

Metro | Agenda

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL
DATE: May 6, 2010
DAY: Thursday
TIME: 5:00 PM
PLACE: Metro Council Chamber

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

1. INTRODUCTIONS

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

3. CONSENT AGENDA

3.1 Consideration of Minutes for the April 29, 2010 Metro Council Regular Meeting.

3.2 **Resolution No. 10-4149**, For the Purpose of Acknowledging the Council President's Appointment of Metro Councilor Rod Park to the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission (MERC) as an Ex-Officio Member.

4. ORDINANCES – FIRST READING

4.1 **Ordinance No. 10-1241**, For the Purpose of Amending the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan to Comply with State Law; To Add the Regional Transportation Systems Management and Operations Action Plan, the Regional Freight Plan and the High Capacity Transit System Plan; To Amend the Regional Transportation Functional Plan and Add it to the Metro Code; To Amend the Regional Framework Plan; And to Amend the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.
PUBLIC HEARING

5. RESOLUTIONS

5.1 **Resolution No. 10-4148**, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Amend An Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Forest Grove for Trail Development. Harrington

5.2 **Resolution No. 10-4150**, For the Purpose of Approving the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and the 2010-2013 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.
PUBLIC HEARING, NO ACTION TAKEN

6. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

7. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

ADJOURN

Television schedule for May 6, 2010 Metro Council meeting

Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, and Vancouver, Wash. Channel 11 – Community Access Network www.tvctv.org – (503) 629-8534 5 p.m. Thursday, May 6	Portland Channel 30 (CityNet 30) – Portland Community Media www.pcmty.org – (503) 288-1515 8:30 p.m. Sunday, May 9 2 p.m. Monday, May 10
Gresham Channel 30 – MCTV www.mctv.org – (503) 491-7636 2 p.m. Monday, May 10	Washington County Channel 30 – TVC-TV www.tvctv.org – (503) 629-8534 11 p.m. Saturday, May 8 11 p.m. Sunday, May 9 6 a.m. Tuesday, May 11 4 p.m. Wednesday, May 12
Oregon City, Gladstone Channel 28 – Willamette Falls Television www.wftvaccess.com – (503) 650-0275 Call or visit website for program times.	West Linn Channel 30 – Willamette Falls Television www.wftvaccess.com – (503) 650-0275 Call or visit website for program times.

PLEASE NOTE: Show times are tentative and in some cases the entire meeting may not be shown due to length. Call or check your community access station web site to confirm program times.

Agenda items may not be considered in the exact order. For questions about the agenda, call the Metro Council Office @ (503) 797-1540. Public hearings are held on all ordinances second read and on resolutions upon request of the public. Documents for the record must be submitted to the Clerk of the Council to be included in the decision record. Documents can be submitted by e-mail, fax or mail or in person to the Clerk of the Council. For additional information about testifying before the Metro Council please go to the Metro website www.oregonmetro.gov and click on public comment opportunities. For assistance per the American Disabilities Act (ADA), dial TDD 797-1804 or 797-1540 (Council Office).

Agenda Item Number 3.1

Consideration of Minutes for the April 29, 2010 Metro Council Regular Meeting.

Consent Agenda

Metro Council Meeting
Thursday, May 6, 2010
Metro Council Chamber

Agenda Item Number 3.2

Resolution No. 10-4149, For the Purpose of Acknowledging the Council President's Appointment of Metro Councilor Rod Park to the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission (MERC) as an Ex-Officio Member.

Consent Agenda

Metro Council Meeting
Thursday, May 6, 2010
Metro Council Chamber

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACKNOWLEDGING) RESOLUTION NO. 10-4149
THE COUNCIL PRESIDENT’S APPOINTMENT)
OF METRO COUNCILOR ROD PARK TO THE) Introduced by Council President David
METROPOLITAN EXPOSITION-RECREATION) Bragdon
COMMISSION (MERC) AS AN EX-OFFICIO
MEMBER

WHEREAS, the Metro Code, Section 6.01.030 and subsection (a) provide that the Metro Council President shall appoint all seven voting members to the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission (“MERC” or “the Commission”) and shall also appoint one Metro Councilor who shall serve ex-officio in a non-voting capacity on the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Code, Section 6.01.030(b), provides that the Metro Council President’s appointments of only the voting members to the Commission are subject to confirmation by the Metro Council; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Code, Section 6.01.030(c) provides that all voting members shall serve four (4) year-terms; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Metro Code, Section 6.01.030, the Metro Council President has determined to appoint Metro Councilor Rod Park to serve as an ex-officio member in a non-voting capacity of the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to a Primary Election being held in the State of Oregon on May 16, 2006, and as accepted by Metro Council Resolution No. 06-3705 (“For the Purpose of Accepting the May 16, 2006 Primary Election Abstract of Votes for Metro”), Councilor Rod Park was elected by the voters of the Metro Area, Subdistrict 1, for a position of Metro Councilor for a term commencing January 1, 2007 and ending on January 2, 2011; and due to term limits Councilor Park’s term on the Metro Council will not extend beyond January 2, 2011; and

WHEREAS, because Councilor Park will not be a voting member on the Commission, his term as an ex-officio non-voting Commission member shall end on the date that Councilor Park’s term on the Metro Council ends, that is, January 2, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council President hereby notifies the Metro Council of his appointment of Councilor Park to the Commission effective immediately and ending on January 2, 2011, at which point the ex-officio non-voting Metro Council position on the MERC Commission shall be vacant, unless by that date the Metro Council President has appointed a different active Metro Councilor to serve in that position on the MERC Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council finds that Councilor Park has the experience and expertise to make a substantial contribution to the Commission’s work; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby acknowledges and supports the Council President's appointment today of Councilor Park as an ex-officio non-voting member of the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission beginning on April 29th, 2010, and ending on January 2nd, 2011.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of April 2010.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Alison Kean Campbell, Deputy Metro Attorney

STAFF REPORT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACKNOWLEDGING THE COUNCIL PRESIDENT'S APPOINTMENT OF METRO COUNCILOR ROD PARK TO THE METROPOLITAN EXPOSITION-RECREATION COMMISSION (MERC) AS AN EX-OFFICIO MEMBER

Date: April 29, 2010

Prepared by: Tom Matney
Ext. 1853, Council Office

BACKGROUND

The Metro Code, Section 6.01.030(a), gives Metro Council President sole authority to appoint all members of the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission, subject to confirmation by the Metro Council. Section 6.01.030(d)(3) of the Metro Code allows the Council President to nominate a candidate for appointment for the Metro Council's consideration. Under Section 6.01.030 of the Metro Code, the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission consists of seven voting members and one Metro Councilor who shall serve ex-officio in a non-voting capacity. Under Section 6.01.030(g) of the Metro Code, vacancies are filled pursuant to the procedure governing initial appointments.

The Metro Council President has appointed Councilor Park as a candidate for ex-officio non-voting membership on the Commission. The Council President has submitted his appointment of Councilor Park to the Metro Council for acknowledgement. Councilor Park is, pursuant to Metro Code, Section 6.01.030, eligible to serve as an ex-officio non-voting member of the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission until the end of his term as a Metro Councilor on January 2, 2011.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. Known Opposition

None.

