

FRAMEWORK and PROCESS

7

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides background information about the requirements and process for the Transportation System Plan (TSP). It summarizes the two phases of the TSP, provides the policy and regulatory framework, and discusses the review process.

PHASES OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN

The TSP was developed in two phases.

Phase I

Phase I began in January 1995. Its purpose was to update the transportation policies and street classifications contained in the Transportation Element (TE) of the Comprehensive Plan and to incorporate the newly adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans. City Council adopted Phase I on May 22, 1996 (ordinance 170136), with an effective date of June 21, 1996.

The policies of the TE were extensively amended to be consistent with the state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and to incorporate new policies developed as part of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans. These changes include:

- Policy 6.6, Urban Form, was strengthened and clarified to address connectivity.
- Policy 6.29, Freight Intermodal Facilities and Freight Activity Areas, was strengthened to reflect the importance of freight movement to the local economy.
- New policies included Policy 6.18, Adequacy of Transportation Facilities; Policy 6.2, Public Involvement; Policy 6.3, Transportation Education; and Policy 6.29, Street Vacations.
- The new pedestrian and bicycle policies reflect the City's commitment to improve the physical environment for pedestrians and bicyclists and encourage walking and biking as alternatives to the automobile.
- Changes to street classifications and classification descriptions were made to reflect new pedestrian and bicycle networks, including the addition of several pedestrian districts that reflect action items in the Outer Southeast Community Plan.
- Other street classification changes were made to correct errors or make minor adjustments to the traffic, transit, and truck networks.

Phase 1 also updated other goals of the Comprehensive Plan, in addition to the TE policies and street classifications:

- Several policies under Goal 2, Urban Development, were amended to better address minimum density requirements near transit corridors and light rail stations and to support infill and redevelopment throughout the City.
- Goal 11, Public Facilities, was amended to better reflect how improvements are made to the right-of-way.

Phase II

Phase II began immediately after Phase I was adopted, and focused on completing the remaining elements of the TSP. Although Phase I added and amended many TE policies, some policy issues were unresolved and were addressed in Phase II. These included addressing the impact of traffic calming on emergency response; parking; access management; and consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Street classifications were revised, and many changes to achieve consistency with the RTP modal maps were necessary during this phase. These changes include:

- Reorganization of transportation policies into topic areas.
- Addition of street design classifications and descriptions consistent with the RTP.
- Incorporation of emergency response policies and classifications developed through the Emergency Response Classification Study.
- Street connectivity policies, standards and maps consistent with RTP requirements.
- Incorporation of the RTP level-of-service standards.
- Development of a transportation system improvement list consistent with the TPR and RTP.
- Development of a transportation finance plan consistent with the TPR.
- Development of system performance measures and benchmarks consistent with the TPR.

POLICY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

State of Oregon

The Oregon State Legislature mandated comprehensive planning in Oregon with the adoption of Senate Bill 100 (ORS Chapter 197) in 1973. This legislation created the state Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), which adopted 19 statewide planning goals and associated guidelines in 1974 (effective January 1, 1975).

Under state law, comprehensive plans and any ordinances or regulations that implement the plans must comply with applicable statewide planning goals. Fourteen of the 19 statewide goals apply to Portland.

Because the TSP is part of the City's Comprehensive Plan, it must comply with all applicable state goals, with findings to that effect included in the adopting ordinance. Two statewide goals are directly applicable to the TSP: Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services, and Goal 12, Transportation.

Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services

State Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services, is “[t]o plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.”

The goal's intent is to ensure that urban and rural development is guided and supported by the appropriate public facilities and services. Goal 11 requires jurisdictions to provide for key facilities in their comprehensive plans. The goal contains a set of planning guidelines for coordinated public facilities planning that will be a major determinant of the carrying capacity of the air, land, and water resources in an area. Implementation guidelines are also included for capital improvement programming that will achieve the desired types and levels of public facilities and services in urban, urbanizable, and rural areas. The guidelines also recommend that the level of key facilities that can be provided should be a principal factor in planning for various densities and types of urban and rural land uses.

State Requirements of OAR 660-11

The state requirements for public facilities planning became much more specific in 1983 when the Legislature adopted HB 2295, which amended ORS 197 to add a new section (Economic Development) that includes the following directive:

197.712(2) By the adoption of new goals or rules, or the application, interpretation or amendment of existing goals or rules, the commission shall implement all of the following:

- (e) A city or county shall develop and adopt a public facility plan for areas within an urban growth boundary containing a population greater than 25,000 persons. The public facility plan shall include rough cost estimates for public projects needed to provide sewer, water and transportation for the land uses contemplated in the comprehensive plan and land use regulations. Project timing and financing provisions of public facility plans shall not be considered land use decisions.

Based on this directive, LCDC adopted a new administrative rule on public facilities planning: OAR 660 Division 11. This administrative rule includes definitions, procedures, and standards for developing, adopting, and amending a public facilities plan. Section 660-11-005(7)(d) outlines specific transportation elements to be included in the public facilities plan (PFP), as follows:

- (a) Transportation
 - (A) Freeway system, if planned for in the acknowledged comprehensive plan
 - (B) Arterial system

- (C) Significant collector system
- (D) Bridge system (those on the Federal Bridge inventory)
- (E) Mass transit facilities if planned for in the acknowledged comprehensive plan, including purchase of new buses if total fleet is less than 200 buses, rail lines or transit service to major transportation corridors and park-and-ride stations
- (F) Airport facilities as identified in current airport master plans
- (G) Bicycle paths if planned for in the acknowledged comprehensive plan.

Section 660-11-010(1) requires the PFP to contain:

- (a) An inventory and general assessment of the condition of all the significant public facility systems which support the land uses designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan;
- (b) A list of the significant public facility projects, which are to support the land uses designated in the acknowledged comprehensive plan. Public facility project descriptions or specifications of these projects as necessary;
- (c) Rough cost estimates of each public facility project;
- (d) A map or written description of each public facility project's general location or service area;
- (e) Policy statement(s) or urban growth management agreement identifying the provider of each public facility system. If there is more than one provider with the authority to provide the system within the area covered by the public facility plan, then the provider of each project shall be designated;
- (f) An estimate of when each facility project will be needed; and
- (g) A discussion of the provider's existing funding mechanisms and the ability of these and possible new mechanisms to fund the development of each public facility project or system.

Status of the Public Facilities Plan

The City adopted a public facilities plan for transportation on April 5, 1989 (ordinance 161770). Since adoption, the PFP has been used to develop the capital improvement program (CIP), which identifies two years of capital projects. The PFP has not been updated or amended since its initial adoption in 1989.

