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MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

DATE: Thursday, October 9, 2003

TIME: 7:15 a.m.

PLACE: Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

7:15 Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum Councilor Park, Chair
7:15 * Review of Minutes Councilor Park, Chair
7:20 Citizen communications to TPAC on non-agenda items Councilor Park, Chair
7:25 * Resolution No. 03-3373 Endorsing the Recommendations of the Powell/Foster Corridor Plan - APPROVAL REQUESTED Bridget Wieghart (Metro)
7:50 TriMet Transit Service Development Report - INFORMATIONAL Ken Zatarain (TriMet)
8:10 OTIA III Freight Allocation – INFORMATIONAL Andy Cotugno (Metro)
8:30 Texas Transportation Institute – What does it mean? INFORMATIONAL Richard Brandman (Metro)
9:00 ADJOURN Councilor Park, Chair

* Material available electronically. Please call 503-797-1916 for a paper copy
** Not all material on this agenda item is available electronically.
# Material provided at meeting.

All material will be available at the meeting.
MEMBERS PRESENT | AFFILIATION
---|---
Rod Park | Metro Council
Matthew Garrett | Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)
Fred Hansen | TriMet
Rob Drake | City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Carl Hosticka | Metro Council
Maria Rojo de Steffey | Multnomah County
Bill Wyatt | Port of Portland
Karl Rohde | City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Rex Burkholder | Metro Council
Roy Rogers | Washington County
Jim Francesconi | City of Portland

MEMBERS ABSENT | AFFILIATION
---|---
Stephanie Hallock | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Bill Kennemer | Clackamas County
Royce Pollard | City of Vancouver
Craig Pridemore | Clark County
Don Wagner | Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

ALTERNATES PRESENT | AFFILIATION
---|---
Martha Schrader | Clackamas County
Paul Slyman | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Dean Lookingbill | SW Washington RTC
Mary Legry | Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

GUESTS PRESENT | AFFILIATION
---|---
Phil Selinger | TriMet
Olivia Clark | TriMet
Dick Feeney | TriMet
John Russell | Oregon Transportation Commission
Robin McArthur | Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)
John Wiebke | City of Hillsboro
Dick Jones | MCCI
Mark Rohden | TriMet
Steve Clark | Community Newspapers
Rick Metsger | Oregon Senate
Kay Van Sickel | OTAK
Robin McKnight | Parsons Brinckerhoff
Ron Papsdorf | City of Gresham
John Rist | Clackamas County
I. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Park called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 7:19 a.m.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES

ACTION TAKEN: Mayor Rob Drake and Commissioner Roy Rogers seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of August 12, 2003. The motion passed.

III. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO JPACT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no citizen communications.

IV. RTP UPDATE

Mr. Tom Kloster presented the RTP Update (included as part of this meeting record).

Ms. Kim Ellis presented the RTP Calendar and Timeline (included as part of this meeting record).

Chair Rod Park asked Tom Kloster to comment on the reasons for a singular model run.

Mr. Tom Kloster stated that during the 2000 RTP amendment process there was a total of six models runs (consisting of six-weeks and $15,000 to $20,000 in staff time and resources per run) completed by the end of the process. He said that in usual model runs consists of testing new ideas that come from all of the jurisdictions. However, during this RTP Update, the majority of the projects are either located in the present RTP or are coming from plans adopted by local jurisdictions. He further stated that the amount of population employment that is being added onto the new horizon year would be roughly served by the preferred list of projects. Therefore, there is not a dramatic difference between the two. In conclusion he said that during the past couple of years, there has been additional analysis completed on critical corridors and adopted new projects. Those projects will also be included in the model run as well.
Ms. Kim Ellis concurred and further stated that conformity analysis is required when the MTIP is adopted. She also stated that with the requirement to adopt the RTP update, there would need to be an additional conformity analysis completed and finally, federal law requires the MTIP to be reconformed after a RTP final adoption. Therefore, they are proposing to combine the three-conformity analysis's into one, which would result in savings to time and money.

Councilor Rex Burkholder asked if staff was comfortable with the constrained timing of the final federal approval.

Ms. Kim Ellis replied that staff believes they have allowed enough time and are confident that because it consists of a majority of minor changes, it should conform.

Councilor Karl Rohde stated that this update was strictly housekeeping and that jurisdictions should resist the attempt to do substantive changes.

Mr. Tom Kloster concurred and said that they would beginning a major RTP update within the next year which would then incorporate major changes and all remaining issues that would not be addressed with this update.

Commissioner Roy Rogers asked for clarification of coordination of regional funding initiatives specifically concerning the layout of projects in each of the Financially Constrained RTP, the Priority System RTP or the Preferred System of the RTP.

Mr. Tom Kloster replied that the Financially Constrained RTP was large enough to encompass around $1.2 billion worth of projects. He further stated that if a jurisdiction has a project they would like to bring forward that is not included in the Financially Constrained RTP, then an RTP amendment could be completed.

Commissioner Roy Rogers commented that the Financially Constrained RTP seems very large.

Mr. Tom Kloster replied that the Preferred RTP contains approximately $4.7 billion of projects.

Mr. Fred Hansen asked how certain was the flow of money in the revenue forecasts.

Mr. Tom Kloster replied that the state revenue forecasts include past assumes continuation of past successes for the last ten to fifteen years.

Mr. Richard Brandman further stated that the revenue forecasts also include an additional five years of federal funds.

Councilor Karl Rohde asked if the additional revenue from the increase of the payroll tax was included in the revenue forecast.

Mr. Ted Leybold stated that the increase of the payroll tax is for current and expanding operations and not new capital facilities.
VI. OTIA III – LOCAL BRIDGE SOLICITATION

Mr. Paul Mather presented OTIA III solicitation process (included as part of this meeting record).

Mr. Fred Hansen asked if the projects were for replacement and/or reinforcement of bridges.

Mr. Paul Mather replied that the projects are replacement of bridges to include safety and seismic features. He stated that for example, Douglas County had 80 bridges on the interest list and 31 of those bridges will be replaced.

Mr. Paul Mather also stated that the average age of Oregon bridges is 50 to 100 years. However, the particular design used for the bridges built between 1947 and 1961 contained a design flaw regarding shear force in the beams and therefore the bridges are only lasting 50 to 60 years.

VII. APPROPRIATIONS LETTER

Mr. Richard Brandman presented the Appropriations Letter (included as part of this meeting record).

Mr. Bill Wyatt referred to an article that was printed in the Oregonian and stated that it says that the Channel Deepening Project is not a part of the President's budget. He concurred and further stated that it has not been in the President's budget for the last 11 years, which is the case for approximately 1/3 of the water projects that occur in the county every year. However, the Oregon/Washington/Idaho congressional delegation members have consistently found the money to support water projects. He said that there is no water project in the President's budget that does not have a record of decision. He said that the Channel Deepening Project does not yet have a decision but one should be coming within the next two weeks. He said that it is challenging to speculate 7 to 8 years in the future as to what appropriations may be. However, the level of congressional interest in funding tends to go up as the project clears additional hurdles. He concluded that in the past, they have never received a mark on the House Energy and Water Committee, however they did this year right after the States of Oregon and Washington issued their certifications and other local permits.

Commissioner Martha Schrader stated that they are asking for $1 million on Sunrise Corridor.

Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffy stated that their request was for $1 million and not $500 million.

Mr. Bill Wyatt stated that the Port of Portland would appreciate a sentence concerning the level of appropriations.

V. TRANSPORTATION FINANCE DISCUSSION

A. LEGISLATIVE RECAP

Senator Metsger accord thanks for the support he has received from the JPACT members and their lobbying efforts in successfully moving House Bill 2041 to the
Governor's desk for signature. He said that when he and Senator Starr were discussing the year's goals that they had wanted to see accomplished, they realized that they were able to accomplish each one of their goals. He said that there were two additional transportation bills he wanted to discuss with the JPACT members and one of those was House Bill 2661. He said that the bill included many aspects. One minor aspect was the increase of speed limits from 65 mph to 70 mph on certain parts of the interstate. A more major of the bill was the change to the statutes or state of authority that Oregon Department of Transportation has been trying to see addressed for the last three sessions. He explained that there are literally thousands of tickets that are dismissed because the statutes do not adequately address the designated speed limits.

The second bill Senator Metsger addressed concerned ODOT infrastructure and making it more efficient for taxpayers as well as the growing desire to have a partnership between the private sector and the public sector. He said that the House made a decision to combine this bill with House Bill 2661. He further stated that it would allow private companies to go under contract with ODOT to develop new products that could be done more efficiently and more cost effectively. Further, to begin a partnership with ODOT to produce some of the components for ODOT's work in the State of Oregon. He further stated that it is a good incentive for small businesses where they come up with a better idea to some of the things ODOT does, on a partner level in case the products become marketable outside of the State of Oregon. Senator Metsger acknowledged the passage of House Bill 3183, which was amended to include the payroll tax for TriMet. He concluded by stating that he looks forward to the next session.

