MEETING: WCCC Transportation Advisory Committee
DATE: Thursday September 25, 2014
TIME: 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
PLACE: Beaverton Library Meeting Room A
12375 SW 5th St., Beaverton

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Growth Management Decision:
   Urban Growth Report and Housing Preference Survey Results
   Purpose: Discuss the draft Urban Growth Report and preliminary findings from the Housing Preference Survey analysis.
   Presenter: Ted Reid, Metro and Erin Wardell, Washington County

3. TDT Memo Update
   Purpose: Review proposed revisions regarding Trails and Transit
   Presenters: Steve Szigethy, Washington County

4. Regional Travel Options Grant Application
   Purpose: Discuss project concepts and review Westside Transportation Alliance proposed scope of work
   Presenters: Jenny Cadigan, WTA and All

5. Other Business and Agency Updates
   • TPAC Agenda
   • WCCC Agenda
   • Area Commission Transportation Task Force

* Material included in packet.
# Material will be distributed at the meeting.
^ Material available electronically and/or distributed in advance of the meeting.

Agenda Parking Lot
National ITS Corridor Designation

WCCC Transportation Advisory Committee
2014 MEETING SCHEDULE
1:30 – 3:00 PM

Thursday, October 30 – Beaverton Library / Cathy Stanton Conference Room
Thursday, November 20 – Beaverton Library / Cathy Stanton Conference Room

December – No meeting

For agenda and schedule information, call Dyami Valentine at 503.846.3821
email: dyami_valentine@co.washington.or.us
If you picnic at Blue Lake or take your kids to the Oregon Zoo, enjoy symphonies at the Schnitz or auto shows at the convention center, put out your trash or drive your car – we’ve already crossed paths.

So, hello. We’re Metro – nice to meet you.

In a metropolitan area as big as Portland, we can do a lot of things better together. Join us to help the region prepare for a happy, healthy future.
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Metro Councilors
Shirley Craddock, District 1
Carlotta Collette, District 2
Craig DirkSEN, District 3
Kathryn Harrington, District 4
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Bus and MAX information
503-238-RIDE (7433) or trimet.org

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.
oregonmetro.gov/connect

To learn more about the growth management decision and the urban growth report, visit oregonmetro.gov/growth
2014 URBAN GROWTH REPORT

Investing in our communities
2015 – 2035
Introduction

As the Portland metropolitan region grows, our shared values guide policy and investment choices to accommodate growth and change, while ensuring our unique quality of life is maintained for generations to come.

Metro, local jurisdictions and many other partners work together to guide development in the region. This means striking a balance between preservation of the farms and forests that surround the Portland region, supporting the revitalization of existing downtowns, main streets and employment areas, and ensuring there’s land available for new development on the edge of the region when needed.

Oregon law requires that every five years, the Metro Council evaluate the capacity of the region’s urban growth boundary to accommodate a 20-year forecast of housing needs and employment growth. The results of that evaluation are provided in the urban growth report.

While complying with the requirements of state law, the urban growth report serves as more than just an accounting of available acres inside the urban growth boundary. It plays a vital role in the implementation of the region’s 50-year plan that calls for the efficient use of land, redevelopment before expansion, and the preservation of the region’s resources for future generations.
WORKING TOGETHER

The population and employment range forecasts in the urban growth report help inform Metro, local jurisdictions, and other public and private sector partners as they consider new policies, investments, and actions to maintain the region’s quality of life and promote prosperity.

The urban growth report, once accepted in its final form by the Metro Council in December 2014, will serve as the basis for the council’s urban growth management decision, which will be made by the end of 2015.

But the work does not end with the council’s decision. Implementation will require coordination of local, regional and state policy and investment actions. In its role as convener for regional decision-making, Metro is committed to building and maintaining partnerships and alignments among the different levels of government and between the public and private sectors.

Past growth-future forecast
Population and job growth within the Metro urban growth boundary 1990-2035

ACHIEVING DESIRED OUTCOMES

To guide its decision-making, the Metro Council, on the advice of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), adopted six desired outcomes, characteristics of a successful region:

- People live, work and play in vibrant communities where their everyday needs are easily accessible.
- Current and future residents benefit from the region’s sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity.
- People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life.
- The region is a leader in minimizing contributions to global warming.
- Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems.
- The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.
SUCCESSES AND CHALLENGES

The region’s longstanding commitment to protecting farms and forests, investing in existing communities, and supporting businesses that export goods and services is paying off in economic growth. From 2001 to 2012, the Portland region ranked third among all U.S. metropolitan areas for productivity growth, outpacing the Research Triangle in North Carolina, the Silicon Valley in California, and several energy producing regions in Texas. Likewise, the region’s walkable downtowns, natural landscapes, and renowned restaurants, breweries, and vineyards are well known around the world. In 2013, visitors to Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties spent $4.3 billion dollars, supporting 30,100 jobs in the region. These successes are no accident – they demonstrate that prosperity, livability and intentional urban growth management are compatible.

However, Metro and its partners also have challenges to face when it comes to planning for additional population and employment growth. These include making sure that workforce housing is available in locations with access to opportunities, providing more family-friendly housing choices close to downtowns and main streets, delivering high quality transportation options that help people get where they need to go, ensuring freight mobility, and protecting and enhancing the environment.

Outcomes-based approach to growth management

A core purpose of the urban growth report is to determine whether the current urban growth boundary (UGB) has enough space for future housing and employment growth. Considerable care and technical engagement have gone into the assessment of recent development trends, growth capacity, and the population and employment forecasts provided in this report. However, this kind of analysis is necessarily part art and part science. State laws direct the region to determine what share of growth can “reasonably” be accommodated inside the existing UGB before expanding it but ultimately, how the region defines “reasonable” will be a reflection of regional and community values.
How has the region been growing?

The Portland region’s original urban growth boundary was adopted in 1979. As depicted in Map 1, the UGB has been expanded by about 31,400 acres. During the same time period, the population inside the UGB has increased by over half a million people. This represents a 61 percent increase in population inside an urban growth boundary that has expanded by 14 percent.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

From 1998 to 2012, 94 percent of the new residential units were built inside the original 1979 boundary. During these 14 years, post-1979 UGB expansion areas produced about 6,500 housing units compared to the approximately 105,000 units produced in the original 1979 UGB. With a couple of notable exceptions, UGB expansion areas have been slow to develop because of challenges with governance, planning, voter-approved annexation, infrastructure financing, service provision, and land assembly. Development of Wilsonville’s Villebois and Hillsboro’s Witch Hazel communities demonstrates that new urban areas can be successful with the right combination of factors such as governance, infrastructure finance, willing property owners, and market demand. There are also challenges in our existing urban areas. Infill and redevelopment have been focused in a few communities while many downtowns and main streets have been slow to develop.

The 2040 Growth Concept, the Portland region’s 50-year plan for growth, calls for focusing growth in existing urban centers and transportation corridors, and making targeted additions to the urban growth boundary when needed. To achieve this regional vision, redevelopment and infill are necessary. During the six years from 2007 through 2012, which included the Great Recession, the region saw levels of redevelopment and infill that exceeded past rates. During

RESIDENTIAL BUILDABLE LAND INVENTORY

If the region’s historic annual housing production records (high and low from 1960 to 2012) are any indication, how long might the residential buildable land inventory last?

SINGLE FAMILY 10 to 52 years
MULTIFAMILY 28 to 354 years

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

How has the region been growing?

The Portland region’s original urban growth boundary was adopted in 1979. As depicted in Map 1, the UGB has been expanded by about 31,400 acres. During the same time period, the population inside the UGB has increased by over half a million people. This represents a 61 percent increase in population inside an urban growth boundary that has expanded by 14 percent.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

From 1998 to 2012, 94 percent of the new residential units were built inside the original 1979 boundary. During these 14 years, post-1979 UGB expansion areas produced about 6,500 housing units compared to the approximately 105,000 units produced in the original 1979 UGB. With a couple of notable exceptions, UGB expansion areas have been slow to develop because of challenges with governance, planning, voter-approved annexation, infrastructure financing, service provision, and land assembly. Development of Wilsonville’s Villebois and Hillsboro’s Witch Hazel communities demonstrates that new urban areas can be successful with the right combination of factors such as governance, infrastructure finance, willing property owners, and market demand. There are also challenges in our existing urban areas. Infill and redevelopment have been focused in a few communities while many downtowns and main streets have been slow to develop.

