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MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

DATE: Thursday, June 10, 2004

TIME: 7:15 A.M.

PLACE: Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

7:15 Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum  Rod Park, Chair

7:16 Citizen communications to JPACT on non-agenda items  Rod Park, Chair

7:20 * Review of Minutes – APPROVAL REQUESTED  Rod Park, Chair

7:25 * Resolution No. 04-3457 – For the Purpose of Making Recommendations to the Environmental Quality Commission of the State of Oregon Concerning the Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan - APPROVAL REQUESTED  
- TCM
- Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets
- Other  Mark Turpel (Metro) Dave Nordberg (DEQ)

7:50 * Resolution No. 04-3456 - For The Purpose Of Designating South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART) Transit District As Eligible To Receive Federal Urbanized Area Formula Program Funds And To Amend The 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) To Reflect Distribution Of Federal Funds To Smart - APPROVAL REQUESTED  Ted Leybold (Metro)

8:00 # I-205 Light Rail Funding - INFORMATIONAL  Richard Brandman (Metro)

8:15 Sunrise Corridor Update - INFORMATIONAL  John Rist (Clackamas Co)

8:30 * Highway 217 Study and Initial Options – INFORMATIONAL  Bridget Wieghart (Metro)

8:40 # MPO Summit Debrief and ACT Proposal - INFORMATIONAL  Rod Park, Chair Andy Cotugno (Metro)

8:55 # Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendments - INFORMATIONAL  Kim Ellis (Metro)

9:00 ADJOURN  Rod Park, Chair

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

** Material to be emailed at a later date.

# Material provided at meeting.
# JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

**May 13, 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS PRESENT</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rod Park</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Garrett</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Hansen</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Rojo de Steffey</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Monroe</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Wagner</td>
<td>Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Haverkamp</td>
<td>City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Rohde</td>
<td>City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Wyatt</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Drake</td>
<td>City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS ABSENT</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rex Burkholder</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Hallock</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Kennemer</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Rogers</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Francesconi</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Pollard</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judie Stanton</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATES PRESENT</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annette Liebe</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Lookingbill</td>
<td>SW Washington RTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUESTS PRESENT</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susie Lahsene</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin McArthur</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Clark</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Busse</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Schilling</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rist</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Nordberg</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Griffith</td>
<td>C-Tran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Patterson</td>
<td>C-Tran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gillam</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Papsdorf</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Miller</td>
<td>AGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Himes</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Park called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 7:24 a.m.

II. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO JPACT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Rod Park presented an article Trouble in the Air (included as part of this meeting record).

III. REVIEW OF MINUTES

ACTION TAKEN: Matthew Garrett moved and Fred Hansen seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of April 8, 2004 with corrections (Kathy Busse asked for wording change of "Concluded" to "Commenced". The motion passed.

IV. RESOLUTION NO. 04-3434

Mr. Andy Cotugno gave a brief history of the process leading to Resolution No. 0434.

Mr. Dave Unsworth presented LRT presentation (included as part of this meeting record).

Mr. Dave Unsworth presented Resolution No. 04-3434 (included as part of this meeting record).

Mr. Fred Hansen stated that originally the wide blocks or double tree blocks where traffic can not proceed and must turn off the mall were the anticipated locations of the light rail plat forms. He said that in the beginning of the process, many people felt that making any changes to the original plan would have resulted in fewer options, which would result in compromises on the design. However, the opposite occurred during this design process. He said that by locating the light rail plat forms not at 1 block south of Pioneer Square but rather at Pioneer Square itself made for a better place for the connection. Likewise, at the northern end of South Mall, they would have had two platforms separated by buildings on fifth and sixth in the original plan. However, now they have a transit area connecting the two platforms around the US Bank Plaza, resulting in a better design. He said that it is an easier system to understand for the user because the current design does not require several different stops for bus routes thus lessening the confusion for which stop the user must be at to connect. The design allows for easier connections and less confusion. Further, the new design now allows for one through lane, thus eliminating the need for turning off of the mall.
Councilor Karl Rohde stated he himself has had the occasional misturn. Further, he stated that the design seems to require a longer distance between light rail stops.

Mr. Fred Hansen replied that five blocks is the better design and if they could go back and change designs for the current light rail stations, they would have made them five blocks, not two blocks, apart.

Councilor Larry Haverkamp asked if the fareless square would remain fareless.

Mr. Fred Hansen replied that the fareless square remains fareless even after the new light rail trains are in place.

Councilor Rod Monroe asked if the design called for one continuous light rail loop.

Mr. Fred Hansen stated that the design does call for one loop train.

Councilor Karl Rohde asked what the construction schedule was for the South Corridor and Downtown light rail alignments.

Mr. Fred Hansen stated that both are scheduled to open fall 2009.

Mayor Rob Drake stated that he has experienced the continues looping when driving downtown and expressed concern that the new design could make the problem worse for those citizens not taking transit.

Mr. Fred Hansen stated that the new design calls for a one through lane, eliminating the need to turn off the mall at 5th and 6th. He further stated that he felt the new design would be less confusing.

ACTION TAKEN: Councilor Karl Rohde moved and Ms. Annette Liebe seconded the motion to approve Resolution No. 04-3434. The motion passed.

V. RESOLUTION NO. 04-3450

Mr. Andy Cotugno presented Resolution No. 04-3450 (included as part of this meeting record).

ACTION TAKEN: Mr. Fred Hansen moved and Mayor Rob Drake seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes of Resolution No. 04-3450.

Ms. Annette Liebe asked if the changes from TPAC were included.

Mr. Andy Cotugno replied that the changes were reflected on page 11.

ACTION TAKEN: The motion to approve Resolution No. 04-3450. The motion passed.
VI. UPDATE ON TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES (TCMS) AND THE PORTLAND AREA CARBON MONOXIDE (CO) PLAN

Mr. Andy Cotugno presented a memo to JPACT regarding the Transportation Control Measures (TCMS) and the Portland Area Carbon Monoxide (CO) Plan (included as part of this meeting record).

Ms. Annette Liebe stated that the Department of Environmental Quality is discussing eliminating the requirement for oxygenated fuel. She explained that the state of California is banning the use of MTBE in their oxygenated fuel due to environmental concerns and would only be allowing ethanol. She said that with the ban of MTBE in California, DEQ is concerned that the availability of ethanol would be jeopardized forcing Oregon to receive oxygenated fuel with MTBE rather than ethanol.

Councilor Karl Rohde asked for the status of the CMAQ crisis in the Transportation bill.

Mr. Andy Cotugno replied that neither transportation bill that passed the House or Senate changed the language. However, he said that there is talk to change the language in conference.

Mr. Fred Hansen asked that DEQ be prepared to discuss with JPACT in the near future, the issues of Greenhouse Gas and what future hazards and requirements the region could face.

VII. JUNE 4 MPO SUMMIT

Chair Rod Park presented information regarding June 4 MPO Summit (included as part of this meeting record).

VIII. ODOT STIP/OTIA III BRIEFING

Mr. Matthew Garrett presented the ODOT STIP/OTIA Briefing (included as part of this meeting record).

Councilor Karl Rohde asked whether freight was a criteria on other funding distributions.

Mr. Matthew Garrett replied that he was not sure. He further stated that the STIP Stakeholders had developed criteria but was not sure if freight had been named.

Commissioner Martha Schrader directed page two, specific to mention of the Sunrise Corridor.

Mr. Matthew Garrett replied that he is not recommending the Sunrise Corridor initially because the price tag of the Sunrise Corridor is large and because of that it does not compete for the funding due to the $100 million ceiling.

Mr. Fred Hansen stated that he understands that ODOT is going against current earmarks. He asked why wouldn't the region assume more earmarks in future years.
Mr. Matthew Garrett replied that ODOT and OTC have not looked beyond the reauthorization conversation and that they agreed to backfill any projects currently earmarked.

Mr. Fred Hansen stated that they the region should keep the pressure on the federal delegation on the ability to deliver additional earmarks rather than using up more of the OTIA dollars for things that could be federally funded. Further, he hoped that the funding strategy is one that would maximize federal participation over years rather than just the current authorization number.

Mr. Andy Cotugno replied that the Oregon Transportation Commission has delayed making any decisions on how the $200 million is allocated for a month in the hopes that the reauthorization bill gets conferenced and that additional earmarks come from the Senate. He explained that if the earmarks go up then less backfill is needed for projects. However, the OTC's plan is to make the decisions on spending the $200 million now based upon what comes out of the reauthorization bill and not based upon forecasting future appropriation bills because there is not a good track record for appropriations earmarks for highway projects.

Chair Rob Park replied that charge given from the OTC to ODOT is fund project now in order to help get the economy moving.

IX. SUNRISE CORRIDOR UPDATE

The Sunrise Corridor Update has been held until the next meeting.

X. HIGHWAY 217 STUDY AND INITIAL OPTIONS

Mr. Andy Cotugno presented a newsletter regarding Highway 217 Study and Initial Options (included as part of this meeting record) and stated that it would be back at the next JPACT meeting for discussion.

XI. BI-STATE COORDINATION COMMITTEE ORGANIZING RESOLUTION

Mr. Mark Turpel presented the Bi-State Coordination Committee Organizing Resolution (included as part of this meeting record).

XII. ACT PROPOSAL

Mr. Andy Cotugno presented the ACT proposal (included as part of this meeting record) and commented that a more in depth conversation would be held at the next JPACT meeting.

XIII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Park adjourned the meeting at 9:16 a.m.

Respectfully committed,
Renee Castilla
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING ) RESOLUTION NO. 04- 3457
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ) Introduced by Councilor Park
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMISSION )
OF THE STATE OF OREGON CONCERNING )
THE SECOND PORTLAND AREA CARBON )
MONOXIDE MAINTENANCE PLAN )

WHEREAS, in 1996 the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality prepared a draft Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan; and

WHEREAS, Metro reviewed the draft Plan, and, after consultation with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, adopted Resolution No. 96-2260, For the Purpose of Recommending to the Environmental Quality Commission the Transportation Control Measures (TCM's), contingencies, and emissions budgets to be included in the Portland Region's Ozone and Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plans; and

WHEREAS, in 1996, the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission approved a Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan and submitted the Plan to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); and

WHEREAS, on September 2, 1997 the EPA approved the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for the Portland, Oregon area; and

WHEREAS, the EPA and the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission agreed that an updated plan would be submitted to the EPA by the year 2005; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Environmental Quality is producing a draft Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan; and

WHEREAS, while the subject of the Maintenance Plan is carbon monoxide, other pollutants including volatile organic compounds, oxides of nitrogen, air toxics such as benzene and acrolein and other emissions from transportation sources are of concern and can be ameliorated through local air quality actions; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Administrative Rules for the Department of Environmental Quality concerning transportation conformity (OAR 340-252-0060) state that the metropolitan planning organization shall be responsible for: "(iv) Developing and evaluating TCMs in ozone and/or carbon monoxide nonattainment and/or maintenance areas"; and "(v) providing technical and policy input on emission budgets"; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Council have reviewed and discussed the transportation aspects of the draft Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan including transportation control measures, emission budgets, subregional areas and oxygenated fuels; now therefore
BE IT RESOLVED,

1. The Metro Council recommends to the Environmental Quality Commission of the State of Oregon that the transportation control measures as listed in Exhibit A, be included in the Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan.

2. The Metro Council will take the following actions and encourages and supports its local government partners and state and other regional agencies to:

   a. continue support of efforts to develop and redevelop in centers and mixed use areas within the urban portion of the region by providing funding for, and cooperating, with the Transit Oriented Development program, the Regional Travel Options program, and any similar programs and projects in the urban area,

   b. continue to implement the 2040 Growth Concept to encourage growth patterns that can be served by a balanced transportation system, including walking, biking, transit as well as motor vehicles in order to maintain air quality within the region as well as meeting other region-wide goals.

   c. keep urban growth boundary and growth forecasts and allocations up-to-date and coordinated for use in future conformity determinations,

   d. maintain support for the Portland Central City Transportation Management Plan, including its parking regulations, to encourage transit use, walking and biking as convenient and effective methods of transportation for people within the Central City area, recognizing that auto trips and goods movement via trucks will remain an important component of travel within the Central City. Any changes to parking regulations should strive to realize or exceed the existing central city parking assumptions of the regional transportation model, especially the parking, transit pass and fareless area factors.

   e. maintain support of the Metro code provisions that regulate parking requirements for the region;

   f. maintain and enhance support for the DEQ Employee Commute Option program to find ways of encouraging employers to provide ECO programs and advance the participation of employees in such programs.

