

SPRINGWATER INTERCHANGE MANAGEMENT AREA

Appendix H – Findings

DRAFT

Findings

Statewide Planning Goals

Oregon law created a hierarchy of consistency between local, regional and state plans. The foundation of Oregon's land use planning program is a set of 19 Statewide Planning Goals ([http://www.lcd.state.or.us/LCD/goals.shtml#Statewide Planning Goals](http://www.lcd.state.or.us/LCD/goals.shtml#Statewide_Planning_Goals)) OAR 660-15-0000 (1-15). The goals express the state's policies on land use and related topics, such as citizen involvement, housing, and natural resources.

Oregon's statewide goals are achieved through local comprehensive plans. State law requires each city and county to adopt a comprehensive plan and the zoning and land-division ordinances needed to put the plan into effect. The local comprehensive plans must be consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals. Plans are reviewed for such consistency by the state's Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). When LCDC officially approves a local government's plan, the plan is said to be "acknowledged". It then becomes the controlling document for land use in the area covered by that plan.

The City of Gresham's and the Multnomah County's Comprehensive Plans have been acknowledged; therefore compliance with the policies and implementation measures of the Comprehensive Plan is considered compliance with the statewide goals. When a local jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan is revised, each application for change is reviewed against the requirements of the goals.

This appendix will list and describe the statewide goals to insure that the facility plan maintains its consistency with state planning goals. These goals include: Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement), Goal 2 (Land Use Planning), Goal 9 (Economic Development), Goal 10 (Housing), Goal 11 (Public Facilities and Service), Goal 12 (Transportation), and Goal 14 (Urbanization).

Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement)

Goal 1, Citizen Involvement, requires development of a citizen involvement program that is widespread, understandable, responsive, funded, and that allows for two-way communications throughout all planning phases.

Finding: Appendix I of the Springwater Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) contains a summary of the public involvement efforts that were undertaken as part of the IAMP project. These efforts included the following:

- *A meeting of interested parties was held on February 12, 2009*
- *A public open house held on July 27, 2010, to discuss the new Springwater interchange and the IAMP;*
- *Small group (property owners) meetings were held on November 2 and November 9, 2010, to answer project-specific questions from business owners and residents directly affected by the project;*

- *Five (5) stakeholder meetings were held between March and July, 2010, with identified stakeholders including:*
 - *Developers*
 - *Johnson Creek Watershed Council*
 - *East Metro Economic Alliance*
 - *Mt. Hood Neighborhood Association, Gresham Fire Department*
 - *Real Estate interests*
 - *Metro staff from land use planning, open spaces and transportation*
 - *Audubon Society*
 - *Portland Parks and Recreation*
- *A newsletter sent out to individuals near the proposed project to provide information and notification of the public involvement events; and*
- *A postcard announcing the small group meetings sent to business and property owners adjacent to the project.*

The draft IAMP was made available for public review and comment for a 45-day period beginning March 4, 2011. Notice of the public review draft was sent via postcard to individuals near the proposed project and those who had expressed interest at previous public events. Public comment was accepted via email, mail and telephone.

Public hearings on the proposed changes to the Gresham Comprehensive Plan and implementing ordinances were held by the Gresham Planning Commission and City Council during the winter 2010-11. The Board of Commissioners of Multnomah County, took no action as the IAMP is considered compliant with the Springwater Community Plan, which has been acknowledged by the County as the planning document for the Springwater area. These hearings provided opportunities for public comment on the proposed changes.

This information demonstrates consistency with Goal 1.

Goal 2 (Land Use Planning)

Goal 2, Land Use Planning, requires that a land use planning process and policy framework be established as a basis for all decisions and actions relating to the use of land. Goal 2 includes several requirements:

It requires planning coordination between those local governments and state agencies, "which have programs, land ownerships, or responsibilities within the area included in the plan." With regard to the Springwater IAMP, Goal 2 requires that ODOT coordinate with Gresham and Multnomah County, each of which has planning authority over some of the area impacted by the proposed interchange improvements. Coordination is particularly important because development within the county or the city will impact

use of the interchange, and land use decisions could affect future use and operation of the interchange.

Finding: *Preliminary tasks for the Springwater IAMP included a thorough review and analysis of all relevant state, regional and local planning documents in order to establish a planning process and policy framework. The following documents were reviewed:*

- *Applicable Oregon Statewide Planning Goals;*
- *Oregon Administrative Rule 731, Division 15, Department of Transportation Coordination Rules;*
- *Oregon Transportation Plan (2006);*
- *Oregon Highway Plan (1999);*
- *Oregon Administrative Rule 734-051, Highway Approaches, Access Control, Spacing Standards and Medians;*
- *Metro Regional Framework Plan (1997);*
- *Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*
- *Metro Regional Transportation Plan (2007);*
- *Gresham Comprehensive Plan (2008);*
- *Gresham Zoning Ordinance;*
- *Gresham Transportation System Plan (2000);*
- *Springwater Community Plan (2005)*
- *Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan*
- *Multnomah County West of Sandy River Transportation and Land Use Plan (2002).*

This review identified how the documents influence planning for the proposed Springwater interchange project.

The Oregon Department of Transportation and the city of Gresham with participation by the city of Damascus, and Multnomah and Clackamas Counties jointly prepared the Springwater IAMP. Coordination between these agencies took place routinely throughout the process. ODOT staff facilitated and supported the adoption of the IAMP by Gresham, Multnomah County, and by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). ODOT, Gresham and Multnomah County will continue to coordinate on development activity and land use actions within the interchange area.

Goal 2 has a provision that land use decisions and actions be supported by an "adequate factual base." This requirement applies to both legislative and quasi-judicial land use actions and requires that such actions be supported by "substantial evidence." In essence, it requires that there be evidence that a reasonable person would find to be adequate to support findings of fact that a land use action complies with the applicable review standards.

Finding: *This requirement is met through the technical analysis associated with the IAMP. Appendices C, D and E of the IAMP contain an analysis of the existing*

conditions within the IAMP study area. Appendix D describes the land use and zoning conditions and historic growth patterns in the vicinity of the proposed interchange, with Appendix E providing an inventory of existing transportation facilities and their relative functionality. A summary of deficiencies and issues is also provided based on analysis of current conditions.

Appendix D also describes expected future (2030) land use conditions within the IAMP study area and Appendices C and F provide future traffic analysis for current and 2030 no-build conditions.

Section 2 provides a description of the land use scenario used, with Appendix D providing the detail; including future household and employment growth and development patterns. The scenario was used for modeling the transportation network and determining where deficiencies may occur over time.

The analysis from Appendix D determined that improvements to the Springwater interchange area were necessary in order to accommodate future traffic. Appendix C summarizes the alternatives considered for the interchange and Appendix B describes the evaluation criteria used to select the preferred alternative.

Appendices A through I offer a factual base to support the Springwater interchange project and provide evidence to demonstrate compliance with the applicable Gresham and Multnomah County review standards.

Goal 2 also requires that city, county, state and federal agencies, and special district plans and actions related to land use are "consistent with the comprehensive plans of cities and counties and regional plans adopted under ORS Chapter 268." This provision is important because elements of the IAMP developed for the Springwater interchange will need to be adopted by Gresham and incorporated into its Transportation System Plan (TSP).

Finding: *Appendix G of the IAMP contains detailed review of plans and policies pertinent to the IAMP. Properties that are within the City of Gresham are currently governed by the Gresham comprehensive plan and zoning designations. Properties that are within Multnomah County are currently governed by the Multnomah County comprehensive plan and zoning designations. These findings show that the Springwater IAMP is consistent with the County and City plans, adopted pursuant to the provisions of ORS 197 and ORS 215.*

OAR 660, Division 4, outlines the Goal 2 exception process. This rule is not expected to be pertinent to the Springwater IAMP because it is entirely contained within the urban growth boundary and is not expected to require the taking of an exception to any of the other state goals under the provisions of this rule.

Goal 5: (Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces)

This goal requires that natural resources, scenic and historic areas and open spaces be protected. The goal goes on to state that these elements be inventoried and planned for.

Finding: *The Project Management Team worked closely with resource agencies such as Metro, the Johnson Creek Watershed Council and the City of Gresham's environmental staff and the City of Portland Parks Bureau to develop an interchange plan that to the greatest extent possible protects the Johnson Creek watershed and the watersheds of its tributary streams. The project management team also reviewed whether any historic and natural resources were within the management area. No known historic resources exist in the management area other than the Springwater Trail, which is a historic rail route, and no natural resources exist. The preferred interchange design avoids, to the greatest extent possible Johnson Creek and its tributaries. Where avoidance is not possible, the IAMP recommends that mitigation occur within the Springwater community.*

The project management team also consulted with the City of Portland Parks Bureau and based on their input developed an interchange plan that will grade separate the Springwater Trail at its intersection with the arterial serving the interchange.

Goal 7: (Areas Subject to Natural Hazards)

The purpose of this goal is to protect people and property from natural hazards.

