600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Memo*

Date: July 3, 2013
To: Stakeholder Advisory Committee for the ATP
From: Lake McTighe, Transportation Planner
Subject: Update on process, timeline and next steps for the Regional Active Transportation Plan

A draft of the ATP is available for stakeholders for review, discussion and refinement. The link below accesses the Metro ftp site where the plan and appendices is available.

ftp://ftp.oregonmetro.gov/pub/tran/ATP

At the July 10 meeting the SAC will provide comments on the draft plan and on next steps. The plan is in draft and staff will be refining the plan and project list in July and August to reflect input from members of the SAC, Metro's advisory committees and stakeholders. The project list will continue to be developed during the update of the RTP.

In response requests from stakeholders Metro has revised the timeline to review and refine the draft plan. The revised timeline is provided below. Staff will be seeking a recommendation from Metro's advisory committees in September to accept work completed to date on the ATP (including changes/refinements made in July and August)and to move forward working with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders to prepare amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan and project list at part of the RTP update in 2014. *A draft of the acceptance resolution is attached.*

Next Steps
June 25 Metro Council work session – *update on process and timeline, overview of plan elements*
June 26 MPAC- *update on process and timeline, overview of plan elements*
June 28 TPAC - *update on process and timeline, response to questions and concerns*
July 10 ATP Stakeholder Advisory Committee – *discussion and provide direction to staff on recommendation to Metro Council*
July 11 JPACT – *comments from the chair, update on process and timeline*

July 19 TPAC – *discussion and provide direction to staff on recommendation to Metro Council*
July 18 Metro Council work session – *discussion and provide direction to staff to refine plan*
July 17 MTAC - *discussion and provide direction to staff on recommendation to Metro Council*
August 1 JPACT - *discussion and provide direction to staff on recommendation to Metro Council*
August 14 MPAC - *discussion and provide direction to staff on recommendation to Metro Council*

August 21 MTAC - *recommendation to MPAC on acceptance of work done to date on the*
August 30 TPAC- *recommendation to JPACT on acceptance of work done to date on the ATP, recommendation to Metro Council*
September 11MPAC - *action on acceptance of work done to date on the ATP, recommendation to Metro Council*
September 12 JPACT - *action on acceptance of work done to date on the ATP, recommendation to Metro Council*
September 26 – *Metro Council action on recommendation from MPAC and JPACT*

Integration into the RTP will involve refining **the plan with stakeholder input and drafting changes/updates to the RTP.**

- August through September 2013– Refine elements of the ATP based on stakeholder input
- October - June 2014 - Networks and policies recommended for incorporation into the RTP
- 2018 RTP update – ATP changes to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan considered

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING THE REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO ACKNOWLEDGE WORK COMPLETED TO DATE	)))	RESOLUTION NO. Introduced by Councilor Kathryn Harrington

WHEREAS, the Metro Council, through adoption of policies in the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), supports the completion of a fully developed regional active transportation network; and

WHEREAS, the RTP identifies development of a Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP) as an implementation activity that is a critical part of the identified strategy to develop the regional active transportation network; and

WHEREAS, planning and implementing a regional active transportation network is a component of the Metro Council's work on climate change and green house gas reduction; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 11-4239 (For the Purpose of Supporting Development of a Regional Active Transportation Plan) directing staff to apply for a Transportation Growth Management grant application to the Oregon Department of Transportation to help fund the Regional Active Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, Metro worked with a regional Stakeholder Advisory Committee and other stakeholders to develop the ATP, which updates the regional pedestrian and bicycle networks, proposes new functional classifications, design guidelines, policies and implementing actions that will help achieve the region’s Six Desired Outcomes, local and regional transportation plans, goals and performance targets; and

WHEREAS, the ATP recommended project list will be available for cities, counties and agencies to consider incorporating into the RTP project list; and

WHEREAS, local plans are not required to be consistent with the ATP until it is adopted into the RTP; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

1. Accepts the Regional Active Transportation Plan, attached to this resolution as Exhibit A, and acknowledges work completed to date.

2. Directs staff to work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders to prepare amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan and project list at part of the RTP update in 2014.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this X day of September, 2013.

Tom Hughes, Council President

Approved as to form:

Alison Kean Campbell, Acting Metro Attorney

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Making a great place*

July 9, 2013

Debra Dunn
Chair, Portland Freight Committee

Pia Welch
Vice Chair, Portland Freight Committee

RE: Comments on the Regional Active Transportation Plan

Dear Debra and Pia:

Thank you for providing comments, on behalf of the Portland Freight Committee, on the draft Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP). The input of the PFC is valued. Refinement of the ATP reflects the PFC comments. An effort was made in the ATP to acknowledge the need to balance and integrate freight and active transportation modes. The draft ATP is available for review and further comments from the PFC would be welcome. The plan can be accessed on Metro's website at www.oregonmetro.gov/activetransport and clicking on the "Active Transportation Plan" link in the green box.

In regards to the specific questions the PFC raises, I have responded to each one in turn. I would be happy to meet with the PFC for further discussion.

- *It is not clear what the term "endorsement" entails in respect to how the RATP will be adopted into the Regional Transportation Plan update and the local Transportation System Plans.* Metro staff will seek "acceptance and acknowledgement of the work completed to date on the ATP" from JPACT, MPAC and the Metro Council in September. Once the work completed to date is accepted Metro will work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders, such as the PFC, to amend the ATP into the RTP. Once adopted into the RTP, local plans, as they are updated, must be consistent with the RTP. However, similar to other RTP modal plans for freight and high capacity transit – consistency does not impose requirements on jurisdictions and agencies. Changes to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP), the implementing plan of the RTP, will be considered during the 2018 update of the RTP. The RTFP includes requirements for jurisdictions and agencies and is not being impacted by the policies or actions of the ATP at this time.

- *We haven't seen an integrated Action Transportation document yet. We need more time to see the RATP in its full context and then an opportunity to ensure it is fully balanced and integrated into the multi-modal RTP.* The draft ATP is available for review now www.oregonmetro.gov/activetransport. Metro has provided additional resources to the project and has extended the timeline to allow for two months of review time. Further stakeholder comment on the RTP and amendment of the ATP to the RTP will be possible during the update of the RTP. Metro welcomes additional comments from the PFC. Staff will be refining the ATP in August. So comments from the PFC should be provided by the second week of August.

- *We need to understand the impacts the RATP would have to the financially constrained RTP project list and weather freight projects would be replaced with active transportation projects.* The ATP provides a list of projects to build out the regional pedestrian and bicycle networks. Many of the projects are already in the RTP; the ATP identifies where additional projects could be added. The list will be available to jurisdictions and agencies to consider adding to the RTP project list. This will be up to the jurisdictions and agencies.

- *Are the "design guidelines" truly intended to be guidelines, or will they become de facto "design standards"? Would the "design guidelines" supersede locally adopted street design guidelines, such as the adopted "Portland Street Design Guidelines for Trucks and Large Vehicles, the Central City Street Plan, etc.?* Yes they are intended as guidelines. They do not supersede any existing adopted guidelines. Cities, including Portland, have implemented many of these deigns.

- *Principle #5 notes in part that designs should be "context sensitive." This is an extremely important value moving forward and deserves to be a stand-alone principal.* A stand-alone principal was added to the ATP: Principal 6. Facility designs are context sensitive and seek to balance all transportation modes.

- *The primary filters for design types appear to be based on volume and speed of the roadway. We suggest vehicle classification be added to the mix. For example Metro could have an independent set of design guidelines for roadways within an RSIA and roads adopted as freight routes in local TSP's.* It is agreed that specific guidelines that address the needs of the different modes in unique contexts, such as an RSIA or where bicycle/pedestrian/transit and freight share the same freight routes would be helpful. We are looking into data sources for the vehicle classification of routes. Policy action item 2.8 was added: "Work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders to identify best practices and successful case studies integrating bicycle, pedestrian and freight facilities, especially within constrained roadways." And, update of Metro's Best Practices guides is planned to include freight design guidelines.

- *Recommended Action #1.2.3 states: "Prioritize pedestrian and bicycle travel on adopted regional pedestrian and bicycle routes." Many of the proposed regional pedestrian and bicycle routes are also identified as NHI Intermodal Connector Routes in the RTP, as well as Priority and Major Truck Streets in the adopted Portland Freight Master Plan. How will freight mobility and safety be addressed and what policy mechanism will be used to address modal conflicts, particularly within constrained ROW and overlapping modal plans on the same corridor - i.e., . North Lombard Street and the St Johns Bridge?* The recommended action (now 2.2) has been reworded: "Work with partners to emphasize the need for safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities on routes with heavy motorized vehicle traffic by prioritizing projects that address pedestrian and bicycle safety on a regular basis. <u>If other policies conflict with the application of this action, seek to integrate the needs of all users while managing the transportation system.</u> In areas where the state and region are actively trying to encourage multi-modal travel, such as multi-modal areas, urban business areas, mixed-use centers, regional boulevards, etc., lead agencies should work to accommodate

environmentally sensitive manner." While the ATP Guiding Principles are meant to be short and high level, the more specific language that you suggest are important considerations that should be part of project development. The Westside Trail project, for example, has included wildlife biologists and habitat specialists that have helped guide the project.

- *Please consider adding an environmental component to the RATP evaluation and prioritization criteria. For example, "Environment: How well does the active transportation network protect and improve natural resources and minimize the risk of natural hazards and climate change."* The criteria in the ATP (access, safety, equity and increased activity) were identified by the Stakeholder Advisory Committee to evaluate improvements to the regional networks to help identify the preferred regional pedestrian and bicycle routes. This evaluation has already taken place. Projects in the RTP identify if they are in a Goal 5 habitat area or environmental justice area. Increasing bicycle and pedestrian activity and reducing trips made by car (Increased Activity criterion) can help protect and improve natural resources and minimize the risk of natural hazards and climate change.

- *There doesn't appear to have been much neighborhood outreach for this plan. If other neighborhoods have concerns about where bicycle and pedestrian facilities are designated in their area, they may feel this is a Metro plan that is being dictated to them, not developed with local aspirations in mind. You may want to consider adding a new principle about local input.* Local involvement is a core value of regional planning. While the budget for the ATP did not allow for extensive stakeholder outreach, the ATP is built on local transportation, bicycle and pedestrian plans. There are no routes in the ATP that are not also identified in local plans. The ATP goal is to knit together local visions into a comprehensive regional network. There is always room to make plans better and to better address the needs of individual communities. The purpose of Principle #10 of the ATP Guiding Principles is to recognize the purpose of plans such as the ATP, which is to provide assistance in achieving local aspirations "Implements regional and local land use and transportation goals and plans to achieve regional active transportation modal targets."

Sincerely,

Lake McTighe,
Senior Transportation Planner
Metro

Cc: Metro Council
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro Policy Advisory Committee
Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee
Metro Technical Advisory Committee
ATP Stakeholder Advisory Committee

June 13, 2013

Lake Strongheart McTighe
Metro Active Transportation Project Manager

PORTLAND FREIGHT COMMITTEE

Dear Lake:

On behalf of the Portland Freight Committee (PFC) we want to provide you with some initial comments and questions on the proposed Regional Active Transportation Plan (RATP) – Final Plan Elements that was presented to TPAC at their May 28th meeting.

- It is not clear what the term "endorsement" entails in respect to how the RATP will be adopted into the Regional Transportation Plan update and the local Transportation System Plans.
- We haven't seen an integrated Action Transportation document yet. We need more time to see the RATP in its full context and then an opportunity to ensure it is fully balanced and integrated into the multi-modal RTP.
- We need to understand the impacts the RATP would have to the financially constrained RTP project list and weather freight projects would be replaced with active transportation projects.
- Are the "design guidelines" truly intended to be guidelines, or will they become de facto "design standards"? Would the "design guidelines" supersede locally adopted street design guidelines, such as the adopted "Portland Street Design Guidelines for Trucks and Large Vehicles, the Central City Street Plan, etc.?
- Principal #5 notes in part that designs should be "context sensitive." This is an extremely important value moving forward and deserves to be a stand-alone principal.
- The primary filters for design types appear to be based on volume and speed of the roadway. We suggest vehicle classification be added to the mix. For example Metro could have an independent set of design guidelines for roadways within an RSIA and roads adopted as freight routes in local TSP's.
- Recommended Action #1.2.3 states: "Prioritize pedestrian and bicycle travel on adopted regional pedestrian and bicycle routes." Many of the proposed regional pedestrian and bicycle routes are also identified as NHI Intermodal Connector Routes in the RTP, as well as Priority and Major Truck Streets in the adopted Portland Freight Master Plan. How will freight mobility and safety be addressed and what policy mechanism will be used to address modal conflicts, particularly within constrained ROW and overlapping modal plans on the same corridor - i.e., . North Lombard Street and the St Johns Bridge?
- Recommended Action #1.2.15 states: "Update Regional Flexible Funds policies to include active transportation elements in all funded projects." Does this imply that all fright projects funded through RFF must also include active transportation elements even under the current 75/25 percent active transportation/freight allocation or on projects where ROW is constrained?

The PFC would appreciate your response to these issues and recommends Metro provide an update on the Regional Active Transportation Plan at one of our upcoming monthly meetings. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions and we look forward working with Metro in addressing these important issues.

Respectfully yours,

Debra Dunn
PFC Chair

Pia Welch
PFC Vice Chair

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Making a great place*

July 9, 2013

Debra Dunn
Chair, Portland Freight Committee

Pia Welch
Vice Chair, Portland Freight Committee

RE: Comments on the Regional Active Transportation Plan

Dear Debra and Pia:

Thank you for providing comments, on behalf of the Portland Freight Committee, on the draft Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP). The input of the PFC is valued. Refinement of the ATP reflects the PFC comments. An effort was made in the ATP to acknowledge the need to balance and integrate freight and active transportation modes. The draft ATP is available for review and further comments from the PFC would be welcome. The plan can be accessed on Metro's website at www.oregonmetro.gov/activetransport and clicking on the "Active Transportation Plan" link in the green box.

In regards to the specific questions the PFC raises, I have responded to each one in turn. I would be happy to meet with the PFC for further discussion.

- *It is not clear what the term "endorsement" entails in respect to how the RATP will be adopted into the Regional Transportation Plan update and the local Transportation System Plans.* Metro staff will seek "acceptance and acknowledgement of the work completed to date on the ATP" from JPACT, MPAC and the Metro Council in September. Once the work completed to date is accepted Metro will work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders, such as the PFC, to amend the ATP into the RTP. Once adopted into the RTP, local plans, as they are updated, must be consistent with the RTP. However, similar to other RTP modal plans for freight and high capacity transit – consistency does not impose requirements on jurisdictions and agencies. Changes to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP), the implementing plan of the RTP, will be considered during the 2018 update of the RTP. The RTFP includes requirements for jurisdictions and agencies and is not being impacted by the policies or actions of the ATP at this time.