3. The Metro Council recommends that the carbon monoxide motor vehicle emission budgets (winter, daily) for the region be set as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,238,575 lbs</td>
<td>1,033,578 lbs</td>
<td>1,181,341 lbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The Metro Council recommends that the emission set asides for industrial sources be set at 14,880 pounds per day of carbon monoxide or 2,700 tons per year.
5. The Metro Council recommends that the subregional areas, namely, that area included in the Portland Central City Transportation Management Plan, and the 82nd Avenue subregion, not be included in the Second Portland Area CO Maintenance Plan and that the region not be required to complete additional air quality analyses for subregions over and above the required region-wide analysis.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ___ day of June, 2004.

__________________________________________
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

__________________________________________
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney
Transportation Control Measures Recommended for Inclusion in the Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Maintenance Plan

1. Transportation Control Measures.
   a. 1.0% cumulative annual average increase in regional transit revenue hours weighted by capacity between the years 2006 through 2017; and

   b. program at least 28 miles of bikeways or trails, consistent with State and regional bikeway standards between the years 2006 through 2017, including a cumulative average of 5 miles funded in each biennium from all sources in the MTIP, these facilities in addition to those required for expansion or reconstruction projects under ORS 366.514; and

   c. program at least nine miles of pedestrian paths in mixed use centers between the years 2006 through 2017, including the funding of a cumulative average of 1½ miles in each biennium from all sources in each MTIP, these facilities in addition to those required for expansion or reconstruction projects under ORS 366.514, except where such expansion or reconstruction is located within a mixed use center.

2. Contingent Actions.

   a. Metro will review the vehicle miles traveled per capita (vmt/capita) based on the most recent estimates of population and daily vehicle miles traveled from Federal, State sources, as reviewed and verified by Metro.

   b. Should reported vmt per capita exceed a rate of 21.5 vmt/capita (a 10 percent increase above the 2002 rate) for the Oregon portion of the Portland-Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area for two successive years, the following measures would become required TCM for the region:

      i. Washington County Commuter Rail within six years after exceeding the 21.5 vmt/capita rate;

      ii. I-205 LRT within six years after exceeding the 21.5 vmt/capita rate;

      iii. an increase of efforts for the Regional Travel Options Program sufficient to increase the number of employers reached by the program by at least 5% per year the number of employers currently subject to the DEQ Employee Commute Options program. Alternatively, specific projects from the Regional Transportation Options program could be substituted.
iv. an increase of funding of at least 5% per year greater than current funding for Transit Oriented Development projects.

v. Other programs or projects consistent with State and Federal law as may be determined by the Metro Council after consultation with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation.

c. Should vmt/capita exceed 20.5 daily vmt/capita (a 5% increase above the 2002 rate) for two successive years, the Standing Committee [TPAC, as defined at OAR 340-252-0060 (2) (b) (A) (iii)] shall be convened to consider:

i) whether there is a data problem with the trigger; and,

ii) if there is not a data problem with the trigger, identification of and analysis of effectiveness of those local actions that could reduce air pollutant emissions; and,

iii) whether a recommendation to initiate one or more of these local air quality actions until the 2002 vmt/capita level is one again attained, should be made to JPACT.
STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 04-3457, FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON CONCERNING THE SECOND PORTLAND AREA CARBON MONOXIDE MAINTENANCE PLAN

Date: June 1, 2004
Prepared by: Mark Turpel

BACKGROUND

Consistent with Federal Clean Air Act, the Environmental Quality Commission of the State of Oregon (EQC) has directed that a draft Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan (CO Plan) be prepared. This CO Plan will be completed in draft form and provided to the public for review in Fall, 2004 with an anticipated final decision by the EQC late 2004 or early 2005. The EQC's CO Plan will then be submitted to the US Environmental Protection Agency for approval.

In order to coordinate with the region, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has worked with local governments in the region to identify CO Plan issues prior to completion of a draft plan. Accordingly, the region has the opportunity to make recommendations about the CO Plan prior to a draft CO Plan being completed for public comment. In addition, Metro and local governments may also participate in the Fall CO Plan public process.

Several issues have been identified that pertain to transportation and/or the region's economy. On May 28, 2004, TPAC met and provided technical review and recommendations. These issues include:

1) What should be the region's CO motor vehicle emission budgets (maximum levels of CO that transportation sources could generate out to the year 2020 and beyond);

   (TPAC recommended that budgets that provide a 1 percent per year increase to the year 2010 be used and that a 2017 and beyond budget be based on a 1 percent per year to 2017 plus a 1.5 percent per year to 2037 be used for the 2017 budget.)

2) Should subregions for analyzing CO concentrations in downtown Portland and 82nd Avenue be continued?

   (TPAC recommended deleting these subareas and no longer requiring separate conformity determinations for these subareas consistent with the DEQ recommendation.)

3) Should local air quality actions (known as Transportation Control Measures, or TCM) be included in the CO Plan;

   (TPAC recommended reducing the number of TCM from nine to three and including contingent TCM should there be unexpected increases in vehicle miles per capita.)

4) Should the DEQ vehicle emissions test procedure be changed;

   (TPAC recommended these tests be changed consistent with the DEQ recommendation)

5) Should Contingency Plan provisions be maintained;
6) What should be the CO Growth Allowance for new businesses in the region;

(TPAC recommended the previous growth allowance level be used as all CO emissions are expected to be reduced over the lifetime of the Plan.)

7) Should oxygenated fuels in the region be recommended to be continued or not.

(TPAC heard DEQ information about this issue, but made no recommendations.)

Items 1, 2, 4 through 7 are addressed in the accompanying memorandum from DEQ, marked attachment A. Item 3 is addressed in the accompanying Metro memorandum marked attachment B.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. Known Opposition There is no know opposition concerning the motor vehicle emission budgets, removing subregions, continuing with contingency plans or using the proposed growth allowance. Some have expressed concern with including TCM in the CO Plan, with changing DEQ vehicle emission procedures and with either including or eliminating oxygenated fuels.

2. Legal Antecedents Federal law includes the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401) as well as transportation legislation (23 U.S.C 109j) concerning transportation plans, programs and projects developed, funded or approved by the US Department of Transportation. State legislation includes OAR Chapter 340, Division 252. Metro legal antecedents include Resolution No. 96-2260, For the Purpose of Recommending to the Environmental Quality Commission the Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), contingencies, and emission budgets to be included in the Portland Region's Ozone and Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plans, and numerous resolutions concerning transportation conformity of the region's transportation plan and metropolitan transportation improvement program.

3. Anticipated Effects Adoption of this resolution will support the progress of the CO Plan, which, when adopted will make it possible for the region to demonstrate required transportation conformity for CO.

4. Budget Impacts No direct budget impacts to Metro.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that Resolution 04-3457 be approved.
State of Oregon
Department of Environmental Quality

Memorandum

To: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee
From: Dave Nordberg, (503) 229-5519
Subject: Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan

Date: May 19, 2004

Background

In the early 1970s, the Portland area exceeded the 8 hour air quality standard for carbon monoxide (CO) approximately 1 out of every 3 winter days. The Environmental Protection Agency, Oregon DEQ, Metro and the City of Portland adopted a number of control measures that effectively reduced CO concentrations. These measures included new car emission controls, the vehicle emissions testing program, wintertime oxygenated fuel, LAER (Lowest Achievable Emissions Rate) emissions control equipment for expanding industry, the downtown parking lid and the downtown traffic circulation plan. In 1991, the area achieved the 9 ppm National Ambient Air Quality Standard for CO, and in 1997 EPA redesignated the area to attainment for carbon monoxide.

As a condition of being designated to attainment, DEQ prepared the first CO Maintenance Plan. That plan detailed the strategies the area would use to stay within the carbon monoxide limit ten years into the future. The Plan took advantage of the area’s Urban Growth Boundary and the 2040 Growth Concept by using both as new control measures. The plan demonstrated that air quality could be maintained while eliminating the downtown parking lid, and reducing the emission control requirement on new industry from LAER to the less restrictive BACT (Best Available Control Technology). The plan also demonstrated that the wintertime oxygenated fuel requirement was no longer needed for the area to continue to comply with the CO standard, however the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) decided to retain the oxy-fuel requirement to provide an added degree of safety.

Since the Plan was adopted, carbon monoxide concentrations continued to decline as shown below:

[Graph showing CO concentrations from 1982 to 2003 for various locations in Portland]
Portland's Second CO Maintenance Plan

The Clean Air Act requires a second maintenance plan to be submitted to EPA 8 years after the first plan is approved. DEQ is now preparing the second plan to meet that requirement and to establish a new Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets using EPA's new Mobile6 emissions factor model. Because many of the emissions reduction strategies used in the plan affect transportation planning DEQ is involving the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) in shaping the plan's requirements before it is proposed for public comment. DEQ's schedule for developing and implementing the plan follows:

TPAC Review: May 28, 2004
JPACT Review: Jun. 10, 2004
Metro Council Recommendation: Jun. 17, 2004
Public Comment Period: ~Aug. 16 to Sept. 17, 2004
Public Hearing: ~Sept. 16, 2004
EQC Plan Adoption: Dec. 9 or 10, 2004 (target)
Submission to EPA: Dec. 31, 2004
EPA Approval (Federal Register): Aug. 2005?
Effective Date: Nov. 2005?

While the Department is requesting the MPO's recommendations on several issues, it is important to note that Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) has final responsibility for determining the requirements of the next Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Plan. The Commission may or may not agree with recommendations made by the MPO, local jurisdictions, or others who comment on the new plan.

Future Carbon Monoxide Projections

DEQ estimated the amount of regional carbon monoxide emissions expected in the future using Metro's travel demand model and Metro's estimates of future growth. The Department then compared future emissions to the airshed's capacity (to accommodate carbon monoxide) and found that the region would stay well below the 9 ppm CO standard throughout the foreseeable future. Projected emissions are shown below in comparison to the airshed's capacity of 3,344,000 lbs. of CO per winter day.

![CO Emissions Graph](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Emissions</td>
<td>104,984</td>
<td>65,517</td>
<td>76,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>809,454</td>
<td>872,794</td>
<td>1,031,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Road Emissions</td>
<td>1,525,100</td>
<td>1,226,312</td>
<td>730,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Road Emissions</td>
<td>365,950</td>
<td>515,067</td>
<td>675,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,805,488</td>
<td>2,679,690</td>
<td>2,513,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Projections assume no oxygenated fuel and replacing the enhanced emissions test with the basic test.]

**Preliminary CO Plan Provisions**

Because the airshed analysis shows the region will continue to maintain the CO standard by a wide margin, DEQ proposes to rely on basic provisions to demonstrate how the area will maintain the CO standard in the future. These provisions will include the Tier II/Low Sulfur Fuel federal requirements, and BACT—the existing level of industrial control requirements. DEQ also proposes to continue the vehicle emissions testing program (in slightly modified form) and to maintain the current industrial growth allowance of 14,880 lbs. of CO per day.

Because oxygenated fuel is not needed to continue meeting the carbon monoxide standard, DEQ may recommend that the EQC discontinue that requirement. However, oxygenated fuel enjoys significant support in the community and the decision of the Commission will not be known until late this year. Therefore, DEQ is developing the Portland area plan without relying on the CO emissions reductions produced by oxygenated fuel which will allow the Environmental Quality Commission the flexibility to retain or eliminate the wintertime oxygenated fuel requirement.

Finally, the Portland CO Plan is being written to project maintenance through 2020—the last transportation analysis year on which the air quality plan is based. However, the area’s obligation for the second plan only extends to 2017, so the plan will expire after 2017.