2. Legal Antecedents

Metro Code, as referenced above.

3. Anticipated Effects

Appointment of Councilor Park to the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission as an ex-officio non-voting member in the manner provided by the Metro Code.

4. Budget Impacts

None.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Council President David Bragdon recommends approval of Resolution 10-4149 to confirm the appointment of Councilor Rod Park to the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission and to begin serving April 29th, 2010.

Agenda Item Number 4.1

Ordinance No. 10-1241, For the Purpose of Amending the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan to Comply with State Law; To Add the Regional Transportation Systems Management and Operations Action Plan, the Regional Freight Plan and the High Capacity Transit System Plan; To Amend the Regional Transportation Functional Plan and Add it to the Metro Code; To Amend the Regional Framework Plan; And to Amend the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

ORDINANCES – FIRST READING
PUBLIC HEARING

Metro Council Meeting
Thursday, May 6, 2010
Metro Council Chamber

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2004) Ordinance No. 10-1241
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO)
COMPLY WITH STATE LAW; TO ADD THE) Introduced by Chief Operating Officer
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS) Michael Jordan with the Concurrence of
MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS ACTION) Council President David Bragdon
PLAN, THE REGIONAL FREIGHT PLAN AND THE
HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM PLAN; TO
AMEND THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION
FUNCTIONAL PLAN AND ADD IT TO THE
METRO CODE; TO AMEND THE REGIONAL
FRAMEWORK PLAN; AND TO AMEND THE
URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL
PLAN

WHEREAS, federal and state law require Metro to adopt a transportation plan for the region and to revise it at least every four years to keep it up to date; and

WHEREAS, Phase 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update focused on development of the federally-recognized metropolitan plan ("Federal Component") for the Portland metropolitan region that serves as the threshold for all federal transportation funding in the region; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council adopted the federal component of the 2035 RTP by Resolution No. 07-3831B (For the Purpose of Approving the Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update, Pending Air Quality Conformity Analysis) on December 13, 2007, deferring adoption of the state component (required by state law) in order to address outstanding issues identified during development of the federal component; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Transportation approved the federal component of the 2035 RTP on March 5, 2008; and

WHEREAS, Phase 2 of the RTP focused on development of the state component of the 2035 RTP; and

WHEREAS, OAR 660-012-0016 directs coordination of the federally-required regional transportation plan with regional transportation system plans such that the state component of the 2035 RTP must be adopted within one year of the federal component or within a timeline and work program approved by the Land Conservation and Development Commission ("LCDC"); and

WHEREAS, on May 1, 2008, the LCDC accepted the RTP into the periodic review process and approved the work program and timeline for the state component of the RTP, which called for completing the RTP by December 2009, pending final review and analysis for air quality conformance; and

WHEREAS, the RTP is a central tool for implementing the 2040 Growth Concept and is part of, and must be consistent with, Metro's Regional Framework Plan; and

WHEREAS, the state component of the 2035 RTP is intended to serve as the regional transportation system plan under statewide planning Goal 12 and the state Transportation Planning Rule, and must be consistent with those laws; and

WHEREAS, the RTP must be consistent with other statewide planning goals and the state transportation system plan as contained in the Oregon Transportation Plan and its several components; and

WHEREAS, central to the 2035 RTP is an overall emphasis on outcomes, system completeness and measurable performance to hold the region accountable for making progress toward the region's desired outcomes and state goals for reductions in vehicle miles traveled and corresponding greenhouse gas emissions; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council accepted elements of the Regional High Capacity Transit System Plan by Resolution No. 09-4052 (For the Purpose of Accepting the Regional High Capacity Transit System Tiers and Corridors, System Expansion Policy Framework and Policy Amendments) on July 9, 2009, for addition to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council accepted the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP") and related elements by Resolution No. 09-4099 (For the Purpose of Accepting the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, With the Following Elements, For Final Review and Analysis For Air Quality Conformance: The Transportation System Management and Operations Plan; The Regional Freight Plan; The High Capacity Transit System Plan; and The Regional Transportation Functional Plan) on December 17, 2009; and

WHEREAS, a third and final 45-day public comment period on the 2035 RTP was provided from March 22 to May 6, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation ("JPACT"), the Metro Policy Advisory Committee ("MPAC"), the Metro Technical Advisory Committee ("MTAC"), the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee ("TPAC"), the Regional Travel Options ("RTO") subcommittee of TPAC, the Intelligent Transportation Systems ("ITS") Subcommittee of TPAC, the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Technical Advisory Committee, the Bi-State Coordination Committee, the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force, the Regional Transportation Coordinating Council ("RTCC"), the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration, and other elected officials, representatives of business, environmental and transportation organizations from the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area assisted in the development of the federal and state components of the 2035 RTP and provided comment on the RTP throughout the planning process; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and MPAC have recommended approval of the state component of the 2035 RTP by the Council; now, therefore,

THE METRO COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The 2004 Regional Transportation Plan is hereby amended to become the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), as indicated in Exhibit A and Appendices, attached and incorporated into this ordinance.
2. The Regional Transportation Systems Management and Operations Action Plan in Exhibit B, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, is hereby adopted as a component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan.
3. The Regional Freight Plan in Exhibit C, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, is hereby adopted as a component of the 2035 RTP.

4. The High Capacity Transit System Plan in Exhibit D, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, is hereby adopted as a component of the 2035 RTP.
5. The Regional Transportation Function Plan (“RTFP”), contained in section 6.4 of the 2004 RTP, is hereby amended as indicated in Exhibit E, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, and added to the Metro Code as Chapter 3.08.
6. Title 2 (Regional Parking Policy) of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan is hereby repealed as indicated in Exhibit F, attached, and is incorporated into the RTFP, as indicated in Exhibit E.
7. Chapter 2 (Transportation) of Metro’s Regional Framework Plan is hereby amended, as indicated in Exhibit G, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, to reflect the new transportation policies in the 2035 RTP in Exhibit A.
8. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Exhibit H, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, explain how these amendments comply with the Regional Framework Plan, statewide planning laws and the Oregon Transportation Plan and its applicable components.
9. Staff is directed to submit this ordinance and exhibits to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) in the manner of periodic review.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 10th day of June, 2010.

David Bragdon, Council President

Attest:

Approved as to form:

Anthony Andersen, Recording Secretary

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

CLICK HERE FOR FULL REPORT

March 2010
Final draft plan




Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 10-1241

2035

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Final draft plan

March 2010



Metro | *People places. Open spaces.*

CLICK HERE FOR FULL REPORT

March 2010
Final draft plan




Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 10-1241

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

2035

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Final draft plan

March 2010

CLICK HERE FOR FULL REPORT

March 2010
Final draft plan



Exhibit B to Ordinance No. 10-1241

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION
SYSTEM MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

2010 – 2020

Final draft plan

March 2010

CLICK HERE FOR FULL REPORT

March 2010
Final draft plan



Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 10-1241

REGIONAL FREIGHT PLAN

2035

Final draft plan

March 2010

CLICK HERE FOR FULL REPORT

March 22, 2010
Summary report




Exhibit D to Ordinance No. 10-1241

REGIONAL HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM PLAN

2035

Summary report

March 22, 2010

CHAPTER 3.08

PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL PLAN
Version 3.0 (with proposed amendments incorporated)
4/28/10

NOTE: This draft document codifies current regional transportation functional plan language and additional functional plan provisions to direct how city and county plans will implement new RTP policies and implementation actions.