Relationship of the PFP to the TPR and TSP

Section 660-1200 of the TPR states that "[t]ransportation system plans adopted pursuant to this Division fulfill the requirements for public facilities planning required under ORS 197.712(2)(e), Goal 11 and OAR Chapter 660, Division 11, as they relate to transportation facilities." The TSP will, therefore, update and replace the City's public facilities plan for transportation.

Goal 12, Transportation

State Goal 12, Transportation, is "[t]o provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system." The goal and its accompanying text (below) has the force of law and is mandatory.

A transportation plan shall:

- (1) consider all modes of transportation including mass transit, air, water, pipeline, rail, highway, bicycle and pedestrian;
- (2) be based upon an inventory of local, regional and state transportation needs;
- (3) consider the differences in social consequences that would result from utilizing differing combinations of transportation modes;
- (4) avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation;
- (5) minimize adverse social, economic and environmental impacts and costs;
- (6) conserve energy;
- (7) meet the needs of the transportation disadvantaged by improving transportation services;
- (8) facilitate the flow of goods and services so as to strengthen the local and regional economy; and
- (9) conform with local and regional comprehensive land use plans.

Each plan shall include a provision for transportation as a key facility.

The planning guidelines for Goal 11 emphasize the use of existing facilities and rights-of-way, and support high-density developments with mass transit rather than auto facilities. The implementation guidelines recommend that transportation facilities direct urban expansion into suitable areas, and that transportation decisions should identify and take into account the positive and negative impacts on local land use patterns, environmental quality, energy use and resources, existing transportation system, and fiscal resources.

State Requirements of OAR 660-12 (Transportation Planning Rule)

LCDC adopted the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) in 1991 to carry out state Goal 12, Transportation. The TPR is spelled out in OAR 660, Division 12, Transportation Planning. The TPR requires the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), metropolitan planning organizations, and local governments to provide a system of transportation facilities and improvements sufficient to meet identified state, regional, and local transportation needs and to

assure that the planned transportation system supports a pattern of travel and land use in urban areas which will avoid the air pollution, traffic and livability problems faced by other areas of the country.

GENERAL TPR REQUIREMENTS

The TPR has general requirements for the development of a Transportation System Plan (TSP). When completed, the TSP will take the place of the public facilities plan for transportation required by Goal 11 and state statutes [ORS 197.712(2)(e)]. A local TSP “shall establish a system of transportation facilities and services adequate to meet identified local transportation needs and shall be consistent with regional TSPs and adopted elements of the state TSP.” The TSP must be coordinated with affected state and federal agencies, local governments, special districts, and private providers of transportation services. The TSP must be adopted as part of the City’s comprehensive plan, except that transportation financing programs may be adopted as a supporting document.

A TSP must be designed to achieve the following objectives for reducing automobile vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita (regionwide):

- (a) no increase within 10 years of adoption
- (b) a 10-percent reduction within 20 years of adoption
- (c) an additional 5-percent reduction within 30 years

SPECIFIC TPR REQUIREMENTS

A TSP must include a determination of transportation needs, including the needs of the transportation disadvantaged and the needs for movement of goods and services to support industrial and commercial development. The determination of needs is based on population and employment forecasts for a 20-year period and on the assumption that there will be reduced reliance on the automobile. A TSP must also evaluate transportation alternatives, addressing improvements to existing facilities or services, new facilities and services, transportation system management measures, demand management measures, and the implications of a 'no-build' alternative.

Section 660-12-020(2) requires modal plans for streets; public transit; bicycles and pedestrians; air, rail, water, and pipelines; transportation system management and transportation demand management; and parking.

The street, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modal plans must include:

- An inventory and general assessment of existing and committed transportation facilities and services by function, type, capacity, and condition.

The modal plan for streets must describe a system of arterials and collectors and other important local street connections that shows:

- Extensions of existing streets
- Connections to existing or planned streets
- Connections to neighborhood destinations

The public transit plan must:

- Describe public transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged and identify service inadequacies
- Describe intercity bus and passenger rail services and identify the location of terminals
- Identify existing and planned transit truck routes, exclusive transit ways, terminals and major transfer stations, and park-and-ride stations

The bike and pedestrian plans must show:

- A network of bicycle and pedestrian routes
- A list of facility improvements

The air, rail, water, and pipeline transportation plan must identify where public use airports, mainline and branchline railroads and railroad facilities, port facilities, and major regional pipelines and terminals are located or planned.

Modal plans must be developed for transportation system management and demand management and for parking, including minimum and maximum parking requirements and measures to reduce parking spaces per capita by 10 percent over the 20-year plan timeframe.

Sections 660-12-020(2)(I) and 660-12040 require the TSP to include a transportation financing program, which must contain:

- (a) A list of planned transportation facilities and major improvements
- (b) A general estimate of the timing for planned transportation facilities and major improvements
- (c) Determination of rough cost estimates for the transportation facilities and major improvements identified in the TSP

The financing program must also discuss the facility provider's existing funding mechanisms and the ability of these and possible new mechanisms to fund the development of each transportation facility and major improvement. The financing program is intended to encourage infill and redevelopment of urban lands before supporting facilities that would cause premature development of urbanizable areas.

Section 660-12-045 of the TPR specifies that the TSP process must include the adoption of policies and land use regulations to implement the TSP. Phase I of the TSP fulfills elements of this requirement. Some of the TPR requirements were already part of City ordinances--for example, protecting airports with height and noise regulations. Further amendments were partially completed in November 6, 1996, when City Council adopted "Interim Implementation of the Transportation Planning Rule." These regulations address requirements for notification, orientation of buildings and parking to transit lines, and bicycle parking. Additional land use regulation amendments to address street connectivity were adopted as part of the revision of Title 34: Land Divisions of the Municipal Code. The TSP includes additional implementation measures to address access as required by 660-12-045(3)(b) and (c).

Jurisdictions must establish interim benchmarks for five-year intervals over the planning period to measure how effectively the TSP is reducing VMT and increasing the use of alternative modes of transportation. . If the interim benchmarks are not met, the TSP must be amended to include new or additional efforts to meet the TPR requirements.

TPR TIMELINES

Following completion of the regional TSP, local jurisdictions have one year to complete their TSPs. Metro's original deadline for completing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was May 1995, and the City of Portland's TSP was due in May 1996. The RTP was completed August 2000. Completion of the TSP is now scheduled for September 2002.

Oregon Transportation Plan

The Oregon Transportation Committee adopted the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) on September 15, 1992. The OTP is intended to meet ORS 184.618(1), which requires the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to "develop and maintain a state transportation policy and a comprehensive, long-range plan for a multimodal transportation system for the state which encompasses economic efficiency, orderly economic development, safety and

environmental quality.” The OTP must also be consistent with the TPR regarding development of a state transportation system plan.

