million to $1.7 million to supplement partial allocation of MTP funds for Phase 1.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>06-05</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sandy Modernization (12th to 67th Avenue)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Sandy to Main Street design guidelines. Full scope includes 4 RTP projects. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SW Clay/Market Reconstruction: Naito Parkway-40S</td>
<td>Reconstruct US 26 thru Downtown Portland. Project is primarily a preservation project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Powell Blvd.: Central Eastside Southbound Access</td>
<td>Install signal on Powell at SE 8th and resign SE 8th and 7th. ODOT opposes the signal on Powell due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. South Portland Circulation Phase I</td>
<td>Improve local connections to redevelopment area. There is a lack of agreement on the design of this project.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>06-05</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 1-5: Greeley - 1-64/Lois Dist. Access</td>
<td>Conduct EIS to develop I-5 design between I-54 and Greely Avenue and local street design in adjacent project area. Project will resolve critical transportation issues and bring ODOT, Portland and the community to agreement on improvements.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Barbur Modernization (Terwilliger to SW City Limit)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Barbur to Main Street design guidelines. ODOT wants to maintain the ability of this road to meet incident response needs on the parallel freeway. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>06-05</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lombard Modernization: 1-5 to St. Johns Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruct segments to Main Street design guidelines. Design needs to continue to accommodate truck traffic. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>06-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 342nd Avenue Connector: 1-44 to Stark</td>
<td>Change alignment of 342nd connection to I-44. EA currently under way. Jointly funded by Multnomah County and ODOT. Multnomah County will fund the segment from Halsey to Stark.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>06-05</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Powell Blvd: 1-205 to Eastman Parkwy (Brasdan)</td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes w/ sidewalks and bike lanes. Project cannot be built in 6 years. The project will not work effectively without modifying the I-205/Powell Blvd interchange and adding expense.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>06-10</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 1-5: Lombard to Expo Center - PE and ROW</td>
<td>Widen I-5 freeway to 3 lanes in each direction. Overall scope of I-5 Trade Corridor improvements still being defined.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>06-10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 1-5/Hwy 217/Kruze Way Interchange - Ph. 2</td>
<td>Complete the next phase of reconstructing this interchange. This phase of the project is not needed for 10-15 years.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES** $84.2

### C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Construction is in the RTP Strategic System from 2011 - 2020; PE project not listed separately.
2. Preservation projects are not itemized in the RTP.
C. Are there other projects in addition to those noted above that should be taken out for public comment?
B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? JPCRT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY JPCRT FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Available in 5 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (Millions)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I-495 Greenley - I-495 Phase 1</td>
<td>City of Knox, Grant Project, see project description on previous page</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tusculum Reconstructed Expansions - BSRPE</td>
<td>Reconstructed project to construct a single lane median.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>101-609</td>
<td>Requires 46-lane median for a 65-mile stretch between 10 and 609.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES $64.2

C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Which of the following projects should also be taken out for public comment? TPAC should determine which of the following supplemental additions/deletions/modifications to the ODOT list should be taken out for public comment. Criteria suggested by TPAC for consideration are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic in 6 Years</th>
<th>Cost Changes (dollars)</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.すで: Dohany - M4, Phase I</td>
<td>Group 4C: Dohany-L4 construction. Site-level construction at Dohany station.</td>
<td>Project must be built in 6 years, no rapport with project design with local community.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>91,30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thomas-Greenwood Extension</td>
<td>Route project to create a single continuous route path in the location.</td>
<td>Project requires design changes that will not be impacted by the local community.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>80,30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Woodhill-Crest Road (16th to 7th Rd)</td>
<td>Complete camouflage design through the Woodhill-Crest Road business district.</td>
<td>Reduced Funding from $25.0 million to $17.7 million.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sandy Mediation</td>
<td>Route project to meet local guidelines.</td>
<td>Construction includes a RTP project.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-120</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NH Portland Reconstruction: 26th 19th Portland</td>
<td>Reconstruct 10th 19th Portland project.</td>
<td>Project must be reviewed in the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Powell St. - Central Portland Southheavy</td>
<td>Unlaid designing at Powell St. and extending 50th St. and 7th.</td>
<td>ODOT approves the design at Powell due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. South Portland Circulation Plan</td>
<td>Improving local circulation to redevelopment areas.</td>
<td>This is a lack of agreement in the design of the project.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. S. Gately - 2nd/2nd Retain Beer, Jesus</td>
<td>Complete policies for developing 2nd and Gately Property and local street design of apartment project area.</td>
<td>Project must be reviewed at the local level.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Burwell Mediation (Midweek to NW City Ltd)</td>
<td>Reconstruct property in Midweek design guidelines.</td>
<td>ODOT wants to re-visit the level of FHWA and local officials are disagreement on improvements.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leach Mediation, 14 to St. John Blvd</td>
<td>Reconstruct segments in the Midweek design guidelines.</td>
<td>Design needs to coincide with accurate traffic and traffic.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Southwest Collegetown, 1st to 4th</td>
<td>Change alignment of I-505 connections to bike.</td>
<td>Sch a highly congested way.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Powell St. - Lim, 10th to 10th</td>
<td>Designed to serve as a performative project.</td>
<td>Project must be reviewed in the local level.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lovers by 22nd Center - PE and MNR</td>
<td>Designed to serve as a performative project.</td>
<td>Overall scope of all local recommendations will be reviewed.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lindley ST(Waver) Way Intersection - Ph 2</td>
<td>Complete the first phase of this crossing; the interchange.</td>
<td>This phase of the project is not needed for 10 15 years.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES: $44,200

C. Are there other projects in addition to those noted above that should be taken out for public comment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Proposed projects are not detailed in the ODOT.
Andy,

I have chosen to vote only on these projects of Bi-State significance. My no vote on #1 should be yes, but since ODOT reports that the project can't be completed in the six-year window, I can't support it now.
B. Which of the following projects should also be taken out for public comment? TPAC should determine which of the following supplemental additions/deletions/modifications to the ODOT list should be taken out for public comment. Criteria suggested by TPAC for consideration are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
<th>Proposed Strategy/FTIP Status</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>PO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I-65 Gahagan Subdivision Phase 1</td>
<td>Gahagan Subdivision construction, see project description in previous pages. Increase in general design with local provision</td>
<td>yea 11-25</td>
<td>8 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bluegrass Kentucky Regional_plan</td>
<td>Park project evaluated in Regional Plan Study (RPS) to identify the optimum alternative for total road between I-65 and I-716</td>
<td>yea 10.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bellmead Parkway Local Road</td>
<td>Constructed for design and traffic safety. Notional range from 15.1 million to 17.7 million in supplemental regional extension of SISP and FTRP</td>
<td>yea 15-41</td>
<td>2 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Scenic Acceleration (mainline) in FTRP Region</td>
<td>Constructed不合理 in main design guidelines</td>
<td>yea 10.10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I-80 Kentucky-Rockwood-Male Highway Project</td>
<td>Regional LTP 26 (see Section Portland)</td>
<td>yea 10.05</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Powell Blvd. Central External Design Study</td>
<td>Initial phase of Powell at SE 8th and redesign SE 8th and SE 9th. ODOT replaces the light on Powell due to lighting fixture.</td>
<td>yea 10.05</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. South Portland Circulation Plan</td>
<td>Improvement in traffic development area</td>
<td>yea 10.05</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I-84 Corridor -129th/Second Ave.</td>
<td>Counties to improve design of I-84 at 129th Avenue and road around design in adjacent project area</td>
<td>yea 10.0</td>
<td>2 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Liberty Corridor (Future) to I-95</td>
<td>Constructed in future design guidelines</td>
<td>yea 10.0</td>
<td>5 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Liberty Corridor I-95 to E. Main Street</td>
<td>Information and expressway design guidelines</td>
<td>yea 10.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Detroit Avenue Extension Exit to East</td>
<td>Change in design of 74th and Madison Road</td>
<td>yea 10.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Flats Road Extension Exit to East</td>
<td>Increase in general design</td>
<td>yea 10.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Union Road to I-40 Corridor</td>
<td>Proposed at 129th and Howard</td>
<td>yea 10.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I-94 Corridor to E. Main Street</td>
<td>Increase in general design</td>
<td>yea 10.0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES:** $8 420

C. Are there other projects in addition to those noted above that should be taken out for public comment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments:


2. Projects/other projects are not separated in the FTIP.
B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? TPAC SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Suitable in 6 Years</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. NW Gevety - 141, Phase 1</td>
<td>NW Gevety 74 construction, see project description on previous page.</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 6 years. No agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>-603.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rosewood-McGraw Highway SBPE</td>
<td>Various projects in a major investment study (MIS) to define the long-term alternatives for a widened version of I-5 and SBW.</td>
<td>Must determine long-term design alternatives for this route. Proposed cost estimate for this project is not completed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-60</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NE (McLaughlin) Hwy 59 to River Rd</td>
<td>Cracked base and design through the downtown area.</td>
<td>Reduce bond funds from $2.5 million to $1.5 million to supplement partial absorption of MIS funds for Phase I.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sandy Mcdonald (E 8th to W 17th Ave)</td>
<td>Rodent control in main street design guidelines.</td>
<td>Plan change includes 4 RTP projects. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maxwell St: Contact Swan Island Authority</td>
<td>An unannounced project in Phase 1.</td>
<td>Proposal requires 60-day notice.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. South Portland Circulation Phase 1</td>
<td>Improve local connections to central area.</td>
<td>There is no agreement on the design of this project.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10-55</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 14th Gevety - 143rd St Annexe</td>
<td>Contact US to develop design for 14th and Gevety Avenue and local street design in adjacent project area.</td>
<td>Project will resolve critical transportation issues and bring CDD to Portland and the community is agreed on improvements.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-65</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SW City Limit Construction (SW City Limit)</td>
<td>Construction factor in main street design guidelines.</td>
<td>ODOT wants to maintain the ability of the road to react under stress on the project area. Would involve transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-55</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ludlow Mediation: 14th St. Allen Bridge</td>
<td>Recompute segments in main street design guidelines.</td>
<td>Design needs to continue on an as-needed basis. Would involve transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 34th Avenue Connector: 54th to 6th St.</td>
<td>Change alignment of 34th road in 6th St.</td>
<td>Project would be built in 6 years.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-55</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 14th Avenue Connector: 54th to 6th St.</td>
<td>Change alignment of 34th road in 6th St.</td>
<td>Priority on map for total project. Would involve transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Powell Blvd: 12-20s to Southeast (North)</td>
<td>Various locations on central and adjacent areas.</td>
<td>Project would be built in 6 years.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 14th Upland Grove: SE and NW</td>
<td>Various locations in 14th Ave.</td>
<td>Overall approved by Trade Center improvements still being defined.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 14th and 18th: Intersection 4 - 18th</td>
<td>Complete the next phase of reconstructing the intersection.</td>
<td>This plan is not approved for 2014-15 years.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-55</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES **$84.2**