SECTIONS	TITLE
3.08.010	Purpose of Regional Transportation Functional Plan
TITLE 1:	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DESIGN
3.08.110	Street System Design
3.08.120	Transit System Design
3.08.130	Pedestrian System Design
3.08.140	Bicycle System Design
3.08.150	Freight System Design
3.08.160	Transportation System Management and Operations
TITLE 2:	DEVELOPMENT AND UPDATE OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS
3.08.210	Transportation Needs
3.08.220	Transportation Solutions
3.08.230	Performance Targets and Standards
TITLE 3:	TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
3.08.310	Defining Projects in Transportation System Plans
TITLE 4:	REGIONAL PARKING MANAGEMENT
3.08.410	Parking Management
TITLE 5:	AMENDMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS
3.08.510	Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans
TITLE 6:	COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
3.08.610	Metro Review of Amendments to Transportation System Plans
3.08.620	Extension of Compliance Deadline
3.08.630	Exception from Compliance
TITLE 7:	DEFINITIONS
3.08.710	Definitions

CHAPTER 3.08

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL PLAN

SECTIONS TITLE

3.08.010 Purpose of Regional Transportation Functional Plan

- A. The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) implements those policies of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its constituent freight, high-capacity transit and transportation system management and operations plans which cities and counties of the region will carry out in their comprehensive plans, transportation system plans (TSPs), other land use regulations and transportation project development. The principal objectives of the RTP are improved public health, safety and security for all; attraction of jobs and housing to downtowns, main streets, corridors and employment areas, creating vibrant, livable communities, sustaining the region's economic competitiveness and prosperity; efficient management to maximize use of the existing transportation system; completion of the transportation system for all modes of travel to expand transportation choices; increasing use of the transit, pedestrian and bicycle systems; ensuring equity and affordable transportation choices; improving freight reliability; reducing vehicle miles traveled and resulting emissions; and promoting environmental and fiscal stewardship.
- B. The RTFP is intended to be consistent with federal law that applies to Metro in its role as a metropolitan planning organization, the Oregon Transportation Plan, and Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) and its Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). If a TSP is consistent with this RTFP, Metro shall deem it consistent with the RTP.

TITLE 1: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DESIGN

3.08.110 Street System Design

- A. To ensure that new street construction and re-construction projects are designed to improve safety, support adjacent land use and balance the needs of all users, including bicyclists, transit vehicles, motorists, freight delivery vehicles and pedestrians of all ages and abilities, city

and county street design regulations shall allow implementation of:

1. Complete street designs as set forth in *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040* (2nd Edition, 2002), or similar resources consistent with regional street design policies;
2. Green street designs as set forth in *Green Streets: Innovative Solutions for Stormwater and Street Crossings* (2002) and *Trees for Green Streets: An Illustrated Guide* (2002) or similar resources consistent with federal regulations for stream protection; and
3. Transit-supportive street designs that facilitate existing and planned transit service pursuant subsection 3.08.120B.

B. City and county local street design regulations shall allow implementation of:

1. Pavement widths of less than 28 feet from curb-face to curb-face;
2. Sidewalk widths that include at least five feet of pedestrian through zones;
3. Landscaped pedestrian buffer strips, or paved furnishing zones of at least five feet, that include street trees;
4. Traffic calming devices, such as speed bumps and cushions, woonerfs and chicanes, to discourage traffic infiltration and excessive speeds;
5. Short and direct right-of-way routes and shared-use paths to connect residences with commercial services, parks, schools, hospitals, institutions, transit corridors, regional trails and other neighborhood activity centers; and
6. Opportunities to extend streets in an incremental fashion, including posted notification on streets to be extended.

- C. To provide a well-connected network of streets for local circulation and preserve the capacity of the region's principal arterials for through trips, each city and county shall amend its TSP, if necessary, to comply with the requirements set forth in subsections D through G of this section.
- D. To improve connectivity of the region's arterial system and support walking, bicycling and access to transit, each city and county shall incorporate into its TSP, to the extent practicable, a network of four-lane major arterial streets at one-mile spacing and two-lane minor arterial streets or collector streets at half-mile spacing considering the following:
1. Existing topography;
 2. Rail lines;
 3. Freeways;
 4. Pre-existing development;
 5. Leases, easements or covenants in place prior to May 1, 1995; and
 6. The requirements of Titles 3 and 13 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP).
 7. Best practices and designs as set forth in Green Streets: Innovative Solutions for Stormwater, Street Crossings (2002) and Trees for Green Streets: An Illustrated Guide (2002), Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040 (2nd Edition, 2002), and state or locally-adopted plans and best practices for protecting natural resources and natural areas.
- E. To improve local access and circulation, and preserve capacity on the region's arterial system, each city and county shall incorporate into its TSP a conceptual map of new streets for all contiguous areas of vacant and re-developable lots and parcels of five or more acres that are zoned to allow residential or mixed-use development. The map shall identify street connections to adjacent areas to promote a logical, direct and connected system of streets and should demonstrate opportunities to extend and connect new streets to existing streets, provide direct public

right-of-way routes and limit closed-end street designs consistent with subsection F.

- F. If proposed residential or mixed-use development involves construction of a new street, the city and county regulations shall require the applicant to provide a site plan that:
1. Is consistent with the conceptual new streets map required by subsection E;
 2. Provides full street connections with spacing of no more than 530 feet between connections, except if prevented by barriers such as topography, rail lines, freeways, pre-existing development, leases, easements or covenants that existed prior to May 1, 1995, or by requirements of Titles 3 and 13 of the UGMFP;
 3. If streets must cross water features protected pursuant to Title 3 UGMFP, provides a crossing every 800 to 1,200 feet unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a full street connection;
 4. If full street connection is prevented, provides bicycle and pedestrian accessways on public easements or rights-of-way spaced such that accessways are not more than 330 feet apart, unless not possible for the reasons set forth in paragraph 3;
 5. Provides for bike and pedestrian accessways that cross water features identified pursuant to Title 3 of the UGMFP at an average of 530 feet between accessways unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a connection;
 6. If full street connection over water features identified pursuant to Title 3 of the UGMFP cannot be constructed in centers as defined in Title 6 of the UGMFP or Main Streets shown on the 2040 Growth Concept Map, or if spacing of full street connections exceeds 1,200 feet, provides bike and pedestrian crossings at an average of 530 feet between accessways unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a connection;
 7. Limits cul-de-sac designs or other closed-end street designs to circumstances in which barriers prevent

full street extensions and limits the length of such streets to 200 feet and the number of dwellings along the street to no more than 25; and

8. Provides street cross-sections showing dimensions of right-of-way improvements and posted or expected speed limits.
- G. For redevelopment of contiguous lots and parcels less than five acres in size that require construction of new streets, cities and counties shall establish their own standards for local street connectivity, consistent with subsection F.
- H. To protect the capacity, function and safe operation of existing and planned state highway interchanges, or planned improvements to interchanges, cities and counties shall, to the extent feasible, restrict driveway and street access in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals consistent with Oregon Highway Plan Access Management Standards and accommodate local circulation on the local system to improve safety and minimize congestion and conflicts in the interchange area. Public street connections, consistent with regional street design and spacing standards in Section 3.08.110, shall be encouraged and shall supercede this access restriction, though such access may be limited to right-in/right-out or other appropriate configuration in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals. Multimodal street design features including pedestrian crossings and on-street parking shall be allowed where appropriate.