The 2040 Growth Concept, the Portland region’s 50-year plan for growth, calls for focusing growth in existing urban centers and transportation corridors, and making targeted additions to the urban growth boundary when needed. To achieve this regional vision, redevelopment and infill are necessary. During the six years from 2007 through 2012, which included the Great Recession, the region saw levels of redevelopment and infill that exceeded past rates. During
this time period, 58 percent of the net new residential units built inside the UGB were through redevelopment (46 percent) or infill (12 percent) and 42 percent were on vacant land. There are a variety of views on whether the recession explains this uptick in redevelopment and infill or whether this is an indication of people wanting to live in existing urban areas with easy access to services and amenities. What is clear is that development challenges exist in both urban areas and past expansion areas. In some cases, however, market demand in existing urban areas appears to have overcome those challenges.

During this same six years, new residential development was evenly split between multifamily and single-family units with a total of 12,398 single-family and 12,133 multifamily residences built. The average density of new single-family development was 7.6 units per acre (5,766 square foot average lot size) and multifamily development was 41.8 units per acre. The highest density multifamily developments also tended to be the largest, so while there were many smaller developments, the statistics are dominated by the large high-density developments. This pattern is clear in Figures 1 and 2 (p. 8), which depict the number of units and developments built per net acre, indicating levels of density.

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

As in most regions, many people in the Portland region lost their jobs in the Great Recession. With the ensuing recovery, total employment in the region was essentially unchanged when comparing 2006 and 2012. However, the recession did lead to some major changes across industries. Private education recorded the highest growth rate at 25.4 percent from 2006 to 2012, while health and social assistance employers saw the largest net gain in employment with the addition of just over 14,000 jobs during the same period. Construction saw the largest decline, with a loss of around 9,600 jobs, or 20.2 percent of total jobs, in the industry as of 2006. The loss of construction jobs reflects the housing crash that brought residential construction nearly to a halt for several years. Appendix 8 describes the region’s employment trends in greater detail.

Aggregating to the sector level, industrial and retail employment declined from 2006 to 2012 while service and government employment increased (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2006 Employment</th>
<th>2012 Employment</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Avg. Annual Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>244,951</td>
<td>218,311</td>
<td>-26,640</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>86,921</td>
<td>84,475</td>
<td>-2,446</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>396,470</td>
<td>419,516</td>
<td>23,046</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>103,736</td>
<td>108,582</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Employment in the three-county area by aggregated sector 2006-2012 (Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington) | Source Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages

Policy considerations

HEALTHY DEBATE AND INFORMED DECISION-MAKING

Though this report strives for completeness, balance, and accuracy, there is always room for debate. At the end of 2014, the Metro Council will be asked to decide if the report provides a reasonable basis for moving forward and making a growth management decision in 2015. Throughout this document, policy questions and topics that have been raised by Metro Council and involved stakeholders are called out for further discussion by policymakers and members of the community.

LAND READINESS OR LAND SUPPLY?

For better or worse, our state land use planning system asks Metro to focus on counting acres of land to determine the region’s 20-year growth capacity. Over the years, it’s become clear that land supply alone isn’t the cause or the solution for all of the region’s challenges. Working together, we must make the most of the land we already have inside the urban growth boundary to ensure that those lands are available to maintain, improve, and create the kinds of communities that we all want – today and for generations to come.

Working together, we can:

- ensure that communities have governance structures in place that can respond to growth and change
- provide the types of infrastructure and services that signal to the development community a site or area is primed for investment
- make the strategic investments needed to clean up and reuse neglected lands.
Policy considerations

CHANGES IN OUR COMMUNITIES

People around the region are concerned about new development in their communities. The concern exists not just in existing urban areas experiencing a new wave of development, but also in areas added to the urban growth boundary. With population growth expected to continue, change is inevitable. What policies and investments are needed to ensure that change is for the better?

From 2006 to 2012, there was also a change in where jobs were located in the three-county area (Map 2). While about 25 percent of all jobs could still be found in the central part of the region, the subarea experienced a loss of about 2,300 jobs, or 1.2 percent. The inner I-5 area saw a decline in employment of roughly 2,200 jobs, or 11.0 percent of 2006 employment. This area was home to many firms involved in real estate and finance, industries that were hard hit by the housing collapse and recession. Many businesses in the area, like mortgage and title companies, contracted or closed during this time period. For example, the Kruse Way area in Lake Oswego had an office vacancy rate of 22.4 percent in 2012. In the southeastern part of the region, the outer Clackamas and outer I-5 subareas together lost about 3,400 jobs or 3.2 percent. In contrast, the outer Westside experienced the greatest increase in employment, gaining about 5,800 jobs, an increase of 5.6 percent. The East Multnomah subarea also gained jobs, increasing employment by 1,800 or 2.7 percent.

Figure 3 Total employment by subarea for 2006 and 2012
The Villebois community is one of only a few urban growth boundary expansion areas that has been developed. The roughly 500-acre area was brought into the UGB in 2000. With plans for about 2,600 households, the area quickly rebounded from the recession and is now about half built. Residents benefit from a variety of amenities such as parks, plazas, and community centers.

Case study
VILLEBOIS, WILSONVILLE

Adjacent to MAX and streetcar stops, construction is now underway on a site that was previously a parking lot. Once built, the development will provide over 600 rental apartments, plazas, office and retail space, more than 1,000 underground car parking places, and space to park more than 1,000 bikes – all in a central location.

Case study
HASSALO ON 8TH, LLOYD DISTRICT, PORTLAND
UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF REDEVELOPMENT

Our region has made a commitment to ensuring its decisions improve quality of life for all. Yet, like many metropolitan areas, we’ve struggled to make good on that intent. Investments made to encourage redevelopment and revitalization have too often disproportionately impacted those of modest means. The consequence has been that people with lower incomes have often been displaced from their long-time communities when redevelopment in the city center drives up land values and prices follow.

Map 3 shows the change in median family income around the region over the last decade. There is a clear trend of incomes increasing in close-in Northwest, Northeast, and Southeast Portland, Lake Oswego, and West Linn, while incomes have stagnated or decreased elsewhere. Outlying areas like outer east Portland, Gresham, Cornelius, and Aloha stand out as having decreasing incomes. In many cases, increases in incomes in central locations and decreases elsewhere indicate displacement of people from their communities as housing prices increase.

GROWTH WITHOUT SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Over the last couple of decades, the trend of depopulation of the urban core and the movement of the middle class to the suburbs has reversed in many regions in the U.S. The Portland metropolitan region is no exception. While there have been positive outcomes, this has also led to displacement and concentrations of poverty in places that lack adequate services and facilities like sidewalks and transit. Additional information about access to opportunity around the region can be found in Appendix 10. Information about housing and transportation cost burdens can be found in Appendix 12.
COMMUTING TRENDS: THE JOBS-HOUSING BALANCE

For years, leaders have talked about a jobs-housing balance – ensuring there are homes close to employment areas. But evidence and common sense tell us that people’s lives don’t neatly line up with the available housing inventory. Some people work at or close to home, some commute from one end of the region to the other, and some live halfway between where they work and their spouse works. In other words, putting homes next to major employers doesn’t necessarily cut down on commuting.

However, services and amenities near residential areas can make our lives outside of jobs and commutes easier and help create strong local economies. When people can go out to eat, do their shopping, visit the bank or see a doctor close to where they live, they spend less time going somewhere and more time with friends and family, actively enjoying their communities and the region.

Map 4 illustrates the region’s commute patterns. Using Washington County as an example (2011 data):

- about 120,000 people who live in Washington County also work there
- about 118,000 people who live outside Washington County work in Washington County
- about 104,000 people who live in Washington County work outside Washington County.

Policy considerations

A BIGGER PICTURE

Regional and local policies and investments also interact with actions taken in neighboring cities, Clark County and Salem. What are the best policies for using land efficiently and reducing time spent in traffic?
How many more people and jobs should we expect in the future?

A core question this report addresses is how many more people and jobs should the region plan for between now and the year 2035. In creating the 2035 forecast, Metro convened a peer review group consisting of economists and demographers from Portland State University, ECONorthwest, Johnson Economics, and NW Natural. The forecast assumptions and results in this report reflect the recommendations of this peer review panel. A summary of the peer review can be found in Appendix 1C.

However, even with a peer review of the forecast, some forecast assumptions will turn out to be incorrect. For that reason, the population and employment forecasts in this report are expressed as ranges, allowing the region’s policymakers the opportunity to err on the side of flexibility and resilience in choosing a path forward. As with a weather forecast, this population and employment range forecast is expressed in terms of probability. The baseline forecast (mid-point in the forecast range) is Metro staff’s best estimate of what future growth may be. The range is bounded by a low end and a high end. There is a ninety percent chance that actual growth will occur somewhere in this range, but the probability of ending up at the high or low ends of the range is less.