- *We haven't seen an integrated Action Transportation document yet. We need more time to see the RATP in its full context and then an opportunity to ensure it is fully balanced and integrated into the multi-modal RTP.* The draft ATP is available for review now www.oregonmetro.gov/activetransport. Metro has provided additional resources to the project and has extended the timeline to allow for two months of review time. Further stakeholder comment on the RTP and amendment of the ATP to the RTP will be possible during the update of the RTP. Metro welcomes additional comments from the PFC. Staff will be refining the ATP in August. So comments from the PFC should be provided by the second week of August.

- *We need to understand the impacts the RATP would have to the financially constrained RTP project list and weather freight projects would be replaced with active transportation projects.* The ATP provides a list of projects to build out the regional pedestrian and bicycle networks. Many of the projects are already in the RTP; the ATP identifies where additional projects could be added. The list will be available to jurisdictions and agencies to consider adding to the RTP project list. This will be up to the jurisdictions and agencies.

- *Are the "design guidelines" truly intended to be guidelines, or will they become de facto "design standards"? Would the "design guidelines" supersede locally adopted street design guidelines, such as the adopted "Portland Street Design Guidelines for Trucks and Large Vehicles, the Central City Street Plan, etc.?* Yes they are intended as guidelines. They do not supersede any existing adopted guidelines. Cities, including Portland, have implemented many of these deigns.

- *Principle #5 notes in part that designs should be "context sensitive." This is an extremely important value moving forward and deserves to be a stand-alone principal.* A stand-alone principal was added to the ATP: Principal 6. Facility designs are context sensitive and seek to balance all transportation modes.

- *The primary filters for design types appear to be based on volume and speed of the roadway. We suggest vehicle classification be added to the mix. For example Metro could have an independent set of design guidelines for roadways within an RSIA and roads adopted as freight routes in local TSP's.* It is agreed that specific guidelines that address the needs of the different modes in unique contexts, such as an RSIA or where bicycle/pedestrian/transit and freight share the same freight routes would be helpful. We are looking into data sources for the vehicle classification of routes. Policy action item 2.8 was added: "Work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders to identify best practices and successful case studies integrating bicycle, pedestrian and freight facilities, especially within constrained roadways." And, update of Metro's Best Practices guides is planned to include freight design guidelines.

- *Recommended Action #1.2.3 states: "Prioritize pedestrian and bicycle travel on adopted regional pedestrian and bicycle routes." Many of the proposed regional pedestrian and bicycle routes are also identified as NHI Intermodal Connector Routes in the RTP, as well as Priority and Major Truck Streets in the adopted Portland Freight Master Plan. How will freight mobility and safety be addressed and what policy mechanism will be used to address modal conflicts, particularly within constrained ROW and overlapping modal plans on the same corridor - i.e., . North Lombard Street and the St Johns Bridge?* The recommended action (now 2.2) has been reworded: "Work with partners to emphasize the need for safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities on routes with heavy motorized vehicle traffic by prioritizing projects that address pedestrian and bicycle safety on a regular basis. <u>If other policies conflict with the application of this action, seek to integrate the needs of all users while managing the transportation system.</u> In areas where the state and region are actively trying to encourage multi-modal travel, such as multi-modal areas, urban business areas, mixed-use centers, regional boulevards, etc., lead agencies should work to accommodate

pedestrian and bicycle solutions when there are conflicting policies. In other areas, seeking solutions such as parallel routes for Bicycle Parkways may be the solution."

- *Recommended Action #1.2.15 states: "Update Regional Flexible Funds policies to include active transportation elements in all funded projects." Does this imply that all freight projects funded through RFF must also include active transportation elements even under the current 75/25 percent active transportation/freight allocation or on projects where ROW is constrained?* This recommended action (now 2.16) has been reworded: "Work with partners, including the Oregon Department of Transportation and TriMet, during the next policy update of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP) to consider: implementing recommendations of the ATP through development of the MTIP project list; updating Regional Flexible Funds polices to include active transportation elements in all projects funded with flexible funds; and, using the ATP pedestrian and bicycle network analysis to help guide project selection." I don't believe anyone involved wants to see another "bike vs. freight" discussion which is counterproductive. The MTIP provides a good opportunity to build partnerships in transportation policy and projects. Policy direction outlined in the ATP is proposed to be incorporated into the next MTIP policy update process. No policy changes to MTIP will be automatic. Regional Flexible Funds represent an extremely important funding source for both active transportation and freight; RFF provide nearly 50% of all funding for regional trails/pathways and over 20% of funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects in the region.

Sincerely,

Lake McTighe,
Senior Transportation Planner
Metro

Cc: Metro Council
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro Policy Advisory Committee
Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee
Metro Technical Advisory Committee
ATP Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Forest Park Neighborhood Association
C/O Neighbors West Northwest
2257 NW Raleigh
Portland, Oregon 97210

June 10, 2013

Lake McTighe, Active Transportation Partnership Project Manager
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Re: Regional Active Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. McTighe,

Forest Park Neighborhood Association (FPNA) supports development of bike and pedestrian facilities that help reduce auto traffic and increases safe alternative transportation options, and most of the draft Regional Active Transportation Plan (RATP) is carefully considered.

But we believe the effect of new bike and pedestrian facilities in valuable habitat areas is not adequately addressed. We'd like to see the RATP set an example for the region by following the recommendations in the Regional Conservation Strategy (RCS) for conserving natural areas, improving regional habitat connectivity, and restoring ecological processes and functions in natural areas. The RCS, developed by the Intertwine with support from Metro, includes several relevant strategies: "Protect and acquire biodiversity corridors and core habitats," "Consider connectivity in urban and transportation planning," and "Physically remove barriers."[1]

Forest Park and the surrounding habitat are among the most important natural features in the region. Metro has identified important wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors in this area. Any transportation facilities in this area must be very carefully evaluated to avoid harm.

Our neighborhood stretches from West Burnside to Cornelius Pass Road, and it includes Forest Park and adjacent rural areas with high value habitat. The draft "Recommended Regional Bicycle Network" presented at the open house on May 23 shows NW Cornell Rd., NW Miller Rd., West Burnside Rd., and the West Side Trail as "Community Bikeways." These roads and trail all pass through wildlife habitat areas.

We are particularly concerned about the infrastructure that bike lanes would require on NW Cornell Road in City of Portland and Multnomah County. This narrow road cuts through the heart of Forest Park, across very steep slopes with significant landslide hazards, very close to Balch Creek. Adding bike lanes would require extensive retaining walls and extensive tree removal, add to landslide risk, and it would be hard to avoid stormwater problems and pollution in the sensitive Balch Creek watershed. Wider pavement and extensive retaining walls would restrict or block wildlife movement, fragment habitat, and increase wildlife killed by traffic.[2]

---

[1] *Regional Conservation Strategy for the Greater Portland-Vancouver Region*, The Intertwine, October 2012, pages 85, 86, 87
[2] The harm to wildlife habitat and connectivity associated with roads, artificial lighting, and noise is well documented in "Wildlife corridors and permeability, A literature review," Metro, April 2010, pages 13-16

Proposed bike lanes along NW Springville Road and NW Skyline Road for the West Side Trail revealed similar issues that are now being carefully studied.
We have not yet studied West Burnside and Miller Roads as closely. Because the land around them is more developed, we believe that they may offer opportunities for Community Bikeways that would serve more people with less harm to natural resources, but we feel that all potential new bike and pedestrian facilities in our neighborhood need additional study to ensure that the bike and pedestrian benefits are carefully weighed against harm to wildlife habitat and connectivity. The goal for these facilities should be to benefit (not harm) natural resources. The RATP hopes to add green infrastructure, but we fear that in this area the result could be a significant loss instead.

More careful study is needed before designating any bike or pedestrian facilities in our neighborhood. Experts on road construction should evaluate the infrastructure required for the facilities and the risk associated with the landslide hazards. Biologists, in consultation with Portland Parks and Recreation, should evaluate the effect this infrastructure would have on the natural resources in the area, including wildlife corridors and water quality.

There are also historic structures to be considered -- Cornell Road passes over bridges, and both Cornell and Burnside pass through tunnels just wide enough for 2 lanes of traffic. Would these be destroyed and replaced with new structures?

Will the West Side Trail and bike lanes along Cornell Road or Burnside Road serve "all ages and all abilities?" These routes are steep and destinations are far apart. The elevation gain is roughly 1000', beyond the capacity of many fit adults, let alone children and the elderly. A bike route along Old Barnes Road and running across the top of the Burnside tunnel might be safer and more accommodating for cyclists of all abilities.

The utility of these proposed facilities should also be evaluated in more detail. The Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) for this area is mostly Forest Park and large rural areas, but includes a fringe of urban development. The characteristics of the small urban area in the TAZ appear to have skewed some of the analysis. The road connectivity measure, for example, seems oddly high for an area with very few through roads. The Active Transportation Plan map of Regional Destinations shows no destinations between Portland and Cedar Mill/Bethany except Forest Park. Homes are sparse.

The utility of each route must be weighed against harm to natural resources.

Specific suggestions for RATP Principles and Criteria

RATP Principle 5, "Routes are integrated with nature and facility designs are context sensitive" is nice, but it appears to focus on putting routes into nature and being sensitive to nature after routes are designated. We believe more is needed to conform to Metro's Six Desired Outcomes, which say "Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems" and "The region is a leader in minimizing contributions to global warming."

Please consider adding two new Principles for the RATP:

10. Biologists should be consulted to ensure that routes do not fragment core habitat or diminish habitat connectivity.

11. Routes should be designed to minimize risk and impact of natural hazards and climate change to people, fish and wildlife, natural resources, and property.[3]

Please also consider adding an environmental component to the RATP Evaluation and Prioritization Criteria. For example: "Environment. How well does the active transportation network protect and improve natural resources and minimize the risk of natural hazards and climate change?"

There doesn't appear to have been much neighborhood outreach for this plan. If other neighborhoods have concerns about where bicycle and pedestrian facilities are designated in their area, they may feel this is a Metro plan that is being dictated to them, not developed with local aspirations in mind. You may want to consider adding new Principle about local input.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Because we value bike and pedestrian facilities, we're concerned that designation of routes that can't be built at reasonable cost, and without significant environmental harm, will slow the development of safer, more achievable routes that would provide access to more destinations.

The natural resources in Forest Park and throughout the Tualatin Mountains are of tremendous value to the region, and transportation infrastructure for all modes is challenging.

We hope that you will follow the recommendations and strategies in the RCS, and incorporate protection of core habitats and wildlife connectivity into this transportation plan. We ask that before any bike and pedestrian facilities are recommended in this complex area, that a group that includes transportation planners, road construction experts, biologists, and neighborhood representatives should study the Tualatin Mountains to identify the most effective transportation options that would result in the least harm to the high value natural resources in the area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jerry Grossnickle
President, Forest Park Neighborhood Association

cc: Metro Council
Commissioner Deborah Kafoury

[3] Based on Policy 5-47, Hazard-resilient design, in the draft Portland Comp Plan, page 5-51

Questions and staff responses regarding the Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP)

Question	Response
1. What does it mean to endorse the plan prior to adoption into the RTP?	In response to concerns from some stakeholders, Metro staff will seek "acceptance and acknowledgement of the work completed to date on the ATP." Metro staff will not seek endorsement of the plan. Acceptance does not adopt the plan into the RTP. It does not require local jurisdictions to take any action, nor does it add any new rules or requirements. Acceptance implies recognizing the work completed to date on the plan, the importance and need for the plan and authorizes staff to begin steps to work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders to integrate the ATP into the RTP during the regular update of the RTP scheduled for spring 2014. Metro's advisory committees will have an opportunity to review and comment on the draft resolution endorsing the ATP prior to being asked to take action. Modifications to the ATP will be possible during the RTP update. When the plan is adopted into the RTP in 2014, local plans would need to be consistent with the RTP, as they are now. For example, the routes on regional and local plans would be the same; changes to local plans would occur during regularly scheduled updates. Any "required" actions by local jurisdictions will not be identified until the Regional Transportation Functional Plan is updated, scheduled for the 2018 RTP update. An example of a potential requirement would be that local jurisdictions identify which routes on local bike plans are regional bicycle parkways in their local plans, with the intent of eventually completing the routes as parkways. Changes to the RTFP such as this would be developed collaboratively with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders.
2. Will the ATP affect how Regional Flexible Funds are allocated?	Policy direction outlined in the ATP is proposed to be incorporated into the next MTIP policy update process. No policy changes to MTIP will be automatic. While Regional Flexible Funds represent approximately 4% of public expenditures on transportation in the region, they provide nearly 50% of all funding for regional trails/pathways and over 20% of funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects.
3. The ATP includes criteria that were used to help determine the preferred pedestrian and bicycle networks. Will the criteria be used in other ways?	The criteria could be considered for helping to prioritize projects or for other purposes; however there are other criteria that should also be considered, such as economic impact, cost, feasibility, etc. The criteria (access, safety, equity, increased activity) were developed by the SAC after a review of criteria from local and state bike and pedestrian plans. The criteria were purposefully limited in number in order to zero in on which routes should be identified as regional bicycle and pedestrian parkways and community bikeways and corridors. The ATP will identify projects that are already in the RTP that will build out the networks identified using the criteria. The ATP will also identify new projects that are not yet listed in the RTP.
4. Policy action item 3.3(formerly 1.3.14/ 3.14) recommends prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian projects in areas with high underserved populations. Does this make serving underserved populations the highest priority?	No, though it is a very important criteria. Policy language has been modified to direct Metro to work with stakeholders to "encourage the implementation of bike and ped projects…in areas with minority, low income, youth, elders, disabled and low English proficiency populations." This action item was proposed by staff to actively address equity in active transportation investments. It is not intended to trump all other priorities, but the intent is to add some actual policy action to addressing incomplete bike/ped/access to transit networks in areas where poor people and other underserved populations live. A similar policy action item, "1.2 (formerly 1.1.2) Prioritize projects that connect people to destinations that serve essential daily needs" stresses the need to prioritize projects that link people to the places they want to go to and increase access for the most people.
5. Is the ATP recommending the removal of auto travel lanes to achieve desired outcomes?	The ATP does not take a position on removing auto lanes. Road diets can be one response to making complete streets, addressing roadway safety, etc. However, there are other ways to elevate safety and increase bike and pedestrian access without removing auto lanes. Language in the plan will be updated to better reflect this.
6. Many of the bicycle and pedestrian routes are also freight routes. Will the ATP reflect the need to balance all modes?	Yes. The ATP will include language acknowledging the need for flexibility, context sensitive design and balancing all modes as projects are designed. The ATP also recommends that other modal plans, such as freight and transit plans, reflect the need to balance with bicycle and pedestrian needs.
7. Stakeholders need more time to look over the network maps. Will there be an opportunity for this?	Yes, Metro has extended the timeline for review and input on the draft plan. Maps, policies and other elements included in the ATP released in June will be labeled draft. Changes may still be made before the networks are finalized and update the existing pedestrian and bicycle maps in the RTP. Very few new routes were added to the pedestrian and bicycle maps. The major changes were in the updated functional classifications, which identify the need for high quality bicycle and pedestrian corridors and districts. Metro staff is very aware of the need to make sure that bicycle and pedestrian routes identified on the ATP are consistent with local priorities and that any questions about routes are answered. The regional networks are a vision that knit local visions together into a comprehensive regional system. Local plans have been referred to in the development of the networks.