Councilor Karl Rohde stated that since the recent funding of OTIA has been the first in a 10-year period and is still not enough. He further stated that there needs to be more discussion of what can be accomplished next.

Senator Metsger replied that in the past there had been a different view of transportation needs. OTIA I, II, III, and what may come in the next session, are funds that have to fix ten years of past problems. He said that he and other members of legislature in both the House and the Senate are committed to continuing the flow of funds for transportation needs.

Mr. Matthew Garrett accorded thanks to Senator Metsger for his success in achieving OTIA III. He then acknowledged that the maintenance funds included in OTIA III had been the first money in several years that will glow to local governments to assist them with basic maintenance.

Councilor Karl Rohde accorded thanks to the League of Oregon Cities for their assistance in the passage of the House Bill 2041.

Senator Metsger stated that House Bill 2041 will mean many more contracts will be written and he said that ODOT will be looking to hire at least 18 more contract writers for OTIA III so that the projects are not slowed down on the basis of contract delay. He also said that this year the House acknowledged that there were transportation needs that needed to be addressed which made the passage of
the bill easier. In addition, the confidence that the public has in Bruce Warner as well as his strong leadership qualities contributed to the success as well.

Chair Rod Park stated that the OTIA packages fund a ten-year program. However, reminded the committee that there is still an additional need for funding.

Senator Metsger stated that the first priority for the legislature was the bridge problem, which totals more than $4.8 billion of need and it was important that it be addressed. He also said that they would be evaluating modernization, preservation, and maintenance needs next.

Chair Rod Park accorded thanks to Senator Metsger for his leadership and further thanked the members of JPACT for their assistance as well. He also commented that it is important to acknowledge that the Portland Metro region important for economic development and the regional formula for allocation does not address that.

Senator Metsger said that there is an understanding in the legislature that industrial lands are directly linked to transportation and further that it would be appropriate for a large share of the economic development funds to end up in the Metro area.

B. TRIMET PAYROLL TAX – NEXT STEPS

Mr. Fred Hansen accorded thanks Senator Metsger for his direction concerning the payroll task. He also accorded thanks to Councilor Rod Park, Mayor Rob Drake and Commissioner Bill Kennemer for their support as well as Ms. Olivia Clark. He stated that the final step is for the TriMet Board to make their findings and adopt a process for implementing.

C. RECAP FLORIDA TRIP

Councilor Rod Park stated that the trip to Florida was constructive.

Mr. Richard Brandman said that it was instructive to learn how Miami was able to take a 2/1 defeat and turn it into 2/1 victory while understanding that Miami is different from Portland. For example, 50% of the population in Miami is foreign born and 80 to 90% of that foreign born are Cuban born. He said that their first approach was a 1-% sales tax, which would fund a large number of transportation projects as well as education, arts and health. That failed in July of 1999 because they did not have enough turn out. In January 2002 the Mayor of Miami/Dade County decided to try again and held forty workshops and summits to discuss what was needed. They decided to do 80 miles of rail extension; $15 million for bus; $200 million for sidewalks and arterials; and $500 million for major highways. They further decided that they would try for ½ cent sales tax with a single ballot issue; transportation. Because it was the 2002 general election there was major interest and they made sure, it was the first measure on the ballot.
Richard Brandman said that it was important to note that people who did not vote in the 1999 election, voted in the 2002 election.

Ms. Olivia Clark said that Miami was able to achieve success but reminded the committee that it was a different demographic with different politics and they spent $750,000 on the campaign. She further stated that the Mayor was able to compel agency staff to volunteer to run and work on the campaign. She also said that it was a very grassworks campaign and were able to demonstrate to the public why the transportation plan was needed and what dollar amounts would be spent.

Councilor Carl Hosticka asked how they counted votes.

Chair Rod Park stated that the voters were not required to mark a voter card, they worked with machines that reminded them when they had not voted. He further stated that the legalities of using agency staff did not arise there but might arise in this region.

Mr. Richard Brandman said that there was no resistance to the campaign and further stated that it never became an issue, even for the newspapers.

D. TRANSPORTATION FINANCE TASK FORCE - NEXT STEPS

Mr. Richard Brandman stated the agenda for the next Transportation Finance Task Force included a discussion determining if the region is right to go to election in November 04 or postpone to a future date as well as what is the right mix of projects.

E. ACT UPDATE/DISCUSSION WITH OTC

Councilor Rex Burkholder stated that different JPACT members have been meeting to discuss the request by the OTC that there be an ACT created for the Metro region which would involve more people. He said that the discussion included how JPACT saw their relationship with the OTC and how JPACT fit within ACT guidelines. He said that he recently spoke with the OTC and that they expressed strong concerns with current boundaries and current members. He said that they are concern with areas outside the metro district boundary that are currently not represented. Further, he said that the OTC expressed concern regarding non-profit advocacy groups and the business community not having a voice at JPACT. He concluded by stating that there is obviously more discussion that needs to take place to address the concerns of the OTC regarding membership and geographic coverage.

Commissioner John Russell said that one specific examples of a project they had not represented by JPACT or an ACT was the Jackson School Road interchange. He said that clearly that area is within Metro's sphere of influence. He further stated that the OTC would like those areas outside of the Metro boundary such as Candy, Estacada and North Plains to be included in discussions because they are areas highly influenced by decisions made within Metro's boundary. He said that
it is important that geographic boundaries include the metro sphere of influence. He further stated that for the purpose of allocation of funds it is important to include non-profit organizations and business organizations a voice as well.

Mr. Steve Clark said congratulated JPACT for its agreement in wanting to become an ACT but said that the stakeholder involvement remains unfulfilled. He said that an ACT’s activity includes all aspects of governmental, economic and public leadership. He said that he would like to see a Task Force created that could make a recommendation and advise whether or not JPACT should be the act; whether the ACT should include JPACT; and how to incorporate those areas that fall outside of the Metro boundary. He said that with the current poor economy there is a sense of urgency to create an ACT and to incorporate the right stakeholders. He said that Chair Foster and Commissioner Russell would not like the request for a Task Force come from the OTC, but that JPACT and other stakeholders made a reasonable effort to engage in an urgent discussion. He said that as Chair of the Portland Business Alliance, he would hope that JPACT takes that consideration seriously.

Mr. Fred Hansen expressed his concerns regarding the sphere of influence of the Portland Metro Region specific to those areas in Region 1 that do not relate to the region. He further asked where the sphere of influence boundaries would be drawn.

Commissioner John Russell stated that the NW ACT includes western Washington County so there would need to be further discussion on changing regional boundaries.

Commissioner Roy Rogers stated that a Washington County ACT for example would be the larger than any other in the state. He said that population wise there are over half a million people in Washington County alone and they have very different views of what is important. When does an Act become too large of a forum? He said that JPACT is forum that most readily fits the need for parts of Washington County but it may not be the forum that North plains or Cornelius would chose to participate in. He expressed his concern with the doughnut problem but admitted that he does not know how it could be resolved with the diverse interests of the parties involved.

Commissioner John Russell stated that there is not a perfect solution however the OTC believes that the current system is less perfect than they would like. He further stated that those cities that are in the Metro sphere of influence should be included in discussions.

Commissioner Roy Rogers stated that JPACT acted in good faith and took a step forward to act as an ACT. He furthered stated that it may be difficult to address the doughnut approach and based upon discussions; there may not be an alternative or a solution for a Metropolitan ACT.
Councilor Karl Rohde expressed concern as to how additional members would be selected and wondered how one determines whether the Business Alliance for 1000 Friends would be able to represent the rest of the stakeholder groups.

Mr. Fred Hansen stated that continued dialogue is important and suggested continuing the ACT discussion meetings.

Councilor Larry Haverkamp expressed his concern that members of the business communities are not "responsible" for the public because they are not elected and are not required to answer to the community.

Chair Rod Park stated that the metro region is unique and that it's elected officials work as partners with their jurisdictions.

IX. TRANSIT SERVICE DEVELOPMENT – PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

The Presentation on transit service development was delayed until the October 9, 2003 meeting.

X. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Park adjourned the meeting at 9:14 a.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Renee Castilla
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING
THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
POWELL/FOSTER CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION PLAN

RESOLUTION NO. 03-3373
Introduced by Councilor Rod Park

WHEREAS, on August 10, 2000 the Metro Council adopted Metro’s 2000 Regional Transportation (RTP) Update with the intent to adopt subsequent amendments from specific outstanding corridor studies; and

WHEREAS, the 2000 RTP, adopted by ordinance, together with portions of the 1996 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan serve as the regional Transportation System Plan (“TSP”) required by the state Transportation Planning Rule and the Regional Metropolitan Transportation Plan required by federal law; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule requires metropolitan planning agencies to identify areas where refinement planning is required to develop needed transportation projects and programs not included in the TSP; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 6.7.6 of the RTP lists specific corridors where a transportation need has been identified but a major corridor planning study is needed to determine the function, mode and general location of an improvement before a project can be fully defined for implementation;

WHEREAS, on July 19, 2001 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 01-3089 for the purpose of endorsing the findings and recommendations of the Corridor Initiative Project which identified a work program for completion of the corridor refinement plans; and

WHEREAS, on June 27, 2002 the Metro Council adopted Ordinance number 02-946A amending the RTP to incorporate the corridor refinement work program; and

WHEREAS, due to the current and anticipated growth and congestion and the need to provide transportation access to support the 2040 Plan and urban expansion areas, that resolution identified the Powell/Foster Corridor as a priority for completion in the first planning period; and

WHEREAS, Metro received a Transportation Growth Management grant from the State of Oregon for the 2002-03 biennium which helped fund Phase I of the Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Phase I refinement planning has been completed with involvement by Multnomah and Clackamas counties, the Cities of Portland and Gresham, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and TriMet; and

WHEREAS, the jurisdictions participated in a technical advisory committee and project management group which reviewed the corridor existing conditions, needs and preliminary transportation alternatives, and developed the Phase I plan recommendations; and
WHEREAS, the project included a significant public involvement program as further outlined in the staff report to this resolution; and

WHEREAS, Metro has coordinated extensively with the various land use and transportation planning efforts in the corridor as described in the staff report to this resolution; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit “A” of this resolution contains key findings and recommendations from Phase I of the Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan and outlines specific subsequent actions for planning and project development work (“next steps”); now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,
1. That the Phase I Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan Recommendations (Exhibit A) are hereby approved and adopted as a program for additional project development and planning work in the corridor; and
2. That Metro Council directs staff to prepare amendments to the RTP in accordance with the Phase I Recommendations; and
3. That Metro Council directs staff to initiate Phase II of the Powell/Foster Corridor Plan and to work with other jurisdictions to implement appropriate local plan amendments and additional planning and project development efforts as outlined in the Recommendations.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ______ day of ________, 2003.

__________________________
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

__________________________
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney
1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document presents recommendations for Phase I of the Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Corridor Transportation Plan based on results of a process that evaluated various multi-modal (transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian) improvements.

1.1 Project Background

The Powell/Foster Corridor represents both a key transportation challenge and an opportunity to meet 2040 regional land use goals. Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identifies the Powell/Foster as a top priority among corridor requiring refinement plans. Despite policy changes to level-of-service standards that permit greater levels of congestion, significant multi-modal improvements will be needed in order to continue to serve transportation needs of the communities and industrial areas in southeast Portland and Gresham. The corridor is also critical to providing access to the planned growth areas in Damascus, Springwater and Pleasant Valley that have recently been added to the Urban Growth Boundary.

1.2 Study Process

In the fall of 2002, Metro commenced a Phase I Corridor Transportation Plan. The purpose of Phase I was to define and preliminarily evaluate an initial range of multi-modal alternatives that will accommodate the 2020 corridor travel demand in a way that supports the 2040 Concept Plan. The Cities of Portland and Gresham, Multnomah and Clackamas counties, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and TriMet partnered with Metro in this planning effort. The planning effort was funded by a combination of Metro and State Transportation Growth Management Grant funds.

Some of the key criteria used to develop and evaluate alternatives were:

- Cost-effectiveness;
- Impacts to neighborhoods and the environment;
- Preservation of the through movement function of the alternatives;
- Safety; and
- Opportunities for access management

The details of the Plan goals and evaluation criteria, the multi-modal transportation alternatives studied, evaluation findings and preliminary cost estimates are available in the *Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan: Initial Alternatives Evaluation Report* (September 2, 2003). All study reports are available through Metro and will be posted on the Powell/Foster study webpage of Metro’s website (www.metro-region.org).
1.3 Organization of This Recommendation

This Phase I recommendation is organized by transportation mode and facility segment or route. Maps are provided for segments where various roadway capacity improvements were considered. For each segment or service, a brief summary of conclusions from the Phase I evaluation of alternatives is presented. More complete conclusions and rationale for the recommendations are contained in the Selection and Refinement of Multi-modal Improvements Report (September 16, 2003). The recommendations section describes projects or studies to address the transportation needs in the corridor. The next steps section outlines specific actions and responsibilities for implementing the recommendations.

Projects have been prioritized into three categories based on needs: short-term (within 0 to 5 years); intermediate-term (5 to 10 years); and long-term (10+ years). The actual scheduling for implementation will depend on individual jurisdictional decisions and the availability of funding.

2.0 ROADWAY RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Powell Boulevard

2.1.1 Powell Boulevard (Ross Island Bridge to I-205)

Summary Conclusion: Due to the built environment, excellent grid system of streets and numerous transit options, this portion of the corridor was not considered for roadway widening. However, the review of existing conditions and concerns raise through public outreach identified significant pedestrian, safety and urban design issues that need to be addressed in a more detailed study.

Recommendation: Develop and implement streetscape improvements to Powell Boulevard between the Ross Island Bridge and SE 50th Avenue. In the short term, a streetscape study should consider enhancements to the aesthetic environment and evaluation of pedestrian safety. It should also address specific issues identified by community members such as pedestrian crossing improvements at Powell Park and Cleveland High School, Creston Park and Creston School and SE Milwaukie, SE 17th and SE 39th Avenues. Pedestrian crossing improvements could include signalized intersections and raised medians.

Next Steps: The City of Portland Office of Transportation (PDOT), ODOT and Metro should consider amending the Financially Constrained RTP to include a streetscape plan of Powell Boulevard in the short-term led by PDOT. The plan will identify specific intersection modifications, pedestrian and transit facilities and aesthetic improvements. ODOT, TriMet, neighborhood associations and Metro will assist in this planning effort.

2.1.2 I-205/Powell Boulevard Interchange

Summary Conclusion: The intersection of SE 92nd Avenue and Powell Boulevard is already congested during peak periods. Lack of full turn movements is anticipated to cause severe traffic queues (to Division, Holgate, 82nd Avenue and extending onto the freeway itself) by 2020. Public
outreach found strong support for revising the restricted interchange movements at the Powell/I-205 interchange ramps.

**Recommendation:** In the short-term, design and construct improvements to allow full turn movements at the Powell Boulevard and I-205 interchange for construction in the short term. An I-205 ramp improvement study at Powell Boulevard and Foster Road is currently in the RTP.

**Next Steps:** Implement RTP (Priority System) Project No. 1164 to plan and design the interchange improvements. Amend the RTP to add a project for construction of the ramp improvements. Metro and ODOT should consider amending the RTP to advance the timing of both design and construction projects into the Financially Constrained System for completion in the short-term. ODOT should immediately lead a design study to evaluate modifications to the existing overpass with full access ramps to I-205. The study should also address impacts to the interchange influence area along Powell Boulevard, Division Street, and SE 92nd Avenue. PDOT, Multnomah County, TriMet and Metro should participate in this design effort.

2.1.3 **Powell Boulevard** (I-205 to SE 174th Avenue)

![Map of Powell Boulevard](image)

**Summary Conclusion:** The evaluation found that a three-lane option for Powell would exacerbate significant congestion problems on Powell and create major backups at intersections in this segment as well as west of I-205. It also spread traffic to neighborhood streets and created or worsened congestion problems on SE Holgate Avenue, SE 122nd, SE 136th, Division and Foster Road. Further, the overall costs of a three lane and a five-lane configuration on Powell were similar due to the need to provide extensive improvements on nearby streets to disperse traffic. Public outreach found significant support for widening Powell east of I-205, particularly by survey respondents in the area proposed for widening. The survey also found strong support for adding sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities and improving public transportation options.

**Recommendation:** Four through lanes are needed on Powell Boulevard throughout this segment. In the short term, conduct a project development study to determine the right-of-way requirements and general dimensions needed to support four traffic lanes, plus turn lanes where needed, as well as bike lanes and sidewalks.

The project development study should examine detailed needs and develop schematic designs that support multi-modal transportation needs and planned land uses in this segment. It should include
significant community input and address specific needs for turn lanes, lane widths, signals and other traffic control, bicycle facilities, pedestrian refuges, bus stops, stormwater management and access management.

