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MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

DATE: April 10, 2003
DAY: Thursday
TIME: 7:15 a.m.
PLACE: Metro Chambers

1. Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum.

2. Citizen communications to JPACT on non-agenda items

*3. Minutes of March 13, 2003 meeting – APPROVAL REQUESTED

4. Resolution No. 03-3306 Approving the Damascus Concept Work Plan – APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno, Metro

5. Resolution No. 03-3303 Adopting the Locally Preferred Alternative for the South Corridor Project – APPROVAL REQUESTED Richard Brandman, Metro

6. Resolution No. 03-3309 Amending the FY 02-05 MTIP to Authorize Obligation of US DOT FY 03 Transit and Roadway “Earmark” Appropriations – APPROVAL REQUESTED – Andy Cotugno, Metro

7. Oregon Highway Design Manual/Special Transportation Areas— APPROVAL OF COMMENT LETTER TO OREGON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION REQUESTED – Tom Kloster, Metro

8. Priorities 2004-07 - 150% List for Public Review and Comment - APPROVAL REQUESTED TO RELEASE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT – Andy Cotugno/Ted Leybold, Metro

9. Adjourn

* Material available electronically. Please call 503-797-1916 for a paper copy.

** Not all material on this agenda item is available electronically.

All material will be available at the meeting.
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</table>

<table>
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<tr>
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<th>AFFILIATION</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<th>GUESTS PRESENT</th>
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<td>City of Gresham</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>SW Washington RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Selinger</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin McArthur</td>
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<tr>
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GUESTS PRESENT (Cont.)  AFFILIATION

Brian Newman  Metro Council
Bob Duehmig  OHSU
Mike Clark  Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Justin Patterson  City of Tualatin
L.A. Ornelas  OHSU

STAFF

Rooney Barker  Richard Brandman  Andy Cotugno  Renée Castilla
Tom Kloster  Ted Leybold  Mark Turpel

I.  CALL TO ORDER

Chair Rod Park called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 7:16 am.

II.  SENATOR RICK METSGER, DISTRICT 26, CHAIR OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Senator Rick Metsger accorded thanks to the JPACT members for inviting him to speak to them. He stated that the Transportation and Economic Development committee is an important committee that would be able to do positive things including job growth and economic development. He said that he recognized that transportation is the essential element and that the committee’s membership is comprised of individuals that are visionary with their approach. He further stated that they hope to work with governor’s office and his objectives for transportation and economic development. The committee members are trying to develop a conduit to carry and try to bring those agendas forward as they are now starting to work their way through the committee. He said it had been a slow start in terms of having the public review because of dealing with the overall reduction of the budget. He provided an overview of the funding and said that he had been meeting weekly (now daily) with the Chair of the House Transportation Committee, the Governor’s Office, and Senator Bruce Starr, Chair of the Senate Committee on Transportation and Economic Development. He said they are working on a funding mechanism that should be able to move through the capitol and he said he thinks they are getting close to having something that they could unveil and start discussions. He said it would address the needs of transportation. The issues that they are facing are not unusual and include bridge maintenance and preservation on all systems throughout the State of Oregon as well as the anticipated growth and need for modernization dollars. He said it was a priority to begin fixing the system so that trucking companies have the ability to move commerce on the roadways and bridges. He acknowledged that there are multiple bridges that need fixing or replacing on I-5 and I-84. He also recognized that there are key preservation and maintenance needs for cities and counties and he hopes to be able to provide up to $500 million for modernization. He said it was important to address issues throughout Oregon including congestion, safety, future growth and industrial land development. He also emphasized the importance of providing affordable housing in Damascus as well as the critical transportation needs along the Sunrise Corridor. He said that it was critical to recognize that decisions on land use alter the transportation
infrastructures. He said that it was important for areas like Wilsonville to have housing so that citizens do not have to use the infrastructures, so that they can live where they work.

Councilor Rex Burkholder stated that a major concern for this region is the need to raise money for general transportation infrastructure and improvements that are on the state system as well as off. He asked how money could be raised for maintenance needs off the state system.

Senator Metsger acknowledged that the need for additional money to fund preservation and modernization projects is greater than they can do. However, a small investment to the system could produce a big impact. He said that they began the process with OTIA with an understanding that they would try to create a transportation-funding program every two years. He stated that the transportation program that they would like includes $1.3 billion for bridges, of which, $300 million for county bridges and one city bridge. He said that they have the opportunity to do major improvements to the system and address some modernization. He further stated that this would be the first of several phases to correct the states transportation issues. He explained that they would not be seeking a gas tax because that had been referred to the voters and beaten. There has been talk of increasing title fees as well as registration fees. They are also looking at ways for their regional and local partners to have a more options and expedited way to raise local funding then currently allowed.

Councilor Karl Rohde asked if the bill being discussed would in any way preempt the local authority to raise revenues, in particular the street maintenance fund.

Senator Metsger stated that the Senate acknowledges that local governments need their ability to raise revenue and there is not an active dialogue-taking place to change that.

Mr. Fred Hansen stated that economic development in this region has been assisted by the transit investments; over the last decade about a $1 billion of discretionary money has come to the region that would have gone to other regions. He asked if that message was getting through to the Senate or is that an important message that JPACT needs to make sure does get through.

Senator Metsger stated that if Mr. Hansen was referring to the leverage factor, all members of the House and Senate think differently on that issue. Therefore, he said it would be more persuasive for Senators and Representatives to be able to identify what certain investments would mean to their communities.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer stated that some of the JPACT members had just returned from Washington D.C. and he stated that things seem to be looking good locally and for South Corridor Light Rail. He accorded thanks to Senator Metsger for his continuing support and appreciates his understanding of the Sunrise Corridor and the need to have urban growth work with the infrastructure.

Senator Metsger echoed the importance of planning communities so that people can live with they work. He further emphasized the importance of improving the infrastructure in those areas to meet the needs of the communities so that all aspects, agriculture, industrial lands and communities work together.
Commissioner Roy Rogers asked what revenue raising options might be available for local jurisdictions.

Senator Metsger responded that they are hoping to make it easier for all jurisdictions to be able to raise registration fees in their locality; as well making other ways easier and more manageable.

Councilor Rohde asked if there would be project earmarking from these funds or if they would be based on the priorities of each region.

Senator Metsger stated that earmarking of projects is always a possibility. He stated that there several ways to allocate funds by either the State Improvement Plan; groups such as JPACT and their priorities of regional needs as well as the needs of the legislature.

Mr. Richard Brandman stated that the Task Force acknowledged that there are transportation needs totaling $7 billion. However, it was recognized that they would only be able to fund $600 million at first; $250 million for transit; $250 million for road; and $190 million for safety improvements. In order to accomplish those objectives, the region would need a match of $400 million from the state.

Senator Metsger recognized that local and regional jurisdictions willing to step up and contribute to funding these transportation needs would enable the state to partnership and help with finding resources.

III. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were no citizen communications.

IV. MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 13, 2003

ACTION TAKEN: Mayor Rob Drake moved and Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of February 13, 2003. The motion passed.

V. RESOLUTION NO. 03-3288 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Mr. Andy Cotugno presented the Resolution No. 03-3288 with the amendments and the United Work Program (UWP) (included as part of the meeting record).

Mr. Cotugno presented Resolution No. 03-3289 Self-Certification (included as part of this meeting record).

ACTION TAKEN: Mr. Hansen moved and Mayor Drake seconded the motion to approve Resolution No. 03-3288 as amended.

Councilor Rohde expressed his concern on approving this item because he was not able to adequately review the material.
Mr. Cotugno stated that approval of Metro’s work plan was routine and happened every year. He further explained that it describes each program Metro is working on and how the funds are allocated.

**ACTION TAKEN:** The motion passed.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Mr. Hansen moved and Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion to approve Resolution No. 03-3289. The motion passed.

**VI. RESOLUTION NO. 03-3262 AND ORDINANCE NO. 03-991B – 2040 PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

Mr. Cotugno presented Resolution No. 03-3262 and Ordinance No. 03-991B. He also gave a brief presentation regarding the 2040 Performance Measures (included as part of this meeting record).

Mayor Drake recognized the need to maintain attainment of clean air and the potential for being penalized. He stated that losing federal dollars is one penalty. He asked how significant this issue was in other regions and how much they are losing in terms of federal funds.

Mr. Cotugno stated that the penalties have been around for the last 5-7 years and they include higher requirements for clean air, more programs needed, mandated actions and employer participation from voluntary to mandatory. He further stated that financial penalties include loss of federal funds for road expansion, safety and bridge and other alternatives.

Mr. Hansen also stated that the flow of federal dollars is significantly slowed down; economic development is hurt because industrial companies must use tighter controls in order to produce cleaner air, which is very expensive and time consuming. Mr. Hansen accorded thanks and expressed his complements to staff for their work.

Mayor Drake emphasized the importance of linking land use and transportation.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Mayor Drake moved and Mr. Hansen seconded the motion to approve Resolution No. 03-3262 and Ordinance No. 03-991B. The motion passed.

**VII. RESOLUTION NO. 03-3290 – MTIP ALLOCATION FOR REGIONAL FUNDING STRATEGY**

Mr. Cotugno presented Resolution No. 03-3290 (included as part of this meeting record).

Councilor Carl Hosticka asked for explanation of the net of debt service; he understands it to mean that the dollars are committed out to 2015 but it is likely that the projects would be completed ahead of time.
Mr. Cotugno stated that it is likely that the project might be completed ahead of schedule by two or three years. Andy Cotugno explained that in essence they would bond for this money. He further stated that amount of MTIP dollars they would have to allocate would continue to grow every year.

Mr. Cotugno reminded that the MTIP is programmed every two years, therefore there would be additional opportunities for a check and balance. Mr. Cotugno further stated that for FY 2006-07, there would be $20 million remaining per year to allocate to other purposes; after FY 06-07 there would be $40 million to allocate to other purposes.

Councilor Hosticka asked for explanation of the anticipated growth and the assumption that the MTIP would have the money available for the obligations.

Mr. Cotugno explained that the anticipated increased is predicated upon a 6% growth per year. He said that the last two bills have seen a 12% growth per year.

Mr. Hansen stated that this Resolution contains a carefully crafted balance. He referred the members to page 2B of Exhibit A, regarding Commuter Rail and other sources of funding. He wanted to clarify that Commuter Rail may go after other federal money, which JPACT agrees, would count toward their 50% share, not MTIP.

Ms. Laurel Wentworth stated that the City recognizes that they would not come back and seek other MTIP funding for North Macadam as a result of gaining this $10 million commitment. However, everyone should understand that it does not limit the City of Portland from seeking other federal funding sources for improvements in North Macadam including other federal sources; i.e. OHSU may find money for some transportation improvements from a non-transportation federal funding source.

Mayor Drake stated that both him and Roy Rogers with Washington County were in support of this resolution with the amended language.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer stated that the agreement for additional funds was not easily achieved and accorded thanks to all involved for their participation in moving Commuter Rail closer to a reality.

Councilor Burkholder reminded the committee members that JPACT has the option to reexamine the agreement every two years and that a future JPACT committee might choose not to guarantee the funds.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Kennemer moved and Councilor Burkholder seconded the motion to approve Resolution No. 03-3290. The motion passed.

VIII. 2004-07 MTIP UPDATE

Mr. Leybold presented the MTIP Update (included as part of the meeting record).
Mr. Larry Haverkamp expressed his concern that the Listening Posts all occur West of the river and he would like to see one in East Multnomah County. He stated that it would be beneficial to citizens not to have to travel as far.

IX. POWELL/FOSTER CORRIDOR STUDY UPDATE

Ms. Bridget Wieghart presented the Powell Foster Corridor Study (included as part of this meeting record).

X. TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS

Mr. Cotugno presented the overview of the Metro region applications for Transportation Enhancement funding (included as part of this meeting record).

XI. Adjourn

There being no further business, Chair Park adjourned the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Renée Castilla
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE ) RESOLUTION NO. 03-3306
DAMASCUS/BORING CONCEPT PLAN WORK ) ) Introduced by Councilor Rod Park
PROGRAM TO ADDRESS CONDITIONS ) IDENTIFIED IN RESOLUTION NO.01-3098A.

WHEREAS, on September 20, 2001, the Metro Council approved Resolution No. 01-3098A, with conditions of approval, amending the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to allocate $2 million of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for concept planning for the Damascus area and to complete the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Sunrise Corridor – Unit 1; and

WHEREAS, the first condition of Resolution 01-3098A directs a portion of this funding toward the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)/Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)/Preliminary Engineering (PE) for the Sunrise Corridor segment extending from I-205 to the Rock Creek Junction (Unit 1), with all other costs needed to complete the SDEIS/FEIS/PE to be provided by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Clackamas County; and

WHEREAS, a second condition of Resolution 01-3098A directs a portion of this funding for the preparation of a Damascus area concept plan upon completion of Metro's periodic review decision for the urban growth boundary and for completion of exceptions findings needed for the portion of the Sunrise Corridor extending from Rock Creek to US 26 with supplemental funds provided by Clackamas County; and

WHEREAS, a third condition of Resolution No. 01-3098A, requires the approval of the work program and budget by JPACT and the Metro Council to carry out these activities; and

WHEREAS, on December 12, 2002, the Metro Council approved Ordinance No. 02-969B amending Metro's urban growth boundary in the Damascus area and completing Metro's decision on the urban growth boundary; in addition, this urban growth boundary amendment included the requirement to develop a concept plan and recommend further territory to add to the urban growth boundary in the future; and

WHEREAS, a future resolution will address the work program and budget for the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)/Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)/Preliminary Engineering (PE) for the Sunrise Corridor Unit 1; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan work program and budget shown in Exhibit A of the Resolution is approved.
ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ______ day of April, 2003

______________________________
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

______________________________
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney
Overview and purpose
The Damascus/Boring Concept Plan will be a cooperative planning effort to create a plan and implementation strategies for development of approximately 12,000 acres located south of Gresham and east of Happy Valley in Clackamas County. The concept plan is a follow-up to a December 2002 decision by Metro to bring the area inside the urban growth boundary. The Damascus/Boring Concept plan will be closely coordinated with the environmental analyses of the Sunrise Corridor Unit 1 effort and will address the general need and location of the proposed Sunrise Corridor (Unit 2). Important components of the concept plan are expected to include:

- A land-use element that locates a combination of uses and densities that support local and regional housing and employment needs, provides a diverse range of housing, and identifies commercial and industrial employment opportunities that allow residents to work near their home

- A multi-modal transportation system element that serves regional and community travel needs and informs the Sunrise Corridor planning process

- A natural resources element that identifies natural resources areas and protection strategies

- A public infrastructure and facilities element for water, sewer, storm water, parks, schools, fire and police

The concept plan will provide the basis for future comprehensive plan amendments and development code regulations that must be adopted before development can take place.

A separate, concurrent process is also underway to define improvements to the "urban" portion of Highway 212, from I-205 to the Rock Creek junction of Highways 212 and 224. This work is being led by Clackamas County, in partnership with Metro and ODOT, and will result in a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for improvements to this segment of the Sunrise Corridor, also known as Unit 1. The study will also examine future right-of-way issues east of Rock Creek junction to approximately 172nd Avenue. This work will result in the identification of potential improvements between I-205 and Rock Creek and does not preclude work related to the Sunrise Corridor that will be completed as part of the Damascus Concept Plan.

The Damascus/Boring Concept Plan will identify and evaluate multi-modal transportation system alternatives to serve regional and community needs in the area. The alternatives will include combinations of highway, arterial, boulevard and transit improvements that are complemented by a network of local streets, multi-use trails and bicycle and pedestrian connections. If the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan determines that the Unit II Sunrise Corridor improvements are needed, the concept plan will identify highway alternatives to be evaluated through a DEIS process similar to that already initiated for the Unit 1 portion of the Sunrise Corridor. However, the Damascus Concept Plan could also identify non-highway alternatives to the proposed Sunrise Corridor Unit II that would better meet the needs of the area while serving statewide travel.
Project tasks and budget
The following is a summary of major tasks identified in the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan work program and costs for completion of the tasks.

Task 1
Project management and coordination
The on-going management and coordination of the project includes oversight of schedules and budgets, creation and operation of an advisory committee, coordination of grant funding and management of consultant and grant contracts. Task 1 also includes communication with elected officials, community organizations and interested agencies and on-going coordination with the groups working on governance, Sunrise Corridor planning and Powell/Foster Corridor planning. A project advisory committee to include Damascus and Boring residents, property owners and representatives from local governments and affected agencies will help direct the project. This task will be jointly managed by Clackamas County and Metro.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1 Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>$143,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$129,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$53,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$325,920</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 2
Establish a public involvement program with community
This task involves the development and implementation of a public involvement program for the project. The primary objective of this task is to ensure that the community is meaningfully involved and to build consensus through a program to be designed by a community-based public involvement committee. The public involvement program, to be determined by the committee, is expected to include actions such as open houses, public meetings, workshops, project newsletters, a project website, media communications and other activities. Clackamas County will lead this task and the community-based public involvement committee will help direct it.

Oregon Solutions will facilitate a community-based process to develop core values, vision and principles to guide the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan, including principles of sustainability. The goal for the visioning process shall be to:

- develop and document the residents' Core Values
- develop and document the residents' vision of the community for 2024
- define the rules and laws that must be followed in the concept plan process
- explore and document how to sustain the area economically, socially and environmentally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 2 Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$50,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Solutions</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 2 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$220,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Task 3**

**Background and existing conditions**
This task includes development of a GIS data set and EMME/2 base transportation model for the study area and preparation of existing conditions/issues technical memoranda for land use, transportation, natural resources and public facilities and services. This task will produce a buildable lands map, natural resources map, existing conditions transportation system map and other materials that will be used in the development of alternatives (Task 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 3 Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>$160,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$121,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$70,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 3 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$352,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 4**

**Alternatives development and analysis**
This task includes development of goals, principles and evaluation measures that will guide the creation and analysis of concept plan alternatives. Concept development workshops will be held in the community. A transportation analysis of the alternatives will be conducted using the regional travel model. An alternatives analysis report will be prepared, documenting how well the alternatives meet project goals and evaluation measures. This step will tie closely to the analysis of alternatives evaluated in the Sunrise Corridor planning effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 4 Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>$125,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$159,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$90,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 4 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$374,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 5**

**Final concept plan and implementation strategies development**
This task will finalize a concept plan that refines lessons learned from the alternatives analysis, and develop implementation strategies that will guide future implementation of the concept plan. The plan will be based on input from the community and project advisory committee. A transportation analysis of the final concept plan will be conducted using the regional travel model, and a final report will be prepared that summarizes the recommended concept plan and implementation strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 5 Summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$70,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$24,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 5 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$171,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Damascus/Boring Concept Plan Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTIP Grant Funded</th>
<th>Agency Contribution (i.e., match &amp; in-kind)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County (includes M&amp;S)</td>
<td>$677,650</td>
<td>$93,150</td>
<td>$770,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$425,450</td>
<td>$93,670</td>
<td>$519,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$243,000</td>
<td>($11,100 contributed by Metro and $16,700 Clackamas County)</td>
<td>$270,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Happy Valley</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Solutions</td>
<td>$8,973</td>
<td>($1,027 contributed by Metro and Clackamas)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,399,073</strong></td>
<td><strong>$220,647</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,619,720</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit A to Resolution No. 03-3306
The information on this map was derived from digital databases on Metro's GIS. Care was taken in the creation of this map. Metro cannot accept any responsibility for errors, omissions, or positional accuracy. This information is intended only as a planning tool and does not represent an accurate legal description of property boundaries or any other legal or developmental matter. Please consult your local government or a professional land surveyor for such information. There are no warranties, expressed or implied, including the warranty of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, accompanying this product. However, notification of any errors will be appreciated.

1 inch equals 1.25 miles
Damascus/Boring Concept Plan

**2002**
- Damascus area UGB decision
- Federal TEA earmark for urban improvements to OR 212 and ROW fund

**2003**
- Damascus/Boring Concept Plan
- Phase 1: Background
  - Transportation
  - Land Use
  - Environment
  - Economic Services
- Phase 2: Concept Alternatives*
  - Concept A
  - Concept B
  - Concept C

**2004**
- Phase 3: Concept Decision
  - Transportation
  - Land Use
  - Environment
  - Economic Services

**2005**
- Implementation
  - Metro Plan & Code Amendments
  - Phasing & Governance (TGM)
  - Local Plans and Codes (TGM)
  - Policy and Map Updates
  - Project Updates
  - Exception Findings
  - Revenue Strategies
  - Phasing Development
  - Phasing Public Infrastructure
  - TSP Updates
  - Plan and Zone Designations
  - Development Code Updates

**2006-2010**
- Local Governance Discussions
  (Damascus Firehouse Study Group)
- Local Governance - Implementation
- Sunrise Corridor
  - I-205 to Rock Creek
    - Draft & Final EIS to improve I-205/224 intersection, scope ROW to Rock Creek/172nd
    - Phase 1 Project
    - Unit 1 Component
    - ROW Protection

Sunrise Corridor
- Phase 2 Development
  - Draft EIS to Highway 26 to identify ROW for incremental protection and acquisition; exception findings for TPR compliance

Sunrise Corridor
- Phase 2 Construction
  - ROW acquisition and protection ordinances developed for local jurisdictions
  - Interchange Area Management Plans
  - Preliminary Engineering and Pre-Construction

*Each option contains with/without scenarios of limited-access Sunrise facility

March 19, 2003
Resolution No. 03-3306 addresses the work program and budget for the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan in response to conditions identified in Metro Resolution No. 01-3098A and Metro Ordinance No. 02-969B. Approval of this resolution allows Metro and Clackamas County staff to finalize a more detailed work program for the project and enter into a contract agreement to perform the tasks identified in the work program. A separate resolution will be presented to the Metro Council in the future to address the Sunrise Corridor Unit 1 work program and budget.

BACKGROUND
On September 20, 2001, the Metro Council approved Resolution No. 01-3098A amending the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to allocate $2 million of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for concept planning for the Damascus area and to analyze environmental implications of constructing Phase 1, Unit 1 of the Sunrise Corridor limited access highway. The Resolution identified the following three conditions of approval:

1. direct approximately $1 million toward the Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS)/final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)/Preliminary Engineering (PE) for the Sunrise Corridor segment extending from I-205 to the Rock Creek Junction (Unit 1), with all other costs needed to complete the SDEIS/FEIS/PE to be provided by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Clackamas County;

2. direct approximately $1 million for the preparation of a Damascus area concept plan upon completion of Metro's periodic review decision for the urban growth boundary and for completion of exceptions findings needed for the portion of the Sunrise Corridor extending from Rock Creek to US 26; and

3. require Metro's review of work program and budget to carry out these activities and to finalize the specific budget allocations to these tasks.

On December 12, 2002, the Metro Council approved Ordinance No. 02-969B amending Metro's urban growth boundary in the Damascus area and completing Metro's periodic review decision for the urban growth boundary.