Questions and staff responses regarding the Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP)

8. Will the design guidelines be required for projects built with regional flexible funds?	A flexible, context sensitive approach will be stressed for the design guidelines in all applications, even if they are eventually used as guidelines for RFF funded projects. Policy direction outlined in the ATP is proposed to be incorporated into the next MTIP policy update process. If, during the policy update process, ATP design guidelines are included in the RFF criteria it is anticipated that they would be treated in the same manner that the Creating Livable Streets guidelines have been used - required for RFF funds, but flexible in how they are implemented, and taking constraints and context (e.g. sensitivity of habitat) into consideration. The design guidelines are just that - guidelines. They are not required standards. They are practices that have been shown to encourage higher levels of walking and bicycling, in this region and across the country. The guidelines are allowed practices under current engineering standards. They are not being proposed to replace the minimum standard requirements that jurisdictions and agencies currently have, rather they are encouraged because they help attain regional and local goals.
9. How does the ATP relate to the Mobility Corridors work?	Network routes and districts identified in the ATP fall into Mobility Corridors and help address the bicycle and pedestrian needs identified in the Mobility Corridors. One of the bicycle parkway concepts evaluated identified one regional bicycle parkway per mobility corridor. Active transportation project needs identified for the Mobility Corridors were much less specific than the needs identified for other modes. The ATP provides more detail. The Mobility Corridors identify a set of general strategies. The ATP fleshes out several of the strategies that relate to active transportation: 1. Implement Regional Transportation Functional Plan and Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. *The new ATP functional classes and design guidelines provide specificity that can help guide investments for more effective outcomes.* 2. Identify where essential destinations are in relation to transit stops, housing, jobs, and retail and prioritize pedestrian pathways between these areas. *The ATP identifies regional destinations and evaluated access to destinations.* 3. Analyze transit stops in relation to bicycle and pedestrian network and build direct, safe, enjoyable bicycle and pedestrian facilities in areas where they do not exist. *The ATP preformed this analysis.* 4. Refer to TriMet's Pedestrian Network Analysis project for recommended places to focus attention and for replicable analysis methodology. *The ATP utilizes the TriMet recommendations.* 5. Refer to the RTP Regional Transit Network map for regional bike-transit facility locations where demand is expected to be sufficient to warrant a major bike parking facility. Bikeway connections to these stations should be prioritized. For all other stations, refer to TriMet's bike parking design guidelines. When finances permit, TriMet will implement. *This helped guide bicycle parkway route identification.* 6. Incentivize high to medium density, mixed-use, pedestrian oriented development in the Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Main Streets, and around HCT station areas. *Pedestrian and Bicycle Parkway concepts were developed with this strategy in mind.* 7. Analyze regional trail access points in relation to on-street bicycle and pedestrian network and build direct, safe, enjoyable bicycle and pedestrian facilities in areas that do not have these connections. *The ATP better integrates the on-street and off-street routes.* 8. *Identify auto access points along arterials and work with city and property owner to find design solutions to unsafe areas. Bike and ped safety data , crash locations were included in the analysis of the networks.* 9. Identify arterials where bicyclists and pedestrians feel unsafe and provide better pedestrian and bicycle facilities along these arterials. *The ATP addresses this* 10. *Identify intersections located on arterials where bicyclists and pedestrians feel unsafe and have high accident rates. Once identified, provide better pedestrian and bicycle crossing protections at these intersections. Routes were identified with this in mind.* 1. 11. Identify regional bridges where bicyclists and pedestrians feel unsafe, and provide better pedestrian and bicycle facilities on these regional bridges. *Bridge crossings are identified in the ATP and the removal of barriers is addressed in the functional classes and in the design guidelines.*
10. Does the ATP require that local jurisdictions add a bunch of new and expensive projects to the RTP and local transportation system plans?	No. Many projects to complete the plan are already in the RTP. However, the RTP does not include all of the projects necessary to build out the pedestrian and bicycle networks. Some new projects will be recommended. It will be up to local agencies to determine if they want to add the projects.

Questions and staff responses regarding the Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP)

11. Some of the routes seem to go through habitat sensitive areas or along riparian areas. Will the ATP provide direction on avoiding habitat sensitive areas, using habitat sensitive design and minimizing impact on the natural environment and habitat?	Yes. This is very important in the ATP. The ATP identifies and refers to resources, such as the data sets in The Regional Conservation Strategy for the Greater Portland Vancouver Metropolitan Area, Metro's Green Trails Handbook, Title 13, local wetland inventories, local tree cover maps etc. that provide data and guidelines. The design guidelines are being updated to reference the need for context sensitive and habitat sensitive design. One of the Principles for the Active Transportation Network is for the network to be developed in a context sensitive manner. The principle also includes language that routes should be integrated with nature. Connecting people with nature through trails and parks and by greening roadways is an important way to develop stewardship, let people enjoy nature in urban environments and encourage walking and bicycling.
12. What works in Portland may not work in other communities in the region. Will the ATP be flexible enough to apply to different types of communities?	Yes. The ATP takes a regional perspective. Communities across the region have unique histories, different land use patterns, and different development patterns. Developing a dense network of low-stress neighborhood greenways for walking and bicycling may work great with a dense grid of quiet streets, but may not work as well in more suburban developments. In some communities where travel distances are greater and street networks or topography prohibit connectivity multi-use paths with a separate right of way, or high quality facilities on the major streets that do provide connectivity may be a better approach. Connecting to transit is very important where travel distances are longer.
13. The ATP seems to focus on large scale “parkways” that may be difficult and/or expensive to build. Will there be other opportunities identified to build out the system, such as removing barriers and completing gaps that leverage existing networks?	Yes. It is important to focus on “quick wins” – projects that may be small but that will “open up” an area and make it easier to walk and bike. However, in some areas there are not a lot of quick wins left and others removing a barrier is the big project that will have a big return on investment because of the latent demand that exists.

ATP Appendix 8

Regional Active Transportation Plan Projects and Map Changes - DRAFT

System Map	County	City/Area	Related RTP proj. #	Project Name	ATP ID #	Route/District Name	Extent From	Extent To	Current RTP Designation	Proposed RTP Designation	Freight Route/state hwy	Notes
Bike/Ped	Washington County	Forest Grove	10783		T2	Hwy 47 Trail	Pacific Ave.	Hwy 47/B street	New	Bicycle /Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike	Washington County		10826	Jackson School Road Bicycle Parkway	1	~~N 1st Ave. NE~~ Jackson School Road	Evergreen	Council Creek Trail/TV Hwy	New	Bicycle Parkway	Intersects Hwy 8	(will be improved in next five years)
Bike	Washington County		10597, 10814	Evergreen Bicycle Parkway	2	NW Evergreen	NE Jackson School Rd.	NW Cornell Road	Community Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		(already considering a buffered bike lane)
Bike	Washington County	Cornelius, Hillsboro, Beaverton, Aloha	10846	TV Hwy Bicycle Parkway	3	Tualatin Valley Hwy	Council Creek Trail (TV Hwy Trail) connection at S 1st Ave	Westside Trail	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway	Connects to TV Hwy (Hwy 8)	RTP project covers Hillsboro section, new project needed to address continuous bicycle parkway
Bike	Washington County	Hillsboro	10833	NE Veterans-Grant Bicycle Parkway	4	~~5th~~ NE Grant/NE Veterans	NE Jackson School Rd.	Brookwood	NEW	Bicycle Parkway		RTP project to construct new road connecting to Brookwood. Project for upgrading Grant needed.
Bike	Washington County		11233, 11235	Walker Road Bicycle Parkway	5	NW Walker	Amberglen	SW Canyon Road	Community bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		RTP projects widens Walker from two to five lanes with bike lanes from 185th to Hwy 217. Update project to include bicycle parkway.
Bike	Washington County	Hillsboro	11140	Brookwood Bicycle Parkway	6	Brookwood	Evergreen	Rock Creek Trail	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		RTP project includes parallel bicycle path. Extend project to include extent of Parkway.
Bike	Washington County	Beaverton	10559	Cornell/Barnes Bicycle Parkway	7	~~Saltzman~~ NW Cornell/SW Barnes	Evergreen	Hwy 26 Multi Use Path connection	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		RTP: widen to 5 lanes from Murray to Hwy 26
Bike	Washington County		10634	Cedar Hills Bicycle Parkway	8	SW Cedar Hills BLvd.	SW Barnes	Walker	Community bikeway	Bicycle Parkway	Crosses Hwy 26	
Bike	Washington County		10274, 10278, 10279	Beaverton Hillsdale Bicycle Parkway	9	Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy	Hocken	Scholls Ferry Road	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway	Hwy 10, Hwy 8, crosses Hwy 217	10278 improvemetns to Hillsdale district
Bike	Washington County	Beaverton	10619, 11220	Crescent Connection	10	Crescent Connection/SW Hall Blvd.	SW Broadway	Fanno Creek Trail, south of Hunziker	NEW (Crescent Connection section), Regional Bikeway (Hall Blvd. section)	Bicycle Parkway	Crosses HWY 217 at two locations, connects to Hwy 10	10619: Crescent extension
Bike	Washington County			Brockman Bicycle Parkway	11	Greenway/Brockman/Nora Beard	Hall Blvd /Fanno Creek Trail	Westside Trail	Community Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike				Scholls Ferry Bicycle Parkway	12	Scholls Ferry Rd.	Tile Flat	Hall Blvd.	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway	Hwy 210	
Bike	Washington County/Multnomah County	Portland and unicorporated?		Multnomah Blvd. Bicycle Parkway	13	Multnomah	SW Oleson	SW Barbur	Community bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		

Note: Relevant RTP projects still being identified; ATP projects may change based on stakeholder input; Extents of some Regional Pedestrian Corriodrs and Regional Bikeways are still being identified.

Bike	Washington County/Multnomah County			99W Bicycle Parkway	14	99 W/Barbur Blvd.	Portland	Tonquin Trail in Sherwood	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway	99 W, intersects Hwy 217and I-5	
Bike	Washington County/Multnomah County			Oleson Rd. Bicycle Parkway	15	SW Scholls Ferry Road/SW Oleson Rd	Hwy 26	Hall Blvd.	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah			Downtown Portland Bicycle Parkways	16	Downtown Portland Parkways			Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah			Boones Ferry Bicycle Parkway	17	~~Stafford Road~~ SW Boones Ferry Road	Eligsen in Wilsonville	Iron Mtn. Blvd	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah			Boeckman Rd. Bicycle Parkway	18	~~Wilsonville Connection~~ SW Boeckman Rd.	Tonquin Trail	SW wilsonville Rd.	Community bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah			Lake Road Bicycle Parkway	19	Lake Road/ SE Harmony Rd	Trolley Trail	Scouter Mtn. trail	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Portland		Powell/Foster Bicycle Parkway	20	Powell/Foster	SE 17th Ave	I-205 Path	NEW	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Portland		Division Bicycle Parkway	21	Division	SE 50th	I-205 Path	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Gresham		Hogan Drive Bicycle Parkway	22	~~242nd~~ NE Hogan Drive	MAX Path	Stark St.	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Gresham, Troutdale		Kane Drive Bicycle Parkway	23	NE Kane Dr./SW 257th Ave	NE Division	SW Halsey	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Portland, Troutdale		Khalsey Bicycle Parkway	24	NE Halsey/NW Halsey	I-205 Path	257th in Troutdale	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Portland, Gresham		Burnside to Gresham Bicycle Parkway	25	Burnside/Stark	I-205 Path to 188th to Yamhill to MAX Path	SW 257th Ave.		Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah			181st/182nd Bicycle Parkway	26	~~SE 155th/Milmain~~ NE 181st/182nd Ave	Stark St.	Springwater Corridor Trail	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Portland		Clinton St. Bicycle Parkway	27	SE Clinton	SE 50th	Clinton St. Path	Community Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah County/Clackamas County	Portland, Milwaukie, unicorportated		Cully to Milwaukie Bicycle Parkway	28	Cully to Springwater to Harmony, via 50's bikeway and Linwood, Webster to I-205 Path	Killingsworth (NE Portland)	I-205 Path (Clackamas County)	Community Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Portland		Sandy Bicycle Parkway	29	Sandy	Sullivan's Gulch Trail	Hogan Rd. in Troutdale	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Portland		Broadway/Wiedler Bicycle Parkway	30	Broadway/Wiedler	Vancouver/Willams	NE 38th crossing	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		

Regional Active Transportation Plan Projects and Map Changes - DRAFT

Bike	Multnomah	Portland		50's Bicycle Parkway	31	~~NE 29th 5~~0's Bikeway	SE Powell Blvd.	Broadway	Community Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike				Vancouver Williams Bicycle Parkway	33	Vancouver/Williams	Rose Quarter	MLK Blvd. to I-5 Bridge	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	LEFT OFF HERE		10267	Going Bicycle Parkway	34	Going	Interstate	Basin	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		RTP: Interstate to Basin
Bike				20's Bicycle Parkway	35	~~NE 16th~~ 20's (28th)	Broadway	Powell		Bicycle Parkway		
Bike				70's Bicycle Parkway	36	72nd, 71st, 76th, 74th	Sullivan's Gulch Trail	Springwater Corridor Trail	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike			/	Springwater/I-205 Connector Parkway	37	SE Johnson Creek Blvd.	Springwater Trail/SE Bell Ave.	I-205 Path	Regionanl Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Clackamas County		10099	Monroe Bicycle Parkway	38	Monroe Blvd.	Trolley Trail	I-205 Path		Bicycle Parkway		10099: Bicycle boulevard, from 21st, need to extend for full extent, connections to trails
Bike	Multnomah County	Portland		Interstate Ave Bicycle Parkway	39	Interstate Ave	Going St	Lombard		Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Clackamas County	Lake Oswego		Iron Mountain Bicycle Parkway	60	Iron Mtn. Road/SW Boones Ferry Road	N State Street, via A Ave	Tualatin River Greenway	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Clackamas County	West Linn		Pimico Bicycle Parkway	61	Salamo/Pimico	Willamtte Drive	Willamette falls Drive	Regional Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Clackamas County	Oregon City		Oregon City Bicycle Parkway	63	Oregon City spine, Bridge, 5th Ave, Warner Milne, Beavercreek Road	Oregon City Bridge	Beavercreek road past Community College		Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Washington County	Beaverton		6th & 5th Bicycle Parkway	64	SW 6th & 5th	Westside Trail	Crescent Connection	New	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Portland		122nd Bicycle Parkway	65	122nd	Stark St.	Springwater Corridor Trail	Community Bikeway	Bicycle Parkway		
Bike	Clackamas	TriMet		PMLR Park Ave. Bicycle Transit Facility		PMLR Park Ave. Bicycle transit facility			NEW	Bicycle transit facility		
Bike	Clackamas	TriMet, Milwaukie		PMLR Milwaukie TC Bicycle transit facility		PMLR Milwaukie TC Bicycle transit facility			NEW	Bicycle transit facility		
Bike	Washington County	Forest Grove	10784, 10783, 10782, 10781	Forest Grove Bicycle and Pedestrian District	1	Forest Grove			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		RTP projects improve connectivity to the town center, additional projects needed within town center to fill sidewalk and bikeway
Bike	Washington County	Cornelius	11095, 10785, 10788, 10795, 10796, 10797, 10798, 10799, 10800, 10801, 10802, 10804	Cornelius Bicycle and Pedestrian District	2	Cornelius			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		RTP projects: main street improvements and road extensions; RTP 10804: bike lnaes on 50 blocks. Consider separate bike/ped distirct improvements