The City of Portland and ODOT are responsible for jointly developing mechanisms for accommodating the right of way requirements for a five-lane cross-section, plus other modal improvement needs, consistent with applicable laws and regulations.

The project development study shall develop a phasing plan for construction of improvements. For the segment of Powell between I-205 and the intersection area of SE 122nd Avenue, any roadway construction project shall be designed to accommodate the planned cross-section and multi-modal needs. For the segment from SE 122nd to 162nd Avenues, alternative interim improvement approaches may be considered, subject to further specific needs analysis and compatible with the long-term planned street improvements.

Next Steps: Affirm RTP Project 2028: Powell Boulevard Improvements, a modernization project to widen Powell Boulevard to five lanes from I-205 to Gresham including sidewalks and bike lanes. PDOT, Metro and ODOT should consider amending the RTP to move Project No. 2028 into the Financially Constrained System. Create a separate RTP project for the project development study with a short-term time frame. Based on costs and timing of needs, the study will develop a phased construction schedule. PDOT and ODOT should lead the project development study, with the assistance of TriMet and Metro, to determine the improvements. Prior to the study, PDOT and ODOT shall determine mechanisms for accommodating right of way requirements.

2.1.4 Powell Boulevard (SE 174th Avenue to Burnside Street)

Summary Conclusion: The City of Gresham recently completed a schematic design for this segment. The design balances mobility and land use goals and has general community support.

Recommendation: Implement the City of Gresham’s schematic design for Powell Boulevard to prioritize standard street improvements and enhance neighborhood identity with additional transit and pedestrian amenities.

From the City of Gresham’s westerly city limit near SE 174th Avenue to SW Duniway Avenue, the Powell Boulevard five-lane cross section would be retained. Mid-block pedestrian crossings will be added west of SE 182nd Avenue and at SW Duniway Avenue. An intersection improvement including a westbound right turn lane will be added at the intersection of SE 182nd Avenue and Powell Boulevard. Bus pullouts are on Powell are recommended for this intersection. This area is also deemed a focal point where gateway treatments will be considered.

From SW Duniway Avenue to NW Birdsdale Avenue, three lanes are proposed with a raised landscaped median where access allows. Driveway access at NW Bryn Mawr Place will be realigned to create a new unsignalized intersection, to improve pedestrian crossing opportunities, and consolidate and improve bus stops.
From NW Birdsdale Avenue to NW Eastman Parkway, an imbalanced four-lane cross section is proposed with two westbound travel lanes, a center turn lane and one eastbound travel lane. Intersection improvements are proposed at NW Birdsdale Avenue. SW Towle Avenue is recommended as a transit focal point.

East of NE Eastman Parkway to Burnside, Powell Boulevard is currently five lanes. The schematic design maintains the existing cross section with recommended enhancements to promote community identity. Street lighting, street trees, on-street parking, transit stop improvements and center medians are all proposed at different intervals in effort to acknowledge Downtown Gresham, encourage future transit-oriented development, and provide safe transit and pedestrian access.

Next Steps: Prior to amending the RTP for Gresham’s portion of project #2028, Gresham and ODOT will work out the specifics of the recommendation under 2.1.4. The City of Gresham has received Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA) and local matching funding for this project. Over the next year, Gresham will review access management needs for the segment between Eastman and Hogan to extend the size and number of center medians, where possible, in order to provide a more pedestrian friendly environment in the downtown area. Final design will begin in 2004 and construction will be completed by 2008.

2.2 Foster Road

2.2.1 Foster Road (Powell Boulevard to I-205)

Summary Conclusion: The City of Portland has recently completed a streetscape plan for this area. The streetscape plan will help develop neighborhood identity, provide for better balance between modes and address safety issues.

Recommendation: Implement the City of Portland’s Inner Foster Transportation and Streetscape Plan which recommends a variety of urban design treatments throughout this segment.

Next Steps: Metro and the City of Portland should consider amending the Financially Constrained RTP project 1159 and 1162 descriptions to specifically refer to the improvements identified in the Inner Foster Streetscape Plan.

2.2.2 Foster Road (I-205 to Jenne Road)
Summary Conclusion: Additional lanes on Foster between SE 122nd and Jenne are needed to handle anticipated growth in Pleasant Valley and relieve congestion. The four-lane option between SE 122nd Avenue and Barbara Welch Road provided better mobility and was safer than either of the three lane options. In addition, cost and environmental effects were similar between the options. Foster Road between Barbara Welch and Jenne is more environmentally sensitive and topographically constrained and traffic demand is less in this portion of the segment so further evaluation of the lane configuration is appropriate.

Recommendation: Widen Foster Road to a four-lane section from SE 122nd Avenue to Barbara Welch Road and advance a range of alternatives to be studied in Phase II of the Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan from Barbara Welch Road to Jenne Road. The Phase II plan should consider the needs for, and feasibility of, various two to four-lane configurations east of Barbara Welch Road. Depending on more detailed analysis of the capacity needs and constraints, options may include consideration of combined bike/pedestrian facilities or alternative routes for portions of this segment.

Next Steps: Amend the RTP (Financially Constrained System) Project No. 7006 to revise the project description to widen Foster to four lanes from SE 122nd to SE Barbara Welch Road. A short-term planning study of Foster Road from SE Barbara Welch Road to Jenne Road should be completed to determine the appropriate cross section to meet roadway, transit, pedestrian and bike needs. Metro will lead this planning effort as part of the next phase of the Powell Foster Corridor Plan with participation from the City of Portland, ODOT, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties and TriMet. Depending on the outcome of the Phase II planning study, construction may be either intermediate or long term.

2.3 Other Roads

2.3.1 Jenne Road/New SE 174th Avenue (Powell Boulevard to Foster Road)
would enhance connectivity and significantly improve north south mobility throughout this portion of the region.

**Recommendation:** As part of Phase II of the Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan, complete a project development study of a new extension of SE 174th Avenue between Jenne and the future Giese Roads. The study may result in an amendment to planning documents to call for a new extension of SE 174th Avenue in lieu of widening Jenne Road to three lanes between Foster Road and Powell Boulevard.

Phase II would consider a new SE 174th Avenue that could be built as a minor arterial with a two-lane cross section between SE Giese and Jenne Roads with turning lanes and merging lanes where warranted, bike lanes, sidewalks and provision for future bus stops. In addition, the project development study would consider a range of configurations up to a four-lane cross section with turning lanes for SE 174th Avenue from the intersection of Jenne Road to Powell Boulevard. The Jenne Road/new SE 174th Avenue intersection could be realigned as a “T” design. Jenne Road would revert to a local street with minimal improvements over its existing condition.

It is recommended that a project development study for the new SE 174th Avenue roadway be initiated to: (1) determine the feasibility of a new roadway alignment in consideration of engineering issues and existing and planned residential subdivision development; (2) finalize cross section(s) and locate proposed right-of-way reservations; and (3) assess the feasibility of the new SE 174th Avenue as an infrastructure corridor to serve the Pleasant Valley development.

**Next Steps:** Metro, the City of Gresham and the City of Portland should consider amending the description of the Powell/Foster Corridor Refinement Plan in the RTP to include, in the short term, a Metro led study of the extension of SE 174th Avenue from Powell Boulevard to SE Giese Road. The study should develop conceptual designs and determine required right-of-way. The cities of Portland and Gresham, Multnomah County and TriMet would participate in this planning study. If appropriate, at the end of the study, Project No. 7016 (widening of Jenne to include bike/ped facilities and turn pockets) may be eliminated or modified and a new intermediate-term, RTP project added for construction of the SE 174th Avenue.

**2.3.2 Highland Drive and Pleasant View Drive/190th Avenue “Modified Couplet” (Powell Boulevard to Butler Road)**
Summary Conclusion: The RTP currently calls for a five-lane improvement on Highland and 190th. This study found that a modified three-lane couplet on Highland Avenue and Pleasant View Drive would provide the same overall capacity, while improving connectivity. The overall costs and impacts of the two options were similar.

Recommendation: Amend planning documents to call for a three-lane cross section on both Highland Drive and Pleasant View Drive. Highland Drive would be widened to accommodate three lanes (two lanes in the southbound direction and one lane in the northbound direction) with left turn pockets where needed, plus bike lanes and sidewalks. Pleasant View Drive would be widened to three-lanes (two-lanes in the northbound direction and one lane in the southbound direction) with left turn pockets where needed, plus bike lanes and sidewalks. The recommendation also includes the construction of a new bridge on Pleasant View across Johnson Creek and would advance the RTP five-lane roadway with sidewalks and bike lanes improvement on SE 190th Avenue between Highland Drive and Butler Road.