**Requested MPO Recommendations**

DEQ requests the MPO’s recommendations on 3 issues related to transportation planning:

1. **Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (MVEBs)**

MVEBs are typically established in relation to projected future vehicle emissions. Given the large safety margin between projected future emissions and airshed capacity, DEQ recommends setting CO MVEBs at projected on-road motor vehicle emissions plus an additional amount. Two techniques for doing this are to add a flat 10% to projected on-road emissions or to increase future emissions projections by 1% per year.

In addition, DEQ suggests that the CO plan set a single MVEB for years beyond 2020. The Department recommends that the post plan budget be sized to accommodate vehicle emission growth of 1.5% per year through 2037 (20 years beyond the end of 2017—the last year of the required air quality planning period). This approach would allow the MPO to write a 20 year Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in the final year of the Second CO Maintenance Plan that is able to demonstrate conformity with the 2020+ emissions budget for the last year of the RTP.
Emissions budgets based on the above rationales would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2020+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td>1,226,312</td>
<td>975,074</td>
<td>730,941</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,348,943</td>
<td>1,072,581</td>
<td>804,035</td>
<td>1,009,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% per yr.</td>
<td>1,238,575</td>
<td>1,033,578</td>
<td>847,891</td>
<td>1,064,103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Emissions are expressed in lbs. of CO per winter day.)

Issue for TPAC: Does the committee prefer to add a safety margin to the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget for carbon monoxide? If so, should that margin be based on a flat 10% or an annual 1% increase?

2. Sub Regions

In addition to specifying emissions budget for the Portland region, the current CO Plan includes additional emissions budgets for two sub regions: the Central Business District of downtown Portland and 82nd Ave. Corridor (Division to Woodstock). Designation of these sub regions seems to have had little or no air quality benefit and adds administrative burden to Metro's conformity demonstrations. DEQ proposes eliminating these sub regions from the new plan.

Issue for TPAC: Does the committee concur with DEQ's recommendation to eliminate sub regions?

3. Transportation Control Measures (TCMs)

The current CO Plan includes a variety of TCMs—measures that are reinforced under the transportation conformity rules. Metro is the lead agency for developing any new TCMs and has prepared a separate staff report on this issue.

Issue for TPAC: Which TCMs (if any) should be specified in the new CO plan?

Other CO Plan Issues

The new CO maintenance plan will address additional issues that are not directly related to transportation planning. The Department is not asking for the Metropolitan Planning Organization's recommendation on these matters, but will note whatever comments are offered.

4. Enhanced Emissions Test

Under DEQ's current emissions testing program in the Portland area, 1981 through 1995 vehicles are subject to the "enhanced" test while 1996 and newer vehicles are subject to the more OBD (On Board Diagnostics) test. The OBD test is quicker and more effective than the enhanced test and will become increasingly dominant as 1996 and newer vehicles become an ever larger portion of the fleet. DEQ will therefore propose to replace the enhanced test requirement for 1981 - 1995 vehicles with the quicker and easier "basic" (two speed idle) emissions test. This change would increase on-road emissions from the Portland area fleet 1.4% in 2005 and by smaller amounts thereafter. This change would be a SIP revision only. The actual test requirement would not occur until DEQ demonstrates that the change is also acceptable in for precursors of ozone.

5. Contingency Plan

DEQ proposes to continue the current contingency plan provisions (possibly modified by TCM decisions):
Phase 1: CO within 90% of National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS)
(2nd high = 8.1 ppm):
Convene planning group to consider applying additional strategies

Phase 2: Violation of CO NAAQS (2nd high = 9.5 ppm):
Reinstate LAER for industrial sources
Remove Growth Allowance (Offsets Required)
Reinstate Downtown Parking Lid (if violation is downtown)
Reinstate Oxy-fuel (if removed)

6. Growth Allowance

The current CO maintenance plan specifies an amount of CO emissions that can be used by new or expanding industry. This relieves new businesses from having to offset their increased emissions with a greater of emission reductions in the same airshed. DEQ suggests continuing the Industrial Growth Allowance for carbon monoxide at the existing level: 14,880 lbs. per day or 2700 tons per year.

7. Oxygenated Fuel

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 mandated the use of wintertime oxygenated fuel in areas such as Portland that failed to meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for carbon monoxide. Since then, Portland’s CO concentrations have improved significantly, and oxygenated fuel has a far lower CO reduction benefit. This reduced benefit is largely due to the increasing prevalence of computerized engine controls which effectively minimize emissions without fuel additives. However, oxygenated fuel continues to generate significant carbon monoxide reductions in the less sophisticated engines used in non-road vehicles (such as lawnmowers, generators and construction equipment). Emissions projections with and without oxygenated fuel show the following carbon monoxide reduction effects:

- Oxy-fuel effects (on-road vehicles): -5.1% in 2005, -1.6% in 2020
- Oxy-fuel effects (non-road engines): -16.5% in 2005, -15% in 2020
- Net effects of oxy-fuel: -5.2% in 2005, -4.5% in 2020

While oxygenated fuel is no longer needed for Portland to continue meeting the air quality standard for CO, fuel oxygenated with ethanol can have other benefits. First, gasoline oxygenated with 10% ethanol produces an estimated 5 to 8% net reduction in the toxicity of motor vehicle emissions. Second, using ethanol to fuel motor vehicles is generally considered to reduce greenhouse gas emissions significantly; however, estimates are subject to some debate. Estimated greenhouse gas benefits vary according to the type of milling process used, the distance between where feedstock is raised and where it is used, plus the degree to which dried distillers’ grain (a by-product of ethanol production) displaces the use of whole grain for fattening livestock. Another benefit is that ethanol is a renewable fuel that decreases the nation’s dependence on foreign oil.

On the other hand, the petroleum industry indicates that retaining an oxygenated fuel requirement could contribute to an upward pressure on fuel cost and would perpetuate an unnecessary requirement. The use of ethanol as fuel also qualifies for a 52¢ per gallon federal tax credit which may affect some evaluations of net costs and benefits.

The Department’s recommendation to the Environmental Quality Commission on this matter is being developed in consultation with other government agencies.
To: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee
From: Dave Nordberg, (503) 229-5519
Subject: Portland Area Carbon Monoxide (CO) Maintenance Plan

DEQ, in consultation with EPA Region 10, has determined that the last year of the Portland Area CO Maintenance Plan does not need to be a full transportation analysis year. Therefore, DEQ will be able to end the Maintenance Plan 2017 without triggering significant additional modeling effort. To accommodate this change DEQ must express a Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget for the last year of the plan. Therefore, DEQ recommends that the emissions budgets proposed in the Department’s memo of May 19, 2004 be modified as shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td>1,226312</td>
<td>975,074</td>
<td>804,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,348,943</td>
<td>1,072,581</td>
<td>1,149,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% per yr.</td>
<td>1,238,575</td>
<td>1,033,578</td>
<td>1,181,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Emissions are expressed in lbs. of CO per winter day.)

The May 19th memo describes two techniques for setting the emissions budget out to 2017: adding a flat 10% to emissions projections, and adding 1% per year to emissions projections. (2017 emissions actually accommodate growth to 2037.)
Environmental Impact of
Motor Vehicle Exhaust Emissions
in Portland, Oregon

Background
Air pollution from cars comes from by-products of the combustion process (burning fuel in the engine to power the car) and from the evaporation of the fuel itself. Emissions from an individual car vary greatly, depending on the type of car, how it is driven, and the time of year it is driven, among other things.

Gasoline and diesel fuels are mixtures of hydrocarbons, which are compounds which contain hydrogen and carbon atoms. In a “perfect” engine, oxygen in the air would convert all of the hydrogen in the fuel to water, and all of the carbon in the fuel to carbon dioxide. Nitrogen in the air would remain unaffected. In reality, the combustion process cannot be perfect, and automotive engines emit several types of pollutants.

Pollutants and Health Effects
Here are the types of air pollutants associated with motor vehicles, and their health effects:

Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC): Volatile organic compound emissions result when fuel molecules in the engines do not burn or bum only partially. VOCs also escape into the air through fuel evaporation. VOCs react in the presence of nitrogen oxides and sunlight to form ground-level ozone, a major component of smog. Ozone irritates the eyes, damages the lungs, and aggravates respiratory problems.

Nitrogen Oxides (NOx): Under the high pressure and temperature conditions in an engine, nitrogen and oxygen atoms in the air react to form various nitrogen oxides, collectively known as NOx. Nitrogen oxides, like volatile organic compounds, are precursors to the formation of ozone. They also contribute to the formation of acid rain.

Carbon Monoxide (CO): Carbon monoxide is a product of incomplete combustion and occurs when carbon in the fuel is partially oxidized rather than fully oxidized to carbon dioxide. Carbon monoxide reduces the flow of oxygen in the bloodstream and is particularly dangerous to persons with heart disease.

Carbon Dioxide (CO2): Carbon dioxide does not directly impair human health, but it is a "greenhouse gas" that traps the earth’s heat and contributes to the potential for global warming.

Air Toxics: Air toxics are air pollutants that cause adverse health effects. Carcinogens are compounds that cause cancer. Non-cancer health effects such as reproductive and neurological problems are also of concern. Motor vehicles emit several pollutants that are known or probable carcinogens, such as benzene; formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, 1,3-
butadiene and diesel particulate matter. The danger to human health from a toxic air pollutant depends on the amount and length of exposure.

EPA estimates that mobile sources of air toxics (cars, trucks and buses) account for as much as half of all cancers attributed to outdoor sources of air toxics. Non-road mobile sources (such as construction equipment and watercraft) emit air toxics as well. Some toxic compounds (such as benzene) are present in gasoline and are emitted to the air when gasoline evaporates or passes through the engine as unburned fuel. A significant amount of automotive benzene comes from the incomplete combustion of compounds such as toluene and xylene that are chemically very similar to benzene. Formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, diesel particulate matter, and 1,3-butadiene are not present in fuel but are by-products of incomplete combustion. Formaldehyde and acetaldehyde are also formed through a secondary process when other mobile source pollutants undergo chemical reactions in the atmosphere.

Environmental Impact:
Much progress has been made in both automotive technologies and fuel formulations to reduce the amount of air pollution from motor vehicles. However, much of the recent improvements in the amount of emissions from motor vehicles have been offset by increases in the number of miles driven. Therefore, local actions to encourage citizens to use alternatives to driving motor vehicles will have a beneficial impact on air quality.

The following is an illustration of "typical" motor vehicle pollutants for the Portland fleet in the year 2005, based on emission factors generated by the Mobile6 model, using winter driving conditions with oxygenated fuel at 40 mph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>1.064 g/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>2.199 g/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>18.9 g/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>20 lb/gallon of gasoline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>38.493 mg/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3 Butadiene</td>
<td>3.563 mg/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formaldehyde</td>
<td>14.703 mg/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaldehyde</td>
<td>10.844 mg/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolein</td>
<td>0.763 mg/mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, May 19, 2004

Sources:
EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality factsheet 400-F-92-007 and OMS-2 http://www.epa.gov/air/transport/index.html
Mobile 6 model run dated 9/24/03 (VOC, NOx, CO) and 3/4/2004 (air toxics)
In response to the upcoming draft Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Maintenance Plan (CO Plan), there has been substantial discussion of TCMs by TPAC and an ad hoc TCM subcommittee formed that held two meetings to discuss the best approach to TCMs. From these discussions, the issues have been raised that include the following:

1. **Should TCMs be included in the CO Plan.**

   Response. TCMs are voluntary and if they are included in the plan and not implemented Federal funds could be withheld for transportation expansion projects, so there is a risk assumed if included in the new CO Plan (the current plan has nine TCMs). In addition, CO has become much less of a problem in this region, actual levels of CO have dropped well below maximum limits and are expected to decrease even more in the future. However, the region may wish to consider the impact of other transportation generated air pollutants, such as volatile organic compounds and oxides of Nitrogen (precursors of ground level ozone, or smog). Transportation shares the airshed with industrial ozone sources and the region is very close to the maximum permitted level. In addition, there are air toxics such as benzene or acrolein and other air pollutants, including greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide for which concerns have been raised. The CO Plan provides a regulatory means of addressing air pollution while other pollutants do not have plans with this feature. Accordingly, it is recommended that the number of TCMs be decreased from nine to three to recognize progress made with CO and that contingent TCMs also be included in the plan in the event that transportation trends are adverse in order to provide some means of addressing other pollutants as well as to continue to encourage reducing CO emissions.