3.08.120 Transit System Design

- A. City and county TSPs or other appropriate regulations shall include investments, policies, standards and criteria to provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to all transit stops where regional transit service exists at the time of TSP development or update and all existing or planned Station Communities.
- B. City and county TSPs shall include a transit plan, and implementing land use regulations, with the following elements to leverage the region's investment in transit and improve access to the transit system:
 1. A transit system map consistent with the transit functional classifications shown in Figure 2.15 of the

RTP that shows the locations of major transit stops, transit centers, high capacity transit stations, regional bicycle transit facilities, inter-city bus and rail passenger terminals designated in the RTP, transit-priority treatments such as signals, regional bicycle transit facilities, park-and-ride facilities, and bicycle and pedestrian routes, consistent with sections 3.08.130 and 3.08.140, between essential destinations and transit stops.

2. The following site design standards for new retail, office, multi-family and institutional buildings located near or at major transit stops shown in Figure 2.15 in the RTP:
 - a. Provide reasonably direct pedestrian connections between transit stops and building entrances and between building entrances and streets adjoining transit stops;
 - b. Provide safe, direct and logical pedestrian crossings at all transit stops and make intersection and mid-block traffic management improvements as needed to enable marked crossings at major transit stops;
 - c. At major transit stops, require the following:
 - i. Locate buildings within 20 feet of the transit stop, a transit street or an intersecting street, or a pedestrian plaza at the stop or a street intersection;
 - ii. Transit passenger landing pads accessible to disabled persons to transit agency standards;
 - iii. An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter and an underground utility connection to a major transit stop if requested by the public transit provider; and
 - iv. Lighting to transit agency standards at the major transit stop.
- C. Providers of public transit service shall consider and document the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations, including minorities and low-income families, when planning levels of service, transit facilities and hours of operation.

3.08.130 Pedestrian System Design

- A. City and county TSPs shall include a pedestrian plan, with implementing land use regulations, for an interconnected network of pedestrian routes within and through the city or county. The plan shall include:
1. An inventory of existing facilities that identifies gaps and deficiencies in the pedestrian system;
 2. An evaluation of needs for pedestrian access to transit and essential destinations for all mobility levels, including direct, comfortable and safe pedestrian routes.
 3. A list of improvements to the pedestrian system that will help the city or county achieve the regional non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 and other targets established pursuant to section 3.08.230;
 4. Provision for sidewalks along arterials, collectors and most local streets, except that sidewalks are not required along controlled roadways, such as freeways; and
 5. Provision for safe crossings of streets and controlled pedestrian crossings on major arterials.
- B. To support transit, a city or county may implement the provisions of section 3.08.120B(2) by establishment of a pedestrian district in its comprehensive plan or land use regulations with the following elements:
1. A connected street and pedestrian network for the district;
 2. An inventory of existing facilities, gaps and deficiencies in the network of pedestrian routes;
 3. Interconnection of pedestrian, transit and bicycle systems;
 4. Parking management strategies;
 5. Access management strategies;

6. Sidewalk and accessway location and width;
 7. Landscaped or paved pedestrian buffer strip location and width;
 8. Street tree location and spacing;
 9. Pedestrian street crossing and intersection design;
 10. Street lighting and furniture for pedestrians; and
 11. A mix of types and densities of land uses that will support a high level of pedestrian activity.
- C. City and county land use regulations shall ensure that new development provides on-site streets and accessways that offer reasonably direct routes for pedestrian travel.

3.08.140 Bicycle System Design

- A. City and county TSPs shall include a bicycle plan, with implementing land use regulations, for an interconnected network of bicycle routes within and through the city or county. The plan shall include:
1. An inventory of existing facilities that identifies gaps and deficiencies in the bicycle system;
 2. An evaluation of needs for bicycle access to transit and essential destinations, including direct, comfortable and safe bicycle routes and secure bicycle parking, considering *TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines*.
 3. A list of improvements to the bicycle system that will help the city or county achieve the regional non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 and other targets established pursuant to section 3.08.230;
 4. Provision for bikeways along arterials, major collectors and nearby parallel routes, and bicycle parking in centers, at major transit stops shown in Figure 2.15 in the RTP, park-and-ride lots and associated with institutional uses; and
 5. Provision for safe crossing of streets and controlled bicycle crossings on major arterials.

3.08.150 Freight System Design

- A. City and county TSPs shall include a freight plan, with implementing land use regulations, for an interconnected system of freight networks within and through the city or county. The plan shall include:
1. An inventory of existing facilities that identifies gaps and deficiencies in the freight system;
 2. An evaluation of freight access to freight intermodal facilities, employment and industrial areas and commercial districts; and
 3. A list of improvements to the freight system that will help the city or county increase reliability of freight movement, reduce freight delay and achieve the targets established pursuant to section 3.08.230.

3.08.160 Transportation System Management and Operations

- A. City and county TSPs shall include transportation system management and operations (TSMO) plans to improve the performance of existing transportation infrastructure within or through the city or county. A TSMO plan shall include:
1. An inventory and evaluation of existing local and regional TSMO infrastructure, strategies and programs that identifies gaps and opportunities to expand infrastructure, strategies and programs;
 2. A list of projects and strategies, consistent with the Regional TSMO Plan, based upon consideration of the following functional areas:
 - a. Multimodal traffic management investments, such as signal timing, access management, arterial performance monitoring and active traffic management;
 - b. Traveler information investments, such as forecasted traffic conditions and carpool matching;
 - c. Traffic incident management investments, such as incident response programs; and

- d. Transportation demand management investments, such as individualized marketing programs, rideshare programs and employer transportation programs.

TITLE 2: DEVELOPMENT AND UPDATE OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS

3.08.210 Transportation Needs

- A. Each city and county shall update its TSP to incorporate regional and state transportation needs identified in the 2035 RTP and its own transportation needs. The determination of local transportation needs shall be based upon:
 1. System gaps and deficiencies identified in the inventories and analysis of transportation systems pursuant to Title 1;
 2. Identification of facilities that exceed the Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards in Table 3.08-2 or the alternative thresholds and standards established pursuant to section 3.08.230;
 3. Consideration and documentation of the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations within the city or county, including minorities and low-income families.
- B. A city or county determination of transportation needs must be consistent with the following elements of the RTP:
 1. The population and employment forecast and planning period of the RTP, except that a city or county may use an alternative forecast for the city or county, coordinated with Metro, to account for changes to comprehensive plan or land use regulations adopted after adoption of the RTP;
 2. Regional needs identified in the mobility corridor strategies in Chapter 4 of the RTP;
 3. System maps and functional classifications for street design, motor vehicles, transit, bicycles, pedestrians and freight in Chapter 2 of the RTP; and

4. Regional non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 and the Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards in Table 3.08-2.