The OTP contains a vision, goals, policies and actions, a preferred transportation network and services, and an implementation section. Since adoption of the OTP, modal or topic plans have also been adopted. These include the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, the Highway Plan, and various corridor plans, including a plan for Highway 30 – St. Helens Road. Each modal plan also contains a set of goals and policies.

OTP Requirements

Policy 4K, Local Government Responsibilities, of the OTP states that “[i]t is the policy of the State of Oregon that:

- Local governments shall define a transportation system of local significance adequate to meet identified needs for the movement of people and goods to local destinations within their jurisdictions; and
- Local government transportation plans shall be consistent with regional transportation plans and adopted elements of the state transportation system plan.

The OTP establishes performance standards or minimum levels of service for motor vehicles on state-controlled facilities. These standards are found in Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Standards, of the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP). Tables in Policy 1F establish maximum volume-to-capacity ratios for state facilities. The ratios “must be used for deficiency analyses of state highways.” In December 2000, however, Metro requested that the OTC substitute the level-of-service measures from the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan for the state standards. The OTC approved the request as an amendment to the OHP.

Relationship of the OTP to the TSP

The OTP states that local TSPs must be consistent with adopted portions of the state transportation system plan. Oregon statutes do not give the OTC authority to impose OTP goals, policies, and performance guidelines on other than state agencies. The TPR does require local TSPs to be consistent with adopted portions of the state transportation system plan (i.e., the OTP and its modal/topic plans). The OTP is generally implemented through the coordination of local and regional jurisdictions with ODOT.

Regional (Metro)

This section gives an overview of the regional transportation policies and requirements that address regional transportation issues.

Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives

The Metro Council adopted Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) in 1991 and amended them in 1995. The RUGGOs provide land use goals and objectives for the region, replacing those previously adopted by the Columbia Region Association of Governments.

The RUGGOs include two principal goals:

- Goal I addresses the planning process Metro uses to coordinate regional growth management issues, including the role of functional plans.
- Goal II addresses urban form:
 - Goal II.1 addresses the natural environment
 - Goal II.2 addresses the built environment, including transportation facilities
 - Goal II.3 addresses growth management
 - Goal II.4 describes the Region 2040 Growth Concept and concept map

The RUGGOs are not directly applicable to local plans and local land use decisions. However, they are the building blocks that shape the Regional Framework Plan and its implementing functional plans.

Goal II.2: Built Environment/Transportation

Policy II.2: Built Environment, addresses how development in the region should occur, including “the provision of infrastructure and critical public services concurrent with the pace of urban growth” and “the creation of a balanced transportation system, less dependent on the private automobile, supported by both the use of emerging technology and the location of jobs, housing, commercial activity, parks and open space.”

Objective 18 states that public services and facilities, including transportation, should be planned and developed to minimize costs, maximize service efficiencies, maintain or enhance environmental quality, keep pace with growth and achieve planned service levels, and shape and direct growth to meet local and regional objectives.

Objective 19, Transportation, addresses how the regional system should be developed. The system will: i) reduce reliance on a single mode of transportation, ii) recognize and protect freight movement, iii) provide adequate levels of mobility, iv) encourage energy efficiency, v) support a balance of jobs and housing, vi) recognize financial constraints, vii) minimize environmental impacts, viii) reward and reinforce pedestrian activity, and x) identify and protect intermodal transfer points.

System priorities are to meet the mobility needs of mixed-use urban centers through a combination of intensifying land uses and increasing transportation system capacity, while minimizing negative impacts on environmental quality and on “where and how people live, work and plan.” Environmental considerations should include reducing energy consumption and air pollution through increased use of transit, telecommuting, zero-emission vehicles, carpools, vanpools, bicycles and walking; maintaining the region’s air quality; and reducing negative impacts on parks, public open space, wetlands, and neighborhood livability. Objective 19.3 seeks a transportation balance that reduces automobile dependency, increases the use of transit, and encourages bicycle and pedestrian movement through the location and design of land uses.

Region 2040 Growth Concept

LCDC adopted the 2040 Growth Concept in December 1995 as part of the RUGGOs (Goal II.4). In December 1996, LCDC acknowledged amended RUGGOs, including the 2040 Growth Concept text and map.

The 2040 Growth Concept states the preferred form of long-term regional growth and development. It includes a general approach to approximately where and how much the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) should be expanded, what ranges of density are estimated to accommodate projected growth, and which areas should be protected as open space. It also designates design types, such as central city, regional center, town center, and main street.

The 2040 Growth Concept responds to the future vision required by the Metro Charter and described in Objective 9 of the RUGGOs. Implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept is also part of the region's efforts to comply with federal clean air requirements by producing more transportation-efficient land use patterns.

Regional Framework Plan

The Metro Charter, approved in 1992, identifies specific requirements for Metro's planning programs, including adoption of the Regional Framework Plan. The Metro Charter requires the Regional Framework Plan to be developed with the consultation and advice of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

The Regional Framework Plan was adopted in 1997 and contains policies that implement the Region 2040 Growth Concept. These policies are based on federal, state, and regional mandates as well as on the RUGGOs. Similar to Portland's Comprehensive Plan, the Regional Framework Plan lays out broad guidance in a variety of areas for which it has jurisdiction.

The Regional Framework Plan's policies are binding on Metro, but are not binding on local jurisdictions and do not directly regulate local plans. The plan has no direct relationship to the City's TSP and does not impose any requirements. It is, however, the basis for the development of functional plans, which do impose requirements on local jurisdictions, and is therefore important for understanding functional plan requirements and guidelines.

Metro can regulate local plans only through specific implementing ordinances. Elements of the Framework Plan that are intended to change local plans are included in functional plans that define exact standards and procedures for specific jurisdictions. State legislation (ORS 268) establishes functional plans as Metro's legal mechanism to require changes in comprehensive plans. It is through adopted functional plans that regional policies directly affect Portland's Comprehensive Plan and implementing ordinances.

The Framework Plan consists of several elements, including a description of the Region 2040 Growth Concept design types, and policies relating to land use; transportation; parks, open spaces and recreational facilities; water supply and management; regional natural hazards; Clark County; management; and implementation.

2040 Design Types

The 2040 Growth Concept is designed to accommodate approximately 720,000 additional residents and 350,000 additional jobs over the life of the plan. Fundamental to the Growth Concept is a multimodal transportation system that assures mobility of people and goods throughout the region. Mixed-use centers inside the UGB are also a key component of the Growth Concept. The 2040 design types and associated transportation elements are described below.