Finding: *While the areas are subject to certain natural hazards, such as landslides and earthquakes, design of the facilities will minimize structural damage from earth movements.*

The interchange itself is not in a designated 100-year floodplain, but the road network serving the interchange cross the floodplains of Johnson Creek and its tributaries. The road network will be designed to minimize floodplain impacts by spanning them on elevated structures. The design of these structures are part of the design and engineering of the interchange facilities and not applicable to this IAMP.

Goal 8 (Recreational Needs)

The purpose of this goal is to satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

Finding: *In order to satisfy this goal, the project management team worked closely with the City of Portland Parks Bureau to address the Springwater Trail, which runs through the management area. In response to the Bureau's input, the design of the arterial serving the interchange is grade-separated from the Springwater Trail.*

The second half of this goal is not applicable as there are no plans to site a destination resort within the Springwater community.

Goal 9: (Economic Development)

This goal requires that local comprehensive plans and policies contribute to a stable and healthy economy in all regions of the state.

Finding: *The Springwater Interchange provides a vital function in supporting local and regional economic development goals and plans. Local traffic, including*

commercial vehicles, must have safe and efficient access to US 26. The intent of the IAMP is to protect the function of the interchange; proposed IAMP policy language illustrates the County's and the City's role in preserving capacity and improving operations at the interchange. Adopting the IAMP will ensure that transportation improvements will be available to support the planned employment uses in Gresham and Multnomah County, consistent with this economic development goal.

Goal 10: Housing

This goal requires the County's and the City's plans provide for housing needs at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of citizens and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.

Finding: *While land in the immediate vicinity of the Springwater Interchange is currently zoned for Mixed Use Agricultural per Multnomah County Land Use, the entire area is slated for urban development and a Springwater Community Plan was developed that identifies predominantly industrial uses and other urban land uses such as Office, Commercial, and Residential when the Springwater Area is annexed into the city of Gresham. Appendix D delineates the future urban land uses. The proposed interchange is in an area that is planned for industrial use. It will not directly affect the supply of housing in the region.*

Goal 11: (Public Facilities Planning) and OAR 660, Division 11

Goal 11, Public Facilities Planning and OAR 660, Division 11, require cities and counties to plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development. The goal requires that urban and rural development be "guided and supported by types and levels of urban and rural public facilities and services appropriate for, but limited to, the needs and requirements of the urban, urbanizable and rural areas to be served."

Findings: *Transportation facilities are considered a primary type of public facility. The Springwater IAMP documents the current and future transportation needs of the urban, urbanizable, and rural areas in the vicinity of Springwater. The analysis of possible alternatives concluded that the grade-separated interchange is the appropriate facility to serve future transportation demand.*

The IAMP contains policies that will guide growth within the vicinity of the interchange to ensure that development takes place at a rate and density that is compatible with the capacity of the interchange.

In terms of other, non-transportation public facilities, the IAMP does not result in any land use changes. No impact on public facilities is expected, because no intensification of land use is created as a result of improvements recommended in the IAMP.

The city of Gresham is developing public facilities plans for the non-transportation related facilities that will be required as the Springwater area urbanizes. The Springwater IAMP does not preclude these other public facilities planning processes.

Goal 12: (Transportation) and OAR 660, Division 12

Goal 12, Transportation, requires cities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and ODOT to provide and encourage a “safe, convenient and economic transportation system.” Goal 12 is implemented through OAR 660, Division 12 (2007), also known as the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) (<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/TPR.shtml>)

Finding: *The purpose of the Springwater interchange is to improve the safety and efficiency of traffic flow through the area and to accommodate efficient freight movements onto and off of US 26. The objective of the Springwater IAMP is to protect the functionality of the interchange and its ability to serve future transportation demands.*

Section 2 of the IAMP contains a discussion of the transportation analysis conducted in order to determine future demand, available capacity, deficiencies and necessary improvements for this interchange area. The analysis demonstrates that the planned transportation facility will adequately serve projected trips generated by future land uses, safely and efficiently for at least 20 years.

The Transportation System Plans of Gresham and Multnomah County have adopted relevant language of the IAMP by either ordinance or resolution. Policy and zoning ordinance language, and resolution language, as provided in IAMP, Appendix J, is added to the Comprehensive Plans and Zoning Ordinances of Gresham, in order to maintain interchange function and ensure that development inconsistent with the objectives of the IAMP does not cause unexpected traffic volumes or create non-conforming access points. The standards reserve capacity at the interchange so it is not consumed prematurely. IAMP policies provide for coordination between Gresham, Multnomah County and ODOT for any land use actions proposed within the IAMP study area. Local plans must be consistent with state plans. The Oregon Transportation Commission, first must approve proposed plan amendments involving land use actions that would exceed standards set forth in the IAMP.

ODOT, Gresham and Multnomah County jointly developed the Springwater IAMP. Policy language contained in the IAMP mandates continued coordination between these agencies for management of the interchange area. Current and future planned land uses were considered in the design of the interchange in order to ensure its ability to support future traffic demands. Policies within the IAMP are intended to manage land uses around the interchange to avoid unplanned growth and development that may impact the function of the facility. The policies also require that plan amendments and zone changes within the IAMP study area must not result in a significant impact on the interchange facility. If a significant impact is expected, then the IAMP must be amended and mitigation strategies, including a funding plan, must be adopted.

The IAMP calls for construction of an interchange. The IAMP documents the various design alternatives considered, the criteria used to evaluate the alternatives, and the rationale for selecting the preferred alternative.

The TPR requires local governments to adopt land use regulations consistent with state and federal requirements “to protect transportation facilities, corridors and sites for their identified functions” (OAR 660-012-0045(2)). A variety of measures help to achieve this policy, including:

- Access control measures which are consistent with the functional classification of roads and consistent with limiting development on rural lands to rural uses and densities;
- Standards to protect future operations of roads;
- A process for coordinated review of future land use decisions affecting transportation facilities, corridors or sites;
- A process to apply conditions to development proposals in order to minimize impacts and protect transportation facilities, corridors or sites;
- Regulations to provide notice to ODOT of land use applications that require public hearings, involve land divisions, or affect private access to roads; and
- Regulations assuring that amendments to land use designations, densities and design standards are consistent with the functions, capacities and performance standards of facilities identified in the TSP. See also OAR 660-012-0060.

Goal 14: (Urbanization) and OAR 660, Divisions 14 and 22

Goal 14, Urbanization, requires an “orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban use” and the establishment of urban growth boundaries (UGBs) to provide land for urban development and identify and separate urban and urbanizable land from rural land.

Finding: *The Springwater interchange planning area is located entirely within the Metro urban growth boundary. Land in the vicinity of the interchange is currently zoned multi-use agriculture per Multnomah County, but with annexation into the city of Gresham will change to urban/suburban-level residential and employment uses. The IAMP contains policies that will guide growth within the vicinity of the interchange to ensure that development takes place at a rate and density that is compatible with the capacity of the interchange that are adopted to protect the function of the interchange from any unplanned future development.*

Generally, compliance with the goals is achieved by demonstrating compliance with an acknowledged comprehensive plan. Since the Gresham Comprehensive Plan and the County’s TSP have been acknowledged as complying with the Statewide Planning Goals and related rules, compliance with the County Comprehensive Plan is considered to equate to compliance with the Statewide Planning Goals. The Springwater interchange area, for which this IAMP is being completed, is contained in these plans and is therefore presumed to comply with the related goal requirements.

- Goal 3 Agricultural Lands***
- Goal 4 Forest Lands***
- Goal 6 Air, Water and Land Resources Quality***
- Goal 13 Energy Conservation***
- Goal 15 Willamette River Greenway***
- Goal 16 Estuarine Resources***
- Goal 17 Coastal Shorelands***
- Goal 18 Beaches and Dunes***
- Goal 19 Ocean Resources***

These goals were determined not to be applicable to the development of the IAMP. Goals 3 and 4 are not applicable because the area within the IAMP is within the Metro urban growth boundary. Goal 6 is not applicable because no changes to waste and discharge will occur from this plan, and environmental quality will not fall below accepted state or federal standards as a result of the plan. Goal 13 is not applicable as no changes will occur to density of land use nor will it encumber energy conservation efforts in the area of the plan. Goal 15 is not applicable because the Willamette River Greenway is not in or near the interchange area. Goals 16, 17, 18, 19 are not applicable because no estuarine resources, coastal shorelands, beaches or dunes or ocean resources exist in or near the interchange area.

Oregon Transportation Plan (2006)

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state's long-range multimodal transportation plan. The OTP is the overarching policy document among a series of plans that together form the state transportation system plan (TSP). An IAMP must be consistent with applicable OTP goals and policies. Findings of compatibility will be part of the basis for IAMP approval. The most pertinent OTP goals and policies for interchange planning are as follows:

POLICY 1.1 – of an Integrated Multimodal System

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to plan and develop a balanced, integrated transportation system with modal choices for the movement of people and goods.