C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Construction is in the RTP Strategic System and 2011-2015. If not listed separately, 
2. Preservation projects are not included in the RTP.
### B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? JPACT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Buildable in 5 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost (Change in Millions)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I-44 - Greatly - I-44, Phase 1</td>
<td>Drop I-44 - Greatly - I-44 construction. See project description on previous page.</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 5 years. Loss of agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>482.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Treatment-Roadway Expansions (EBME) Buildable Strategic Change</td>
<td>Improve project to reduce project cost. Site for real estate between I-44 and EBME.</td>
<td>Must first identify viable design alternatives for this real estate. Site real estate is not to be rezoned for development.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PEE (I-269): I-269 to River Rd</td>
<td>Continue on design through the Tunnel near central business district.</td>
<td>Reduce funds from $23.5 million to $1.7 million to supplement partial allocation to ODOT funds for Phase I.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. County Roadway (36th to 58th Avenue)</td>
<td>Reconstruct County to County street guidelines.</td>
<td>Full scope includes 4 RTP projects. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the County of Humboldt.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PEE (DD): I-269 to River Rd</td>
<td>Improve on design through the Tunnel.</td>
<td>Project is primarily a preservation project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Port of Portland - Central Eastside Southbound Access</td>
<td>Plant signal on Portland at SE 16th and modeled SE 16th and 17th.</td>
<td>ODOT opposes the signal on Portland due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. South Portland Circulation Phase I</td>
<td>Improve local connections on new street construction.</td>
<td>There is a lack of agreement on the design of the project.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I-44 - Greatly - I-44, Phase 1 Access</td>
<td>Conduct ES to develop a design between I-44 and Greatly Avenue and local street design on adjacent project area.</td>
<td>Project will remove critical transportation issues and bring ODOT Portland and the community to agreement on improvements.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Barlow Treatment (Tualatin to SW City Limit)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Barlow to 6th Street guidelines.</td>
<td>ODOT wants to maintain the ability to forest train response needs on the parallel freeway. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the County of Multnomah.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Landmark-Roadway: I-44 to St. Johns Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruct portions of I-44 to Portland guidelines.</td>
<td>Design needs to continue to accommodate local needs. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I-44 Roadway Access: I-44 to Stark</td>
<td>Change alignment of 23rd connection to I-44.</td>
<td>ODOT currently under way. Jointly funded by Multnomah County and ODOT. Multnomah County will fund the segment from Stark to I-44.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Southbound I-269 to Broadway (Williams)</td>
<td>Will be in 5-lane of automobile and bike lanes.</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 5 years. The project will not work effectively without modifying the I-269/Powell Blvd interchange and adding capacity.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I-44 - Landmark to Expo Center-PED and RSD</td>
<td>Will be in 2-4 lanes in two lanes in each direction.</td>
<td>Overall scope of I-44 Transit Corridor improvements will be determined.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I-44: 23rd West Way Interchange - PH 2</td>
<td>Complete the next phase of construction.</td>
<td>This phase of the project is needed for 10-15 years.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES | $44.2 |

### C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Construction is in the RTP Strategic System from 2011 - 2020. PE project not listed separately.
* Preservation projects are not included in the RTP.
### A. THE FOLLOWING ORIGINAL ODOT LIST WILL BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slby &amp; Market Rd — Adds lane eastbound and westbound; restores Braes Ave. Ext. ramp. improves Cedar Hills Interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly &amp; 217 northbound to 5 lanes; reconstruct ramps at TV Hwy, Walker and US-26 interchanges; install sound walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide new connection for Columbia Blvd traffic to access the Columbia-200 interchange; alleviate current congestion at 92nd/Columbia/Gainesworth intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slby Corridor Unit 1, Phase 1 from T-205 to 145th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly I-5 from 2 lanes in each direction to 3 lanes in each direction then I-5 to Gresham Avenue, modify ramps @ Broadway/West and Rose Quarter; improve freeway to freeway connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit EIS for a 4-lane, limited access tolled road between I-5 and 99W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety improvement; add left-lane turn, extend climbing lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add eastbound travel lane on US 26 between Clackamas Court and Hwy 217; add ramp meters, soundwalls, and bicycle facilities; reconstruct southbound 217 to eastbound US 26 ramp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete design-build design thru Milwaukie Central Business District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Strategy In 6 Years?</th>
<th>RTP Status</th>
<th>Published Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Revised Cost (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. US 26: Waverly to Murray Blvd (Waverly Rd</td>
<td>Adds lane eastbound and westbound; restores Braes Ave. Ext. ramp, improves Cedar Hills Interchange.</td>
<td>Begin Environmental Assessment 1/00. ODOT and Tri-Met have agreed to construct the Barlow oe-ramp by 2003. Washington County and City of Beaverton have prioritized this project.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'06-10</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>$28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Waverly to US 26</td>
<td>Waverly Hwy, 217 northbound to 5 lanes; reconstruct ramps at TV Hwy, Walker and US-26 interchanges; install sound walls.</td>
<td>EIS Complete; Deferred element of Westside Corridor Project</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'06-20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Columbia/Killingworth/82nd Ave Connection</td>
<td>Provide new connection for Columbia Blvd traffic to access the Columbia-200 interchange; alleviate current congestion at 92nd/Columbia/Gainesworth intersection.</td>
<td>Three alternatives are now out for public review; Environmental documentation to start Jan '00. May narrow to one alternative following public outreach in early October.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.0-18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clackamas Industrial Corridor: 1-285 to 145th</td>
<td>Slby Corridor Unit 1, Phase 1 from I-205 to 145th Ave.</td>
<td>EIS Awaiting Resource Agency Sign-off</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. H-5: Gresham - N. Heights/Lloyd District/Rose Quarter Access Phase 1</td>
<td>Waverly I-5 from 2 lanes in each direction to 3 lanes in each direction then I-5 to Gresham Avenue, modify ramps @ Broadway/West and Rose Quarter; improve freeway to freeway connections.</td>
<td>Project cannot be constructed in six years. No agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>'11-20</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Troutdale-Sherwood Expressway EIS/PE</td>
<td>Conduit EIS for a 4-lane, limited access tolled road between I-5 and 99W.</td>
<td>Must first identify feasible design alternatives for this new road. It would be more cost effective at this point to conduct a Major Investment Study.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. US 30: Sweedtown-Lost Creek</td>
<td>Safety improvement; add left-lane turn, extend climbing lanes.</td>
<td>Rural project outside Metro boundary</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. US 26: I-5 to Gresham (I-5)</td>
<td>Add eastbound travel lane on US 26 between Clackamas Court and Hwy 217; add ramp meters, soundwalls, and bicycle facilities; reconstruct southbound 217 to eastbound US 26 ramp.</td>
<td>EIS Complete; Deferred element of Westside Corridor Project</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'06-10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I-205 (Mcloughlin); Hwy 224 to River Rd</td>
<td>Complete design-build design thru Milwaukie Central Business District.</td>
<td>Partially funded through MTIP Priorities 2000</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Region 1 Total:** $271.50 - $250.6 - $279.8
B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? JPACT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Buildable In 6 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-20: Greenly 4-44, Phase 1</td>
<td>Drop I-20: Greenly 4-44 construction, See project description #5 in previous table. Project cannot be built in 6 years. No agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway 6/SPE</td>
<td>Revise project to conduct a Major Investment Study (MIS) to define the location, design alternatives for a self-aided between 6 and 8/SPE. Must first entirely feasible and alternatives for the new road. It would be more cost effective at this time to conduct a Major Investment Study.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% (McCough) I-224 to River Rd</td>
<td>Construct Roundabout design through the Alternative central business districts. Reduces bond funds from $1.7 million to supplement partial allocation of MTP funds for Phase 2.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Modernization (32nd to 37th Avenue)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Sandy to Main Street design guidelines. Full scope includes 4 RTP projects. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW City-Market Reconstruction, Halei Pitney prepares 403</td>
<td>Reconstruct US 26 thru Downtown Portland. Project is primarily a preservation project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Blvd: Central Eastside Southbound Access</td>
<td>Initial signal on Powell SE 8th and realign SE 8th and 7th. ODOT opposes the signal on Powell due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Portland Circulation Phase II</td>
<td>Improve local connections to redevelopment area. There is a lack of agreement on the design of the project.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100-20</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4: Greenly - I-44/Lloyd Dist. Access</td>
<td>Conduct EIS to develop a design between I-44 and Greenly Avenue and local street design in alignment project area. Project will resolve critical transportation issues and bring ODOT, Portland and the community to agreement on improvements.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbur Modernization (Tannenger to SW City Limit)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Barbur to Main Street design guidelines. ODOT wants to maintain the ability of the road to meet excellent response needs on the parallel freeway. Would include transfer of jurisdiction in the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard Modernization: S-4 to St. Johns Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruct segments to Main Street design guidelines. Design needs to continue to accommodate truck traffic. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd Avenue Connector: 1-04 to Stark</td>
<td>Change alignment at 23rd/24th connection to 1-04. EA currently under way. Jointly funded by Multnomah County and ODOT. ODOT, Multnomah County will fund the segment from I60 to Stark.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Blvd: 7-106 to Southeast Pathway (Bellevue)</td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes of through and bike lanes. Project cannot be built in 6 years. The project would work effectively without modifying I-205/Powell Blvd interchange and adding expensive.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>10-10</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard to Expo Center - PE and ROW</td>
<td>Widen I-5 freeway in 3 lanes in each direction. Overall scope of I-5 Trade Corridor improvements still being defined.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-10</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhley 215th/Expo Way Interchange - Ph 2</td>
<td>Complete the next phase of reconstructing this interchange. This phase of the project is not needed for 10-13 years.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES $54.2

C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Construction is in the RTP Strategic System from 2011-2020, PE project not listed separately.