Bike	Washington County	Hillsboro		Hillsboro Bicycle and Pedestrian District	3	Hillsboro			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Hillsboro Airport Bicycle/Pedestrian District	4	Hillsboro Airport			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Orenco Station Bicycle and Pedestrian District	5	Orenco			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Bethany Staton Bicycle/Pedestrian District	7	Bethany			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Willow Creek Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	8	Willow Creek			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Elmonica Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	9	Elmonica			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Merlo Rd Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	10	Merlo Rd			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Beaverton Creek Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	11	Beaverton Creek			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Millikan Way Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	12	Millikan Way			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Aloha Bicycle/Pedestrian District	13	Aloha			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County		10616, 10619, 10646, 10630	Beaverton Bicycle/Pedestrian District	14	Beaverton			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		RTP 10619/10616: Biggi extension, crescent St. Multi-modal extension; 10646: Hall Blvd. / Watson Ave. pedestrian improvements. 10630 Hall Blvd. extension
Bike	Washington County			Cedar Mill Bicycle/Pedestrian District	15	Cedar Mill			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Sunset Transit Center Bicycle/Pedestrian District	16	Sunset Transit			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County/Multnomah County			Raleigh Hills Bicycle/Pedestrian District	17	Raleigh Hills			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		

Regional Active Transportation Plan Projects and Map Changes - DRAFT

Bike	Washington County			Washington Square Bicycle/Pedestrian District	18	Washington Square			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Murray/Scholls Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	19	Murray/Scholls			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Tigard Bicycle/Pedestrian District	20	Tigard			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			West Portland Bicycle/Pedestrian District	21	West Portland			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County		10278, 10279	Hillsdale Bicycle/Pedestrian District	22	Hillsdale			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		RTP project is Pedestrian District impr
Bike	Multnomah County			Washington Park Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	23	Washington Park			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			King City Bicycle/Pedestrian District	24	King City			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			Lake Grove Bicycle/Pedestrian District	25	Lake Grove			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			Lake Oswego Bicycle/Pedestrian District	26	Lake Oswego			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Sherwood Bicycle/Pedestrian District	27	Sherwood			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Tualatin Bicycle/Pedestrian District	28	Tualatin			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			Wilsonville WES Bicycle/Pedestrian District	29	Wilsonville			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			Wilsonville TC Bicycle/Pedestrian District	30	Wilsonville			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			West Linn - WillametteBicycle/Pedestrian District	31	West Linn			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			West Linn - Bolton Bicycle/Pedestrian District	32	West Linn			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			Oregon City Bicycle/Pedestrian District	33	Oregon City			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		

Bike	Clackamas County			Gladstone Bicycle/Pedestrian District	34	Gladstone			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			Park Ave P&R Bicycle/Pedestrian District	35	Park Ave P&R			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			Milwaukie Bicycle/Pedestrian District	36	Milwaukie			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Tacoma P&R Bicycle/Pedestrian District	37	Tacoma P&R			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Bybee Blvd. Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	38	Bybee Blvd			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Holgate Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	39	Holgate			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Downtown Portland Bicycle/Pedestrian District	40	Downtown Portland			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Overlook Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	41	Overlook			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County	Portland	10300	Prescott Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	42	Prescott			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		10300: Prescott station area improvements
Bike	Multnomah County			Killingsworth Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	43	Killingsworth			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Rosa Parks Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	44	Rosa Parks			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Lombard Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	45	Lombard			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Kenton Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	46	Kenton			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Delta Park/Vanport Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	47	Delta Park/Vanport			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		

Bike	Multnomah County			Expo Center Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	48	Expo Center			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Hayden Island Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	49	Hayden Island			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Hollywood Bicycle/Pedestrian District	50	Hollywood			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			60th Ave. Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	51	60th Ave			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			82nd Ave. Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	52	82nd Ave			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Portland Airport Bicycle/Pedestrian District	53	Portland Airport			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Mt Hood Ave. Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	54	Mt Hood Ave			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Cascades Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	55	Cascades			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Parkrose Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	56	Parkrose			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Gateway Bicycle/Pedestrian District	57	Gateway			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Division St. Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	58	Division St. Station			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Powell Blvd Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	59	Powell Blvd Station			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Lents Bicycle/Pedestrian District	60	Lents			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			Flavel St. Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	61	Flavel St			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		

Bike	Clackamas County			Fuller Rd. Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	62	Fuller Rd			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Clackamas Regional Center Bicycle and Pedestrian District	63	Clackamas			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			122nd Ave. Bicycle/Pedestrian District	64	122nd Ave			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			148th Ave. Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	65	148th Ave			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Rockwood Bicycle/Pedestrian District	66	Rockwood			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Gresham Bicycle/Pedestrian District	67	Gresham			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Fairview Bicycle/Pedestrian District	68	Fairview			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Troutdale Bicycle/Pedestrian District	69	Troutdale			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			Pleasant Valley Bicycle/Pedestrian District	70	Pleasant Valley			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			Happy Valley Bicycle/Pedestrian District	71	Happy Valley			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Clackamas County			Damascus Bicycle/Pedestrian District	72	Damascus			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Multnomah County			St. Johns Bicycle/Pedestrian District	73	St. Johns			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Hawthorn Farm Station Bicycle/Pedestrian District	74	Hawthorn Farm			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike	Washington County			Tanasbourne Bicycle/Pedestrian District	6	Tanasbourne			Pedestrian District	Bicycle/Pedestrian District		
Bike/Ped	Washington County			Council Creek Trail	T1	Council Creek Trail	NW Thatcher Road (connects to segment to Banks)	TV Hwy	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Washington County/Clackamas County			Tualatin River Greenway	T10	Tualatin River Greenway Trail (segment)	Westside Trail	Willamette falls Drive	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		

Regional Active Transportation Plan Projects and Map Changes - DRAFT

Bike/Ped	Washington County/Clackamas County			Ice Age Tonquin Trail	T11	Ice Age Tonquin Trail (segment)	Downtown Sherwood	SW Boeckman Rd in Wilsonvillle	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Washington County/Clackamas County			Fanno Creek Greenway	T12	Fanno Creek Greenway	SW Denny Road	Tualatin River Greenway	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike	Washington County/Clackamas County			Kruse Way Path	T13	Kruse Way Path (segment)	Iron Mountain Road	SW Bonita	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		Entire trail could be parkway if connection over I-5
Bike/Ped	Washington/ Multnomah	Porltand, Beaverton, ODOT		Hwy 26 Parkway	T15	Hwy 26 Bike Path/Sunset Transit Center Trail	I-405 Path	SW Barnes Road	NEW	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Washington County/Multnomah County	Portland, Washington County		Red Electric Trail	T20	Red Electric Trail	SW Oleson Rd.	Willamette River Greenway	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			Terwilliger Trail	T21	Terwilliger Trail			NEW	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County			I-405 Parkway	T23	I-405 Trail			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County			Goose Hollow Trail	T24	Goose Hollow Trail			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County	Portland/Lake Oswego		Portland to Lake Oswego Willamette Greenway Trail	T25	Portland to Lake Oswego Willamette Greenway Trail/Hwy 43 Corridor	Ross Island Bridge	Lake Oswego, A Ave	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Southwest Portland Willamette Greenway Trail	T26	Southwest Portland Willamette Greenway Trail	Steel Bridge	Ross Island Bridge	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		St. Johns Bridge	T29	St. Johns Bridge			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Washington County	Hillsboro		Rock Creek Trail	T3	Rock Creek Trail			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Porltand		North Portland Willamette Greenway	T30	North Portland Willamette Greenway	Steel Bridge	Columbia Slough Trail	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	ODOT		I-5 Bridge Trail	T34	I-5 Bridge Trail			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County			Southeast Portland Willamette Greenway	T35	Southeast Portland Willamette Greenway	Steel Bridge	Springwater Corridor Trail	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah/Clackamas	Portland, Milwaukie		Milwaukie LRT Trail	T36	Milwaukie LRT Trail	New Willamette River Light Rail Bridge	Springwater Corridor Trail	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Sullivan's Gulch Trail	T37	Sullivan's Gulch Trail	Steel Bridge	I-205 Path	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County			Springwater Corridor Trail	T38	Springwater Corridor (along	Sellwood Bridge	Hwy 212	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County			Trolley Trail	T39	Trolley Trail	17th Ave (connects to 17th Ave Path)	Oregon City, including proposed bridge connecting to Oregon City	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		

Regional Active Transportation Plan Projects and Map Changes - DRAFT

Bike/Ped	Washington County			Beaverton Creek Trail	T4	Beaverton Creek Trail	Sw Broadway	SW Jenkins	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County			Clackamas River Greenway Trail	T40	Clackamas River Greenway Trail	I-205 Path	McLoughlin Blvd.	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Hawthorne Bridge	T42	Hawthorne Bridge			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Steel Bridge River Walk	T42	Steel Bridge River Walk			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Morrison Bridge	T42	Morrison Bridge			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Sellwood Bridge Trail	T42	Sellwood Bridge Trail	Springwater Corridor	Southwest Portland Willamette Greenway Trail	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah /Washington /Clackamas County			I-205 Corridor Path	T43	I-205 Corridor	Columbia River	Tualatin (trail)	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		New segment in Washington County added as Trail Map update
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County			Lake Oswego to Milwaukie Trail	T46	Lake Oswego to Milwaukie Trail			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County	ODOT		Sunrise MultiUse Path	T47	Sunrise MultiUse Path			NEW	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/ped	Clackamas County			East Buttes Power Line Corridor Trail	T48	East Buttes Power Line Corridor Trail			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County			Mt. Scott/Scouter Mountain Trails	T49	Mt. Scott/Scouter Mountain Trails			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		Parkway, segment, Regional segment
Bike/ped	Washington County			Pearl-Keeler Powerline Trail (BN Powerline Trail)	T5	Pearl-Keeler Powerline Trail (BN Powerline Trail)	Rock Creek Trail	Cooper Mountain Trail	NEW	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		Parkway until UGB, then Regional
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Gresham		Gresham / Fairview Trail	T54	Gresham / Fairview Trail			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	ODOT		I-84 Bike Path	T55	I-84 Bike Path			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah County	Gresham		MAX Path	T56	MAX Path			Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Washington County			Westside Trail	T9	Westside Trail (includes on street segment, SW Hocken Ave from Broadway to Jenkins to SW Cedar Hills)	Rock Creek Trail (south of NW Springville Road)	99w	Regional Trail	Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike	Multnomah	Portland		NE 9th Bicycle/Pedestrian Parkway	32	NE 9th and 9th Ave crossing of I-84	Caruthers (Willamette River Bridge Crossing)	Mason Bikeway	NEW	BicyclePedestrian Parkway	crosses I-84	Update maps
Bike	Clackamas County			Stafford Road Bicycle Parkway	62	Stafford Road	Willamette River Trail via McVey	Tualatin River Greenway	Regional Bikeway	Biycle Parkway		

Regional Active Transportation Plan Projects and Map Changes - DRAFT

Ped	Multnomah /Washington /Clackamas County					Urban arterials			Urban arterials on RTP Arterial and Throughway Network	Commnity Pedestrian Corridor		Designate existing urban arterials identified on the RTP Arterial and Throughway Network system map as Regional Pedestrian Corridors
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Ross Island Bridge Trail	T42	Ross Island Bridge Trail			Regional Trail	Not currently on ATP maps		
Ped	Washington County	Forest Grove, Cornelius, ODOT	10779, 10846, 10805, 11094	Forest Grove to Cornelius Pedestrian Parkway	1	Pacific Ave, 19th Ave; N Adair St./Baseline St.	Forest Grove, C St.	Cornelius - to Hillsboro city limits	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Exisintg RTP projects include ped sidewalk infill on TV hwy in Cornelius, Boulevard/pedestrian treatments in Forest Grove. 10805: TV Hwy sidewalk infill; 11094 sidewaklks on baseline
Ped	Washington County			Hillsboro to Aloha Pedestrian Parkway	2	Tualatin Valley Hwy	Hillsboro (UGB)	Aloha (SW 185th Ave)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County			Hillsboro TC to Willow Creek MAX Pedestrian Parkway	3	Baseline, E. Main St., W. Baeline Rd.	SW Oak St (Hillsboro)	SW 185th Ave.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County			Tualatin Valley Hwy Pedestrian Parkway	4	Tualatin Valley Hwy	SW 185th Ave (Aloha)	Hwy 217 (Beaverton)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County			Beaverton to Hwy 26	5	SW Canyon Road	SW Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy	Hwy 26	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County		10559, 11090, 10824	Hillsboro to Cedar Mill Pedestrian Parkway	6	NE Cornell/NW Cornell	Hillsboro , E Main St.	Cedar Mill at SW Murray Blvd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		RTP projects: Widen to 5 lanes
Ped	Washington County			HWY 8 to Orenco Pedestrian Parkway	7	NW 231st Ave.	Hwy 8	Orenco	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County			Orenco to Tanasbourne Pedestrian Parkway	8	NW 229th/Evergreen	NE Brookwood Pkwy	NW Cornell Rd	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		includes HF bus segment
Ped	Washington County			Tanasbourne to Beaverton Pedestrian Parkway	9	NW 229th/Evergreen	SW 185th Ave	SW Canyon Rd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County			Murray Scholls to Cedar Mill Pedestrian Parkway	10	SW Murray Blvd.	HWY 210	NW Cornell Rd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County/Multnomah County		10274, 10278, 10279	Aloha to Hillsdale Pedestrian Parkway	11	HWY 10 (Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy) and 185th and SW Farmington Triangle	SW 185th to Kinnaman at SW Farmington	SW Farmington, Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy to SW Capitol Hwy	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Need project on BH between Beaverton and Portland. RTP: Beaverton-Hillsdale /Bertha/Capitol Hwy, SW: Intersection Improvements. 10278 improvemetns to Hillsdale district