Portland's **Central City** is the region's largest market area, employment center and cultural hub. Under the Growth Concept, downtown Portland will continue to contain approximately 20 percent of regional employment. Densities will increase from today's 150 people per acre to about 250 people per acre. Improvements to the transit system network, development of a multimodal street system, and maintenance of regional through-routes will provide mobility to and from the City center.

Regional centers, such as Gateway, serve large market areas outside the Central City and are connected to it by light rail transit and highways. These regional centers will become the focus of compact development, redevelopment, and high-quality transit service; contain multimodal street networks; and act as major nodes along regional through-routes. From the current 24 people per acre, the centers will grow to about 60 people per acre. In addition to light rail connecting to the Central City, a dense network of multimodal arterial and collector streets will tie regional centers to surrounding neighborhoods and other centers. The street design within regional centers is planned to encourage public transportation, bicycle, and pedestrian travel, while also accommodating auto and freight movement.

Smaller **town centers** are connected to each regional center by roadways and transit lines. Town centers such as St. Johns, Hollywood, Lents, and Hillsdale will provide local shopping, employment, recreational and cultural opportunities within a local market area. The 1990 density of an average town center will nearly double, from 23 to about 40 persons per acre.

Station communities are nodes of development centered around a light-rail or high-capacity transit station that features a high-quality pedestrian and bicycle environment. They provide for the highest densities outside centers, averaging around 45 persons per acre within approximately one-half mile from the station stop.

Main streets, linear in nature, and neighborhood centers, nodal in character, are typical of how the City has grown in the past. They are expected to grow from 1990 levels of about 36 people per acre to about 39 people per acre. Main streets and neighborhood centers are served by high-quality transit and are characterized by neighborhood and special shopping areas. When several main streets occur within a few blocks of one another, they may serve as a dispersed town center, such as the main street areas of Belmont, Hawthorne, and Division. Main streets feature street designs that emphasize pedestrian activity, public transit, and bicycle travel.

Corridors are located along good-quality transit lines and have average densities of about 25 people per acre. They provide a place for densities that are somewhat higher than today and feature a high-quality pedestrian environment and convenient access to transit. Densities will average about 25 persons per acre. Some corridors will be continuous, narrow bands of higher-intensity development along arterial roads; others will be more nodal, with small centers at major intersections. The corridors will also emphasize a high-quality bicycle and pedestrian environment, especially at nodes.

Neighborhoods are a key component of the Growth Concept and fall into two categories. Inner neighborhoods include areas such as Portland where access to employment is good. Average lot sizes will be slightly smaller than today to accommodate approximately 14 persons per acre. Outer neighborhoods are farther from large employment centers and will be characterized by larger lot sizes and lower densities than inner neighborhoods. Some existing neighborhoods are characterized by a lack of street connections, which discourages

walking and bicycling. The Growth Concept envisions neighborhoods with good internal connectivity, as well as connectivity to other neighborhoods and to the arterial system.

Industrial areas are locations set aside primarily for industrial activities. Other supporting uses, including some retail uses, are allowed if limited to sizes and locations intended to serve the industrial uses. Access to the industrial areas and intermodal facilities are centered on rail, the regional freeway system, public transportation, bikeways, and a network of arterials.

Employment areas mix various types of employment and include some residential development. Overall densities are envisioned to be about 20 people per acre. Employment areas are expected to include some limited retail uses to serve the needs of people working or living in, or in close proximity to, the employment area.

Transportation Policies

Chapter 2 of the Regional Framework Plan addresses transportation. The transportation policies in the Regional Framework Plan comply with and replace the air quality and transportation objectives in the RUGGOs. Implementation of the policies is through the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and the RTP, which have requirements for local jurisdictions. Chapter 1 of the RTP also contains the transportation policies of the Regional Framework Plan, along with objectives, performance measures, project identification and funding criteria. Transportation policies in Chapter 2 of the RTP address a large variety of issues, including intergovernmental coordination, consistency between land use and transportation planning, public involvement, street design, water and air quality, public transportation, demand management, and funding.

Other Framework Policies

Other chapters of the Regional Framework Plan include policies that address land use; parks, open spaces and recreational facilities; water; regional natural hazards; and management. The parks, open spaces and recreational facilities policies include a policy that addresses the desire to identify a regional trails system to be included in the RTP.

Urban Growth Management Functional Plan

The Metro Council adopted the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) on November 21, 1996. The purpose of the UGMFP is to require early implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept prior to adoption of the Framework Plan. The UGMFP states:

Early implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept is intended to take advantage of opportunities now and avoid use of land inconsistent with the long-term growth policy. The MPAC, as well as the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Water Resource Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC), have made recommendations that are the basis for this functional plan. All of the elements considered by MPAC, JPACT and WRPAC were deemed by the Metro Council to be matters of metropolitan concern that have significant impact upon the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area.

The regional policies contained in the UGMFP recommend (in some cases) and require (in other cases) changes to city and county comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances.

'Shall' or other directive words are used with requirements. The local comprehensive plan changes and related actions, including implementing regulations, must be adopted within 24 months of the effective date of the UGMFP (February 21, 1999). The UGMFP is structured so that, in some instances, jurisdictions can choose to meet either a performance standard or a prescriptive standard. The intent is to allow local flexibility, although there are some mandatory requirements that apply to all cities and counties.

Title 2: Regional Parking Policy

The TPR calls for reducing parking spaces per capita by restricting construction of new parking spaces and redeveloping existing parking to other uses. Excessive parking can result in less efficient land usage and lower floor-area ratios. Where transit is provided or other non-auto modes are convenient, less parking can be provided and still allow accessibility and mobility. Fewer auto trips can reduce congestion and increase air quality. The federally mandated air quality plan adopted by the State relies on the 2040 Growth Concept fully achieving its transportation objectives, including reducing vehicle trips and parking spaces per capita through the establishment of minimum and maximum parking ratios.

Cities and counties are required to amend their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations to meet or exceed standards established in the UGMFP Plan for minimum and maximum parking ratios. The regional parking ratios table included in the UGMFP establishes parking ratios based on the availability of good transit service by dividing the region in two zones. Some parking may be exempted from the ratios, such as paid parking (at market rate), carpool parking, and parking in structures. The maximum parking ratios apply to most uses, but residential uses, including hotels and motels, are exempt. Cities and counties must also monitor the number and location of newly developed parking spaces and show compliance with the minimum and maximum parking standards.

Portland City Council adopted new minimum and maximum parking ratios to comply with Title 2 requirements on October 11, 2000 (ordinance no. 174980). Chapter 6: Implementation Strategies and Regulations provides additional discussion of this action.