3.08.220 Transportation Solutions

- A. Each city and county shall consider the following strategies, in the order listed, to meet the transportation needs determined pursuant to section 3.08.210 and performance targets and standards pursuant to section 3.08.230. The city or county shall explain its choice of one or more of the strategies:
 1. TSMO investments that refine or implement regional strategies in the RTP;
 2. Transit, bicycle and pedestrian system improvements;
 3. Traffic-calming designs and devices;
 4. Land use strategies in OAR 660-012-0035(2) to help achieve the thresholds and standards in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 or alternative thresholds and standards established pursuant to section 3.08.230;
 5. Improvements to parallel arterials, collectors or local streets, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities, consistent with the connectivity standards in section 3.08.110, in order to provide alternative routes or encourage use of modes other than SOV; and
 6. Motor vehicle capacity improvements, consistent with the RTP Arterial and Throughway Network Concept, only upon a demonstration that other strategies in this subsection are not appropriate or cannot adequately address identified transportation needs.
- B. A city or county shall coordinate its consideration of the strategies in subsection A with the owner of the transportation facility affected by the strategy. Facility design is subject to the approval of the facility owner.
- C. If analysis under subsection 3.08.210A indicates an unmet regional or state need that has not been addressed in the RTP, the city or county shall propose one of the following actions:

1. Propose a project at the time of Metro review of the RTP to be incorporated into the RTP during the next RTP update; or
 2. Propose an amendment to the RTP for needs and projects if the amendment is necessary prior to the next RTP update.
- D. Upon its conclusion that the strategies in subsection A would not be feasible to address identified needs, a city or county shall, in coordination with Metro, pursue one or more of the following strategies:
1. Amend the comprehensive plan or land use regulations for an area to reduce trips generated by allowed uses;
 2. Take an exception to the relevant RTFP requirement pursuant to section 3.08.630;
 3. Change the RTP functional classification of a facility for any mode in Chapter 2 of the RTP; or
 4. Amend the policy in the RTP which the relevant RTFP requirement implements.

3.08.230 Performance Targets and Standards

- A. Each city and county shall demonstrate that solutions adopted pursuant to section 3.08.220 will achieve progress toward the targets and standards in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 and performance measures in subsection D or toward alternative targets and standards adopted by the city or county pursuant to subsections B and C. The city or county shall include the regional targets and standards or its alternatives in its TSP.
- B. A city or county may adopt alternative targets or standards in place of regional targets and standards prescribed in subsection A upon a demonstration that the alternatives:
1. Are no lower than those in Table 3.08-1 and Table 3.08-2;
 2. Will not result in a need for motor vehicle capacity improvements that go beyond the planned arterial and throughway network defined in Figure 2.12 of the RTP

and that are not recommended in, or are inconsistent with, the RTP; and

3. Will not increase SOV travel to a degree inconsistent with the non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1.
- C. If the city or county adopts mobility standards for state highways different from those in Table 3.08-2, it shall demonstrate that the standards have been approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission.
- D. Each city and county shall also include performance measures for safety, vehicle miles traveled per capita, freight reliability, congestion, and walking, bicycling and transit mode shares to evaluate and monitor performance of the TSP.
- E. To demonstrate progress toward achievement of performance targets in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 and to maintain performance of state highways within its jurisdiction as much as feasible and avoid their further degradation, the city or county shall adopt the following:
1. Parking minimum and maximum ratios in Centers and Station Communities consistent with subsection 3.08.410A;
 2. Designs for street, transit, bicycle, freight and pedestrian systems consistent with Title 1;
 3. TSMO projects and strategies consistent with section 3.08.160; and
 4. Land use actions pursuant to OAR 660-012-0035(2).

TITLE 3: TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

3.08.310 Defining Projects in Transportation System Plans

- A. Each city or county developing or amending a TSP shall specify the general locations and facility parameters, such as minimum and maximum ROW dimensions and the number and size of traffic lanes, of planned regional transportation facilities and improvements identified on the appropriate RTP map. The locations shall be within the general location depicted in the appropriate RTP map. Except as

otherwise provided in the TSP, the general location is as follows:

1. For new facilities, a corridor within 200 feet of the location depicted on the appropriate RTP map;
 2. For interchanges, the general location of the crossing roadways, without specifying the general location of connecting ramps;
 3. For existing facilities planned for improvements, a corridor within 50 feet of the existing right-of-way; and
 4. For realignments of existing facilities, a corridor within 200 feet of the segment to be realigned as measured from the existing right-of-way depicted on the appropriate RTP map.
- B. A city or county may refine or revise the general location of a planned regional facility as it prepares or revises its TSP. Such revisions may be appropriate to reduce the impacts of the facility or to comply with comprehensive plan or statewide planning goals. If, in developing or amending its TSP, a city or county determines that the general location of a planned regional facility or improvement is inconsistent with its comprehensive plan or a statewide planning goal requirement, it shall:
1. Propose a revision to the general location of the planned facility or improvement to achieve consistency and, if the revised location lies outside the general location depicted in the appropriate RTP map, seek an amendment to the RTP; or
 2. Propose a revision to its comprehensive plan to authorize the planned facility or improvement at the revised location.

TITLE 4: REGIONAL PARKING MANAGEMENT

3.08.410 Parking Management

- A. Cities and county parking regulations shall set minimums and maximums as set forth in this section, consistent with the following:

1. No minimum ratios higher than those shown on Table 3.08-3.
 2. No maximum ratios higher than those shown on Table 3.08-3 and illustrated in the Parking Maximum Map. If 20-minute peak hour transit service has become available to an area within a one-quarter mile walking distance for bus transit or one-half mile walking distance from a high capacity transit station, that area shall be added to Zone A. If 20-minute peak hour transit service is no longer available to an area within a one-quarter mile walking distance for bus transit or one-half mile walking distance from a high capacity transit station, that area shall be removed from Zone A. Cities and counties should designate Zone A parking ratios in areas with good pedestrian access to commercial or employment areas (within one-third mile walk) from adjacent residential areas.
- B. Cities and counties may establish a process for variances from minimum and maximum parking ratios that includes criteria for a variance.
- C. Free surface parking shall be subject to the regional parking maximums for Zones A and B in Table 3.08-3. Following an adopted exemption process and criteria, cities and counties may exempt parking structures; fleet parking; vehicle parking for sale, lease, or rent; employee car pool parking; dedicated valet parking; user-paid parking; market rate parking; and other high-efficiency parking management alternatives from maximum parking standards. Reductions associated with redevelopment may be done in phases. Where mixed-use development is proposed, cities and counties shall provide for blended parking rates. Cities and counties may count adjacent on-street parking spaces, nearby public parking and shared parking toward required parking minimum standards.
- D. Cities and counties may use categories or standards other than those in Table 3.08-3 upon demonstration that the effect will be substantially the same as the application of the ratios in the table.
- E. Cities and counties shall provide for the designation of residential parking districts in local comprehensive plans or implementing ordinances.