Ped	Washington County			SW 185th Ave. to PCC Pedestrian Parkway	12	SW 185th Ave.	Aloha at Hwy 8 to NW Springville Rd.	NW Bethany Blvd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County			NW Bethany Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	13	NW Bethany Blvd.	NW German Town Rd	NW Cornell	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		crosses Sunset Hwy
Ped	Washington County		10634	SW Cedar Hills Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	14	SW Cedar Hills Blvd.	Beaverton at SW Farmington Rd.	Hwy 26, Cedar Mill	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		RTP: Walker to Farmington
Ped	Washington County/Multnomah County			Cedar Mill to Portland Pedestrian Parkway	15	SW Barnes Road/W Burnside Rd.	NW Cornell Rd	NW 23rd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County	Beaverton, Tigard, Tualatin	10646, 11220, 10630	Beaverton to Tualatin Pedestrian Parkway	16	Hall Blvd; includes SW Hunzikier Rd spur; via Washington Square and Tigard	SW Farmington	SW Sagert St.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		10646: Hall Blvd. / Watson Ave., add pedestrian improvements at intersections and amenities (lighting, plazas). RTP 11220: Tigard, Locust to Durham
Ped	Washington County/Clackamas County			SW Parkway Ave to Wilsonville TC Pedestrian Parkway	17	SW Parkway Ave	SW Boones Ferry at SW Day Rd	SW Town Center Loop	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County			Murray Scholls to Raliegh Hills Pedestrian Parkway	18	Hwy 210 (Scholls Ferry Rd)	SW Murray Blvd.	Hwy 10	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Washington Square
Ped	Washington County			SW Oleson Rd./SW Greenburg Rd. Pedestrian Parkway	19	SW Oleson Rd./SW Greenburg Rd.	Washington Square at Hall Blvd	99W	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		includes HF bus segment
Ped	Washington County			Sherwood to Tigard Pedestrian Parkway	20	99W (Pacific Coast Hwy)	Tualatin Sherwood Road	SW Hall Blvd	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via King City; includes HF bus segment
Ped	Washington County/Multnomah County			Barbur Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	21	Barbur Blvd.	SW Hall Blvd (as Pacific Coast Hwy)	Downtown Portland, Hawthorne Bridge	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Tigard and West Portland
Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			Boones Ferry Pedestrian Parkway	22	Boones Ferry	Pilkington Rd	SW Macadam Ave	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Lake Grove
Ped	Clackamas County			Kruse Way Pedestrian Parkway	23	Kruse Way	Tigard at I-5	Boones Ferry Rd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Connects Tigard and Lake Grove
Ped	Clackamas County			Country Club Road Pedestrian Parkway	24	Country Club Road	Boones Ferry Rd	SW Riverside Dr.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		to Downtown Lake Oswego

Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			Hwy 43 - Portland to Oregon City Pedestrian Parkway	25	Hwy 43 - Portland to Oregon City	99E in Oregon City	SE Powell Blvd. (Hwy 26)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Lake Oswego
Ped	Clackamas County			Molalla Ave Pedestrian Parkway	26	Molalla Ave	99E/7th Ave Oregon City	Hwy 213	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Oregon City
Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			McLoughlin Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	27	McLoughlin Blvd.	UGB	SE Powell Blvd. (Hwy 26), with Bybee Blvd, SE th loop in Sellwood)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		?includes 17th Ave in Portland?
Ped	Multnomah County			SE Grand Ave. Pedestrian Parkway	28	SE Grand Ave	Powell Blvd (Hwy 26)	NE Weidler St.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland
Ped	Multnomah County			Martin Luther King Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	29	Martin Luther King Blvd.	Powell Blvd (Hwy 26)	NE 6th Drive via NE vancouver Way	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland, includes HF bus
Ped	Washington County/Multnomah County			Beaverton to Barbur Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	30	Beaverton to Barbur Blvd.	SW Murray Blvd.	SW Barbur Blvd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County			Capitol Hwy. Pedestrian Parkway	31	Capitol Hwy	SW 49th Ave. in West Portland	SW Macadam Ave (Hwy 43)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via West Portland and Hillsdale
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		NW 23rd Ave. Pedestrian Parkway	32	NW 23rd Ave.	W. Burnside St.	NW Nickolai St.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		21, 22, 20th ave	33	21, 22, 20th ave	W. Burnside St.	NW Thurman	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		NW Lovejoy Pedestrian Parkway	34	NW Lovejoy	I-405	NW Cornell	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County	Sherwood		Sherwood Pedestrian Parkway	35	99W, SW Sherwood Blvd, SW	Tualatin Sherwood Road	SW Oregon St at SW Murdock Rd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Sherwood
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Oregon St. Pedestrian Parkway	36	Oregon St.	Hawthorne Bridge, Downtown Portland	SE Powell Blvd. (Hwy 26)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Includes SE Madison, inlcudes HF bus
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Belmont Pedestrian Parkway	37	Belomont St.	Morrison Bridge, Downtown Portland	SE 50th Ave.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Includes SE Morrison
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Burnside Portland to Gresham Pedestrian Parkway	38	Burnside	Burnside Bridge, Downtown Portland	Intersection with SE Powell Blvd in Gresham	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Gateway and Rockwood
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Stark Pedestrian Parkway	39	Stark	SE 50th Ave	NE Kane Drive.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Gateway and Rockwood
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Halsey St. Pedestrian Parkway	40	Halsey St.	Hollywood	Troutdale, SW 257th Ave	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Gateway, Rockwood, Wood Village

Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Naito Parkway	41	Naito Parkway	SW Barbur	Steel Bridge	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		includes HF bus segment, Portland, includes Steel Bridge
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Weidler Pedestrian Parkway	42	Weidler	West end of Broadway Bridge	Hollywood Town Center	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland	10194	Interstate Ave. Pedestrian Parkway	43	Interstate Ave	Steel Bridge	Hayden Island	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		RTP 10194: Construct street improvements to improve pedestrian connections to Interstate MAX LRT and to establish a main street character promoting pedestrian-oriented activities.
Ped	Multnomah County			Lombard Pedestrian Parkway	44	Lombard	St John's Bridge, West end	NE MLK	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		vis St. John's Town Center, loop of three streets in St. John's
Ped	Multnomah County			Killingsworth Pedestrian Parkway	45	Killingsworth	N Greeley Ave	Cascade Hwy (NE 82nd Ave)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland
Ped	Multnomah County			Alberta Pedestrian Parkway	46	Alberta	NE MLK	NE 33rd Ave.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland
Ped	Multnomah County			Going St. Pedestrian Parkway	47	Going St.	N Interstate Ave	NE MLK	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland
Ped	Multnomah County		10300	Prescott Pedestrian Parkway	48	Prescott	NE 42nd Ave.	NE 122nd Ave.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		RTP: Prescott station area improvements
Ped	Multnomah County			Fremont Pedestrian Parkway	49	Fremont	NE MLK	NE Sandy Blvd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland
Ped	Multnomah County			Cesar Chavez Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	50	Cesar Chavez Blvd	SE Woodstock	NE Columbia	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland
Ped	Multnomah County			Division Pedestrian Parkway	51	Division	SE Grand Ave. (99E)	NE Kane Drive.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Downtown Portland to Greasham
Ped	Multnomah County			Sandy Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	52	Sandy Blvd.	intersecton with NE Couch	SW 257th Ave.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Fairview and Troutdale
Ped	Multnomah County			Cully Pedestrian Parkway	53	Cully	NE Killingsworth	SE Powell Blvd. (Hwy 26)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland
Ped	Multnomah County			82nd Ave.Pedestrian Parkway	54	82nd Ave.	Clcakamas RC at SE Sunnyside Rd.	NE Killingsworth	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Clackamas RC, Lents TC
Ped	Multnomah County			Glisan Pedestrian Parkway	55	Glisan	Sandy Blvd.	NE 102nd Ave	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		to Gateway, includes HF bus route
Ped	Multnomah County			122nd Ave.Pedestrian Parkway	56	122nd Ave.	SE Foster Rd.	NE Sandy Blvd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland/ODOT		Powell Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	57	Powell Blvd	Ross Island Bridge (W end)	Gresham, intersection with Burnside	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		

Ped	Multnomah County			181st/182nd Ave. Pedestrian Parkway	58	181st/182nd Ave	Powell Blvd (Hwy 26)	NE Sandy Blvd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Rockwood
Ped	Multnomah County			Fairview to Gresham Pedestrian Parkway	59	Fairview to Gresham	NE Sandy Blvd	E Powell Blvd	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Wood Village
Ped	Multnomah County			Troutdale to Gresham Pedestrian Parkway	60	NE Kane Drive, SW 257th	NE Division St.	E Columbia River Hwy	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			Holgate Pedestrian Parkway	61	Holgate	99E	SE Powell Blvd., via 136th	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		Portland
Ped	Multnomah County			Woodstock Pedestrian Parkway	62	Woodstock	SE 39th	SE Foster Rd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		to Lents
Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			Portland to Damascus Pedestrian Parkway	63	SE Foster Rd.	SE Powell Blvd. (Hwy 26)	SE Sunnyside Rd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		includes SE 190th spur
Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			Portland to Oregon City Pedestrian Parkway	64	SE 52nd/SE Flavel/SE Linwood/Webster Rd.	SE Powell Blvd. (Hwy 26)	SE McLoughlin Blvd. (99E)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County			Tacoma St. Pedestrian Parkway	65	Tacoma St.	West end of Sellwood Bridge	SE McLoughlin Blvd. (99E)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Clackamas County			Johnson Creek Blvd. Pedestrian Parkway	66	Johnson Creek Blvd.	SE Harney Drive	SE 92nd Ave	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			Milwaukie to Clackamas TC Pedestrian Parkway	67	SE Harrison/Milwaukie Expy/SE Harmony/SE Sunnyside/SE Lake Rd./SE McLoughlin	SE McLoughlin Blvd (99E) at Holgate, with loop around Eastmoreland to SE 46th Ave.	I-205 Clackamas TC	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		includes SE 32nd Ave. spur
Ped	Clackamas County			Clackamas TC to Damascus Pedestrian Parkway	68	SE Sunnyside Rd/Hwy 212 (Clackamas Boring Hwy)	I-205	Hwy 212 at UGB	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Happy Valley
Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			SE 172nd Pedestrian Parkway	69	SE 172nd	SE Foster Rd.	Hwy 212	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		via Happy Valley
Ped	Clackamas County			SE 222nd Dr. Pedestrian Parkway	70	SE 222nd Dr	Between SW Butler and SE Borges Rd	Hwy 212 (Clackamas Boring Hwy)	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Clackamas County/Multnomah County			SE 242nd Ave. Pedestrian Parkway	71	SE 242nd Ave	SE Butler Rd	SE Roberts Rd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		

Ped	Clackamas County			Clackamas Hwy. Pedestrian Parkway	72	Clackamas Hwy	Hwy 212-224	Eagle Creek Hwy	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County			OHSU Loop Pedestrian Parkway	73	OHSU Loop			Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		HF bus segment
Ped	Multnomah County			NW Everett Pedestrian Parkway	74	NW Everett	I-405 bridge crossing	NW 21st	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		HF bus segment
Ped	Multnomah County			NW Gleason	75	NW Gleason	I-405 bridge crossing	NW 21st	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		HF bus segment
Ped	Multnomah County			NW Portland to Sauvie Island Pedestrian Parkway	76	NW Vaugn, NW St. Helen's Rd., NW 35th Ave, NW Yeon Ave, to NW St Helen's Rd.	NW 23rd Ave.	NW Sauvie Island Bridge at NW Gillihan Loop Rd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		HF bus segment
Ped	Multnomah County			12th and 11th couplet Pedestrian Parkway	77	Milwaukie, 11th, 12th, NE15th,	SE McLoughline Blvd and Milwaukie	NE Dekum	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County			52nd to MLK via Columbia Pedestrian Parkway	78	52nd to MLK via Columbia, Columbia to Dekum	NE 52nd Ave	NE MLK	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County			Rosa Parks Lombard Pedestrian Parkway	79	Rosa Parks, Willamette Blvd (w.Portsmuth connection to Lombard)	N Vancouver Ave	N Richmond Ave.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County			Vancouver/Williams	80	Vancouver/Williams	Rose Quarter	Rosa Parks	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County			Mississippi/Albina Pedestrian Parkway	81	Mississippi/Albina	Fremont and Vancouver to Mississippi	Lombard	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County			Swan Island to St John's Bridge Pedestrian Parkway	82	Going, Greeley, N Penninsula, N Willis, N Alaska, Fesseden, N Lombard	Going St on Swan Island	St Johns; Lombard and N Commando Ave	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Washington County			185th and SW Farmington Triangle Pedestrian Parkway	11.a	185th and SW Farmington Triangle	Kinneman to SW Farmington	to Kinneman	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		HF Bus segment
Ped	Washington County			NW Union Rd./NW 143rd Ave. Pedestrian Parkway	13.a	NW Union Rd./NW 143rd Ave.	NW Bethany	NW Cornell	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		HF bus segment
Ped	Multnomah County			72nd Ave. Loop Pedestrian Parkway	54.a	72nd Ave. Loop	SE Woodstock	SE 82nd. Ave	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		

Ped	Multnomah County			Mt. Scott Blvd. spur Pedestrian Parkway	54.a	Mt. Scott Blvd. spur	SE 82nd Ave.	SE 112th Ave.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Ped	Multnomah County			Duke and Flavel Pedestrian Parkway	62.a	Duke and Flavel	52nd Ave	Duke: 82nd., Flavel, 72nd.	Pedestrian Corridor	Pedestrian Parkway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County	Portland		Northwest Portland Willamette Greenway Trail	T27	Northwest Portland Willamette Greenway Trail			Regional Trail	Regional Bikeway		
Bike	Multnomah /Washington /Clackamas County					Community and Regional Bikeways identified on 2035 Bicycle Network Map			All community and regional bikeways not designated as Bicycle Parkways	Regional Bikeway		
Bike	Washington County		10630	Hall Blvd		Hall Blvd	SW Durham	Fanno Creek Trail (north intersection)	Regional Bikeway	Regional Bikeway		
Bike	Washington County			Hall Blvd		Hall Blvd	SW Durham	Fanno Creek Trail (south intersection)	NEW	Regional Bikeway		New road
Bike	Washington County			Hall Blvd		Hall Blvd	SW Greenway	Cedar Hills Blvd.	Regional Bikeway	Regional Bikeway		
Bike	Multnomah County	Portland		Burnside Couch Couplet		Burnside Couch Couplet	Sandy	Burnside Bridge	NEW	Regional Bikeway		
Ped	Washington County			N 1st Ave.	B-1	N 1st Ave.			NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Bicycle Parkway and urban arterial
Ped	Multnomah			SW Stafford Rd.	B-10	SW Stafford Rd.	N State Street, via McVey Rd	SW Borland rd.	NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Regional Bikeway and urban arterial
Ped	Multnomah			~~SE 155th/Milmain~~ SE 162nd Ave	B-12	~~SE 155th/Milmain~~ SE 162nd Ave	I-84 Trail	SE powell	New	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Commu nity Bikeway and urban arterial
Ped	Multnomah			SE 242nd/SE Hogan (segment)	B-13	SE 242nd/SE Hogan (segment)	NE sandy Blvd	SE Lusted Rd	NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Bicycle Parkway and urban arterial
Ped	Washington County			NW Evergreen	B-2	NW Evergreen			NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Bicycle Parkway and urban arterial
Ped	Washington County			SW Brockman/SW Beard	B-5	B-5 SW Brockman/SW Beard	Westside trail	Hall Blvd.	NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Bicycle Parkway and urban arterial
Ped	Washington County/Multnomah County			SW Scholls Ferry Rd.	B-8	B-8 SW Scholls Ferry Rd.	Hwy 26	Hillsdale Hwy	NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Bicycle Parkway and urban arterial
Ped	Multnomah			SW Dosch Rd.	B-9	B-9 SW Dosch Rd.	Hwy 26 Trail	Hillsdale Hwy	NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Regional Bikeway
Ped	Multnomah County	Gresham		Beaver Creek Canyon Trail (Sandy River to Springwater)	T58	Beaver Creek Canyon Trail (Sandy River to Springwater)			NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Pedestrian only