Next Steps: Amend RTP Project No. 2045: SE 190th Avenue/Highland Drive Improvements and RTP Project No. 7012: Highland Corridor Plan and substitute two intermediate term projects: Highland Drive Couplet and Pleasant View Drive Couplet from Powell Boulevard to SE 190th Avenue.

Next steps include initiating a refinement plan of the three-lane Highland Drive and Pleasant View Dr. design option as an element of the Phase II Corridor Plan. This refinement plan would need to address design, operational, and safety-related issues associated with this option as compared to the five-lane Highland Drive/190th Avenue. The refinement plan would also include development of a conceptual design for the modified couplet option, including the unconventional intersection of Highland Drive, Pleasant View Drive and 190th Avenue and locations for left turn accommodations and non-motorized facilities.

2.3.3 Butler Road/Towle Avenue (SE 190th Avenue to Powell Boulevard)
Summary Conclusion: The study found a need for more north-south capacity in this portion of the corridor. However, widening Butler Avenue and Towle Roads to four lanes does not address north-south mobility needs as well as the proposed extension of 174th Avenue between Jenne and Giese Roads. It is also more expensive and has greater impacts.

Recommendation: Affirm the RTP community street design designation and collector motor vehicle designation for affected sections of Butler Road and Towle Avenue. The Phase I corridor transportation study recommends a two-lane cross section with turn pockets where needed as well as bike lanes and sidewalks.

Widening Towle Avenue and Butler Road to a four-lane cross section may be considered in the future, based on forecasted growth in the Damascus area. If new growth projections produce significantly more travel demand in the area south of Pleasant Valley, then improvements to Butler Road and Towle Avenue will be revisited in Phase 2.

Next Steps: No Action. Affirm the existing status of RTP project (No. 7015) Towle/Eastman Corridor Plan.

2.3.4 SE 242nd Avenue (Palmquist Road to Highway 212)

Summary Conclusion: The study considered an option that would add turn pockets where needed to the current two-lane cross section as well as an option to widen the road to four lanes. Based on population and employment assumptions available at the time of this analysis, it appears that widening of SE 242nd to four lanes may not be needed.

Recommendation: Affirm the SE 242nd Avenue improvement in the RTP, which calls for reconstruction and widening of SE 242nd Avenue to three lanes from Highway 212 to the Multnomah County line. The Phase I corridor transportation study recommends a two-lane cross section with turn pockets, where needed, bike lanes and sidewalks.

Widening SE 242nd Avenue to a four-lane option may be considered in the future, based on Damascus and Springwater growth projections developed as part of the Concept Planning for those areas. If new growth projections developed during Concept Planning produce significantly more travel demand in this area, then improvements to SE 242nd Avenue and other north/south routes into Damascus will be revisited in Phase II.


2.3.5 Other North/South Routes Between Pleasant Valley and Damascus
Summary Conclusion: Land use planning in the Damascus area may result in a need for further analysis of north south routes in the Powell/Foster Corridor between Pleasant Valley and Damascus.

Recommendation: The Damascus Concept Planning will identify the need for additional transportation projects on north/south routes between Pleasant Valley and Damascus based on updated growth projections. This will include reaffirming the need and addressing the general location of the 190th Extension between SE 190th and Tillstrom Road, and SE 172nd. Damascus Concept Planning will include an evaluation of transportation system needs within Damascus and on roadways like SE 172nd Avenue, Foster Road, SE 242nd Avenue, and other north/south routes.

Next Steps: Based on the conclusions of the Damascus Concept Planning, Phase II of the Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Corridor Plan could affirm the need for the 190th Extension and evaluate costs, right-of-way, and alignment issues. In addition, Phase II would incorporate any improvement projects identified in the Damascus Concept Planning and further evaluate any outstanding issues (i.e. Engineering cost estimates, right-of-way impacts) on roadways north of Damascus.

3.0 TRANSIT RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Foster Road (Ross Island Bridge to Damascus Town Center)

Summary Conclusion: Because it links three town centers and would serve a strong ridership base west of SE 122nd Avenue, the Foster Rapid Bus demonstrated good transit ridership gains and fulfills an important need in a growth area.

Recommendation: Affirm the RTP designation of Foster Road as Rapid Bus. The roadway design concept should incorporate extended right turn pockets with queue bypass signals, far-side bus stop accommodations and traffic signal improvements. Furthermore, design and implementation of the Foster Rapid Bus should be timed to concur with residential and employment growth in Pleasant Valley and Damascus areas and in the context of TriMet's Transit Investment Plan covering all regional needs. TriMet will continue to incrementally improve service in the corridor as warranted by demand.

Next Steps: Metro and TriMet should reaffirm the RTP (Priority System) Project No. 1228. Overall capital improvements and implementation should take place in conjunction with growth in this ridership area.

3.2 Powell Boulevard (Ross Island Bridge to Highway 26)

Summary Conclusion: Powell Boulevard is an important transit corridor that is currently designated for Regional Bus service in the RTP. Because Division is designated for frequent bus service and the Gresham Regional Center is served by MAX, Powell Rapid Bus did not significantly increase ridership in the corridor.

Recommendation: Gresham is incorporating many transit elements and intersection design concepts in the Powell Boulevard Schematic Design Project. These will include many of the following: extended right turn pockets (allowing for their use as a transit queue-bypass lane), far-side bus stop
accommodations and traffic signal improvements (including transit priority). The same types of improvements should be developed in City of Portland as part of the project development study for Powell Boulevard from I-205 to SE 174th Avenue. These types of improvements enhance transit operations and reliability and are consistent with the RTP designation of Powell Boulevard as a Regional Bus Route. The improvements also allow for a future reconfiguration of existing transit services that could include Rapid Bus, when warranted.

Bus service “streamlining” is anticipated to continue on portions of Powell Boulevard, which will improve ridership levels. Improvements will include transit queue-bypass lanes, far-side bus stops and traffic signal pre-emption.

**Next Steps:** The cities of Gresham and Portland should continue to seek transportation system management (TSM) funding for enhancements to transit operations and reliability.

### 3.3 North-South Bus Service

**Summary Conclusion:** Based on analysis of a network that enhanced north south routes, significant improvements to bus services connecting employment areas in the Columbia Corridor, Pleasant Valley and Damascus town Centers and Gresham and Clackamas Regional Centers are warranted.

**Recommendation:** Phase I recommends improvement to north-south bus service connecting the Columbia Corridor with Pleasant Valley, Damascus and Clackamas Regional Center and routes connecting Gresham with Pleasant Valley and Damascus. Several of these cross-town routes studied in Phase I performed well in the regional transportation model and would provide an important element in the overall transportation strategy serving these future growth areas.

Long-range transit plans for the Columbia Corridor, East Multnomah County, Gresham, Pleasant Valley and Damascus should recognize the importance of high quality north-south transit connections serving these communities. The optimal routes would be selected through community and TriMet processes that would take into account levels of development, key transfer points, roadway grades and other characteristics.

**Next Steps:** TriMet should incorporate potential north-south service in future updates to the Transit Investment Plan. Within that context, TriMet should work with the local jurisdictions to further design and develop expanded transit services between the Columbia Corridor, East Multnomah County, Gresham, Pleasant Valley and Damascus as population, employment and demand warrants.

### 4.0 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN RECOMMENDATIONS

**Summary Conclusion:** Significant pedestrian and bicycle improvements are needed throughout the corridor to provide connections to regional and town centers and other key land uses and encourage the use of alternative modes. In prioritizing these improvements into short-, medium- and long-term timeframes, the evaluation considered four criterion including network connectivity, land use, access and ease of implementation. The land use criterion relates to the connections the project provides to schools, parks, commercial centers, residential development and other attractors.
Exhibit A to Resolution No.: 03-3373

**Recommendation and Next Steps:** The recommended roadway improvement actions described above would incorporate bike lanes and sidewalks and other safety and convenience accommodations and encourage the use of these facilities.

Bicycle-only and pedestrian-only improvement needs also are recommended for implementation. The project list is based on actions identified in the RTP, the transportation system plans (TSP) or capital improvement programs (CIP) of the affected jurisdictions¹.

4.1 Short-Term Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations (0 – 5 years)

**On-Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements**

- **SE 92nd Avenue (Foster Road to Powell Boulevard)**
  Implement RTP Project No. 1157 and portions of Portland TSP Project No. 7008 (Powell to southern city limits): build sidewalks, crossing improvements and bike lanes.

- **Division Street (SE 174th to Wallula Avenues)**
  Implement RTP Project Nos. 2056 and 2059, and Gresham TSP Project No. 21: retrofit street to add bike lanes and sidewalks.