- F. Cities and counties shall require that parking lots more than three acres in size provide street-like features along major driveways, including curbs, sidewalks and street trees or planting strips. Major driveways in new residential and mixed-use areas shall meet the connectivity standards for full street connections in section 3.08.110, and should line up with surrounding streets except where prevented by topography, rail lines, freeways, pre-existing development or leases, easements or covenants that existed prior to May 1, 1995, or the requirements of Titles 3 and 13 of the UGMFP.
- G. To support local freight delivery activities, cities and counties shall require on-street freight loading and unloading areas at appropriate locations in centers.
- I. To encourage the use of bicycles and ensure adequate bicycle parking for different land uses, cities and counties shall establish short-term and long-term bicycle parking minimums for:
1. New multi-family residential developments of four units or more;
 2. New retail, office and institutional developments;
 3. Transit centers, high capacity transit stations, inter-city bus and rail passenger terminals; and
 4. Bicycle facilities at transit stops and park-and-ride lots.
- J. Cities and counties shall adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities. The policies, plans and regulations shall be consistent with subsections A through H. Plans may be adopted in TSPs or other adopted policy documents and may focus on sub-areas of Centers. Plans shall include an inventory of parking supply and usage, an evaluation of bicycle parking needs with consideration of *TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines*. Policies shall be adopted in the TSP. Policies, plans and regulations must consider and may include the following range of strategies:
1. By-right exemptions from minimum parking requirements;

2. Parking districts;
3. Shared parking;
4. Structured parking;
5. Bicycle parking;
6. Timed parking;
7. Differentiation between employee parking and parking for customers, visitors and patients;
8. Real-time parking information;
9. Priced parking;
10. Parking enforcement.

TITLE 5: AMENDMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

3.08.510 Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans

- A. When a city or county proposes to amend its comprehensive plan or its components, it shall consider the strategies in subsection 3.08.220A as part of the analysis required by OAR 660-012-0060.
- B. If a city or county adopts the actions set forth in section _____ of Title 6 of the UGMFP, it shall be eligible for an automatic reduction of 30 percent below the vehicular trip generation rates recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers when analyzing the traffic impacts, pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060, of a plan amendment in a Center, Corridor or Station Community.
- D. If a city or county proposes a transportation project that is not included in the RTP and will result in a significant increase in SOV capacity or exceeds the planned function or capacity of a facility designated in the RTP, it shall demonstrate consideration of the following as part of its project analysis:
 1. The strategies set forth subsection 3.08.220A;

2. Complete street designs adopted pursuant to subsection 3.08.110A and as set forth in *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040* (2nd Edition, 2002) or similar resources consistent with regional street design policies; and
 3. Green street designs adopted pursuant to subsection 3.08.110A and as set forth in *Green Streets: Innovative Solutions for Stormwater and Street Crossings* (2002) and *Trees for Green Streets: An Illustrated Guide* (2002) or similar resources consistent with federal regulations for stream protection.
- E. If the city or county decides not to build a project identified in the RTP, it shall identify alternative projects or strategies to address the identified transportation need and inform Metro so that Metro can amend the RTP.
- F. This section does not apply to city or county transportation projects that are financed locally and would be undertaken on local facilities.

TITLE 6: COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES

3.08.610 Metro Review of Amendments to Transportation System Plans

- A. Cities and counties shall update or amend their TSPs to comply with the RTFP, or an amendment to it, within two years after acknowledgement of the RTFP, or an amendment to it, or by a later date specified in the ordinance that amends the RTFP. The COO shall notify cities and counties of the dates by which their TSPs must comply.
- B. Cities and counties that update or amend their TSPs after acknowledgment of the RTFP or an amendment to it, but before two years following its acknowledgment, shall make the amendments in compliance with the RTFP or the amendment. The COO shall notify cities and counties of the date of acknowledgment of the RTFP or an amendment to it.
- C. One year following acknowledgment of the RTFP or an amendment to it, cities and counties whose TSPs do not yet comply with the RTFP or the amendment shall make land use decisions consistent with the RTFP or the amendment. The

COO, at least 120 days before the specified date, shall notify cities and counties of the date upon which RTFP requirements become applicable to land use decisions. The notice shall specify which requirements become applicable to land use decisions in each city and county.

- D. An amendment to a city or county TSP shall be deemed to comply with the RTFP if no appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals is made within the 21-day period set forth in ORS 197.830(9), or if an appeal is made and the amendment is affirmed by the final decision on appeal. Once the amendment is deemed to comply with the RTFP, the RTFP shall no longer apply directly to city or county land use decisions.
- E. An amendment to a city or county TSP shall be deemed to comply with the RTFP as provided in subsection D only if the city or county provided notice to the COO as required by subsection F.
- F. At least 45 days prior to the first public hearing on a proposed amendment to a TSP, the city or county shall submit the proposed amendment to the COO. The COO may request, and if so the city or county shall submit, an analysis of compliance of the amendment with the RTFP. Within four weeks after receipt of the notice, the COO shall submit to the city or county a written analysis of compliance of the proposed amendment with the RTFP, including recommendations, if any, that would bring the amendment into compliance with the RTFP. The COO shall send a copy of its analysis to those persons who have requested a copy.
- G. If the COO concludes that the proposed amendment does not comply with RTFP, the COO shall advise the city or county that it may:
 - 1. Revise the proposed amendment as recommended in the COO's analysis;
 - 2. Seek an extension of time, pursuant to section 3.08.620, to bring the proposed amendment into compliance;
 - 3. Seek an exception to the requirement, pursuant to section 3.08.630; or

4. Seek review of the noncompliance by JPACT and the Metro Council, pursuant to subsections H and I of this section.
- H. The city or county may postpone further consideration of the proposed amendment and seek JPACT review of the COO's analysis under subsection F within 21 days from the date it received the COO's analysis. JPACT shall schedule the matter for presentations by the city or county and the COO at the earliest available time. At the conclusion of the presentations, JPACT, by a majority of a quorum, shall decide whether it agrees or disagrees with the COO's analysis and shall provide a brief written explanation as soon as practicable.
- I. The city or county may seek review of JPACT's decision by the Metro Council within 10 days from the date of JPACT's written explanation. The Council shall schedule the matter for presentations by the city or county and the COO at the earliest available time. At the conclusion of the presentations, the Council shall decide whether it agrees or disagrees with JPACT's decision and shall provide a brief written explanation as soon as practicable.
- J. A city or county that adopts an amendment to its TSP shall send a printed or electronic copy of the ordinance making the amendment to the COO within 14 days after its adoption.

3.08.620 Extension of Compliance Deadline

- A. A city or county may seek an extension of time for compliance with the RTFP by filing an application on a form provided by the COO. Upon receipt of an application, the Council President shall set the matter for a public hearing before the Metro Council and shall notify the city or county, JPACT, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and those persons who request notification of applications for extensions.
- B. The Council shall hold a public hearing to consider the application. Any person may testify at the hearing. The Council may grant an extension if it finds that:
 1. The city or county is making progress toward compliance with the RTFP; or

2. There is good cause for failure to meet the compliance deadline.
- C. The Council may establish terms and conditions for an extension in order to ensure that compliance is achieved in a timely and orderly fashion and that land use decisions made by the city or county during the extension do not undermine the ability of the city or county to achieve the purposes of the RTFP requirement. A term or condition must relate to the requirement of the RTFP for which the Council grants the extension. The Council shall not grant more than two extensions of time, nor grant an extension of time for more than one year.
 - D. The Council shall issue an order with its conclusion and analysis and send a copy to the city or county, JPACT, the DLCD and any person who participated in the proceeding. The city or county or a person who participated in the proceeding may seek review of the Council's order as a land use decision described in ORS 197.015(10)(a)(A).