Sunrise Corridor. A Sunrise Corridor Draft EIS was prepared in 1993. In 1996, the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners approved the preferred alternative, which consists of the central alignment within the Lawnfield/Mather Road area and the southern alignment around Damascus. A Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is needed to update the design and environmental information, to consider whether alternatives to the Sunrise Corridor should be considered and to determine the construction phasing of Unit 1 (I-205 to Rock Creek junction).
This work will be led by Clackamas County, in partnership with Metro and ODOT, and will complete a SDEIS and FEIS, and start preliminary engineering needed for Unit 1 of the Sunrise Corridor. The study will also examine future right-of-way issues east of Rock Creek junction to approximately 172nd Avenue. This work will result in the identification of potential improvements between I-205 and Rock Creek and does not preclude work related to the Sunrise Corridor that will be completed as part of the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan. While this work is underway, Metro and Clackamas County will complete the land use planning elements for Unit 2, including Sunrise Corridor exceptions findings and the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan. A future resolution will be considered dealing with the scope and budget for the Sunrise Corridor – Unit 1.

Metro will be independently responsible for completing amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that result from the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan and the Sunrise Corridor planning efforts, including the completion of exceptions findings for the Sunrise Corridor. Clackamas County will be independently responsible for completing necessary amendments to the County’s comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances. These activities will not be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) grant funds allocated in Resolution No. 01-3098A.

Damascus/Boring Concept Plan. The Damascus/Boring Concept Plan will be a cooperative planning effort to create a plan and implementation strategies for development of approximately 12,000 acres located south of Gresham and east of Happy Valley in Clackamas County. The Damascus/Boring Concept plan will be closely coordinated with the environmental analyses of the Sunrise Corridor Unit 1 effort and will address the general need and location of the proposed Sunrise Corridor (Unit 2). Early in the process, Oregon Solutions will facilitate a community-based process to develop core values, vision and principles to guide the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan, including principles of sustainability.

Important components of the concept plan are expected to include:

- A land-use element that locates a combination of uses and densities that support local and regional housing and employment needs, provides a diverse range of housing, and identifies commercial and industrial employment opportunities that allow residents to work near their home
- A multi-modal transportation system element that serves regional and community travel needs and informs the Sunrise Corridor planning process
- A natural resources element that identifies natural resources areas and protection strategies
- A public infrastructure and facilities element for water, sewer, storm water, parks, schools, fire and police

The concept plan will provide the basis for future comprehensive plan amendments and development code regulations that must be adopted before development can take place by the governing jurisdiction(s). Governance for this area is yet to be determined. The Damascus/Boring Concept Plan will identify and evaluate multi-modal transportation system alternatives to serve regional and community needs in the area. The alternatives will include combinations of highway, arterial, boulevard and transit improvements that are complemented by a network of local streets, multi-use trails and bicycle and pedestrian connections.

If the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan determines that the Unit II Sunrise Corridor improvements are needed, the concept plan will identify highway alternatives to be evaluated through a DEIS process similar to that already initiated for the Unit 1 portion of the Sunrise Corridor. However, the Damascus
Concept Plan could also identify non-highway alternatives to the proposed Sunrise Corridor Unit II that would better meet the needs of the area while serving statewide travel. Any further DEIS requirements that may be needed for any projects recommended through this concept plan will be undertaken at a future date.
ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition.** There is no known opposition to the proposed legislation.

2. **Legal Antecedents.** This action responds to conditions identified in Metro Resolution No. 01-3098A which allocated $2 million of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for Damascus area land use planning and to analyze environmental implications of constructing Phase 1, Unit 1 of the Sunrise Corridor limited access highway. This action also responds to Metro Ordinance No. 02-969B, which amended Metro's urban growth boundary in the Damascus area and included the requirement to develop a concept plan for this area and recommend further territory to add to the urban growth boundary in the future.

3. **Anticipated Effects.** Approval of this Resolution does two things. First, it satisfies a condition of approval of Metro Resolution No. 01-3098A, approving the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan work program and budget. Second, it allows Metro and Clackamas County staff to proceed with finalizing a more detailed scope of work and entering into a contract agreement to perform the work identified in work program. A separate resolution will be presented to the Metro Council in the future to address the Sunrise Corridor Unit 1 work program and budget.

4. **Budget Impacts.** There will be impacts on Metro's budget from this Resolution. The draft FY 03-04 budget already assumes that the work scope for the Damascus/Boring project will be completed and approved by JPACT and the Council during the current fiscal year, with $212,725 in the draft Metro budget for MTIP grant funds in the upcoming fiscal year (FY 03-04). The work program also calls for $460,325 in MTIP funding for Clackamas County, including consulting services, in FY 03-04 for the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan work. The MTIP grant covers a two-year work program, which means that another $212,725 in Metro funding and $460,325 in Clackamas County funds are proposed for Damascus/Boring planning FY 04-05.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve Resolution No. 03-3306.
DATE: April 10, 2003

TO: JPACT Members and Interested Parties

FROM: Ray Valone, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Agenda Item 4 - Change to Exhibit A of Resolution No. 03-3306

The correct version of Task 1 of Exhibit A should read as follows (additional sentence underlined):

Task 1  Project management and coordination
The on-going management and coordination of the project includes oversight of schedules and budgets, creation and operation of an advisory committee, coordination of grant funding and management of consultant and grant contracts. Task 1 also includes communication with elected officials, community organizations and interested agencies and on-going coordination with the groups working on governance, Sunrise Corridor planning and Powell/Foster Corridor planning. Clackamas County and Metro will work with ODOT to define ODOT’s role in the final work program. A project advisory committee to include Damascus and Boring residents, property owners and representatives from local governments and affected agencies will help direct the project. This task will be jointly managed by Clackamas County and Metro.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1 Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1 Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE
LOCALLY PREFERRED STRATEGY FOR THE
SOUTH/NORTH CORRIDOR PROJECT TO DEFINE
A TWO-PHASED MAJOR TRANSIT INVESTMENT
STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTH CORRIDOR, WITH
THE I-205 LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT PROJECT AS
THE PHASE 1 LOCALLY PREFERRED
ALTERNATIVE FOLLOWED BY THE MILWAUKIE
LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT PROJECT IN PHASE 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 03-3303

Introduced by:

Councilor Brian Newman

WHEREAS, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Metro published the South/North Corridor Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement in February 1998, that evaluated a No-Build and numerous Light Rail Alternatives in the South/North Corridor; and

WHEREAS, on July 23, 1998 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 98-2674 defining the Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS) and Resolution No. 98-2672 adopting the Land Use Final Order (LUFO) for the South/North Light Rail Project; and

WHEREAS, Metro and FTA published the South/North Corridor Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) in June 1999 and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in October 1999 for the North Corridor Interstate MAX Light Rail Project, and in June 1999 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 99-2806A amending the LPS for the South/North Corridor Project to define the Interstate MAX Project as the first construction segment; and

WHEREAS, in June 1999, Metro Council passed Resolution No. 99-2795A refocusing the region’s attention on the southern portion of the South/North Corridor and initiating the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study; and

WHEREAS, the South Corridor SDEIS, published on December 20, 2002, evaluated a no-build alternative, a Bus Rapid Transit Alternative, a Busway Alternative, a Milwaukie Light Rail Alternative, an I-205 Light Rail Alternative and a Combined Light Rail Alternative along with various design options; and

WHEREAS, the downtown community strongly supported a Portland Mall alignment for the CBD, the Central City Plan, the adopted LPA, and the adopted LUFO all call for the Portland Mall alignment, and there is limited capacity on the cross-mall alignment; and

WHEREAS, the public was invited to comment on the SDEIS and Downtown Light Rail Systems Analysis during the public comment period from December 20, 2002 through February 7, 2003, and comments received during the comment period, including at two public hearings, are documented in the South Corridor Project Public Comment Report (February 2003); and

WHEREAS, the South Corridor Policy Committee reviewed the SDEIS, considered the public comments and adopted a recommendation to amend the South/North LPS through a two-phased major transit investment strategy for the South Corridor, with the I-205 Light Rail Project as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for Phase 1, to be followed by the Milwaukie Light Rail Project in Phase 2 as further described in Exhibit A, the South Corridor Project Locally Preferred Alternative Report; and
WHEREAS, the local jurisdictions in the South Corridor have reviewed the Policy Committee’s recommendation and the TriMet Board, ODOT, and the Local Jurisdictions each adopted a resolution supporting the recommendation; and

WHEREAS, FTA regulations require that the Locally Preferred Alternative be included in the Financially Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP), and State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) to be advanced into Preliminary Engineering; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby:

1. Adopts the amendment to the South/North Corridor Project LPS as described in the South Corridor Project Locally Preferred Alternative Report (Exhibit A), generally including the following:

   • Phase 1 will be the I-205 Light Rail Project including light rail on the Portland Mall, as well as the following transit improvements in Milwaukie; 1) construction of a Southgate park-and-ride lot scheduled to begin construction in Fall 2003, 2) relocation of the existing on-street Milwaukie transit center to the Southgate area pending resolution of design and environmental issues, and 3) between Milwaukie and Oregon City, implement select BRT and park-and-ride improvements pending evaluation in TriMet’s Transit Investment Plan process.

   • Phase 2 will be the Milwaukie Light Rail Project, which will be advanced following completion of the I-205 FEIS, adoption of a finance plan for the project and the resolution of issues related to the Willamette River crossing; and

2. Directs Metro staff to work with the FTA and FHWA, ODOT, TriMet, the City of Portland, the City of Milwaukie, and Clackamas County to initiate Preliminary Engineering (PE) and the FEIS for the I-205 LRT Project and to amend the South Corridor SDEIS to include the Portland Mall; and

3. Directs staff to initiate an amendment to the LUFO, consistent with the South Corridor Project LPA for the Council’s consideration; and

4. Directs Metro staff to prepare an amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to include the I-205 LRT Project in conjunction with the LUFO amendment, and

5. Directs staff to prepare an amendment to the MTIP that includes the I-205/Portland Mall project; and

6. Directs Metro staff to request an amendment to the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) to include the I-205 LRT Project.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 17 day of April, 2003

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney
STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 03-3303, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE LOCALLY PREFERRED STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTH/NORTH CORRIDOR PROJECT TO DEFINE A TWO-PHASED MAJOR TRANSIT INVESTMENT STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTH CORRIDOR, WITH THE I-205 LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT PROJECT AS THE PHASE 1 LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOLLOWED BY THE MILWAUKIE LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT PROJECT AS PHASE 2

Date: March 21, 2003
Prepared by: Sharon Kelly
Ross Roberts
Richard Brandman

BACKGROUND

The South Corridor Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) was prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are Federal co-lead agencies for the project. Metro is the local lead agency. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is a cooperating federal agency and the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon (TriMet) is a cooperating local agency. The South Corridor SDEIS supplements the South/North Corridor Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement that was published in February 1998 and supplemented by the North Corridor Interstate MAX SDEIS in April 1999 and FEIS in October 1999.

Eight state and local jurisdictions are participating in the South Corridor Project (Metro, TriMet, ODOT, the City of Portland, the City of Milwaukie, Oregon City, Clackamas and Multnomah Counties). The coordination effort takes place within a process that the FTA and FHWA prescribe for evaluating the environmental impacts, benefits, costs, and financing associated with the proposed project alternatives in order to qualify for Federal funding. Metro, with assistance from TriMet, consultants and the participating local jurisdictions, prepared the technical analysis supporting the SDEIS. FTA and FHWA furnished technical and procedural guidance to Metro and independently reviewed the SDEIS for technical and legal sufficiency prior to its approval and publication.

The federal transportation project development process is designed to be an integral part of the metropolitan area’s long-range transportation planning process. It provides decision makers and the public with better and more complete information before the final decisions are made. Early in the process, the regional transportation planning efforts identify corridors and/or sub-areas with significant transportation problems that may need a major transportation investment. The local jurisdiction, in cooperation with FTA and/or FHWA completes an Alternatives Analysis (AA) or Major Investment Study (MIS) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to determine the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) to address identified transportation problems. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and short-range Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are then amended to reflect the LPA. Following completion of the NEPA process, the project may qualify for federal funding and implementation can be initiated.

The South Corridor Project has a long history. Between the early 1980s and 1993, the region undertook several System Planning and Pre-Alternative Analysis studies in the North Corridor, South Corridor and Portland Central Business District (CBD). Both the South and North Corridors were identified in the RTP as future High-Capacity Transit Corridors. In October 1993, following several local system planning studies and priority corridor studies, the FTA issued notice in the Federal Register of the intent to publish...
an EIS for the combined South/North Corridor. Scoping included an evaluation of a wide range of mode, alignment and terminus alternatives. At the conclusion of Scoping in December 1993, the range of alternatives was narrowed based on initial technical analysis and public comment. The project then completed three narrowing steps that led to the selection of alternatives described and considered within the South/North DEIS: 1) Tier I Narrowing of Terminus and Alignment Alternatives; 2) Tier I Design Option Narrowing; and 3) Cost-Cutting. Each of these three steps included:

- The adoption and application of a wide range of criteria and measures;
- The development and documentation of technical analysis of the costs, the transportation and environmental benefits and impacts of the study alternatives; and
- An early and pro-active public involvement program, including a public comment period prior to narrowing and a local selection process, which included the involvement of the South/North Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), the Steering Committee and the participating jurisdictions and agencies.

In November 1995, the Metro Council adopted the South/North Major Investment Study (MIS) Final Report which documented the project’s compliance with the FTA’s and FHWA’s Major Metropolitan Planning Rule. The MIS Final Report included the selection of the design concept and scope of the LPA for the South/North Corridor. In April 1996, the FTA concurred that Metro had met the federal MIS requirements for the South/North Corridor, and approved Metro’s request to advance the corridor into PE concurrently with the preparation of the South/North DEIS.

The South/North DEIS was published in February 1998. The purpose of the DEIS was to summarize the benefits, cost and impacts associated with the alternatives and to provide citizens, agencies and jurisdictions with information needed to make an informed judgment when selecting the LPA to advance into the PE/FEIS stages of project development. Following the publication of the DEIS, there was an approximately 6-week public comment period and three public hearings were held. Upon closure of the public comment period, local jurisdictions, project committees and the Metro Council selected the Full-Length light rail alternative from Clackamas Regional Center to Vancouver as the LPA, with South Corridor identified as the first construction segment. In November 1998, the voters of the region did not re-approve the primary local match for the South/North Project and the region was required to reassess the project.

Following the defeat of the local funding measure, a series of “listening posts” were held where elected officials from Metro, TriMet and the jurisdictions in the region solicited comments and input from citizens around the region regarding how the region should proceed with transit solutions in the South and North Corridors. Following the “listening posts” a group of business leaders and citizens requested that a revised Full-Interstate Avenue Alternative in the North Corridor be evaluated as a smaller and lower cost project. An SDEIS, focusing on the North Corridor Interstate Avenue Alternative, was published in April 1999. Following a public comment period and public hearing, in June 1999 the Metro Council amended the LPA and defined the North Corridor Interstate MAX Light Rail Project as the first construction segment for the South/North Corridor and selected the new Full-Interstate Alignment Alternative. The North Corridor Interstate MAX Light Rail Project FEIS was published in October 1999. The North Corridor Project is currently under construction and expected to begin operations in September 2004.

Following the “listening posts” and amendment to the LPA for the North Corridor Interstate MAX Project, the region refocused on Transportation Alternatives in the South Corridor. The South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study (SCTAS) was initiated by the Metro Council to examine non-light rail alternatives. The purpose of the SCTAS was to develop, evaluate and prioritize non-light rail transportation options that were responsive to community needs and the travel demand in the South Corridor that could be implemented expeditiously and moved forward into advanced design, environmental analysis and construction. The SCTAS examined the following eight alternatives: No-
Build Alternative, Radial Commuter Rail Alternative (Oregon City – Portland), Circumferential Commuter Rail Alternative (Milwaukie – Beaverton), River Transit Alternative, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes Alternative, High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes Alternative, Bus Rapid Transit Alternative (BRT), and Busway Alternative.

Based on the findings in the October 2000 South Corridor Project Evaluation Report, the South Corridor Study Policy Group (a committee of elected and appointed officials in the South Corridor) narrowed the list of alternatives to be studied further in the South Corridor SDEIS. The Policy Group determined that HOV lanes, HOT lanes, Commuter Rail and River Transit did not meet the study’s Purpose and Need and should not be studied further. In addition, after hearing from citizen groups in Southeast Portland, Milwaukie and Clackamas County, the Policy Group decided that the SDEIS should examine both a revised Milwaukie Light Rail Alternative and an I-205 Light Rail Alternative.

An extensive and pro-active public involvement program has been conducted throughout the larger South/North Transit Corridor Study and the preparation the South Corridor SDEIS. The public involvement program has been designed and implemented to meet the FTA’s and FHWA’s goals of providing complete information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and early and continuing involvement of the public (23 CRG Part 450.3161; October 1993). Chapter 6 of the SDEIS, Community Participation, Agency Coordination and Required Permits, contains a more detailed description of the public involvement activities.

The South Corridor SDEIS and the SDEIS Executive Summary has been circulated to Federal, state, regional and local agencies and officials, and has been made available to interested people and groups. During the public comment period the public, agencies and jurisdictions had the opportunity to provide comments on the SDEIS and/or the proposed alternatives in writing, via facsimile, via e-mail, on the transportation telephone hotline and/or at the public hearing(s). After the public comment period closed, the South Corridor Policy Committee, the Local Advisory Groups and the Local Jurisdictions reviewed the comments that were compiled in the South Corridor Project Public Comment Report and developed recommendations on project elements to be included in the LPA. The recommendations have been forwarded to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and to the Metro Council. During the subsequent PE phase an FEIS will be prepared, focusing on the LPA, its impacts and measures to mitigate any significant adverse impacts.

The recommended LPA includes a two phased approach, including:

- Phase 1 will be the I-205 Light Rail Project including light rail on the Portland Mall, as well as the following transit improvements in Milwaukie; 1) construction of a Southgate park-and-ride lot scheduled to begin construction in Fall 2003, and 2) relocation of the existing on-street Milwaukie transit center to the Southgate area pending resolution of design and environmental issues, and 3) between Milwaukie and Oregon City, implement select BRT and park-and-ride improvements pending evaluation in TriMet’s Transit Investment Plan process.

- Phase 2 will be the Milwaukie Light Rail Project, which will be advanced following completion of the I-205 FEIS, adoption of a finance plan for the project and the resolution of issues related to the Willamette River crossing.

**ANALYSIS/INFORMATION**

1. Known Opposition
Over 300 public comments were received during the SDEIS public comment period between December 20, 2002 and February 7, 2003. These comments are compiled in the South Corridor Project Public Comment Report (Metro, February 2003). The comment report was made available to the public, the South Corridor Project Steering Committee, the local jurisdictions within the South Corridor and to the Metro Council.

Generally comments demonstrated a mix of support for I-205 Light Rail, Milwaukie Light Rail or both Light Rail Projects. Few comments were received in support of the Bus Rapid Transit or Busway alternatives. Those who opposed light rail preferred subway, increased Bus Rapid Transit or Highway solutions. Some concerns were raised about noise and vibration, safety and security, and traffic related impacts by the Lents community. Opposition to a bus transfer facility at the Waldorf School was received. There was some opposition to use of the Hawthorne Bridge for light rail, and support for a new Caruthers bridge instead. Many business owners and residents along McLoughlin Boulevard between Milwaukie and Oregon City opposed Bus Rapid Transit improvements in their area.

2. Legal Antecedents

There are a wide variety of Federal, State, Regional and Local regulations that apply to this project. The South Corridor Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Metro, December 2002) addresses many of these regulations. The local jurisdictions will address their local land use regulations through the land use permitting process that will occur during the Final Design and Construction phases of the project. An amendment to the South/North Corridor Project Land Use Final Order (LUFO) will be brought to the Metro Council for consideration during the Preliminary Engineering/Final Environmental Impact Statement phase of the project.

Previous related Metro Council Resolutions include:
- In July 1998 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 98-2764 for the purpose of adopting the Locally Preferred Strategy for the South/North Light Rail Project.
- In July 1998 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 98-2673 for the purpose of adopting the Land Use Final Order establishing the light rail route, station, lots and maintenance facilities and the related highway improvements, including their locations, for the South/North Light Rail Project.
- In June 1999 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 99-2806A for the purpose of amending the Locally Preferred Strategy for the South/North Light Rail Project to define the Interstate MAX Project as the first construction segment and to amend the FY 2000 Unified Work Program.
- In June 1999 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No 99-2795A for the purpose of amending the FY '00 Unified Work Program to add the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study and amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to authorize FY '99 Surface Transportation (STF) Funds.
- In October 1999 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 99-2853A for the purpose of adopting a Land Use Final Order amending the light rail route, light rail stations and park-and-ride lots, including their locations, for that portion of the South/North Project extending from the Steel Bridge to the Exposition Center.

3. Anticipated Effects

After Metro’s adoption of the amendment to the Locally Preferred Strategy, TriMet will take over as the local lead agency for the project. TriMet will work with Metro, the Federal Transit Administration, the Federal Highway Administration and the local jurisdictions to complete Preliminary Engineering and the Final Environmental Impact Statement, complete the details of the finance plan, complete Final Design and initiate construction of the project. Metro staff will prepare an amendment to the SDEIS for light rail
improvements related to the Mall Alignment 5th and 6th Avenues in downtown Portland. The project could initiate construction as early as 2005.

4. Budget Impacts

Metro Staff will continue to work with TriMet, FTA, FHWA and the local jurisdictions on the project through completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Metro staff costs will continue to be funded through the project budget that has federal and local sources. Capital funding of the project will be through various local and federal sources and will be managed by TriMet.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The South Corridor Project Policy Committee, the TriMet Board of Directors, the Portland City Council, the Milwaukie City Council, the Oregon City Commission, the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners, the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners have all recommended that the Metro Council adopt the resolution amending the Locally Preferred Alternative for the South Corridor Project.
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S. SUMMARY

This document presents the implementation strategy and the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) recommendation for transit improvements within the South Corridor. This recommendation is based on information documented in the South Corridor Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Metro: December 2002), the South/North Corridor Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Metro: February 1998), the South/North Transit Corridor Study Locally Preferred Strategy Final Report (Metro: July 1998), the Downtown Light Rail Systems Analysis (TriMet and Metro: December 2002) and from public input received during the public comment period as documented in the South Corridor Project Public Comment Report (Metro, February 2003).

S.1 South Corridor Strategy

A two-phased major transit investment strategy is recommended for the South Corridor. The implementation of the 1-205 LRT Alternative is recommended as the initial LPA, to be followed by the implementation of the Milwaukie LRT Alternative. While the South Corridor strategy recommends implementation of both the 1-205 and Milwaukie light rail alignments, the two light rail projects would be constructed sequentially because sufficient local and federal dollars to construct both alignments concurrently have not been identified.

Pursuant to this LPA, TriMet will submit an application including all appropriate New Starts documentation to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to advance the 1-205 project and Portland Mall into Preliminary Engineering (PE) and to initiate the South Corridor I-205 Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Based on consultation with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Metro and TriMet will also immediately undertake an amendment to the South Corridor SDEIS to update environmental and transportation analyses for the Portland Mall LRT alignment. Because an amendment is required to the SDEIS, the Portland Mall LRT alignment section of the I-205 LRT Project has the status of Preliminary Locally Preferred Alternative (PLPA) until the amended SDEIS is completed and a final LPA decision is made. The Portland Mall alignment will then be included in the South Corridor I-205 Project FEIS.