***Finding:** The Springwater Community Plan calls for an integrated Multi-modal system including sidewalks and bike lanes on roads classified as collectors and above. The IAMP for Springwater reinforces the Community Plan and builds from it by recommending that the Springwater Trail be grade-separated from the arterial street that serves the interchange.*

The Springwater IAMP was developed to facilitate improved movement of good (freight) from the Springwater Community, which is a planned area for industrial expansion. The interchange will provide for a safe and integrated roadway network in the area with improved access to and from US 26.

POLICY 1.2 – Equity, Efficiency and Travel Choices

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to promote a transportation system with multiple travel choices that are easy to use, reliable, cost-effective and accessible to all potential users, including the transportation disadvantaged.

***Finding:** Improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities are incorporated into the design for the interchange reconstruction. Any new roadway projects (including local streets) will meet current applicable standards. Pursuant to existing local requirements, 5-foot wide sidewalks will be constructed as part of all collector or local streets planned within the interchange area (see Proposed Local Circulation Plan, Exhibit 14), with separate bike lanes required for roadways classified as collectors or above. The Local Street Connectivity Plan includes connections for bicycles and pedestrians where street connections are not possible or practical.*

The Springwater Community currently has one transit route serving the area along SE Orient Drive. The Springwater Community Plan identifies three new transit routes. One Primary Transit Route along SE Hogan Road, west of the management area; one Secondary Transit Route along the arterial serving the Springwater interchange; and one Neighborhood Circulation Route along the proposed collector crossing US 26 to the north of the interchange.

The Springwater IAMP builds off of the Springwater Community Plan and does not prohibit or otherwise limit more transit routes in the future.

POLICY 1.3 – Relationship of Interurban and Urban Mobility

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to provide intercity mobility through and near urban areas in a manner which minimizes adverse effects on urban land use and travel patterns and provides for efficient long distance travel.

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP provides for improved safety and intercity mobility along the US 26 corridor. The IAMP regulates access and land uses in the vicinity of the interchange to ensure the facility will operate at levels consistent with established state/regional mobility standards for the 20-year planning horizon and beyond.*

The IAMP process has coordinated with local partners in vicinity of the Springwater Interchange, through their TSPS, to develop/enhance the local street network, to accommodate local access and connectivity. A proposed new local arterial will provide connectivity between SE Hogan Road and SE Orient Drive in Multnomah County (future City of Gresham), as will a new collector crossing between SE 252nd Avenue and the proposed arterial provide greater connectivity between neighborhoods, and improve access across US 26.

POLICY 2.1 - Capacity and Operational Efficiency

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to manage the transportation system to improve its capacity and operational efficiency for the long term benefit of people and goods movement.

***Finding:** The Springwater interchange was developed in response to safety, capacity and operational efficiency issues affecting the US 26 corridor. Short term actions in the IAMP accomplish these management objectives by minimizing access locations through this section of US 26. The medium-term and long-term actions in the IAMP protect long-term system capacity by ensuring that the interchange continues to function at a level that meets the mobility expectations of the state. The IAMP contains policies that regulate land use in the vicinity of the interchange by requiring that proposed land use actions must include a review of potential impacts to interchange operations.*

POLICY 2.2 – Management of Assets

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to manage transportation assets to extend their life and reduce maintenance costs.

***Finding:** The stated purpose of the IAMP is to maximize the operational life of the Springwater Interchange, and consequently, protect the State's investment in the facility. Specifically, the goal of the IAMP is to protect the function and operation of the interchange and the local street network within the IAMP area. This includes providing safe and efficient connections between local streets and state highways and minimizing local traffic traveling through the interchange. The IAMP requires proposed changes to the planned land use system to demonstrate consistency with IAMP policies protecting the long-term function of the interchange facility.*

The US 26 corridor includes bus service on the facility between Gresham and the neighboring city of Sandy.

TriMet's Metropolitan Area Express light rail service is within 2-miles of the Springwater area.

POLICY 3.1 – An Integrated and Efficient Freight System

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to promote an integrated, efficient and reliable freight system involving air, barges, pipelines, rail, ships and trucks to provide Oregon a competitive advantage by moving goods faster and more reliably to regional, national and international markets.

***Finding:** The US 26 corridor serves as a primary connection between the Portland metro region and central and eastern Oregon. The highway is a designated Statewide Freight Route in the Oregon Highway Plan. It serves the planned development of the Springwater Community and the cities of Portland, Gresham, Damascus, Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village to the west, with the area around Mt. Hood and Central and Eastern Oregon to the east.*

The US 26 corridor is a principal facility for freight traffic and regional through-trips. The Springwater interchange will alleviate congestion and conflicts of combined local trips and through-trips currently experienced in the Springwater Community. The Springwater IAMP provides management tools to ensure the continued safety and efficiency of travel along the US 26 Corridor, particularly in the vicinity of the new interchange.

POLICY 3.2 – Moving People to Support Economic Vitality

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to develop an integrated system of transportation facilities, services and information so that intrastate, interstate and international travelers can travel easily for business and recreation.

***Finding:** The Springwater interchange will facilitate improved connections to and from the Springwater community and US 26, providing for an efficient and safe transportation network for travelers on business and pursuing recreational pursuits.*

POLICY 4.1 - Environmentally Responsible Transportation System

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to provide a transportation system that is environmentally responsible and encourages conservation and protection of natural resources.

***Finding:** IAMP policy language protects resource land within the IAMP study area by restricting the location and operation of approach roads in the vicinity of the interchange consistent with the existing designations in the comprehensive plan. The Springwater Interchange will span the adjacent Johnson Creek and its tributaries, home to threatened and endangered salmonid species. Actions necessary to protect and enhance the natural resources within the management area were taken in the refinement of the preferred alternative. The IAMP has goals and policies to address the protection of the natural environment.*

POLICY 5.1 – Safety

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to continually improve the safety and security of all modes and transportation facilities for system users including operators, passengers, pedestrians, recipients of goods and services, and property owners.

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP addresses crash rates along this section of US 26. The highway improvements minimize access to the highway and the grade-separated interchange limits conflicts between local and regional trips - a contributing cause for vehicle crashes in the area. The interchange design, and the specified location and authorized use of approach roads provide for long-term highway safety.*

POLICY 7.1 – A Coordinated Transportation System

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to work collaboratively with other jurisdictions and agencies with the objective of removing barriers so the transportation system can function as one system.

***Finding:** ODOT worked in collaboration with Gresham and Multnomah County to develop and adopt the IAMP. Improvements to local street connectivity and access to state facilities within the IAMP area were further coordinated in the development and updating of local jurisdiction TSPs. The IAMP policy language adopted by these local jurisdictions requires continued coordination between themselves and ODOT to protect the long-term function of the interchange.*

POLICY 7.3 – Public Involvement and Consultation

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to involve Oregonians to the fullest practical extent in transportation planning and implementation in order to deliver a transportation system that meets the diverse needs of the state.

***Finding:** Appendix I of the Springwater Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) contains a summary of the public involvement efforts that were undertaken as part of the IAMP project. These efforts included the following:*

- *A meeting of interested parties was held on February 12, 2009*
- *A public open house held on July 27, 2010, to discuss the new Springwater interchange and the IAMP;*
- *Small group (property owners) meetings were held on November 2 and November 9, 2010, to answer project-specific questions from business owners and residents directly affected by the project;*
- *Five (5) stakeholder meetings were held between March and July, 2010, with identified stakeholders including:*
 - *Developers*
 - *Johnson Creek Watershed Council*

- *East Metro Economic Alliance*
- *Mt. Hood Neighborhood Association, Gresham Fire Department*
- *Real Estate interests*
- *Metro staff from land use planning, open spaces and transportation*
- *Audubon Society*
- *Portland Parks and Recreation*
- *A newsletter sent out to individuals near the proposed project to provide information and notification of the public involvement events; and*
- *A postcard announcing the small group meetings sent to business and property owners adjacent to the project.*

The draft IAMP was made available for public review and comment for a 45-day period beginning March 4, 2011. Notice of the public review draft was sent via postcard to individuals near the proposed project and those who had expressed interest at previous public events. Public comment was accepted via email, mail and telephone.

Public hearings on the proposed changes to the Gresham Comprehensive Plan and implementing ordinances were held by the Gresham Planning Commission and City Council during the winter 2010-11. The Board of Commissioners of Multnomah County, took no action as the IAMP is considered compliant with the Springwater Community Plan, which has been acknowledged by the County as the planning document for the Springwater area. These hearings provided opportunities for public comment on the proposed changes.

POLICY 7.4 - Environmental Justice

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to provide all Oregonians, regardless of race, culture or income, equal access to transportation decision-making so all Oregonians may fairly share in benefits and burdens and enjoy the same degree of protection from disproportionate adverse impacts.

***Findings:** Appendix I provides a summary of the public involvement efforts that took place during development of the IAMP. Various methods were used to gather public input about the interchange project and the management plan, including two open houses, a series of small group meetings, and a public review and comment period for the draft IAMP. Press releases to announce the open houses and small group meetings were sent to all local newspapers, as well as local radio and television stations. Input from citizens was used to evaluate alternatives. These opportunities were provided equally to all, regardless of race, culture or income.*

Oregon Highway Plan

The 1999 Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) establishes policies and investment strategies for Oregon's state highway system over a 20-year period and refines the goals and policies

found in the OTP. Policies in the OHP emphasize the efficient management of the highway system to increase safety and to extend highway capacity, partnerships with other agencies and local governments, and the use of new techniques to improve road safety and capacity. These policies also link land use and transportation, set standards for highway performance and access management, and emphasize the relationship between state highways and local road, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, rail and air systems.