3.08.630 Exception from Compliance

- A. A city or county may seek an exception from compliance with a requirement of the RTFP by filing an application on a form provided by the COO. Upon receipt of an application, the Council President shall set the matter for a public hearing before the Metro Council and shall notify JPACT, the DLCD and those persons who request notification of requests for exceptions.
- B. Following the public hearing on the application, the Metro Council may grant an exception if it finds:
 1. It is not possible to achieve the requirement due to topographic or other physical constraints or an existing development pattern;
 2. This exception and likely similar exceptions will not render the objective of the requirement unachievable region-wide;
 3. The exception will not reduce the ability of another city or county to comply with the requirement; and

4. The city or county has adopted other measures more appropriate for the city or county to achieve the intended result of the requirement.
- C. The Council may establish terms and conditions for the exception in order to ensure that it does not undermine the ability of the region to achieve the policies of the RTP. A term or condition must relate to the requirement of the RTPFP to which the Council grants the exception.
- D. The Council shall issue an order with its conclusion and analysis and send a copy to the city or county, JPACT, the DLCD and those persons who have requested a copy of the order. The city or county or a person who participated in the proceeding may seek review of the Council's order as a land use decision described in ORS 197.015(10) (a) (A).

TITLE 7: DEFINITIONS

3.08.710 Definitions

For the purpose of this functional plan, the following definitions shall apply:

- A. "Accessibility" means the ease of access and the amount of time required to reach a given location or service by any mode of travel.
- B. "Accessway" means right-of-way or easement designed for public access by bicycles and pedestrians, and may include emergency vehicle passage.
- C. "Alternative modes" means alternative methods of travel to the automobile, including public transportation (light rail, bus and other forms of public transportation), bicycles and walking.
- D. "At a major transit stop" means a parcel or ownership which is adjacent to or includes a major transit stop, generally including portions of such parcels or ownerships that are within 200 feet of a major transit stop.
- E. "Bikeway" means separated bike paths, striped bike lanes, or wide outside lanes that accommodate bicycles and motor vehicles.

- F. "Boulevard design" means a design concept that emphasizes pedestrian travel, bicycling and the use of public transportation, and accommodates motor vehicle travel.
- G. "Capacity expansion" means constructed or operational improvements to the regional motor vehicle system that increase the capacity of the system.
- H. "Chicane" means a movable or permanent barrier used to create extra turns in a roadway to reduce motor vehicle speeds or to prevent cars from driving across a pedestrian or bicycle accessway.
- I. "Connectivity" means the degree to which the local and regional street, pedestrian, bicycle, transit and freight systems in a given area are interconnected.
- J. "Complete Streets" means streets that are designed to serve all modes of travel, including bicycles, freight delivery vehicles, transit vehicles and pedestrians of all ages and abilities.
- K. "COO" means Metro's Chief Operating Officer or the COO's designee.
- L. "DLCD" means the Oregon state agency under the direction of the Land Conservation and Development Commission.
- M. "Deficiency" means a capacity, design or operations constraint that limits, but does not prohibit the ability to travel by a given mode or meet standards and targets in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2. Examples of deficiencies include throughway portions with less than six through lanes of capacity; arterial portions with less than four through lanes of capacity; arterial streets with substandard design features; at-grade rail crossings; height restrictions; bicycle and pedestrian connections that contain obstacles (e.g., missing curb ramps); distances greater than 330 feet between pedestrian crossings; absence of pedestrian refuges; sidewalks occluded by utility infrastructure; high traffic volumes; complex traffic environments; transit overcrowding or schedule unreliability; and high crash locations.
- N. "Design type" means the conceptual areas depicted on the Metro 2040 Growth Concept Map and described in the RFP including Central City, Regional Center, Town Center,

Station Community, Corridor, Main Street, Inner Neighborhood, Outer Neighborhood, Regionally Significant Industrial Area, Industrial Area and Employment Area.

- O. "Essential destinations" means hospitals, medical centers, pharmacies, shopping centers, grocery stores, colleges, universities, middle schools and high schools, parks and open spaces, social service centers with more than 200 monthly LIFT pick-ups, employers with more than 1,500 employees, sports and entertainment venues and major government offices.
- P. "Full street connection" means right-of-way designed for public access by motor vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles.
- Q. "Gap" means a missing link or barrier in the "typical" urban transportation system for any mode that functionally prohibits travel where a connection might be expected to occur in accordance with the system concepts and networks in Chapter 2 of the RTP. There is a gap when a connection does not exist. But a gap also exists if a physical barrier, such as a throughway, natural feature, weight limits on a bridge or existing development, interrupts a system connection.
- R. "Growth Concept Map" means the conceptual map depicting the 2040 Growth Concept design types described in the RFP.
- S. "High capacity transit" means the ability to bypass traffic and avoid delay by operating in exclusive or semi-exclusive rights of way, faster overall travel speeds due to wide station spacing, frequent service, transit priority street and signal treatments, and premium station and passenger amenities. Speed and schedule reliability are preserved using transit signal priority at at-grade crossings and/or intersections. High levels of passenger infrastructure are provided at transit stations and station communities, including real-time schedule information, ticket machines, special lighting, benches, shelters, bicycle parking, and commercial services. The transit modes most commonly associated with high capacity transit include:
- light rail transit, light rail trains operating in exclusive or semi-exclusive right of way¹

¹ Exclusive right of way, as defined by Transportation Research Board TCRP report 17, includes fully grade - separated right of way. Semi-exclusive right of way includes separate and shared rights of way as well light rail and

- bus rapid transit, regular or advanced bus vehicles operating primarily in exclusive or semi-exclusive right of way
 - rapid streetcar, streetcar trains operating primarily in exclusive or semi-exclusive right of way
 - commuter rail, heavy rail passenger trains operating on exclusive, semi-exclusive or nonexclusive (with freight) railroad tracks
- T. "Improved pedestrian crossing" means a marked pedestrian crossing and may include signage, signalization, curb extensions and a pedestrian refuge such as a landscaped median.
- U. "Institutional uses" means colleges and universities, hospitals and major government offices.
- V. "JPACT" means the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, composed of elected officials and agency representatives involved, that makes recommendations to the Metro Council on transportation planning and projects.
- W. "Landscape strip" means the portion of public right-of-way located between the sidewalk and curb.
- X. "Land use decision" shall have the meaning of that term set forth in ORS 197.015(10).
- Y. "Land use regulation" means any local government zoning ordinance, land division ordinance adopted under ORS 92.044 or 92.046 or similar general ordinance establishing standards for implementing a comprehensive plan, as defined in ORS 197.015.
- Z. "Level-of-service (LOS)" means the ratio of the volume of motor vehicle demand to the capacity of the motor vehicle system during a specific increment of time.
- AA. "Local trips" means trips that are five miles or shorter in length.

pedestrian malls adjacent to a parallel roadway. Nonexclusive right of way includes operations in mixed traffic, transit mall and a light rail/pedestrian mall.