Following completion of the South Corridor I-205 Project FEIS, adoption of a finance plan for the Milwaukie project and the resolution of issues related to the Willamette River crossing, Metro and TriMet will prepare New Starts rating materials and an application to FTA to advance the Milwaukie project into Preliminary Engineering. This application will include any segment(s) of the Portland Mall not constructed with the 1-205 project and also initiate the South Corridor Milwaukie Project Final Environmental Impact Statement. The South Corridor strategy is defined as follows:

A. Gateway to Clackamas Regional Center

I-205 Light Rail Alternative, including:

- East of CTC Transit Center Terminus Option.
- Downtown LRT Alignment (Preliminary LPA recommendation, to be finalized subsequent to amended SDEIS):
  Preferred: Advance Portland Mall LRT alignment between the Steel Bridge and Portland State University (PSU) with I-205 LRT Alignment
Fall-back options: (1) Portland Mall LRT alignment between the Steel Bridge and SW Main Street or (2) the existing SW 1st Avenue/Cross Mall alignment as identified in the 1-205 SDEIS Alternative.

B. Milwaukie to Portland

Milwaukie Light Rail Alternative, including:

- Lake Road Terminus.
- 17th Avenue Design Option.
- Southgate Crossover Design Option.
- Portland Mall (Preliminary LPA recommendation, pending future amended SDEIS): Complete remaining segment(s) of the Portland Mall light rail alignment if not completed with the I-205 project as part of Phase 1.
- Willamette River Crossing Alignment (Preliminary LPA recommendation, pending future amended SDEIS):
  Preliminary Preferred: Caruthers Bridge and SW Lincoln Street to PSU/Mall Alignment. Fall-back options: (1) Caruthers Bridge with the Harrison Alignment, or (2) Hawthorne Bridge river crossing with (a) a SW Main/Madison connection to a Portland Mall LRT alignment or (b) the existing SDEIS SW 1st Avenue to Steel Bridge alignment.

C. Milwaukie to Oregon City

Implement Limited Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Improvements and park-and-ride lots incrementally in accordance with priorities in TriMet’s Transit Investment Plan.

D. Milwaukie to Clackamas Regional Center

No-Build Alternative. Maintain local bus service in this segment.

S.2 Locally Preferred Alternative Status

As stated above, the 1-205 LRT Project is recommended to be the initial LPA for the South Corridor, to be followed by the Milwaukie LRT Alternative as the next LPA. Upon consultation with FTA, the Downtown Portland sections of the LPA alignments will have Preliminary LPA status until additional environmental work is completed.

A. I-205 LRT Project

I-205 LRT Alignment. The I-205 LRT Project includes two new LRT alignments, Clackamas Regional Center to Gateway via I-205 and the downtown Portland Mall from the Steel Bridge to Portland State University. Because the I-205 LRT alignment was evaluated through the South Corridor SDEIS, the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) designation is based on current environmental and transportation analysis. Because the LPA for the I-205 LRT Project’s I-205 alignment was based on a current and active federal environmental document, it is recognized by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as meeting their guidelines for the definition of an LPA, and no further environmental work is required prior to the South Corridor I-205 Light Rail Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).
**Portland Mall LRT alignment.** The LPA decision on the Portland Mall LRT alignment should be referred to as a Preliminary Locally Preferred Alternative (PLPA). The FTA makes this distinction because the Portland Mall alignment was not included in the *South Corridor SDEIS* alternatives, and the previous federal environmental document that evaluated a Portland Mall light rail alignment (South/North DEIS) is over five years old and in need of updating. Rather than proceeding directly into the FEIS, the Portland Mall alignment will be documented and evaluated in an amendment to the SDEIS. At the completion of the amended SDEIS for the Portland Mall alignment, a final LPA decision will be made.

**B. Milwaukie LRT Project**
The South Corridor Strategy’s next LPA would require a distinction similar to the I-205 Project LPA. Environmental work on the Willamette River crossing and Mall connection alignment sections of the Milwaukie LRT Alternative will need to be updated as well and will be the subject of a future second amendment to the South Corridor SDEIS. The Milwaukie LRT alignment, based on the current South Corridor SDEIS, meets FTA guidelines for an LPA. The Caruthers Bridge and Lincoln Street alignment recommendations should be referred to as a Preliminary LPA recommendation, requiring a second amendment to the South Corridor SDEIS and subsequent final LPA decision.

**S.3 Major Transit Investment Strategy Phasing Plan**

As detailed in Section 4 of this LPA report, financial considerations require that the two light rail projects be built sequentially. Below is a summary of the two phases, followed by a more detailed description of each phase.

- **Phase 1** will be the I-205 Light Rail Project including light rail on the Portland Mall, as well as the following transit improvements in Milwaukie; 1) construction of a Southgate park-and-ride lot scheduled to begin construction in Fall 2003, and 2) relocation of the existing on-street Milwaukie transit center to the Southgate area pending resolution of design and environmental issues detailed in this report.

- **Phase 2** will be the Milwaukie Light Rail Project, which will be advanced following completion of the I-205 FEIS, adoption of a finance plan for the project and the resolution of issues related to the Willamette River crossing.

**S.3.1 Phase 1: Construct I-205 and Portland Mall Light Rail and Implement Transit Improvements in the McLoughlin Corridor**

Phase 1 would include construction of I-205 Light Rail Project between the Gateway regional center and Clackamas regional center and construction of the Portland Mall light rail alignment. Concurrent with Phase 1, construct a Southgate park-and-ride lot and relocate the existing on-street Milwaukie transit center to the Southgate area as early as practical pending resolution of environmental and design issues.
A. I-205 LRT Project

Undertake engineering and environmental studies required to seek a federal funding contract for the I-205 LRT Project during 2005. Pursuant to this LPA decision, staff will:

- Update environmental and transportation analyses for the Portland Mall Preliminary LPA alignment with an *Amended South Corridor SDEIS* as required by FTA, to be followed by a final LPA decision,
- Submit an application including all appropriate New Starts documentation to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to advance the I-205 Project including the Portland Mall Preliminary LPA into Preliminary Engineering (PE), and
- Initiate the *South Corridor I-205 Project Final Environmental Impact Statement* (FEIS),
- Identify project elements during Preliminary Engineering that can be eliminated, deferred or value engineered to reduce project costs consistent with the project finance plan. In addition, project staff would work with City of Portland bureaus to identify methods of reducing utility-related costs.
- Undertake activities to finalize the capital and operating finance plan for the project by the time the FEIS is published.

B. Activities to be undertaken concurrently with Phase 1: Milwaukie Transit Center and Park and Ride lot.

- Concurrent with Phase 1, continue to address outstanding issues associated with Milwaukie light rail between downtown Portland and downtown Milwaukie including Willamette River crossing issues.
- Concurrent with Phase 1, construct a Southgate Park-and-Ride lot (construction is scheduled to start in Fall 2003), and subsequently relocate the existing on-street transit center in downtown Milwaukie to the Southgate area, after resolution of design and environmental issues identified in this report.

C. Activities to be undertaken concurrently with Phase 1: Milwaukie to Oregon City Transit Improvements

- Concurrent with Phase 1, implement an incremental approach for select BRT and park-and-ride improvements between Milwaukie and Oregon City with transit service continuing to the Clackamas Community College. TriMet should include improved transit service concepts for SE McLoughlin Boulevard in their *Transit Investment Plan* process.
S.3.2 Phase 2: Construct Milwaukie LRT

Following completion of the South Corridor I-205 Project FEIS, adoption of a finance plan for the Milwaukie project and the resolution of issues related to the Willamette River crossing, Metro, TriMet and partner jurisdictions would:

A. Undertake engineering and environmental studies required to seek a federal funding contract for the Milwaukie LRT Project including a Caruthers Bridge Willamette River crossing or fallback options. Metro, TriMet and partner jurisdictions will initiate the process by:

- Updating environmental and transportation analyses for the Willamette River crossing and connection to the Portland Mall through an Amended South Corridor SDEIS;
- Preparing New Starts rating materials and an application to FTA to advance the Milwaukie project including any segment(s) of the Portland Mall not constructed with the I-205 project into PE; and
- Initiating the *South Corridor Milwaukie Project Final Environmental Impact Statement* and any other environmental review required for the Willamette River crossing.

B. Complete PE, environmental analysis and construction of Portland Mall segments that were not completed as part of the I-205 LRT Project during Phase 1 of the South Corridor strategy.

C. Complete the funding plan for the Milwaukie LRT Project.

The South Corridor Strategy and phasing plan are further detailed in the body of this report, including the rationale for selecting the strategy and a more specific accounting of issues requiring further analysis.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Locally Preferred Alternative Report Purpose

The purpose of the Locally Preferred Alternative report is to provide documentation for the South Corridor major transit investment strategy including the choice of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and design options that will be moved forward by the region into the next phases of project development. The LPA is the basis of subsequent project activities such as development of Preliminary Engineering, the preparation of the South Corridor Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), preparation of the project finance plan and amendment of the South/North Project Land Use Final Order (LUFO).

1.2 Project History

The South Corridor Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) is a supplement to the original South/North Corridor Project DEIS. A brief history is included here, to provide context for the current LPA decision. In July 1998, the Metro Council adopted the Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS) for the South/North Corridor Project that included a light rail line between Clackamas Regional Center, Milwaukie, and Downtown and the Portland Mall via a new Caruthers Bridge. The LPS alignment would then cross the Steel Bridge and travel through North Portland, then over the Columbia River into Vancouver. In November 1998, local voters did not re-approve a 1994 funding measure that would have provided local funding for the project. In early 1999, community and business leaders requested that TriMet and Metro evaluate a new light rail alignment on Interstate Avenue in the north part of the Corridor which is documented in the North Corridor Interstate MAX Supplemental Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The South/North LPS was amended to reflect the changes for the Interstate Max Project.

In the southern portion of the corridor, from 1999 to 2000, the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study (SCTAS) examined eight alternatives that intentionally did not include light rail in the South Corridor. Based on the findings in the South Corridor Project Evaluation Report (Metro: October 2000), the South Corridor Study Policy Committee (a committee of elected and appointed officials from jurisdictions within the corridor) narrowed the list of alternatives to be studied further in the South Corridor Project SDEIS. Most notably, after hearing from citizen groups from southeast Portland, Milwaukie and Clackamas County, the Policy Committee decided that the SDEIS should examine both a reduced cost Milwaukie Light Rail Alternative and an I-205 Light Rail Alternative. At the same time, the South Corridor Policy Committee directed staff to examine other potential river crossing options with the Milwaukie Light Rail Alternative and other downtown Portland alignments for both the Milwaukie and I-205 light rail alternatives. This analysis was documented in the Downtown Light Rail System Analysis (TriMet and Metro: December 2002).

1.3 South Corridor SDEIS Distribution and Public Comment

The South Corridor Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement was distributed on December 13, 2002, and notice of availability was published in the Federal Register on December 20, 2002. Early results of this document were also circulated and discussed at three community open houses (December 9, 10, 11, 2002). The 61-day local public comment period ended on February 7, 2003 and included numerous neighborhood meetings and two public hearings. The South Corridor Project Policy Committee has made the initial recommendation for the Locally Preferred Alternative.
(LPA) for the South Corridor. This *South Corridor Project Locally Preferred Alternative Report* documents the amendment to the South/North Project LPS. It documents the decision defining the I-205 Project as the Locally Preferred Alternative and the first construction segment, to be followed by the Milwaukie Light Rail Project.

### 1.4 South Corridor LPA Decision Process

The South Corridor LPA recommendation was made by the South Corridor Project Policy Committee on February 13, 2003. It will be considered by local jurisdictions, ODOT and TriMet, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and by the Metro Council (See Figure 1.4-1). The final LPA decision will be made by the Metro Council after consideration of:

A) Public comments on the South Corridor SDEIS made during the public hearings and as documented in the *South Corridor Project Public Comment Report* (Metro, February 2003);

B) Data and analysis included in the *South Corridor Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement* (Metro, December 2002) and the *Downtown Light Rail System Analysis* (TriMet and Metro, December 2002);

C) Consistency with the study purpose and need and the project’s adopted goals and objectives, and

D) Consideration of recommendations from the following committees and jurisdictions, scheduled on the following dates:

- The Clackamas County Board of Commissioners on March 19, 2003
- The City of Oregon City Commission March 19, 2003
- The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners on March 20, 2003
- The TriMet Board of Directors on March 26, 2003
- The Milwaukie City Council on April 1, 2003
- The City of Portland Council on March 19, 2003
- The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation on April 10, 2003
- Metro Council on April 17, 2003

The resolutions adopted by the bodies listed above are contained in Appendices B – J of this report.
# South Corridor Project

## Locally Preferred Alternative Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDEIS Public Comment Period</th>
<th>Project Recommendation</th>
<th>Jurisdictional Recommendations</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 9</td>
<td>Feb 7</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Houses</td>
<td>Policy Committee</td>
<td>Multnomah County 3/20</td>
<td>TPAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9, 12/10, 12/11</td>
<td>Draft recommendation 2/13</td>
<td>Clackamas County 3/19</td>
<td>JPACT 4/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Hearings</td>
<td>City of Milwaukie 4/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/29, 2/4</td>
<td>Oregon City 3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Portland 3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TriMet Board 3/27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metro Council 4/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief description of the six alternatives that were examined in the South Corridor Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)(Metro: December, 2002) and the Willamette River crossing options and downtown Portland light rail alignments studied in the Downtown Light Rail Systems Analysis (Metro and TriMet: December, 2002). For a complete description of these alternatives, please see the South Corridor SDEIS, Chapter 2 Alternatives Considered and the Downtown Light Rail Systems Analysis report.

2.1 South Corridor Project SDEIS Alternatives

Except for the No-Build Alternative, each of the alternatives includes design options, which are relatively small variations in the proposed alignment and/or other characteristic of an alternative (e.g., park-and-ride lots).

A. No-Build Alternative The transit service network, related transit facilities and roadway improvements included in the No-Build Alternative are consistent with the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2020 financially constrained transit and road network (Metro: adopted August 2000). The transit capital improvements in the No-Build Alternative would be included in all other alternatives.

B. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternative would provide improved bus operations, reliability and travel time for a modest capital investment. BRT would operate between Downtown Portland, Milwaukie, and Oregon City, as well as between Milwaukie and the Clackamas Regional Center.

C. Busway Alternative provides higher level of reliability and improved travel times through primarily exclusive bus operations in a separate guideway from downtown Portland to Milwaukie and the Clackamas regional center. A BRT connection from Oregon City would enter the busway in Milwaukie.

D. Milwaukie Light Rail Alternative provides a direct high-capacity rail transit connection between downtown Portland and Milwaukie on exclusive right-of-way. BRT would connect from Oregon City and the Clackamas regional center and transfer to light rail at the Milwaukie Transit Center.

E. I-205 Light Rail Alternative provides a direct high-capacity rail transit connection between Downtown Portland and the Gateway and Clackamas regional centers via the existing east-west light rail alignment to Gateway and an extension primarily along existing reserved right-of-way on I-205 from Gateway to the Clackamas regional center. BRT would connect Downtown Portland to Milwaukie and Oregon City.

F. Combined Light Rail Alternative provides direct high-capacity rail transit connections between Downtown Portland and Milwaukie and between Downtown Portland and Clackamas regional center via the Gateway regional center. BRT would connect Milwaukie with Oregon City.
2.2 Downtown Portland River Crossing and Alignment Options

The South Corridor Project Policy Committee directed staff to examine other potential river crossing alignments and downtown rail alignments, and assess the train capacity and system reliability of the current Cross Mall alignment. The results are documented in the *Downtown Light Rail Systems Analysis* report. The alignments analyzed in this study are listed below:

A. River Crossings and Downtown Alignment Combinations with Milwaukie LRT:

- Hawthorne Bridge with 1st Avenue alignment to the Steel Bridge (SDEIS option);
- Hawthorne Bridge with a SW Main/Madison alignment to the Portland Mall alignment and to the Steel Bridge;
- Hawthorne Bridge with a 1st Avenue alignment to the Cross Mall;
- Caruthers Bridge with a Harrison alignment to the Portland Mall;
- Caruthers Bridge with a Lincoln alignment to the Portland Mall with or without grade separation over SW Harbor Way; and
- Ross Island Bridge alignments to the Portland Mall.

B. Downtown Alignment Combinations with I-205 LRT Alternative:

- I-205 with the Cross Mall alignment;
- I-205 with a Portland Mall alignment to Main Street; and
- I-205 LRT Alternative with Portland Mall alignment to PSU.

2.3 Downtown Portland Light Rail Operations and Capacity Analysis

The Policy Committee directed staff to evaluate the long-term capacity and operating reliability of the existing Cross Mall LRT alignment (SW 1st Avenue, SW Morrison and SW Yamhill streets) and to develop measures to improve reliability and increase capacity. The *Downtown Light Rail Systems Analysis* report documents the analysis and found that there is a limit of 30 trains that can operate per hour in each direction on the existing Cross Mall alignment without significant modifications. In the year 2020, the I-205 Light Rail Alternative operating on the Cross Mall in combination with the existing lines and service growth would equal 33 trains per hour.

Operations on the track section between SW 1st and SW 11th Avenues on SW Yamhill and Morrison streets would create the most significant constraint on system capacity. As volumes approached the limit, delays and service quality reductions could be expected. A delayed train could affect other trains that are following and the system would have less ability to recover. To mitigate for this potential impact, five system modifications were examined. Although one of these (signal timing modifications) held promise to increase capacity to allow for the additional trains associated with the I-205 project, service quality on the Cross Mall would still be reduced as the number of trains per hour approaches the theoretical limit of 30 trains per hour. Therefore, an additional alignment in downtown Portland should be considered for the long-term growth of the system.
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

3.1 Clackamas to Gateway: I-205 Light Rail Alternative

A. Phasing

The I-205 LRT Project would be implemented as Phase 1 of the South Corridor major transit investment strategy.

B. Rationale for Selection

- **The I-205 Alternative would have the highest transit ridership** of all the Alternatives for this segment, and would carry over 33,000 trips in 2020, the highest of any individual alternative considered in the SDEIS;
- **I-205 LRT Alternative would save transit travel time**; 12 minutes between the Rose Quarter Transit Center and the Clackamas Town Center Transit Center compared to the No-Build Alternative;
- **I-205 LRT would support the 2040 growth concept** by offering high capacity transit connections between the Gateway regional center and the Clackamas regional center while serving the Lents town center as well as connecting directly to the Central City;
- **The I-205 LRT Alternative would provide excellent opportunities for transit oriented development** in support of the Region 2040 Plan in the Gateway regional center, Lents Town Center and at the Clackamas Regional Center;
- **With construction of I-205 in the late 1970s, right-of-way was established for a high capacity transit improvement** for much of the alignment. Because of the existing right-of-way, I-205 LRT could be constructed with minimal residential and business displacements, property acquisition and related costs; and
- **I-205 LRT would provide regional connections** to the airport, Gresham, downtown Portland, the Lloyd District, Beaverton, Hillsboro and other areas served by the regional light rail system.

C. Issues to be Addressed by Staff

- **Foster Road/Lents Town Center design issues.** Based on input from the Federal Highway Administration, the potential 150-space surface park-and-ride lot under I-205 at SE Foster Road was eliminated from the I-205 Alternative. Prior to and during the PE/FEIS phase, staff should continue to work with the Lents neighborhood and the Lents Urban Renewal Advisory Committee to determine a location for the station and park-and-ride that supports the community vision of the Lents Town Center while maintaining good station access and bus connections. Staff should continue to coordinate with the City of Portland, Portland Development Commission (PDC) and the Lents community on potential design refinements in the Lents Town Center. These design refinements could include a relocated station, joint-use parking structures and improved pedestrian facilities.
- **Holgate Boulevard Station.** Staff should continue to consult with the City of Portland and the Lents community to determine if a park-and-ride at Holgate is compatible with the surrounding land uses and is acceptable to neighbors.
- **Flavel Street Station.** Staff should work with the City of Portland Parks Bureau and Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) to resolve issues related to the Johnson Creek floodplain and the
at-grade crossing of the Springwater Trail. Appropriate mitigation or engineering changes including moving or redesigning stations should be considered in balance with project costs.

- **Fuller Road/Johnson Creek Boulevard Design Issues.** The Fuller Road park-and-ride and station may need to be refined to address concerns related to intersection access at Johnson Creek Boulevard. Alternative park-and-ride and station locations should be investigated. Staff should work with Clackamas County and neighborhoods in refining the light rail alignment and park-and-ride lot design in this vicinity prior to and during the PE/FEIS phase. Both the LRT alignment and the park-and-ride facility should be located to minimize the potential impact to future I-205/Johnson Creek Boulevard interchange improvements. TriMet should work with ODOT and Clackamas County to ensure that the light rail design is compatible with a variety of potential interchange configurations and with economic development opportunities in the area under the Clackamas Urban Renewal plans.

- **Continue to Allow for Future Highway Expansion.** Staff should continue to work with ODOT to refine the current I-205 Light Rail alignment design to make minor modifications necessary to address FHWA/ODOT concerns about future expansion of the freeway.

- **LRV and Ruby Junction Expansion Financing.** Staff should develop long-term plan and funding strategy to purchase light rail vehicles and expand Ruby Junction to address the future fleet needs of the I-205 alignment.

- **Noise and vibration.** Staff should undertake further detailed noise and vibration analysis for the I-205 alignment with specific attention to the area between SE Foster Road and SE Johnson Creek Boulevard. This work should be coordinated with ODOT to ensure that construction of the LRT line would not lessen the effectiveness of the ODOT existing or planned noise mitigation.

- **Identify Potential Cost Reductions.** Staff should analyze ways to lower cost of the I-205 Alternative by eliminating or postponing project elements. These items could include park-and-ride lots, park-and-ride capacity and types, stations, cost efficient engineering methods, vehicles or the expansion of the Ruby Junction maintenance and storage facility. These potential cost reductions should be sensitive to community needs and the project’s objectives.

- **Address community concerns.** Neighborhood, community and urban renewal groups along the I-205 alignment have raised concerns about noise and vibration impacts, traffic, safety and security, property acquisition, visual screen and landscaping. Staff and community members should seek to find solutions that can be funded with the project budget while meeting community needs and as justified by more detailed environmental analysis during the FEIS process.

3.1.1 **Preferred Clackamas Town Center Terminus design option: East of the Clackamas Town Center.**

**A. Alternatives Considered**

Two design options were considered for the terminus of the I-205 LRT alignment:

- North of Clackamas Town Center, along Monterey Avenue, and
- East of the Clackamas Town Center, parallel to and west of the I-205 Freeway.

**B. Rationale for Selection**

- **Better park-and-ride access.** The East of the Town Center Terminus Option could provide 500 to 1,000 park-and-ride space capacity at the station;
• **Better access to jobs.** This option would result in 1,490 more employees located within a quarter mile of a light rail station;

• **This option would create a more direct future alignment** if light rail were to be extended to the east or south from the Clackamas Town Center;

• **East option favored by Clackamas Town Center.** As owner of the site of either transit center, the Clackamas Town Center management supports this option as it fits well with future mall expansion plans; and

• **This option would affect fewer prime commercial parking spaces** at the Clackamas Town Center while increasing overall accessibility.