The OHP identifies gaps to the region's throughway system that are needed to improve access from the Portland metropolitan region to the rest of the state, and destinations beyond. Among these is a connection from I-84 to the Mt. Hood Hwy (US 26). The OHP policies applicable to planning for this connection are described below.

Under Goal 1: System Definition, the following policies are applicable:

Policy 1A (Highway Classification) defines the function of state highways to serve different types of traffic that should be incorporated into and specified through IAMPs.

***Finding:** Section 2 of the Springwater IAMP summarizes the functional classification of roadways within the IAMP study area. US 26 is classified as a Statewide Freight Route and an Expressway. Construction of an interchange to replace an at-grade intersection at Springwater (US 26 and SE 267th Avenue), and limiting approach roads are consistent with the highway's classification.*

Policy 1B (Land Use and Transportation) recognizes the need for coordination between state and local jurisdictions.

***Finding:** Coordination between state and local jurisdictions occurred throughout the preparation of the IAMP, and in the preparation/updating of local jurisdiction TSPs. A Project Management Team (PMT) subgroup was formed to inform the IAMP process and included members representing Gresham, ODOT, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties, and Damascus. The PMT subgroup met numerous times and reviewed draft documents in order to provide input and revisions.*

Policy 1C (State Highway Freight System) states the need to balance the movement of goods and services with other uses.

***Finding:** The project improves freight mobility through the area by addressing safety and efficiency issues that have been identified throughout the corridor due to the conflict of combined regional freight movements and local trips. Existing freight distribution centers to the north (Columbia Corridor), and lands to be zoned as future Industrial Areas in the Springwater Community, will benefit from the construction of a new, interchange along US 26.*

Policy 1D (Scenic Byways) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to preserve and enhance designated Scenic Byways, and to consider aesthetic and design elements along with safety and performance considerations on designated Byways.

***Finding:** Policy 1D is not applicable as this section of US 26 is not a Scenic Byway SE Orient Drive, which is the east boundary of the Springwater IAMP, is part of the Mt.*

Hood Scenic Byway. There are no policies or actions within the IAMP that would prohibit US 26 from being designated as a Scenic Byway in the future.

Policy 1E (Lifeline Routes) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to provide a secure lifeline network of streets, highways, and bridges to facilitate emergency services response and to support rapid economic recovery after a disaster.

***Finding:** There is nothing in the Springwater IAMP that prohibits or otherwise limits the establishment of US 26 as a Lifeline Route.*

Policy 1F (Highway Mobility Standards) sets mobility standards for ensuring a reliable and acceptable level of mobility on the highway system by identifying necessary improvements that would allow the interchange to function in a manner consistent with OHP mobility standards.

***Finding:** The analysis of existing and future traffic conditions in the vicinity of the Springwater Interchange shows that the existing highway cannot perform at the level expected in the OHP without modernization. Since the Springwater Interchange Project entails construction of a new grade-separated crossing of US 26, the Highway Design Manual (HDM) standards were used as a criterion for selecting a preferred design for the new interchange, instead of the OHP/Metro mobility standards. The HDM standards adopted as part of the plan will result in acceptable interchange and highway operations throughout the 20-year planning horizon.*

Policy 1G (Major Improvements) requires maintaining performance and improving safety by improving efficiency and management before adding capacity. ODOT works with regional and local governments to address highway performance and safety.

***Finding:** Appendix C summarizes the alternatives that were evaluated for their potential to accommodate existing and future traffic demand at the Springwater interchange. Those alternatives included an evaluation of a 2030 No-Build scenario with retention of at-grade intersection at SE 267th Avenue and US 26, as well as different Build Alternative roadway alignments and interchange designs. The 2030 No-Build alternative, that did not include a grade-separated interchange, does not provide a solution to the highway capacity and highway safety needs. Therefore, adding capacity is the necessary means for improving safety and efficiency in this highway section.*

Policy 1H (Bypasses) Bypasses are highways designed to maintain or increase statewide or regional mobility. Generally they relocate a highway alignment around a downtown, an urban or metropolitan area or an existing highway. The goal of bypass facilities is to effectively serve state and regional traffic trips. It is the policy of the State of Oregon to build bypasses to provide safe, efficient passage for through travelers and commerce.

***Finding:** Policy 1H is not applicable as US 26 is designated a limited access Expressway through the Springwater IAMP area. The development of the IAMP helps to ensure the future operations of US 26 so that construction of a bypass is never necessary.*

Under Goal 2: System Management, the following policies are applicable:

Policy 2A (Partnerships) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to establish cooperative partnerships to make more efficient and effective use of limited resources to develop, operate, and maintain the highway and road system. These partnerships are relationships among ODOT and state and federal agencies, regional governments, cities, counties, tribal governments, and the private sector.

***Finding:** The development of the Springwater IAMP was a partnership between ODOT and the Cities of Gresham and Damascus and the Counties of Multnomah and Clackamas. Private organizations such as the Johnson Creek Watershed Council and the East Multnomah Economic Alliance also participated in the development of the IAMP as did the citizens of the Springwater community.*

Policy 2B (Off-System Improvements) helps local jurisdictions adopt land use and access management policies.

***Finding:** Adoption of the land use and access management policies and actions in the IAMP protect the function of the interchange and other related improvements. The IAMP actions minimize the use of US 26 and the new arterial for property access. For most properties, local roads are used to provide access. Off-system improvements within the Springwater IAMP area were identified in the IAMP process, as well as in the local jurisdiction TSP process, to ensure coordination among these efforts.*

Policy 2C (Interjurisdictional Transfers) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to consider, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, interjurisdictional transfers that:

- Rationalize and simplify the management responsibilities along a particular roadway segment or corridor;
- Reflect the appropriate functional classification of a particular roadway segment or corridor; and/or
- Lead to increased efficiencies in the operation and maintenance of a particular roadway segment or corridor.

***Finding:** Policy 2C is not applicable to the Springwater IAMP as there will be no jurisdictional transfer of state facilities, nor will there be a transfer of local facilities to the state.*

Policy 2D (Public Involvement) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to ensure that citizens, businesses, regional and local governments, state agencies, and tribal governments have opportunities to have input into decisions regarding proposed policies, plans, programs, and improvement projects that affect the state highway system.

***Finding:** Refer to Goal 1 Finding above.*

Policy 2E (Intelligent Transportation Systems) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to consider a broad range of Intelligent Transportation Systems services to improve system efficiency and safety in a cost-effective manner. Deployment of ITS shall reflect the user

service priorities established in the Oregon Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Plan. Specifically:

- Incident Management
- En-route Driver Information
- Traffic Control (Arterials and Freeways)
- Route Guidance
- Commercial Vehicle Electronic Clearance
- Pre-trip Travel Information
- Public Transportation Management
- Emergency Notification and Personal Security
- Emergency Vehicle Management
- Commercial Fleet Management

Finding: Policy 2E is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However elements of Policy 2E can be implemented for the Springwater interchange and US 26, in the Springwater community without affecting the Springwater IAMP.

Policy 2F (Traffic Safety) improves the safety of the highway system.

Finding: An important reason for construction of the interchange project is to address safety issues in this section of the highway. The IAMP protects the safe and efficient operation of the interchange by regulating access and land use in the vicinity, and through separation of local, regional, and freight movements.

Policy 2G (Rail and Highway Compatibility) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to increase safety and transportation efficiency through the reduction and prevention of conflicts between railroad and highway users.

Finding: Policy 2G is not applicable to the Springwater IAMP as there are no active rail lines in the vicinity of the management area

Under Goal 3: Access Management, the following policies are applicable:

Policy 3A: (Classification and Spacing Standards) sets access spacing standards for driveways and approaches to the state highway system.

Finding: The IAMP largely adheres to the approach road spacing standards established by OAR 734-051. Only two locations within the Springwater interchange influence area do not meet interchange spacing standards (the intersection of SE Teleford Road and the new arterial and EB ramp terminals; and the new intersection of SE Jeanette Street and the new arterial and the WB ramp terminals). The reasons for deviating from this standard are provided in detail in the Access Management Plan component of the IAMP. Generally, these deviations are sought to provide access for an existing intersection (SE Teleford Road) and to protect the riparian area of the North Fork Johnson Creek (new intersection of SE Jeanette Street).

The IAMP contains short and long-term access strategies that will be applied within the IAMP planning area in order to regulate existing and future driveway and other approaches in the vicinity of the interchange.

Policy 3B (Medians) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to plan for and manage the placement of medians and the location of median openings on state highways to enhance the efficiency and safety of the highways, and influence and support land use development.