Regional Active Transportation Plan Projects and Map Changes - DRAFT

Ped	Multnomah County	Gresham		Kelly Creek Greenway Trails (Sandy River to Springwater)	T59	Kelly Creek Greenway Trails (Sandy River to Springwater)			NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		PED Only part of the Sandy River to Springwater Connection
Ped	Multnomah County	Troutdale		Cherry Creek Road Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Cherry Creek Road	SW 257th	S Troutdale Road	NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		
Bike	Multnomah County/Portland				65	9th Ave	Clinton St. path	Mason	New	Regional Bikeway		
Bike	Washington County	Forest Grove	10782	B-Street Regional Bikeway		B-Street	Hwy 47	19th Ave	Regional Bikeway	Regional Bikeway		
Bike	Washington County	Hillsboro	11090, 10824	Cornell Regional Bikeway		NE CornellRoad/10th Ave.	NW 206th Ave.	TV Hwy	Regional Bikeway	Regional Bikeway		RTP project from Baseline to 25th, and Arrington to Main
Bike	Washington County	Washington County	10558	Cornell Regional Bikeway		NW Cornell Road	NW Saltzmann	NW 24th Ave	Regional Bikeway	Regional Bikeway		RTP project from 113th to 107th
Bike	Clackamas County	Milwaukie	11174	SE 29th & SE 40th Regional Bikeway		SE 29th & SE 40th	SE King Road	Springwater Corridor Trail	Regional Bikeway	Regional Bikeway		RTP project for adjacent streets, not Regional Bikeways: 29th/40th/42nd Bike Boulevard Intersection Improvements
Bike	Multnomah	Portland		122nd Regional Bikeway		122nd	Stark St.	NE Airport Way	Community Bikeway	Regional Bikeway		
Bike	Clackamas/Multnomah			17th Ave Regional Bikeway		17th Ave	Springwater Trail	McLoughlin	Regional Bikeway	Regional Bikeway		
Bike/Ped	Washington County			Beaverton Creek Trail	T4	Beaverton Creek Trail	SW Cornelius Pass Road	SW Jenkins	Regional Trail	Regional Pedesrian Corridor/Bikeway		
Ped	Multnomah County	Portland			T22	Marquam Trail			NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		Pedestrian Only
Ped	Washington County	Hillsboro	11140	Brookwood Regional Ped Corridor		Brookwood	Hwy 26	TV Hwy	NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		RTP project includes pedestrian path from Ihly to Cornell. Extend project to include extent of Parkway.
Ped	Washington County		10558	Cornell Regional Pedestrian Corridor		NW Cornell Road	NW Saltzmann	NW Miller Road	New (RTP arterial)	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		RTP project from 113th to 107th
Ped	Washingon County			Cedar Hills Regional Pedestrian Corridor			SW Barnes Road	NW Cornell	New (RTP arterial)	Regional Pedestrian Corridor		
Bike/Ped	Washington County/Clackamas County				T13	Kruse Way Path (segment)	SW Bonita	I-5	Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		Entire trail could be parkway if connection over I-5
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County				T17	Lake Oswego to West Linn Trail			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		Trail name may be wrong. Part of Willamette River Greenway
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County				T18	Lake Oswego Willamette River Greenway Trail			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		

Note: Relevant RTP projects still being identified; ATP projects may change based on stakeholder input; Extents of some Regional Pedestrian Corriodrs and Regional Bikeways are still being identified.

Regional Active Transportation Plan Projects and Map Changes - DRAFT

Bike/Ped	Multnomah County			Columbia Slough Trail	T31	Columbia Slough Trail			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		Fills gaps in system; need to determine what is ped only
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County				T32	Peninsula Crossing Trail			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County				T33	Marine Drive Trail			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		
Bike/ped	Clackamas County				T44	Phillips Creek Trail			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		need to add back on
Bike/Ped	Clackamas County				T45	Oregon City Loop			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County/Clackamas County	Damascus			T50	Gresham Butte Saddle Trails	SE 172nd Ave.	Springwater Corridor Trail at SE Palmquist Rd.	Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		
Bike/Ped	Multnomah County			Kelley Creek Trail	T51	Kelley Creek Trail	Springwater Corridor Trail (near SE Jenner Rd.)	Gresham Butte Saddle Trails	Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		This is part of the sandy Rver Springwater connection??
Bike/ped	Clackamas County			Cazadero Trail	T53	Cazadero Trail			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		
Bike	Multnomah County	Gresham		Sandy River Connections (Sandy River to Springwater)	T57	Sandy River Connections (Sandy River to Springwater)	NE Sandy Blvd	Springwater Corridor Trail	NEW	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		recommendation from East Metro Connections Plan. This is on S/SE Troutdale Road but designated as off-street connection
Bike/Ped	Washington County			Cooper Mountain Trail	T6	Cooper Mountain Trail			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		Ped only??
Bike/Ped	Washington County			Bronson Creek Greenway	T7	Bronson Creek Greenway			Regional Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		*Ped only??*
Bike/Ped	Washington County			Waterhouse Trail	T8	Waterhouse Trail			Community Trail	Regional Pedestrian Corridor/Bikeway		

Note: Relevant RTP projects still being identified; ATP projects may change based on stakeholder input; Extents of some Regional Pedestrian Corriodrs and Regional Bikeways are still being identified.

SUMMARY

RECOMMENDED REGIONAL BICYCLE NETWORK CONCEPT

Based on the evaluation of the bicycle network, a recommended bicycle network concept was identified. The recommended concept combines elements of the Spiderweb concept and the Grid concept. The recommended concept provides a denser network of bicycle parkways than the three scenarios tested; this is in part due to input from local jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders, as well as outcomes of the evaluation. The recommended network provides:

- A bicycle parkway in each of the region's Mobility Corridors within the urban growth boundary.
- A network of bicycle parkways, spaced approximately every two miles, that connect to and/or through every to town and regional center, many regional destinations and to most employment and industrial land areas and regional parks and natural areas (all areas are connected by regional bikeways, the next functional class of bicycle routes).
- A network of regional bikeways that connect to the bicycle parkways, providing an interconnected regional network. Local bikeways connect to bicycle parkways and regional bikeways.
- Regional bicycle districts. Regional and town centers and station communities were identified as bicycle districts, as well as pedestrian districts.

The recommended regional bicycle network identified bicycle parkway routes that demonstrated a high level of demand (in 2010 and 2035) and serve areas with average underserved populations (in 2010). Routes on the edge of the urban area showed less activity compared to other areas. Therefore, routes on the edge of the urban areas are regional bikeways. Regional bikeways may experience less demand than bicycle parkways, however they provide key routes and connectivity on the regional network; bicycle parkways would not function without them. Routes that showed a high level of demand, but that are not currently on the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) bicycle network map are recommended as new bicycle parkway or regional bikeway routes, for example Foster Road in Portland

FINDINGS FOR GUIDING PRIORITIZATION

Results from the evaluation provide *one* set of information to help inform regional and local decision making about where and how to prioritize investments in the recommended regional bicycle network. Below is a summary of the findings from the evaluation.

1. Areas of the region that increased bicycle network density in 2035 saw an increase in bicycle activity. Areas with less density saw less of an increase.

2. Bicycle mode share increases the most for commuting trips, indicating the need to connect bicycle routes to jobs.

3. In general, planned investments in the regional bike network increase bicycle network density in areas with above average underserved populations (in 2010). However, several areas with underserved populations continue to have lower bike network density, compared to other parts of the region:

    - Forest Grove
    - Cornelius
    - Hillsboro South
    - Hillsboro Central
    - Beaverton – East/Raleigh Hills/Washington Square
    - Beaverton- South /Aloha South
    - Tigard
    - Milwaukie – North/ Clackamas Regional Center
    - N. Portland – St. Johns
    - NE Portland – Cully/Rose City Park/Rocky Butte
    - Happy Valley
    - Central Gresham/Wood Village/Fairview

4. As the miles of protected bicycle facilities increases, such as trails and cycletracks, the number of bicycle miles traveled on those types of facilities increases, while the number of miles of bicycle facilities on standard five foot bicycle lanes or routes with no separated facilities decreases. This indicates an increase in bicycling safety since more miles traveled by bicycle are on facilities more fully separated from traffic. An increase in safety can be translated into a reduction crash related costs.

5. While investment in trails and cycle tracks sees a return on the number of bicycle miles traveled on those facilities, it is important to note that even under the most ambitious scenarios, standard bicycle lanes still account for 55% of bicycle network facilities.

6. Bicycle parkways have about 2.5 times more bicycle traffic than the average bicycle facility, indicating that the importance of the routes and the importance of separated facility designs.

7. Routes on the perimeter of the urban growth boundary have lower volumes of bicycle travel due to population levels. However, these routes provide key connections that get people to the higher demand routes.

8. Trails and cycle tracks are highly desirable facility types. Trails and cycle tracks that are in denser population and employment areas and connect to destinations tend to attract more bicycle trips. Diagonal routes also showed a high level of demand for bicycle trips.

Trails that show a high to moderate bicycle volumes:

- Sullivan's Gulch Trail in Portland
- Hwy 26 Trail connecting Portland and Washington County
- I-405 trail in Portland (connects to Hwy 26 Trail)
- Lake Oswego to Portland Trail
- Bronson Creek Greenway, in the North Hillsboro/Bethany areas
- Gresham MAX Path
- Gresham-Fairview Trail
- I-84 Path, Multnomah County
- Springwater Corridor Trail
- Surf to Turf Trail, parallel to Iron Mtn. Road, Lake Oswego
- I-205 Path
- Phillips Creek Trail, connecting to I-205 Path, Clackamas County
- Trolley Trail in Clackamas County
- Sunrise Corridor Trail in Clackamas County
- Trail along McLoughlin Blvd and the future Portland to Milwaukie Light rail
- East Buttes Powerline Corridor Trail, Clackamas, connecting to the Gresham Fairview Trail
- Rock Creek Trail, Hillsboro
- Fanno Creek Trail, Washington County
- Beaverton Creek Greenway, Washington County
- Westside Trail
- Tualatin River Greenway Trail between Fanno Creek and Westside trail
- Willamette River Greenway/Hwy43, south of Lake Oswego, Clackamas County
- Red Electric Trail/Capitol Highway
- Council Creek Trail
- Waterhouse Trail, Washington County
- Tonquin Trail, Washington County
- Oregon City Loop, Clackamas County
- Mt. Scot/Scouter Mtn. Trails that connect to the East Buttes Powerline Corridor Trail, Clackamas and Multnomah County

Roadway routes that show a high to moderate bicycle volumes:

- Sandy Blvd. in Portland
- Foster Road in Portland
- Downtown Portland
- SE Hawthorne Blvd.
- 17th Ave. connection between Trolley Trail and Springwater Corridor
- NE 15th Ave and 20's Bikeway, Portland
- Barbur Blvd./99 W in Portland and Washington County
- SW Multnomah Blvd. Portland/Washington County
- Clinton Bike Boulevard in inner SE Portland
- Williams/Vancouver, Portland
- Cully Blvd. Portland

- 40's and 50's Bikeways, Portland
- Going Street, Portland
- NE Airport Way
- Powell Blvd., especially in inner SE Portland
- SE Lincoln, SE Market, SE Mill, Portland/East Multnomah County
- SE Stark St., I-205 to SW 257th, Multnomah County
- Division Street, Portland to Gresham
- Hogan Road, Multnomah County
- SW 257th, Multnomah County
- SE 181st Ave, East Multnomah County
- SE 162nd, Multnomah County
- SE 136th Multnomah County
- SE 122nd Ave, East Multnomah County
- SE 148th Ave, East Multnomah County
- Burnside in East Multnomah County
- NE Halsey, Multnomah County
- Main Street, Hillsboro
- SW Baseline, Washington County
- Scholls Ferry Road
- SW Canyon Road
- SW 5th and 6th Avenues, Beaverton
- SW Western Ave., Beaverton
- Capitol Highway and Kerr Parkway, Portland and Washington County
- SW Boones ferry Road, Fanno Creek to Wilsonville
- SW Tualatin Sherwood hwy.
- SW Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy.
- SW Oleson Road, Washington County
- SW Brockman St. Washington County
- SW Dosch Road, Washington County
- SW McDonald, SW Gaard St, Washington County
- Tualatin Valley Highway, Washington County
- NW Evergreen Rd, Washington County
- SW Cedar Hills Blvd., Washington County
- Hall Blvd. , Beaverton to Fanno Creek Trail, Washington County
- Kruse Way, Washington County (assumed crossing over I-5)
- SW 72nd, Washignton County, between SW Bonita and 99W
- SE Sunnyside Road, Clackamas
- Monroe Blvd. Clackamas
- SE Thiessen Rd., Clackamas County
- SE Linwood Ave. Clackamas County
- SE Johnson Creek Road, connecting to I-205 Path, Clackamas County
- Pacific Hwy/Willamette Falls Drive, Clackamas
- Pimlico Drive, West Linn
- Lake Road in Milwaukie
- Warner Milne Road, Linn Ave, Central Point Road, Oregon City
- Iron Mountain Road (parallel Surf to Turf Trail)

9. Land use is a key factor in the demand and use of bicycle routes. Bike routes in areas with a lot of destinations show higher volumes of trips, even when no bicycle facilities exist or they are unimproved. This indicates the need to provide bicycle facilities in areas that are destination rich.

10. Areas in the region that show the highest level of bicycle activity (other areas show substantial activity, and all areas of the region show bicycling activity):

    - Downtown Portland
    - Inner SE Portland
    - Outer East Portland/West Gresham
    - Central Gresham/Wood Vilage/Fairview
    - SW Portland
    - Beaverton - South/Aloha-South
    - Beaverton North
    - Tigard
    - SE Portland – Eastmoreland/Woodstock/Foster
    - Inner NE Portland

11. Facilities added that overcome barriers saw a relatively large number of bicycle trips. All bridges, existing and added, showed demand for bicycle trips. These facilities include:

    - The new light rail bridge in downtown Portland
    - TheLake Oswego to Portland Bridge
    - Hwy 26 Trail
    - Crossings of Hwy 26, including the Westside Trail
    - Gaps in the I-205 Trail
    - Crossings of I-84

5 Summary Tables and Conclusions

5.1.1 Description of information in the summary tables

The results of the access, equity and safety analyses are presented in the tables found on the following pages. Each table includes the following information for each regional pedestrian area:

- Total residential and employment population within ½ mile buffer of the area
- Percent of population within walking access of essential destinations with the existing pedestrian network
- Percent of population that would gain access to essential destinations upon completion of the pedestrian network

The above information is provided as context to interpret the remainder of the tables, which are the results of the access, equity and safety criteria:

- Change in number of people with access to essential destinations (Access) – calculated for each pedestrian area.
- Cost per person with increased access (Access) – calculated by dividing the estimated cost to provide the sidewalks, trails and crossings required to complete the pedestrian network in each area by the change in number of people with access to essential destinations.
- Percentage of census tracts with an above average concentration of underserved (Equity)
- Length of sidewalk added per mile of barrier street (Safety)
- Number of crossings added per mile of barrier street (Safety)

5.1.2 Notes on interpreting the tables

This analysis has identified areas that would see the most gain in access with the completion of the pedestrian network. However, as described in the Considerations and Caveats section, the regional pedestrian areas are not of uniform size so the total change in number of people with access to essential destinations tends to favor larger areas with higher population and employment levels. Furthermore, the analysis identified that in some areas with a high access score, the cost for providing that increased access can be much higher than other areas, including ones with a lower access score.