C. **Issues to be Addressed by Staff**

• **Pedestrian connection.** A clear and protected pedestrian connection from the transit center to the mall entrance should be developed;

• **Clarify bus access.** Bus access to the transit center that minimizes bus delay and increases bus reliability from SE Monterey and SE Sunnyside Road should be developed;

• **Transit supportive development.** Clackamas County should re-examine the adopted Clackamas Regional Center Plan and make changes that acknowledge and maximize the benefit of the new transit center location for active transit supportive uses around the station and supports the area’s designation as a regional center in the Region 2040 growth concept; and

• **Auto and bus access.** Staff should work with Clackamas County and the Clackamas Town Center management to develop plans for auto and bus access to and from the transit center and park-and-ride site.

3.1.2 **Preliminary Preferred Downtown Portland Light Rail Alignment: Portland Mall from Steel Bridge to Portland State University**

The LPA decision on the Portland Mall LRT alignment should be referred to as a Preliminary Locally Preferred Alternative (PLPA). The FTA makes this distinction because the Portland Mall alignment was not included in the *South Corridor SDEIS* alternatives, and the previous federal environmental document that evaluated a Portland Mall light rail alignment (South/North DEIS) is over five years old and in need of updating. Rather than proceeding directly into the FEIS, the Portland Mall alignment will be documented and evaluated in an amendment to the SDEIS. At the completion of the amended SDEIS for the Portland Mall alignment, a final LPA decision will be made.

A. **Alignments Considered**

Two alignments were developed for the I-205 Light Rail Alternative in Downtown Portland. These alignments include service either on the existing Cross Mall or on the Portland Mall. The Cross Mall alignment was examined in the SDEIS while the Portland Mall alignment was selected as the LPA in 1998 after study in the South/North Project DEIS. Issues related to the Portland Mall alignment were also documented in the *Downtown Light Rail Systems Analysis* (TriMet and Metro: December 2002).

With the I-205 Cross Mall alignment, trains would enter downtown Portland over the Steel Bridge and would use the existing tracks on SW First Avenue and SW Morrison streets with trains turning around on SW 11th Avenue and returning on SW Yamhill Street. With the Portland Mall alignment,
trains would enter using the Steel Bridge and would require new tracks on either NW Glisan or NW Irving streets to access 5th and 6th avenues. This alignment would extend to either PSU at SW Jackson Street or SW Main Street depending on the results of the finance plan.

B. Rationale for Preliminary Preference

- **The Portland Mall alignment would ensure improved service quality on both downtown LRT alignments** by providing greater capacity and reliability on second alignment in downtown Portland in addition to the Cross Mall.
- **Light rail on the Portland Mall reinforces 30 years of transportation and land use policy.** Since the adoption of the 1972 Downtown Plan, the Portland City Council has continuously reaffirmed that the Portland Mall is the preferred location for a light rail alignment. Public and private investment decisions have been made in downtown over the last 30 years that support transit access on SW 5th and 6th avenues and auto and truck access along SW 4th and SW Broadway.
- **The Portland Mall alignment would directly serve important Downtown destinations** alignment including Union Station and Portland State University;
- **The Cross Mall Alignment would limit service expansion ability** and would eventually decrease service quality with the addition of trains needed for system growth;
- **The Portland Mall was selected as the South/North Corridor Project LPA in 1998** after significant public and technical analysis;
- **The Portland Mall alignment received considerable public support** during the South Corridor public comment period, especially from the downtown community; and
- **Construction of light rail on the Portland Mall would be concurrent with the Mall Rehabilitation Project**, which is needed to facilitate the City of Portland’s desired retail strategy.

C. Caveat

If financial resources are not available for a Portland Mall Alignment with a terminus at Portland State University, then a shorter terminus at SW Main Street should be considered. If there is a greater financial shortfall, then the SDEIS option using SW First Avenue and SW Morrison and Yamhill streets should be considered.

The selection of the Portland Mall Alignment will be dependent upon additional environmental work and public process.

D. Issues to be Addressed by Staff

- **Update environmental analysis.** Staff will update environmental and transportation analyses for the Portland Mall Preliminary LPA alignment by preparing an *Amended South Corridor SDEIS* as required by FTA, to be followed by a final LPA decision,
- **North Entry Study.** There are two routes that could connect the Steel Bridge to the Portland Mall. The Glisan Option would use the off-ramp from the Steel Bridge to NW 5th and 6th avenues with a common station located between NW 2nd and 3rd avenues. The Irving option, which was included in the 1998 LPS, would require a new ramp from the Steel Bridge parallel to the railroad tracks that lead to Union Station. This option would proceed to Union Station and turn on NW Irving Street where the alignment would connect onto the Portland Mall. Staff
should work with the business, residential and non-profit communities to determine the best alignment in the North Entry to downtown Portland that balances cost, travel times and property impacts with the benefit of serving Union Station.

- **Configuration of the Portland Mall.** The Portland Business Alliance and others have called for continuous auto access (an auto through-lane) along SW 5th and 6th avenues as part of a strategy to revitalize the retail environment. This configuration along with the adopted Portland Mall configuration of light rail and buses sharing the center lane will be examined. Staff should continue to work with the City of Portland, downtown businesses, residents and transit riders to determine the best configuration of the Portland Mall considering the needs of retail establishments, pedestrians, auto circulation and transit (bus and light rail).

- **Terminus in Downtown Portland.** There are two potential termini options in downtown Portland with the I-205 LRT Alternative with the Portland Mall Design Option. One option is to extend to Portland State University at SW Jackson Street and the other option is to turn trains around at SW Main Street. Providing service to PSU and it’s 25,000 students would allow direct light rail access to one of the region’s largest attractor of transit trips and would allow TriMet the flexibility to store trains in downtown Portland for special events and to service heavy loadings during peak periods. The Main Street terminus would save approximately $51 million (2006$) and should be considered if the financial plan does not identify adequate funding for the alignment to PSU.

### 3.2 Portland to Milwaukie: Milwaukie Light Rail

**A. Phasing**

Milwaukie LRT Project will be implemented in Phase 2 of the South Corridor major transit investment strategy. As a part of Phase 1, the construction of a Southgate park-and-ride lot (to begin in Fall 2003) and the relocation of the existing on-street Milwaukie transit center to the Southgate area will begin as early as practical pending resolution of environmental and design issues.

**B. Rationale for Selection**

- In 2020, Milwaukie LRT would have the highest number of transit trips in this segment of any alternative, adding over 20,000 light rail trips in addition to I-205 light rail for a combined total of over 53,000 daily light rail trips in the South Corridor;
- The Milwaukie LRT Alternative would provide the fastest travel time of any of the Alternatives between Milwaukie and downtown Portland;
- LRT station areas would provide excellent opportunities for transit oriented development in southeast Portland and in downtown Milwaukie;
- Milwaukie LRT would provide better neighborhood transit service than the BRT or Busway Alternatives, by providing accessible, high-capacity transit service to Southeast Portland neighborhoods, Milwaukie and downtown Portland;
- The Milwaukie LRT Alternative has generated significant community support in Milwaukie, southeast Portland and downtown Portland. For example, the Milwaukie Neighborhood Leaders have actively engaged their community and City Council over a period of two years in a grass-roots effort to identify light rail alignments that fit with community goals;
- The Milwaukie LRT Alternative would have fewer environmental and displacement impacts than the Busway Alternative; and
• Milwaukie LRT would be compatible with and would augment the regional light rail transit system offering direct service to downtown Portland, the Rose Quarter and north Portland as well as easy transfers to the Blue and Red Lines between Hillsboro, downtown Gresham and the Portland Airport.

C. Issues to be Addressed by Staff

• **Update Environmental Analysis.** Environmental work on the Willamette River crossing and Mall connection alignment sections of the Milwaukie LRT Alternative will need to be updated and will be the subject of a future second amendment to the South Corridor SDEIS. The Milwaukie LRT alignment, based on the current South Corridor SDEIS, meets FTA guidelines for an LPA. The Caruthers Bridge and Lincoln Street alignment recommendations should be referred to as a Preliminary LPA recommendation, requiring a second amendment to the South Corridor SDEIS and subsequent final LPA decision.

• **Water Quality and Hydrology.** Develop detailed designs for storage and treatment of stormwater along the alignment and from the stations and park-and-ride facilities;

• **Park and Ride Access.** Staff will continue to develop and evaluate options for increasing park and ride opportunities along the Milwaukie LRT alignment to better accommodate demand and minimize neighborhood parking impacts;

• **Displacements.** Continue to work with potentially impacted property owners to help them to understand the process of property acquisition;

• **Traffic Issues.** Explore modifications to SE Water Avenue (in the vicinity of SE Clay Street and OMSI) to ensure that autos queuing from the freight and passenger railroad (UP) tracks east of SE Water Avenue would not block the light rail tracks. Work with City of Portland traffic engineers to ensure that the proposed light rail crossing of SE 11th and 12th Avenues allows for adequate traffic operations; and

• **Truck issues.** Work with Milwaukie North Industrial area business owners and jurisdiction staff to ensure that truck access, movements and loading needs for adjacent businesses are addressed.

3.2.1 Preferred Brooklyn Design Option: 17th Avenue

A. Alternatives Considered

Two design options were evaluated in this segment:

• **West of Union Pacific Railroad** (UPRR), with the alignment located adjacent to the UPRR parallel to the Brooklyn Yards, and;

• **17th Avenue,** with the alignment along the western edge of 17th Avenue through the Brooklyn Neighborhood.

B. Rationale for Selection

• **17th Avenue stations would be closer to the Brooklyn Neighborhood** and provide better station environments and pedestrian access than with the West of Brooklyn Yard Design Option;

• **The 17th Avenue Design Option would serve more transit supportive land uses** located along SE 17th Avenue compared to the West of Brooklyn Yard Design Option;

• **The 17th Avenue Option would avoid displacements to large employers**;

• **The 17th Avenue Option would avoid railroad property** which would otherwise be an impediment to timely and cost-effective implementation; and
• The 17th Avenue Option is strongly supported by the Brooklyn neighborhood.

C. Issues to be Addressed by Staff

• Displacements and property impacts. Work diligently to minimize potential displacements and property impacts with this design option.
• Truck movements. Continue to work with businesses and property owners to refine designs to allow for truck turning movements necessary to serve adjacent businesses.
• Center Street Bus Operations Facility. Work to identify solutions to parking loss and impacts to bus storage and operations at the TriMet’s Center Street facility.

3.2.2 Preferred Milwaukie Design Option: Southgate Crossover

A. Alternatives Considered

Two design options were considered for Milwaukie:
• Tillamook Branch Design Option, which would locate light rail adjacent to the Tillamook Branch railroad from the Tacoma Station to a transit center and LRT station located at the Waldorf School. This option would have no Southgate park-and-ride, transit center or LRT station.
• Southgate Crossover Design Option, which would follow McLoughlin Blvd south from the Tacoma LRT Station to a 600-space Southgate Park and Ride, Transit Center and LRT station. The alignment would then cross to the east to join with the Tillamook Branch alignment.

B. Rationale for Selection

• Impacts to the Waldorf School site and a limited capacity for transit operations are drawbacks of Tillamook Branch Design Option. The Milwaukie Transit Center would be located at the Southgate site with the Southgate Crossover Design Option. The Southgate Transit Center site is a preferred location over the Waldorf School Transit Center site with the Tillamook Branch Line Design Option.
• The Southgate Crossover alignment would result in more transit ridership due to an additional station and park-and-ride and a more convenient transit center location that could better accommodate increases in transit service than the other options.
• The Southgate Crossover would provide better access to jobs and residents, providing access to 1,500 more jobs and 50 more residents within a quarter-mile of a light rail station than the Tillamook Branch design option.
• The Southgate Crossover would allow for additional park-and-ride capacity (600-space structured lot at Southgate) compared to the Tillamook Branch design option.

C. Issues to be Addressed by Staff

• Relocate the on-street Milwaukie Transit Center to the Southgate site as early as practical during Phase 1. In order for the this project to proceed in phase 1, the following issues need to be resolved:
  - Environmental Review: additional environmental review as may be required by the FTA. TriMet has received environmental clearance for a park-and-ride lot at this location and will proceed initially with this project.
3.2.2 Bus Routing and Transit Operations: Review with involved communities and constituents required bus rerouting and identify changes in bus operations necessary to cost-effectively implement the new transit center site.

- Capital Funding: Identify the capital funding sources to fund the transit center component.

- Traffic and Freight Mobility. Work to address traffic and truck access issues along the Southgate Crossover, especially on SE Main Street, SE Milport Street and SE Mailwell Drive and the SE Milport intersection with SE McLoughlin Boulevard.

- Waldorf School. Work with the Waldorf School to ensure safety at the station and for the alignment in the vicinity of the school.

- Displacements and property impacts. Work to minimize displacements and property impacts with this design option.

3.2.3 Preferred Milwaukie Terminus Design Option: Lake Road Terminus

A. Alternatives Considered

Two termini locations were evaluated for the Milwaukie LRT Alternative:

- Waldorf School Terminus (formerly known as Milwaukie Middle School Terminus), with a station and transit center on the Tillamook Branch railroad alignment located south of Harrison Street and east of the school, and;
- Lake Road Terminus, with a station and park and ride structure further south along the Tillamook Branch railroad alignment at the intersection with Lake Road.

B. Rationale for Selection

- The Lake Road Terminus Option provides an additional station in downtown Milwaukie serving the southern portion of the downtown with access to Milwaukie High School.
- The Lake Road Terminus Option provides an additional 275 structured park-and-ride spaces that would capture auto trips prior to going through downtown Milwaukie.
- The Lake Road Terminus Option would provide better access to jobs and residents, resulting in 1,710 more residents and 1,410 employees located within a quarter mile of a light rail station than the Waldorf School Terminus option.

C. Issues to be Addressed by Staff

- Interim terminus option. Consider a shorter interim terminus at the Waldorf School if financial plans are not adequate to fund the extension of light rail to the Lake Road terminus. A bus transit center would not be located at the Waldorf School with this interim terminus option.
- Bus access. Refine bus service and access to the SE Lake Road light rail station during the PE/FEIS phase of the project.
- Displacements. Work with property and business owners at the site of the park-and-ride garage to help them understand the acquisition process.
- Access to Lake Road Park-and-Ride Lot. Consider an alternative garage access point for the Lake Road Station Park-and-Ride lot.

3.2.4 Preliminary Preferred Willamette River Crossing: Caruthers Bridge

A. Alternatives Considered
The South Corridor Policy Committee directed that a low cost Milwaukie Light Rail Alternative be studied in the SDEIS and that other potential river crossing alignments for the Milwaukie Alternative be studied in a parallel study, the *Downtown Light Rail Systems Analysis* (TriMet and Metro, December 2002).

Three Willamette River Crossing locations were examined during these processes: the existing Hawthorne Bridge, a new Caruthers Bridge and a new Ross Island Bridge.

The Hawthorne Bridge alignment would require inbound trains to use the SW Water Avenue ramp on the east side and cross from the inside lanes to the outside lanes of the Hawthorne Bridge where trains would operate in mixed traffic across the bridge. On the west side of the bridge, inbound trains would cross back to the center lanes and would turn onto SW First Avenue and continue north connecting to the Interstate Max line. New traffic signals on both ends of the Hawthorne Bridge would impact traffic. The frequent lifts of the Hawthorne Bridge would cause transit reliability issues. Downtown Portland businesses do not support this alignment because riders would be required to transfer or walk to get to the Portland Mall and many downtown Portland destinations.

Additional alignments with the Hawthorne Bridge crossing were also examined. These alignments include the Hawthorne Bridge with a Main and Madison connection to the Portland Mall and the Hawthorne Bridge with a connection via First Avenue to the Cross Mall.

The Caruthers Bridge alignment would be located directly south of the Marquam Bridge and would connect OMSI to SW River Parkway on the west bank. This alignment was selected as part of the Locally Preferred Alternative in 1998. This bridge would be a fixed span bridge to eliminate reliability issues due to bridge openings and would be constructed to allow for bike and pedestrian connections from the greenways on both banks of the Willamette. Connections from the Caruthers Bridge to the Portland Mall would be via either SW Lincoln or Harrison streets.

A new bridge located north or south of the existing Ross Island Bridge would impact a number of historic resources, would not serve OMSI and the Central Eastside Industrial District and would impact the Corbett-Terwilliger-Lair Hill Neighborhood

B. Rationale for Preferred Preference

- **The Caruthers Bridge alignment would provide better access** to PSU, South Auditorium and South Waterfront areas than the Hawthorne Bridge Alignment
- **The Caruthers Bridge would provide more reliable service.** The frequent openings of the Hawthorne Bridge would affect light rail service reliability where the Caruthers would be a fixed span bridge.
- **Delays to traffic and buses would occur on Hawthorne Bridge.** Light rail trains would have to cross from the outside lanes to the inside on both ends of the bridge.
- **The Hawthorne Bridge would require significant modifications** that could result in closures of the bridge, which would affect auto commuters and Hawthorne area businesses.
- **Traffic on the Hawthorne Bridge could delay light rail and bus service.**
- **The Caruthers Bridge was selected as part of the South/North DEIS Locally Preferred Alternative in 1998** after significant public discussion.
Many groups have opposed the Hawthorne Bridge alignment during the South Corridor public comment period.

The Caruthers Bridge has been supported during the South Corridor public comment period.

C. Caveat

If the financial plan cannot accommodate the Caruthers Bridge Alignment, then the Hawthorne Bridge with a Main/Madison Street Alignment to the Transit Mall should be moved forward. If the financial resources are not available for the Hawthorne Bridge with the Main and Madison alignment, then the alignment studied in the SDEIS on SW First Avenue should be moved forward.

3.2.5 Preferred Alignment Connecting Caruthers Bridge to Portland Mall: Lincoln Alignment

A. Alternatives Considered

The Harrison Alignment was selected in 1998 as the South/North LPA alignment due to cost, travel time, ridership and public input. Currently, Portland Streetcar Inc. is in Preliminary Engineering for the extension of streetcar service from PSU to the North Macadam area via SW Harrison Street. The compatibility of operating streetcar and light rail on the same alignment was investigated, as were the differences between construction methods. The conclusions were that operating streetcar and light rail on the same tracks would negatively impact both modes. In addition, since light rail has more restrictive grade requirements and different station clearances than the streetcar, modifications to the tracks and stations would be required, disrupting streetcar service. Finally, if both modes were operating on the same tracks both modes would need to pre-empt traffic signals resulting in significant traffic delays at SW Naito Parkway. Finally, if both modes operate on the same tracks with stations and signals, the ultimate capacity of each is significantly reduced.

The Lincoln Alignment for light rail would avoid the issues with the Harrison Alignment. This alignment would cross over the intersection of SW River Parkway and SW River Drive at grade and would cross over SW Harbor Drive and the Harrison Street Extension on new structure. The alignment would cross SW Naito Parkway and SW First Avenue at-grade as the alignment continues up SW Lincoln Street. A station could be located between SW 2nd and 3rd avenues. The alignment would continue to SW 5th and 6th avenues where it would tie into the Portland Mall LRT alignment.

B. Rationale for Selection

- Combining light rail and streetcar on Harrison could create operational difficulties. The Portland Streetcar will likely use the Harrison Alignment and analysis has shown that operations could be difficult on a shared alignment. Either modifying Harrison streetcar tracks to accommodate light rail or building the streetcar to light rail standards would be expensive, and could result in a non-optimal shared LRT/Streetcar alignment.

- The Lincoln Alignment could allow for a better station in the South Auditorium Area.

C. Caveat

Additional engineering and design work is needed to ensure that the Lincoln Alignment will not effect I-405 exit and entrance ramps. If Lincoln Street proves not to be a viable option, then the Harrison Alignment should remain as a fallback option.
D. Issues to be Addressed by Staff

• **Update Environmental Analysis.** As noted above, the selection of the Caruthers Bridge with the Lincoln Street Alignment would likely require additional environmental work on the Willamette River crossing and will be the subject of a future second amendment to the South Corridor SDEIS.

• **Connection from the Caruthers Bridge to PSU.** Finalize the alignment from the west end of the Caruthers Bridge to PSU. Proceed with additional work needed on the Lincoln Alignment at 1) SW 5th and 6th avenues and 2) at SW River Parkway and SE River Drive where the alignment would ramp to cross SW Harbor Drive. Staff should work with ODOT and FHWA to ensure that access to and from the I-405 is not impeded.

• **Financial plan.** Continue to develop plans for the Caruthers Bridge for inclusion in the project. The Harrison Street alignment should be retained as a fallback option until a financial plan is adopted that accommodates the Caruthers Bridge.

### 3.3 Milwaukie to Oregon City: Develop Incremental BRT-type Improvements

**A. Phasing**

Concurrent with Phase 1, implement an incremental approach for select BRT and park-and-ride improvements between Milwaukie and Oregon City with transit service continuing to the Clackamas Community College. TriMet should include improved transit service concepts for SE McLoughlin Boulevard in their *Transit Investment Plan* process.

**B. Rationale**

It is recommended to proceed with incremental implementation of bus service and BRT-type elements in this segment. TriMet should include improved transit service concepts for McLoughlin Boulevard in their Transit Investment Plan process. This process should evaluate park-and-ride sites, bus stop improvements, pedestrian facilities and other service enhancements for implementation in cooperation with Milwaukie, Clackamas County and Oregon City. Service improvements to the Clackamas Community College southeast of Oregon City should also be considered. When light rail is implemented between Portland and Milwaukie, additional bus service improvements between Milwaukie, Oregon City and Clackamas Community College should be evaluated.

### 3.4 Milwaukie to Clackamas: No-Build - Maintain Local Bus Service

**A. Rationale**

With both I-205 and Milwaukie LRT lines implemented in the corridor, local bus service would be maintained or improved in this segment. The trips in this segment traveling through to central Portland would either travel east to access I-205 Light Rail or travel west to access Milwaukie Light Rail. With this service concept, BRT-type treatments, which facilitate transit travel through this segment, would not be needed.

As the I-205 and Milwaukie LRT alignments move toward implementation, TriMet should work with the neighborhoods in this segment (along with the City of Milwaukie and Clackamas County) to explore improvements to the local bus service in this segment. Improvements could include new routes, route modifications and improved service frequency.
4. PROJECT PHASING

While the previous sections of this report document the merits of implementing the I-205 LRT and Milwaukie LRT extensions along with the Portland Mall, this section addresses the need to phase implementation of the alignments and defines the proper sequencing for doing so.

4.1 Funding Considerations

4.1.1 Funding Context

The need for sequencing the two LRT extensions is addressed by assessing the viability of implementing the Combined LRT Alternative, which presumes that the I-205 LRT and Milwaukie LRT extensions would be concurrently implemented. As reported in the SDEIS, the “Fixed Guideway Opening Day” capital cost in year of expenditure dollars (YOE$) for the Combined LRT Alternative would be approximately $800 million. The inclusion of the Caruthers Bridge/Mall LRT alignment in downtown Portland (per the LPA) would increase the capital cost of the Combined LRT Alternative by an additional $249. In addition, the annual LRT operating cost of the Combined LRT alternative is estimated to be $13.3 million (2002$) in the year 2020.