2 Preservation projects are not included in the RTP.
B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? JPPACT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Buildable in 6 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I-47 Gresham - 104, Phase I</td>
<td>Drive I-5 Gresham-Rt construction See project narrative on previous page Project cannot be built in 6 years. No agreement on project design with local jurisdiction</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>499.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tualatin-Brookwood Expressway RSVP</td>
<td>Review project in current major Investment Study. Study to define the location alternatives for a toll road between I-4 and I-105. Must find feasible design alternatives for a new road. It would be effective if this project is conducted in major investment study.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>18-47</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NE 82nd (Langley) Ave to New Hbld</td>
<td>Construct Boulevard design through the Wilkesville commercial business district. Reduce noise level from 25,000 to 21,1 million $ 1 million in equivalent partial allocation of RTP funds for Project</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sandy Boulevard (East 87th Avenue)</td>
<td>Repurposed Sandy to State Street design guidelines</td>
<td>Full inclusion of RTP projects. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>18-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. W St Clarmet-Marist Reconstruction 8th to 13th</td>
<td>Project is already a preservation project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16-10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Powell Blvd. - Naito East 80th Avenue</td>
<td>Minor signal on Powell at 80th and Sw. St. and 7th.</td>
<td>ODOT expresses the signal on Powell due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. South Portland Corridor Phase I</td>
<td>Improve local connections to main street. There is a lack of agreement on re-design of key project</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I-47 Gresham - 104, (Lloyd Dia) Access</td>
<td>Construct the design between I-4 and Gresham Avenue and local street design in adjacent project area.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16-10</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reed Warrington (Town Center to SW City Loop)</td>
<td>Reconstruction from main street design guidelines.</td>
<td>ODOT would like to maintain the ability of the road to meet local transportation needs on the partial highway. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16-10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lombard Modernization 14 to St. James Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruction on main street design guidelines.</td>
<td>Design needs to continue to accommodate further growth. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 22nd Avenue Connector 14th to Stark</td>
<td>Change alignment of 22nd connector to N 14th.</td>
<td>EA currently under way. Jointly funded by Multnomah County and ODOT. Multnomah County will fund the replacement of Highway 51.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Powell Blvd. - 126th to Eastman Highway (Southeast)</td>
<td>Width to 5 lanes to accommodate and bike lanes</td>
<td>Projects completed to date. Future projects will be conducted to build the new road in three years.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>18-10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I-47 Gresham-104, Phase II</td>
<td>Complete the final phase of reconstructing the interchange</td>
<td>This phase of the project will begin after 10-15 years</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lloyd Morrison Way Interchange - Phase 2</td>
<td>Complete the final phase of reconstructing the interchange</td>
<td>This phase of the project will begin after 10-15 years</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10-05</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES $34.2

C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Construction is in the RTP Strategic System: Year 2001 - 2020, Phase project not listed separately
2. Preservation project not included in the RTP.
6. Which of the following projects should also be taken out for public comment? ODOT should determine which of the following supplemental additions/deletions/modifications to the ODOT list should be taken out for public comment. Criteria suggested by TPAC for consideration are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Suitable for Immediate Construction</th>
<th>Add to Plan for Next Two Years</th>
<th>Cost (millions)</th>
<th>New Projects Selected</th>
<th>Change (millions)</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildable</td>
<td>ln<strong>Y</strong>ra2</td>
<td>Strategic Change</td>
<td>RTp Status (millions)</td>
<td>V65</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Supply=100</td>
<td>100-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Blvd: Central Eastside Southbound Access</td>
<td>Install signal on Powell at SE 8th and ording 6th and 7th</td>
<td>ODOT opposes the signals on Powell due to safety concerns</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Corridor Phase 1</td>
<td>Improve local connections to new alignments</td>
<td>There is a lack of alignment on the design in this project</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-84 Devel 3</td>
<td>Develop design for I-84 and Conklin Avenue and Seek a local concept design in adjacent project area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood/Benjamin 14th &amp; BL Jibra Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruce segment in assist street design guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Avenue Overpass 64th to 87th</td>
<td>Change alignment of 22nd connection connecl</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Avenue Bridge 84th to 87th 2nd Story Bus</td>
<td>Provide a 3 lane of HOV andeliminates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th Avenue Bridge Center - PE and ROW</td>
<td>14th Bridge to 60th and 70th</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Complete the final phase of remediation of 8th interchange</td>
<td>This phase of the projects not needed for 10-15 years.</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Supply=10</td>
<td>100-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES $64.2

C. Are there other projects in addition to those noted above that should be taken out for public comment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Construction is in the RVP Economic System from 2011-2009 PE project was listed separately.
2. Preservation projects are not listed in the ATP.

Note: We abstain from voting on the other projects for lack of profound knowledge or project details.
B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? JPACT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
<th>&quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;No&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildable Strategic Change In 6 years RTPStnut (millions)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project cannot be built in 6 years. Agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for delivering one-demand design alternatives for the corridor, it would be more cost effective at this point to conduct a major corridor study</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide new designs to the Mill counts business district</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recompose designs to the Mill street design guidelines</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed primarily a preservation project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial design on Powell at SE 8th and redesign 6th 9th and 10th</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no lack of agreement on the design of this project</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project will not work effectively without modifying the I-5 vehicle through a project</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall scope of I-5 Trade Corridor improvements still being defined</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the next phase of reconstructing this interchange. This phase of the project is estimated for 10-15 years.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES $84.2
## ODOT, REGION 1 BOND PROGRAM:

**ODOT LIST AND POTENTIAL JPACT SUPPLEMENTS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

### A. THE FOLLOWING ORIGINAL ODOT LIST WILL BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Buildable In 6 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Published Cost (millions)</th>
<th>Revised Cost (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. US 26: Hwy 217 to Murray Blvd (w/ Barnes Rd Ramp)</td>
<td>Adds lane eastbound and westbound; restores Barnes Rd. on-ramp, improves Cedar Hills Interchange.</td>
<td>Begin Environmental Assessment 1/00. ODOT and Tri-Met have agreed to construct the Barnes on-ramp by 2005. Washington County and City of Beaverton have prioritized this project.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'06-10</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
<td>$26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hwy 217: TV Hwy to US 26</td>
<td>Widen Hwy. 217 northbound to three lanes; reconstruct ramps at TV Hwy, Walker and US 26 Interchanges; install sound walls.</td>
<td>EIS Complete; Deferred element of Westside Corridor Project</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'11-20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Columbia/Killingsworth/82nd Ave Connection</td>
<td>Provide new connection for Columbia Blvd traffic to access the Columbia/I-205 interchange; alleviate current congestion at 92nd/Coll/Killingsworth intersection.</td>
<td>Three alternatives are now out for public review. Environmental documentation to start Jan '00. May narrow to one alternative following public outreach in early October.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>19.0-48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clackamas Industrial Connection: I-205 to 145th</td>
<td>Sunrise Corridor Unit 1, Phase 1 from I-205 to 145th Ave.</td>
<td>EIS Awaiting Resource Agency Sign-off</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I-5: Greeley - N. Banfield/Lloyd District/Rose Quarter Access Phase 1.</td>
<td>Widen I-5 from 2 lanes in each direction to 3 lanes in each direction from I-84 to Greeley Avenue, modify ramps @ Broadway/Weidler and Rose Quarter; improve freeway to freeway connections.</td>
<td>Project cannot be constructed in six years. No agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>'11-20</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway EIS/PE</td>
<td>Conduct EIS for a 4-lane, limited access toll road between I-5 and 99W.</td>
<td>Must first identify feasible design alternatives for this new road. It would be more cost effective at this point to conduct a Major Investment Study.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. US 30: Swedetown-Lost Crk</td>
<td>Safety improvement; add left-turn lane, extend climbing lane.</td>
<td>Rural project outside Metro boundary</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. US 26: Hwy 217 to Camelot (EB)</td>
<td>Add eastbound travel lane on US 26 between Camelot Court and Hwy 217; add ramp meters, soundwalls, and bicycle facilities; reconstruct northbound 217 to eastbound US 26 ramp.</td>
<td>EIS Complete; Deferred element of Westside Corridor Project</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'06-10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 99E (McLoughlin): Hwy 224 to River Rd</td>
<td>Construct Boulevard design thru Milwaukee Central Business District.</td>
<td>Partially funded through MTIP Priorities 2000</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>'00-05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Region I Total:** $271.50 - $250.6 - $279.6
B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? TPACT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Buildable in 6 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Greeley - I-84, Phase 1</td>
<td>Drop I-6: Greeley - I-84 construction. See project description #5 on previous page.</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 6 years. No agreement on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway EIS/PE</td>
<td>Revise project to conduct a Major Investment Study (MIS) to define the location alternatives for a toll road between I-5 and I-99W. Must first identify feasible design alternatives for this new road. It would be more cost effective at this point to conduct a Major Investment Study.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89E (McLaughlin): Hwy 224 to River Rd</td>
<td>Construct Boulevard design through the Milwaukee central business district.</td>
<td>Reduce bond funds from $2.5 million to $1.7 million to supplement partial allocation of MTIP funds for Phase I.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sandy Modernization (12th to 87th Avenue)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Sandy to Main Street design guidelines. Full scope includes 4 RTP projects. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SW Clay/Market Reconstruction: Naito Parkway - I-405</td>
<td>Reconstruct US 26 thru Downtown Portland</td>
<td>Project is primarily a preservation project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Powell Blvd.: Central Eastside Southbound Access</td>
<td>Install signal on Powell at SE 8th and realign SE 8th and 7th.</td>
<td>ODOT opposes the signal on Powell due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>South Portland Circulation Phase I</td>
<td>Improve local connections to redevelopment area.</td>
<td>There is a lack of agreement on the design of this project.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-6: Greeley - I-84/Lloyd Dist. Access</td>
<td>Conduct EIS to develop I-6 design between I-64 and Greeley Avenue and local street design in adjacent project area.</td>
<td>Project will resolve critical transportation issues and bring ODOT, Portland and the community to agreement on improvements.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Barbur Modernization (Terwilliger to SW City Limit)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Barbur to Main Street design guidelines.</td>
<td>ODOT wants to maintain the ability of this road to meet incident response needs on the parallel freeway. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lombard Modernization: I-5 to St. Johns Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruct segments to Main Street design guidelines. Design needs to continue to accommodate truck traffic. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>242nd Avenue Connector: I-84 to Stark</td>
<td>Change alignment of 242nd connection to I-84.</td>
<td>EA currently under way. Jointly funded by Multnomah County and ODOT. Multnomah County will fund the segment from Halsey to Stark.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Powell Blvd: I-205 to Eastman Parkway (Bendside)</td>
<td>Widen to 5 lanes w/ sidewalks and bike lanes</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 6 years. The project will not work effectively without modifying the I-205/Powell Blvd. interchange and adding expenses.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-5: Lombard to Expo Center - PE and ROW</td>
<td>Widen I-5 freeway to 3 lanes in each direction.</td>
<td>Overall scope of I-5 Trade Corridor improvements still being defined.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I-5/Hwy 217/Thrusway Interchange - Ph. 2</td>
<td>Complete the next phase of reconstructing this interchange.</td>
<td>This phase of the project is not needed for 10-15 years.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES $84.2