Using cost per person with increased access identifies those areas that seem to offer the greatest 'bang for the buck' in terms of increasing walking access to destinations relative to the required investment in walking facilities. Areas that score well in this regard are of varying size.

The equity metric identifies those areas where improved access would serve higher proportions of historically underserved populations. The areas with the most to gain in terms of safety due to completion of the network on barrier streets are identified in the last two columns of the tables below.

5.1.3 Results

The table on the following page (Top Districts, Corridors and Trails) identifies the regional pedestrian areas that score well across multiple metrics:

- The tables identify areas that score 3 or above in each of the following metrics: Access, Cost per Person with Increased Access, and Equity.[11,12]
- The table identifies the top 66 out of a total of 214 pedestrian areas:
    - 21 of 73 pedestrian districts
    - 26 of 82 pedestrian corridors
    - 19 of 59 pedestrian trails

5.1.4 Conclusion

The analyses summarized on the following pages provide Metro and its regional partners with a variety of information to help make informed decisions about pedestrian investments as part of the Regional Active Transportation Plan. This analysis also serves as a 'tool' that Metro and regional partners can use in the future (i.e., the access, equity and safety results can be filtered or sorted in different ways based on changing priorities).

Metro and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee's recommendations on how to prioritize investments will be based on identifying areas where the most people gain the most access to essential destinations, considering areas with underserved populations and costs. Those areas that provide the most access to the most people, reduce barriers to safer travel and improve the pedestrian network in areas with underserved populations should be prioritized first.

[11] Note that for trails, the costs per person with increase access threshold is 2 or above, reflecting the relatively higher cost of providing trails.

[12] The safety metrics are not explicitly included in this filtering exercise. As described in the Considerations and Caveats section, while the access and equity metrics are more concrete (i.e., the number of people with improved walking access and concentrations of underserved populations), the safety metrics are a proxy for improved safety based on improvements made to barrier streets. The safety metrics are provided in the tables to illustrate the potential safety benefits of pedestrian improvements in each area.

Top Districts, Corridors and Trails

					Access			Equity	Safety	
#	NAME	Total Population (including 1/2 mile buffer)	% of Population with Access (Existing Conditions)	% of Population with Increased Access	Access Score (higher score = more people with access)	Cost per Person with Increased Access (higher score = lower cost)	% of Census Tracts with Above Average Underserved Populations	New sidewalks per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)	New crossings per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)
	Pedestrian Districts								
1	Forest Grove	22,062	>80%	10%	3	4	4	1	1
2	Cornelius	21,720	41-60%	15%	4	4	5	1	1
9	Elmonica	27,972	61-80%	10%	4	5	4	1	2
10	Merlo Rd	34,038	41-60%	13%	4	5	5	1	3
11	Beaverton Creek	39,057	41-60%	24%	5	5	5	1	3
12	Millikan Way	60,378	61-80%	18%	5	5	5	1	2
13	Aloha	34,710	61-80%	9%	4	4	5	1	1
14	Beaverton	98,679	>80%	5%	4	4	5	1	2
24	King City	19,347	41-60%	12%	3	4	3	1	2
41	Overlook	13,105	61-80%	16%	3	3	3	2	2
56	Parkrose	7,196	41-60%	21%	3	3	3	1	2
57	Gateway	34,170	61-80%	17%	5	4	4	1	2
58	Division St	11,070	41-60%	26%	4	4	5	2	2
59	Powell Blvd	11,543	61-80%	14%	3	3	5	2	2
62	Fuller Rd	7,792	41-60%	19%	3	3	3	1	3
63	Clackamas	33,230	21-40%	10%	4	4	3	1	3
64	122nd Ave	10,888	61-80%	28%	4	4	4	1	2
65	148th Ave	8,259	41-60%	42%	4	5	5	1	3
66	Rockwood	24,394	41-60%	18%	4	4	5	1	3
67	Gresham	27,349	>80%	5%	3	4	4	1	2
69	Troutdale	7,623	41-60%	20%	3	3	3	2	1
	Pedestrian Corridors								
1	Forest Grove to Cornelius	113,772	>80%	5%	4	4	5	1	1
2	Hillsboro to Aloha	84,537	61-80%	10%	4	4	5	1	2
3	Hillsboro TC to Willow Creek	115,131	41-60%	5%	3	4	5	1	1
4	Aloha to Beaverton	121,878	>80%	9%	5	5	5	1	2
5	Beaverton to Hwy 26	101,179	61-80%	7%	4	4	3	1	2
6	Hillsboro to Cedar Mill	202,857	61-80%	9%	5	5	4	1	2
11	Aloha to Hillsdale	166,563	61-80%	11%	5	4	3	1	2
12	SW 185th Ave. to PCC	125,478	41-60%	6%	4	4	3	1	2
14	SW Cedar Hills Blvd.	78,990	61-80%	7%	3	4	4	1	1
16	Beaverton to Tualatin (Hall B	273,493	61-80%	8%	5	5	4	1	2
23	Kruse Way	34,713	41-60%	16%	3	4	3	1	1
38	Burnside Portland to Gresham	312,688	>80%	4%	5	4	4	1	2
39	Stark	73,235	61-80%	17%	5	4	4	1	3
40	Halsey St.	63,837	41-60%	11%	4	3	3	1	2
45	Killingsworth	28,675	61-80%	11%	3	3	3	1	1
48	Prescott	20,567	61-80%	18%	3	3	3	1	3
51	Division	86,776	61-80%	11%	4	4	4	1	3
52	Sandy Blvd.	98,441	61-80%	10%	4	3	3	1	3

Top Districts, Corridors and Trails

					Access		Equity	Safety	
#	NAME	Total Population (including 1/2 mile buffer)	% of Population with Access (Existing Conditions)	% of Population with Increased Access	Access Score (higher score = more people with access)	Cost per Person with Increased Access (higher score = lower cost)	% of Census Tracts with Above Average Underserved Populations	New sidewalks per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)	New crossings per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)
54	82nd Ave.	60,949	61-80%	14%	4	3	4	1	3
56	122nd Ave.	37,655	41-60%	31%	5	4	5	1	3
57	Powell Blvd	96,350	61-80%	15%	5	4	4	1	3
58	181st/182nd Ave	23,755	41-60%	15%	3	4	5	1	3
61	Holgate	39,365	61-80%	17%	4	4	4	1	3
82	Swan Island to St John's Brid	25,530	61-80%	16%	3	3	3	1	3
B-4	SW 206th	60,936	41-60%	7%	4	4	3	1	2
B-12	SE 155th/Milmain	13,510	41-60%	35%	3	4	5	1	3
	Regional Trails								
1	Council Creek Trail	81,954	41-60%	3%	3	2	5	2	2
2	Highway 47 Trail	34,956	61-80%	12%	4	3	5	1	1
4	Beaverton Creek Trail	123,540	61-80%	14%	5	5	5	1	5
5	Pearl-Keeler Powerline Trail	36,132	21-40%	18%	4	4	3	2	5
8	Waterhouse Trail	94,353	41-60%	4%	3	4	3	1	2
9	Westside Trail	154,942	41-60%	8%	5	4	3	2	5
12	Fanno Creek Greenway	167,470	41-60%	14%	5	5	3	1	2
13	Kruse Way Path	52,761	41-60%	9%	4	4	3	1	1
14	Highway 217 Trail	91,560	41-60%	10%	5	5	5	2	2
26	Southwest Portland Willamette Greenway Trail	116,376	>80%	3%	3	3	3	2	5
31	Columbia Slough Trail	59,332	21-40%	16%	5	2	5	2	5
38	Springwater Corridor	37,821	41-60%	23%	5	3	3	1	5
42	Willamette River Bridges	125,860	>80%	2%	3	2	3	2	5
43	I-205 Corridor	92,962	41-60%	21%	5	3	4	1	5
44	Phillips Creek Trail	23,165	41-60%	17%	3	4	3	1	2
48	East Buttes Power Line Corridor Trail	12,515	21-40%	15%	3	2	3	2	2
49	Mt. Scott/Scouter Mountain Trails	44,174	21-40%	9%	4	2	4	1	5
54	Gresham / Fairview Trail	19,073	21-40%	13%	3	3	5	1	5
55	I-84 Bike Path	20,443	0-20%	9%	3	3	3	2	2

Regional Pedestrian Districts

					Access		Equity	Safety	
District #	NAME	Total Population (including 1/2 mile buffer)	% of Population with Access (Existing Conditions)	% of Population with Increased Access	Access Score (higher score = more people with access)	Cost per Person with Increased Access (higher score = lower cost)	% of Census Tracts with Above Average Underserved Populations	New sidewalks per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)	New crossings per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)
1	Forest Grove	22,062	>80%	10%	3	4	4	1	1
2	Cornelius	21,720	41-60%	15%	4	4	5	1	1
3	Hillsboro	61,815	>80%	1%	1	3	5	1	1
4	Hillsboro Airport	33,096	0-20%	0%	1	2	4	1	1
5	Orenco	37,107	41-60%	26%	5	5	1	1	2
6	Tanasbourne	89,115	61-80%	10%	5	5	1	1	2
7	Bethany	13,932	61-80%	4%	1	3	3	1	3
8	Willow Creek	15,357	41-60%	10%	3	4	2	1	2
9	Elmonica	27,972	61-80%	10%	4	5	4	1	2
10	Merlo Rd	34,038	41-60%	13%	4	5	5	1	3
11	Beaverton Creek	39,057	41-60%	24%	5	5	5	1	3
12	Millikan Way	60,378	61-80%	18%	5	5	5	1	2
13	Aloha	34,710	61-80%	9%	4	4	5	1	1
14	Beaverton	98,679	>80%	5%	4	4	5	1	2
15	Cedar Mill	44,538	41-60%	18%	5	5	2	1	1
16	Sunset Transit	55,584	41-60%	15%	5	5	1	1	1
17	Raleigh Hills	20,437	61-80%	24%	5	4	1	1	3
18	Washington Square	101,307	61-80%	13%	5	5	2	1	3
19	Murray/Scholls	28,509	61-80%	7%	3	5	1	1	2
20	Tigard	113,124	41-60%	12%	5	5	2	1	2
21	West Portland	9,190	41-60%	27%	4	3	1	2	1
22	Hillsdale	7,605	61-80%	26%	3	3	1	2	4
23	Washington Park	3,147	21-40%	20%	2	2	1	2	3
24	King City	19,347	41-60%	12%	3	4	3	1	2
25	Lake Grove	10,734	41-60%	32%	4	3	1	1	1
26	Lake Oswego	7,362	>80%	8%	1	2	2	2	3
27	Sherwood	18,564	61-80%	16%	4	4	2	1	2
28	Tualatin	53,702	41-60%	6%	4	5	2	1	1
29	Wilsonville	8,387	41-60%	7%	2	3	1	1	1
30	Wilsonville	9,757	41-60%	5%	1	5	2	1	1
31	West Linn	4,578	21-40%	11%	1	2	1	2	1
32	West Linn	5,580	61-80%	12%	2	2	2	1	4
33	Oregon City	13,008	41-60%	14%	3	2	2	2	2
34	Gladstone	3,734	61-80%	16%	2	3	2	1	1
35	Park Ave P&R	5,079	21-40%	58%	4	4	1	1	5
36	Milwaukie	17,625	61-80%	15%	4	3	2	2	5
37	Tacoma P&R	5,191	61-80%	29%	3	4	2	1	3
38	Bybee Blvd	5,141	61-80%	11%	2	3	1	2	2
39	Holgate	10,530	>80%	6%	2	3	2	1	2
40	Portland	348,066	>80%	2%	5	2	2	1	3
41	Overlook	13,105	61-80%	16%	3	3	3	2	2
42	Prescott	8,966	>80%	11%	2	3	4	2	1
43	Killingsworth	8,313	>80%	6%	1	2	3	1	1
44	Rosa Parks	7,737	>80%	2%	1	2	2	1	1
45	Lombard	7,641	>80%	9%	2	3	2	1	1

Regional Pedestrian Districts

					Access		Equity	Safety	
District #	NAME	Total Population (including 1/2 mile buffer)	% of Population with Access (Existing Conditions)	% of Population with Increased Access	Access Score (higher score = more people with access)	Cost per Person with Increased Access (higher score = lower cost)	% of Census Tracts with Above Average Underserved Populations	New sidewalks per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)	New crossings per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)
46	Kenton	5,761	>80%	10%	2	2	2	2	1
47	Delta Park/Vanport	1,803	21-40%	28%	1	2	2	2	2
48	Expo Center	3,512	21-40%	38%	3	2	2	2	4
49	Hayden Island	3,675	21-40%	43%	3	3	2	2	5
50	Hollywood	12,979	>80%	3%	1	2	1	1	3
51	60th Ave	13,173	>80%	1%	1	2	1	1	4
52	82nd Ave	6,228	>80%	13%	2	3	3	1	4
53	Portland Airport	961	0-20%	13%	1	1	1	1	1
54	Mt Hood Ave	4,569	41-60%	20%	2	2	1	2	1
55	Cascades	6,420	21-40%	20%	2	2	1	2	2
56	Parkrose	7,196	41-60%	21%	3	3	3	1	2
57	Gateway	34,170	61-80%	17%	5	4	4	1	2
58	Division St	11,070	41-60%	26%	4	4	5	2	2
59	Powell Blvd	11,543	61-80%	14%	3	3	5	2	2
60	Lents	6,693	>80%	7%	1	2	5	1	4
61	Flavel St	3,619	41-60%	27%	2	3	4	1	5
62	Fuller Rd	7,792	41-60%	19%	3	3	3	1	3
63	Clackamas	33,230	21-40%	10%	4	4	3	1	3
64	122nd Ave	10,888	61-80%	28%	4	4	4	1	2
65	148th Ave	8,259	41-60%	42%	4	5	5	1	3
66	Rockwood	24,394	41-60%	18%	4	4	5	1	3
67	Gresham	27,349	>80%	5%	3	4	4	1	2
68	Fairview	11,092	21-40%	10%	2	3	4	1	1
69	Troutdale	7,623	41-60%	20%	3	3	3	2	1
70	Pleasant Valley	1,184	0-20%	21%	1	2	4	2	4
71	Happy Valley	7,345	21-40%	3%	1	2	3	2	3
72	Damascus	4,024	0-20%	15%	2	2	2	3	2
98	St. Johns	3,939	>80%	0%	1	1	3	1	5
99	Hawthorn Farm	30,078	21-40%	14%	4	5	1	1	1