Appendix 1B describes the accuracy of past forecasts. These typically have been reliable, particularly when it comes to population growth. For example, Metro’s 1985 to 2005 forecast proved to be off by less than one percent per year for both population and employment over the 20-year time frame.

POPULATION AND JOB GROWTH IN THE SEVEN-COUNTY PORTLAND/VANCOUVER METROPOLITAN AREA

To “show our work” and to understand our region in its economic context, this analysis starts with a forecast for the larger seven-county Portland/Vancouver/Hillsboro metropolitan area. Full documentation of the metropolitan area forecast is available in Appendix 1A. It is estimated that there will be about 470,000 to 725,000 more people in the seven-county area by the year 2035. Mid-point in the forecast range, or best estimate, is for 600,000 more people. This amount of growth would be consistent with how the region has grown in the past; the seven-county area grew by about 600,000 people between 1985 and 2005 and by about 700,000 from 1990 to 2010. Adding 600,000 people would be comparable to adding the current population of the city of Portland to the seven-county area.

The forecast calls for 120,500 to 648,500 additional jobs in the seven-county Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area between 2015 and 2035. The forecast range for employment is wider than the forecast range for population since regional employment is more difficult to predict in a fast-moving global economy. Unexpected events like the Great Recession, technological advances, international relations, and monetary policy can lead to big changes. Mid-point in the forecast range, or best estimate, is for 384,500 additional jobs. This amount of growth would surpass the 240,000 additional jobs that were created in the seven-county metropolitan area during the 20-year period from 1990 to 2010, which included job losses from the recession.

Policy considerations

MANAGING UNCERTAINTY

What are the risks and opportunities of planning for higher or lower growth in the forecast range?

Recognizing that the two forecasts are linked, are there different risks when planning for employment or housing growth?

Are there different risks when planning for land use, transportation, or for other infrastructure systems?

Who bears the public and private costs and benefits associated with different growth management options?
A market-based land and transportation computer model is used to determine how many of the new jobs and households in the seven-county area are likely to locate inside the Metro urban growth boundary. The model indicates that about 75 percent of new households and jobs may locate inside the UGB. The share of regional growth accommodated inside the boundary varies depending on what point in the forecast range is chosen. More detail can be found in Appendices 4 and 6. It is estimated that there will be about 300,000 to 485,000 additional people inside the Metro urban growth boundary between 2015 and 2035 (Figure 4). At mid-point in this range, the UGB will have about 400,000 additional people. This would be comparable to adding more than four times the current population of the city of Hillsboro to the UGB. The population forecast is converted into household growth for this analysis.

It is estimated that there will be about 85,000 to 440,000 additional jobs in the Metro UGB between 2015 and 2035 (Figure 5). At mid-point in this range, there would be about 260,000 additional jobs between 2015 and 2035. This job forecast is converted into demand for acres for this analysis.

Figure 4 Population history and forecast for Metro UGB 1979-2035

Figure 5 Employment history and forecast for Metro UGB, 1979-2035
How much room for growth is there inside the UGB?

Cities and counties around the region plan for the future and prioritize investments that support their community’s vision. In most cases, however, long-term plans for downtowns, main streets and employment areas are more ambitious than what is actually built or redeveloped. One task of this analysis is to help us understand how the market might respond to long-term community plans in the next 20 years.

To analyze the region’s growth capacity, detailed aerial photos of all the land inside the urban growth boundary were taken. Factoring in current adopted plans and zoning designations, the photos were used to determine which parcels of land were developed and which were vacant. Methodologies for assessing the redevelopment potential and environmental constraints of the land were developed over the course of a year by Metro and a technical working group consisting of representatives from cities, counties, the state and the private sector (see pages 30-31 for a complete list of technical working group members).

After settling on the methodology described in Appendix 2, Metro produced a preliminary buildable land inventory that local cities and counties had more than two months to review. The draft buildable land inventory described in Appendix 3 reflects refined local knowledge about factors such as environmental constraints including wetlands, steep slopes, and brownfield contamination. Maps 4 through 7 illustrate the buildable land inventory reviewed by local jurisdictions. They are available at a larger scale in Appendix 3. The buildable land inventory is considered a “first cut” at determining the region’s growth capacity. For a variety of reasons described in the next section, not all of it may be developable in the 20-year time frame.
ESTIMATING RESIDENTIAL GROWTH CAPACITY

Current plans and zoning allow for a total of almost 1.3 million residences inside the urban growth boundary after accounting for environmental constraints and needs for future streets and sidewalks. About half of that potential capacity is in use today. This urban growth report does not count all of this capacity since doing so would assume that every developed property in the region will redevelop to its maximum density in the next twenty years. A rational developer will only build products that are expected to sell. Redevelopment requires market demand, which is a function of a number of factors, including expected population growth. This affects whether a property will be redeveloped and at what density.

Map 4 Employment vacant buildable tax lots (reviewed by local jurisdictions)

Map 5 Employment infill and redevelopment candidate tax lots (reviewed by local jurisdictions)
Acknowledging this complexity, Metro staff convened representatives from cities, counties, the state and the private sector to establish consensus for estimating how much of the region’s buildable land inventory might be absorbed by the year 2035 (see pages 30-31 for a complete list of technical working group members). Redevelopment and infill are most common in locations where there is significant demand for housing, so the growth capacity from redevelopment and infill rises with assumptions for population growth. For this reason, the region’s residential growth capacity is expressed as a range. The amount of growth capacity that the region has depends, in part, on the point in the household forecast range for which the Metro Council chooses to plan. Appendix 4 describes the approach for identifying the 20-year capacity range for housing.
Case study
4TH MAIN, HILLSBORO

With a shared vision for an active, historic main street area, Metro, the City of Hillsboro and the Federal Transit Administration worked together to attract private sector redevelopment of a city block adjacent to the Hillsboro Central MAX station. 4th Main offers 71 market-rate apartments, underground parking, and active retail along main street. The existing 1950s era vacant bank building on site is being updated for restaurant and retail use. When 4th Main opened in May 2014, over half the units were leased.
ESTIMATING EMPLOYMENT GROWTH CAPACITY

To determine the UGB’s employment growth capacity, analysis began with the creation of a buildable land inventory. As with the residential analysis, employment capacity depends on demand since different types of jobs have different space needs. For instance, an office job will have very different location and space needs than a warehouse job. Metro staff convened a group of public and private sector experts to help update these employment demand factors. Appendix 6 describes the approach for identifying the 20-year capacity range. (See pages 30-31 for a complete list of technical working group members).
Is there a regional need for additional growth capacity?

Under state law, Metro’s analysis must assess regional, not local or subregional, growth capacity needs. While some local jurisdictions may desire additional land for growth, this analysis is required to keep those needs in the regional context, knowing that other locations in the region may have greater growth capacity.

This analysis uses a probabilistic range forecast. The baseline forecast (middle of the range) has the highest probability. Though there is a 90 percent chance that growth will occur within the range, it is less probable at the low and high ends of the range.

DOES THE REGION NEED MORE LAND FOR HOUSING GROWTH?

Regional growth management policy alone cannot ensure adequate housing choices. Other elements that influence what kind of housing gets built include tax policy, lending practices, local plans and decisions, public investments, market demand, and developer responses. All of these factors impact housing production.

Appendix 4 describes in detail the residential demand analysis and includes estimates of potential demand by housing type (single-family and multifamily), tenure (own and rent), average density, as well as detail about demand from different household income brackets. For accounting purposes, the detailed analysis uses rigid supply and demand categories – for instance, single-family and multifamily. In reality, demand for these two housing types is somewhat fluid, particularly as average household sizes continue to decrease. By 2035, about 60 percent of new households are expected to include just one or two people.
Policymakers have the challenge of balancing the type of housing and neighborhoods people prefer with funding realities, governance and annexation challenges. They also must consider regional and community goals such as preserving the character of existing neighborhoods, reducing carbon emissions, preserving farms and forests, and creating vibrant downtowns and main streets. To inform that discussion, Metro and a group of public and private sector partners conducted a study on residential preferences across the region and will make results available to policymakers in the early fall of 2014.

The capacity estimation method recommended by Metro’s public and private sector advisory group recognizes that infill and redevelopment depend on demand. Consequently, the capacity from those two sources increases with greater household demand (i.e., a higher growth forecast results in a greater housing capacity).

Table 2 and Table 3 summarize the more detailed analysis of residential needs provided in Appendix 4.