C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 Construction is in the RTP Strategic System from 2011 - 2020; PE project not listed separately.
2 Preservation projects are not itemized in the RTP.

Note: Oregon DOT (ODOT) abstains from voting on the other projects (be voted for #1, #8, #13) for lack of profound knowledge on project details.

Mayor Hollands no vote on #1 should be a yes, but can't support it now since it can't be completed in 6 yrs.
### B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? J-PACT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL, ADDITIONS/DELETIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Buildable in 4 Years?</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I-204, Phase 1</td>
<td>Deep I-204 Bypass construction. See project description in previous page.</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 4 years. Approved for project design with local funding.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>492.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. West Linn-Mt. Angel Expressway</td>
<td>Premier project to construct a Major Investment Study (MIS) to define the location alternatives for a new median between 16th and 96th.</td>
<td>Abstain from identifying location alternatives for this corridor. It would be more cost effective at this point to construct a Major Investment Study.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Northeast Extension: I-204 to River Rd</td>
<td>Construct realigned design through the Minnesota central business district.</td>
<td>Reduce bond limits from $2.5 million to $1.7 million to supplement partial allocation of JTP funding for Phase 1.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sandy Boulevard (12th to 40th Avenue)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Sandy to W 12th Street design guidelines.</td>
<td>Full scope includes a 75% project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>120.46</td>
<td>-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SW 36th &amp; Downtown Portland</td>
<td>Reconstruct SW 36th &amp; Downtown Portland.</td>
<td>Project is primarily a preservation project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Powell Blvd</td>
<td>Central Lake Shore Boulevard Access.</td>
<td>Install signal on Powell at SE 6th and replace SE 8th &amp; 9th.</td>
<td>ODOT approves the signal on Powell due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SW Portland Mass Transit Plaza</td>
<td>Improve local connectivity to redeveloped area.</td>
<td>There is a lack of agreement on the design of this project.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>110.06</td>
<td>-45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I-405 &amp; NW 21st Dr Access</td>
<td>Construct I-405 &amp; NW 21st Dr Access.</td>
<td>Project will require critical transportation improvements to redevelop SW 12th Street and Portland and the community to agree to an agreement.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Burnside Boulevard (Vanport to West End)</td>
<td>Reconstruct Burnside to West End design guidelines.</td>
<td>ODOT intends to stabilize the ability of the road to meet local access needs on the parcel triangle. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100.46</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Southeast 120th Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruct bridge to meet 120th design guidelines.</td>
<td>Design needs to continue to accommodate lack of traffic. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Southeast 120th Bridge</td>
<td>Reconstruct bridge to meet 120th design guidelines.</td>
<td>Design needs to continue to accommodate lack of traffic. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SW 42nd &amp; Evergreen Parkway</td>
<td>Widened 34-lane corridor in SW 42nd &amp; Evergreen Parkway.</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 4 years. This project will not work effectively without modifying the I-205 Freeway.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I-205 Expressway</td>
<td>Reduce I-205 to 3 lanes to 6 lanes</td>
<td>Overall scope of I-205 Expressway improvements still being defined.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I-590 West Corridor</td>
<td>Widened 3-lane corridor to 5 lanes</td>
<td>Overall scope of I-590 Expressway improvements still being defined.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>-35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES $44.2**

### C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

- [ ] Other Projects

---

1. Construction is still under the RTP Strategic Plan started in 2011: S200, PE project not listed separately.
2. Preservation projects are not included in the RTP.
B. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SHOULD ALSO BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? JPACT SHOULD DETERMINE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL ADDITIONS/DELTIONS/MODIFICATIONS TO THE ODOT LIST SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY TPAC FOR CONSIDERATION ARE SHOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ODOT Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Strategic RTP Status</th>
<th>Cost Change (millions)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Construction is in the RTP Strategic System from Day 1 - JD20;</td>
<td>Project cannot be built in 6 years. Its represent on project design with local jurisdiction.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Repair project to maintain a major investment of $800M is before the location alternatives for a new road between 60 and 0075. Project in need of a large investment.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>$812.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Construct two-lane design through the Meade area business district. Reduce bond taxes from $2.5M to $2.1M to supplement partial satisfaction of NIP funds for Planned.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Reconstruct Sandy to Main Street design guidelines.</td>
<td>Full scope includes 4 RTP projects. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$11/10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Reconstruct US 26 (Diversion, Portland). Project is primarily a preservation project. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$11/10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Install signal on Powell SE 8th and redline SE 8th. ODOT opposes the signal on Powell due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Improve local connections to redevelopment area.</td>
<td>There is a lack of agreement on the design of the project.</td>
<td>$10.05</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Conduct EIS to develop 14 design between 604 and 604 and 607 and 0075. Project would solve critical transportation issue.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Reconstruct Figure to Main Street design guidelines.</td>
<td>ODOT wants to maintain the ability of the road to meet essential functional needs on the parallel freeway.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$12/05</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Reconstruct segments to Main Street design guidelines.</td>
<td>Design needs to continue to accommodate traffic.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$12/10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Change alignment of 25th intersection.</td>
<td>Existing alignment was selected from a phase plan by BHT.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$12/05</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Widens to 5 lanes on residential and 2500M. Project cannot be built in 6 years. Project will not work effectively without modifying the proposed site.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>$12/10</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Overall scope of (and Corrals improvements still being discussed).</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$12/10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Complex the next phase of reconstructing this interchange.</td>
<td>This phase of the project is not needed for 15-15 years.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>$12/05</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OF ALL CHANGES: $54.2

C. ARE THERE OTHER PROJECTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE THAT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Construction is in the RTP Strategic System from 2011 - 2030. "No project list included separately.
2. Preservation projects are not included in the RTP.
In the listing attached, I wish to call special attention to items number 9 and 7.

Item 9, the Barbur Modernization is a significant need for Portland. Barbur is the main street of SW Portland, a part of the city with few through streets and travel options. Barbur is the major path for not only automobiles, but also ped and bike users. It is lined with commercial enterprises, large and small, and its proximity to I-5 provides significant reinvestment opportunity at a number of locations. This project will carry through with planning that has already created key elements for the design. This project is the most important item on the list.

Item 7, the South Portland Circulation Study, is a step at clearing up a transportation maze that most any who drive through it consider, even in technical terms, to be a mess. A CAC/TAC committee has arrived at agreement on what the project should look like; if there is disagreement as to design, it probably comes from the TAC members who have not been devoting sufficient attention to the project to understand the community values and objectives, and offering the design solutions that will meet those objectives.

Glenn Bridger
Planning and Transportation Chair
Hillsdale Neighborhood Association
Presenting our new Regional Transportation Plan

Imagine the year 2020 – larger cities with more people – and then think of the traffic! Whatever you think about congestion now, consider how it could increase in the next 20 years. But there's hope for continued livability in the form of the Regional Transportation Plan, described in this newsletter.

The future of transportation

The new Regional Transportation Plan is a blueprint for improving the region's transportation system in the next 20 years. The plan begins to carry out the 2040 Growth Concept to protect the region's livability while planning for continued growth in this region. The plan shows how to keep people and goods moving throughout our metropolitan area.

With the area's unprecedented growth in population, our travel has increased twice as much. Use of cars is increasing, due partially to two-income households with people traveling to work alone, often on long commutes. Building homes, business and shopping far apart also contributes to the increase in driving.