- **SW Walter Road/Springwater Trail Access**
  Implement RTP Project No. 2055: study feasibility of widening roadway to add sidewalks and bike lanes.

**On-Street Pedestrian Improvements**

- **Division Street (SE 12th to SE 76th avenues)**
  Implement RTP Project No. 1214 and portion of Portland TSP Project No. 70014 (Grand Avenue to I-205): construct intersection and streetscape improvements.

- **SE 122nd Avenue (SE Bush Street to SE Harold Street)**
  Implement portions of Portland TSP Project No. 80016 (Bush to Harold and other locations): build sidewalks and crossing improvements.

- **Main Street (Division Street to 5th Street)**
  Implement Gresham TSP Project No. 185: improve pedestrian access points to MAX transit stops.

**On-Street Bicycle Improvements**

- **Highway 212 (SE 152nd to SE 242nd avenues)**
  Re-stripe the shoulders as bike lanes on this key link that is designated as a Regional Corridor Bikeway in the RTP.

¹ Projects identified in transportation system plans (TSP) or capital improvement projects (CIP) will require amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan. The update of the RTP will begin in 2003.
Off-Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails

Gresham-Fairview Trail (Springwater Corridor to Burnside)
Implement as identified in the Master Plan adopted by the City of Gresham. Additional funds should be acquired and the trail should be designed and constructed.

East Buttes Powerline Corridor Trail (SE 172nd Avenue to Gresham-Fairview Trail)
Initiate a feasibility study of this project proposed in the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan, to look at property ownership, alignment options and environmental issues.

4.2 Medium-Term Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendation (5 - 10 years)

On-Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

Holgate Avenue (SE 28 to SE 92nd avenues)
Implement portions of RTP Project No. 1247, Portland TSP Project No. 7032 and portions of Portland TSP Project No. 7031 (52nd Avenue to I-205): provide ADA improvement and study possibility of removing a travel lane and retrofitting with bike lanes.

Holgate Avenue (SE 92nd to SE 122nd avenues)
Implement portion of RTP Project No. 1247, portion of Portland TSP Project No. 80012 (92nd to 142nd) and portion of Portland TSP Project No. 7031 (52nd Avenue to I-205): provide ADA improvement and study possibility of removing a travel lane and retrofitting with bike lanes.

Holgate Avenue (SE 122nd to SE 136th Avenue). Implement portion of RTP Project No. 1247 and portion of Portland TSP Project No. 80012 (92nd to 142nd): provide ADA improvement and study possibility of retrofitting with or adding bike lanes.

SE 111th Avenue/SE 112nd Avenue (Mt. Scott to Division Street)
Implement RTP Project No. 2018 and Portland TSP recommendation: study feasibility of widening the roadway to provide sidewalks and bike lanes.

Towle Avenue (Butler Road to Eastman Parkway)
Implement Multnomah County CIP Project No. 162: construct sidewalks bike lanes and intersection improvements.

Butler Road (SE 190th Avenue to Regner Road)
Implement Gresham TSP Project No. 83 and Multnomah County recommendations: construct sidewalks and bike lanes.

Butler Road (Regner Road to 242nd Avenue)
Recommend amendment to RTP, adding at project to retrofit this street with bike lanes. It is a key link that is designated as a Community Connector Bikeway in the RTP.

SE 162nd Avenue (Powell Boulevard to Division Street)
Implement RTP Project No. 2130 and a portion of Portland TSP Project No. 8006 (Stark to Powell): study feasibility of narrowing lanes, sidewalks and bike lanes.

Regner Road (Butler to Roberts Roads)
Implement Gresham TSP Project Nos. 107-109: construct sidewalks bike lanes and intersection improvements.

On-Street Pedestrian Improvements

Foster Road/Woodstock Boulevard within Lents Town Center
Implement Lents Town Center Revitalization Plan recommendations including RTP Project Nos. 1158, 1160, and 1161, and Portland TSP Project No. 70039: construct sidewalks and crossing improvements.

Springwater Corridor Trail @ Towle Road, Roberts Road, Regner Road and Hogan Road
Implement RTP Project No. 2058 and Gresham TSP Project No. 41: improve trail access with bike lanes, widen sidewalks and provide lighting at Springwater entrances (Towle Road, Roberts Road, Regner Road and Hogan Road).

On-Street Bicycle Improvements

- Holgate Boulevard (McLoughlin Boulevard to SE 28th Avenue)
  Implement RTP Project No. 1248 and Portland TSP Project No. 7033: study possibility of removing a travel lane and retrofitting with bike lanes.

- SE 50th Avenue/SE 52nd Avenue (Woodstock to Hawthorne Boulevards)
  Implement RTP Project No. 1126 and portion of Portland TSP Project No. 70018 (Tillamook to Woodstock): modify signals, and signage, and curb ramps and provide bike lanes if parking lane can be removed.

- SE 136th Avenue (Foster Road to Division Street)
  Implement Portland TSP Project No. 8004: study feasibility of widening the roadway to provide sidewalks and bike lanes.

- Clatsop Road (SE 132nd to SE 145th Avenues)
  Recommend amendment to Portland TSP, adding a project to retrofit this street with bike lanes. It is a key link that is designated as a Community Connector Bikeway in the RTP.

- Clatsop Road (SE 145th to SE 172nd Avenues)
  Recommend amendment to Portland TSP adding a project to study the feasibility of widening this roadway to provide bike lanes. It is a key link that is recommended for designation as a Community Connector Bikeway in the 2003 RTP update.

- SE 174th Avenue (Powell Boulevard to Division Street)
Implement RTP Project No. 2131: study feasibility of narrowing lanes to provide sidewalks and bike lanes.

- Sunnyside Road (Highway 212 to SE 172\textsuperscript{nd} Avenues)
  Recommend studying the feasibility of widening roadway to provide bike lanes as part of Damascus Concept Planning. It is a key link that is designated as a Regional Corridor Bikeway in the RTP.

**Off-Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails**

- Mount Scott Trail (Clatsop Road to Foster Road)
  As proposed in the Metro Regional Trails Plan, study feasibility of developing a soft-surface trail, which will entail addressing streamside issues, stream crossings, roadway crossings and property acquisition/easements.

- East Buttes Loop Trail (Powell Butte to Butler Road)
  As proposed in the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan, study feasibility of developing a soft-surface trail, which will entail addressing streamside issues, stream crossings, roadway crossings and property acquisition/easements.

4.3 Long-Term Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations (10 + years)

**On-Street Bicycle Improvements**

- Division Street (SE 52\textsuperscript{nd} to SE 76\textsuperscript{th} avenues)
  Implement amended portion of Portland TSP Project No. 70013 (bike lanes from SE 12\textsuperscript{th} to SE 73\textsuperscript{rd} Avenue as part of multi-modal improvements on Division Street from Grand Avenue to I-205): retrofit street and add bike lanes.

**Off-Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Trails**

- Scouter Mountain Trail (Highway 212 to Foster Road)
  As proposed in the Metro Regional Trails Plan, study feasibility of developing a soft-surface trail, which will entail addressing streamside issues, stream crossings, roadway crossings and property acquisition/easements.
STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 03-3373; FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PHASE I POWELL/FOSTER CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

Date: October 9, 2003 Presented by: Richard Brandman

PROPOSED ACTION
This resolution would endorse the recommendations of the Phase I Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Corridor ("Corridor") Transportation Plan. The recommendation identifies a work program to complete planning work and develop projects to address the transportation needs in the Corridor. It also directs Metro staff to develop related amendments to the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and to work with jurisdictional staff on associated local plan amendments.

BACKGROUND
Chapter 6.7.6 of the 2000 RTP lists the Powell Boulevard/Foster Road corridor as corridor where transportation needs have been identified but where a major corridor planning study is needed to determine the function, mode and general location of improvements before projects can be fully defined for implementation.

In 2001, Metro undertook a regional effort to develop a strategy for the completion of the 18 corridor refinement plans identified in the RTP. That analysis found that recent and anticipated growth would create high levels of congestion in the Powell/Foster corridor. In order to provide access to key land uses and support implementation of the 2040 land use plan, planning work in this corridor was determined to be a top priority. Accordingly, this corridor was identified for completion in the short term in the corridor refinement work program, which was adopted as an amendment to the RTP in June of 2002.

In 2002-03, Metro led the first phase of an effort to develop the Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan. Funded by a combination of Metro and State Transportation Growth Management funds, the effort was undertaken in partnership with Multnomah and Clackamas counties, the cities of Portland and Gresham, ODOT and Tri-Met. Partner jurisdictions participated in technical advisory and project management committees, which oversaw the work and developed the recommendations attached as Exhibit A.