### Single-family dwelling units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Forecast</th>
<th>Buildable land inventory</th>
<th>Market-adjusted supply</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Surplus/need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low growth forecast</td>
<td>118,700</td>
<td>76,600</td>
<td>70,600</td>
<td>+6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (baseline) forecast</td>
<td>90,700</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>+1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High growth forecast</td>
<td>97,700</td>
<td>103,800</td>
<td>103,800</td>
<td>-6,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Metro UGB single-family residential needs 2015 to 2035 expressed in dwelling units

### Multifamily dwelling units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Forecast</th>
<th>Buildable land inventory</th>
<th>Market-adjusted supply</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Surplus/need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low growth forecast</td>
<td>274,000</td>
<td>130,800</td>
<td>108,400</td>
<td>+22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (baseline) forecast</td>
<td>165,800</td>
<td>132,200</td>
<td>132,200</td>
<td>+33,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Metro UGB multifamily residential needs 2015 to 2035 expressed in dwelling units

If policymakers choose to plan for the high end of the growth forecast range, there is a need for additional capacity for jobs and housing. But, at mid-point in the forecast range and below, there is no need for additional growth capacity. No scenarios points to a regional need for additional multifamily housing capacity. However, if policymakers decide to plan for high growth and expand the UGB for residential purposes, there may be valid policy reasons for considering some amount of multifamily housing and commercial uses in the local planning process for the area.
Policy considerations

PROVIDING HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

As policymakers consider their options for responding to housing needs, there are considerations to keep in mind.

- If policymakers decide that an urban growth boundary expansion is needed to provide room for housing, where should that expansion occur? Metro is aware of two cities in the region that are currently interested in UGB expansions for housing—Sherwood and Wilsonville. Both cities had residential land added to the UGB in 2002 that they have not yet annexed. Sherwood requires voter-approved annexation and voters have twice rejected annexing the area. What is a reasonable time frame for seeing results in past and future UGB expansion areas?

- Given that the region has ample growth capacity for multifamily housing but a more finite supply of single-family growth capacity, should policymakers consider ways to encourage “family-friendly” housing in multifamily and mixed-use zones? To what extent might that address single-family housing needs in this analysis? Are there ways to ensure that housing in downtowns and along main streets remains within reach of families with moderate or low incomes?

- State land use laws and regional policy call for efficient use of any land added to the UGB. However, over the years very little multifamily housing has been built in UGB expansion areas. What is the right mix of housing types in areas added to the UGB in the future and how are they best served?

- How might policymakers balance residential preferences with other concerns such as infrastructure provision, transportation impacts, affordability, and environmental protection?

IMPACT OF MILLENNIALS ON HOUSING

Millennials, those born since 1980, are the biggest age cohort the U.S. has ever had (bigger than the Baby Boomer cohort) and will have a significant influence on the types of housing that are desired in the future. Today, 36 percent of the nation’s 18 to 31-year-olds are living with their parents. This has variously been attributed to student loan debt, high unemployment or fear of losing a job, and stricter mortgage lending standards. Builders have responded by reducing their housing production and focusing on apartment construction. What will these trends mean for home ownership, housing type, and location choices in the longer term?
DOES THE REGION NEED MORE LAND FOR INDUSTRIAL JOB GROWTH?

Industrial employment includes a wide range of jobs like high tech manufacturers, truck drivers, and metal workers. Since it is common to find commercial jobs (offices, stores, restaurant, etc.) in industrial zones, this analysis shifts a portion of the overall industrial redevelopment supply into the commercial category.

Table 4 summarizes regional needs for general industrial employment growth, expressed in acres. Additional detail about this analysis can be found in Appendix 6. The need for large industrial sites (sites with over 25 buildable acres) is described separately. At mid-point in the forecast range, there is no regional need for additional land for general industrial employment uses. At the high end of the forecast range, there is a deficit. However, there are limited areas in urban reserves that may eventually be suitable for industrial uses.

Table 4 Metro UGB general industrial acreage needs 2015 to 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low growth forecast</th>
<th>Buildable land inventory</th>
<th>Market-adjusted supply</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Surplus/need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>+4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (baseline) growth forecast</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>-1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High growth forecast</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Metro UGB general industrial acreage needs 2015 to 2035

Note: reflecting real market dynamics where commercial uses locate in industrial zones, the market adjustment shifts some of the region’s industrial redevelopment supply into the commercial land supply. The amount varies by demand forecast.

Case study
TROUTDALE REYNOLDS INDUSTRIAL PARK

Located between the Columbia and Sandy rivers and bordered by the Troutdale Airport and Marine Drive, this 700-acre superfund site is being redeveloped with a mix of industrial uses, natural areas and utility and trail access. The Port of Portland is working closely with local, regional and state jurisdictions to redevelop this former aluminum plant brownfield site and return it to productive industrial use with a traded-sector job focus. The Port has invested over $37 million in the acquisition and redevelopment of the site. Today, a portion of the site is home to FedEx Ground’s regional distribution center. Another $48 million in investment is needed to make the remainder of the site ready to market to industrial employers. At full build-out, this industrial development is projected to result in 3,500 direct jobs, $410 million in personal income and $41 million in state and local taxes annually (all jobs).
HOW SHOULD THE REGION PRIORITIZE INVESTMENTS IN LARGE INDUSTRIAL SITE READINESS?

The region’s economic development strategy focuses on several sectors with anchor firms that sometimes use large industrial sites (over 25 buildable acres). These firms are important because they often pay higher-than-average wages, export goods outside the region (bringing wealth back), produce spin off firms, and induce other economic activity in the region. However, forecasting the recruitment of new firms or growth of existing firms that use large industrial sites is challenging since these events involve the unique decisions of individual firms. To produce an analysis that is as objective as possible, the estimate of future demand for large industrial sites is based on the employment forecast. That assessment and its caveats are described in Appendix 7.

The analysis finds that there may be demand for eight to 34 large industrial sites between 2015 and 2035. There are currently 50 large vacant industrial sites inside the UGB that are not being held for future expansion by existing firms. This does not include sites added to the UGB in 2014 under HB 4078. To exhaust this supply of sites by 2035, the region would need to attract five major industrial firms every two years. In addition to this inventory of 50 sites, there are 24 sites inside the UGB that are being held by existing firms for future expansion (growth of existing firms is implicit in the demand forecast). Given this total supply of 74 large industrial sites and the fact that there are only two areas in urban reserves (near Boring and Tualatin) that may be suitable for eventual industrial use, policymakers can consider whether to focus on land supply or site readiness.

There are a limited number of areas in urban reserves that may be suitable for eventual industrial use. Therefore, this demand analysis may be more useful for informing the level of effort that the region may wish to apply to making its existing large industrial sites development-ready. Existing sites typically require actions such as infrastructure provision, wetland mitigation, site assembly, brownfield cleanup, annexation by cities, and planning to make sites development-ready. Many of these same development-readiness challenges exist in the two urban reserve areas that may eventually be suitable for industrial use. Metro and several public and private sector partners continue to work to understand the actions and investments that are needed to make more of the region’s large industrial sites development-ready.

3 This inventory is preliminary as of June 16, 2014, and will be confirmed by Metro and its partners before Metro Council consideration of the final UGR. This work is being conducted by Mackenzie for an update of the 2012 Regional Industrial Site Readiness project. However, the inventory is not expected to change enough to result in a different conclusion regarding there being no regional need for additional UGB expansion.

Policy considerations

THE PORTLAND HARBOR

The harbor is a unique environmental, recreational and economic asset that cannot be replaced elsewhere in the Portland region. For more than a century, the harbor has played a critical role in the history of trade and manufacturing in our region. Today, the harbor needs to be cleaned up to continue providing benefits. What is the appropriate balance between environmental and economic goals? What investments and policies can advance those goals?
DOES THE REGION NEED MORE LAND FOR COMMERCIAL JOB GROWTH?

The commercial employment category includes a diverse mix of jobs such as teachers, restaurant workers, lawyers, doctors and nurses, retail sales people, and government workers. Generally, these are population-serving jobs that are located close to where people live. Table 5 summarizes regional needs for commercial employment growth, expressed in acres. Additional detail about this analysis can be found in Appendix 6. At mid-point in the forecast range, there is no regional need for additional land for commercial employment uses. At the high end of the forecast range, there is a deficit. However, it may not be desirable to locate commercial uses on the urban edge unless those uses are integrated with residential development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial employment (acres)</th>
<th>Buildable land inventory</th>
<th>Market-adjusted supply</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Surplus/need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low growth forecast</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>+2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle [baseline] growth forecast</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>+900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High growth forecast</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>-600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Metro UGB commercial acreage needs 2015 to 2035

Note: reflecting real market dynamics where commercial uses locate in industrial zones, the market adjustment shifts some of the region’s industrial redevelopment supply into the commercial land supply. The amount varies by demand forecast.