***Finding:** US 26 is currently a divided highway through the Springwater community. The location of the Springwater interchange will close an existing median opening, thereby improving safety along the highway.*

Policy 3C (Interchange Access Management Areas) sets policy for managing interchange areas by developing an IAMP that identifies and addresses current interchange deficiencies and establishes short, and long term solutions.

***Finding:** The purpose of the Springwater IAMP is to effectively manage the US 26 at Springwater interchange area. The IAMP provides recommendations for short and long term implementation and access management actions, as well as land use policies that are intended to protect the interchange into the 20-year planning horizon and beyond.*

Policy 3D (Deviations) establishes general policies and procedures for deviations from adopted access management standards and policies.

***Finding:** The Access Management Plan component of the IAMP identifies access points that will require an access spacing deviation request, and the rationale for the request. Deviations will be requested in accordance with the applicable state procedure.*

Policy 3E (Appeals) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to manage appeals of both denied requests for approach roads and denied requests for deviations from adopted access management standards and policies through an appeals process to ensure statewide consistency.

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP does not prohibit the uniform application of Policy 3E.*

Policy 4A (Efficiency of Freight Movement) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to maintain and improve the efficiency of freight movement on the state highway system and access to intermodal connections. The State shall seek to balance the needs of long distance and through freight movements with local transportation needs on highway facilities in both urban areas and rural communities.

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP seeks to improve the efficiency of freight movement by constructing a grade-separated interchange to US 26 in an area planned for future development of industrial uses.*

Policy 4B: (Alternative Passenger Modes) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to advance and support alternative passenger transportation systems where travel demand, land use, and other factors indicate the potential for successful and effective development of alternative passenger modes.

Finding: Policy 4B is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit or otherwise constrain the development of alternative passenger modes of transportation.

Policy 4C (High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Facilities) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to utilize HOV facilities to improve the efficiency of the highway system in locations where travel demand, land use, transit, and other factors are favorable to their effectiveness. A systems planning approach shall be taken in which individual HOV facilities complement one another and the other elements of the multimodal transportation system.

Finding: Policy 4C is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit or otherwise constrain the development of alternative passenger modes of transportation.

Policy 4D: (Transportation Demand Management) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to support the efficient use of the state transportation system through investment in transportation demand management strategies.

Finding: Policy 4D is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit or otherwise constrain the development of transportation demand management strategies.

Policy 4E (Park-and-Ride Facilities) It is the policy of the State of Oregon to encourage the efficient use of the existing transportation system and to seek cost-effective expansion of the highway system's passenger capacity through development and use of park-and-ride facilities.

Finding: Policy 4E is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit or otherwise constrain the development of park-and-ride facilities.

Policy 5A (Environmental Resources) It is the policy of the State of Oregon that the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the state highway system should maintain or improve the natural and built environment including air quality, fish passage and habitat, wildlife habitat and migration routes, sensitive habitats (i.e. wetlands, designated critical habitat, etc.), vegetation, and water resources where affected by ODOT facilities.

Finding: Development of the Springwater IAMP took into consideration avoidance and enhancement of the natural environment. The Project Management Team work closely with the Johnson Creek Watershed Council, Metro, City of Portland Parks Bureau and the City of Gresham's environmental staff to develop an interchange plan that avoids to the extent possible natural features. The IAMP specifically calls for enhancement to the natural environment when feasible during the design and construction of the interchange and its supporting road network.

Policy 5B (Scenic Resources) It is the policy of the State of Oregon that scenic resources management is an integral part of the process of creating and maintaining the state

highway system. The State of Oregon will use best management practices to protect and enhance scenic resources in all phases of highway project planning, development, construction, and maintenance.

Finding: The finding of Policy 5A are also applicable to Policy 5B.

OAR 731-015-0065 Coordination Procedures for Adopting Final Facility Plans

OAR 731-015-0065 regulates the ODOT procedure for adopting facility plans. An IAMP is a facility plan. The procedure outlined in OAR 731-015-0065 requires that ODOT coordinate with local government agencies during development of the plan and provide a draft of the facility plan to affected cities, counties, and other agencies for comment. The facility plan must be consistent with statewide planning goals and local comprehensive plan policies, and findings of compatibility must be presented to the Oregon Transportation Commission for facility plan adoption.

Finding: The Springwater IAMP was developed jointly by ODOT, Gresham, and Multnomah County. A final draft of the IAMP will be provided to all affected government and other agencies, and any potential conflicts with state or local plans will be jointly resolved. These findings were developed with statewide planning goals and local comprehensive plans in mind for presentation to the Oregon Transportation Commission. Adoption of the IAMP will take place in conformance with this provision.

OAR 734, Division 51: Highway Approaches, Access Control, Spacing Standards and Medians

ODOT adopted OAR 734, Division 51 to address access management and it is expected that as part of this project, ODOT will engage in access management consistent with its Access Management Rule and Highway Plan policies. This could involve the purchase of access rights within at least one-quarter mile of the interchange ramps, as well as the development of local roadways to provide access to parcels whose access may be affected by right-of-way acquisitions.

OAR 734-051 governs the permitting, management, and standards of approaches to state highways to ensure safe and efficient operation of the state highways. OAR 734-051 policies address the following:

- How to bring existing and future approaches into compliance with access spacing standards, and ensure the safe and efficient operation of the highway;
- The purpose and components of an access management plan; and
- Requirements regarding mitigation, modification and closure of existing approaches as part of project development.

Section 734-051-0125, Access Management Spacing Standards for Approaches in an Interchange Area, establishes interchange management area access spacing standards.

Section 734-051-0155 specifies elements that are to be included in an IAMP, such as short-, medium-, and long-range actions to improve and maintain safe and efficient

roadway operations within the interchange area.

ODOT adopted OAR 734, Division 51 to address access management and it is expected that as part of this project. ODOT will engage in access management consistent with its Access Management Rule and Highway Plan policies. This could involve the purchase of access rights within at least one-quarter mile of the interchange ramps, as well as the development of local roadways to provide access to parcels whose access may be affected by right-of-way acquisitions.

The Access Management Plan component of this project will compare access spacing with adopted access standards. If future proposed interchange improvements would not meet access spacing standards outlined in OAR 734-051-0125, the project will require deviations to interchange and roadway approach (public and private streets and driveways) access management spacing standards to be approved by ODOT regional access manager, as per OAR 734-051-0135.

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP identifies where approach roads along the proposed arterial serving the new interchange will not meet the standards after interchange construction. Short-term and long-term access strategies are provided to abandon the access points, restrict turning movements, or bring them into compliance over time. In some cases, new road alignments will provide alternative access. The IAMP also identifies access spacing deviations that will be needed and provides rationale for each.*

The IAMP contains approach road spacing standards for new development near the interchange. These standards, shown in Table 2 of OAR 734, are the spacing standards in OAR 734-051, Table 8 for Non-freeway Interchanges with Multi-lane Crossroads.

Regional Regulations

Metro is the regional government for the Oregon portion of the Portland Metropolitan area. Metro's jurisdictional boundary encompasses the urban portions of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas counties.

Metro's Role in Land Use Planning

Metro is responsible for regional land use and transportation planning functions, including all adjustments to the UGB and related activities.

Metro's Role in Transportation Planning

Metro is the regional government responsible for regional transportation planning under state law and is the federally-designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Portland metropolitan area. As the federally designated MPO, Metro guides regional transportation system planning and development in the Portland metropolitan area. Metro is also responsible for developing a regional transportation system plan (TSP), consistent with Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements and Federal planning rules.

Metro’s Regional Framework Plan

The Regional Framework Plan unites all of Metro’s adopted land use planning policies and requirements. The Metro Charter directs the agency to address the following subjects in the Plan:

- Management and amendment of the Urban Growth Boundary
- Protection of lands outside the Urban Growth Boundary for natural resource use and conservation, future urban expansion or other uses
- Urban design and settlement patterns
- Housing densities
- Transportation and mass transit systems
- Parks, open spaces and recreational facilities
- Water sources and storage
- Coordination with Clark County, Washington
- Planning responsibilities mandated by state law
- Other issues of metropolitan concern

Metro’s Regional Framework Plan can be accessed in its entirety through this link:

<http://www.oregonmetro.gov/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=432>).

Regional Framework Plan Structure

Each chapter of this Plan contains an introduction followed by a list of relevant Fundamentals. Fundamentals are eight value statements adopted by the Metro Council that synthesize the 2040 Growth Concept and regional policies and are listed below:

- Fundamental 1:** Encourage a strong local economy by providing an orderly and efficient use of land, balancing economic growth around the region and supporting high quality education.
- Fundamental 2:** Encourage the efficient use of land within the UGB including buildable industrial and commercial land and focus development in 2040 mixed use centers and corridors.
- Fundamental 3:** Protect and restore the natural environment including fish and wildlife habitat, streams and wetlands, surface and ground water quality and quantity, and air quality.
- Fundamental 4:** Provide a balanced transportation system including safe, attractive facilities for bicycling, walking and transit as well as for motor vehicles and freight.
- Fundamental 5:** Maintain separation between the Metro UGB and neighboring cities by working actively with these cities and their respective counties.
- Fundamental 6:** Enable communities inside the Metro UGB to enhance their physical sense of place by using among other tools, greenways, natural areas, and built environment elements.
- Fundamental 7:** Enable communities to provide diverse housing options for all residents by providing a mix of housing types as well as affordable

homes in every jurisdiction.