2. **If contingent TCMs are included, what trigger should be used and how will it work.**

   Response. Contingent TCMs are proposed using a vehicle miles traveled per capita measurement. Each year the vmt/capita will be calculated and reported. Action would be triggered: 1) (at greater than 5 percent above 2002 levels for two years in a row) evaluation of whether there is a transportation/air quality problem (or whether there is a vmt/capita measurement problem) that should be addressed and if so, what local air quality actions might be taken - without any commitment to take action; 2) (at greater than 10 percent above 2002 levels for two years in a row) specific TCMs are required to be implemented including transit improvements, alternatives to single occupant vehicle use and transit oriented development support.
3. Concerning contingent TCM, is the baseline year (2002), a reasonable starting point? Have past trends been influenced by employment trends and 2002 vmt/capita dampened by unemployment? and,

4. Concerning contingent TMC, is HPMS data reliable enough to use as an evaluation factor?

Table 1 plots vmt/capita (dvmt/person) and vmt/employee. Each show a similar pattern - that is, increases during the 1980's and a plateau and slight decline over the 1990's. This leads to the conclusion that the vmt has not been greatly influenced by employment or population growth. However, it does appear that vmt/employee is a somewhat more stable measure (less deviation from the mean) than vmt/capita (see Table 2).

However, using employment based data to compare against vmt has its own issues. For example, the employment data used in the analysis is from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA). BEA data lags by about 2 years, therefore we do not have 2001 and 2002 data. So use of BEA data for a trigger would mean comparing the most current vmt data against employment data that is two year old or simply using two year old vmt and employment data.

Generally speaking, Metro is migrating from the use of BEA data to Bureau of Labor Statistics data (BLS) BLS employment data, however, uses SMSA geography. As the SMSA boundaries have changed over the past years, we don't have a continuous, consistent set of historical BLS employment data from which to analyze the use of BLS data for past stability (deviation from a mean) and appropriateness for use in a vmt/employee measurement.

A suggestion was made to State of Oregon Office of Economic Analysis data. While population and unemployment data is readily available from this source, historical employment data was not found and it would take additional time to explore whether OEA has historical employment data different from BLS and BEA, whether such data could be broken down for the Metro area and whether any time lag exists for these data.

 Accordingly, a trigger measure choice must be made between: 1) using BEA employment data that would always be two years old but more stable than population data; 2) using BLS employment data that would be timely, but no analysis of its historical stability could be done; 3) taking more time to explore the use of OEA data, or 4) using population data that would be timely, but not quite as stable as BEA employment data.

The other part of the measurement, vehicle miles traveled, is another variable about which concerns have also been expressed. That is, the HPMS data (gathered by ODOT and recommended for use in the trigger) varies from year to year. Concern has been expressed about not making the trigger so sensitive that it could be set off by slight variations, or "noise" in the data. Accordingly, in order to examine variability of the vmt data, traffic volumes reported by electronic sensors managed by ODOT for the freeways ringing downtown Portland were gathered for analysis. Table 3 shows five days in April and four days in May, 2002 when traffic volumes
at single points on the reported freeways were gathered. It has been hypothesized that ideally, the mean variation for each freeway should be the same. However, the data show that different freeways have differing means, with as little variation as six percent to as much as nine percent. It does seem likely however, that the larger the data set, the less noise is likely to be reported as individual low anomalies would likely cancel out high deviations. In addition, Metro forecasts future vmt in the region to remain flat (that is, not to increase) Nevertheless, designing a trigger that is activated by "noise" is a concern.

Several choices exist for how sensitive a trigger to set. One approach is to consider just the past historic rate of variability and to avoid activating the trigger needlessly. Another choice is to consider both the historic rate and the forecasts of future. It has been proposed that the trigger not be activated for a high reading for just one year, rather that it be triggered only if two consecutive years are registered in order to avoid an anomalous year or reading. In addition, the contingent TCM trigger has been proposed to include two levels - the first being a "soft" trigger that would activate analysis of the change in vmt per capita or job and why that reading might have occurred and to consider, but not mandate, a list of possible local air quality actions that could be initiated. The second trigger level - a "hard" trigger, would be activated at a higher threshold and would include a specific list of local air quality actions that would have to be done or risk loss of transportation funds.

Accordingly, the following is recommended for contingent TCM triggers.

- 5% trigger - would require that should reported vmt/capita for two consecutive years exceed 20.5 dvmt/capita, that the Standing Committee (TPAC) shall be activated to consider:
  a) whether there is a data problem with the trigger; and,
  b) if there is not a data problem with the trigger, identification of and analysis of effectiveness of those local actions that could reduce air pollutant emissions; and,
  c) whether a recommendation to initiate one or more of these local air quality actions should be made to JPACT.

- 10% trigger - would require two consecutive years exceeding 21.5 daily vmt/capita. Should this level of vmt/capita be exceeded, mandatory TCM would be required.

Should HMPS data parameters change (such as higher quality ITS data become available) the region could, with the advise of the Standing Committee (TPAC) revise the trigger, including using another data base, if warranted. Triggers are calculated using a 2002 base year of 19.5 dvmt/capita (daily vehicle miles data from the Highway Performance Monitoring System, HPMS, and population for the three Oregon counties as checked by Metro prior to use)

5. Is vmt/capita the right measure for a trigger or should emissions be used?
Carbon monoxide is one of many transportation air emissions. CO generation from transportation sources is expected to continue to drop, as is total CO to the year 2020. (Transportation based CO emissions are estimated to drop by about 50 percent - from 1.5 million pounds per winter day in 1999 to .731 million pounds per day in 2020. Total CO emissions are expected to decrease from 2.8 million pounds in 1999 to 2.5 in the year 2020.

However, there are other air pollutants from transportation that are high and trending higher. These include precursors of ground level ozone (volatile organic compounds and oxides of Nitrogen). While we do not currently forecast that the region will exceed air quality standards in the implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan, the region is close to the maximum standard. Exceeding the standard could have adverse consequences to the region's economy as well as transportation system.

In addition, there are several air toxics about which concern has been stated. Transportation is responsible for as much as ½ or more of some of these toxics, including benzene and acrolein.

Although contested, greenhouse gases such as CO₂ are of concern such that the Governors of the three western US states (California, Oregon and Washington) are looking at means to decrease greenhouse gases, including those from transportation sources. Greater vehicle miles traveled, (even if vmt/capita or job decreases) could lead to added levels of some of these pollutants and air toxics even though CO emissions continue to decrease. Accordingly, using CO emissions as a trigger would not track with the expected increase of other air pollutants. Measuring all pollutants of concern, while very useful, is not data readily available on a yearly basis at this time.

Accordingly, a transportation based measure that is consistent with the definition of Transportation Control Measures ("...any measure....for the purpose of reducing emissions or concentrations of air pollutants from transportation sources by reducing vehicle use...") has been proposed.

6. Should the proposed bike and ped facilities financed through the MTIP be the only improvements counted or should the region be able to count all additions, including those required by existing state law?

An easy method of accounting for bike and ped facilities is for Metro to track the MTIP. Are local governments and ODOT willing to agree to reporting requirements for number of bike and ped facilities built? It is suggested that short of local and State agreement to report such data, that Metro track MTIP funding of bike and pedestrian projects as the appropriate method of tracking progress for this TCM.

7. Should the synergistic effects of bike and ped facilities placed in the right places be taken into consideration?
Bike and ped facilities along with other local actions (land use patterns and designs, transit service, etc.) interact to encourage or discourage walking and biking. However, Metro staff is not aware of how to account for these interactions. How should these synergistic effects be taken into consideration? This question may be better answered in broader discussions during future MTIP updates.

8. The trigger numbers should be clarified so that further interpretation is not needed.

This was done. See above.

9. Do we have the capacity to easily achieve the full TCM's?

We have checked with TriMet and they have agreed with the transit service increase TCM. Counting all types of bike facilities we have built 103 miles compared with a goal of 28. Pedestrian facilities built were 10.6 miles compared with a goal of 9.

10. Are the contingent "hard trigger" TCM measures flexible enough to be managed?

The soft trigger trips before the hard trigger and should provide help to avoid the hard trigger. By introducing flexibility to the hard trigger, we can't quantify them and therefore could not advance them in the event of conformity lapse, losing one benefit of having them listed as contingent TCM.

11. The formula for the annual average transit increase should be clarified.

The basic idea of the formula is to recognize that increases in transit service differs depending on the type of vehicle used. Buses typically are able to accommodate about 60 people (seated and standing), while LRT vehicles can accommodate as many as 200 people (again counting people both seated and standing). A formula has been proposed as follows: bus hours of transit revenue hours plus LRT transit hours (weighted by the difference between LRT vehicles and buses) plus streetcar revenue hours (weighted by the difference between streetcars and buses) plus commuter rail revenue hours (weighted by the difference between commuter rail cars and buses). In formula format this would be expressed as:

\[ \text{Bus} + (\text{LRT} \times \text{factor}) + (\text{streetcar} \times \text{factor}) + \text{commuter rail} \times \text{factor}. \]

The total increase for the year will be compared with the previous transit revenue hours and in order to meet the TCM, TriMet will need to show at least a one percent increase over the past year. (The measure is cumulative average, so that for example in the first year transit revenue hours could increase by 2 percent and the second year by only ½ percent and the TCM would still be met.)

Please let me know if you have any questions about this information.
### Table 1: Comparison of Portland Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel Per Person and Per Employee

<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>DVMT/ Person (Miles)*</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVMT/ Employee (Miles)</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Portland Population and Travel (DVMT, Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel) are from the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS, ODOT-Salem). Data from correspondence, and verified with the FHWA, Wash., D.C. Portland is defined as the Oregon portion of the Federal-Aid Urban Area 27 (The Portland-Vancouver Urbanized Area), and consists of a geographic area which includes Multnomah County and portions of Washington and Clackamas Counties in Oregon.

** Employment is for the Portland Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and includes Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties in Oregon. An area basically equivalent to that used for population and DVMT. The data is from the Metro Regional Data Book, September 2002; and originally is from the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Table CA 25; REIS, May 2002; (nonfarm employment includes proprietors).
# A Comparison of Portland Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel Per Person and Per Employee

<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><strong>DVMT/ Person (Miles)</strong></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DVMT/ Employee (Miles)</strong></td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DVMT/ Person % Change</strong></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DVMT/ Employee % Change</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990 to 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DVMT/ Person, Mean 1990 to 2000</strong></td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DVMT/ Employee, Mean 1990 to 2000</strong></td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DVMT/ Person, Standard Deviation 1990 to 2000</strong></td>
<td>STDEV(18.8,19.2,19.8,20.9,20.1,20.9,21.7,20.8,21.0,20.5,20.0) = 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DVMT/ Employee, Standard Deviation 1990 to 2000</strong></td>
<td>STDEV(25.2,25.6,25.5,27.9,26.0,26.3,26.6,26.2,26.3,25.7,25.5) = 0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DVMT/ Person, Mean + &amp; -1 Standard Deviation 1990 to 2000</strong> = 20.3-.85; 20.3+.85</td>
<td>19.45 21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DVMT/ Employee, Mean + &amp; -1 Standard Deviation 1990 to 2000</strong> = 26.2-.73; 26.2+.73</td>
<td>25.47 26.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATR D Summary - Wednesdays In April & May 200