The overall goal of Phase I was to “define and preliminarily evaluate an initial range of multi-modal alternatives that will accommodate the 2020 corridor travel demand in a way that support the 2040 Concept Plan”. The effort resulted in completion of an existing conditions and needs analysis for the corridor, development and evaluation of a range of multi-modal transportation alternatives, and refinement and selection of a smaller group of alternatives for more detailed planning work. The recommendations attached as Exhibit A to the resolution identify specific projects and other actions needed to address long-term transportation needs.

Outreach Activities

The study included an extensive public involvement program. In order to ensure that a wide cross section of the community had the opportunity to be involved in the study, outreach for the Powell/Foster Transportation Corridor Plan was closely coordinated with other planning efforts in the corridor. These efforts included the Lents Revitalization Plan, the Inner Foster Road Transportation...
and Streetscape Plan, ODOT’s Powell Boulevard Preservation Project, Gresham’s Powell Boulevard Schematic Design Study, the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan Implementation, the Damascus Concept Plan and the Sunrise Corridor Phase I EIS.

Input was also solicited through scientific and non-scientific surveys, open houses, stakeholder interviews, mailings and an on-line questionnaire. Metro and jurisdictional staff made presentations and obtained input from the East Multnomah County Transportation Coordinating Committee and other elected officials, neighborhood associations throughout the corridor, the Pleasant Valley Steering Committee, and other public meetings associated with planning efforts in the corridor.

Special outreach efforts were made in areas where roadway widening were considered or concerns were anticipated. Since alternatives were being considered on several roads heading into Pleasant Valley and residents were engaged in intensive planning activities, information was provided in Pleasant Valley Plan newsletters and input solicited at each Pleasant Valley Forum.

Because the study was considering widening of Powell from I-205 to SE 174th Avenue, special outreach efforts were made in that area. The AIM survey project, which engaged high school students in a 10-week course, won an American Planning Association award. During the AIM project, students studied planning concepts and developed, conducted and tabulated results of a survey. As a part of this process, information was provided to over 1000 parents of elementary school children in the immediate project vicinity. Approximately 400 of these parents completed a survey about transportation needs and preferences in the area. Project staff visited all neighborhood associations along this segment of Powell several times. Specific questions were asked about widening Powell in this area on the random sample scientific surveys and the web-based questionnaire. A 5,000 person mailing prior to the open houses in June 2003 targeted property owners near this section of Powell.

Additional, targeted, outreach will be incorporated into the more detailed planning efforts, particularly in the areas of proposed roadway widenings.

ANALYSIS /INFORMATION

1. Known Opposition

Public outreach activities for the study found generally positive support for multi-modal projects and strong support for roadway widening. As part of the outreach program, staff addressed initial concerns expressed by several neighborhood associations. Although some concerns remain about specific proposals by individuals, no strong group opposition is known to any of the recommended actions. While the public involvement program for the plan was extensive, given the scope of the study and size of the corridor it will be important for the more detailed planning efforts to include significant, additional outreach. Public involvement will need to be especially targeted in the areas of proposed roadway widenings.

2. Legal Antecedents

The Oregon State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) section 660-12-020 requires that regional transportation system plans establish a coordinated network of transportation facilities adequate to serve regional transportation needs. Section 660-12-025 of the TPR allows Metro and other Metropolitan Planning Organizations to defer decisions regarding function, general location and mode as long as they can demonstrate that the refinement effort will be completed in a timely manner. On June 15, 2001, the 2000 RTP was acknowledged by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). In the summer of 2002, the RTP was amended to incorporate
a work program for completion of the corridor refinement studies that are needed to develop
solution to transportation problems. That work program identified the Powell/Foster corridor as a
top priority.

3. Anticipated Effects

The Powell/Foster corridor represents a key transportation challenge and an opportunity toward
meeting regional land use goals. Despite policy changes to level-of-service standards that permit
greater levels of congestion, significant multi-modal improvements will be needed in order to
continue to serve transportation needs of the communities and industrial areas in southeast Portland
and Gresham. The corridor also provides access to Damascus, Springwater and Pleasant Valley
areas that have recently been added to the Urban Growth Boundary. The Phase I recommendation
identifies a number of roadway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects that are needed to serve
corridor transportation needs over the next twenty years. It also establishes a work program for
completion of more detailed planning and a timeline for implementation. The Powell/Foster
Corridor Plan Recommendations are timely and needed to allow for implementation of the 2040
land use plan and to serve key growth areas.

4. Budget Impacts

The resolution calls for commencement of Phase II in the near term. This project will proceed in
coordination with completion of initial phase of the Damascus Concept Plan in the winter of 2004-
05. Phase II has a total of $500,000 of MTIP funding in place. The rest of the anticipated $1
million Phase II costs will be budgeted through on-going planning funds, which support planning
staff. In the longer term, construction funds for corridor improvements, which are or will be in the
RTP will be sought through the usual variety of federal, state, regional and local monies.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approval is sought of Resolution No. 03-3373.
TO:       JPACT

FROM:  Andrew Cotugno

RE:  Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan Recommendations

DATE: October 9, 2003

Based on conversations with the involved jurisdictions and agencies, the following are proposed amendments to Exhibit A of the resolution number 03-3373, (“Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan Phase I Recommendations”). The proposed changes are shown in underline, strikethrough format.

1. Section 2.1.2, under “Next Steps”, the fourth sentence should read: “ODOT should immediately lead a design study to…”

2. Section 3.3, under “Next Steps Recommendation”, add a new first sentence: “As part of the Damascus and Springwater Concept Planning processes, TriMet should work with local jurisdictions to expand the TriMet service district to include newly incorporated areas.”
Attached please find information relating to freight mobility project funding, House Bill 2041. The bill designates $100 million for projects that are to be recommended by the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee or that provide access to industrial lands or other job creating sites. The materials attached outline eligibility criteria, prioritization factors and a timeline adopted by the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC) for determining its recommendations.

Under this process, OFAC intends to publish a list of high priority projects in October, solicit "nomination review forms" from interested parties through January 31 and make its recommendations to the Oregon Transportation Commission by March. The solicitation for input to OFAC will be distributed to MPOs, ACTs and members of the OFAC.

As a member of OFAC, Metro is proposing that the region develop a list of priorities and provide input to the OFAC between now and January 31. We propose that JPACT:

1) Notify local jurisdictions and business organizations of the OFAC process when it is published in late October.
2) Ask for entities seeking regional support of priority projects to submit draft nomination review forms to Metro by early December.
3) Utilize the same overall criteria as the OFAC, but give priority to projects that serve Regionally Significant Industrial Sites and intermodal facilities.
4) Seek approval from JPACT and the Metro Council on the region's final input to OFAC in January.

The Regional Freight Committee, which is comprised of staff from Washington, Multnomah, and Clackamas Counties, the Cities of Gresham, Portland, Vancouver and Tualatin, the Ports of Portland and Vancouver, ODOT and the RTC has been providing information to OFAC as it develops freight project listings. We propose that it operate as a technical advisory committee to TPAC and JPACT in the upcoming prioritization process.
To: Metro Regional Freight Committee
From: Steve Kale
Subject: Freight Project Identification and Prioritization

House Bill 3364 (2001) calls for the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee to advise the Oregon Transportation Commission and regionally based advisory groups about the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and its consideration and inclusion of high priority freight mobility projects in each Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) region.

House Bill 2041 (2003) expands on HB 3364 by authorizing $100 million in bonding for projects that a) are recommended by the Freight Advisory Committee, b) provide or improve access to industrial land sites, or c) provide or improve access to sites where jobs can be created.

The following page describes a process for developing a list of freight mobility projects per the provisions of House Bills 3364 (2001) and 2041 (2003). This includes describing:

- eligibility criteria for identifying a list of projects to consider for funding, and
- prioritizing factors for reducing the list of eligible projects to a shorter list for each ODOT region.

The Freight Advisory Committee approved this process at its meeting on September 9, 2003.