We need to:

- expand some roads and highways in developing parts of the region
- improve bus and light rail service and the ability to walk to stations
- build new sidewalks and bicycle lanes for safety and access
- limit delays for national

continued on page 2
and international freight movement.

- develop new strategies to improve how our system works.

Metro's goal is to provide a balanced range of transportation choices in this region. The plan recognizes that the car will continue to be the primary choice of personal travel. However, the Regional Transportation Plan sets goals for all forms of urban travel: cars, buses, light rail, walking, bicycling and trucking. The plan includes a list of strategies for local and regional transportation changes.

Why is the plan needed?

More and more traffic is clogging our roads. Twelve percent of roads in the urban tri-county area are now congested. It takes longer to get to work and to school, to shopping and recreation. In the future, more than a quarter of our roads could be clogged during peak periods. We can't build our way out of congestion, but we can lessen the impact of traffic by expanding transportation choices and improving roads and bridges to make them work better.

What will the plan accomplish?

The plan sets a new direction for the future. Planning by all government partners in the region will be guided by the following strategies:

- Reduce the need to drive by making jobs and shopping more convenient to where people live.
- Expand transportation choices by providing safe and convenient alternatives to driving.
- Avoid sprawl and reinforce main streets and traditional downtowns by targeting transportation projects.
- Sustain economic health by providing access to jobs and industry.
- Balance transportation and land use plans to protect livability in the region.
- Maintain access to natural areas around the region.

How can transportation serve new growth?

The plan ties together transportation and land use policies from the adopted Regional Framework Plan (1997) and the 2040 Growth Concept. These policies include expansion of regional and town centers within established transportation corridors. The plan addresses state planning requirements and looks at future transportation needs through the year 2020 - when our children and grandchildren will be using the transportation system that we build.

Transportation can benefit from the careful placement of new developments. This means building new homes and businesses close to existing transportation, where roads already exist and people can walk to the bus or MAX. This could help reduce the need to expand the transportation system. It...
also means placing new transportation projects in areas that most need access, and where the region has decided future growth should occur within the urban growth boundary. This will help slow traffic growth by providing good alternatives to driving alone to work, shopping or cultural events and entertainment.

How will the plan's projects be funded?
Metro’s funding strategy is to use limited state and federal dollars to support projects in our major transportation corridors. The plan requires more funding to maintain the existing roads, bridges and other transportation facilities while improving the efficiency of the overall system. Maintenance and safety projects will come before building new projects. Roads, bridges and transit systems are some of our largest public investments. However, funds are scarce and many projects must wait until funding is available. See pages 20-22 for more detailed funding information.

Why does the plan matter?
With a growing population, the transportation system becomes even more important. The Regional Transportation Plan is needed as a guide that transportation plans of all of the region’s cities, counties, Tri-Met, Oregon Department of Transportation and Port of Portland must follow. It clearly sets transportation strategies in the urban area for the next 20 years. Decisions made today about how to make room for future growth and travel around the region will have lasting impacts on our environment and quality of life. The Regional Transportation Plan is a big part of Metro’s overall strategy to protect our valued livability.

How does the plan protect the environment?
The plan expands our choices of travel within the region. Even on an occasional basis, the use of bus or MAX, walking, bicycling or sharing a ride can help the region maintain its clean air, conserve energy and reduce pressure to expand the urban growth boundary. By linking transportation and land use planning, there are many ways to limit driving alone to nearby destinations, such as biking to a neighborhood coffee shop or walking to a restaurant close to work. Also, Metro’s new Green Streets project will help fish passage through our cities by replacing or repairing old culverts to allow for better stream flows under roads.

How did the plan evolve?
The Metro Council adopted the first Regional Transportation Plan in 1983. Since then, it has been updated every three to five years to reflect changes in the region. The council adopted an interim plan in 1995 to address new federal requirements. In 1996, transportation plan policies were updated to carry out land use policies found in Metro’s Regional Framework Plan and the 2040 Growth Concept. The 1999 plan builds on the new policies and looks at state planning requirements and future needs through the year 2020. The current plan received extensive review and feedback during the past four years from the public, from the 21-member citizen advisory committee, and from our government partners throughout the region.

How does the plan tie in with statewide planning goals?
The plan includes goals required by the state Transportation Planning Rule. The goals for the next...
A closer look at the Regional Transportation Plan
This newsletter contains a brief summary of nearly 1000 proposed projects in the updated Regional Transportation Plan. The projects represent the most needed improvements to meet the 20-year demand, as funding becomes available.

For more information
To receive a more complete list of projects in your area of interest, stop by Metro or call the transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900, option 2. Leave your name and address and ask for “Getting There” transportation fact sheets in one or more of the following areas:
1. West Columbia Corridor (industrial areas)
2. Portland Central City (and neighborhoods)
3. East Multnomah County
4. Pleasant Valley and Damascus (urban reserves)
5. Urban Clackamas County
6. South Washington County (including Washington Square)
7. North Washington County (including Beaverton and Hillsboro)
8. Also, new transit projects are described in a publication called Regional Transit Service Strategy for 2020

Visit Metro’s transportation web site at www.metro-region.org for a look at the Regional Transportation Plan. You can also send e-mail to the Transportation Department at trans@metro.dst.or.us or fax a request to (503) 797-1949. Leave your name, address, ZIP code and phone number and staff will send you information or return your call during business hours. For the hearing impaired, call (503) 797-1804.

20 years include reducing the miles we drive by 10 percent per person, reducing dependence on the automobile and driving alone, reducing parking spaces by 10 percent per person and preserving rural lands. Metro is now linking transportation and land use planning, another state goal.

What happens next?
With adoption of the plan, city and county governments will update local plans to reflect the new regional policies. In this way, the transportation planning system throughout the tri-county urban area can be coordinated and upgraded to serve a growing population.

"The involvement of all citizens in regional transportation planning is vital to the long-term livability of this region. There are no easy answers to the problems of transportation. One way to ensure that the plans reflect what we as citizens want and desire for the future is to participate."
Metro was involved in a long-range planning process that included many residents and most local governments. The 2040 Growth Concept effort was started in 1992 because of the rapid population growth in this region and the concern that we were losing our quality of life.

The purpose of the 2040 Growth Concept is to develop a plan for protecting the nature of the region. This effort is based on the values people in this region hold - such as access to nature, ability to get around the region, clean air and water, safe and stable neighborhoods and a strong regional economy.

Adopted in 1995, the 2040 Growth Concept directs most development to population centers and along major transportation corridors. It relies on a balanced transportation system that accommodates walking, bicycling, driving, using transit and keeping freight moving to national and international destinations.

Focusing new jobs, housing and services in these centers and corridors provides many benefits and has important implications for the region’s transportation system.

Reducing the need to drive
The 2040 Growth Concept supports the goal of providing jobs and shopping closer to where people live. A diverse and well-designed community provides closer access to a variety of jobs, recreation, shopping and other services. This reduces the need to drive longer distances, thus lessening traffic.

Protecting the environment
By asking residents to examine tradeoffs, we learned that a small expansion of the urban growth boundary and greater protection of environmentally sensitive areas were ideas that generated strong support. Metro has identified areas outside the urban growth boundary for future growth called urban reserves. These urban reserves will allow the region to expand slowly and carefully, and will only require an 8 percent increase of land during the next 10 to 30 years.

In addition, Metro has adopted a Stream and Floodplain Protection Plan that will help preserve rivers, streams and wetlands while reducing future risk of flood damage. Habitat for fish and wildlife in the region is also being examined.

Using land wisely
Using urban land wisely allows for more cost-effective and efficient provision of road, sewer, water and stormwater systems. Our technical analysis showed that without the 2040 Growth Concept, the region’s urban growth boundary would need to be expanded by about 50 percent to accommodate forecasted housing and employment growth. This would result in the need for costly extensions of existing transportation and utility systems.

Providing transportation choices
More people will walk, take transit or ride a bike if our transportation system provides safe and convenient opportunities. Focusing new jobs and housing close to restaurants, stores and other services makes walking, bicycling and riding buses more convenient. These travel options allow people who can’t drive (or choose not to drive) to get where they need to go. Finally, more households may choose not to own a car, or decline a second car, if...
"Working as a Metro region, we are able to work cooperatively to solve transportation problems. Regional transportation planning allows small cities a chance to interact with large cities and counties to plan for the future. Cornelius has benefited greatly from this process."

there are a number of travel options. Money could be saved that would otherwise be spent on car payments, fuel, insurance and maintenance.

Keeping the economy strong
Experience has shown that economic vitality occurs in areas with the best transportation. Therefore, it is important that the Regional Transportation Plan invests transportation funds in areas that need the best access. These areas include the central city, regional centers, industrial areas and facilities where goods move from one form of transportation to another, such as from trucks to ships or rail. It also includes investing in areas where the region decides future development should occur.

This means targeting investments to areas that have been identified as major centers of activity in the 2040 Growth Concept. These kinds of investment decisions are now being made as part of the current Regional Transportation Plan.

For more information
Call Metro’s 2040 hotline at (503) 797-1888 and leave your name, address and a message. You can also send e-mail to Metro’s Growth Management Services Department at 2040@metro-region.org and information will be sent to you.
Regional highways

Highways give us the most direct link to our jobs. In addition, these routes provide access for trucks to move freight destined for national and international ports. The regional economy depends on highways to keep people and goods moving efficiently. This is why highways are some of the most critical items on the future projects map.

In the past, many of our major streets and highways have been widened to accommodate more traffic. However, further widening of our system would displace homes and jobs, in addition to incurring high costs in construction and environmental impacts. This is why a balanced approach to planning for the region’s 20-year transportation needs has evolved. Highway projects will be balanced with alternatives, such as transit, bicycling and walking.