**By Name & Station Number: Source ODOT (Combined Traffic Volume Directions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Apr-02</th>
<th>Apr-09</th>
<th>Apr-16</th>
<th>Apr-23</th>
<th>Apr-30</th>
<th>May-07</th>
<th>May-14</th>
<th>May-21</th>
<th>May-28</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>&lt;M</th>
<th>&gt;M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stadium (I-405) 26-005</td>
<td>107,391</td>
<td>110,434</td>
<td>111,085</td>
<td>104,451</td>
<td>109,720</td>
<td>107,950</td>
<td>111,359</td>
<td>112,582</td>
<td>112,246</td>
<td>109,691</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Banfield (I-5) 26-015</td>
<td>152,621</td>
<td>157,649</td>
<td>155,370</td>
<td>146,019</td>
<td>156,152</td>
<td>150,386</td>
<td>158,784</td>
<td>158,223</td>
<td>159,598</td>
<td>154,978</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa St (I-5) 26-016</td>
<td>157,238</td>
<td>158,985</td>
<td>162,360</td>
<td>153,935</td>
<td>160,011</td>
<td>158,421</td>
<td>161,358</td>
<td>162,485</td>
<td>163,249</td>
<td>159,782</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamhill (I-205) 26-018</td>
<td>167,650</td>
<td>168,621</td>
<td>171,130</td>
<td>158,491</td>
<td>171,425</td>
<td>170,417</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>163,574</td>
<td>171,102</td>
<td>167,801</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota (I-5) 26-019</td>
<td>141,912</td>
<td>141,970</td>
<td>144,930</td>
<td>140,039</td>
<td>144,364</td>
<td>144,836</td>
<td>149,137</td>
<td>148,477</td>
<td>149,034</td>
<td>144,967</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont (I-405) 26-027</td>
<td>123,730</td>
<td>121,990</td>
<td>126,552</td>
<td>123,547</td>
<td>125,640</td>
<td>126,618</td>
<td>126,659</td>
<td>128,263</td>
<td>129,141</td>
<td>125,793</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined ATR Mean</td>
<td>141,757</td>
<td>143,275</td>
<td>145,238</td>
<td>137,747</td>
<td>144,552</td>
<td>143,105</td>
<td>141,459</td>
<td>145,601</td>
<td>147,395</td>
<td>143,348</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Daily vmt/capita for the Portland side of the metropolitan area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Vehicle Miles per Capita (HPMS)
- Projected vmt/capita - Metro UGB

5% increase over 2002 rate of 19.5 = 20.5
10% increase over 2002 rate = 21.5
TO: Councilor Rod Park, Chair, JPACT  
FROM: Mark Turpel, Principal Planner  
DATE: June 3, 2004  
SUBJECT: Resolution 04-3457 - Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Plan

As part of JPACT's consideration of the Second Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Plan, Transportation Control Measures (TCM) are proposed as local actions to help keep the region in compliance with air quality standards. One TCM applies to cumulative annual average increases in transit service hours weighted by capacity. That is, in order to recognize that light rail vehicles can carry three or more times the passengers than buses, transit service hours are weighted to take this fact into consideration.

Recently, a concern has been raised by TriMet that transit service improvements, especially high capacity transit like light rail, often occurs in bursts. For example, major increases in transit service occurred with Westside Light Rail, Airport MAX and Interstate MAX. Work is proceeding to complete the Washington Commuter Rail Project in 2006 and the South Corridor LRT Project in 2009. However, there are many unknowns yet to be addressed and these schedules could be extended. In addition, the proposed wording may not allow for consideration of the very recent addition of Interstate MAX service in the calculations.

Accordingly, we recommend that the TCM for transit service increases be revised as follows:

a. a 5 year rolling average of 1.0 % cumulative annual per cent per year average increase in regional transit revenue hours weighted by capacity, including the addition of Interstate MAX in 2004, between the years 2006 through 2017; and ...

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

cc: Phil Selinger, TriMet, Dave Nordberg, DEQ
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF DESIGNATING SOUTH  )  RESOLUTION NO. 04-3456
METRO AREA RAPID TRANSIT (SMART) TRANSIT  )
DISTRICT AS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE FEDERAL  )  Introduced by
URBANANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM  )  Councilor Rod Park
FUNDS AND TO AMEND THE 2004-07  )  JPACT Chair
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION  )  
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO REFLECT  )
DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO SMART.  )

WHEREAS, the City of Wilsonville’s South Metro Area Rapid Transit service area has been
designated by the federal government as a part of the contiguous Portland Metro urbanized area as a result
of an analysis of the 2000 Census data; and

WHEREAS, public transit service agencies within an urbanized area of more than 200,000
population are eligible for federal transit funding through the Urbanized Area Formula Program (Title 49
United States Code section 5307); and

WHEREAS, a certified resolution of the policy-making body of the Metropolitan Planning
Organization in an urbanized area concurring with the designation of a transit agency as an eligible
recipient for Urban Area Formula Program funding; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and the Metro Council are identified in federal regulations as the Portland
Area Metropolitan Planning Organization responsible for the allocation of federal highway and transit
funding; and

WHEREAS, legal counsel for SMART will be providing documentation of the legal capacity of
SMART to perform the functions of a Designated Recipient; and

WHEREAS, SMART, TriMet and C-Tran, the public transit service agencies within the
boundaries of the Portland Metro urbanized area have agreed to an allocation formula for the division and
distribution of Portland Metro area Urbanized Area Formula Program funds; and

WHEREAS, federal regulations identify preparation of a metropolitan transportation
improvement program (MTIP) as the means for programming of such funds; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Council concur that
the City of Wilsonville’s South Metro Area Rapid Transit service is an eligible Designated Recipient of
federal Urbanized Area Formula Program funds in the Portland Metro area, and

2. The 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in
Exhibit A.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ______ day of _____________________, 2004.
APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel
April 19, 2004

Mr. Richard Krochalis  
Regional Administrator  
Federal Transit Administration  
915 Second Avenue, Suite 3142  
Seattle, WA 98174-1002

RE: Portland, OR--WA UZA  
FY04 Section 5307 Sub-Apportionment

Dear Mr. Krochalis:

This letter documents the understanding reached by TriMet, SMART and C-TRAN regarding the sub-apportionment of the FY04 Section 5307 formula funds for the Portland, OR--WA region. The division of the total funds available to the UZA is also a part of this understanding.

Grant personnel from each authority reached consensus regarding the sub-apportionment of the FY04 funds and utilized Region 10's worksheets, *FY2004 Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Apportionments and Fiscal Year 2004 Formula Grant Apportionments - Unit Values of Data*, to calculate the funds available and the division of funds between the three agencies.

We hereby certify that the following represents the correct and agreed upon sub-apportionment between our three agencies for the FY04 Section 5307 funds. The agreed upon allocation is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TriMet</th>
<th>SMART</th>
<th>C-TRAN</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY04 Apportionment</td>
<td>$26,424,620</td>
<td>$206,162</td>
<td>$3,830,630</td>
<td>$30,461,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Enhancements</td>
<td>266,915</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>38,693</td>
<td>307,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FY04 Apportionment</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,691,535</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208,245</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,869,323</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,769,103</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMART and C-TRAN confirm they are not eligible for Fixed Guideway Modernization funds.

Based on correspondence received from Ken Johnson at FTA in DC, clarifying language on page 6731 of the February 11, 2004 Federal Register (Vol. 69, No. 28) SMART is eligible for FY03 Section 5307 formula funds.
We hereby certify that the following represents the correct and agreed upon revised FY04 sub-apportionment between our three agencies for the FY03 Section 5307 funds previously not allocated to SMART:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TriMet</th>
<th>SMART</th>
<th>C-TRAN</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY04 Apportionment</td>
<td>$26,424,620</td>
<td>$206,162</td>
<td>$3,830,630</td>
<td>$30,461,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FY03 SMART Apportionment</td>
<td>(115,300)</td>
<td>126,438</td>
<td>(11,137)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised FY04 Apportionment</td>
<td>$26,309,320</td>
<td>$332,600</td>
<td>$3,819,493</td>
<td>$30,461,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Enhancements</td>
<td>266,915</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>38,693</td>
<td>307,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revised FY04 Apportionment</strong></td>
<td>$26,576,235</td>
<td>$334,682</td>
<td>$3,858,186</td>
<td>$30,769,103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are questions regarding the above information, please contact Alison Langton at TriMet, 503-962-5850, Steve Dickey at SMART, 503-570-1576 or Jan Allen at C-TRAN, 360-906-7312.

Sincerely,

TriMet    SMART    C-TRAN

Fred Hansen  Steve Dickey  Lynne Griffith
General Manager  General Manager  Executive Director/CEO

cc: Jan Allen, Budget & Grants Coordinator, C-TRAN
Frederick Bateman, Director, Finance & Administration, C-TRAN
Dale Robbins, Regional Transportation Council
Alison Langton, Finance Administrator, TriMet
Claire Potter, Director, Financial Analysis & Grants Administration, TriMet
Ted Leybold, MTIP Program Administrator, Metro
IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 04-3456, FOR THE PURPOSE OF DESIGNATING SOUTH METRO AREA RAPID TRANSIT (SMART) TRANSIT DISTRICT AS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE FEDERAL URBANIZED AREA FORMULA PROGRAM FUNDS AND TO AMEND THE 2004-07 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO REFLECT DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO SMART.

Date: June 1, 2004
Prepared by: Ted Leybold

BACKGROUND

Prior to the 2000 census, the City of Wilsonville and its South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART) service area was not part of the contiguous Portland Metro urbanized area as recognized by the US Department of Transportation. This boundary is defined by population density and similar factors and is distinct from the Metro boundary or the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) boundary. The urbanized area boundary is used by the department of transportation to establish eligibility for their distinct federal urban and rural transit funding programs.

In 2003, the department of transportation established rules for the transition of transit service districts that had moved between an urbanized and rural area as a result of the new data from the 2000 census. The transition of including SMART as eligible for federal urban transit funding corresponds to inclusion of data from the Wilsonville area in the Federal Transit Administration’s determination of the Portland Metro urbanized areas share of federal urban transit funds.

As the city of Wilsonville and its SMART service area became a part of the Portland Metro urbanized area, an agreement between SMART and the other public transit operators in the Portland Metro area (TriMet and C-Tran) was completed to define how to divide the Portland Metro urbanized area’s federal transit funds, also known as Section 5307 funds. This agreement was completed by the three public transit agencies and is attached as Exhibit A to Resolution 04-3456. The agreement uses factors such as population, population density and vehicle service hours to divide the funds among the transit agencies. These are similar to factors used by the Federal Transit Administration to apportion these funds between the urban areas.

While the Portland Metro urbanized area now includes the Wilsonville area, the Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Governor for the urbanized area must concur that a public transit operator is eligible to receive Section 5307 federal urban transit funds. Adoption of this resolution will serve this function for Metro as the region’s MPO. Acceptance of this resolution and other applicant materials will establish eligibility for SMART to apply to the Federal Transit Administration for the grant funds apportioned to the Portland Metro urbanized area consistent with the sub-allocation of funds per the public transit agency agreement.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

As data for the Wilsonville area is included in the factors considered by the Federal Transit Administration in apportioning urban transit funds to the Portland Metro urbanized area, the agreement
sub-allocating funds to SMART does not represent a reduction in funds to the other public transit agencies in the Metro area.

1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.

2. **Legal Antecedents** This resolution fulfills Metro’s obligation under federal rules (Federal Register/ Vol. 69, No. 28/ March 12, 2003, p 11908 III C.3) as the Portland Metro urbanized area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization to concur that the South Metro Area Rapid Transit is an eligible designated recipient of federal urban transit (Section 5307) funds. It also amends the 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) as adopted by Metro Resolution No. 03-3381A to reflect the distribution of urban transit funds between TriMet, C-Tran and SMART for federal fiscal year 2004.

3. **Anticipated Effects** Adoption of this resolution is a necessary step to make SMART eligible to receive federal urban transit funds.

4. **Budget Impacts** Adoption of this resolution has no effect on the Metro budget.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Metro Council approve Resolution No. 04-3456.
The Gap with Current Funds

The current cost to construct the combined I-205/Portland Mall LRT project is currently estimated by TriMet to be approximately $499 million. The project’s financing plan calls for 60% of the cost to be paid for by the federal government with the remaining 40% match, or $199.6 million, coming from local sources. To date, $173.8 million of local sources have been pledged, leaving a gap of $25.9 million to round out the funding plan.