**Policy considerations**

KEEPING SHOPPING AND SERVICES CLOSE BY

It makes sense to locate commercial uses close to where people live. If the Metro Council chooses to plan for a high growth scenario, are there places where it makes sense to expand the UGB for a mix of residential and commercial uses?
Conclusion

The 2014 urban growth report is more than an accounting of available acres and forecast projections. It provides information about development trends, highlights challenges and opportunities, and encourages policymakers to discuss how we can work together as a region to help communities achieve their visions. This region has seen tremendous change and progress over the last 20 years and we know change will continue. Our shared challenge is to guide development in a responsible and cost-effective manner so that we preserve and enhance the quality of life and ensure that the benefits and costs of growth and change are distributed equitably across the region.

LOCAL LEADERSHIP

Examples of strong partnerships abound already. At the local level, cities and counties are working closely with the private sector to bring new vibrancy to downtowns, more jobs to employment areas, and to provide existing and new neighborhoods with safe and convenient transportation options. Residential and employment areas as varied as Beaverton’s Creekside District, Portland’s South Waterfront, Hillsboro’s AmberGlen, Wilsonville’s Villebois, the Gresham Vista Business Park and many others, both large and small, are pointing the way to our region’s future.

METRO’S ROLE

At the regional level, Metro supports community work with a variety of financial and staff resources. The Community Planning and Development Grant program has funded over $14 million in local project work to support development readiness. The RISE (Regional Infrastructure Supporting our Economy) program is designed to deliver regionally significant projects and spur infrastructure investment. The Transit-Oriented Development Program provides developers with financial incentives that enhance the economic feasibility of higher density, mixed-used projects served by transit. Corridor projects such as the Southwest Corridor and East Metro Connections Plan are bringing together Metro, local jurisdictions, educational institutions, residents, businesses and others to develop comprehensive land use and transportation plans for individual areas that will support local community and economic development goals.

INVESTING IN OUR COMMUNITIES

These are just a few examples of the kind of work that’s happening all across the region. While the Metro Council’s growth management decision must address the question of whether to adjust the region’s urban growth boundary, the more difficult questions center on how to find the resources needed to develop existing land within our communities and new land in urban growth boundary expansion areas in a way that meets community and regional goals. Many of these questions and policy considerations are highlighted throughout this urban growth report to support policy discussions in the 2015 growth management decision and beyond.
Next steps

JULY THROUGH DECEMBER 2014 The urban growth report helps inform policy discussions for the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and Metro Council.

DECEMBER 2014 The Metro Council will consider a final urban growth report that will serve as the basis for its growth management decision in 2015. The Metro Policy Advisory Committee will be asked to advise the council on whether the urban growth report provides a reasonable basis for its subsequent growth management decision.

JULY 2014 – MAY 2015 Local and regional governments will continue to implement policies and investments to create and enhance great communities while accommodating anticipated growth.

MAY 2015 Local jurisdictions interested in urban growth boundary expansions in urban reserves must complete concept plans for consideration by MPAC and the Metro Council.

SEPTEMBER 2015 Metro’s chief operating officer makes a recommendation for the Metro Council’s growth management decision that becomes the basis for MPAC and council discussion during fall 2015. The recommendation will take into account the final urban growth report, assessments of urban reserve areas, actions that have been taken at the regional or local level – such as measures that lead to more efficient land use and adopted concept plans for urban reserves – and other new information that may influence our understanding of future growth in the region.

BY THE END OF 2015 If any additional 20-year capacity need remains, the Metro Council will consider UGB expansions into designated urban reserves. The Metro Policy Advisory Committee will be asked to advise the council on the growth management decision.
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Overview
In July, Metro staff issued a draft of the 2014 Urban Growth Report. It contains population and employment forecasts for the next 20 years and assesses the region’s capacity for accommodating anticipated growth with existing plans and policies at the local, regional and state levels.

Metro staff have identified two corrections that need to be made to the report’s estimate of future regional housing needs. First, in one step of the report’s calculations for housing demand, household data for the entire seven-county metropolitan area were used instead of data limited to the area within the Metro urban growth boundary. As a result, the draft report overestimated demand for single-family housing within the urban growth boundary.

A second correction relates to lands added to the urban growth boundary by the Oregon Legislature in March 2014 under House Bill 4078, which addressed the designation of urban and rural reserves and made changes to the urban growth boundary. At the request of staff from the city of Forest Grove, the revised draft report will count lands added near Forest Grove as industrial, rather than residential. This has the effect of increasing the regional surplus of industrial land.

Taken together, these corrections result in a larger surplus of single-family housing capacity than previously identified in the draft report, while the multifamily surplus is reduced. The corrected numbers are provided below and replace the numbers in tables 2 and 3 on page 22 of the July 2014 draft Urban Growth Report. Metro staff will issue a revised draft of the report as soon as possible to allow time for review by MTAC and MPAC before making recommendations to the Metro Council later this fall.

Background
There are many ways that this region could accommodate future population growth. The housing need numbers included in the draft 2014 UGR describe how existing plans and funding realities may play out in the future. This analysis should not be understood as prescribing a future for the region. It remains up to policy makers to decide whether these projected outcomes are desirable and, if not, what plans and investments are needed to achieve a different outcome that matches the public’s preferences, values, and funding priorities.
For the last couple of decades, Metro, local jurisdictions and many other partners have been working to implement the 2040 Growth Concept and all of the local plans that are based on that vision. Those plans call for efficient use of land inside the urban growth boundary and a finite supply of land that may be available for future urban growth boundary expansions. Implementation of those plans takes place in the context of state laws governing growth management policy in both Oregon and Washington, which place an emphasis on efficient use of lands.

The policy and financial context that exists today, along with demographic changes, steers a greater share of growth towards multifamily housing than has been observed in the past. Likewise, this context leads to a greater share of seven-county growth being drawn to the Metro area than observed in the past. Different policy and funding assumptions would produce different results. For instance, if zoning for multifamily housing were limited, state law allowed more urban growth boundary expansion and there were additional funding sources to pay for outward growth, these numbers would place more emphasis on single-family capacity needs. For this analysis, staff has not second-guessed local and regional policies, but is reporting back that those policies and plans do provide a way of accommodating additional households and jobs.

**Revised tables for draft Urban Growth Report**

**Table 2: Metro UGB single-family residential market analysis of existing plans and policies (2015 to 2035)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildable land inventory</th>
<th>Market-adjusted supply</th>
<th>Market-adjusted demand</th>
<th>Surplus or need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low growth forecast</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>75,900</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (baseline) growth forecast</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>90,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Metro UGB multifamily residential market analysis of existing plans and policies (2015 to 2035)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildable land inventory</th>
<th>Market-adjusted supply</th>
<th>Market-adjusted demand</th>
<th>Surplus or need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low growth forecast</td>
<td>273,300</td>
<td>118,400</td>
<td>89,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (baseline) growth forecast</td>
<td>130,100</td>
<td>130,100</td>
<td>120,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High growth forecast</td>
<td>165,100</td>
<td>145,900</td>
<td>145,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 27, 2014

Executive summary:
Preliminary results of a residential preference study for the Portland region

Introduction
We all make choices when buying or renting a home. Some of the factors we weigh include price, proximity to work, size of the home, size of the yard, and the type of neighborhood. Understanding what’s important to residents of the metro area can inform local and regional policies, as well as public and private investment decisions.

In the spring of 2014, a partnership of public and private sector interests conducted an innovative residential preference study for the four-county Portland metropolitan area.\(^1\) The study seeks to develop a better understanding of:

- Preferences for different housing, community, and location characteristics
- How factors such as income, number of household members, presence of kids, the age of the householder, and lifestyle relate to residential preferences

\(^1\) Clackamas, Clark, Multnomah, and Washington counties
The project partners consider this a first effort at gaining a better understanding of a complex topic and intend to conduct this study periodically in the future to gauge whether and how preferences may be changing. This document summarizes the study’s preliminary findings. The project partners have also identified possible topics for research and plan to continue investigating trends in the data. Additional detail about the partnership, survey methods, and survey results can be found in the full report.