Please note that the criteria and factors focus primarily on roadway projects, including those that facilitate movements on connectors to/from intermodal facilities as well as projects that support multimodal movements (e.g., grade-separated rail crossing improvements). Projects that would enhance movements of non-roadway modes will be considered in a separate memorandum to be developed later.
Freight Mobility Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritization Factors  
(Approved by the Freight Advisory Committee, September 9, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Criteria</th>
<th>Prioritization Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects can be considered for funding if they</td>
<td>Priority shall be given to projects that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are modernization projects on freight routes of</td>
<td>- Would remove identified barriers to the safe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statewide or regional significance, including</td>
<td>reliable, and efficient movement of goods,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ highways on the State Highway Freight System as</td>
<td>- Would facilitate public and private investment that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated in the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan, or</td>
<td>creates or sustains jobs5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ highways or local roads designated as National</td>
<td>- Would support multimodal freight transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway System intermodal connectors, or</td>
<td>movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ other highways with a high volume or percentage</td>
<td>- Are likely to be constructed within the time frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of trucks or which are important for regional or</td>
<td>contemplated (project readiness)6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interstate freight movements, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ local freight routes designated in a regional or local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are estimated to cost $1 million or more2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Have not previously been programmed for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction in a Statewide Transportation Improvement Program approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are consistent with the applicable acknowledged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Plan (TSP) or, in the absence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of an applicable acknowledged TSP, the applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledged comprehensive plan and any applicable adopted TSP4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support 1999 Oregon Highway Plan policies per the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provisions identified in the process approved by the OTC for the selection of projects to be included in the STIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other types of projects (e.g., operations or safety) may be considered if they would accomplish purposes similar to those of modernization projects or would otherwise substantially support freight mobility.

A project costing less than $1 million may be considered if it meets other eligibility criteria, is critical to removing barriers to goods movement, or would otherwise substantially support freight mobility.

Multi-phased projects or STIP-listed projects that have been delayed and otherwise meet the eligibility criteria may be considered. Additionally, projects that are scheduled for construction during the latter two years of an approved STIP may be considered for inclusion in future STIPs or freight mobility project listings. Costs of planning, development, and design may be included in the identification of projects eligible for funding consideration.

The FAC may consider projects that are not identified in an acknowledged or adopted plan if efforts to amend the applicable planning document are underway or expected to proceed within timelines for developing state or Metropolitan Planning Organization transportation improvement programs.

Examples of investment leveraging would include, but not be limited to, additional federal funds, local matching funds, donation of project right-of-way, or private-sector contributions.

Project readiness is dependent on an assessment of the remaining requirements that must be met before a project can be constructed, and the likelihood that the requirements can be met and construction started within the time frame anticipated. Assessment of project readiness includes assessment of the timing and likelihood of obtaining environmental approvals.

---

1 Other types of projects (e.g., operations or safety) may be considered if they would accomplish purposes similar to those of modernization projects or would otherwise substantially support freight mobility.

2 A project costing less than $1 million may be considered if it meets other eligibility criteria, is critical to removing barriers to goods movement, or would otherwise substantially support freight mobility.

3 Multi-phased projects or STIP-listed projects that have been delayed and otherwise meet the eligibility criteria may be considered. Additionally, projects that are scheduled for construction during the latter two years of an approved STIP may be considered for inclusion in future STIPs or freight mobility project listings. Costs of planning, development, and design may be included in the identification of projects eligible for funding consideration.

4 The FAC may consider projects that are not identified in an acknowledged or adopted plan if efforts to amend the applicable planning document are underway or expected to proceed within timelines for developing state or Metropolitan Planning Organization transportation improvement programs.

5 Examples of investment leveraging would include, but not be limited to, additional federal funds, local matching funds, donation of project right-of-way, or private-sector contributions.

6 Project readiness is dependent on an assessment of the remaining requirements that must be met before a project can be constructed, and the likelihood that the requirements can be met and construction started within the time frame anticipated. Assessment of project readiness includes assessment of the timing and likelihood of obtaining environmental approvals.
Timeline/Schedule for Implementing Provisions of HB 2041, Sections 11(a), 37, and 46
(Approved by the Freight Advisory Committee, September 9, 2003)

Shown below is an approximate timeline/schedule for implementing Sections 11(a), 37, and 46 of House Bill 2041 (see page 2). The actual timeline/schedule may differ depending on circumstances that arise during implementation efforts.

Sometimes referenced as the Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA) III, HB 2041 was signed into law by Governor Kulongoski in late July 2003. Section 11 calls for the Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) to make recommendations to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) on freight-related projects to be considered for funding from $100 million of new revenues. Section 37 defines freight mobility projects and directs the Department of Transportation to give priority to freight mobility projects in developing the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Section 46 authorizes the FAC to make recommendations for multimodal freight mobility projects to the OTC for consideration in developing the STIP.

August-September 2003: FAC
• develops draft eligibility criteria and prioritization factors for freight mobility projects*
• continues developing a master list of possible projects*
• receives update on work related to identifying high priority freight mobility projects at the September 9 FAC meeting
• approves draft eligibility and prioritization factors at the September 9 meeting
• approves implementation timeline/schedule at the September 9 meeting
• begins applying eligibility criteria and prioritization factors to the master list*

October 2003: FAC
• develops initial listing of highest rated projects based on eligibility criteria and prioritization factors*
• develops a project review form for interested parties to use in advocating for projects for the FAC to recommend to the OTC*
• circulates (beginning approximately October 15) a project review form and package of information to interested parties by January 31 on projects to recommend to the OTC per the following:
  ✓ eligibility factors and prioritization criteria
  ✓ initial listing of highest rated projects based on eligibility criteria and prioritization factors

November-December 2003: FAC
• continues updating the master list of possible projects as needed*
• refines prioritization criteria to assist with reviewing list of highest rated projects*
• reviews progress at its December 2 meeting

January 2004: FAC
• ends period on January 31 for receipt of project review forms from interested parties
• reviews materials received and develops additional information to support highest rated projects*
• prepares preliminary list of highest rated projects and supporting information for each*

February-March 2004: FAC
• holds meeting (third or fourth week in February) to
  ✓ review list of highest rated projects and supporting information and adjust as needed
  ✓ approve the list of highest rated projects or defer approval until later
• makes recommendations at the Oregon Transportation Commission’s March meeting**

* This work will be primarily conducted through the FAC’s Freight Projects Subcommittee.
**The date for making recommendations to the OTC will depend on when the FAC approves a list of projects.
Provisions of HB 2041 That Pertain Specifically to the Freight Advisory Committee and Freight Mobility Projects*

SECTION 11. (1) The Oregon Transportation Commission shall use $100 million of the net proceeds of bonds authorized under ORS 367.620 (3)(b):
(a) For the capitalizable cost of planning, development, design and construction of projects recommended by the Freight Advisory Committee created by section 2, chapter 240, Oregon Laws 2001.
(b) To provide or improve access to industrial land sites. In selecting sites under this paragraph, the commission shall consult with the Economic and Community Development Department and local governments and shall give preference to sites for which local matching moneys are available.
(c) To provide or improve access to sites where jobs can be created.
(2) Notwithstanding ORS 366.507 (4)(b), projects selected under this section need not be equitably distributed throughout the state.

SECTION 37. (1) As used in this section, “freight mobility project” means a project that supports the safe, reliable and efficient movement of goods between and among local, national and international markets.
(2) The Legislative Assembly finds that investment in freight mobility projects will yield a return on the state's investment in terms of improved economic opportunity and safety.
(3) In developing the STIP, the Department of Transportation shall give priority to freight mobility projects that:
(a) Are located on identified freight routes of statewide or regional significance;
(b) Remove identified barriers to the safe, reliable and efficient movement of goods; and
(c) Facilitate public and private investment that creates or sustains jobs.

SECTION 46. Section 2, chapter 240, Oregon Laws 2001, is amended to read:
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Sec. 2. (1) There is created the Freight Advisory Committee to be appointed by the Director of Transportation to advise the director and the Oregon Transportation Commission regarding issues, policies and programs that impact multimodal freight mobility in Oregon.
(2) The director shall have discretion to determine the number of committee members and the duration of membership. The committee membership shall include, but not be limited to, representatives from the shipping and carrier industries, the state, local governments and ports, including the Port of Portland.
(3) The committee shall:
(a) Elect a chairperson and a vice chairperson.
(b) Meet at least four times a year.
(c) Provide input on statewide and regional policies and actions that impact freight mobility.
(d) Provide input on the development of policy and planning documents that impact freight mobility.
[(e) Define “freight mobility projects.”]
[(f)] (e) Advise the commission and regionally based advisory groups about the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and the program’s consideration and inclusion of highest priority multimodal freight mobility projects in each Department of Transportation region.
(4) The committee may make recommendations for freight mobility projects to the commission. In making the recommendations, the committee shall give priority to multimodal projects.
[(4)] (5) The Department of Transportation shall provide policy and support staff to the committee. The department shall also provide other personnel to assist the committee as requested by the chairperson and within the limits of available funds.
[(5) The committee shall report to the Seventy-second Legislative Assembly on the committee's progress and recommendations.]

*New language is in bold font; existing language is in regular font, deleted language is in italics.
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