Fundamental 8: Create a vibrant place to live and work by providing sufficient and accessible parks and natural areas, improving access to community resources such as schools, community centers and libraries as well as by balancing the distribution of high quality jobs throughout the region, and providing attractive facilities for cultural and artistic performances and supporting arts and cultural organizations.

These Fundamentals are followed by policies of the Metro Council. Chapters 1 through 6 address substantive planning policies. Chapter 7 addresses how Metro will manage the plan and amendments to the plan. Chapter 8 addresses how the plan policies are to be implemented. Related documents and background information are contained in Appendices.

Policies – Chapter 1, Land Use

- 1.1 Urban Form
- 1.2 Built Environment
- 1.3 Housing Choice
- 1.4 Economic Opportunity
- 1.5 Economic Vitality
- 1.6 Growth Management
- 1.7 Urban/Rural Transition
- 1.8 Developed Urban Land
- 1.9 Urban Growth Boundary
- 1.10 Urban Design
- 1.11 Neighbor Cities
- 1.12 Protection of Agriculture and Forest Resource Lands
- 1.13 Participation of Citizens
- 1.14 School and Local Government Plan and Policy Coordination
- 1.15 Centers
- 1.16 Residential Neighborhoods

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP contains no policies or actions that would limit Metro from carrying out policies identified in Chapter 1 of the Regional Framework Plan. In fact, the IAMP contributes positively to many of the land use policies identified in the Regional Framework Plan.*

Policies – Chapter 2, Transportation

- 2.1 Public Involvement
- 2.2 Intergovernmental Coordination
- 2.3 Urban Form
- 2.4 Consistency Between Land Use and Transportation Planning
- 2.5 Barrier-Free Transportation
- 2.6 Interim Job Access and Reverse Commute Policy

- 2.7 Transportation Safety and Education
- 2.8 The Natural Environment
- 2.9 Water Quality
- 2.10 Clean Air
- 2.11 Energy Efficiency
- 2.12 Regional Street Design
- 2.13 Local Street Design
- 2.14 Regional Motor Vehicle System
- 2.15 Regional Public Transportation System
- 2.16 Public Transportation Awareness and Education
- 2.17 Public Transportation Safety and Environmental Impacts
- 2.18 Regional Public Transportation Performance
- 2.19 Special Needs Public Transportation
- 2.20 Regional Freight System
- 2.21 Regional Freight System Investments
- 2.22 Regional Bicycle System Connectivity
- 2.23 Regional Bicycle System Mode Share and Accessibility
- 2.24 Regional Pedestrian System
- 2.25 Regional Pedestrian Mode Share
- 2.26 Regional Pedestrian Access and Connectivity
- 2.27 Transportation System Management
- 2.28 Regional Transportation Demand Management
- 2.29 Regional Parking Management
- 2.30 Peak Period Pricing
- 2.31 Transportation Funding
- 2.32 2040 Growth Concept Implementation
- 2.33 Transportation System Maintenance and Preservation
- 2.34 Transportation Safety

Finding: *The Springwater IAMP contains no policies or actions that would limit Metro from carrying out policies identified in Chapter 2 of the Regional Framework Plan. In fact, the IAMP contribute positively to many of the transportation policies identified in the Regional Framework Plan.*

Policies – Chapter 3, Nature in Neighborhoods

- 3.1 Inventory of Park Facilities and Identification and Inventory of Regionally Significant Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Trails and Greenways
- 3.2 Protection of Regionally Significant Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Trails and Greenways
- 3.3 Management of the Publicly-Owned Portion of the Regional System of Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Trails and Greenways
- 3.4 Protection, Establishment and Management of a Regional Trails System
- 3.5 Provision of Community and Neighborhood Parks, Open Spaces, Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Natural Areas, Trails and Recreation Programs

3.6 Participation of Citizens in Environmental Education, Planning, Stewardship Activities, and Recreational Services

Finding: *The project management team worked closely with Metro and the Johnson Creek Watershed Council to ensure the Springwater interchange avoided to the greatest extent possible natural areas and where avoidance is not possible ensure that mitigation is located within the Springwater area. The PMT also worked with the City of Portland to ensure that the regionally significant Springwater Trail is grade separated from the arterial. The IAMPs contain no policies that would preclude Metro from carrying out policies in this chapter for the acquisition of parks and open spaces.*

Policies – Chapter 4, Watershed Health and Water Quality

- 4.1 Water Supply
- 4.2 Overall Watershed Management
- 4.3 Water Quality
- 4.4 Stormwater Management
- 4.5 Urban Planning and Natural Systems

Finding: *Chapter 4 of the Regional Framework Plan is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP because the chapter addresses how Metro is to plan for watershed health and water quality. The Springwater interchange will need to address water quality and stormwater runoff during the design of the interchanges, but the Springwater IAMP will not itself prohibit Metro from implementing Policies in Chapter 4 of the Regional Framework Plan.*

Policies – Chapter 5, Regional Natural Hazards

- 5.1 Earthquake Hazard Mitigation Measures
- 5.2 Flood Hazard Mitigation Measures
- 5.3 Landslide Hazard Mitigation Measures
- 5.4 Volcanic Hazard Mitigation Measures
- 5.5 Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Mitigation Measures
- 5.6 Severe Weather Hazard Mitigation Measures
- 5.7 Biological Hazard Mitigation Measures
- 5.8 Other Hazard Mitigation Measures
- 5.9 Natural Disaster Response Coordination

Finding: *Chapter 5 of the Regional Framework Plan is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP because the chapter addresses how Metro is to plan for the future with consideration given to natural hazards. Chapter 5 is applicable in that the design of the Springwater interchange will need to address natural hazards and that ODOT will need to work with Metro to ensure the design of the interchange do not contribute to a natural disaster.*

Policies – Chapter 6, Clark County

- 6.1 Coordination with Clark County

Finding: Chapter 6 of the Regional Framework Plan is not applicable to the Springwater interchange as it is far removed from Clark County, Washington.

Policies – Chapter 7, Management

- 7.1 Citizen Participation
- 7.2 Metro Policy Advisory Committee and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
- 7.3 Applicability of Regional Framework Plan Policies
- 7.4 Urban Growth Boundary Management Plan
- 7.5 Functional Plans
- 7.6 Periodic Review of Comprehensive Land Use Plans
- 7.7 Implementation Roles
- 7.8 Performance Measures
- 7.9 Monitoring and Updating
- 7.10 Environmental Education

Finding: Policies contained in Chapter 7 of the Regional Framework Plan are not applicable to the Springwater IAMP as the chapter addresses how the Regional Framework Plan is updated and how conflicts between policies are resolved.

Policies – Chapter 8, Implementation

- 8.1 Implementation
- 8.2 Regional Funding and Fiscal Policy
- 8.3 Schools
- 8.4 Administration
- 8.5 Enforcement

Finding: Policies contained in Chapter 8 of the Regional Framework Plan are not applicable to the Springwater IAMP as the chapter addresses how the Regional Framework Plan is implemented. There are no policies in the IAMP that contradict policies in Chapter 8 of the Regional Framework Plan.

Regional Transportation Plan (2007)

According to state law, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) serves as the region's TSP. The RTP is the 20-year blueprint that guides investment in the region's transportation system. It must meet federal requirements specific to the metropolitan transportation planning process and also be consistent with state plans and the statewide planning goals. For transportation projects and programs to receive federal – and some state – funding, they must be in the RTP, and local plans must be consistent with the RTP. Gresham coordinates with Metro's sixteen cities and transit providers in regional transportation planning related to the RTP.

The RTP establishes policies and strategies for all modes of travel – motor vehicles, transit, walking and bicycling – as well as the movement of freight and goods. The RTP also addresses street design and the efficient management of the transportation system.

Elements of the RTP: Regional Transportation System

Regional multi-modal transportation facilities and services include eight components: Regional Street and Throughway System; Regional Transit System; Regional Bicycle System; Regional Pedestrian System; Regional Freight System; Regional Design System; System Management Strategies and Demand Management Strategies.

Elements of the RTP: Regional Street and Throughway System

The **Regional Street and Throughway System** seeks to apply a regularly spaced street network design to accommodate travel demands of the region. **Throughways** connect major activity centers within the region, including the central city, regional centers, industrial areas and intermodal facilities. They generally span several jurisdictions and often are of statewide importance linking the Metro area with neighboring cities, other parts of the state, and beyond. Throughway interchanges are spaced no less than two miles apart.

***Findings:** US 26 is identified in the RTP as Principal arterial and Regional Throughway. SE Orient Drive is identified as a Rural arterial as is SE 242nd Avenue.*

Elements of the RTP: Regional Mobility Corridors

The regional mobility corridor concept is a sub-section of the regional street and throughway network concept that integrates arterial streets and throughways, as well as transit and other modes, into corridors that work together to provide for cross-regional, statewide and interstate travel. This corridor approach considers multiple facilities, modes, jurisdictions, and land uses.