**Survey design**

This study seeks to go beyond typical opinion survey methods in order to gain a better understanding of how people make choices when faced with real-life tradeoffs. The survey presented respondents with two types of preference questions. In the first type, respondents were asked straightforward questions about their preferences. In the second type, respondents were asked with words and images to make tradeoffs like those they would consider when choosing where to live. For this tradeoffs section, respondents were asked to choose one of two housing situations that differed by housing type, commute time, house size, renting vs. owning, neighborhood type, and price. Repetition of those choices by thousands of respondents allows us to understand how important each of these factors is for people from different market segments.

This study used an online survey tool. To ensure that the study produced valid results, the survey was completed by a managed representative panel of 800 respondents (200 respondents for each of the four counties – Clackamas, Clark, Multnomah, and Washington). In order to collect enough data for in-depth statistical analysis, the survey was also distributed via e-mail advertisement, including to Metro’s Opt In panel, resulting in an additional 5,700 responses (the “public engagement panel”). In total, more than 6,500 people responded to the survey. For both panels, the survey responses were weighted by respondent county, age, and tenure (whether they currently rent or own) to ensure that the sample was representative of the region’s population distributions as described in the 2010 U.S. Census.\(^2\) A comparison of survey responses from the managed panel and the public engagement panel indicates that the demographic profile is comparable enough that the full data set can be used for analysis, but that there are some differences that warrant additional study.

For any survey, the phrasing of questions and selection of images play a critical role in producing meaningful results. The project partners brought diverse perspectives to this study and sought to use words and images in the survey that clearly describe different housing and neighborhood types without introducing bias. Over the course of about six months, the project partners worked together to refine those words and images to describe the following housing and neighborhoods types for use in the survey. A description of these housing and neighborhood types can be found in the full report.

**Housing types**

Three different housing types were described in the survey:

---

\(^2\) For example, before weighting, both panels under-represent renters and don’t reflect the proportions of people living in each of the four counties. Weighting techniques such as these are standard practices used on any sample, including the U.S. Census.
• Single-family detached
• Single-family attached
• Condo or apartment

Neighborhood types
Four different neighborhood types that illustrate a variety of activity and density levels were described in the survey:
• Urban central or downtown
• Urban neighborhood or town center
• Outer Portland or suburban
• Rural

Even with a deliberate effort to use clear text descriptions and images, people will understand these neighborhood types differently, perhaps more so than housing types. Additional work could be done to understand how differing interpretations may influence responses.

Preliminary results

Overall, most respondents live in and prefer single-family detached homes

When asked simple questions about their preferences, most respondents live in and prefer single-family detached housing.

Single-family detached homes
65 percent of respondents currently live in a single-family detached home. 87 percent of the respondents living in a single-family detached home prefer this housing type. 80 percent of all respondents prefer this housing type.

Single-family attached homes
8 percent of respondents currently live in a single-family attached home. 11 percent of the respondents living in a single-family attached home prefer this housing type. 7 percent of all respondents prefer this housing type.

---

Key takeaways:
Most respondents live in a single-family detached home and this is the most preferred housing type, not just for those that live in this type of home, but also for respondents who currently live in single-family attached homes, condos and apartments.

---

3 Results for this section are reported for the managed panel only. See the full report for a description of survey results from public engagement.
Condos or apartments
28 percent of respondents currently live in a condo or apartment. 26 percent of the respondents living in a condo or apartment prefer this housing type. 13 percent of all respondents prefer this housing type.

Respondents typically live in their preferred neighborhood type
When asked simple questions about preferences, most respondents prefer their current neighborhood type. Since the majority of respondents live in the *outer Portland or suburban* neighborhood type, this is the most preferred neighborhood type overall. However, current residents of *outer Portland or suburban neighborhoods* report the lowest level of satisfaction with their current neighborhood type, followed by residents of *urban central or downtown* neighborhoods. Residents of *rural* neighborhoods, followed by *urban neighborhood or town center* residents are most satisfied with their current neighborhoods.

- 11 percent of respondents currently live in an *urban central or downtown* neighborhood. 55 percent of the respondents living in this neighborhood type prefer this neighborhood type. 13 percent of all respondents prefer this neighborhood type.
- 25 percent of respondents currently live in an *urban neighborhood or town center*. 62 percent of the respondents living in this neighborhood type prefer this neighborhood type. 27 percent of all respondents prefer this neighborhood type.
- 56 percent of respondents live in an *outer Portland or suburban* neighborhood type. 51 percent of the respondents living in this neighborhood type prefer this neighborhood type. 34 percent of all respondents prefer this neighborhood type.
- 8 percent of respondents live in a *rural* neighborhood. 70 percent of the respondents living in this neighborhood type prefer this neighborhood type. 26 percent of all respondents prefer this neighborhood type.

Key takeaways:
Most respondents identified their neighborhood type as *outer Portland or suburban* and about half of those residents prefer this neighborhood type. Though a smaller share of respondents lives in *urban central or downtown* neighborhood types, about half of them prefer that neighborhood type.

Key takeaways:
Current residents of rural neighborhoods, which account for 8 percent of respondents, are most satisfied with their neighborhood.

---

4 Results for this section are reported for the managed panel only. See the full report for a description of survey results from public engagement.
Controlling for other factors such as commute time and price, people are most likely to choose their current neighborhood type

This survey went beyond typical questions about preferences to collect information about how various factors affect housing choices. The next section of the survey presented respondents with multiple housing option choice sets where factors such as price, commute time, housing type, neighborhood type, size of residence, and tenure (own vs. rent) varied. All 6,500 plus survey responses (weighted to match Census distributions) are used for reporting the results of these choice sets. The larger number of responses makes it possible to conduct more complex analysis.

To understand the importance of neighborhood type when people make housing choices, statistical analyses were conducted on the response data. Those analyses held all other factors such as price, commute time, and housing type constant. If respondents could pay the same price, have the same type of housing, same commute distance, etc. but in different neighborhood types, they are most likely to choose the neighborhood type that they currently live in. However, in no case is there a majority of respondents that would be likely to choose their current neighborhood type. Residents of urban central or downtown neighborhoods have the highest likelihood of choosing their current neighborhood type (44 percent probability) and residents of outer Portland or suburban neighborhoods have the lowest likelihood (31 percent probability). Controlling for other factors, residents of the urban central or downtown neighborhood type have a secondary likelihood (32 percent) that they will choose an urban neighborhood or town center. As a secondary choice, respondents living in urban neighborhood or town center locations were split on whether to choose more or less urban neighborhoods. As a secondary choice, those living in outer Portland or suburban neighborhoods were twice as likely to choose more urban as opposed to more rural neighborhood types.

**Key takeaways:**
All other things being equal, people are most likely (though not a majority) to choose to live in their current neighborhood type. As a secondary choice, respondents living in urban neighborhood or town center locations are split on whether to choose more or less urban neighborhoods. As a secondary choice, those living in outer Portland or suburban neighborhoods are twice as likely to choose more urban as opposed to more rural neighborhood types.

Controlling for other factors, the importance of owning vs. renting varies by neighborhood choice

Respondents that choose urban central or downtown neighborhoods are more likely to prefer renting their home. Respondents that choose rural neighborhoods are more likely to prefer owning their home. These preferences are less clear for respondents that choose the other two neighborhoods types, urban neighborhood or town center and outer Portland or suburban neighborhoods.
Some people's neighborhood choices change when they are asked to consider other factors. Though people are generally satisfied with their current housing and neighborhood types, some make different choices when they consider other factors. To understand how respondents make tradeoffs regarding neighborhoods, statistical techniques were used to test a series of “what if” scenarios. These “what if” scenarios are not intended to be policy recommendations. They are used for illustrative purposes only to help understand how people make housing choices. Different “what if” scenario assumptions would produce different results.

**What if housing prices increase?**
Some people may change their neighborhood choices if housing prices go up by one-third in their current neighborhood type. Current residents of the outer Portland or suburban neighborhood type are most sensitive to increased housing prices; 11 percent would choose different neighborhood types under this scenario. Of these suburban respondents that shift neighborhood choices based on price, the most common response is to shift to more urban neighborhoods, but a portion would also switch to a rural neighborhood (3 percent shift to urban central or downtown, 5 percent to urban neighborhood or town center, and 3 percent to rural).

**What if ownership of single-family detached homes is more limited?**
Some people may choose a different neighborhood type if they are unable to own a single-family detached home in their current neighborhood type. Current residents of rural neighborhoods place the most importance on owning a single-family detached home and there is a 27 percent probability that they will shift to a more urban neighborhood type to accommodate that housing preference. On the other hand, current residents of urban central or downtown neighborhoods place the least importance on owning a single-family detached home; most would rather choose a different housing type than

---

**Key takeaways:**
People are most likely to choose their current neighborhood type regardless of tradeoffs in price, commute time, square footage, and ownership.