Title 2 was amended as part of the adoption of the RTP in 2000. Two new requirements were added for local jurisdictions. Cities and counties must allow the designation of residential parking districts in their comprehensive plans or codes. Portland already does this. A requirement was added, consistent with language in the TPR, to ensure that large parking lots (greater than three acres in area) include 'street-like features' along major driveways, including curbs, sidewalks, and street trees or plant strips. Chapter 6 of the TSP presents Portland's approach to fulfilling this requirement.

Title 6: Regional Accessibility

Title 6 was superseded by the RTP when it was adopted in 2000. All of the requirements of Title 6 have been incorporated into Chapter 6 of the RTP.

Regional Transportation Plan (Transportation Functional Plan)

The RTP is intended to implement the 2040 Growth Concept and is Metro's functional plan for transportation. It is a 20-year blueprint for making decisions about transportation in the region. The Metro Council adopted the RTP on August 10, 2000, following extensive public input and the advice of JPACT and MPAC.

As a condition for receiving federal funding for transportation projects, federal regulations require each urbanized area to have a transportation plan consistent with the planned development of the area. Metro, along with ODOT and Tri-Met, are the agencies designated to carry out the federal transportation and related air quality planning requirements. Metro must adopt a transportation plan at least every three years, and a Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) at least every other year to identify the federally funded transportation projects to be implemented.

The RTP, like the City's TSP, must also be consistent with the State transportation plan and the requirements of the TPR. Some parts of the RTP, such as its policies and street classifications, are included in the Regional Framework Plan.

Regional Transportation Vision

The regional transportation vision seeks to protect the region's livability by defining a transportation system that:

- Anticipates the region's current and future travel needs
- Accommodates an appropriate mix of all forms of travel
- Supports key elements of the 2040 Growth Concept through strategic investments in the region's transportation system

The RTP includes the following table, which establishes funding priorities based on 2040 design types.

Table 7.1
Hierarchy of 2040 Design Types

<i>Primary Land Use Components</i>	<i>Secondary Land Use Components</i>
Central City	Station communities
Regional centers	Town centers
Industrial areas	Main streets
Intermodal facilities	Corridors
<i>Other Urban Land Use Components</i>	<i>Land Use Components outside the Urban Area</i>
Employment areas	Urban reserves
Inner neighborhoods	Rural reserves
Outer neighborhoods	Neighboring cities
	Green corridors

Regional Transportation Policies

The RTP policies and objectives address public process, connecting land use and transportation, equal access and safety, protecting the environment, designing the transportation system, managing the transportation system, and implementing the transportation system. The policies are summarized in the relevant modal and management plans in Chapter 5 of the TSP.

Transportation System Design

Similar to Portland's TE and TSP, the RTP is based on a multimodal system of regional streets. It is different from the TSP because it focuses only on streets of regional significance. The regional motor vehicle system provides access to the Central City, regional centers, industrial areas, and intermodal facilities, with an emphasis on mobility between these destinations. The hierarchy of motor vehicle classifications is from principal arterials, which include freeways and highways, to major arterials, minor arterials, and collectors of regional significance. This last category was added with the update of the RTP to include collectors that carry significant amounts of regional traffic and that need to be part of the regional system. Collectors of regional significance can be a single street or a collection of streets that carry some amount of regional traffic, while also functioning as neighborhood collectors. The design of the streets may be the same as other neighborhood collectors, including having traffic calming design features if needed.

The public transportation classifications have also been changed to reflect the increased importance of high-speed transit in accommodating growth. The regional public transportation system consists of light rail and street car, rapid bus, frequent bus, and regional bus. All of the primary transit network service is intended to have high frequencies throughout the day, varying in the length of trip served and the level of passenger amenities provided. The network also includes commuter rail, intercity high speed rail, intercity air passenger terminals, intercity rail passenger terminals, intercity bus passenger terminals, transit centers, LRT stations, and major bus stops.

The regional freight system includes main roadway routes, road connectors, main railroad lines, and branch railroad lines and spur tracks. A number of freight facilities are also mapped: marine, railroad, air cargo, distribution facilities, truck terminals, and intermodal railyards.

The regional bicycle system has four categories of bike facilities: regional access bikeways, regional corridor on-street bikeways, regional corridor off-street bikeways, and community connectors.

The regional pedestrian system identifies pedestrian districts (mixed-use centers), which include the Central City, regional and town centers, and light rail stations; transit/mixed-use corridors; and multi-use facilities with pedestrian transportation functions.

In addition to these modal elements of the regional transportation system, Metro has added street design classifications, which recognize the link between transportation and land use in implementing the 2040 Growth Concept. Street design classifications are differentiated as throughways, which include freeways and highways; boulevards, which are differentiated as either regional or community and have high levels of facilities for pedestrian, bicycle, and

transit travel; Streets, which are also either regional or community level; and roads, which may be either urban or rural in character. The street design classifications also define potential boulevard intersections where special attention should be given to pedestrian movement.

Recommended Transportation Improvements

The RTP includes a project matrix showing transportation investments that are the most efficient way to use public funds to solve the region's transportation problems and implement the 2040 Growth Concept. (Chapter 13: Transportation and Land Use Alternatives provides more detail about RTP alternatives and the priority system. Chapter 14: Financial Plan has more detail about the financial aspects of the RTP.)

Implementation

Metro uses the RTP's list of projects to develop the MTIP. Chapter 14 provides additional information about the connection between regional and local financing of transportation projects.

Local jurisdictions have one year after adoption of the RTP to implement its requirements, which are summarized below.

Chapter 1: Regional Transportation Policy

Local jurisdictions must be consistent with the policies, objectives, motor vehicle level-of-service measure and modal targets, system maps, and functional classifications. The TSP policies and objectives and the level-of service matrix are included in Chapter 2: Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Some policies addressed by the RTP are in other policies of the Comprehensive Plan under Goal 7, Energy, and Goal 8, Environment. These policies are summarized on pages 17 through 19 of this chapter. Modal targets are included in Chapter 15: System Performance.

Chapter 6: Implementation

Sections of Chapter 6 of the RTP establish new and restate existing TPR requirements for local jurisdictions. In some cases, the RTP is more specific than the TPR requirements. Local TSPs must be in compliance with the following:

- Local jurisdictions must be consistent with the 2020 population and employment forecasts for the purpose of TSP development and analysis. These forecasts are based on the 2040 Growth Concept. Portland meets this requirement.
- Development of a conceptual new streets plan for vacant and redevelopable parcels of five acres or more and adoption into the comprehensive plan. (See Chapters 2 and 11 of the TSP.)
- Requirement for developers to provide a specific street plan map as a part of residential or mixed-use development. (See Chapter 6 of the TSP.)
- Consideration of narrow street designs and other local approaches to provide connectivity and support neighborhood livability. (See Chapters 2 and 6 of the TSP.)