4.1.2 FTA Statutory Requirements

FTA administers a discretionary federal funding program for LRT projects (alternatively called Section 5309 funds or New Start funds). FTA only permits light rail extensions to proceed to Final Design and to receive a Full Funding Grant Agreement if they are determined to be consistent with FTA’s financial capacity policy. Section 5309(e)(1)(C) of the federal transit code requires that a grantee receiving a New Start funding grant must demonstrate that the project is “supported by an acceptable degree of local financial commitment, including evidence of stable and dependable financing resources to construct, maintain and operate the system or extension.”

Pursuant to FTA policy promulgated in response to the above statute, each South Corridor Project must meet two financial criteria to be eligible for a New Start funding grant:

- **Financial Condition.** Satisfactory financial condition means that the grantee (i.e. TriMet) can pay its current operations, capital and vehicle/facility replacement program costs from existing revenues.

- **Financial Capability.** Satisfactory financial capability means the grantee’s ability to meet its expansion costs in addition to its existing operations from project revenues.

4.1.3 Implications of Concurrent Construction of Milwaukie and I-205 LRT Projects

The Combined LRT Alternative could not comply with the above criteria and, therefore, cannot be eligible for a federal New Start funding grant because:

- **The Region could not commit an amount of local funding sufficient for the Combined LRT Alternative within the schedule required to secure a federal funding contract by March 2005.** An LRT project must have completed at least 60 percent of its Final Design in order to be eligible for a federal funding contract. For a project the size of the Combined LRT Alternative, it
could easily take a year from the start of Final Design to achieve the 60 percent threshold. However, FTA will not permit an LRT project to commence Final Design, unless the local funds for building and operating the project are fully committed.

- By approximately February 2004 the region would have to demonstrate to FTA a fully committed, dependable source of $419.0 million to $524.5 million of non-Section 5309 funds (i.e., local and federal formula funds), depending on whether a 60% or 50% “New Start” share was to be pursued. Based on financial capacity analyses, it currently appears that the region may be able to secure commitments for up to $180 million of local and locally controlled federal formula funds by the time required. This is well under the amount required for the full Combined Alternative.

- The region could not reasonably expect to secure sufficient federal funds within the 4 to 5 year construction period to ensure judicious financial management. The federal share of the Combined LRT Alternative would be $524.5 million to $629.4 million in Section 5309 New Start funds, depending on whether a 50% or 60% “New Start” share was to be pursued. Assuming it would take five years to receive the federal funds, the Combined LRT Alternative would have to receive, on average, $104.9 to $125.9 million per year in Section 5309 New Start funds to secure its entire federal allotment. Based on past experience, it appears reasonable that TriMet could receive about $80 million per year in federal New Start funding for all of the projects under contract. TriMet could not implement an interim borrowing program to accommodate this degree of deferred federal funding without seriously jeopardizing the remainder of its program.

- TriMet could not accommodate the increased operating funds required to implement the Combined LRT Alternative in one phase, while continuing to operate and maintain the remainder of the transit system. Cash flow analyses of TriMet’s operating budget prepared for the SDEIS indicated that the entirety of TriMet’s proposed payroll tax would have to be dedicated to the Combined LRT Alternative for about a decade to meet this requirement if the full Combined Light Rail Alternative were built in one phase without further resources. This would be inconsistent with the Transit Improvement Plan that underlies the proposal for the payroll tax increase.

- For the reasons stated above, the Region could not demonstrate to FTA the financial capability to construct and operate the Combined LRT Alternative in one phase. Consequently, it is recommended that a two-phase implementation strategy be undertaken. While some minor overlapping may be possible, these two phases would generally be sequential.

4.2 Phase 1 of the South Corridor Major Transit Investment Strategy: I-205 LRT Project including the Portland Mall and Transit Improvements in the McLoughlin Corridor

With the project savings to be identified during Preliminary Engineering, it is estimated that an I-205 LRT Project that includes a Mall alignment in downtown Portland between the Steel Bridge and Portland State University (PSU) would cost $450 million (in YOE$). Assuming a 60% New Start share, the maximum practical share given current FTA practice, this would require $180 million in non-New Start funds. This is an amount that the region potentially will be able to commit by early 2004 (of that total, $35 million is uniquely available for the I-205 LRT Project and $25 million for the Portland Mall alignment due to the sources of these funds).
The required $270 million of New Start funds, assuming a 60% share, would be reasonably obtainable over a 4-5 year period in increments of $80m or less per year, and would not require an excessive interim borrowing program. In addition, with the proposed payroll tax increase, the operating costs of the I-205 LRT Project can be met while implementing the remainder of TriMet’s Transit Improvement Program. Consequently, it appears that an I-205 LRT (with Portland Mall) Project could comply with FTA’s financial capacity policy.

The greater the length of the Portland Mall Alignment that is constructed as part of the I-205 LRT Project, the easier it will be to implement the Milwaukie LRT Project. The Steel Bridge to PSU mall alignment discussed above represents the longest mall alignment possible with the I-205 LRT Project. However, it requires substantial local match that may not be possible to secure within the project schedule. While all reasonable efforts should be undertaken to secure sufficient funds for the Portland Mall alignment to PSU, a secondary, less expensive, option should be maintained that incorporates a Portland Mall alignment between the Steel Bridge and SW Main Street as part of the I-205 LRT Project. If this secondary option is pursued, the Portland Mall alignment between SW Main Street and PSU may be incorporated in the Milwaukie LRT Project, in the second phase of the project. In addition, if dictated by a larger local funding shortfall, a tertiary, least expensive option should be maintained that defers the entire Portland Mall alignment to the second phase of the project.

Construction of a Southgate park and ride lot in Milwaukie and relocation of the on-street transit center in downtown Milwaukie to the Southgate area is anticipated to use a mix of local and federal funds other than Section 5309 New Starts funds. Pending programming in TriMet’s Transit Investment Plan, incremental implementation of BRT-style improvements between Milwaukie and Oregon City would be funded with a mix of local and federal funds other than Section 5309 New Starts funds.

4.3 Phase 2 of the South Corridor major transit investment strategy: Milwaukie LRT Project

Without a Mall alignment (as reported in the SDEIS), the Milwaukie LRT Project would cost approximately $418 million (in YOE$), if constructed as the first phase (i.e. between 2004 and 2008). Assuming a 60% New Start share, the amount of local funds (including formula federal funds) required to be committed to the Project by early 2004 would be approximately $167.2 million. Based on analyses to date, this is almost $50 million more than is currently available or the maximum that may be obtainable for a Milwaukie LRT (and no mall alignment) Project within the project schedule.

If constructed as the first phase of the project, a Milwaukie LRT Project that uses the Hawthorne Bridge and includes a Portland Mall alignment to the Steel Bridge would cost $578 million. The costs would rise to $666 million if it included the desired Caruthers Bridge to Steel Bridge alignment. These mall alignment options add between $44 million and $103 million to the local share deficit.

Consequently, a new funding source would be required for the Project. The Metro Transportation Investment Task Force has proposed a funding measure that incorporates GO bond funds for the Milwaukie LRT Project. Given the Oregon constitutional requirement for 50% voter turnout, such an election would only be practical during a general election (i.e. November 2004 or 2006). If
successful, the ability to commit these funds to the project would occur from one to three years after the time such a commitment would be required to start Final Design (early 2004).

With Milwaukie LRT being pursued as a second phase, the capital cost of the Milwaukie LRT Project depends on (i) the added inflationary costs associated with the later construction date and (ii) the extent of the downtown Portland alignment incorporated in the I-205 LRT Project:

- If the I-205 LRT Project incorporates a Portland Mall alignment to PSU, as desired, the Milwaukie LRT Project would cost $514 million including the desired Caruthers Bridge to PSU alignment.

- If the I-205 LRT Project incorporates a Portland Mall alignment to SW Main Street, the Milwaukie LRT Project would cost $566 million including the desired Caruthers Bridge to SW Main Street alignment, or, if sufficient funds are not available for the Caruthers Bridge alignment, $478 million for the Hawthorne Bridge to SW Main Street to Portland Mall alignment.

- If the I-205 LRT Project does not incorporate any Portland Mall improvements, the Milwaukie LRT Project would cost $666 million for the desired Caruthers Bridge to Steel Bridge alignment, or, if sufficient funds are not available for the Caruthers Bridge alignment, $578 million for the secondary option of Hawthorne Bridge to SW Main/Madison Street to Mall to Steel Bridge alignment, or, if no funds are available for a Mall alignment, $418 million for the tertiary option of not having any mall alignment (as in the SDEIS).

Depending on the amount of funding incorporated in a General Obligation (G.O.) bond election for the project, each of the above options and sub-options could be feasible. Moreover, reasonable design options exist if a lower amount of local funding is secured.

To maximize the opportunity for the Milwaukie LRT Project, steps should be undertaken in Phase 1 to begin to implement capital and transit service improvements in the Milwaukie corridor. In particular, the park-and-ride at the old Southgate Theater site should be implemented in Phase 1, followed by the relocation of the current on-street transit center to the Southgate area as early as practical pending resolution of environmental and design issues.

4.4 Overall Phasing Recommendation

Given the findings reported above, the following phased implementation plan is proposed for the South Corridor major transit investment strategy:

- Implement the I-205 LRT Project as the first phase of the South Corridor major transit investment strategy using existing local funds, including locally controlled federal formula funds, and federal discretionary “New Start” funds.

- As part of the I-205 LRT Project, incorporate the maximum affordable Portland Mall alignment in downtown Portland. The desired alignment would run from the Steel Bridge to PSU. If sufficient local funding is not available, implement a Steel Bridge to S.W. Main Street alignment as a secondary option, and no Mall alignment (as set forth in the SDEIS) as the tertiary option.
• **During Phase 1, Implement Transit Improvements in Milwaukie.** In Phase 1, construct a Southgate Park-and-Ride lot (construction is scheduled to start in Fall 2003), and relocate the existing on-street transit center in downtown Milwaukie to the Southgate area, pending resolution of environmental and design issues.

• **Implement the Milwaukie LRT Project as the second phase of the South Corridor major transit investment strategy,** using GO Bond funds (requiring voter approval) and federal discretionary “New Start” funds.

• **The downtown alignment component of the Milwaukie LRT Project depends on the downtown alignment incorporated in the I-205 LRT Project.** However, the downtown component should be based on the following priorities: (a) the Caruthers Bridge, which is most desired, (b) the Hawthorne Bridge to SW Main Street to Mall alignment, as the secondary option, and (b) no Mall alignment (as set forth in the SDEIS) as the tertiary option; depending on the amount of local funds secured for the Project.

• **Continue to address transit issues between Milwaukie and Oregon City.** During Phase 1, subject to evaluation in TriMet’s *Transit Investment Plan*, begin incremental implementation of limited Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and park-and-ride improvements from Milwaukie to Oregon City.
South Corridor Project Update

Policy Committee

- Decisions about the project have been guided by the South Corridor Policy Committee:
  - Brian Newman (chair), Metro Councilor
  - Jim Bernard, Mayor of City of Milwaukie
  - Jim Francesconi, Commissioner City of Portland
  - Alice Norris, Mayor of Oregon City
  - Maria Rojo de Steffey, Commissioner Multnomah County
  - Bill Kennemer, Commissioner Clackamas County
  - Kay Van Sickel, Regional Manager ODOT
  - Fred Hansen, General Manager TriMet

April 10, 2003
South Corridor History

- South Corridor is an outgrowth of the South/North Project
- Initial South Corridor alternatives were based on input from “listening post” held after 1998 vote
- Non-Light Rail Study
- Light rail added as result of significant community support

Why the South Corridor

- Supports 2040 growth concept
- Important regional link
- Service high growth areas
- Addresses increasing congestion with environmental sustainability
SDEIS Overview

• Six alternatives studied in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)
  • No-Build
  • Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
  • Busway
  • Milwaukie Light Rail (LRT)
  • I-205 Light Rail (LRT)
  • Combined Light Rail (Milwaukie and I-205)
• SDEIS compares impacts, benefits and costs

Public Involvement Process

• Attended hundreds of community meetings over the past 18-months
• Held workshops, open houses and other events
• Canvassed areas likely to be impacted
• Distributed several newsletters to 8,000 households and businesses
SDEIS Public Comment period

- 61-days from Dec. 9 to Feb. 7
- Held 3 open houses and 2 public hearings
- Received over 300 comments
  - Supportive of I-205 LRT with Portland Mall Alignment and Milwaukie LRT with Caruthers Bridge
  - No support for Busway and BRT
  - Identified some outstanding concerns
LPA Recommendation

- Policy Committee deliberation included:
  - Technical analysis in SDEIS
  - Financing plans
  - Public Comments

Recommendation

- Two-phased project
  - First project: I-205 light rail with Portland Mall
  - Second project: Milwaukie light rail
  - To be constructed sequentially
Phase 1: I-205 with Portland Mall

- Highest ridership
- Lowest light rail cost
- Few environmental impacts
- Connects two regional centers and a town center
- Few impacts to existing neighborhoods while providing good transit service
- Utilizes right-of-way set aside during freeway construction

How Many New Transit Trips?
(Compared with the No-Build in 2020)

- Combined LRT would have over 6 million new transit trips per year.
- I-205 LRT would have nearly 5 million new transit trips.
- Busway and Milwaukie LRT would have over 2 million new transit trips.
Construction Jobs Created

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BRT</th>
<th>Busway</th>
<th>Milwaukee LRT</th>
<th>I-205 LRT</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs years created</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>7,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Use Connection

- BRT - somewhat supportive of land use. Provides high capacity service, but without reliability and permanence
- Busway - more supportive with more reliable high quality service
- LRT - very supportive with proven ability to support land use
Phase 1: I-205 with Portland Mall

- I-205 Light Rail with Portland Mall Alignment and PSU Terminus
- Other options, in case of financial shortfall:
  - Build shorter terminus at SW Main Street
  - Use the existing Cross Mall alignment
- Relocate Milwaukie on-street transit center to Southgate with park-and-ride

Phase 1: Portland Mall alignment

- Result of decades of central city planning
- Public support
- Revitalizes Portland Mall
- Serves PSU
- Extends rail capacity
- Increases ridership
Phase 2: Milwaukie Light Rail

- Milwaukie light rail with Caruthers Bridge and 17th Avenue Alignment in Brooklyn Neighborhood
- In case of financial shortfall, use the Hawthorne Bridge
- Finance plan will be developed
- Construction expected to begin after I-205 is completed
Next Steps

Adoption of the LPA

- Consideration by local jurisdictions in March and April
- Consideration by JPACT on April 10
- Adoption of the LPA by Metro Council on April 17
Milwaukie light rail
Next Steps

- Complete additional design and environmental work
- Continue to refine river crossing options
- Complete financial plan
- Begin construction after completion of I-205

Questions and answers
April 10, 2003

Mr. Steven Corey, Chair
Oregon Transportation Commission
355 Capitol Street, N.E., Room 101
Salem, OR 97301-3871

Dear Mr. Corey:

Metro recently learned of Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT) decision to publish the updated Oregon Highway Design Manual (OHDM) without the benefit of review by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). Metro has participated to the limited extent allowed in the update to the OHDM, which has been underway for more than two years, though not to an acceptable degree.

We are concerned that the new urban provisions in Chapter 8 of the OHDM, in particular, have not received adequate peer review by practicing professionals from our region, or from other urban areas of the state. These new provisions will be the basis for advancing a number of projects in the Metro region that are central to leveraging development of the main streets, light rail station communities, town centers, regional centers and Portland's central city, as envisioned in our 2040 Growth Concept.

A number of street improvements in these areas have already been funded through Metro's transportation improvement program, yet they have met opposition by ODOT officials accustomed to measuring designs against a highway standard, and not for land use and community benefits. The new urban chapter of the OHDM could remedy this conflict, but local engineers in the Metro region have raised concerns that the manual will actually make such projects more difficult to design and build, instead of streamlining the process.

Compounding our concerns over the direction of the new OHDM is the link to the Special Transportation Area (STA) designation in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP). Metro strongly supports the STA designation as a tool for implementing the main streets and centers envisioned in our 2040 plan, but thus far have been unable to find a way to designate STAs in our region. The OHDM only amplifies the need to solve the STA problem, since the new urban designs are explicitly limited to designated STAs in the OHDM.
This situation is complicated by the fact that ODOT has applied OHDM standards to all federally funded projects, regardless of whether a project is located on an ODOT facility. This means that some mechanism for establishing STA status on non-ODOT facilities will also be needed in order for our planned improvements to proceed.

We propose the following actions for moving these programs forward, and developing the necessary consensus for the OHDM to be accepted by local jurisdictions:

1. For the purpose of the Metro region, we propose that the OHP be amended to include an STA map for the areas covered by our 2040 Growth Concept and the “boulevard” street design classification in the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Such an amendment would recognize that the level of planning and public outreach used to develop the 2040 Growth Concept and 2000 RTP far exceeds the amount of effort that could be afforded by designating each STA separately, as currently called for in the OHP. The 2000 RTP was approved by the OTC in December 2000 and acknowledged by the Land Conservation and Development Commission in June 2001 as consistent with statewide planning goals and the OPP. These recommendations stem from regional designations that have already been found to be consistent with state plans. The RTP designations, in turn, were based on early Region 2040 designations that were acknowledged by the state as part of the 2040 Growth Concept.

Based on these existing plans, the Metro region includes 60 STA candidates, with more than a third of these located on state-owned facilities. The rest are on local facilities that may require state design approval where federal funds are used. In each case, local governments have adopted the necessary local planning provisions needed to comply with our 2040 planning requirements, which greatly exceeds those set forth in the STA provisions of the OHP. The enclosed draft maps of the proposed STAs, are derived from the 2000 RTP. Map 1 identifies all of the proposed STAs in the Metro region and Map 2 illustrates proposed STAs located on the National Highway System.

Metro will work with our local partners to refine and finalize the enclosed maps over the next few months for the purpose of a possible OHP amendment. We propose that this action be taken immediately, in order to advance a number of projects that are currently in the preliminary engineering stage.

2. We recommend that ODOT conduct a formal peer review of the OHDM prior to the final publication that is scheduled for this summer. Our understanding is that a metric edition will be published in limited quantities in March, but that a final publication with English dimensions will occur in June or July, and will include some technical editing. This provides an ideal opportunity for ODOT to build the necessary acceptance of the new OHDM urban standards at the local level, and for
fine-tuning where the current draft does not adequately anticipate urban design needs. Metro would welcome the opportunity to partner with ODOT to coordinate such a review in our region. However, we strongly urge that such a review also be undertaken with cities outside the Metro region.

3. Finally, we recommend that your Commission review the final OHDM before it is adopted. While some past editions have been developed and adopted administratively, our belief is that transportation engineering is an increasingly important part of the larger planning process, sets important statewide policy and thus must be conducted in full view of the public.

We have previously shared many of these concerns and comments in a January 10, 2002 letter to Bruce Warner. We now look forward to working with the OTC and ODOT to advance these proposals, and begin to realize the broader vision contained in both state and regional plans.

Sincerely,

Rod Park, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

David Bragdon
Metro Council President

Enclosures

cc: Pat Egan, Office of the Governor
    Xavier Falconi, President, Oregon Institute of Transportation Engineers
    Randy Franke, Chair, Land Conservation and Development Commission
    Ken Strobeck, League of Oregon Cities
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Proposed Special Transportation Areas for the Metro Region
DATE: April 10, 2003
TO: JPACT Members and Interested Parties
FROM: Ted Leybold, Principal Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: Transportation Priorities 2004-07 - TPAC Recommended 150% List

Attached are the following updated Priorities 2004-07 Technical Ranking documents:

- TPAC Recommended 150% list of projects recommended for further consideration
- Final technical evaluation scores and summaries of qualitative factors

The TPAC Recommended 150% list represents a balance of several factors considered by TPAC:

1. Previous funding commitments made by JPACT and the Metro Council. These include:
   - the existing South/North transit corridor contribution of $6 million per year; the 2006-07 biennium completes this commitment with contributions to the Interstate Avenue MAX project and continues matching funds for the South Corridor program.
   - an additional $2 million a year commitment in 2006-07 to the South Corridor, Washington County commuter rail and North Macadam development projects (Metro Resolution #03-3290, which extends the total $8 million dollar a year commitment beginning in 2006 to the year 2015).
   - funding of $1.956 million for the Boeckman Road project in Wilsonville as part of an agreement (Metro resolution #02-3151) linked to the Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA).

2. Regional policy direction. Projects, and balance among the project categories, that best met the stated policy direction of the Transportation Priorities 2004-07 program, were included in the TPAC 150% list. The primary program policy goals are to invest in Region 2040 centers, industrial areas and urban growth boundary expansion areas that have completed concept plans. Other policy objectives include funding projects and programs without dedicated sources of revenue, completing gaps in modal systems, and developing a multi-modal transportation system.
3. Technical rankings and qualitative factors. Within modal categories an attempt was made to identify clear breaks in technical rankings and include those projects that were grouped in the top of the technical rankings. Consideration was also given to qualitative factors supplied by the applicant that were not reflected in or were beyond the capacity of the technical analysis in considering the merit of a project. No project was nominated for further consideration based on qualitative factors if the project did not score within 10 points of a nominated project within its mode category.

4. Funding projects throughout the region. Equity in project application amounts were established by limiting the amount that could be requested from four sub-regions (Clackamas County, East Multnomah County, Portland and Washington County) to two times the MTIP funding available proportionate to their populations. While no analysis was completed on distributing the funding of projects to particular geographic areas, selection of projects included an attempt to fund projects throughout the region, balanced against the other selection factors.

Following are summaries of the technical analysis for the projects by mode category.

Bike/Trail

- The top five technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

Boulevard

- The top eight technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

- Funding for the right-of-way portion of the Cornell Boulevard project was not nominated for further consideration since they are for the preservation of right-of-way for the possible future expansion of the road to a 5-travel lane configuration as opposed to providing traditional boulevard design improvements.

- At the request of the applicant, the Stark Street Boulevard Phase II project in Gresham (Rockwood town center) was reduced in scope to the portion of the project that is within the regionally designated boulevard area (to approximately SE 191st Avenue). This request also increased their technical score to reflect increased cost efficiency and percent of trips on Stark Street with origins or destinations from the surrounding land uses.

- Whereas the Interstate MAX project is being completed under budget and whereas previous allocations of regional flexible funds were allocated to this project, TPAC requests that the City of Portland and TriMet investigate whether any remaining funds from the Interstate MAX project may be allocated to the Killingsworth Boulevard project, which would provide improvements from the Killingsworth MAX station on Interstate Avenue eastward to MLK Jr. Boulevard.

Bridge

- The Broadway Bridge Span 7 painting application was not recommended for inclusion in the 150% list. The bridge project has been awarded funding from federal (HBR) and state (OTIA) sources. The additional funds for painting Span 7 would not complete the unfunded portion of the project (painting of spans 2, 3 and 7). Funding this project did not appear to leverage other benefits such as multi-modal improvements or additional new funding.

Green Streets

- All green street demonstration projects were nominated for further consideration. However, the Cully Boulevard Green Street demonstration project was perceived to
benefit from further planning and design work with the community prior to committing to construction funds.

• The *Beaver Creek Culvert* projects were nominated for further consideration.