Table 1 shows the current funding commitments to the I-205/Mall LRT project and the resulting gap in local funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COSTS</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project</td>
<td>7,658</td>
<td>$31,086</td>
<td>$155,336</td>
<td>$193,137</td>
<td>$97,095</td>
<td>$13,878</td>
<td>$1,015</td>
<td>$499,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTIP: Current</td>
<td>$7,658</td>
<td>$23,586</td>
<td>$8,556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$299,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/PDC (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Finance</td>
<td>$112,524</td>
<td>$12,095</td>
<td>($56,122)</td>
<td>($68,496)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT</td>
<td>$7,658</td>
<td>$31,086</td>
<td>$155,336</td>
<td>$193,137</td>
<td>$97,095</td>
<td>$13,878</td>
<td>$1,014</td>
<td>$499,205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes about $9.2M in interim borrowing cost.
(2) $1M of the original $35M commitment is applied to Preliminary Engineering.
(3) In addition, City will contribute $1M to Preliminary Engineering.

As shown in Table 1:

- While the total cost of the project is sensitive to federal financing and interim borrowing assumptions, the cost of the project, as currently constituted, is about $499.2M (in year of expenditure dollars).
- Under this “initial” capital cost and “existing” MTIP plan, the funding gap is about $26M.
2 Proposed Strategy to Fill Gap

The proposed finance plan/cash flow is shown in Table 2. Table 2 reflects the following proposed changes to Table 1:

(a) Reduce Project costs by $10M—saving $4 million in local funds,
(b) Additional funding from TriMet of $5M,
(c) Additional funding from City of Portland of $2M,
(d) Additional funding from PSU of $2M,
(e) Additional funding from Clackamas County of $1M (bringing total for Final Design and construction back to $35M (another $1M is being used for PE),
(f) Additional funding from ODOT of $3M, and
(g) A supplemental multi-year commitment of MTIP funds to cover the remaining $8.7M shortfall.

As shown in Table 3, this proposed strategy results in a requirement for a supplemental allocation of MTIP funds of $1.3M per year from FY 2008 through FY 2015, inclusive. This is in addition to the currently committed $8M per year allocation during this period. These additional funds could be either STP or CMAQ funds.

Table 2
I-205 LRT Proposed Funding Plan and Cash Flow Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TriMet Fiscal Year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Costs</td>
<td>$7,504</td>
<td>$30,461</td>
<td>$152,214</td>
<td>$189,189</td>
<td>$94,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Starts</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$63,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial MTIP Allocation</td>
<td>$7,504</td>
<td>$22,962</td>
<td>$9,335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>$20,380</td>
<td>$4,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT (1)</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/PDC</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$108,907</td>
<td>$9,977</td>
<td>-$56,613</td>
<td>-$62,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT</td>
<td>$7,504</td>
<td>$30,462</td>
<td>$152,215</td>
<td>$189,189</td>
<td>$94,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The proposed supplemental ODOT funds presume that the region will assist ODOT in seeking replacement federal funds.

(2) This contribution is proceeds from bonds backed by a multi-year stream of MTIP funds shown in Table 3.
### Table 3: Use of Supplemental MTIP Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supplemental MTIP Allocation to I-205/Mall LRT Project</th>
<th>Value of Supplemental MTIP Funds Applied to Supplemental GARVEE Bond Issue</th>
<th>Supplemental GARVEE Bond Proceeds Applied to I-205/Mall LRT Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '08</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '09</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '10</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '11</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '12</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '13</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '14</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '15</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$10.40</td>
<td>$8.76</td>
<td>$8.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clackamas County Growth and Infrastructure

- **SUNRISE CORRIDOR**
  - A new planned roadway serving interstate commerce, existing and new communities.

- **DAMASCUS AREA**
  - The Metro Region's opportunity for significant expansion of the regional employment base.
Sunrise Corridor
Collaboration begins 16 years ago

- 1988 Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) lists as "Access Oregon Highway" project in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
- 1993 ODOT completes draft EIS – public hearings on Unit 1 (I-205 – 172nd Avenue). ODOT purchases properties at Camp Withycombe for project right-of-way.
- 1996 Clackamas County Board of Commissioners chooses preferred corridor routes for Unit 1 and Unit 2. The preferred route minimized impacts and costs.
- 1998 ODOT delays Final EIS for Unit 1 due to lack of construction funding and as a result of added ESA (Endangered Species Act) requirements.
Sunrise Corridor

- **2000** Metro adds Sunrise Corridor to the RTP as a limited access four lane facility with interchanges at key points.

- **2002** County amends Industrial Area Urban Renewal District boundary and permits up to $20 million of TIF funds to the project.

  Metro adds an additional 12,000 acres within the Urban Growth Boundary in the Damascus Area.

  OTC designates the Sunrise Corridor as one of six highway projects of statewide significance.

- **2003** ODOT allocates $909,000 for EIS.
Sunrise Corridor

- **2003**
  - **Metro approves** $2 million of MTIP funds for Supplemental EIS and Damascus/Boring concept planning.
  - **JPACT unanimously endorses** project as a priority for federal funding.
  - **County allocates** $860,000 for supplemental EIS.

- **2004**
  - **Congress appropriates** $500,000 for EIS work.
  - **County begins** work on EIS and concept planning. EIS will examine modal alternatives.
  - **County Development Agency has spent** to date $2,805,889 to acquire right of way in Unit 1. Another $5 million is pending for right-of-way acquisitions.
The Sunrise Corridor

Unit 1 extends from I-205 to 172nd Avenue (5 miles)

Unit 2 extends further east to Highway 26 (8 miles)

(Alignment to be determined - illustration only)
Significant Transportation Corridor

The existing Hwy 212/224 is a transportation corridor of National and Statewide significance and designated on:

- The State Highway Freight System.
- The National Highway System (NHS).
- One of 8 projects endorsed statewide by the 2003 Oregon Business Plan.
- Project is on ODOT's list of projects of statewide significance.

This Corridor is an important route on the Portland Metropolitan Regional Freight System.
Figure 1.17

The Sunrise Corridor

Freight Designations
- Main roadway routes
- Road connectors
- Main railroad lines
- Branch railroad lines and spur tracks
- Marina facility
- Railroad facility
- Air cargo facility
- Distribution facility
- Truck terminal
- Intermodal railyard

Land-use key:
- Urban centers
- Rural area
- Industry
- Neighborhoods
- Urban growth boundary

The Sunrise Corridor

Regional Freight System
Sunrise Corridor deemed a critical element of the RTP "priority system" in the 20 year plan period.

RTP calls for design elements and phasing of improvements to reinforce development in the Damascus town center to include:

- Construct segment from I-205 / Hwy 224 interchange to existing Hwy 212 at Rock Creek.
- Preserve right-of-way (ROW) from Rock Creek to US 26.
- Sequence construction as follows:
  - Complete I-205 to Rock Creek.
  - ROW acquisition of remaining segments.
  - Construction of 222nd Ave. to Hwy 26.
  - Construct middle segment from Rock Creek to 222nd Ave. as Damascus town center develops.

Interchange locations include 172nd Ave., the major north/south route serving the Damascus and Pleasant Valley areas.
Sunrise Corridor
Important to Fix Today

The Sunrise Corridor is needed today to fix the problems on an existing state highway facility.

- Freight movement is impacted because of safety and congestion problems. Many intersections are failing.

- The SPIS (Safety Performance Index System) ranks this route in the top 10% of unsafe routes statewide.

- According to the Fred Meyer distribution center, it can take up to 45 minutes for a truck to travel from their front door to reach I-205 via Highway 212, only ½ mile and three traffic signals away.
Sunrise Corridor – Needed Today
Congestion Exceeds
Level of Service Standards for County and ODOT

HIGHWAY 212 CONGESTION
- CONGESTED ROADWAY
- CONGESTED INTERSECTION
Sunrise Corridor – Needed Today
Congestion Exceeds
Level of Service Standards for County and ODOT
Sunrise Corridor
Important for Today’s Economy

- Existing Hwy 212 corridor serves a vital local economy.
  - Home to the Fred Meyer, Safeway and USF/Reddaway distribution centers.
  - Sustains 24,000 family wage jobs with an estimated annual payroll of $824 million.
  - Supports 45 million square feet of industrial and commercial development on 1,000 acres.
  - 75% of all vehicular trips on this facility stay within the region.
Important as an East / West Connector in the State and Region

- The western terminus of the Sunrise Corridor is located at the intersection of I-205 and Highway 212/224.
  - The average daily traffic volume is 58,400 trips daily.
  - The average daily truck volume is 7,000 or 12% of all trips.
- The Sunrise Corridor is a gateway to Mt. Hood, eastern and central Oregon and beyond.
  - 25% of all east bound trips are through trips, including autos and freight, traveling from I-205 to Highway 26.
Major Transportation Corridor with High Traffic Volumes

YEAR 2002 TRUCK COUNTS AND TRUCK PERCENTAGE OF ALL VEHICLES

- **Oregon City**: 0.0% (0,000)
- **Gladstone**: 6.3% (2,450)
- **Milwaukie**: 9.1% (3,353)
- **Gresham**: 3.0% (750)
- **West Linn**: 10.3% (1,814)
- **Happy Valley**: 10.3% (1,212)
- **212**: 12.0% (3,936)
- **205**: 12.0% (7,009)
- **224**: 11.6% (17,830)

MULTNOMAH COUNTY
CLACKAMAS COUNTY

TRUCK TRAFFIC PERCENTAGE OF ALL AVERAGE DAILY VEHICLE TRAFFIC
AVERAGE DAILY TRUCK TRAFFIC COUNT
SUNRISE CORRIDOR
Unit 1 (I-205 – 172nd Avenue)

Unit 1 Schedule

- EIS 2004 - 2005
- ROW and PE 2006 - 2008
- Construction 2008 - 2011
Sunrise Corridor - Unit 1  
(I-205 – 172nd Avenue)  
Funding Partnership

Supplemental Draft and Final EIS
- MTIP funds $600,000
- Clackamas Industrial Area Urban Renewal funds $860,000
- State ODOT funds $909,000
- Federal 2004 appropriations $500,000

Total: $2,869,000
# Sunrise Corridor Unit 1
## Estimated Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Current Funding</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIS Update</td>
<td>$2,869,000</td>
<td>$2,869,000</td>
<td>Urban Renewal, Federal, State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelim. Eng.</td>
<td>$17,130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way Acquisition</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$160,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$219,999,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,869,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds needed: $197,130,000
Urban Expansion in the Metro Region
December 2002

Damascus Area
~12,000 acres

Approved Urban Growth Boundary Expansion Areas in the Portland Metro Region
A New City

Damascus

- Will receive majority of growth and new jobs in the Portland Metro region in the next 20 years.
Damascus

- Damascus Area – Chosen for urbanization through land use planning process.
  - Close proximity to Portland Metro Region.
  - Ability to serve with urban infrastructure.
  - Comprised of ‘secondary lands’ - no prime agricultural soils important for farming.
A Complete Community

A new urban area is now being planned in the Damascus-Boring unincorporated area of Clackamas County.

- 60,000 new people, 25,000 new dwelling units and 50,000 new jobs over the next twenty years.
- Planned for 1 person per 8,000 square feet, far exceeding today's density of 1 person per acre.
- A new ‘Complete Community’ where people can live, work, and play.
- Community to provide a jobs and housing balance with multimodal transportation options reducing the need for commuting outside the area.
## Coordinated Land Use and Transportation Planning for the Urbanization of Damascus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 - 2005</td>
<td>Concept Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Begin Comprehensive Plan Changes and Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - 2009</td>
<td>Unit 2 EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - 2011</td>
<td>Unit 2 PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 - 2011</td>
<td>Unit 2 ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2013</td>
<td>Unit 2 Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Damascus Area Employment

Foundation for Economic Development

- About 2,300 acres of high quality potential employment properties.
- 50,000 + new jobs.
Current and Future Employment Areas

Sunrise Corridor Freight Movement
Current & Future Demand in New Employment Area

Sunrise Corridor UNIT 1
Sunrise Corridor UNIT 2
Milwaukie/Clackamas Industrial Area

The southern alignment was recommended and adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in Resolution 96-763.