The following are major projects needed in the region’s highway corridors, to be constructed as funds become available:

### Interstate 5 corridor

Improvements in the I-5 corridor are focused on preserving mobility for freight and commuters. Congestion will likely continue to exist during the morning and evening rush hours, but not during other times of the day. The planned Interstate MAX light rail, from the Rose Quarter to the Expo Center, will provide an alternative to driving on North I-5.

Some of the improvements planned for I-5 include:

- Provide three through lanes in each direction from the Fremont Bridge to Vancouver. A bridge replacement or expansion is under consideration across the Columbia River.
- Add truck-climbing lanes on I-5 between Terwilliger Boulevard and the Ross Island Bridge.
- Construct new freeway access from the Central Eastside Industrial District to I-5.
- Construct a full interchange at I-5 and Columbia Boulevard.
- Widen the I-5/Nyberg Road interchange and Tualatin-Sherwood Road to maintain access to the Tualatin industrial area.
- Reconstruct the I-5/Highway 217 interchange in phases to maintain access from I-5 to the Beaverton area.
- Construct new freeway access from the Ross Island Bridge and I-405.

### Sunset Highway (Highway 26)

Westside MAX light rail is expected to slow traffic growth on the Sunset Highway by providing a convenient alternative to driving. Long-planned improvements from Sylvan to Highway 217 will be completed, as well, such as widening the freeway to six lanes from Highway 217 to Northwest 185th to maintain access to jobs in this rapidly growing area.

### Banfield (I-84)

Widening I-84 is limited by the environmental and neighborhood impacts. Instead, light rail service is proposed to double and expanded park-and-ride is proposed east of I-205. More transit service will be provided on streets parallel to the freeway between Portland and Gresham.

### Interstate 205

Rapid growth in Clackamas County is projected for the next 20 years, creating more demand on I-205. A combination of highway improvements (from I-5 to I-84) and high-quality transit is proposed to address this need. Rapid bus would travel from Oregon City to Gateway.

A more detailed study will identify actual improvements in this corridor but may include:

- Widening I-205 to six lanes from West Linn to I-5.
- Widening Oregon City Bridge to six lanes with
Traffic can be heavy on regional highways, especially during peak travel hours. Improvements are planned on many routes to alleviate auto and freight delays.

auxiliary lanes in each direction.

- Improving streets parallel to I-205, including new overpasses and street extensions near Clackamas regional center.

**Proposed Sunrise Highway**

Growth in Clackamas County will increase traffic significantly in the Damascus area, creating the need for a new highway in the next 20 years.

Examples of several projects planned for the Sunrise Highway include:

- Build a new four-lane highway, from I-205 to Rock Creek Junction in the near-term.
- An extension from Rock Creek Junction to US 26 is also planned for the long-term, as warranted by development in the Damascus area.

**McLoughlin Corridor**

A more streamlined highway design is planned along McLoughlin and Highway 224 to improve travel between Portland and Clackamas County. Greatly expanded bus service with the possibility of carpool lanes is under consideration in this corridor. Light rail service may be considered in the future.

**Highway 217**

Significantly increased traffic on Highway 217 creates the need for expansion. The Highway 217 study will consider auto and freight traffic and possible solutions to congestion in this area. A combination of transit, highway and street projects are proposed to maintain access to Washington Square and Beaverton regional centers. In addition, commuter rail is proposed to link Beaverton to Wilsonville, complementing other transit in this corridor.

**Mt. Hood Corridor in Gresham**

A Mt. Hood Parkway project will continue to be part of the long-term vision for connecting I-84 to US 26 and providing access to Gresham regional center.

Meanwhile, a series of improvements are proposed to streamline the Hogan Road connection from I-84 to US 26.

**Proposed Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway**

A new connection on I-5 between Tualatin and Sherwood is proposed to route through traffic around the Tigard and Tualatin town centers. The location of the new route will be studied and the highway could be built as a tollway.
Bridges provide the only access across our rivers, often connecting people with jobs. The region's bridges are aging and in need of repair to maintain their usefulness into the future. Since few new bridges are proposed, bridge repair and preservation plays an important part in the Regional Transportation Plan.

The following are several bridge projects in the plan:

- Preserve the Willamette River crossings with repairs and painting, including the Broadway, Burnside, Morrison and Sauvie Island bridges.
- Preserve or replace the Sellwood Bridge with a two-lane bridge, adding bicycle and pedestrian improvements (see box).
- Restore the St. Johns Bridge.
- Study the need for a new North Willamette crossing from US 30 to the Rivergate industrial area.
- Construct a new bridge from Marine Drive to Hayden Island for access to marine terminals.

Sellwood Bridge improvements

Metro's South Willamette River Crossing Study concluded in July 1999. The study examined new bridge locations, as well as four-lane and two-lane Sellwood Bridge alternatives. Due to other funding priorities and potential adverse community impacts of new or bigger bridges, the Metro Council and local elected officials recommended that the Sellwood Bridge be maintained or replaced as a two-lane structure. They also recommended improvements to the Ross Island and I-205 bridges, more transit and bicycle improvements, widening Southeast McLoughlin and Highway 224 (as necessary), and working to provide more jobs in Clackamas County to reduce demand for long-distance commuter trips.

Hawthorne Bridge improvements

The Hawthorne Bridge underwent a $20.7 million renovation in 1998-99. More than $4.7 million of Metro transportation improvement funds went to replacing the surface of the bridge deck and for widening the shared bicycle and pedestrian sidewalks on the bridge and ramps. The rest of the funding, approximately $16 million, was authorized by JPACT from federal bridge repair funding administered by the Oregon Department of Transportation.
Designing streets for cars and people

Whatever your destination and however you travel, well-designed streets can get you there. The design of streets directly affects our quality of life. Street design is one way the 2040 Growth Concept can be carried out, by linking the way a street is designed to the land uses it serves. In this way, neighborhoods can be protected for pedestrians, bicycles and local traffic, with through traffic and truck travel encouraged in major transportation corridors.

Metro has worked with the region's residents and governments to develop new policies for street design. The result has been the creation of new street design classifications: boulevards, streets and roads. Boulevards emphasize people; roads are for cars and trucks; and streets balance all modes of travel. The policies apply to regionally significant streets throughout the metropolitan area, primarily arterial or major street networks.

**Focus on boulevards**

Boulevards are located in regional and town centers and along main streets. They are often the centerpiece of a community and the focus of civic activities. Although they often carry heavy traffic, they are designed for walking and transit. Designs include improved pedestrian crossings at every intersection, wider sidewalks with on-street parking, benches, bus shelters and curb extensions. These people-friendly elements are intended to slow traffic and make walking, bicycling and the use of transit safer and more inviting. Boulevards can encourage more livable communities with nearby services within walking distance.

Boulevard projects are a transportation priority in this region. Streets that will be redesigned to become boulevards include:

- McLoughlin Boulevard in Milwaukie
- Sandy Boulevard
- West Burnside
- Hawthorne
- Division Street in East Multnomah County
- Barbur Boulevard
- Capitol Highway
- Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway
- Main and Adair streets in Cornelius

The plan includes many other boulevard projects throughout the region.
Livable streets

Division Street boulevard

Before
Division Street brings many of Gresham regional center's destinations together. It is a bus corridor that connects to light rail. It ties Gresham's historic downtown to the new development called Civic Neighborhood. It connects Gresham with Portland and provides neighborhood access to parks, shopping centers and schools.

Yet Division is completely auto-oriented. A major five-lane arterial, it has heavy traffic and lacks even basic sidewalks in many areas. It acts as a neighborhood divider rather than a connector.

A new boulevard design (lower picture, above) was developed for Division. When completed, the street will become the new heart of Gresham regional center. The boulevard will have broad sidewalks, street trees, lighting, bicycle lanes and on-street parking. Travel lanes for cars and transit will be divided with a raised and landscaped median that also serves as a pedestrian refuge. Division Street is an example of how major streets in the region can be made more attractive and functional for multiple uses.

New fish-friendly bridge

Steelhead have traditionally used Mt. Scott Creek in Clackamas County. The creek passes under Sunnyside Road in an old box culvert that does not provide fish passage when water is low. The culvert will be removed and replaced with a new bridge over the road near 117th Avenue. The bridge will allow steelhead to more easily pass under Sunnyside Road. It will also provide a wider crossing for traffic, including bike lanes and sidewalks. A proposed pathway under the bridge could connect to a future Mt. Scott multiuse path connecting to a regional park.

Green Streets for fish passage

What happens when roads must cross over streams? Metro is working to make sure that regional transportation projects do not block fish passages. With the recent federal listing of salmon and steelhead and proposed listing of cutthroat trout as threatened species, new attention is focusing on urban fish habitat, stream passage and water quality.

The new Green Streets program will provide new guidelines for transportation projects to ensure fish-friendly design solutions. For example, more than 150 culverts around the region were found to need repair to allow fish to pass under roads. Metro is identifying culverts that should be replaced in the near future. Federal and state transportation programs must allocate funds to replace or repair these fish access problems.

Johnson Creek is a free-flowing stream, spanned by the Seventh Street Bridge in Gresham. The bridge protects the steelhead and trout from road impacts. The Green Streets program will promote similar "fish-friendly" designs to protect streams around the region.
Major regional corridors

In just the last 35 years, most of our major highway and light rail lines were built, making up the backbone of the region’s transportation system.

Now there is a new emphasis on preserving these existing facilities, while carefully expanding the system, where necessary. This strategy will provide the best use of scarce transportation dollars into the year 2020. Shown on the map are summaries of future projects needed in each transportation corridor. For more details on specific projects, see page 4 to order fact sheets for various areas around the region.
Public transit has become more important to our region’s transportation system in the past 25 years. Since the Portland Transit Mall was built in the 1970s, bus ridership has grown steadily. With the addition of light rail and the upcoming streetcar line, the types of transit service offered in Portland have also grown. New ideas, such as commuter rail and rapid bus, add to the potential of transit use in our growing region.