- Development of alternative mode share targets for all 2040 Growth Concept land use design types, and strategies to achieve the targets. (See Chapters 4, 6, and 15 of the TSP.)
- Incorporation into comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances of the motor vehicle level-of-service policy for regional facilities contained in the RTP. (See Chapter 2 of the TSP.)
- Consideration of transportation system management, alternative modes, comprehensive plan map amendments, connectivity, and traffic calming prior to capacity improvements (other than those in the RTP) during system planning, corridor or area studies, and land use reviews. (See Chapters 2, 5 and 6 of the TSP.)
- Adoption of an approach for areas of special concern (as identified in the RTP) that either 1) adopts a set of performance measures, or 2) establishes an action plan. (See Chapters 4 and 10 of the TSP).
- Adoption of a transit system map consistent with the transit functional classifications in the RTP. (See Chapter 2 of the TSP.)
- Adoption of development code regulations to require orientation of retail, office, and institutional buildings at major transit stops. (See Chapter 6 of the TSP.)
- Provision for pedestrian crossings and street designs that respond to transit service. (See Chapters 2, 4, and 6 of the TSP.)
- Consideration of operational and design considerations during transportation project analysis, including transportation system management to address or preserve existing street capacity and street design policies, classifications, and design principles contained in the RTP. (See Chapter 2 of the TSP.)
- Consideration of system management and regional street design policies and guidelines during transportation project analysis. (See Chapters 2 and 6 of the TSP.)

Portland Comprehensive Plan

The Portland City Council adopted a Comprehensive Plan in 1980 that included goals, policies, objectives, and a plan map to guide the future development and redevelopment of the City. The plan was intended to be dynamic. Since its adoption, the goals, policies, and objectives have been amended to respond to new circumstances, special studies, new technology, and changes in state land use and transportation regulations.

The goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan provide the context and guidance for future City programs, major capital projects, and other funding decisions. They respond to existing needs and conditions and provide initial guidance for decision making over the next 20 years. State law requires major development decisions to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. For this reason, the goals and policies must be reviewed periodically and modified as necessary to respond to changing conditions.

Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan

The Transportation Element of the City of Portland's Comprehensive Plan includes transportation policies, street classification descriptions and maps, and district policies that are adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as other sections of the TE that are not adopted in the Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of the TE is to establish a framework within which transportation projects and plans are developed and implemented within Portland.

The TE is the policy portion of the TSP. The street classifications dictate what types of automobile, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, truck, and emergency response use should be emphasized on each street. The current use of the street may not match these functional classifications, but land use changes and transportation projects should not be approved unless they are consistent with the classifications of the affected streets.

The TE also addresses issues such as neighborhood livability, land use/transportation relationships, public transit and transit-oriented development, and increased opportunities for walking and bicycling.

The TE indicates what types of improvements are appropriate on various kinds of streets and in different areas of the City. Citizens, City staff, and other agencies use the TE to identify transportation problems, develop and evaluate projects, and review private development proposals that will affect the street system.

The TE is updated every five years as part of the update of the TSP.

The TE includes three goals and their associated policies and objectives:

- Goal 6, Transportation
- Goal 11B: Public Rights-of-Way
- Central City Transportation Management Plan Goal

Chapter 2 of the TSP contains the complete TE, along with explanatory text.

Transportation-Related Policies

While Goal 6 of the Comprehensive Plan contains most of the Comprehensive Plan's transportation policies, some transportation-related policies are also found in other chapters. These policies address the interaction between transportation and urban development, economic development, energy conservation, and public infrastructure, as summarized below.

Comprehensive Plan Goal 2: Urban Development

Goal 2 policies relevant to transportation are 2.12, Transit Corridors; 2.13, Auto-Oriented Commercial Development; 2.15, Living Closer to Work; 2.17, Transit Stations and Transit Centers; 2.18, Transit-Supportive Density; 2.19, Infill and Redevelopment; 2.24, Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan; and 2.25, Northwest Triangle District. The listed policies between 2.12 and 2.19 describe the ways in which land use can support transit use. Specifically, they call for minimum residential densities and a mixture of land uses along transit corridors and

at transit stations and centers. They also encourage transit-oriented development patterns along transit streets and at transit centers to enhance accessibility to transit. Policies 2.24 and 2.25 address specific areas of the City. Policy 2.24 calls for the preservation and enhancement of the scenic character of the Terwilliger Corridor. Policy 2.25 calls for efficient access and circulation in the Northwest Triangle District.

Comprehensive Plan Goal 3: Neighborhoods

Goal 3 policies relevant to transportation are 3.6, Neighborhood Plan; 3.8, Albina Community Plan Neighborhoods; and 3.9, Outer Southeast Community Plan Neighborhoods and Business Plan. Policy 3.6 calls for maintaining and enforcing neighborhood plans that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and adopted by City Council. Policies 3.8 and 3.9 call for including neighborhood plans developed as part of community plans in the Comprehensive Plan.

Community and neighborhood plans are the primary vehicles for updating the City's Comprehensive Plan and Comprehensive Plan Map. These planning efforts develop policies and objectives relating to a number of topics, including transportation, land use, and urban design, which are adopted into the Comprehensive Plan. They also involve a rezoning effort that updates the Comprehensive Plan Map. The transportation policies in these plans are supportive and consistent with the TE and, once adopted, become part of Portland's transportation policy. The plans also suggest possible changes in street classifications, which are considered in the development of the City's TSP.

For community planning purposes, the City is divided into eight districts to examine transportation and other broad issue areas. Neighborhood plans provide the focus to address specific problems or needs and guide neighborhoods as they change over time.

Three community plans have been completed to date, two with concurrent neighborhood and business plans:

- Central City Plan
- Albina Community Plan (concurrent neighborhood plans: Arbor Lodge, Boise, Concordia, Eliot, Humboldt, Irvington, Kenton, King, Piedmont, Sabin, and Woodlawn)
- Outer Southeast Community Plan (concurrent neighborhood and business plans: Centennial, Foster-Powell, Hazelwood, Lents, Mill Park, Montavilla, Mt. Scott-Arleta, Outer Southeast Business Coalition, Pleasant Valley, Powellhurst-Gilbert, and South Tabor).

Individual neighborhood plans have also been developed over the years, a number of which address transportation and land use issues.

The Southwest Community Plan is the most recent community planning effort. Its policies, including transportation policies, were adopted in 2000. Its zoning map was adopted November 21, 2001 (ordinance no. 176090). Separate neighborhood plans were not adopted as part of the Southwest Community Plan.