**Additional context:**
Relatively small percentages of the region’s population represent large numbers of people. Seemingly minor shifts in housing or neighborhood choices can thus have a large impact on housing demand and traffic. For perspective, there are likely to be about 820,000 households inside the urban growth boundary in 2035. Just five percent of that is 41,000 households.

**Key takeaways:**
Residents of rural neighborhoods feel strongly about owning a single-family detached home. Over a quarter of them would choose a more urban neighborhood type if that was their only option to own a single-family detached home.
leave their current neighborhood type. 6 percent would choose a different neighborhood type.

What if commute times increase?
Some people may choose a different type of neighborhood if commute times go up by ten minutes in their current neighborhood type. Current residents of the urban neighborhood or town center type are most sensitive to commute times. 7 percent of urban neighborhood or town center respondents would shift neighborhood choices based on increased commute time. 3 percent would choose an urban central or downtown neighborhood, 2 percent would choose an outer Portland or suburban neighborhood, and 1 percent would choose a rural neighborhood. Current residents of rural neighborhoods are least sensitive to increased commute times, with 3 percent shifting their neighborhood choice when faced with increased commute time.

What if residences are smaller?
Some people may choose a different neighborhood type if the size of residences in their current neighborhood type decrease by 500 square feet. Current residents of the urban central or downtown neighborhood type are most sensitive to decreases in residence size. Making up the 12 percent of urban central respondents that shift neighborhood choices based on decreased home size, 7 percent choose an urban neighborhood or town center, 4 percent choose an outer Portland or suburb, and 2 percent would choose a rural neighborhood.

Other factors that people consider when deciding where to live
In addition to asking respondents to weigh potential tradeoffs, the survey also included traditional opinion polling to address other factors that may influence residential choices, but that are not possible to quantify to present as tradeoffs. Safety of neighborhoods and public school quality are two such factors that were addressed with more traditional survey techniques.

Respondents say that housing price, safety of the neighborhood, and characteristics of the house, in that order, are the most important factors when choosing a home.
- 44 percent rank housing price as their top influencer when choosing a home.

---

5 That increase is about a third of the average commute time.
6 Numbers don’t add up to 7 percent because of rounding.
7 This would represent a decrease by about a third of average residence size.
8 Numbers don’t add up to 12 percent because of rounding.
9 Results for this section are reported for the managed panel only. See the full report for a description of survey results from public engagement.
• Safety of the neighborhood (19 percent choose this as their top priority) and characteristics of the house (19 percent) are the next most influential factors.
• Quality of public schools was the number one influencer for just 3 percent of respondents and was ranked in the top three by 11 percent.

A majority of respondents prefer neighborhoods with a moderate amount of foot and vehicle traffic.
• 55 percent prefer moderate foot and vehicle traffic during the day with some activities within a 15 minute walk.
• Those living in Multnomah County were twice as likely to desire "heavy foot and vehicle traffic" than those in Clackamas, Clark, and Washington counties.

The largest share of respondents, though not a majority, prefer a medium-sized yard.
• 32 percent of respondents prefer a medium sized yard separating their home from a neighbor.
• Owners are more likely than renters to prefer a medium sized or large yard.
• Renters are more likely than owners to prefer no yard or little private outdoor space.

Next steps
This study provides initial insight into the complex topic of how people decide where to live. Together, we hope this work can inform public and private sector efforts, such as the upcoming regional growth management decision, to provide the diversity of housing and neighborhood choices that people desire. The project partners hope to improve upon and update this study to understand how preferences may change over time. The project partners have identified several topics that warrant additional research:

• Even with text descriptions and images, people may have different perceptions about what is meant by the various housing and neighborhood types. How might this affect survey responses? How might we improve the survey instrument?
• Every survey sample has limitations in its ability to represent the full population. This study attempts to account for that by weighting for housing tenure, age, and county of residence of the respondents. However, as with any sample, there are some variables that cannot be validated (for example, how to balance residents of different neighborhood types when there is no objective way to define neighborhood types).
• This study relies on different respondent sources. Are there significant differences in how respondents from the different panels make choices?
• What are the best methods for incorporating these survey results into forecast models?
• This study represents a snapshot of preferences today. How might they change in the future?
Memorandum

To: WCCC Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Steve Szigethy, Senior Planner

Date: September 25, 2014

Re: Transportation Development Tax (TDT) – Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit Improvements in the TDT Project List

At the last WCCC TAC meeting, we had a discussion about updating the Transportation Development Tax (TDT) Capital Improvements Project List, including the potential for adding pedestrian/bicycle projects. Based on that discussion and subsequent due diligence, some revised guidance is necessary. In a related matter, the transit component of the TDT project list is out of date and requires some coordination among the jurisdictions to update. Both topics are discussed below.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements

After reexamining the TDT code language and conferring with County Counsel, we have made an interpretation that TDT expenditures are limited to extra capacity improvements to arterials, collectors and transit facilities, but that these improvements may include sidewalks, bike lanes and trails.

Therefore, on-street projects that add sidewalks and/or bike lanes to arterial or collector roadways are still eligible to be on the project list. We recommend an eligible capacity amount of 90%. As stated last month, the project must meet or exceed the jurisdiction’s minimum standard for sidewalks and bikeways (no “throw-away” projects).

The new guidance is that off-street trail projects must be tied to transit access in order to meet the intent of the TDT code. As a result, we recommend that any trails proposed to be added to the project list meet all of the following guidelines:

- It is designated as a “Pedestrian Parkway” or “Bicycle Parkway” in the 2014 Regional Active Transportation Plan, or a “Regional Trail” in the proposed Washington County TSP Pedestrian Element Map (Ordinance 783);
- It provides direct access or is part of a contiguous, complete route that leads to a light rail, commuter rail, frequent service bus or standard service bus stop;
- It is within a half-mile of the transit stop as measured along the resulting ped/bike network;
- It is designed in a way that accommodates 24-hour transportation utility, not just recreation.

Similar to sidewalks/bike lanes, we recommend an eligible capacity amount of 90%. Trail projects would be added to the TDT Transit Project List under a new category called “Pedestrian/Bicycle Access to Transit.”
Transit Project List

The transit component of the TDT project list (attached) is in need of an update. It was developed in 2008 and includes some items that are no longer adopted as policy (for example, commuter rail to McMinnville and bus service on Cornelius Pass Road), as well as some items that may have been completed (bus stop improvements, etc.)

The list would also be updated to add proposed trail projects per the previous section.

Please review the Transit Project List and come prepared with any comments. TriMet has been sent an advance copy.

Timeline

We are still on track with the following schedule:

- July 24 – WCCC TAC discusses project list update process
- August 28 – WCCC TAC continues discussion on project list update
- September 25 – WCCC TAC continues discussion on project list update (ped/bike/transit)
- October 1 – Deadline for submitting projects to county staff (same as Annual Report info)
  steven_szigethy@co.washington.or.us
- October 23 – WCCC TAC makes recommendation to the WCCC Policy Group
- November 10 – WCCC Policy Group makes recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners
- Mid-late November – Board action (Resolution & Order)

Guidance from Previous Memo

For your reference, below is the guidance from the previous memo that is still applicable to the project list update process:

- Eligible projects must be on the jurisdiction’s adopted Transportation System Plan.
- Per state statutes on SDCs, TDT is to be used only on capital projects that add capacity for future users.
- With a few exceptions, projects on the state system have generally not been included as a matter of policy. (The main exception has been TV Highway).
- For motor vehicle capital improvements SDC-eligible costs are based upon the proportion of the improvement that is related to capacity, and the proportion of that capacity that is attributed to a future need rather than an existing need.

If you are submitting changes, here is the information we need:

- Project List addition, deletion, or modification - Use cell highlighting or different fonts to indicate which is which. For example: green=add, yellow=change, pink=delete.
- Jurisdiction
- Project description and location - Facility, From, To, Description. For intersections, include the cross street in the From column.
- Estimated project cost (present dollars)
- Other (non-TDT) anticipated primary funding sources
- Other information relevant to the project – For “Proportion of Project Related to Capacity,” use Table 2 in the TDT Methodology Report (included below).
- I will be sorting projects alphanumerically by facility name, then from north-to-south or west-to-east. Feel free to do this before sending.
- You can remove projects that are complete, as long as there is no foreseeable need to spend any more TDT on it.