Light rail and rapid bus will become the backbone of the transit system, connecting regional centers to each other and to the central city. Light rail service will operate at least every 10 minutes during the day, seven days a week. Rapid bus will operate every 15 minutes during the day, seven days a week. Light rail or rapid bus will connect regional centers and the central city.

On an average weekday in 1998, about 186,000 riders used the bus and rail systems. By 2020, that number is expected to increase to more than 500,000 riders. The Regional Transportation Plan identifies the need for fast, convenient transit access to all parts of the region.

The following types of transit projects or expansions are planned for the metropolitan area:

**Light rail transit**

Light rail provides speedy and convenient service between downtown Portland and Gresham and Hillsboro regional centers. Extensions are currently under study for future regional service.

- Light rail is currently being built from Gateway to Portland International Airport under a public/private funding package.
- A light rail line on North Interstate Avenue, from the Rose Garden to the Expo Center, is under study and construction is expected to begin in 2001. A future extension may be considered to Vancouver, Wash.
- If funded, a future light rail extension may travel from Portland to Clackamas County. Until then, more frequent buses will serve Highway 99E/Highway 224 from Clackamas Town Center to Portland.
- Future rail service will be evaluated to Oregon City and in the Highway 217 and Barbur Boulevard corridors.
Commuter rail

Commuter rail uses existing railroad tracks for diesel-powered passenger train cars that typically run long distances, mostly during rush hours. Washington County is seeking funding for an 18-mile commuter rail line from Beaverton's MAX station to Wilsonville, with a possible future extension south to Salem. Corridors for other commuter rail studies could include McMinnville to Portland, Lake Oswego to Portland and Canby to Portland.

Streetcars

Streetcars are returning to the Portland area.

Streetcars run on new tracks set in the middle of existing streets. A new central city streetcar line is being built from Portland State University in downtown Portland to Good Samaritan Hospital in Northwest Portland. Future streetcar lines to be studied include one from North Macadam to connect to Portland State.

Rapid bus

New rapid bus service will provide fast, frequent and reliable service with limited stops along major transit corridors. The service may run on reserved bus lanes. Stations will include schedule kiosks, ticket machines, lighting and benches, covered shelters and bike parking.

- An interim rapid bus system will be developed from downtown Portland to Clackamas Town Center and Oregon City. A new Milwaukie Transit Center will be built.
- New rapid bus service will be enhanced on the Powell/Foster Corridor to Damascus.
- Service will be improved along Barbur Boulevard and 99W to connect King City, Tigard and Portland.
- Studies will be done for rapid bus lines along I-205 from Vancouver to Oregon City and from Oregon City to as far west as the Beaverton Transit Center.

Frequent bus

"Frequent bus" means high-frequency local bus service along main streets or major routes with frequent stops. Stations feature covered bus shelters, lighting, benches and curb extensions. Frequent bus service will be enhanced on Sandy Boulevard, Killingsworth/82nd, MLK/Lombard, Hawthorne Boulevard, Division Street, Hall Boulevard, Kruse Way and Highway 43 and Belmont/NW 23rd Avenue, as well as Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway and Tualatin Valley Highway.

New buses

One of the major funding decisions is to purchase more buses to alleviate rush-hour overcrowding on the region's most-used transit routes. Providing new buses during peak use is one of the best ways to keep and gain new ridership. Service improvements during off-peak times are also being funded, as well as bus service to new areas.

Added bus shelters and better schedule information will also be provided.

Regional transit service strategy

Metro and Tri-Met have worked with residents and government partners to define a long-term transit strategy for the region. Future transit service will focus on regional centers, such as Gresham, Beaverton, Clackamas and...
In working with Metro and the other governments in the region, my mission has been to provide a broad range of transportation choices to Milwaukie residents, support the livability of our community and ensure that our community is connected to the entire metropolitan region. The RTP reflects a careful balance between the transportation goals of the entire region and of local communities. Milwaukie is very pleased to be a partner in this planning effort.

Portland’s central city. Improvements planned for the next 20 years will provide transit service that better meets the needs of a growing region by offering:

- Faster, more direct connections to different communities, minimizing the need to travel to downtown Portland to transfer.
- Better routes to serve neighborhoods, employment areas and schools.
- Efficient, reliable service with adequate space for passengers at all times.
- Improved bus connections for better access to light rail.
- New low-floor, air-conditioned buses with security cameras and bigger windows, providing service to all, including those using mobility devices.
- Improved bus stops, with shelters, lighting, phones, maps, schedules, better sidewalks and electronic signs with accurate bus arrival times.
- Support of transportation management associations to improve commute options for employees (see box at right).

Transportation management associations, which are private enterprises or private/public partnerships, offer alternatives to employees driving to work alone during rush hour. TMAs can promote ride sharing, transit, walking, biking, work schedule changes and telecommuting to reduce rush hour traffic congestion. One TMA will be located in each regional center.

The Lloyd District TMA formed to reduce traffic congestion around the Lloyd Center area. The TMA has joined with Tri-Met to offer a PASSport program that increased the use of bus passes from 2,500 to nearly 5,000 employees in the Lloyd District during the past year.

The Lloyd District TMA negotiated four new bus lines, adding direct access from Southeast and Southwest Portland and Clark County. New bike lanes and bike parking facilities have also been added to the area. Businesses that participate in the TMA have seen a significant reduction in employees driving to work, thus complying with Oregon’s commute rule.
Walking into the millennium

New, wider sidewalks are being built throughout the region to encourage more walking, as part of the regional pedestrian system. This sidewalk is on Northeast Grand Avenue in Portland.

Walking would we be without walking?
Walking is the most basic and reliable form of transportation. Everyone who can walk is a pedestrian, even those who need mobility assistance. In neighborhoods with good sidewalks and access to transit, more than 20 percent of all travel is on foot.

Metro wants to continue encouraging walking, which is our link to cars, bicycles, buses, trucks and light rail. It is also a valuable form of transportation to accomplish short trips in your neighborhood or to shops near work. Walking can link neighbors and communities, as well.

Improving streets to make them pedestrian-friendly is one goal of the Regional Transportation Plan. This will allow people to walk safely in attractive areas, especially to transit and major centers. Community design can also help foster convenient walking routes. Walking trips are expected to more than double in the next 20 years, so pedestrian improvements are necessary.

Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan calls for the development of a regional pedestrian system to make streets more walkable and improve walkways to public transit. Needed improvements include sidewalks, multiuse paths, curb extensions, bus shelters, safer street crossings, lighting, street trees, benches, landscaping and wide planting strips that buffer walkers from cars.

The design of pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods, with well-connected streets and sidewalks and nearby shopping, fosters nearly four times more walking trips than other areas.

Examples of specific improvements in the plan to encourage walking are as follows:

- Retrofit existing streets in the Lloyd District, Hillsdale, Washington Square, Beaverton, Gateway and other centers to include wider sidewalks, safer street crossings, bus shelters, curb extensions and benches at major transit stops.

- Improve streets and corridors that connect to light rail transit in regional centers, such as Gresham, Gateway, Beaverton and Hillsboro.

- Provide wide sidewalks along major transit corridors – particularly at transit stations and bus stops – with landscaped buffers, bus shelters and benches, curb extensions and marked or signal crossings.

- Construct new multiuse trails throughout the region, including along Phillips, Rock and Fanno creeks.

- Fill in missing sidewalks on arterial streets throughout the region.

Walking can be our link to nearby schools, parks, neighbors and shopping. Pedestrian-friendly design, with well-connected streets and wider sidewalks, is planned throughout the region.
Bicycles: from the past into the future

One of the best, cleanest and least expensive transportation choices in the region is bicycling. This is helped by the many new bicycle lanes striped on major streets around the region, with more planned for the near future.

A major goal of the plan is to provide a regional network of safe and convenient bikeways, including bike lanes, multi-use paths and bicycle boulevards. The goals include the following:

- Provide a regional, interconnected network of safe and convenient bikeways.
- Provide good bike access to downtown Portland and the regional centers.
- Increase the number of bicycle trips throughout the region.
- Ensure that transportation projects are designed to accommodate bicyclists.
- Encourage bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists to share the road safely.

There is a coordinated bicycle planning effort in the region, involving Metro, city of Portland, Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, Tri-Met and the Oregon Department of Transportation.

Planned bicycle facilities fall into three categories:

- **Bike lanes** - Striped sections of the roadway designated for bicycles. Bike lanes are planned on many major streets throughout the region. One example is Greeley/Interstate, connecting the Portland central city to North and Northeast Portland. In Washington County, bike lanes on Cornell Road will help fill gaps in the regional bikeway system. Another example is the Division Street boulevard project in Gresham, which includes bike lanes and sidewalks as part of the project.

- **Bicycle boulevard** - A street with little traffic that becomes a through street for bicyclists while maintaining local access for cars. One example is the Tillamook bikeway in Northeast Portland, which includes a boulevard retrofit in the Hollywood town center.

- **Multiuse paths** - Separated from car traffic, multi-use paths are used by bicyclists, pedestrians, skaters and other non-motorized travelers. An example for future construction is the Clackamas regional center trail, which connects area residents to North Clackamas Park.

More bicycling will be encouraged through the addition of new bike lanes and bicycle boulevards around the region. Providing a regional, interconnected network of safe and convenient bike ways is one of the plan’s goals.

Bike There! bike map on sale for a greener, cleaner community

Want to pedal your way to a better community? Metro’s new and improved bike map is available. If you like to cycle, the bike map can help you find the best and safest way to travel around the region. Streets are color-coded for safety, and new bike lanes and paths are highlighted. Other features include shaded elevation, topography and water-resistant synthetic paper.