The City's planning focus has changed recently changed from district-wide planning to updating the Comprehensive Plan in Region 2040 land use type area studies. Recently

completed area studies cover the Gateway regional center, Hollywood town center and Sandy main street, and Lents town center. The St. Johns town center and Lombard main street planning are currently underway.

Comprehensive Plan Goal 5: Economic Development

Goal 5 policies relevant to transportation are 5.4, Transportation System; 5.5, Infrastructure Development; and 5.10, Columbia South Shore. Policy 5.4 recognizes the transportation system's role in economic development. It encourages a transportation system that efficiently moves people, goods, and services. Policy 5.5 calls for promoting public and private investments in public infrastructure to foster economic development in Council-designated target areas. Policy 5.10 addresses the specific needs of the Columbia South Shore – the building of recreational facilities in the area, the protection of the transportation capacity of the area's highways and roads, and the importance of the airport and other regional transportation facilities to the district.

Comprehensive Plan Goal 7: Energy

Goal 7 policies relevant to transportation are 7.4, Energy Efficiency through Land Use Regulations; 7.6, Energy Efficient Transportation; and 7.7, Telecommunications as an Energy Efficient Strategy. Policies 7.4 and 7.6 promote efforts to increase the energy efficiency of the transportation system, including encouraging transit-supportive densities and a mixture of land uses, and using alternative modes and cleaner burning fuels. Policy 7.7 supports telecommunication as a means of reducing the need for travel.

Comprehensive Plan Goal 8: Environment

Goal 8 policies relevant to transportation are 8.1, Interagency Cooperation - Air Quality; 8.2, Central City Transportation Management Plan; 8.3, Air Quality Maintenance Strategies; 8.4, Ride Sharing, Bicycling, Walking, and Transit; and 8.14, Natural Resources. These policies relate to the improvement of air quality, promotion of alternative modes of transportation, and preservation of viewpoints and corridors.

Comprehensive Plan Goal 11: Public Facilities

Goal 11 policies relevant to transportation are 11.6, Public Facilities System Plan; 11.7, Capital Improvement Program; and Goal 11B: Public Rights-of-Way. Chapter 2 of the TSP contains the complete text of policies 11.8 through 11.12 for Goal 11B, which are considered part of the TE.

Comprehensive Plan Goal 12: Urban Design

The Goal 12 policy relevant to transportation is 12.4, Provide for Pedestrians. This policy discusses the importance of a pedestrian environment that is attractive, comfortable, and safe. This is an environment that is not compromised by transportation improvements aimed at motor vehicle traffic and that improves pedestrian accessibility to parks, developments, and attractions.

Central City

The Downtown and, later, the Central City have been the subject of numerous plans, policies and regulations intended to preserve and enhance them as the region's employment and cultural center.

Downtown Plan and Downtown Parking and Circulation Policy

The Downtown Plan was adopted in 1972 to revitalize the central business district. The Downtown Plan transportation goal was to “design a balanced transportation system which is supportive of the other Downtown goals and which recognizes that the transportation system should provide more efficient use of both right-of-way and vehicles. This means reducing reliance on the automobile, increasing the number of persons per car and increasing the number of persons moving through concentrated areas on transit facilities.” More specific goals addressed the desired mode share for transit (75 percent of all trips), walking, bicycling, and public parking.

The Downtown Parking and Circulation Policy, adopted in 1975, implemented the Downtown Plan’s transportation goals and guidelines. Major updates occurred in 1980 and 1986, and amendments were made in 1988, 1991, and 1992. Major components of DPCP included a lid on the number of parking spaces, maximum parking ratios for new development, and restrictions on surface parking lots. This policy was the City’s plan for ensuring compliance with the carbon monoxide standards of the federal Clean Air Act. The Downtown Parking and Circulation Policy was superseded by the Central City Transportation Management Plan (CCTMP).

Central City Plan

In the mid-1980s, the City of Portland recognized that there was more to downtown than the downtown core – that surrounding neighborhoods had equal potential for high-density commercial, retail, and residential development. The Central City Plan was a broad planning approach to achieve this potential in the eight districts of the Central City. City Council adopted the Central City Plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan in 1988. A key assumption was that transportation had and would continue to play a major role in shaping the Central City and implementing the Central City Plan. The transportation policy states:

Improve the Central City’s accessibility to the rest of the region and its ability to accommodate growth, by extending the light rail system and by maintaining and improving other forms of transit and the street and highway system and while preserving and enhancing the City’s livability.

Subpolicies address supporting light rail and other transportation facility improvements, providing adequate parking within each district, encouraging walking and the use of bicycles, improving goods movement, and protecting adjacent neighborhood livability. A specific recommended action in the plan directed PDOT to “[d]evelop a parking strategy for each Central City district, and for specific sectors within the Downtown. . . .”

Central City Transportation Management Plan

City Council authorized development of the Central City Transportation Management Plan (CCTMP) in 1990 to carry out the Central City Plan’s transportation policy and to replace the Downtown Parking and Circulation Policy (DPCP). The CCTMP is intended to serve as the transportation system plan for the Central City, with modifications to be made only as necessary to ensure consistency with the City’s and Metro’s TSPs.

City Council adopted the CCTMP in December 1995 as part of the Comprehensive Plan. The CCTMP was the result of a five-year process to carry out the Central City Plan’s transportation policy and to replace the DPCP. The CCTMP includes transportation policies and potential actions for implementation. Regulations to implement the CCTMP were

adopted by ordinance and incorporated into Title 33, Planning and Zoning. The CCTMP is incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Plan TE.

Central City Transportation Management Plan Policies

Much like the TE, the CCTMP is divided into several sections. It contains a transportation goal, a number of policies and objectives, district strategies, descriptions of street classifications, and street classification maps. Most of the policies and objectives apply throughout the Central City, but some are specific to certain districts or sectors. The policies are used to guide future improvements to the transportation system, while the strategies are potential implementation measures.

The CCTMP uses a concentrated growth scenario that predicts only a four percent increase in peak-hour auto use over historical patterns. One of the main reasons for this small increase is the amount of housing assumed to develop under this scenario. An increase in housing development will reduce the need to drive to jobs, and the implementation of parking management strategies will control the amount and use of parking.

Chapter 2 of the TSP contains the full text of the CCTMP goal, policies, and objectives. The CCTMP maps have been updated as a part of the TSP process and are in Chapter 2.

REVIEW PROCESSES

State Requirements

Transportation Planning Rule

The TPR [OAR 660-12-015(5)] requires the development of TSPs to be coordinated with “affected state and federal agencies, local governments, special districts, and private providers of transportation services.” Where conflicts are identified between proposed regional TSPs and acknowledged comprehensive plans, representatives of affected local governments must meet to discuss ways to resolve the conflicts. These measures may include: a) changing the draft TSP to eliminate the conflicts, or b) amending the comprehensive plan provision to eliminate the conflict.