UNIT 1
- Square Feet: 45 million sq. ft. (Tech/Flex or Industrial)
- Jobs: 24,607
- Acres: 1,025

UNIT 2
- Square Feet: 25 to 31 million sq. ft. (25 million Tech/Flex - 31 million Ind)
- Jobs: 56,454
- Acres: 2,352

UNIT 1 SCHEDULE:
(I-205 to 172nd Ave.)
- EIS: 2003 to 2005
- ROW and PE: 2006 to 2008
- Construction: Starting in 2008 on Phase 1 on Unit 1

UNIT 2 SCHEDULE:
(172nd Ave. to State Hwy 26)
- EIS: Fall 2006 to Winter 2009
- PE: Winter 2009 to Spring 2011
- ROW: Winter 2010 to Spring 2011
- Construction: Spring 2011 to Fall 2013

2002 Metro Approved UGB Expansion Area
Current UGB
New Employment Sites
(24 jobs/acre)
Industrial or Distribution Site
Warehouse Space
All Other Industrial Use in the Clackamas Area

Average daily truck volume (Source ODOT, 2000)

Truck traffic % of average daily vehicles

Sunrise Corridor UNIT 1
Sunrise Corridor UNIT 2
Milwaukie/Clackamas Industrial Area
Proposed New Industrial Areas

- 172nd and Hwy 212 Area (industrial, office & retail)
  - 10 minutes or 4 miles to I-205
  - 25 minutes to Portland International Airport

- 242nd Avenue Area Employment Land (industrial)
  - 15 minutes or 8 miles to I-205
  - 30 minutes to Portland International Airport

- Employment sites in Boring
  Adjacent to Highway 26 with excellent interstate access
  - 9 miles to I-205
  - 20 minutes to I-205, 20 minutes to I-84
  - 30 minutes to Portland International Airport
Project Development and Financing

Challenges Ahead

- Build a major transportation facility providing a critical link in the state highway system for greater economic mobility and vitality.

- Cost estimate for Sunrise Corridor project to Hwy 26: $520 million. All of Unit 2 is unfunded including acquisition of right of way.

- Need to avoid additional expense by proceeding in a timely manner.
Our Greatest Challenge

To provide the needed transportation infrastructure in a timely manner for urbanization of the Damascus area to occur within a 20-year time frame.
Highway 217 Corridor Study

Like the entire region, Washington County has experienced unprecedented growth during the last 20 years – and the county is still growing. New residents and businesses create new demands – from moving freight to additional bus riders – on the transportation system.

Highway 217, the major north-south route for the county, operates near capacity during rush hour and can be especially congested when a minor accident occurs or even when it rains.

Because of growing demands on Highway 217, Metro, in partnership with the cities of Beaverton, Lake Oswego and Tigard; Washington County, the Oregon Department of Transportation and TriMet, is undertaking a study of the Highway 217 Corridor. The 18-month study, guided by a Policy Advisory Committee that includes business representatives, residents and elected officials, will consider improvements to make Highway 217 function more efficiently while minimizing impacts to surrounding communities.

Study goal
The goal of the study is to develop transportation strategies that can be implemented during the next 20 years to provide for efficient movement of goods and people along the corridor while supporting economically dynamic and attractive regional and town centers and respecting the livability of nearby communities.

The study will look at ways to:
• engage community members in discussions about possible improvements and develop widely supported projects that include financing and phasing plans
• support and enhance regional and town centers by improving bike, pedestrian, roadway and transit access to centers and connections across the highway
• enhance the function of Highway 217 as a major thoroughfare that serves key regional destinations
• promote the safety of all modes and develop alternatives that are cost effective
• support the pivotal role that Highway 217 plays in the economy of the region by enhancing the efficient movement of goods, services and people along the corridor
• minimize impacts to neighborhoods and the natural environment
• consider a range of lane-types, including carpool and peak hour priced lanes, and enhanced transit service.

The Policy Advisory Committee and technical staff will work together to develop criteria to measure how well each alternative achieves project goals.
Study organization
An advisory committee of technical staff from each of the jurisdictions will meet regularly to review technical documents, study options and designs and findings.

The Policy Advisory Committee will meet once a month throughout the study to review findings, make recommendations and advise staff on public outreach. The committee also will hear public comment and make final study recommendations to the Metro Council and local jurisdictions.

Get involved
As the study progresses, there will be many opportunities for you and other community members to get involved. Study staff will provide information and ask for feedback through workshops and open houses, meetings with neighborhood and civic organizations, public opinion research and one-on-one meetings. To join the mailing list for notices of future meetings and public comment opportunities, call Kristin Hull at (503) 797-1864 or send an e-mail to hull@metro.dst.or.us.

Policy Advisory Committee meetings are held from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. on the third Wednesday of each month at the Beaverton City Library, 12375 SW Fifth St., and are open to the public. Visit Metro’s web site at www.metro-region.org for meeting information.

Timeline
The study will be completed in two consecutive phases beginning in September 2003.

PAC members
Brian Moore – PAC chair; Tigard City Council; PGE
Frank Angelo – Westside Economic Alliance Transportation Committee chair
Dan Aberg – Westside Transportation Alliance
Steve Clark – Community Newspapers; Westside Economic Alliance
Domonic Biggi – Beaverton Chamber of Commerce; Beaverton Foods
Nathalie Darcy – Garden Home resident
Rob Drake – mayor of Beaverton; member of Metro’s Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Matthew Garrett – ODOT Region 1
Kent Haldorson – citizen representative, north of Highway 217
S. Joan Hamrick – citizen representative, south of Highway 217
Van Hooper – Sysco Food Systems
Carl Hosticka – Metro councilor, District 3
James A. Johnson – frequent user of Highway 217
John Kaye – Tektronik
George Machan – Cornforth Consultants, Inc.
Jim Persey – Greenway Neighborhood Association Committee chair
Lynn Peterson – Lake Oswego City Council
Jack Reardon – Washington Square
Dick Schouten – Washington County Board of Commissioners
Dennis Thomas – Beaverton School District
Phase One Highway 217 Corridor Study Options

The Highway 217 Policy Advisory Committee, a committee of community members, business representatives and elected officials, has approved a range of alternatives to be considered during the first phase of the Highway 217 Corridor Study. The first phase will include preliminary technical and environmental analysis of each option. In fall 2004, community members will be invited to review the analysis and help the committee select which options should be carried forward to the second phase.

Expected to recommend transportation improvements for the Highway 217 corridor in the spring 2005, the study is a cooperative effort by Metro, the cities of Beaverton, Lake Oswego and Tigard, Washington County, the Oregon Department of Transportation and TriMet.

Seven options have been selected for study. In addition to these options, the study will identify needed bike, pedestrian and local street connections in the corridor. These improvements will be considered in addition to the baseline option.

Baseline option
The baseline option helps determine the benefits of each alternative by offering a base for comparison. It assumes construction of improvements that are adopted as part of the region's financially constrained transportation plan. The financially constrained plan includes road, transit, bike and pedestrian projects expected to be constructed in the next 20 years given current funding streams. Because these improvements are likely to be constructed, they are included as the base for each of the options that will be studied.

The baseline option would include:
- additional northbound lane on Highway 217 from Canyon Road to US 26
- additional lanes on US 26 from the Sylvan interchange to Highway 217 (under construction)
- additional lanes on US 26 from Highway 217 to Murray Boulevard
- roadway improvements throughout the corridor planned by local jurisdictions
- transit service increases
- commuter rail service from Wilsonville to Beaverton during rush hour.

Four-lane plus transit and interchange improvements option
The four-lane option does not include new lanes on Highway 217 except a new northbound lane from Canyon Road to US 26 that has already been funded. This option attempts to meet transportation demand in the corridor by improving ramps, increasing transit service and constructing improvements to other streets that are in the region's preferred transportation plan. The region's preferred plan includes projects that are not expected be constructed unless new funding sources are identified. This option also would include building braided ramps or consolidating interchanges by connecting them with frontage roads. These solutions seek to address the merge and weave problem that has been identified by both technical analysis and community observation as a cause of accidents and slow traffic on Highway 217.

The four-lane plus option would include:
- four through lanes from Canyon Road to I-5 on Highway 217 (no additional through lanes)
- six through lanes north of Canyon Road to U.S. 26, as currently constructed or funded
- improvements to streets that cross or parallel Highway 217 that are included in the region's preferred transportation plan
- either braided ramps or consolidated interchanges at some locations on the highway
- additional bus service such as new light-rail feeder routes, new connections between centers and capital improvements to make bus service function better
- more frequent headways and longer hours of operation for commuter rail between Wilsonville and Beaverton.

Braided ramps separate traffic that is trying to exit from entering traffic by creating a bridge for traffic entering the freeway that does not descend to the freeway until it has crossed over traffic exiting the freeway. In this way, traffic engineers "braid" ramps with some traffic crossing over and some crossing under to prevent accidents and slowing traffic.
Another way to address merge/weave conflicts is consolidating interchanges and connecting them with frontage roads. This solution has been applied at Canyon Road and the Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway on Highway 217 where access to two streets has been combined into one interchange. Drivers entering Highway 217 going north from Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway use a frontage road to enter at the Canyon Road entrance. Frontage roads are less expensive to construct than braided ramps but require more right of way. They also remove local trips from the freeway by providing a parallel off-freeway connection between streets.

**SEX LANE OPTIONS**

**Six-lane option without interchange improvements**

The six-lane option would include:

- six through lanes (three in each direction) on Highway 217 from US 26 to I-5
- existing on and off ramp system with auxiliary lanes
- improvements included in the baseline option.

**Six-lane plus option**

The six-lane plus option would include:

- six lanes (three in each direction) on Highway 217 from US 26 to I-5
- braided ramps or consolidated interchanges
- improvements included in the baseline option.

**Carpool lane option**

Carpool lanes, like those on I-5 between 405 and the Interstate Bridge, are lanes restricted to automobiles carrying two or more people and buses during rush hours. Carpool lanes are an incentive to carpool or take transit. A bypass lane on ramps for carpools could be constructed to further reduce delay for carpools. Carpool lanes are sometimes referred to as high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes.

The carpool lane option would include:

- six lanes (three in each direction) on Highway 217 from US 26 to I-5
- braided ramps or consolidated interchanges
- improvements included in the baseline option.

**Rush-hour toll lane option**

In other cities, a concept called rush-hour tolling, or value pricing, has been successfully implemented to give drivers another option to sitting in traffic and to help fund construction of new lanes. In this case, rush-hour tolling would include building a new lane on Highway 217 that drivers would pay a fee to use during the peak hours.

The toll would only be applied to the new lane and would be assessed electronically without requiring drivers to stop at a tollbooth. The toll would vary so that it would cost more to use the lane when the highway is most congested.

The rush-hour toll lane option would include:

- six lanes (three in each direction) on Highway 217 from US 26 and I-5
- one lane in each direction would be a rush-hour toll lane
- two express bus routes that would use the tolled lane to provide service between key corridor destinations
- braided ramps or consolidated interchanges
- improvements included in the baseline option.

**Ramp meter bypass option**

Another way to apply the rush-hour tolling concept would be to offer drivers a choice to wait at ramp meters as they do today or pay a toll to avoid waiting on the ramp. This option would include a new lane on the freeway that would be open to all traffic. Like rush-hour tolling, tolls would be assessed electronically without requiring drivers to stop at a tollbooth and would vary based on the level of congestion.

The ramp meter bypass option would include:

- six lanes (three in each direction) on Highway 217 from US 26 and I-5
- an extra tolled lane on entrance ramps
- two new express bus routes that would use the ramp meter bypass and provide service between key corridor destinations
- braided ramps or consolidated interchanges
- improvements included in the baseline option.