The northern half of the Springwater Management Area is identified in the RTP, and illustrated as a regional corridor on the Regional Mobility Corridors map (Corridor 15).

***Finding:** The northern half of the Springwater Management Area is identified in the RTP, and designated as a Regional Mobility Corridor.*

Elements of the RTP: Local Streets Network Concept

Collector and local streets are general access facilities that provide for community and neighborhood circulation. Although they are not part of the regional transportation system, they play an important supporting role to the design and optimization of the regional transportation system.

Local jurisdictions are responsible for defining the network of local streets within a mile-spacing grid of arterial streets. Since the late 1990s, the region has required a maximum spacing of 1/10 mile for local streets, with the goal of encouraging local traffic to use local streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets. Local street connectivity also benefits emergency response.

The local street network concept provides for bicycle and pedestrian travel and provides for direct access from local street systems to community destinations and transit on regional arterial streets. More frequent bike and pedestrian connections are recommended where collector and local streets cannot be constructed due to existing

development or topographic or environmental constraints.

The local street network was analyzed as part of the IAMP, and modifications to the system were proposed.

Finding: *The Springwater IAMP examines how best to integrate the interchange with adjacent local streets, to enhance local access and connectivity in the study area. IAMP work is coordinated with on-going TSP work in both the City of Gresham and Multnomah County, to ensure safe and convenient traffic operations in the interchange study area.*

Elements of the RTP: Regional Freight System

The Regional Freight System identifies the transportation networks and facilities that serve our region and state's freight mobility needs, based on the regional freight concept.

Since US 26 connects the eastern Columbia Corridor to Central and Eastern Oregon and points farther east, the Regional Freight System standards must be addressed in the IAMP.

Finding: *US 26 is identified in the RTP, and designated as a Main Roadway Route on the Regional Freight System.*

Elements of the RTP: 2035 RTP Investment Pool

The 2035 RTP Investment Pool describes the projects and programs identified by local agencies, ODOT, TriMet and Metro to address the impacts of future growth on our regional transportation system.

State and Regional Mobility Corridor Investment Strategy focuses on regional mobility corridor investments that leverage the 2040 Growth Concept and improve interstate, intrastate and cross-regional people and goods movement. These corridors are the backbone of the regional transportation system because of their statewide significance and the magnitude of costs associated with providing for people and goods movement in these corridors.

Examples of the types of projects include:

- *Freight access and connections.* Rail and street expansions to maintain access and connections for national and international rail, air and marine freight to reach its destination with limited delay.
- *Throughway expansion.* Major throughway expansions to maintain regional mobility and enhance access to intermodal industrial areas and facilities where goods move from one transportation mode to another.

Finding: *The Springwater interchange is identified in the near-term (1-4 years) of RTP analysis for construction.*

Elements of the RTP: Financially Constrained RTP Project List

The **financially constrained system** is the system of investments that responds to federal planning requirements, and is based on the financial forecast. The following is a

list of the projects in the vicinity of the Springwater IAMP Management Area that are on the Financially Constrained RTP Project List.

DRAFT

Metro Project ID	Nominating Agency	Facility Owner/Operator	Project/Program Name	Project Start Location (Identify starting point of project)	Project End Location (Identify terminus of project)	Local Functional Classification	Project Purpose	Description
10474	Gresham	N/A	Rugg Rd. Ext.	Orient Dr.	US 26	Local	Provide congestion relief and facilitate Springwater Industrial economic development.	Construction of new roadway that adds e/w capacity in vicinity Rugg Rd and connects Springwater Industrial area to Highway 26.
10475	Gresham	N/A	Rugg Rd. Ext.	US 26	252nd Ave.	Local	Provide congestion relief and facilitate Springwater Industrial economic development.	Construction of new roadway that adds e/w capacity in vicinity Rugg Rd and connects Springwater Industrial area to Highway 26.
10476	Gresham	N/A	Rugg Rd.	252nd Ave.	242nd. Ave.	Local	Provide congestion relief and facilitate Springwater Industrial economic development.	Construction of new roadway that adds e/w capacity in vicinity Rugg Rd and connects Springwater Industrial area to Highway 26.
10477	Gresham	Gresham	Springwater Road Section 4	242nd Ave.	252nd Ave.	Local	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Construction of new street for implementation of Springwater Plan.
10478	Gresham	Gresham	252nd Ave.	Palmquist Rd.	10	Local	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Construction of new street for implementation of Springwater Plan.
10479	Gresham	Gresham	252nd Ave.	10	Rugg Rd.	Local	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Construction of new street for implementation of Springwater Plan.

10481	Gresham	Gresham	Springwater Road Section 8	242nd Ave.	9	Local	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Construction of new street for implementation of Springwater Plan.
10482	Gresham	Gresham	Springwater Road Section 9	7	252nd Ave.	Local	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Construction of new street for implementation of Springwater Plan.
10483	Gresham	Gresham	Springwater Road Section 10	252nd Ave.	Telford Rd.	Local	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Construction of new street for implementation of Springwater Plan.
10484	Gresham	Gresham	Springwater Road Section 11	Telford Rd.	Orient Dr.	Local	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Construction of new street for implementation of Springwater Plan.
10485	Gresham	Gresham	Hogan	Palmquist Rd.	Rugg Rd.	Minor Arterial	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Improvement of existing roadway to arterial 4 lane standards.
10486	Gresham	Gresham	Telford Rd.	Springwater Boundary	252nd Ave.	Local	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Improvement of existing roadway to collector standards, add bike and ped facilities, intersection improvements.
10488	Gresham	Gresham	282nd Ave.	Springwater Boundary	20	Local	Economic development and implementation of Springwater Plan.	Improvement of existing roadway to collector standards, add bike and ped facilities, intersection improvements.

***Finding:** Components of the Springwater interchange including the US 26 expressway mainline, the arterial and interchange, the collector, and associated local street improvements designed to complement the network and enhance local access and connectivity, have been identified in the RTP financially-constrained project list.*

Gresham Comprehensive Plan

Gresham's Comprehensive Plan was originally adopted in 1969, with major updates in 1980 and 1992. In addition, revisions to the plan text and maps have been made periodically in response to an opportunity, or a state, federal or regional requirement. The Comprehensive Plan is available on the county's website:

<http://greshamoregon.gov/city/city-departments/planning-services/resources-and-links/default.aspx?id=3598>

Gresham's Comprehensive Plan has five volumes. Volume 4: Transportation System Plan, includes policy language that must be addressed by the Springwater IAMP

Volume 4 of the Comprehensive Plan: Transportation System Plan (TSP)

The Gresham Transportation System Plan (TSP) background documents provide the framework for the transportation system and policies codified in Volume 4 of the City's Comprehensive Plan, which is the official TSP. They summarize the review, analysis and strategies behind the adopted maps and policies and include the original source of the list of capital transportation projects that needed over a twenty-year period. The "Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)," described below, implements these adopted transportation goals and policies.

The essential elements of the TSP, i.e., the project lists and transportation goals and policies, are adopted into Volume 4 of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the authors of the Springwater IAMP will not need to look separately at the city TSP to determine if its requirements are met, except to the extent that the IAMP authors will need to understand how the policies and lists were derived.

The Gresham Transportation System Plan was adopted by the City Council in December 1999. Chapter 4 of the TSP contains the transportation policies and strategies, which need to be consistent with the IAMP.

Volume 4 of Gresham's Comprehensive Plan addresses the following specific modes of transportation: Roadways; Transit; Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities; and Freight, Rail, Air, Pipelines and Water Transportation. Volume 4 lays out the planning framework, discusses assumptions and forecasts, provides an inventory and assessment of existing conditions and need, contains the transportation policies and strategies, analyzes three system alternatives, describes the System Plan and presents measures necessary to implement the System Plan.

Policies relevant to the Springwater IAMP are addressed below.

Transportation System

Policy 1: Develop and promote a balanced transportation system that provides a variety of travel choices and reduces reliance on automobiles.

***Finding:** While the Springwater IAMP primarily focuses on facilitating the safe and efficient movement of motorized vehicles on to and off of US 26, accommodations for all modes are made. Collector level and above streets that serve the interchange will have sidewalks and bicycle lanes, and the Springwater Trail will be elevated as it crosses the arterial road that serves the Springwater interchange.*

Policy 2: Plan, implement, and maintain an efficient transportation system.

***Finding:** The development of the Springwater IAMP was a coordinated effort between the City of Gresham and ODOT. Other agencies that were directly involved included the City of Damascus and Multnomah and Clackamas Counties. The IAMP speaks to ongoing coordination between ODOT and the City of Gresham as the Plan is implemented.*

Policy 3: Provide a transportation system that maximizes accessibility to and within regional centers, town centers, transit corridors, station areas, and employment centers.

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP identifies a future street system and contains design standards based on street classification. The arterial that directly serves the interchange has an Access Management Plan based on state access management standards. The street network is based on the adopted Springwater Community land use designations.*

Policy 4: Provide a safe transportation system.