Oregon Department of Transportation Review

ODOT staff from the Region 1 office have actively participated in developing both the region's and the City's TSPs. ODOT must prepare and adopt a state TSP, which it has done (the Oregon Transportation Plan).

ODOT does not have a formal review process for local TSPs. It relies on Metro and the DLCD to review local TSPs for compliance with ODOT plans and policies. Metro ensures compliance with the RTP, and DLCD ensures compliance with the TPR. ODOT reviews local TSPs during their development and submits comments on issues affecting state highways and compliance with the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP), including access management requirements.

Land Conservation and Development Commission Review

The TSP is submitted to the LCDC for formal review and adoption. The LCDC must be notified, and copies of the TSP must be sent to Salem, at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing (typically the first Planning Commission hearing). The LCDC review is governed by ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 – Division 18 and Senate Bill 543 (effective June 30, 1999). Within five days of adoption of the TSP by City Council, notice must be sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

Regional Requirements

Role of Cities in Carrying Out RUGGOs

Objective 8 of the RUGGOs lays out the roles of Metro, cities, counties, the state, and other special districts in carrying out the RUGGOs. Objective 8.2 defines the role of cities to:

- 8.2.1 Adopt and amend comprehensive plans to conform to functional plans adopted by Metro;
- 8.2.2 Identify potential areas and activities of metropolitan concern through a broad-based local discussion;
- 8.2.3 Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern;
- 8.2.4 Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

Development and Review of the RTP

Metro had extensive involvement with local jurisdictions as it developed the RTP. Metro convened work teams, made up of representatives from affected jurisdictions, to develop RTP policies and maps between 1995 and 1997. A coordination work team oversaw the work of the teams. The 17-member JPACT provides a forum for elected officials and representatives of agencies involved in regional transportation needs to evaluate the update of the RTP and make recommendations to the Metro Council. JPACT's discussions are based on the technical assessments of the TPAC, which includes technical staff from the same agencies as JPACT, as well as six citizens appointed at large by the Metro Council. This involvement of local jurisdictions is crucial because of the RTP's role as the framework for local TSPs.

Metro Review

The Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) establish compliance review requirements.

Urban Growth Management Functional Plan

Section 1 and Section 5 of Title 8 of the UGMFP govern review of Title 2 requirements that were amended with adoption of the RTP. These requirements are: 1) provide for residential parking districts and 2) street-like features along major driveways in parking lots of more than three acres in size. Cities and counties must amend their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances to comply with these new UGMFP provisions within one year of the adoption of the RTP.

Any amendments to a comprehensive plan or implementing ordinance, including the City's TSP, must be consistent with the requirements of the UGMFP. Notice must be given to Metro at the same time it is given to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). The notice to Metro should include an analysis demonstrating that the proposed amendments are consistent with the UGMFP. If this analysis is not included in the initial notice, a report containing the analysis must be sent to Metro no later than 14 days before the City conducts a final hearing on the proposed amendment.

The Metro Council may grant exceptions to any of the requirements, after MPAC review. Exceptions to Title 6, Regional Accessibility, may be granted if a city or county can show that a street system or connection is not feasible for reasons of topographic constraints or natural or built environmental considerations.

Metro may grant an extension to timelines in the functional plan if the city or county has demonstrated substantial progress or proof of good cause for failing to complete the requirements on time.

City or county requests or determinations that functional plan requirements should not or cannot be incorporated into their comprehensive plan are subject to the conflict resolution and mediation processes of RUGGO (Goal I) provisions. Final city or county land use decisions that are inconsistent with functional plan requirements, or failure to amend comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances, are subject to immediate appeal for violation of the functional plan and may result in a reduction of regional transportation funding.

Regional Transportation Plan

Section 6.4.3, Process for Metro review of Local Plan Amendments, Facility and Service Plans, of the RTP describes how Metro will review the TSP. The TSP is submitted to Metro prior to public hearings. Metro will:

- Review of the TSP for consistency with the elements of the RTP listed in Section 6.4.1
- Within four weeks of submission, send written comment identifying whether the TSP is consistent with RTP requirements and what, if any, modifications would be required to achieve consistency

The city or county must notify Metro of its final action on the TSP. Following adoption of the TSP, Metro will complete a 'final consistency review' and forward a finding of consistency to DLCD, or identify inconsistencies that were not remedied as part of the local adoption process. Metro's written finding of consistency or finding of non-compliance (if conflicting elements cannot be resolved between Metro and the local jurisdiction) for consideration as part of state review of the TSP.

Portland Comprehensive Plan Requirements

Policy Requirements

Goal 1: Metropolitan Coordination, of Portland's Comprehensive Plan directs changes to the plan to be coordinated with federal and state law and to support regional goals, objectives, and plans adopted by Metro to promote a regional planning framework. Policy 1.5,

Compliance with Future Metro Planning Efforts, requires updates of Portland's Comprehensive Plan to comply with the Regional Framework Plan adopted by Metro. Policy 6.1, Intergovernmental Coordination, states:

Coordinate long range transportation planning activities by participating in Metro's management of funds and resources. Coordinate transportation facilities and improvements with development activities, both public and private, and with regional transportation and land use plans in order to achieve maximum benefit with the limited funds. Coordinate with affected state and federal agencies, local governments, special districts, and providers of transportation services in the development of the Transportation System Plan. Update the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan to be consistent with the City and Regional Transportation System Plans and the Transportation Planning Rule.

Technical Advisory Committee

To develop the TSP, Portland convened a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) made up of agency representatives inside and outside the City structure. The TAC includes representatives from Metro, the Port of Portland, Tri-Met, ODOT, and Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties. The TAC has met monthly during development of the TSP. It meets the requirements for coordination with affected state agencies, local governments, and special districts. Members of the TAC are listed in Volume I of the TSP.

Public Review

Chapter 8 of the TSP details the extensive TSP public review process. Public review is prescribed by the City's Comprehensive Plan, Metro's public involvement process, and Statewide Planning Goal 1. In addition to specific requirements, the City has established a citizen advisory committee, held numerous public workshops and briefings for citizens and neighborhood and business groups, and mailed newsletters to a large list of interested persons.

Planning Commission Review

The Portland Planning Commission received numerous briefings on the TSP in 2001. Formal hearings began on June 11, 2002. Public notice was mailed 30 days before the first public hearing, and the TSP documents (Volumes I, II, and III and the TSP inventory) were available a minimum of 10 days before the first hearing.

City Council Review

City Council review of the TSP is scheduled for September 2002.