Regional Pedestrian Corridors

					Access		Equity	Safety	
Corridor #	Name	Total Population (including 1/2 mile buffer)	% of Population with Access (Existing Conditions)	% of Population with Increased Access	Access Score (higher score = more people with access)	Cost per Person with Increased Access (higher score = lower cost)	% of Census Tracts with Above Average Underserved Populations	New sidewalks per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)	New crossings per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)
1	Forest Grove to Cornelius	113,772	>80%	5%	4	4	5	1	1
2	Hillsboro to Aloha	84,537	61-80%	10%	4	4	5	1	2
3	Hillsboro TC to Willow Creek	115,131	41-60%	5%	3	4	5	1	1
4	Aloha to Beaverton	121,878	>80%	9%	5	5	5	1	2
5	Beaverton to Hwy 26	101,179	61-80%	7%	4	4	3	1	2
6	Hillsboro to Cedar Mill	202,857	61-80%	9%	5	5	4	1	2
7	HWY 8 to Orenco	76,776	21-40%	13%	4	5	1	1	2
8	Orenco to Tanasbourne	96,312	41-60%	6%	5	5	1	1	2
9	Tanasbourne to Beaverton	152,175	61-80%	7%	5	5	2	1	2
10	Murray Scholls to Cedar Mill	113,295	61-80%	13%	5	5	2	1	2
11	Aloha to Hillsdale	166,563	61-80%	11%	5	4	3	1	2
12	SW 185th Ave. to PCC	125,478	41-60%	6%	4	4	3	1	2
13	NW Bethany Blvd.	51,054	41-60%	6%	3	4	2	1	3
14	SW Cedar Hills Blvd.	78,990	61-80%	7%	3	4	4	1	1
15	Cedar Mill to Portland	168,687	61-80%	7%	5	4	2	1	1
16	Beaverton to Tualatin (Hall B	273,493	61-80%	8%	5	5	4	1	2
17	SW Parkway Ave to Wilsonville	32,778	21-40%	14%	3	4	1	1	1
18	Murray Scholls to Raliegh Hil	108,975	61-80%	9%	4	5	2	1	2
19	SW Oleson Rd./SW Greenburg Rd	117,517	61-80%	16%	5	5	2	1	3
20	Sherwood to Tigard	94,362	41-60%	15%	5	5	2	1	2
21	Barbur Blvd.	194,722	61-80%	7%	5	3	2	1	3
22	Boones Ferry	21,751	41-60%	30%	4	3	2	2	4
23	Kruse Way	34,713	41-60%	16%	3	4	3	1	1
24	Country Club Road	5,348	21-40%	23%	2	2	2	1	2
25	Hwy 43 - Portland to Oregon C	48,452	61-80%	12%	3	2	2	2	4
26	Molalla Ave	18,467	41-60%	18%	3	3	2	1	3
27	McLoughlin Blvd.	53,255	61-80%	21%	5	3	1	2	4
28	SE Grand Ave	81,982	>80%	3%	2	3	2	1	4
29	Martin Luther King Blvd.	66,018	>80%	3%	2	2	3	1	2
30	Beaverton to Barbur Blvd.	73,540	41-60%	12%	4	4	2	1	2
31	Capitol Hwy	25,688	61-80%	19%	3	3	1	2	3
32	NW 23rd Ave.	114,062	>80%	1%	1	3	2	1	1
33	NW 21st Ave.	128,780	>80%	1%	2	3	2	1	1
34	NW Lovejoy	126,076	>80%	0%	1	2	2	1	1
35	Sherwood	29,310	41-60%	11%	3	4	2	1	1
36	Hawthorne Blvd.	117,820	>80%	1%	1	2	2	1	3
37	Belmont St.	102,314	>80%	0%	1	2	2	1	3
38	Burnside Portland to Gresham	312,688	>80%	4%	5	4	4	1	2
39	Stark	73,235	61-80%	17%	5	4	4	1	3
40	Halsey St.	63,837	41-60%	11%	4	3	3	1	2
41	Naito Parkway	147,409	>80%	2%	2	2	3	1	3
42	Weidler	70,928	>80%	2%	2	3	2	1	2
43	Interstate Ave	88,475	>80%	5%	3	2	2	1	2
44	Lombard	22,912	61-80%	3%	1	2	3	1	3
45	Killingsworth	28,675	61-80%	11%	3	3	3	1	1
46	Alberta	10,271	>80%	0%	1	1	4	1	2
47	Going St.	13,155	>80%	8%	1	3	3	1	1
48	Prescott	20,567	61-80%	18%	3	3	3	1	3
49	Fremont	20,308	>80%	3%	1	4	2	1	3
50	Cesar Chavez Blvd	40,505	>80%	6%	2	3	2	1	3
51	Division	86,776	61-80%	11%	4	4	4	1	3
52	Sandy Blvd.	98,441	61-80%	10%	4	3	3	1	3
53	Cully	29,393	>80%	2%	1	2	2	1	3
54	82nd Ave.	60,949	61-80%	14%	4	3	4	1	3
55	Glisan	50,241	>80%	5%	2	3	3	1	3
56	122nd Ave.	37,655	41-60%	31%	5	4	5	1	3
57	Powell Blvd	96,350	61-80%	15%	5	4	4	1	3
58	181st/182nd Ave	23,755	41-60%	15%	3	4	5	1	3

Regional Pedestrian Corridors

					Access		Equity	Safety	
Corridor #	Name	Total Population (including 1/2 mile buffer)	% of Population with Access (Existing Conditions)	% of Population with Increased Access	Access Score (higher score = more people with access)	Cost per Person with Increased Access (higher score = lower cost)	% of Census Tracts with Above Average Underserved Populations	New sidewalks per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)	New crossings per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)
59	Fairview to Gresham	29,382	41-60%	6%	2	3	4	1	2
60	Troutdale to Gresham	15,125	61-80%	8%	2	2	3	1	2
61	Holgate	39,365	61-80%	17%	4	4	4	1	3
62	Woodstock	16,197	>80%	12%	2	3	3	1	4
63	Portland to Damascus	30,025	41-60%	10%	3	2	4	2	3
64	Portland to Oregon City	28,997	41-60%	24%	4	3	2	2	3
65	Tacoma St.	5,791	61-80%	18%	1	3	1	2	4
66	Johnson Creek Blvd.	10,631	21-40%	36%	3	3	2	2	5
67	Milwaukie to Clackamas TC	61,038	61-80%	13%	4	3	2	2	3
68	Clackamas TC to Damascus	41,320	21-40%	10%	3	2	3	2	3
69	SE 172nd	6,716	0-20%	4%	1	1	3	2	2
70	SE 222nd Dr	3,490	0-20%	3%	1	1	2	2	2
71	SE 242nd Ave	4,628	0-20%	9%	1	1	3	3	3
72	Clackamas Hwy	663	0-20%	20%	1	1	3	2	2
73	OHSU Loop	71,424	61-80%	3%	2	2	2	1	3
74	NW Everett	134,311	>80%	0%	1	1	2	1	1
75	NW Gleason	141,691	>80%	0%	1	1	2	1	1
76	NW Portland to Sauvie Island	52,810	61-80%	4%	2	2	1	2	3
77	12th and 11th couplet	105,308	>80%	2%	2	2	2	1	3
78	52nd to MLK via Columbia	11,123	41-60%	14%	2	3	4	1	1
79	Rosa Parks Lombard	24,025	61-80%	2%	1	2	3	1	3
80	Vancouver/Williams	66,876	>80%	1%	1	2	4	1	2
81	Mississippi/Albina	26,343	>80%	7%	2	3	3	2	1
82	Swan Island to St John's Brid	25,530	61-80%	16%	3	3	3	1	3
B-1	N 1st Ave.	37,251	>80%	3%	2	4	4	1	1
B-10	SW Stafford Rd.	5,474	61-80%	16%	1	2	1	3	1
B-11	5th/Warner Milne/Beavercreek Rd.	19,211	41-60%	21%	3	3	2	2	2
B-12	SE 155th/Milmain	13,510	41-60%	35%	3	4	5	1	3
B-13	SE 242nd/SE Hogan	20,095	41-60%	6%	2	3	5	1	1
B-14	Sandy River to Springwater Connection	11,275	21-40%	9%	2	1	2	2	1
B-2	NW Evergreen	92,202	0-20%	3%	3	4	2	1	1
B-3	NE 25th/SE 32nd	57,810	21-40%	0%	1	3	5	1	1
B-4	SW 206th	60,936	41-60%	7%	4	4	3	1	2
B-5	SW Brockman/SW Beard	22,950	41-60%	2%	1	5	1	1	2
B-6	SW Walnut	23,415	41-60%	4%	2	4	1	1	2
B-7	SW Tualatin Sherwood Rd.	49,440	41-60%	2%	2	4	2	1	1
B-8	SW Scholls Ferry Rd.	17,218	41-60%	22%	3	4	1	2	2
B-9	SW Dosch Rd.	4,700	21-40%	32%	2	2	1	2	5

Note - Corridors identified with a "B" are potential new regional bicycle parkways. All regional bicycle parkways are also regional pedestrian corridors.

Regional Trails

					Access		Equity	Safety	
Trail #	Name	Total Population (including 1/2 mile buffer)	% of Population with Access (Existing Conditions)	% of Population with Increased Access	Access Score (higher score = more people with access)	Cost per Person with Increased Access (higher score = lower cost)	% of Census Tracts with Above Average Underserved Populations	New sidewalks per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)	New crossings per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)
1	Council Creek Trail	81,954	41-60%	3%	3	2	5	2	2
2	Highway 47 Trail	34,956	61-80%	12%	4	3	5	1	1
3	Rock Creek Trail	133,845	21-40%	8%	5	4	2	2	5
4	Beaverton Creek Trail	123,540	61-80%	14%	5	5	5	1	5
5	Pearl-Keeler Powerline Trail	36,132	21-40%	18%	4	4	3	2	5
6	Cooper Mountain Trail	20,730	0-20%	1%	1	1	2	2	2
7	Bronson Creek Greenway	70,365	61-80%	10%	4	5	2	2	2
8	Waterhouse Trail	94,353	41-60%	4%	3	4	3	1	2
9	Westside Trail	154,942	41-60%	8%	5	4	3	2	5
10	Tualatin River Greenway Trail	82,489	21-40%	9%	5	3	2	1	3
11	Ice Age Tonquin Trail	144,125	21-40%	8%	5	4	2	1	2
12	Fanno Creek Greenway	167,470	41-60%	14%	5	5	3	1	2
13	Kruse Way Path	52,761	41-60%	9%	4	4	3	1	1
14	Highway 217 Trail	91,560	41-60%	10%	5	5	5	2	2
15	Hwy 26 Bike Path/Sunset Transit Center Trail	68,013	21-40%	15%	5	4	1	1	2
16	River to River Trail	2,805	21-40%	27%	2	2	2	1	1
17	Lake Oswego to West Linn Trail	8,726	41-60%	9%	2	2	1	1	2
18	Lake Oswego Willamette River Greenway Trail	10,366	61-80%	13%	2	2	2	2	1
19	Hillsdale to Lake Oswego Trail	13,892	61-80%	16%	3	2	1	1	2
20	Red Electric Trail	29,634	61-80%	20%	4	3	1	1	5
21	Terwilliger Trail	60,227	61-80%	5%	3	2	1	1	5
22	Marquam Trail	23,726	0-20%	4%	2	2	1	2	3
23	I-405 Trail	52,644	>80%	1%	1	1	3	2	2
24	Goose Hollow Trail	59,910	>80%	1%	1	1	2	2	3
25	Portland to Lake Oswego Willamette Greenway Trail	9,864	61-80%	11%	2	2	2	2	4
26	Southwest Portland Willamette Greenway Trail	116,376	>80%	3%	3	3	3	2	5
27	Northwest Portland Willamette Greenway Trail	76,669	61-80%	5%	3	3	2	2	5
28	Wildwood Trail	203	0-20%	2%	1	1	1	1	1
29	St. Johns Bridge Trail	3,081	>80%	0%	1	1	1	2	2
30	North Portland Willamette Greenway	71,315	61-80%	7%	4	3	2	1	5
31	Columbia Slough Trail	59,332	21-40%	16%	5	2	5	2	5
32	Peninsula Crossing Trail	4,531	61-80%	6%	1	2	4	2	3
33	Marine Drive Trail	40,959	0-20%	11%	4	2	2	1	3
34	I-5 BridgeTrail	2,693	41-60%	36%	2	2	2	1	2
35	Southeast Portland Willamette Greenway	84,657	>80%	2%	2	2	2	1	1
36	Milwaukie LRT Trail	34,434	>80%	11%	4	3	1	1	5
37	Sullivan's Gulch Trail	84,672	>80%	3%	3	2	2	3	4
38	Springwater Corridor	37,821	41-60%	23%	5	3	3	1	5
39	Trolley Trail	25,432	61-80%	29%	4	4	2	2	1
40	Clackamas River Greenway Trail	2,288	61-80%	11%	1	2	3	2	1
41	North Clackamas Greenway	30,213	21-40%	13%	4	3	2	3	5
42	Willamette River Bridges	125,860	>80%	2%	3	2	3	2	5

Regional Trails

					Access		Equity	Safety	
Trail #	Name	Total Population (including 1/2 mile buffer)	% of Population with Access (Existing Conditions)	% of Population with Increased Access	Access Score (higher score = more people with access)	Cost per Person with Increased Access (higher score = lower cost)	% of Census Tracts with Above Average Underserved Populations	New sidewalks per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)	New crossings per mile of barrier streets (higher score = greater potential safety benefit)
43	I-205 Corridor	92,962	41-60%	21%	5	3	4	1	5
44	Phillips Creek Trail	23,165	41-60%	17%	3	4	3	1	2
45	Oregon City Loop	19,077	21-40%	24%	4	2	1	1	2
46	Lake Oswego to Milwaukie Trail	7,201	61-80%	19%	2	3	2	1	2
47	Sunrise MultiUse Path	16,098	0-20%	3%	1	1	3	1	3
48	East Buttes Power Line Corridor Trail	12,515	21-40%	15%	3	2	3	2	2
49	Mt. Scott/Scouter Mountain Trails	44,174	21-40%	9%	4	2	4	1	5
50	Gresham Butte Saddle Trails	5,409	0-20%	2%	1	1	2	2	1
51	Kelley Creek Trail	3,814	0-20%	10%	1	1	3	1	1
52	Damascus Trails	11,453	0-20%	7%	2	1	2	2	1
53	Cazadero Trail	1,707	0-20%	4%	1	1	2	1	1
54	Gresham / Fairview Trail	19,073	21-40%	13%	3	3	5	1	5
55	I-84 Bike Path	20,443	0-20%	9%	3	3	3	2	2
56	MAX Path	26,201	>80%	4%	2	4	5	2	3
57	Sandy River Connections	5,714	0-20%	0%	1	1	2	2	3
58	Beaver Creek Canyon Trail	9,060	41-60%	15%	2	2	2	1	1
59	Kelly Creek Greenway Trails	8,564	21-40%	12%	2	2	2	1	2