You can purchase the bike map for $6 from many local bike shops and bookstores and through Metro’s web site at www.metro-region.org. Additional information about the bike map is available through Metro’s web site or by calling the transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900, option 6.
Coping with traffic congestion

While the Regional Transportation Plan assumes that the automobile will continue to be a primary transportation option, it also recognizes that the amount of miles we drive – and therefore the degree of congestion on our roads – is directly related to the availability of varied and dependable transportation choices. For the most part, our road system is built to accommodate the heavy rush hour demand. It stands to reason that if demand is spread over more hours of the day or reduced through use of alternative travel choices, congestion will be better managed and the need to build costly road expansion projects reduced.

The transportation choices and land uses outlined in this newsletter can be tools to reduce growth in traffic congestion. In some cases, people will adjust their travel times to avoid rush hour traffic or workers may arrange to work at home on some days or to share rides with neighbors. Some trips could be made by using an improved transit network, including regional light rail, rapid bus, frequent bus, streetcars, and commuter rail, or by bicycling and walking. Our individual choices can help reduce congestion during peak traffic times.

The Regional Transportation Plan recognizes the following:

- Strategic road and highway improvements are needed to address the most critical areas of congestion.
- A realistic standard for traffic operations, based on what the public has indicated it is willing to fund, translates into some congestion during the morning and evening rush hours.
- Increased congestion can be avoided by providing people with more varied and reliable transportation choices.
- Efficient land use patterns, with employment centers and housing located near one another with easy access to transit and services, will help to manage congestion and sustain communities.

Traffic relief options apply to new highways

The Traffic Relief Options Study began in 1996 to review the concept of “congestion pricing” or “peak period pricing,” which would charge drivers a fee for using major highways during peak hours. This could reduce the number of commuters using congested freeways by diverting them to other routes or dedicated lanes, or to use transit or travel at other times of day.

A citizen task force conducted an in-depth analysis of peak period pricing for the Portland metropolitan area. They concluded that:

- Peak period pricing could be an appropriate tool to manage congestion. It could also generate revenues to help fund needed transportation improvements.
- It should be considered a feasible option when major new highway capacity is added to congested corridors.
- Existing roadways should not be priced at this time.
- In the next two years, the region should identify a specific project to serve as a pilot project to test peak period pricing.

For more information, call the Metro transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900, and ask for the TRO final report.
How to finance the future?

The Regional transportation Plan identifies three funding scenarios to help give elected officials and residents a picture of how different levels of investments can address future transportation needs.

The plan considers funding at three investment levels:

- **Existing resources system** - limited to current funding levels which fall short of maintaining the system already in place.

- **Preferred system** - includes all future projects necessary to meet the adopted goals and standards for the transportation system.

- **Strategic system** - lies in between the other two systems, and is made up of the most critical programs that are needed to keep pace with future growth.

The plan studies these investment levels during three time periods: short-term (five years), medium-term (10 years) and long-term (20 years).

Metro’s existing resources system is estimated at $1.94 billion through the year 2020 for the most-needed road-related and transit projects.

But Metro estimates that to keep up with growth and build all necessary road-related and transit projects, the preferred system would require approximately $9.09 billion.

The mid-level strategic system is projected to cost $7.21 billion and would need increased revenue sources. A portion of this increase could be funded by the 5 cents per gallon gas tax increase and $10 per biennium vehicle registration fee increase passed by the 1999 Oregon Legislature.

Now, here’s the concern: state and local funding sources are currently too low to adequately maintain our existing transportation system. They are clearly inadequate to fund maintenance of the existing system or improvement projects identified in all three investment scenarios, even the lowest.

Closing the gap

The $4.05 billion required by the mid-level strategic system for road-related projects translates to an increase of the gas tax by 2 cents per gallon per year during the next 20 years - an average increase of about $12 per vehicle per year for 20 years.
Auto tax comparisons
Compared with other state auto-related taxes, Oregon ranks among the lowest in the nation. Many nearby states have higher total auto registration and related fees, sales taxes and gas taxes.

The average gas and auto taxes currently paid in Oregon is $162.60 per year. In comparison, Washington residents pay $564, Nevada residents pay $455.10 and Idaho residents pay $316.80. In California, average total gas and auto taxes come to $466.20 per year.

Utility costs are another comparison. The proposed average Oregon road use taxes are $27.10 per month, based on a two-car household. In comparison, an average monthly electric bill is $61.50 and water/sewer charges are $45.70. Natural gas is $37.55; cable TV $29.40; local phone $25 and trash pickup $17.20. A two-zone bus pass is $41 per month.

Funding future projects
Metro funds transportation projects with federal money through the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

The MTIP was updated recently to determine which projects in the plan will be funded during the four-year period of October 1999 through September 2003. Local governments and transportation agencies, such as Tri-Met, cities, counties and Port of Portland, submitted requests for projects to

 Legislative funding package
The 1999 Oregon Legislature took steps to partially close the funding gap. A package of transportation funding measures (House Bill 2082) was passed by the legislature and may be referred to voters in May 2000.

The package includes a 5-cents-per-gallon gas tax increase, and a $10-per-biennium auto registration fee increase. The truck weight-mile fees would be replaced with a new 29-cent tax on diesel fuel and an increase in truck registration fees. In addition, it allows counties to enact a $10 per year add-on to the vehicle registration fee.

If this package is enacted, it would help close the gap for two areas of need. It would fund approximately $180 million of unfunded modernization projects on the state highway system in the metro area ($600 million statewide). It would also allow the state, cities and counties to address some of the backlog of unmet maintenance and preservation needs of our highway and road system.

Operating and maintaining what's on the ground

Projections show that existing funding sources to maintain our road system already fall 7 percent short of need. The shortfall will grow to 44 percent because resources don't increase as quickly as costs and needs. While transit funds do grow, transit service needs to grow faster than current funding levels to make service more convenient to more people.
Transportation funding puzzle (continued)

Metro for consideration.

The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council then selected projects for funding that support a balance of alternatives, promote 2040 land use objectives, provide geographic equity and meet air quality standards.

The federal transportation act (ISTEA) adopted in 1991 ushered in a new era, calling for integrated planning and financing for all travel methods. This region has met the federal challenge with a comprehensive and integrated long-range plan for transportation and land use.

**How projects get funded**

There is a selection process that all projects must go through before being accepted for funding:

**Step 1 - Application**
Application is submitted by state, regional or local jurisdiction.

**Step 2 - Initial criteria**
Elected officials establish “threshold criteria” that must be met to ensure consistency with regional planning goals.

**Step 3 - Technical ranking**
A technical score is calculated based on how well the project supports the 2040 Growth Concept and meets transportation goals. Project categories include: pedestrian, transit oriented development, bicycle, road modernization, road reconstruction, transit, freight, transportation demand management and boulevard projects.

**Step 4 - Selection**
If the funding amount is available and project meets all necessary criteria, the project is recommended for public hearing and funding by JPACT and Metro Council elected officials.

**Where the money comes from**
The region’s transportation system is funded through a combination of federal, state, regional and local money sources. Federal funds are given to this region with differing requirements on how they can be spent. The state generates funds through a series of user fees that are constitutionally limited to road use, including a gas tax, taxes on heavy trucks, vehicle/truck registration fees and drivers license fees. Tri-Met and SMART (Wilsonville) collect regional transit funds through a business payroll tax and fares. Local sources include county gas taxes, dedicated property tax levies and other development-related fees.

---

**How to close the gap?**

*Transportation needs exceed available revenue*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of road-related projects (street, highway, bike, pedestrian and Willamette River bridges)</th>
<th>Cost of public transportation capital projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$253 million ($183 million highway, $70 million local bridges) in HB2082 revenue</td>
<td>$9.09 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.21 billion</td>
<td>$9.09 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.16 billion</td>
<td>$4.33 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.94 - 2.32 billion</td>
<td>$4.76 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategic system is projected to cost $7.21 billion, of which more than half includes street, highway, bike, pedestrian and Willamette River bridges projects.
Metro: Protecting the nature of our region
"It's better to plan for growth than ignore it."

Planning is Metro's top job. Metro provides a regional forum where cities, counties and citizens can resolve issues related to growth – things such as protecting streams and open spaces, transportation and land-use choices and increasing the region’s recycling efforts. Open spaces, salmon runs and forests don’t stop at city limits or county lines. Planning ahead for a healthy environment and stable economy supports livable communities now and protects the nature of our region for the future.

Metro serves 1.3 million people who live in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties and the 24 cities in the Portland metropolitan area. Metro provides transportation and land-use planning services and oversees regional garbage disposal and recycling and waste reduction programs.

For more information about Metro or to schedule a speaker for a community group, call (503) 797-1510 (public affairs) or (503) 797-1540 (council).

Metro’s web site: www.metro-region.org

The Regional Transportation Plan brings together all aspects of our transportation system: street design, arterial streets, highways, public transportation, bikeways, pedestrian walkways and freight movement. They combine to create a collective vision for transportation for the next 20 years.
Moving into the new millennium

We are poised on the threshold of new challenges as we enter the 21st century. One of the most visible concerns affects us all: traffic congestion.

Metro's main task is to maintain this region's livability as we plan for more growth in population. Keeping communities livable is our primary goal, now and into the next millennium.

The Regional Transportation Plan, summarized in this newsletter, is the culmination of four years of work by citizens, local government partners and Metro. The plan sets out a collective vision for the future of our region. In doing so, it reflects Metro's commitment to link transportation, land use and environmental planning so that our future can reflect our values.

A balanced transportation system is at the heart of the plan, including walking, bicycling, driving, using transit and keeping freight moving to national and international destinations.

The plan also incorporates the 2040 Growth Concept, which is based on using land wisely. The 2040 Growth Concept directs new development to population centers and along existing transportation corridors.

When 2020 arrives, we hope people will look back and recognize everyone's current efforts to protect the livability of the Portland metropolitan region.

Sincerely,

Mike Burton
Metro Executive Officer

Rod Monroe
Metro Council Presiding Officer
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