**Freight**

• Only two freight projects were submitted for MTIP funding. Both were nominated for further consideration.

**Planning**

• Five of the planning applications were nominated for further consideration.

• The *Livable Communities on Major Streets* application was the lowest priority application from Metro and may be eligible for funding through the state TGM grant process due to its links to land use.

• The *I-5/99W Connector* corridor study could compete with other corridor studies for the Next Priority Corridor study nomination and was a means to achieving geographic balance.

**Pedestrian**

• The top 6 technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

• In order to maximize the number of worthy projects for consideration, the 5th and 6th ranked projects were reduced in scope. The *Tacoma Street Pedestrian Improvement* project would eliminate two signal upgrades and five curb extensions to meet the new scope. The *St. John's Pedestrian Improvement* project would retain the pedestrian crossing improvements on Ivanhoe Street east of Philadelphia Avenue and redesign of the Ivanhoe/Philadelphia intersection.

**Road Modernization**

• The prior commitment to *Boeckman Road* project was nominated for further consideration.

• Five of the top six technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration. *Cornell Road* (Evergreen Parkway to Bethany Boulevard), was not advanced due to a balance of several considerations, including:
  - geographic balance; five of the six road projects grouped at the top of the technical ranking were located in Washington County
  - policy considerations; of these five road projects, the Cornell Road project was judged least likely to meet the primary program policy objective of leveraging economic development in mixed-use centers based on the application materials related to development of mixed-use centers and meeting local objectives (Attachment C).

• TPAC recommended that JPACT consider adding the Sunnyside Road project; (crm2), to the list for further consideration. While TPAC’s process for nominating projects based on technical merit would not have allowed this project to advance, the committee recognized that this project’s technical analysis was affected by its phasing into smaller parts and that JPACT had previously funded earlier project phases. Specifically, during the OTIA allocation recommendation of December 21, 2001, the Metro Resolution 02-3151 staff report stated “Approval of this funding would complete the Boeckman Road project. However, it would only complete the funding for the Sunnyside Road project from 122nd to 142nd. It is anticipated that future applications for MTIP funding will be considered for the remaining sections to 152nd and 172nd.” Five additional technical points for inclusion of a
Green Street infiltration device were credited to this project by Metro staff after the TPAC meeting. This information was provided prior to TPAC meeting but was not included in the technical score.

- TPAC also requested Metro staff consider revising the technical score of the 10th Avenue; East Main to Baseline project in Hillsboro based on vehicle delay data provided by the City of Hillsboro. Staff is currently working on a proposal to address this concern and will provide a technical update at the JPACT meeting.

**Road Reconstruction**

- The top three technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

**Regional Travel Options**

- The *Regional Travel Options* program and the top two technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

- The *I-5 Corridor TDM Plan* was nominated at half of the requested amount reflecting the region’s desire for the project applicant, the Oregon Department of Transportation, to provide half of the funding for a plan that would significantly benefit one of their primary facilities.

- The *Clackamas Regional Center Shuttle Program* should be encouraged to reapply for funding through the Regional Travel Options program.

**Transit Oriented Development (TOD)**

- *The Metro TOD program* and the top two technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

**Transit**

- The previous commitments to *South Corridor, Washington County Commuter Rail* and *North Macadam* development (Metro Resolution 03-3290) were nominated for further consideration.

- The portion of the *Frequent Bus Corridors* proposal that would fund stop, signal and transit tracker improvements within regional centers and industrial areas, and incorporating the 102nd Avenue Frequent Bus Stops application was recommended for further consideration at $3.2 million. (Note, actual costs for these improvements are $3.235 million). This reduces the scope of the application by approximately half, eliminating improvements in or near town centers, main streets and station communities.

- *Local Focus Areas* was recommended for further consideration at $500,000, roughly half of the application amount for a program with six focus areas.

- The *Gresham Civic Station TOD* project was recommended for further consideration at $2 million of a $3.5 million dollar application. This would eliminate some of the project elements at the station development.

- The *North Macadam Transit Access* and *South Metro Amtrak Station* projects are nominated for further consideration as the remaining top technically ranked projects.

**Next Steps**

The purpose of this step in the MTIP process is to release a more focused set of proposed projects for public review. The public comment period is scheduled to begin on April 10, 2003,
with JPACT and Council approval of a narrowed set of projects for further funding consideration. These recommendations from TPAC represent a project list that is approximately 184% of the remaining uncommitted MTIP funds for 2004-07. While public testimony will be accepted on any project application, the purpose of releasing a 150% list is to focus public dialogue on the projects that appear to have the most merit for MTIP particular funds based on their measurable benefits, as defined in the technical analysis.

Following the close of the public comment period on May 16th, JPACT and the Council will be asked to take further action to narrow the project list to the expected available funds of $53.75 million dollars during the 2006-07 biennium and to balance any adjustments needed to the previous allocation for the 2004-05 biennium.
DATE: April 3, 2003

TO: JPACT Members and Interested Parties

FROM: Ted Leybold, Principal Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Transportation Priorities 2004-07 – TPAC Recommended 150% List

* * * * *

Attached are the following updated Priorities 2004-07 Technical Ranking documents:

- TPAC Recommended 150% list of projects recommended for further consideration
- Final technical evaluation scores and summaries of qualitative factors

The TPAC Recommended 150% list represents a balance of several factors considered by TPAC:

1. *Previous funding commitments made by JPACT and the Metro Council.* These include:

   - the existing South/North transit corridor contribution of $6 million per year; the 2006-07 biennium completes this commitment with contributions to the Interstate Avenue MAX project and continues matching funds for the South Corridor program.
   - an additional $2 million a year commitment in 2006-07 to the South Corridor, Washington County commuter rail and North Macadam development projects (Metro Resolution #03-3290, which extends the total $8 million dollar a year commitment beginning in 2006 to the year 2015).
   - funding of $1.956 million for the Boeckman Road project in Wilsonville as part of an agreement (Metro resolution #02-3151) linked to the Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA).

2. *Regional policy direction.* Projects, and balance among the project categories, that best met the stated policy direction of the Transportation Priorities 2004-07 program, were included in the TPAC 150% list. The primary program policy goals are to invest in Region 2040 centers, industrial areas and urban growth boundary expansion areas that have completed concept plans. Other policy objectives include funding projects and programs without dedicated sources of revenue, completing gaps in modal systems, and developing a multi-modal transportation system.
3. **Technical rankings and qualitative factors.** Within modal categories an attempt was made to identify clear breaks in technical rankings and include those projects that were grouped in the top of the technical rankings. Consideration was also given to qualitative factors supplied by the applicant that were not reflected in or were beyond the capacity of the technical analysis in considering the merit of a project. No project was nominated for further consideration based on qualitative factors if the project did not score within 10 points of a nominated project within its mode category.

4. **Funding projects throughout the region.** Equity in project application amounts were established by limiting the amount that could be requested from four sub-regions (Clackamas County, East Multnomah County, Portland and Washington County) to two times the MTIP funding available proportionate to their populations. While no analysis was completed on distributing the funding of projects to particular geographic areas, selection of projects included an attempt to fund projects throughout the region, balanced against the other selection factors.

Following are summaries of the technical analysis for the projects by mode category.

**Bike/Trail**

- The top five technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

**Boulevard**

- The top eight technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

- Funding for the right-of-way portion of the Cornell Boulevard project was not nominated for further consideration since they are for the preservation of right-of-way for the possible future expansion of the road to a 5-travel lane configuration as opposed to providing traditional boulevard design improvements.

- At the request of the applicant, the Stark Street Boulevard Phase II project in Gresham (Rockwood town center) was reduced in scope to the portion of the project that is within the regionally designated boulevard area (to approximately SE 191st Avenue). This request also increased their technical score to reflect increased cost efficiency and percent of trips on Stark Street with origins or destinations from the surrounding land uses.

**Bridge**

- The Broadway Bridge Span 7 painting application was not recommended for inclusion in the 150% list. The bridge project has been awarded funding from federal (HBR) and state (OTIA) sources. The additional funds for painting Span 7 would not complete the unfunded portion of the project (painting of spans 2, 3 and 7). Funding this project did not appear to leverage other benefits such as multi-modal improvements or additional new funding.

**Green Streets**

- All green street demonstration projects were nominated for further consideration. However, the Cully Boulevard Green Street demonstration project was perceived to benefit from further planning and design work with the community prior to committing to construction funds.

- The Beaver Creek Culvert projects were nominated for further consideration.
Freight
• Only two freight projects were submitted for MTIP funding. Both were nominated for further consideration.

Planning
• Five of the planning applications were nominated for further consideration.
• The *Livable Communities on Major Streets* application was the lowest priority application from Metro and may be eligible for funding through the state TGM grant process due to its links to land use.
• The *I-5/99W Connector* corridor study could compete with other corridor studies for the Next Priority Corridor study nomination and was a means to achieving geographic balance.

Pedestrian
• The top 6 technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.
• In order to maximize the number of worthy projects for consideration, the 5th and 6th ranked projects were reduced in scope. The *Tacoma Street Pedestrian Improvement* project would eliminate two signal upgrades and five curb extensions to meet the new scope. The *St. John's Pedestrian Improvement* project would retain the pedestrian crossing improvements on Ivanhoe Street east of Philadelphia Avenue and redesign of the Ivanhoe/Philadelphia intersection.

Road Modernization
• The prior commitment to *Boeckman Road* project was nominated for further consideration.
• Five of the top six technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration. *Cornell Road* (Evergreen Parkway to Bethany Boulevard), was not advanced due to a balance of several considerations, including:
  • geographic balance; five of the six road projects grouped at the top of the technical ranking were located in Washington County
  • policy considerations; of these five road projects, the Cornell Road project was judged least likely to meet the primary program policy objective of leveraging economic development in mixed-use centers based on the application materials related to development of mixed-use centers and meeting local objectives (Attachment C).
• TPAC recommended that JPACT consider adding the Sunnyside Road project; (crm2), to the list for further consideration. While TPAC’s process for nominating projects based on technical merit would not have allowed this project to advance, the committee recognized that this project’s technical analysis was affected by its phasing into smaller parts and that JPACT had previously funded earlier project phases. Specifically, during the OTIA allocation recommendation of December 21, 2001, the Metro Resolution 02-3151 staff report stated “Approval of this funding would complete the Boeckman Road project. However, it would only complete the funding for the Sunnyside Road project from 122nd to 142nd. It is anticipated that future applications for MTIP funding will be considered for the remaining sections to 152nd and 172nd.”
• TPAC also requested Metro staff consider revising the technical score of the 10th Avenue; East Main to Baseline project in Hillsboro based on vehicle delay data provided by the City of Hillsboro. Staff is currently working on a proposal to address this concern and will provide a technical update at the JPACT meeting.
Road Reconstruction

• The top three technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

Regional Travel Options

• The Regional Travel Options program and the top two technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

• The I-5 Corridor TDM Plan was nominated at half of the requested amount reflecting the region’s desire for the project applicant, the Oregon Department of Transportation, to provide half of the funding for a plan that would significantly benefit one of their primary facilities.

• The Clackamas Regional Center Shuttle Program should be encouraged to reapply for funding through the Regional Travel Options program.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

• The Metro TOD program and the top two technically ranked projects were nominated for further consideration.

Transit

• The previous commitments to South Corridor, Washington County Commuter Rail and North Macadam development (Metro Resolution 03-3290) were nominated for further consideration.

• The portion of the Frequent Bus Corridors proposal that would fund stop, signal and transit tracker improvements within regional centers and industrial areas, and incorporating the 102nd Avenue Frequent Bus Stops application was recommended for further consideration at $3.2 million. (Note, actual costs for these improvements are $3.235 million). This reduces the scope of the application by approximately half, eliminating improvements in or near town centers, main streets and station communities.

• Local Focus Areas was recommended for further consideration at $500,000, roughly half of the application amount for a program with six focus areas.

• The Gresham Civic Station TOD project was recommended for further consideration at $2 million of a $3.5 million dollar application. This would eliminate some of the project elements at the station development.

• The North Macadam Transit Access and South Metro Amtrak Station projects are nominated for further consideration as the remaining top technically ranked projects.

Next Steps

The purpose of this step in the MTIP process is to release a more focused set of proposed projects for public review. The public comment period is scheduled to begin on April 10, 2003, with JPACT and Council approval of a narrowed set of projects for further funding consideration. These recommendations from TPAC represent a project list that is approximately 184% of the remaining uncommitted MTIP funds for 2004-07. While public testimony will be accepted on any project application, the purpose of releasing a 150% list is to focus public dialogue on the projects that appear to the have the most merit for MTIP particular funds based on their measurable benefits, as defined in the technical analysis.
Following the close of the public comment period on May 16th, JPACT and the Council will be asked to take further action to narrow the project list to the expected available funds of $53.75 million dollars during the 2006-07 biennium and to balance any adjustments needed to the previous allocation for the 2004-05 biennium.
## Transportation Priorities 2004-07

### TPAC Recommended 150% List

### Bike/Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Bike/Trail</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wilmot Greenway: River Front to River Parkway</td>
<td>$1,256</td>
<td>1 pmb1 N Macadam TOD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1 mb1 Yamhill Rezon: 190th to 197th</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trolley Trail: Jefferson to Courtyard (PE to Glen Echo)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2 pmb1 120th Ave: Waverly to Burnside</td>
<td>$3,355</td>
<td>2 mb1 Cully Blvd Rezon: PE</td>
<td>$773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beaverton Powerline Trail: LRT to Schraubeck Park</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>3 pmb2 21st St: 2a to 19th at 191st</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>3 mb2 Civic Drive Rezon: LRT to 13th</td>
<td>$295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Washington St: River to Hwy 217 (PE to Greenberg)</td>
<td>$3,081</td>
<td>4 mb3 Midlothian 2256 to Hwy 43 Bridge</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>4 mb3 Beaver Creek Culverts: Troubleshooting, Stark</td>
<td>$1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rock Creek Trail: Amberswood to Cornelius Pass</td>
<td>$2,016</td>
<td>5 mb2 Burnside: W 16th to E 14th (PE only)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>5 mb2 Killingsworth: Inactive to MLK (PE only)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,258</strong></td>
<td>6 mb1 Corbett: Murray to Sellman (construction)</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>6 mb1 <strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Road Modernization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Road Modernization</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tuskawilla Sherwood Rd: Hwy 99 to Tolon (PE only)</td>
<td>$2,818</td>
<td>1 mtr1 Metro MPO required planning</td>
<td>$1,709</td>
<td>1 mtr1 Broadway Bridge Span 7 painting</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MLX: Columbia to Lombard (PE only)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2 mtr3 Powell/Foster Corridor Plan (Phase II)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2 mtr1 Cully Blvd Rezon: ROW/Construction</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,818</strong></td>
<td>3 mtr1 Regional Freight Data Collection</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>3 mtr1 <strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Freight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Freight</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Levison Communities on Major Sts</td>
<td>$0.276</td>
<td>1 mtr2 Metro: Sts 16th to 21st</td>
<td>$0.578</td>
<td>1 mtr1 Bridge: Commercial</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>158W 1st Connector Study</td>
<td>$0.500</td>
<td>2 mtr3 St. Johns TC Pad Improvements</td>
<td>$0.987</td>
<td>2 mtr1 Music Rd: LRT Station to 170th</td>
<td>$1,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,818</strong></td>
<td>3 mtr4 Metro: W 14th to E 14th (PE only)</td>
<td>$0.271</td>
<td>3 mtr1 <strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wright St to 21st</td>
<td>$1,059</td>
<td>1 mb3 North Macadam Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,927</td>
<td>1 mb3 Murray Blvd: Schools Ferry to Barney</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lombard St to 21st</td>
<td>$0.800</td>
<td>2 mb3 Wilsonville Rd: Traveler Info</td>
<td>$0.550</td>
<td>2 mb1 Transportation Development</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,950</strong></td>
<td>3 mb1 North Macadam Transit Access</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td>3 mb1 <strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Travel Options (RTO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Regional Travel Options (RTO)</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Division: 6th to 39th (Streetscape plan to 60th)</td>
<td>$0.036</td>
<td>1 mtr1 TDM Core Program</td>
<td>$1,014</td>
<td>1 mtr1 <em>Metro TDM Program @ $1 m 06-07</em></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>234th Ave: Green Rd</td>
<td>$0.036</td>
<td>2 mtr1 TDM Assistance Programs</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2 mtr1 TDM Program: Increase of $5 m 04-07</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lake Rd: 21st to Hwy 22 (PE/ROW)</td>
<td>$1.481</td>
<td>3 mtr1 TDM Core Program</td>
<td>$1,014</td>
<td>3 mtr1 TDM Program: Restoration of $1.25 m 04-05</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,531</strong></td>
<td>4 mtr1 Interstate Ave: TravelSmart</td>
<td>$0.330</td>
<td>4 mtr1 <strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metro Res. 03-3290; South Corridor, Washington</td>
<td>$4,374</td>
<td>1 mtr1 TDM Core Program</td>
<td>$1,014</td>
<td>1 mtr1 <em>Metro TDM Program @ $1 m 06-07</em></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Co. Commuter Rail, North Macadam Development</td>
<td>$0.370</td>
<td>2 mtr1 TDM Assistance Programs</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2 mtr1 TDM Program: Increase of $5 m 04-07</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local Focus Areas</td>
<td>$0.500</td>
<td>3 mtr1 North Macadam Transit Access</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3 mtr1 TDM Program: Restoration of $1.25 m 04-05</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metro Rapid Transit</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>4 mtr1 Interstate Ave: TravelSmart</td>
<td>$0.330</td>
<td>4 mtr1 <strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TDM Core Program</td>
<td>$0.112</td>
<td>5 mtr1 TDM Core Program</td>
<td>$1,014</td>
<td>5 mtr1 <strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>South Metro Attraction Station</td>
<td>$2,244</td>
<td>6 mtr1 TDM Core Program</td>
<td>$1,014</td>
<td>6 mtr1 <strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Recommended Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal:** **$8,520**

**Federal List Grant:** **$83,661**
## Transportation Priorities 2004-07 Projects: Technical Ranking and Qualitative Factors

### Bicycle/Trail Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Willamette Greenway: River Forum to River Parkway</td>
<td>$1,264</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Clack. Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trolley Trail: Jefferson to Courtney (PE to Glen Echo)</td>
<td>$0.844</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tualatin Hills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beaverton Powerline Trail: LRT Crossing to Schuepbach Park</td>
<td>$0.431</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Washington Square Greenway: Hwy. 217 to Hall Blvd.</td>
<td>$0.396</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rockcreek Trail: Amberwood to Cornelius Pass Road</td>
<td>$0.216</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eastbank Trail/Springwater Gaps (PE/ROW)</td>
<td>$1.049</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gresham/Fairview Trail: Burnside to Division</td>
<td>$0.830</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subtotal:       |                |                                                   |                      | $4,812                  |               |               |                          |                     |            |                             |                              |                             |                            |              |                  |

### Qualitative Factors

- **Greenway width of 100’ gives space to integrate high-density urban development with the ecological function of a riparian buffer. Subdivision on one major site has condition of approval that includes the wide greenway donation within 3 years. Multi-modal potential of connection at SW Gibbs to proposed aerial tram to OHSU.**

- **NCPRD & Metro jointly purchased former streetcar ROW in 12/01. NCPRD will manage and maintain trail. Trolley Trail is a central component of Milwaukie’s Downtown Waterfront Master Plan.**

- **Improves livability for inner Beaverton residents; opportunity for transportation choices, recreation and exercise. Direct off-link to Tualatin Hills Nature Park. Citizen trail advisory committees, local trails advocates, and Friends of Westside Trails are in support of the project.**

- **A key concept of Washington Square Regional Center Plan is need for parks and open spaces to soften density that is proposed; vision of livable community with balance between urban and nature.**

- **Hillsboro anticipates completing design and any necessary ROW acquisition entirely with local funds. City will provide 50% match for MTP construction dollars.**

- **Completing 0.9 mile gap makes 19.2 miles of continuous off-street trail. Construction-ready project would increase support for Portland Parks bond package including trail improvements and not require future MTP funding.**

- **Over-match of funding for this phase; funding secured for ROW and construction of Phase 1 NE Halsey to SE Burnside. Benefits Rock Creek TC Unique opportunity to access TriMet’s Ruby Junction facility. Public support by neighborhoods and watershed councils. Serves low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>pb1t</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>North Macadam TOD: SW Bond and Moody avenues</td>
<td>$0.500</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Linked to Macadam district redevelopment and complements SDC monies, private investment and TIF that will be used to finance the North Macadam TOD project. Also complements Portland street car extension and other North Macadam transportation improvements. Fits gaps in bikeway network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>pb6l</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102nd Avenue: Westerly to Burside</td>
<td>$3.350</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Linked to Gateway Transit Center redevelopment at NE Pacific and 102nd Ave. and complements 1.5M SDC monies, urban renewal district funds and MTIP grant for PE and design in 2003-04. Community interested in forming LID for additional funding to complement this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>mh1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stark Street Phase 2: 10th to 16th</td>
<td>$1.000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Linked to Phase 1 Stark Street (10th to 16th) to complete boulevard design in Rockwood TC; complements TEA-21 funds; prior MTIP funds; local TIF monies and prior ped-to-MAX improvements. Part of ongoing effort to revitalize Rockwood neighborhood. Weed and Seed program and Rockwood Business Assistance Program and Oregon Green Infrastructure Initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oregon City</td>
<td>m23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>McLaughlin Bridge: I-205 to Highway 43 bridge</td>
<td>$2.000</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Project complements extensive planning and redevelopment in downtown Beaverton - library expansion, the Round, Hall/Watson Beautification Plan, downtown parking and street design study and other plans. Provides critical multi-modal connection to the Round and Beaverton Transit Center which serves light rail, buses and future commuter rail. Supports other transit-oriented development activities. 15% overmatch provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>wm9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rose Reigl extension: LRT to Creased St.</td>
<td>$1.907</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Project resulted from a 3-year community planning effort adopted in the Burside Transportation and Urban Design Plan adopted by City Council. The project complements urban renewal area monies and was endorsed by the PDC and Portland Business Alliance’s Transportation Committee. Facilitates better bike, pedestrian and transit connections across Burside and supports development, jobs and housing within the Central City while maintaining good access and mobility to downtown Portland. Services very low income area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>d22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Burside Street, W 19th to E 14th (PE only)</td>
<td>$2.000</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Linked to implementation of downtown Community plan and waterfמצו master plan, supporting downtown revitalization efforts, complements 40% earmarks with urban renewal district funds and complements South Centre recommened improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>d24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Killingsworth: interior to MLK (PE only)</td>
<td>$1.000</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Project received $540,000 for ROW acquisition in Priorities 2000. Design resulted from extensive public involvement as part of Cedar Mill Town Center Plan and a project advisory committee (PAC) recommendation. Project complements $5.7M in MSTIP monies (which provide 69% overmatch) and completes gaps in bike and pedestrian network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>m25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cornell Road: Murray to Saltzman</td>
<td>$3.500</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Project complements extensive planning and redevelopment in downtown Beaverton - library expansion, the Round, Hall/Watson Beautification Plan, downtown parking and street design study and other plans. Provides critical multi-modal connection to the Round and Beaverton Transit Center which serves light rail, buses and future commuter rail. Supports other transit-oriented development activities. 15% overmatch provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lake Oswego</td>
<td>db3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roosevelt Ferry Rd.: House Way to MacRona (PE &amp; ROW)</td>
<td>$2.550</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Lake Grove TC plan (and implementing code amendments) not yet adopted. Project complements TIF district if approved by City Council, completes gaps in bikeway network and provides crossing refuge near school. Project does not provide on-street parking and wide sidewalks due to ROW constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 18,887
### Transportation Priorities 2004-2007: Technical Ranking and Qualitative Considerations

#### Green Street Design Elements: Retrofit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Federal Funds Request (millions)</th>
<th>Total Project Points</th>
<th>2040 Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Size of Project</th>
<th>Design Elements</th>
<th>Amount infiltrated/project cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yamhill Green Street</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Central City, Regional Center, Industrial Area, Station Community</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50 30 20 10 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cully Green Street</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Lowe Streets, Station Community</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 10 10 10 10 50 20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro TOD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NW Civic Drive Green Street</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>All other areas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 3 10 5 10 10 10 10 45 10 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2040 Land Use Objectives**
- Effective removal of stormwater runoff from piped system and infiltration of stormwater near source of runoff

**Cost Effectiveness**
- Qualitative Factors
- Project planning and preliminary design work nearly completed. Good pilot for upgrading an "unimproved" street to Green Street standards in a newly developing Town Center. Leveraging funds from many other sources. Serves very low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

- Project part of a TOD, high visibility. Good pilot for mitigating water quality impacts of high density, urban development. Leveraging funds from other TOD development plans. Connected to a larger stormwater planning effort on 14 acres of Metro owned land.