**TABLE 2**

**GUIDELINE FOR DETERMINING PROPORTION OF IMPROVEMENT RELATED TO CAPACITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Percent of Improvement Related to Need for Extra Capacity*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add through-lane</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add turn lane</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend existing or construct new roadway</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade separate intersection</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconfigure intersection (e.g., roundabout)</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add signal interconnect or adaptive signal system</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add new signal, upgrade existing traffic signal, or change signal phasing</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do minor lane widening requiring reconstruction</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realign roadway</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add backage road to improve access</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For projects with multiple improvement elements, percentage of improvement related to extra-capacity need is equal to the element having the highest individual assigned percentage. Improvements not listed on this table have no significant extra-capacity element which would qualify them for SDC eligibility.
## Transportation Development Tax
### Transit Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Year (on line)</th>
<th>Total Cost ($08)</th>
<th>Expected Federal/State Share</th>
<th>Total Non-Federal/State Cost</th>
<th>% within Washington Co.</th>
<th>Total Non-Federal/State Cost within Wash. Co.</th>
<th>Capacity %</th>
<th>Eligible SDC Amount (Total Non-Federal/State Cost within Wash. Co. Future Capacity Related)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Line and Bus Stop Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Hwy near-term project</td>
<td>TV HWY curb and lane improvements</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Hwy future project</td>
<td>Improved bus stops and improved pedestrian access to transit along busy highway. Sidewalks, crosswalks, additional stops not addressed in first round of improvements.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185th Ave Upgrades</td>
<td>Shelter and stop improvements associated with continued development of Frequent Service Corridor grid.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookwood, SW 247th N-S route</td>
<td>Shelter and stop improvements.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Pass Rd N-S route</td>
<td>Shelter and stop improvements.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton - Tualatin FS Corridor</td>
<td>Improved stops and pedestrian access in Frequent Service corridor (line 76)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall &amp; Nimbus bus stop improvements</td>
<td>Bus pull-outs and shelters for stops near Washington Square</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other county bus stop improvements</td>
<td>Shelters, amenities, crosswalks, sidewalks, street improvements for bus volumes as needed throughout county.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$6,900,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$5,520,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$5,520,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$5,520,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,310,000</td>
<td>$10,930,000</td>
<td>$10,930,000</td>
<td>$10,930,000</td>
<td>$5,987,454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Priority Treatments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline Bus Efficiency Improvements</td>
<td>Bus efficiency treatments such as signal priority, queue bypasses, dedicated bus stops and other treatments to enhance efficiency and improve or preserve service speeds for Frequent Service and key bus lines throughout county</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>$1,506,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park &amp; Ride Lots / Transit Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millikan Way Park &amp; Ride</td>
<td>Secure P&amp;R for long-term use</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset TC</td>
<td>Gradual expansion of paid parking cost recovery</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R expansion</td>
<td>Expand P&amp;R capacities in smaller lots on sites within Washington County with direct transit service to Portland and/or Washington County employment corridors</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,050,000</td>
<td>$17,050,000</td>
<td>$17,050,000</td>
<td>$17,050,000</td>
<td>$9,559,874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C

## Transportation Development Tax

### Transit Project List

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington County System Requirements</td>
<td>Merlo bus operating base expansion</td>
<td>Long-term expansion of bus service in Washington County require additional capacity at bus storage and maintenance shops.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$684,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County System Requirements</td>
<td>Elmonica LRV Expansion</td>
<td>Expansion of LRV yard and maintenance facility for increased service.</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$2,191,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>Washington County Commuter Rail Improvements (P&amp;W RR)</td>
<td>Capital improvements to allow future service upgrade including double-tracking (for improved frequency and time of day). Lower end of estimated cost range is shown because detailed project scoping has not been developed.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$10,956,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>SW Corridor - Portland and Western RR</td>
<td>East-West commuter rail corridor through southern Washington County from McMinnville to Milwaukie. Lower end of estimated project cost range is shown because detailed project scoping has not been developed.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$300,000,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$33,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$33,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$18,077,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>Commuter Rail Improvements (P&amp;W RR)</td>
<td>Capital improvements to allow future service upgrade including double-tracking (for improved frequency and time of day). Lower end of estimated cost range is shown because detailed project scoping has not been developed.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$350,000,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$175,000,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$53,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$53,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$29,033,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity Transit (LRT and/or BRT)</td>
<td>T-205 Ring Connector</td>
<td>Tualatin, Ore City and beyond suburban limited-stop service. Assumes BRT. Lower end of estimated project cost range is shown because detailed project scoping has not been developed.</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$600,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$600,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$328,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity Transit (LRT and/or BRT)</td>
<td>Pacific Hwy Corridor</td>
<td>Portland, Sylvania, Tigard, King City and Sherwood high-capacity transit. Lower end of estimated project cost range is shown because detailed project scoping has not been developed.</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$1,500,000,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$450,000,000</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$270,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$270,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$147,906,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity Transit (LRT and/or BRT)</td>
<td>East-West BRT</td>
<td>North High-Tech Corridor East-West on-street BRT connecting Hillsboro and Tanasbourne, STC, and St. Vincent's. Lower end of estimated project cost range is shown because detailed project scoping has not been developed.</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$5,478,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity Transit (LRT and/or BRT)</td>
<td>Blue Line west : Highway B extension (LRT assumed)</td>
<td>Hillsboro, Cornelius, Forest Grove LRT extension with Hatfield TC bypass or reconfiguration. Lower end of estimated project cost range is shown because detailed project scoping has not been developed.</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$200,000,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>$32,868,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Name: Streetcar loop circulator or Red Line extension into Amber Glen

- **Project Description:** Amber Glen LRT spur. (Pending development with sufficient density) Alternative would be a streetcar circulator. Lower end of estimated project cost range is shown because detailed project scoping has not been developed.
- **Year:** 2030
- **Total Cost ($\text{08})**: $175,000,000
- **Expected Federal/State Share**: $52,500,000
- **% within Washington Co.**: 100%
- **Total Non-Federal/State Cost within Wash. Co.**: $52,500,000
- **Capacity % within Washington Co.**: 100%
- **Total Non-Federal/State Cost within Wash. Co. Capacity Related**: $52,500,000
- **Future Growth Share**: 54.8%
- **Eligible SDC Amount (Total Non-Federal/State Cost within Wash. Co. Future Capacity Related)**: $28,759,500

**Cost Subtotal**: $1,905,000,000

**Cost Total**: $2,292,960,000

**Future Growth Share**: 54.8%

**Eligible SDC Amount (Total Non-Federal/State Cost within Wash. Co. Future Capacity Related)**: $28,759,500
2015-2017 RTO
Draft Project Solicitation and Selection Timeline
Updated August 12, 2014

September 2014

WCCC TAC
September 25
Discuss project eligibility and evaluation criteria guidelines.
WTA to present draft work scope.

October 2014

WCCC TAC
October 30
Project sponsor presentations
Advance DRAFT project list to WCCC for consideration

November 2014

WCCC
November 10
Project sponsor presentations
Take action on endorsement of MSTIP Opportunity Funds

December 2014

Applications due to Metro by December 19

January 2015

WCCC TAC
January (TBD)
Advance sub-regional prioritized project list to WCCC for consideration

February 2015

WCCC
February (TBD)
Review TAC recommendation and
advance sub-regional prioritized project list to Metro

March 2015

Metro
March 2
Grant awards announced
Whether you moved to Oregon last week or trace your roots generations deep, you have your own reason for loving this place – and Metro wants to keep it that way. Help shape the future of the greater Portland region and discover tools, services and places that make life better today.

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.
www.oregonmetro.gov/connect
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Public comment period
Monday, Sept. 15 to Thursday, Oct. 30, 2014

Your input today on the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project will determine the future of the region for generations to come.

The Oregon Legislature has required the Portland metropolitan region to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions from cars and small trucks by 2035. Weigh in on a draft approach and proposed actions for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and building great communities. Your input today will help inform the Metro Council’s decision in December.

Your voice is important

You are invited to provide feedback during the public comment period from Sept. 15 through Oct. 30, 2014.

• Take a short survey online at makeagreatplace.org on transportation and land use policies and actions that can shape our communities.

To provide more in depth feedback, visit oregonmetro.gov/draftapproach to download and review the draft approach and implementation recommendations (Regional Framework Plan amendments, toolbox of possible actions and performance monitoring approach) and provide comments in one of the following ways:

• Mail comments to Metro Planning CSC Comment, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232
• Email comments to climatescenarios@oregonmetro.gov
• Phone in comments to 503-797-1750 or TDD 503-797-1804
• Testify at a Metro Council hearing on Oct. 30, 2014, at 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232 in the Council chamber

To learn more about the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project, visit oregonmetro.gov/climatescenarios