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP greatly improves safety over the existing intersection of US 26 and SE 267th Avenue by providing grade separation.*

Street System

Policy 1: Provide a street system that accommodates a variety of travel options.

***Finding:** While the Springwater IAMP primarily focuses on facilitating the safe and efficient movement of motorized vehicles on to and off of US 26, accommodations for all modes are made. Collector level and above streets that serve the interchange will have sidewalks and bicycle lanes, and the Springwater Trail will be elevated as it crosses the arterial road that serves the Springwater interchange.*

Policy 2: Develop a street system that meets current needs and anticipates future population growth and development.

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP further implements the street system already adopted in the Springwater Community Plan.*

Policy 3: Provide a street system that maximizes accessibility within the community.

Finding: *The Springwater IAMP further implements the street system already adopted in the Springwater Community Plan.*

Policy 4: Ensure a safe street system.

Finding: *Implementation of the Springwater IAMP will facilitate a more safe street network in the plan area by grade-separating US 26 and the main arterial street serving Springwater.*

Transit System

Policy 1: Advocate convenient, expanded transit service within Gresham and the east Multnomah area.

Finding: *While the Springwater IAMP is not directly responsible for implementing transit policy, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit the expansion of transit service into the area.*

Policy 2: Encourage efficient transit services to meet the current and projected transportation needs of the citizens of Gresham.

Finding: *This policy is not directly applicable to the IAMP. However, the Springwater IAMP does not conflict with the implementation of this policy.*

Policy 3: Promote the development of a transit system that maximizes accessibility.

Finding: *This policy is not directly applicable to the IAMP. However, the Springwater IAMP does not conflict with the implementation of this policy.*

Policy 4: Assist in the development of a safe transit system.

Finding: *This policy is not directly applicable to the IAMP. However, the Springwater IAMP does not conflict with the implementation of this policy.*

Bicycle System

Policy 1: Develop a continuous and convenient bicycle network.

Finding: *Collector level and above streets that serve the interchange will have sidewalks and bicycle lanes, and the Springwater Trail will be elevated as it crosses the arterial road that serves the Springwater interchange.*

Policy 2: Support programs and projects to improve bicycle safety and reduce the rate of bicycle-related accidents.

Finding: *This policy is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit the implementation of this policy.*

Pedestrian System

Policy 1: Provide pedestrian facilities that are continuous, accessible, and adaptable to all users.

Finding: The street network in the Springwater Community will include pedestrian facilities which connect to existing pedestrian facilities in the city of Gresham. As part of the implementation of the IAMP, the arterial serving the interchange will be grade separated from the Springwater Trail.

Policy 2: Improve pedestrian access to transit.

Finding: This policy is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit the implementation of this policy.

Policy 3: Develop safe pedestrian environments.

Finding: During development of the alternatives, consideration was given to providing for a safe pedestrian environment. One criterion for evaluating the alternatives included: Improve connectivity to the existing and planned bicycle, pedestrian, trail, and street networks.

Transportation Demand Management

Policy: Implement transportation demand management programs and strategies that reduce the need to travel, reduce single occupant vehicle (SOV) travel, and make the use of alternative modes more convenient for all trips throughout Gresham.

Finding: This policy is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit the implementation of this policy.

Parking Management

Policy: Manage the on- and off-street parking supply to ensure there is an adequate but not excessive amount of parking available for all land uses.

Finding: This policy is not directly applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit the implementation of this policy.

Truck and Rail Freight System

Policy: Provide for the safe and efficient movement of truck and rail freight through and within Gresham.

Finding: One of the key reasons for development of the Springwater IAMP was to provide for safe and efficient movement of truck traffic on to and off of US 26 and serve the industrial development of the Springwater community. There is no rail freight services in the Springwater community, although the Springwater Trail is a Rails-to-Trails corridor and could, one day, accommodate new freight rail service.

Passenger Rail

Policy: Support federal, state, regional and private investments in passenger rail service to the metropolitan area.

Finding: This policy is not applicable to the Springwater IAMP.

Air Transportation System

Policy: Ensure that land uses in Gresham are compatible with aircraft noise exposure and aircraft safety.

***Finding:** This policy is not applicable to the Springwater IAMP.*

Pipeline System

Policy: Ensure that land uses in Gresham are compatible with established and planned pipeline corridors.

***Finding:** This policy is not applicable to the Springwater IAMP.*

Springwater Transportation System Plan

The purpose of the Springwater Transportation System Plan (TSP) is to address the transportation needs for new urban community development within the Springwater Plan District. This TSP will be amended to Volume 4 – Transportation System Plan in the Gresham Community Development Plan.

Policies

1. Identify improvements to Highway 26 that enhance access and mobility to and through the Springwater Community plan area to support industrial and employment development. Design elements are to be compatible and supportive of the Springwater Community Plan.

***Finding:** The Springwater IAMP provides enhanced access and mobility to and through the Springwater Community plan area. It was specifically developed to support industrial and employment development.*

2. Incorporate the North/South Transportation Study recommendations to identify better connections between Springwater and I-84 and I-205.

***Finding:** While the Springwater IAMP does not directly apply to this policy, the North/South Transportation Study was a consideration in the development of the traffic analysis.*

3. Incorporate Green Street designs as described in Metro’s handbook entitled *Green Streets: Innovative Solutions for Stormwater and Stream Crossings* and as designed in the Pleasant Valley Plan District area.

***Finding:** Street design is typically not part of IAMP development, beyond designating the functional classification of a street. However, there is no part of the Springwater IAMP that would hinder the development of Green Street concepts.*

4. Develop transportation corridors and associated right-of-way widths for Green Street swales.

***Finding:** Street design is typically not part of IAMP development, beyond designating the functional classification of a street. However, there is no part of the Springwater IAMP that would hinder the development of Green Street concepts.*

5. Create streets for people as well as cars.
Finding: *The Springwater IAMP incorporates facilities designated for people such as sidewalks, bike lanes and trails.*
6. Encourage alternative modes of transportation within the Springwater community.
Finding: *The Springwater IAMP incorporates facilities designated for people such as sidewalks, bike lanes and trails.*
7. Provide good connectivity and access to practical destinations.
Finding: *The Springwater IAMP built upon and refined the street connectivity plan identified in the Springwater Community Plan TSP.*
8. Provide safe and convenient access to and from employment areas, including freight access.
Finding: *The primary purpose of developing the Springwater IAMP was to provide safe and convenient access to and from employment areas, including freight access.*
9. Incorporate adequate public safety access.
Finding: *The Springwater IAMP specifically calls for the grade separation of the Springwater Trail as it crosses the main arterial serving the interchange. As the plan is implemented, City of Gresham standards for public safety will be implemented.*
10. Provide public transit options, such as bus, van, streetcar and/or light rail within the Springwater community and for east/west and north/south connections to the greater region.
Finding: *While the Springwater IAMP does not directly incorporate transit options, there is nothing in the IAMP that would prohibit the implementation of transit option.*
11. Consider traffic impacts on surrounding rural areas and existing City of Gresham neighborhoods.
Finding: *The location of the preferred alternative in the Springwater IAMP considered traffic impacts on adjoining rural areas. Appendix C-4 specifically addresses why locating the interchange at SE Stone Road was not preferred.*
12. Provide pedestrian and bicycle connections within the Springwater community and to the greater region.
Finding: *Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are integrated into the street design standards adopted by the City of Gresham.*
13. Plan roads to accommodate the movement of goods and services (truck traffic).
Finding: *The primary function of the interchange is to address existing and future safety needs, improve access to the existing transportation system, and provide for a future transportation network that efficiently accommodates the planned development in the Springwater area, while preserving the function of US 26.*

14. Consider environmental barriers and constraints.

Finding: *Consideration of the natural environment was critical in refining the arterial and interchange for Springwater. Goal 3 of the Evaluation Criteria specifically address minimizing impacts to the natural environments and provide opportunities for environmental enhancement.*

15. Address existing transportation safety issues.

Finding: *The primary purpose of developing the Springwater IAMP was to provide safe and convenient access to and from employment areas, including freight access.*

16. Identify and promote the quality and level of telecommunication services needed to serve the industrial and other uses in the Springwater Community.

Finding: *This policy is not applicable to the Springwater IAMP. However, there is nothing in the IAMP that would restrict implementation of this policy.*

Multnomah County

Currently, unincorporated areas within the Springwater management area are subject to land use and transportation policies in Multnomah County's *West of Sandy River Transportation and Land Use Plan*. The Multnomah County Zoning Code regulates land use and development in the unincorporated area.

Multnomah County Board of Commissioners accepted, by resolution, the *Springwater Community Plan* as the concept plan for urbanizing the Springwater area, required by Metro. Urbanization, including the transportation facilities identified in the *Springwater TSP*, will only occur in areas that are incorporated into the City of Gresham. Multnomah County does not have land use or transportation jurisdiction within the City of Gresham; therefore, no County actions are required for the IAMP. Multnomah County continues to support Gresham's implementation of the *Springwater Community Plan*.