Subtotal: 2,900
### Green Street Culvert Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Federal Funds Requested (millions)</th>
<th>Total Project Points</th>
<th>Attachment S</th>
<th>Multiple Culverts on same Stream</th>
<th>Design Consistent with GS Handbook</th>
<th>PE Includes geomorphology analysis</th>
<th>On regional inventory of Culverts</th>
<th>Type of Solution</th>
<th>Amount of Improved Habitat</th>
<th>Quality of Habitat</th>
<th>Presence of downstream barriers</th>
<th>Amount of Improved fish passage/project cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaver Creek Culvert Retrofits</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPECIAL CRITERIA**

- **COST EFFECTIVENESS**
  - Considerable amount of federal funding being leveraged. Cost effectiveness is good compared with other culvert replacement projects. Significant impact compared with other culverts on regional list.
### Freight Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Technical Rank</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Federal Funds Requested (millions)</th>
<th>Total Project Points</th>
<th>QUALITATIVE FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co.</td>
<td>2S18</td>
<td>2318</td>
<td>Tualatin Sherwood Rd.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>High volume truck route will be improved into a multi-modal connection between 99W and I-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Co.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Improves a critical gap in Regional Freight System.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORT BUSINESS:**
- Cost Effectiveness
- Past Regional Commitment?
- Minimum Phase?
- Multi-Modal Benefit?
- Overmatch? (local match shown for projects that exceed required 10% match)
- Affordable Housing/Schools?
- Economic development, jobs impact?

**Received Comments?**
- Y | Y | Y | Y | Y

**SUBTOTAL:**
- 2 | 4,518

---

**Transportation Priorities 2004-07:**

**Technical Ranking and Qualitative Factors**

---

4/3/03 3_19Freightrankings.xls
### Transportation Priorities 2004-07 Projects: Technical Rankings and Qualitative Factors

#### Pedestrian Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Forest Grove</td>
<td>wsp1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complements project (including ADA accessibility); complements prior MTIP allocation for downtown ped improvements. Serves concentration of Hispanic population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>gpp1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Central eastside bridgeheads</td>
<td>1.456</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complements current bike/ped improvements to Morrison Bridge and potential future streetcar via MLK/Grand, completes gaps in pedestrian system and implements GISQ Opportunity Strategy. Could be split to Roosevelt/Kinsman/ Crawford/Auburn Bridgeheads and Water Avenue ramp. Serves low-income area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
<td>wsp2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hillsboro Regional Center Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completes gaps in pedestrian system that connect to businesses, schools, bike lanes and to LRT in RC; serves low/moderate income households. 20% match provided. Serves low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tigard</td>
<td>wsp3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tigard Town Center Pedestrian Improvements (Commercial Street)</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complements future commuter rail station by improving pedestrian access between station and town center area. Implements traffic study and local recommendations. Serves concentration of Hispanic population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>gpp3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tacona Street, 6th to 21st</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linked to first two projects (Imperial and median refuge and curb extension construction) funding through local and state grants. Provides Willsawt River Crossing study recommendations and 2040 main street designation. Provides critical pedestrian crossing improvements and increases on-street parking in support of main street and bicycle boulevard on adjacent street. Supports employment by leveraging main street enhancements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>gpp4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>St. John Town Center Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>1.534</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implements St. John's Bridge Truck Strategy recommendations. Town center plan (and implementing code amendments) not yet adopted. Provides critical signal system improvements and realigns intersections to better facilitate truck movements and improve pedestrian safety. Serves low-income area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>wsp4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Merlo Road, LRT station to 170th</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improves pedestrian access to TRPRD nature park, completes gap in pedestrian system and complements other public investments such as the Merlo transit station. Truax bus barn, Beaverton School District offices and an alternative high school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oregon City</td>
<td>gpp5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Multnomah Avenue, Gateway to Fir</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completes gaps in high-pedestrian corridors; provides 35% match; implements Multnomah Corridor improvement plan and linked to $2.1 million for Phase 1 improvements invested by the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $ 7,364
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Proposed Rank</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Federal Funds Requested</th>
<th>Total Project Points</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>2040 SUPPORT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY CRITIC BENCHMARKS</th>
<th>SAFETY</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTED RELIEF</th>
<th>GREEN STREET BONDS</th>
<th>CONGESTION RELIEF</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL: $32,561</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrw4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cornel Road Evergreen to Gateway (EC)</td>
<td>$1,085</td>
<td>64 34 30 6 5</td>
<td>$1.005</td>
<td>31 8 6 2 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrw2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baseline/Jenkins ATM</td>
<td>$0.449</td>
<td>76 31 14 14 6 6</td>
<td>$0.581</td>
<td>42 12 6 6 5 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrw3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15 Wintonvile Rd.</td>
<td>$1.656</td>
<td>51 17 13 20</td>
<td>$1.906</td>
<td>51 17 13 20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrw7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 Farmington Rd. @ Murray interaction</td>
<td>$0.385</td>
<td>56 13 20 13 10</td>
<td>$0.600</td>
<td>46 8 10 13 15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrw1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 Farmington Rd. 170th to 180th (FE)</td>
<td>$1.137</td>
<td>67 25 17 2</td>
<td>$2.350</td>
<td>58 8 17 20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornel</td>
<td>wrm1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Highway 9 Intersection @ 19th (Schl Hr)</td>
<td>$0.250</td>
<td>66 13 14 16</td>
<td>$2.618</td>
<td>57 13 19 19</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>pm2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SW Faire/Barclay wmn intersection</td>
<td>$0.599</td>
<td>63 13 14 10 6</td>
<td>$0.105</td>
<td>49 13 10 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrm4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13th Ave 112th to Basilone</td>
<td>$1.346</td>
<td>60 8 17 13 10</td>
<td>$0.105</td>
<td>49 13 10 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>pm1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SW Marion Broadway School</td>
<td>$2.390</td>
<td>58 8 17 20</td>
<td>$0.105</td>
<td>49 13 10 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrm3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12th Muncy Blvd. Schultz Ferry to Evermore</td>
<td>$3.500</td>
<td>17 13 19 19</td>
<td>$0.105</td>
<td>49 13 10 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrm5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ophir Avenue Hazelwood King Transfer Info</td>
<td>$4.090</td>
<td>56 13 20 13 10</td>
<td>$0.105</td>
<td>49 13 10 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrm7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rose Bldg LRT to Crescent</td>
<td>$0.385</td>
<td>56 13 20 13 10</td>
<td>$0.105</td>
<td>49 13 10 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrm4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15th Muncy Blvd. 17th to 20th (FE)</td>
<td>$1.197</td>
<td>66 13 14 16</td>
<td>$0.105</td>
<td>49 13 10 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MullCo</td>
<td>mm1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16th Johnson Blvd. 20th to 25th (FE)</td>
<td>$1.197</td>
<td>66 13 14 16</td>
<td>$0.105</td>
<td>49 13 10 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard</td>
<td>wrm2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17th 185th Ave.</td>
<td>$1.005</td>
<td>31 8 6 2 12</td>
<td>$0.581</td>
<td>42 12 6 6 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WashCo</td>
<td>wrm2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18th 19th to 20th</td>
<td>$1.085</td>
<td>64 34 30 6 5</td>
<td>$1.906</td>
<td>51 17 13 20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUALITATIVE FACTORS**

Funding approved by prior Metro Resolution; no further analysis conducted, this model constraints applicable to Kinsman true of this project site.

Multi-modal missing link; no overmatch but ROW mostly acquired. Town City plan not actually adopted. Serves five Oaks elementary school. Serves concentration of Asian population.

Prior PE & ROW allocations; provides missing roadway and multimodal links. Serves low-income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

Very hi accident rate in short distance; no safety committee rank; very 2040 supportive road project that supplies missing multimodal links and improves town center gateway. Serves Concentral Boulevard MSTRP project.

Segment connects to 5 LRT station communities; derives from County ITS Master Plan and operations center investments. Serves concentration of Hispanic population.

Project links to 223rd Sandy interaction signalization project; prior PE & ROW allocation; hi committee safety rank. Serves low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

New takead-Pedfac facilities provided - Bicycled environment impacted by double left and right-turn lanes on all approaches. Serves low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

Serves Mountain View middle school. Serves concentration of Hispanic population.

FY 2006-03 MSTRP project reconstructed Adair from 10th - 20th. Adds bike lanes to regional corridor. Serves concentration of Hispanic population.

whi 1 mile of Pleasant Valley Town Center; Gateway to Damascus; salmonid coiffent replacement & green streets drainage

Delay value may under report intersection level congestion of right turn movements. Potential for MAX train delay by vehicle density or lack of signal preemption. Serves very low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

Serves Mountain View middle school. Serves concentration of Hispanic population.

Inadequate basis for assignment of future year congestion relief/cost effectiveness

Model does not assign volume to minor road facility; facility contribution to Improvement of Ram. City local circulation and reduction of main arterial delay is not well represented. Serves very low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

Model does not assign volume to minor road facility; facility contribution to Improvement of Ram. City local circulation and reduction of main arterial delay is not well represented. Serves very low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

Model does not assign volume to minor road facility; facility contribution to Improvement of Ram. City local circulation and reduction of main arterial delay is not well represented. Serves very low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

Model does not assign volume to minor road facility; facility contribution to Improvement of Ram. City local circulation and reduction of main arterial delay is not well represented. Serves very low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

Model does not assign volume to minor road facility; facility contribution to Improvement of Ram. City local circulation and reduction of main arterial delay is not well represented. Serves very low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.

Model does not account for probable loop ramp relief of congestion at Fuller Road signal. County data inconclusive regarding benefit but low to moderate congestion relief seems probable. Preliminary cost estimate of $4.6 million down from original staff est.

Model does not account for probable loop ramp relief of congestion at Fuller Road signal. County data inconclusive regarding benefit but low to moderate congestion relief seems probable. Preliminary cost estimate of $4.6 million down from original staff est.

Model does not account for probable loop ramp relief of congestion at Fuller Road signal. County data inconclusive regarding benefit but low to moderate congestion relief seems probable. Preliminary cost estimate of $4.6 million down from original staff est.

Model does not account for probable loop ramp relief of congestion at Fuller Road signal. County data inconclusive regarding benefit but low to moderate congestion relief seems probable. Preliminary cost estimate of $4.6 million down from original staff est.
### Road Reconstruction Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Technical Rank</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Federal Funds Request (millions)</th>
<th>Total Project Points</th>
<th>PAVEMENT CONDITIONS</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVENESS FACTORS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY CHRT. READINESS</th>
<th>SAFETY</th>
<th>COSTREDUCED DELAY</th>
<th>GREEN STREETS BONUS POINTS</th>
<th>QUALITATIVE FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total points possible for each scoring category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### QUALITATIVE FACTORS

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bridge Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Code</th>
<th>Technical Rank</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Federal Funds Request (millions)</th>
<th>Total Project Points</th>
<th>PAVEMENT CONDITIONS</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE EFFECTIVENESS FACTORS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY CHRT. READINESS</th>
<th>SAFETY</th>
<th>COSTREDUCED DELAY</th>
<th>GREEN STREETS BONUS POINTS</th>
<th>QUALITATIVE FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total points possible for each scoring category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### QUALITATIVE FACTORS

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **Dawson Rd:** 22nd to 3rd (bridge replacement)
  - $1,477
  - 76
  - Very good pavement condition today but high volume expected to produce very poor conditions by 2010
  - 50%
  - Priorities safe route to Milwaukee HS and Rowe Middle School. Link to Harmony Road improvements, providing connection to Clackamas RC.

- **SE 39th: Bumstead to Holgatt:**
  - $0.500
  - 88
  - Provides safe route to Milwaukee HS and Rowe Middle School. Link to Harmony Road improvements, providing connection to Clackamas RC.

- **Bridge Repair and Painting:**
  - Bridge repair and painting received HBR and OTIA funds but not enough to complete painting of all spans.

- **Endangered Species Recovery:**
  - Received public comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TOD Implementation Program</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>broad public support; elected officials, neighborhood associations; serves as regional and national case study; high public to private leverage ratio of invested funds; supports urban centers strategies in centers with light rail, broad geographic distribution of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regional &amp; Urban Centers Implementation Program</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>expands TOD Program activities to urban centers served by high frequency bus expands geographic distribution of funds; demonstrated public support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas C.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CRC Parking Garage</td>
<td>$0.250</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Funding for planning and PE only; urban renewal funds available for capital; joint development project could be included in I-205 budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Macadam Couplet</td>
<td>$0.500</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>project also ranked in boulevard funding category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rose Biggi Extension</td>
<td>$1.908</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>project also ranked in boulevard funding category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transportation Priorities 2004-07 Projects: Technical Ranking and Qualitative Factors

#### Regional Travel Options Program and Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional TDM Program</td>
<td>$3,987</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interstate Ave. Travel Smart</td>
<td>$0.300</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-5 Corridor TDM Plan</td>
<td>$0.224</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clackamas RC TMA Shuttle</td>
<td>$0.125</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUALITATIVE FACTORS**

- Regional TDM Program Components include the following: $1,700,000 for core TDM program for 2006 & 2007, including management, outreach and marketing; program evaluation; and regional telecommute program. $1,130,000 for regional TMA program from 2004 to 2007. $850,000 for region 2040 initiatives program from 2004 to 2007. $130,000 for SMART/Wilsonville TDM Program for 2006 & 2007. $114,000 for regional information clearinghouse in 2006 & 2007. $80,000 for business energy tax credit and telework in 2006 & 2007.

- Positive results in Europe and Australia. Pilot project currently underway in SW Portland. Serves low income area and concentrations of minority populations.

- This plan must coordinate with the Regional TDM Program and with the proposed Interstate Travel Smart Project. Metro staff recommends that ODOT fund 50% of the plan. Governors' 1-5 Partnership findings note that the corridor will require better management of traffic demand and measures that manage demand. Serves low income area and concentrations of minority populations.

- Need to determine how shuttle will be paid for after 3 years of CMAQ Funding. This project could compete for Regional TDM Program Region 2040 Initiatives Funds in 2004.
## Transportation Priorities 2004-07 Projects: Technical Ranking and Qualitative Factors

### Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>Frequent Bus Corridors</td>
<td>$4,374</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>Local Focus Areas</td>
<td>$1,005</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>102nd Avenue Bus Stops</td>
<td>$0,135</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Y Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Ind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>Gresham Civic Station TOD</td>
<td>$3,450</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>North Macadam Transit Access</td>
<td>$0,449</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oregon</td>
<td>South Metro Amtrak Station</td>
<td>$0,700</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>North Macadam Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,347</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clack Co</td>
<td>Clackamas RC TOD IPS/R (PE only)</td>
<td>$0,280</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Ind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>Hybrid Bus Expansion</td>
<td>$2,224</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>Jantzen Beach Access</td>
<td>$0,414</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>Rockwood Bus/MAX Transfer</td>
<td>$0,382</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ped</td>
<td>Y Ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$16,765</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUALITATIVE FACTORS

- Capital portion of expansion of successful McLoughlin and Barber frequent bus projects.
- Several corridors serve low income areas. • Indirect support of economic development in areas served.
- Indirect support of economic development in areas served.
- Transit portion of 102nd Avenue Boulevard project. • Indirect support of economic development in areas served. Serves low income area.
- Creates 1,400 new system riders. • Increases density in regional center. • Increases alternative mode split in Gresham RC. • Leverages previous regional investment in Civic Drive and LRT station projects.
- Linked to other North Macadam projects such as streetcar, N Macadam TOD, SW Macadam road modernization, and N Macadam infrastructure.
- Intra-city ridership not a true comparison to inter-city transit ridership on which technical score is calculated. Trip lengths are longer and or statewide significance. • Locating regional facility in regional center adjacent to major tourist destination.
- Linked to other North Macadam projects such as streetcar, N Macadam TOD, SW Macadam road modernization, and N Macadam transit access.
- Supplements regional South Corridor commitment and 1-205 LRT project.
- Would increase alternative mode split in CRC. • Overmatch at 50%. • Allows increased density in a regional center.
- Follows purchase of 2 hybrid test vehicles in 2002. • Will run in frequent bus corridors.
- Efficient bus connection to Interstate MAX.
- Link to Stark Street Boulevard project. • Large Hispanic (33%) and low income (57% < 2X PL). • Indirect support of economic development in areas served. Serves low income area and concentration of Hispanic population.
April 7, 2003

Rod Park, JPACT Chairman
David Bragdon, Council President
Andy Cotugno, TPAC Chairman
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736

RE: MTIP Preliminary 150% List

Dear Mssrs. Park, Bragdon and Cotugno:

The City of Hillsboro generally supports the Metro Transit Oriented Development (TOD) program, Hillsboro Regional Center Pedestrian Improvements and the Rock Creek Trail extension and is pleased these projects are proposed to move forward to the 150% MTIP list.

However, we strongly disagree with the scoring and ranking of projects listed under the Road Modernization category and urge the Metro Council, JPACT/TPAC and staff to reassess the methodology used in the points and subsequent ranking assigned. Our specific concerns center on the Hillsboro-sponsored 10th Avenue Southbound Right Turn Lane project between E. Main Street and SE Baseline Street located in the heart of the Hillsboro Regional Center.

As brought to my attention in the attached staff memo, it is clear that the technical and qualitative criteria have significantly underestimated the current safety situation and effectiveness of planned improvements. The potential hazards associated with the likelihood of vehicles backing up over the MAX light rail tracks during peak travel times were identified years ago during the light rail planning process. Nothing has been done to date to address this hazard.

Furthermore, since the project received funding for preliminary engineering during the previous MTIP review, it seems that our proposal for funding to construct the much needed improvements merits greater consideration during the current review process.
Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mayor Tom Hughes
City of Hillsboro

Attachment: April 3rd Staff Memo

Cc: Phil Selinger, Tri-Met
    Rob Drake, Mayor of Beaverton
    Randy McCourt, DKS Associates
April 3, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Tom Hughes
FROM: John Wiebke, Urban Planner II

RE: MTIP Preliminary 150% List (10th Avenue)

In December 2002, the City Planning Department submitted applications for three projects for funding consideration under the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Two of the three projects are currently recommended for inclusion in the 150% preliminary lists. Not recommended for inclusion on the list is the addition of a southbound right turn only lane along NE 10th Avenue between E. Main Street and SE Baseline Street. The project was awarded funding for Preliminary Engineering during the prior MTIP review process that occurred approximately two years ago. Therefore, it would stand to reason that this committed investment should be seen through to a logical conclusion. There are three primary issues and concerns that we believe Metro, through its ranking criteria, is not fully appreciating.

1. The project should be recognized under qualitative considerations as serving a multi-modal benefit.
   - Planned road improvements would alleviate traffic queuing that occurs frequently during the PM peak hours that can potentially disrupt MAX light rail service when vehicles inadvertently are trapped over the tracks.
   - This section of 10th Avenue funnels three Tri-Met bus lines (46, 47, and 48) into and out of the Hillsboro Regional Center.

   Conclusion: In addition to reducing vehicle congestion, planned roadway improvements would greatly enhance light rail and bus service efficiency between downtown Hillsboro and outlying areas.

2. The project received a low technical score under two criteria (Effectiveness Factor and Cost Effectiveness) that is not representative of existing or future conditions.
The 10th Avenue project is at a ranking disadvantage for these criteria in that the EMME-2 program used by Metro to assess operational aspects does not recognize the significant imbalance in lane use caused by the directional distribution of southbound traffic turning right onto Baseline Road.

Since SE 10th Avenue south of Baseline Road and the Oak/Baseline Road couplet are part of Highway 8, the signal timing for this corridor must service the highway traffic as first priority. This results in only 20 seconds of available green time for southbound left, through, and right turn traffic on 10th Avenue. Coupled with the unbalanced lane use due to the heavy southbound right turn volume to westbound Baseline Road, the actual capacity for the southbound approach is at or near capacity during most of the peak hour.

The area targeted for improvement lies at a convergence of several commuter modes serving the Regional Center that include three arterials (TV Highway, Cornell Road and E. Main Street) all of which serve as Tri-Met transit routes, plus MAX light rail service that runs down the centerline of SE Washington Street.

The above issues are not recognized by the EMME-2 model, resulting in an inability to score points under the effectiveness factor.

DKS Associates made a sketch plan level assessment of the intersection that provides at least a basis for consideration with regards to scoring the effectiveness factor. They calculate base 2000 average vehicle delay to be 4.9 seconds with a future 2020 delay of 17.8 hours.

Conclusion: The creation of a third southbound lane would nearly double the available capacity for this approach.

3. From the outset, Metro has continually reminded the jurisdictions that a primary emphasis will be placed on the extent to which considered projects "directly or significantly benefit a 2040 primary or secondary land use."

Tenth Avenue provides a vital multi-modal link to and from the Hillsboro Regional Center. That the project is in a two-way tie for most points earned in the Community Center Readiness Factor scoring criteria serves as testimony that Metro too recognizes this fact.

Demands on the roadway can only be expected to increase in the future as the downtown area continues to infill with high density development, including a new mixed-use Civic Center and a multi-phased expansion at Tuality Community Hospital.

Conclusion: Resolving this outstanding safety issue is paramount to long-term assurances that the Regional Center is served by a safe and efficient multi-modal transportation system.
April 8, 2003

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

Subject: FY 06/07 MTIP Funding for Regional Transit

Dear Members of JPACT:

The region’s 2040 Growth Concept and Regional Transportation Plan rely on the continued development of public transit. TriMet is grateful this continues to be reflected in the distribution of MTIP resources. Most recently, the region has set aside a portion of the MTIP for continued development of the regional rail network. The region has also made a commitment to the continued development of regional bus services and facilities.