**NOT SELECTED FOR STUDY AT THIS TIME**

**Eight-lane option**

The committee decided not to include an eight-lane option at this time because it would have significant environmental and neighborhood impacts and would cost about twice as much as a six-lane option. The committee will consider studying it in the second phase if projected traffic demand cannot be met with the other options.
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE ) ORDINANCE NO. 04-1045A
2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN )
(“RTP”) FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE )
2004 INTERIM FEDERAL RTP AND ) Introduced by Councilor Rod Park
STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS )

WHEREAS, the Metro Council approved the 2000 RTP by Ordinance No. 00-869A (For the Purpose of Adopting the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan) on August 10, 2000 as the regional “Transportation System Plan” (“TSP”) required by state Goal 12 through the statewide planning Goal 12 through the state Transportation Planning Rule (“TPR”); and

WHEREAS, a key purpose of the regional TSP is to define a system of transportation facilities and services adequate to meet transportation needs and support planned land uses set forth in the 2040 Growth Concept, consistent with the requirements of other statewide planning goals; and

WHEREAS, the Land Conservation and Development Commission approved and acknowledged the 2000 RTP and 2020 Priority System on July 9, 2001, as the regional TSP for the Portland metropolitan region until the next RTP update; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council directed that the 2004 update to the RTP be narrowed in scope to only address federal planning requirements and approved the 2004 Interim Federal RTP by Resolution No. 03-3380A (For the Purpose of Adopting the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan as the Federal Metropolitan Transportation Plan to Meet Federal Planning Requirements) on December 11, 2003; and

WHEREAS, as a follow-up to the 2004 update, Exhibit “A” identifies consistency amendments to the 2000 RTP to address statewide planning goals and implement the 2004 Interim Federal RTP in anticipation of a major review of RTP policies and projects to be completed by 2007; and
WHEREAS, no major changes to policies and projects are proposed in Exhibit “A”; and

WHEREAS, cities and counties in the region have made amendments to their transportation systems plans in order to comply with Metro’s 2000 RTP, and these TSP amendments have generated proposed amendments to the functional system maps in the RTP, new transportation projects and studies and changes in the location, description, cost or timing of previously approved projects; and

WHEREAS, Metro and cities and counties of the region have completed corridor studies and comprehensive planning pursuant to Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, since adoption of the 2000 RTP, and these plans have generated proposed technical amendments to Chapter 6 (Implementation) of the RTP; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has received and considered the advice of its Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and its Metro Policy Advisory Committee, and all proposed amendments identified in Exhibit “A” have been the subject of a 45-day public review period; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council held public hearings on amendments to the 2000 RTP identified in Exhibit “A” on May 13 and July 8, 2004; now, therefore

THE METRO COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Text and maps in Chapter 2 (Transportation) of the Regional Framework Plan (“RFP”), and Chapter 1 (Regional Transportation Policy) and Chapter 3 (Growth and the Preferred System) of the 2000 RTP are hereby amended as set forth in Part 1 (Policy Amendments) of Exhibit “A”, attached and incorporated into this ordinance.

2. Text and maps in Chapter 5 of the 2000 RTP are hereby amended as set forth in Part 2 (Project Amendments) of Exhibit “A” to identify the scope and nature of the proposed transportation improvements that address the 20-year needs.

3. Text in Chapter 6 (Implementation) of the 2000 RTP is hereby amended as set forth in Part 3 (Technical Amendments) of Exhibit “A” to demonstrate regional compliance with state and federal planning requirements and establish regional TSP and functional requirements for city and county comprehensive plans and local TSPs.

4. Metro’s 2000 RTP and these amendments to it, together with Titles 2 and 10 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, comprise Metro’s 2000 RTP, adopted as the regional functional plan for transportation under ORS 268.390, and the regional transportation system plan required by state planning law.
5. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Exhibit “GB”, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, explain how these amendments to the RTP comply with state transportation and land use planning laws and the RFP.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of July, 2004.

__________________________________________
David Bragdon, Council President

ATTEST:

Approved as to Form:

__________________________________________
Christina Billington, Recording Secretary

__________________________________________
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney
CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 04-1045A FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE 2004 INTERIM FEDERAL RTP AND STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS

Date: April 13, 2004
Prepared by: Kim Ellis

PROPOSED ACTION

This ordinance would adopt amendments to the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the regional transportation system plan (TSP) and the regional functional plan for transportation, as required by ORS 268.390, and establish consistency with the state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and interim 2004 Federal RTP. No major changes to policies or projects are proposed. The proposed amendments focus on incorporating new transportation projects, and policy and technical updates that were approved in the 2004 Interim Federal RTP on Dec. 11, 2003. Metro is not required to update the regional transportation plan for state planning purposes until 2007.

The amendments to the 2000 RTP, included as Exhibit “A” are organized as follows:

• Policy Packet (Exhibit A. Part 1) – Chapter 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) presents the overall policy framework for specific transportation policies, objectives and actions identified throughout the plan. It also sets a direction for future planning and decision-making by the Metro Council and the implementing agencies, counties and cities.

The Policy Packet includes functional map amendments to various modal system maps and policy text changes to Chapter 1 of the 2000 RTP to establish two tiers of industrial areas ("regionally significant" and "local") for the purpose of transportation planning and project funding. The amendments reflect changes recommended in local transportation plans adopted since 2000 that were endorsed by Metro as “friendly amendments” as part of the local review process, and policy discussions during the 2004 Interim Federal Update to the RTP.

• Project Packet (Exhibit A. Part 2) - Chapter 5 of the 2000 RTP includes a description of the priority system, which is intended to satisfy the state TPR requirements for an "adequate" system, as well as procedures and criteria in Chapter 6 for amending the projects. As the federally recognized system, the 2004 RTP financially constrained system is the source of transportation projects that are currently eligible for state and federal funding. New transportation projects amended into local plans since adoption of the 2000 RTP and that were included in the 2004 Interim Federal RTP financially constrained system would need to be amended into the 2000 RTP priority system in order to advance to project development planning and construction prior to 2007, when the next RTP update is required.

The Project Packet identifies a list of projects recommended for amendment into Chapter 5 of the 2000 RTP, which defines the 2020 RTP Priority System. The packet was limited to new projects recommended in local transportation plans or corridor studies adopted since 2000 and endorsed by Metro as “friendly amendments” as part of the local review process and that were included in the updated financially constrained system as part of the 2004 Federal Update. The amendments include project recommendations from the I-5 Trade Corridor Partnership Study, Powell/Foster Corridor Study (Phase 1), Pleasant Valley Concept Plan, Powell Boulevard Streetscape Study and the McLoughlin Boulevard Enhancement Plan. Projects that require goal exceptions findings have not be
recommended for inclusion in these amendments. 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 a particular project.

- **Technical Packet (Exhibit A, Part 3)** - Chapter 6 of the 2000 RTP establishes regional compliance with state and federal planning requirements, and sets requirements for city and county compliance with the RTP. This chapter also identifies future studies needed to refine the RTP as part of future updates. These future studies are consistent with state TPR provisions that require refinement planning in areas where a transportation need exists, but further analysis is required to define specific solutions. Since the 2000 RTP update, a number of corridor studies and concept plans for new urban areas have been completed, and approved by local or regional officials, or are about to be completed.

The Technical Packet incorporates several technical changes to Chapter 6 of the 2000 RTP that delete technical requirements that have been addressed through recently adopted corridor studies and frame future work that must still be completed as part of future updates to the RTP. The changes reflected in the technical amendments include recommendations from the following planning efforts: Powell-Foster Corridor study (Phase I), I-5 South – Wilsonville Area study and Regional Travel Option strategic planning.

**BACKGROUND**

The most pressing need for amendments to the 2000 RTP is to establish regional consistency with statewide planning goals for policies and projects adopted in the 2004 Interim Federal RTP to allow projects to advance toward project development and possibly construction during the period in which separate state and federal RTP documents exist.

On December 11, 2003, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council approved the 2004 Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) by Resolution No. 03-3380A. The 2004 RTP update was narrowed to include only those amendments needed to address federal planning regulations and ensure continued certification by federal agencies. As a result, the 2004 update focused on updating the 2000 RTP financially constrained system. Amendments to the plan that address state planning goals and Transportation Planning Rule requirements were deferred to the next scheduled update, due for completion in 2007.

As a result, Metro now has two, regional transportation plans in place that serve separate purposes:

- **2000 RTP meets state planning requirements and serves as the basis for land use decisions in the region**
  
  In 1991, the Land Conservation and Development Commission adopted the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The TPR implements State Land Use Planning Goal 12, Transportation, which was adopted by the Oregon Legislature in 1974. The TPR requires most cities and counties and the state’s four MPOs (including Metro) to adopt transportation system plans that consider all modes of transportation, energy conservation and avoid principal reliance on any one mode to meet transportation needs. By state law, local plans in MPO areas must be consistent with the regional transportation system plan (TSP).

  In the Portland region, the existing 2000 RTP and 2020 priority system serves as the regional Transportation System Plan (TSP) that meets state planning requirements, as required by the Transportation Planning Rule. As the regional TSP, the 2000 RTP serves as the regional strategy for addressing transportation needs, integrating land use and transportation to implement the 2040...
Growth Concept, and determining whether regional transportation projects are consistent with state planning goals until the next RTP update. Metro is not required to update the regional TSP until 2007.

- **2004 Interim Federal RTP meets federal planning requirements**

The 2004 Interim Federal RTP and 2025 financially constrained system is the “federally recognized” transportation plan that meets federal planning requirements. Projects that are included in the 2025 Financially Constrained System are eligible to receive state and federal funds and have been demonstrated to conform with the Clean Air Act. Metro is not required to update the federal plan until 2007.

Because the amendments to the 2000 RTP represent more of a “housekeeping” effort, the emphasis in the public comment period will be on the proposed changes to the plan, not the overall 2000 RTP document.

**Public Comment Opportunities**

A public comment period was held on the proposed policy, project and technical amendments was held from April 15 to June 1, 2004. Because this update of the RTP constitutes a "housekeeping" effort, the emphasis in the public comment period was on the staff recommended changes to the plan as identified in the public review document, not the overall RTP document. The proposed amendments were consolidated into a single public review document that was available for review on Metro's website. The Metro Council held a public hearing on May 13, 2004 on Exhibit “A.” No public comments were received during the public comment period.

The Metro Council is being asked to approve Exhibits “A,” and “B” and direct this Ordinance, and Exhibits “A,” and “B” upon its adoption by the Metro Council be submitted to the Department of Land Conservation and Development pursuant to the post-acknowledgement process at ORS 197.610.

**ANALYSIS/INFORMATION**

1. **Known Opposition**

   None known.

2. **Legal Antecedents**

   Previous related Metro Council actions include:
   - Metro Ordinance No. 00-869A, adopting the 2000 RTP as the regional transportation system plan for the Portland metropolitan region.
   - Metro Resolution No. 02-3186A, amending the 2000 RTP and 2002 MTIP to incorporate OTIA bond projects.
   - Metro Ordinance No. 02-946A, amending the 2000 RTP to incorporate post-acknowledgement amendments to the 2000 RTP.
   - Metro Resolution 03-3351, amending the 2000 RTP and MTIP to incorporate the South Corridor LRT Project recommendations.
   - Metro Resolution 04-3080A, approving the 2004 Federal Update to the Regional Transportation Plan as the Federal Metropolitan Transportation Plan to meet federal planning requirements.
3. **Anticipated Effects**

Approval of this Ordinance completes an interim update to the 2000 RTP to meet federal planning requirements and allows projects in the updated 2004 RTP financially constrained system to be funded and allowed to proceed to project development, and possibly construction, during the development of the 2007 RTP. Projects, in particular, need to be included in both documents in order to receive federal and state funding and move forward to construction during the period when separate state and federal transportation plans are in place. Several projects are under consideration for federal earmarks and state funding through the Oregon Transportation Investment Act III.

The Council is considering a budget proposal to postpone the next scheduled update to the RTP to allow more staff resources to be devoted to the 2040 Re-evaluation. This proposal would defer the bulk of the next RTP update to 2006-07, which would still meet state and federal planning requirements. In the interim, Metro will likely be asked to amend the RTP, as necessary, to incorporate projects resulting from corridor studies or other transportation planning efforts.

If this proposal is approved, staff recommends that an explanatory handout be provided for the general public in the short term, since a Fall 2004 start to the next RTP update has been widely discussed.

4. **Budget Impact**

None.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Adopt Ordinance 04-1045A.