The FY04/05 MTIP allocated $4.1 million to bus transit investments, which sustained “frequent” 15-minute service in two major corridors and provided continued support for on-street capital improvements. To ensure that MTIP funds are not used for ongoing operations, all future transit allocations are to be used exclusively for capital improvements and those improvements are to be documented in TriMet’s 5-year Transit Investment Plan.

The adopted Transit Investment Plan is focused on building transit service in frequent bus corridors, in focus areas and in local communities. The program includes installation of improved bus stop signs with schedule displays, shelters, trashcans, bus priority treatments, real time customer information and larger shelters at heavily used stops. The Transit Investment Plan also calls for pedestrian access improvements. These safety and convenience improvements are critical responsibilities of TriMet and our jurisdiction partners and are important mode choice considerations for the traveling public. TriMet’s FY 06/07 MTIP application includes projects that support these themes. This request addresses priority, permanent improvements to the transit system and to the surrounding communities. The application has been reviewed with each jurisdiction and has received broad, documented support. It is a balanced and results-oriented approach to investing in this region’s public transit infrastructure.

The facilities funded by this request would support the essential transit services to our communities. TriMet is committed to sustaining and expanding service levels using its general funds. This requires that beginning in FY 04 the on-street capital program be fully MTIP funded.
The FY 06/07 150% MTIP recommendation for supporting the regional bus transit system is inadequate for addressing the expanding needs and scope of the bus program. Recent and proposed funding for the transit categories is summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project / Program</th>
<th>FY 04/05 funded</th>
<th>FY 06/07 application</th>
<th>FY 06/07 150% list</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCL corridor service development</td>
<td>$2,850,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Bus corridors / safe crossings</td>
<td>$1,256,000</td>
<td>$7,130,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Investment Plan Focus Areas</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally significant projects</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,825,000</td>
<td>$449,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macadam transit infrastructure</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,106,000*</td>
<td>$13,575,000</td>
<td>$4,149,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requested Supplement for safe crossings $3,200,000

New Total $4,949,000

* Transit Development Program Reserve

The 150% list represents status quo funding for the on-street transit development program. However, improved pedestrian access to transit is new and is reflected in the Transit Investment Plan work scope that is a priority for both TriMet and TriMet's jurisdiction partners. It is not possible to support the essential bus stop and bus operational improvements and also begin improvements to the priority street crossings identified in the Frequent Bus Corridors portion of TriMet's MTIP application. These twelve crossings on state arterials are at the top of a list of priority locations identified in a recent study. The required safety improvements would cost an estimated $1.5 million.

TriMet requests that the $3.20 million recommended for the Frequent Bus Corridors category be increased to $4.00 million. This would bring the total amount of the bus transit application to $4.95 million. This level of commitment would allow TriMet to begin to address priority on-street transit needs noted above, including improvements to street crossings that presently threaten the safety of pedestrians and bus riders.

Thank you for this consideration. Let me know if you have questions at (503) 962-4831.

Sincerely,

Fred Hansen
General Manager
Agency Held Liable for Unsafe Route to Bus Stop

In widely watched case, state high court rules for a woman hit by a car on her way to wait for a bus.

By Maura Dolan
Times Staff Writer
April 8, 2003

SAN FRANCISCO -- Transit agencies in California can be held legally responsible when patrons are injured on their way to a bus stop that is hazardous to reach, the California Supreme Court ruled Monday.

The 5-2 ruling was a defeat for more than 200 transit agencies in California that had joined the case on behalf of the defendant, the Central Contra Costa Transit Authority. A lawyer for the transit agencies predicted that the ruling will increase lawsuits and hurt public transportation in California.

"It is very significant for all transit agencies in the state because it says they have to determine that the means to get to bus stops are safe," said David W. Baer, who represented the agencies. A dissenting judge said the majority decision is "like watching a traffic accident in slow motion."

But an attorney for a woman who was injured on her way to a bus stop said the decision will force transit agencies to take notice when patrons complain of unsafe conditions.

"If it is brought to their attention that a bus stop is dangerous, they are going to have to do something about it instead of saying that is not our problem," said Walter Walker III, who represented the plaintiff.

The case involved a crosswalk in Contra Costa County across the bay from San Francisco. Other than bus riders, few pedestrians used the crosswalk. Traffic on the street was heavy during the morning commute, and the speed limit was often disregarded, the court said.

The court noted that someone had been hurt in the crosswalk previously. In February 1986, a schoolgirl was struck by a car while in the crosswalk on her way to the bus stop. The girl's family sued in July 1987, and the county installed traffic signal lights with pushbuttons at a nearby intersection. But the transit agency left its stop at the unlighted, unsafe crosswalk.

In November 1993, Darlene Bonanno, who was developmentally disabled, tried to cross the street to get to the bus stop on her way to her job as a motel housekeeper. Two motorists eventually stopped for her, but a third driver rear-ended one of the cars, forcing it into Bonanno, who as a result is partially paralyzed.

Bonanno sued, and a jury found the transit agency was partly responsible for the accident. The transit agency was ordered to pay Bonanno $1.6 million in compensation, and the agency appealed.

Justice Kathryn Mickle Werdegar, writing for the court, said a bus stop may be deemed dangerous because bus patrons must cross a dangerous crosswalk to reach it.

"We reject CCCTA's contention that it cannot be held liable for an injury occurring on property it neither owned nor controlled," Werdegar wrote. The agency "owned and controlled its own bus stop, and a condition of that property, its physical situation, caused users of the bus stop to be at risk from the immediately adjacent property."


"Reading the majority opinion is painful, like watching a traffic accident in slow motion, because the majority's misguided effort to compensate the victim of this accident will, quite foreseeably, victimize everyone else who is dependent on public transit," Brown wrote.

"Where you stand can depend on where you sit, and, let us be frank, Supreme Court justices don't sit on buses very often," she said.

"Therefore, the majority would do well to consider the plight of those dependent on ... the transit agency serving northwestern Contra Costa County."

Baxter complained that the court majority had significantly expanded liability for dangerous conditions on others' property. He contended the decision could increase liability for private property owners as well as government.
April 7, 2003

Rod Park, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Rod:

TPAC recently approved a recommended Transportation Priorities 2004-07 150% funding list. Six East Multnomah County projects have made the list including the following projects:

- 223rd Ave. Railroad Undercrossing, City of Fairview, $3.4 million, Road Modernization
- Gresham Civic Station TOD, Metro/City of Gresham, $2 million, Transit
- Beaver Creek Culverts, City of Troutdale, $1.47 million, Green Streets/Culverts
- Yamhill St. Reconstruction, City of Gresham, $0.45 million, Green Streets
- 242nd Ave. Reconstruction, Cities of Troutdale and Gresham, $0.55 million, Road Reconstruction
- Stark St. boulevard/intersection, City of Gresham $1 million, Boulevard

Each of these projects serves an important function in East Multnomah County and promotes the Metro objectives of serving 2040 Centers and Industrial Areas; Green Street Demonstration and Culvert projects; Safety; and Multi-Modal facilities. We recognize that funding is very limited and competition is stiff.

In most cases, the projects listed above are substantially overmatched in an effort to secure sufficient funding to make the project whole. The success of each project is dependent upon full funding of the MTIP request. We ask that JPACT give each proposal full consideration as projects are reviewed for MTIP funding.

Sincerely,

Lonnie Roberts, Chair
East Multnomah County Transportation Committee
April 9, 2003

Mr. Rod Park, Chairman
JPACT
Metro Regional Center
600 N.E. Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Re: Murray Boulevard Extension

Dear Chairman Park:

On April 4, 2003, I sent you and other interested parties a letter summarizing the City of Beaverton’s rationale for MTIP funding of the Murray Boulevard extension from Scholls Ferry Road to Barrows Road (at Walnut Street). On the City’s behalf, we asked JPACT substitute that project for the City’s Farmington Road/Murray Boulevard intersection improvement project for inclusion on the 150% cut list.

Since that April 4 letter was prepared, several additional, significant events have occurred, lending even greater support for MTIP funding of the Murray extension project. These include:

1. The residential/open space/infrastructure plans for the Murray-Scholls Town Center have been formally and unanimously approved by the Beaverton Planning Commission and Board of Design Review. These plans will involve an environmental restoration of Summer Creek, an extensive wetlands enhancement, as well as converting into a community amenity the very deep hole left from years of excavation at the Progress Quarry. It is notable that the Planning Commission and Board of Design Review approvals came after extensive public hearings but without any meaningful negative comment. At the Planning Commission hearings, four members of the public spoke; none asked that the project be denied. At the Design Review hearing, no one from the public spoke in opposition.

In approving the Concept Plan and subdivision for the Town Center, our Planning Commissioners praised the plan for its innovation, its attention to environmental values and its pedestrian-friendly approach to circulation within the plan area.
As I noted in my April 4 letter, the Concept Plan's creative re-location of Barrows Road into the midst of the Town Center not only provides access (and a Town Center entry) to the future mixed-use commercial area but also allows for the existing Barrows right-of-way be used for restoration of Summer Creek and the establishment of a linear park and regional trail system linkage. The Planning Commission specifically found that the Concept Plan very closely implemented the aspirational plan for the Murray-Scholls Town Center. Both Planning Commission and City staff found this to be a remarkable achievement in light of the many topographical, infrastructure and environmental issues associated with the former quarry property.

2. As part of the Planning Commission's consideration of the Concept Plan, the General Manager of the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District provided a written statement indicating that THPRD staff has reviewed the plans for the linear park and freshwater lake, which will be created from the existing 160' deep quarry pit. Based upon that review, the THPRD staff has recommended to the THPRD Board that THPRD accept a dedication of these areas as public park facilities. Please note that THPRD currently has no outdoor aquatic activity locations, making the Town Center lake the first. The lake will serve multiple purposes, including its function as an aquifer recharge facility for the City.

3. At the April 7, 2003 Washington County Coordinating Committee meeting, the City specifically raised the issue of prioritizing funding for the Murray extension, consistent with my April 4, 2003 letter. After considering the City's comments, the Coordinating Committee endorsed the position expressed in my April 4 letter.

From a policy and planning standpoint, Metro, with the City of Beaverton's wholehearted support, has promoted the development of regional town centers. The Murray-Scholls Town Center is among the first regional town center projects which has taken a previously undeveloped (and pretty unattractive) piece of property and turned it into a project that has met widespread community and public agency support. If the region is to be truly supportive of these types of town center projects, the region should provide a share of infrastructure costs which allow such town center projects to become realities.

In the case of the Murray-Scholls Town Center, the residential developer has agreed to shoulder the entire infrastructure cost for the wetlands enhancement, the environmental restoration, the linear park, the lake, the relocation of Barrows Road, and the balance of the Town Center infrastructure (other than for the commercial area).
Mr. Rod Park, Chairman
JPACT
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland OR 97232-2736

Dear Chairman Park:

This letter is to request that the City of Beaverton’s MTIP application for the extension of Murray Blvd. from Scholls Ferry Road to Barrows Road (at Walnut Street) be substituted for our Farmington Road/Murray Blvd. intersection improvement project that TPAC ranked within the 150 percent cut list. There are three highly significant reasons for this request:

1. The Murray Blvd. extension is key to the Progress Quarry Planned Unit Development (PUD) currently being reviewed by the City. The proposal is for a 110-acre development consisting of 340 individually owned town homes, 204 carriage flats, and 202 apartment units with associated improvements, a 20-acre potential commercial area, a lake, a linear park, and an enhanced Summer Creek and associated wetlands and grove. Development of the Murray/Scholls Town Center is critical to the City’s and the region’s ability to achieve the 2040 Growth Concept. The Progress Quarry PUD fulfills the 2040 Growth Concept goals of the Murray/Scholls Town Center Plan.

2. The design of the Murray Blvd. extension includes a bridge over Summer Creek (currently a marginalized drainage ditch) that achieves a high level of wetland and wildlife enhancement. The bridge is an arch-type span of five 20-foot concrete arches on strip footings that allow for the free flow of water through the structure and a natural bottom in the arches, which allows fish and wildlife to pass through safely. Moreover, to minimize impacts to the existing wetland area and Summer Creek, the Progress Quarry applicant proposes to move the Barrows Road alignment north of its existing location. Restoration and enhancement of the old road right-of-way and the Creek and wetlands, as well as creation of a “green space” corridor and Linear Park are integral to the development plan. The quarry site also contains a steep depression resulting from the previous mining operation, which the applicant has proposed to be made into a forested lake amenity for the public. A Significant Tree Grove located at the northwest corner of the project site is also enhanced.
3. The Murray Blvd. extension has been planned since the 1980s. In 1986, the City of Tigard, the City of Beaverton, and Washington County entered into an Urban Planning Area Agreement that identified the Murray Blvd. extension as a required road improvement to be constructed after completion of Roy Rogers Road (Beef Bend/Elsner). The Roy Rogers Road improvement is complete, and the opportunity to take the next step is now.

Polygon Northwest Company, developer of the Progress Quarry site, has committed a private contribution of 25 percent of the total project cost. This contribution will result in a local overmatch that reduces the federal request to only 65 percent of the total. Washington County supports this proposed project and has committed to providing one-half of the local match for the project should the federal funding be secured. The City of Beaverton will provide the remaining half.

It is consideration of these critical Administrative Factors that compels me to submit this request. This is truly a “once in a lifetime” opportunity.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Rob Drake,
Mayor

cc: Washington County Coordinating Committee Members
Andy Cotugno, Director of Planning, Metro
DATE: April 9, 2003

TO: MPAC, JPACT, Metro Council and Interested Parties

FROM: Ted Leybold, Principal Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Calculation of Intersection Delay for the 10th Avenue (Hillsboro) Road Modernization project

* * * * * * *

TPAC, in their recommendation of April 3rd, directed Metro staff to work with the City of Hillsboro to review the technical score of the 10th Avenue road modernization project (E Main to Baseline) with regard to additional information on how the project addresses congestion. Following is a summary of the analysis provided by a consultant to the City of Hillsboro, Mr. Randy McCourt of DKS Associates.

As explained in Attachment 1, intersection level analysis uses a different methodology than the system wide methodology used by Metro to calculate the impact of a project on congestion. Both methodologies have strengths and weaknesses in calculating the measure of congestion: vehicle hours of delay.

Recognizing this, Metro staff will discuss with TPAC the possibility of incorporating intersection level analysis of congestion for the next iteration of the Transportation Priorities process. We do not recommend, however, attempting to adjust the technical score of the 10th Avenue project at this time, given that this methodology was not adopted prior to the application process and was not made available to other road modernization projects.

Metro staff does recommend that JPACT and the Metro Council consider adding the 10th Avenue project to the 150% list. This recommendation is based on:

- recognition that the current methodology does not capture all of the potential reduction in congestion that a targeted intersection improvement may provide and that the supplemental analysis provided does indicate a reduction in congestion not captured by the existing methodology

- that application of the supplemental intersection analysis congestion relief to the existing technical score methodology would have elevated this project to the top tier of technically ranked projects
• the project directly meets the policy direction of the Transportation Priorities program of investing in and leveraging economic development in centers

• the project has other important qualitative benefits such as prior regional commitment of funding preliminary engineering and right-of-way, the multi-modal benefit of alleviating conflicts with light rail operations and serving large Hispanic and low-income populations.
Dear Mr. Leybold:

Here is an alternative methodology and the numbers that go with it for the 10th Avenue project in Hillsboro. The data I gave you before was primarily focused on the right turn movements ONLY (southbound on 10th at Baseline). I have thought about how to keep a methodology simple enough to be replicated for all projects in the future and be useful for this project right now. As you know, the Metro effectiveness measures (both operational and cost) have trouble with smaller spot improvements that may not reflect intersection operational issues, but assesses the lack of link capacity. Using an analogy it is sort of like a water pipe with a value - the EMME/2 tool is like a flow meter in the pipe measuring the pipe capacity - addressing the friction or constriction in capacity. Where as the intersection analysis measures the flow at a point – or at the value – indicating how much flow gets through the intersection. It may be desirable to have both measures (the EMME/2 “pipe” and the intersection analysis “value”) to consider in the evaluation – retaining the current EMME/2 approach and adding an intersection measure. Since each TSP evaluates just about every signalized intersection – the TSP background data would be the source for the intersection part. I have outlined a methodology below and the application for 10th/Baseline.

Methodology

Identify the signalized intersections along the limits of the proposed project improvement. Obtain from the TSP the existing, future unimproved and future mitigated intersection capacity calculations for each of the signalized intersections within the limits of the proposed improvement. Take the HCM intersection delay value and subtract 35 seconds (the boundary of LOS D conditions where below this level it is assumed to be normal conditions and above this level is where queuing becomes an issues and is considered to be – for most people - delay). Multiply the number of total vehicles entering the intersection by the difference between the intersection delay less 35 seconds. This value (in vehicle hours) would be the comparable to the 2000VHD for intersections. A similar calculation would be performed for the future unimproved and mitigated conditions. This calculation would be performed for every intersection within the limits of the proposed improvement. All the intersections would be then averaged to produce a project intersection delay value in vehicle hours. For example if there were five intersections and four were at LOS C or better and one was E with 25 vehicle hours of delay – the project intersection delay value would be 5 vehicles hours ( (25+0+0+0+0) / 5 intersections).

Application at 10th Avenue

For 10th Avenue, only the intersection of 10th/Baseline has conditions above an average delay of 35 seconds/vehicle (in both the 2002 existing and future TSP scenario). Utilizing data from the Hillsboro TSP – the existing condition is 3.7 VHD – so with three signalized intersections within the project limits that would be 1.2 VHD. For the future the vehicle hours of delay are substantially higher. The future condition would be 240 VHD – with three intersections would be 80 VHD. The right turn lane would reduce the project value by 24 VHD in the future. A future phase of improvements to the 10th/Baseline intersection that provides double northbound left turn lanes would reduce the project value by an additional 52 VHD.
Let me know if you have any questions. You can consider this approach or the one that we did earlier for John (focusing only on the right turn movement). This approach is pretty simple, very repeatable and utilizes information from the TSPs which should always be readily available for other project.

Randy McCourt

Ramsford S. McCourt, PE, PTOE
DKS Associates
1400 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97201
(503) 243-3500
FAX (503) 243-1934

rsm@dksassociates.com
MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 20, 2003
TO: Chair Rod Park and JPACT Committee Members
FROM: Paul Slyman, Deputy Director
RE: Consequences of Air Quality Designations

At this month’s JPACT meeting, a question came up about the consequences to communities that fail to meet the national air quality standards. This memo provides an overview of this issue.

Beginning with the basics, the Clean Air Act requires EPA to set standards for six common air pollutants: carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, ground level ozone, particulate matter and lead. These standards are set at the levels necessary to protect human health. Air quality is tested across the nation and areas that exceed the specified thresholds are designated as not attaining the air quality standard. Such “nonattainment” areas are obligated to develop and implement attainment plans that reduce emissions to achieve the standard in the future. (Areas are granted varying amounts of time to achieve the standard according to the severity of their air quality problems.)

NONATTAINMENT AREAS

Nonattainment areas have a lot of flexibility to decide how to reduce emissions; however certain requirements apply to all. The most notable are:

- New or expanding industries must install the highest level of pollution control equipment regardless of cost—LAER or Lowest Achievable Emission Rate.
- New or expanding industries must “offset” their emission increases with even greater reductions of the same pollutant (from other sources).
- Transportation conformity rules require that transportation plans be aligned with air quality plans before new highways are approved.

Any area that fails to adopt or implement an adequate plan for attaining the air quality standard is subject to the harshest provisions of the clean air act: 2 to 1 offsets for new or expanding industry, withholding of an area’s federal grants for transportation, or both. Fortunately, the prospect of 2 to 1 offsets or sanctioned highway funds no longer threatens Oregon communities since all have EPA-approved attainment plans in place.

Nonattainment areas in Oregon are:

Carbon Monoxide: Salem-Keizer

Particulate Matter: Grants Pass, Klamath Falls, Medford/Ashland, Lakeview, La Grande, Oakridge and Eugene/Springfield
Ozone: Salem (Unclassified Area—attainment plan not required)

MAINTENANCE AREAS

After an area achieves an air quality standard, it is eligible to be redesignated to attainment. One requirement for redesignation is for the area to adopt a maintenance plan that ensures the area will continue to meet air quality requirements for ten years into the future. Advantages of redesignation are:

- Emission control requirements for new and expanding industry are reduced from LAER to (the less costly) BACT (Best Achievable Control Technology).
- Emission offset requirements are reduced for new and expanding industry.
- Maintenance plans can often be written to provide an “industrial growth allowance” to facilitate economic prosperity.
- The area avoids the risk of being “bumped up” to a more serious degree of nonattainment in the event of future air quality violations.
- There is no deadline to submit a redesignation request and no penalty for failing to do so, except for continuation of nonattainment requirements.

Oregon areas redesignated to attainment (maintenance areas) are:


Ozone: Portland

OTHER

One aspect of the Clean Air Act’s requirements—transportation conformity—changes little with redesignation. The conformity rules dictate that emissions produced by a highway system be reconciled with the pollution anticipated by an area’s air quality plan before new projects can proceed. These requirements apply to nonattainment areas and maintenance areas alike.

Similarly, both nonattainment and maintenance areas qualify for additional transportation funding under the Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality (CMAQ) program. However, the amount of funding granted increases according to the severity of a community’s air quality problem. The most polluted areas receive 75% more CMAQ funding than those that succeeded in being redesignated to attainment. At this year’s January meeting, JPACT discussed how this creates a disincentive to remedy air quality problems. As a result, the committee modified its recommendations for reauthorization of the transportation bill and urged that disadvantageous treatment for areas with improved air quality be discontinued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Busse</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUREL WENTWORTH</td>
<td>CITY OF PORTLAND - PDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Roberts</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Monroe</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Papsdorf</td>
<td>Cities of Mult. Co. (Gresham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Appelhueser</td>
<td>The Oregonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Wortberg</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hiat</td>
<td>Port of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wiebe</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewel Kitchell-Bayuk</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Roux</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Clark</td>
<td>CITY OF MILWAUKIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Cowan</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE SATTERLIE</td>
<td>City of Wilsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kloster</td>
<td>MILWAUKIE - PORTLAND LIGHT RAIL COALITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Orneus</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Markgraf</td>
<td>OHSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Ostrom</td>
<td>Cong. Blumensala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ande Young</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Parks</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil McFarlane</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Drake</td>
<td>Cities of Washington Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Hosticka</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Lem arrang</td>
<td>Clarkacmas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Van Sickel</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Haverkamp</td>
<td>Citay Multi Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Proemore</td>
<td>Clark Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Heidbreche</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Lockingbill</td>
<td>RTC (alternate for Vancouver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wagner</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie Lakecene</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karon Roush</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Burkholder</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Freniere</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Rogers</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Z Bird</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob McUnited</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Seskin</td>
<td>PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Meyer</td>
<td>City of Cornelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gott</td>
<td>City of Cornelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Ellis</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Selinger</td>
<td>TRIMET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Trum-Bean</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Newman</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Schilling</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Rejo de Jeffrey</td>
<td>MULTCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg S. Evensen</td>
<td>Portland Parks &amp; Rec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>