- BB. "Low-income families" means a household who earned between 0 and 1.99 times the federal Poverty level in 199.
- CC. "Low-income populations" means any readily identifiable group of low-income persons who live in geographic proximity and, if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed or transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who would be similarly affected by a TSP.
- DD. "Major driveway" means a driveway that:
1. Intersects with a public street that is controlled, or is to be controlled in the planning period, by a traffic signal;
 2. Intersects with an existing or planned arterial or collector street; or
 3. Would be an extension of an existing or planned local street, or of another major driveway.
- EE. "Major transit stop" means transit centers, high capacity transit stations, major bus stops, inter-city bus passenger terminals, inter-city rail passenger terminals and bike-transit facilities, all as shown on Figure 2.15 of the Regional Transportation Plan.
- FF. "Median" means the center portion of public right-of-way, located between opposing directions of motor vehicle travel lanes. A median is usually raised and may be landscaped, and usually incorporates left turn lanes for motor vehicles at intersections and major access points.
- GG. "Metro" means the regional government of the metropolitan area, the elected Metro Council as the policy-setting body of the government.
- HH. "Metro boundary" means the jurisdictional boundary of Metro, the elected regional government of the metropolitan area.
- II. "Minority" means a person who is:
1. Black (having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa);
 2. Hispanic (of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race);

3. Asian American (having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent or the Pacific Islands);
 4. American Indian and Alaska Native (having origins in any of the original peoples of North American and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition); or
 5. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacifica Islander (having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa or other Pacific Islands).
- JJ. "Minority population" means any readily identifiable group of minority persons who live in geographic proximity and, if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed or transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who would be similarly affected by a TSP.
- KK. "Mixed-use development" includes areas of a mix of at least two of the following land uses and includes multiple tenants or ownerships: residential, retail and office. This definition excludes large, single-use land uses such as colleges, hospitals, and business campuses. Minor incidental land uses that are accessory to the primary land use should not result in a development being designated as "mixed-use development." The size and definition of minor incidental, accessory land uses allowed within large, single-use developments should be determined by cities and counties through their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances.
- LL. "Mobility" means the speed at which a given mode of travel operates in a specific location.
- MM. "Mode-split target" means the individual percentage of public transportation, pedestrian, bicycle and shared-ride trips expressed as a share of total person-trips.
- NN. "Motor vehicle" means automobiles, vans, public and private buses, trucks and semi-trucks, motorcycles and mopeds.
- OO. "Motor vehicle level-of-service" means a measurement of congestion as a share of designed motor vehicle capacity of a road.

- PP. "Multi-modal" means transportation facilities or programs designed to serve many or all methods of travel, including all forms of motor vehicles, public transportation, bicycles and walking.
- QQ. "Narrow street design" means streets with less than 46 feet of total right-of-way and no more than 28 feet of pavement width between curbs.
- RR. "Near a major transit stop" means a parcel or ownership that is within 300 feet of a major transit stop.
- SS. "Non-SOV modal target" means a target for the percentage of total trips made in a defined area by means other than a private passenger vehicles carrying one occupant.
- TT. "Performance measure" means a measurement derived from technical analysis aimed at determining whether a planning policy is achieving the expected outcome or intent associated with the policy.
- UU. "Person-trips" means the total number of discrete trips by individuals using any mode of travel.
- VV. "Refinement plan" means an amendment to a transportation system plan which determines at a systems level the function, mode or general location of a transportation facility, service or improvement, deferred during system planning because detailed information needed to make the determination could not be reasonably obtained at that time.
- WW. "Regional vehicle trips" are trips that are greater than five miles in length.
- XX. "Residential Parking District" is a designation intended to protect residential areas from spillover parking generated by adjacent commercial, employment or mixed use areas, or other uses that generate a high demand for parking.
- YY. "RFP" means Metro's Regional Framework Plan adopted pursuant to ORS chapter 268.
- ZZ. "Routine repair and maintenance" means activities directed at preserving an existing allowed use or facility, without expanding the development footprint or site use.

- AAA. "RTFP" means this Regional Transportation Functional Plan.
- BBB. "Shared-ride" means private passenger vehicles carrying more than one occupant.
- CCC. "Significant increase in Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) capacity for multi-modal arterials" means an increase in SOV capacity created by the construction of additional general purpose lanes totaling 1/2 lane miles or more in length. General purpose lanes are defined as through travel lanes or multiple turn lanes. This also includes the construction of a new general purpose arterial facility on a new location. Lane tapers are not included as part of the general purpose lane. An increase in SOV capacity associated with a safety project is considered significant only if the safety deficiency is totally related to traffic congestion. Significant increases in SOV capacity should be assessed for individual facilities rather than for the planning area.
- DDD. "Significant increase in Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) capacity for regional through-route freeways" means an increase in SOV capacity created by the construction of additional general purpose lanes other than that resulting from a safety project or a project solely intended to eliminate a bottleneck. An increase in SOV capacity associated with the elimination of a bottleneck is considered significant only if such an increase provides a highway section SOV capacity greater than ten percent over that provided immediately upstream of the bottleneck. An increase in SOV capacity associated with a safety project is considered significant only if the safety deficiency is totally related to traffic congestion. Construction of a new general purpose highway facility on a new location also constitutes a significant increase in SOV capacity. Significant increase in SOV capacity should be assessed for individual facilities rather than for the planning area.
- EEE. "SOV" means a private motorized passenger vehicle carrying one occupant (single-occupancy vehicle).
- FFF. "Substantial compliance" means city and county comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances, on the whole, conform with the purposes of the performance standards in the functional plan and any failure to meet individual performance standard requirements is technical or minor in nature.

- GGG. "Throughway" means limited-access facilities that serve longer-distance motor vehicle and freight trips and provide interstate, intrastate and cross-regional travel.
- HHH. "TPR" means the administrative rule entitled Transportation Planning Rule adopted by the Land Conservation and Development to implement statewide planning Goal 12, Transportation.
- III. "Traffic calming" means street design or operational features intended to maintain a given motor vehicle travel speed.
- JJJ. "Transportation system management and operations" (TSMO) means programs and strategies that will allow the region to more effectively and efficiently manage existing and new multi-modal transportation facilities and services to preserve capacity and improve safety, security and reliability. TSMO has two components: (1) transportation system management, which focuses on making facilities better serve users by improving efficiency, safety and capacity; and (2) transportation demand management, which seeks to modify travel behavior in order to make more efficient use of facilities and services and enable users to take advantage of everything the transportation system offers.
- KKK. "TriMet" means the regional service district that provide public mass transit to the region.
- LLL. "TSP" means a transportation system plan adopted by a city or county.
- MMM. "UGB" means an urban growth boundary adopted pursuant to ORS 268.390(3).
- NNN. "Update" means TSP amendments that change the planning horizon and apply broadly to a city or county and typically entails changes that need to be considered in the context of the entire TSP, or a substantial geographic area.
- OOO. "Woonerf" means a street or group of streets on which pedestrians and bicyclists have legal priority over motor vehicles.

Table 3.08-1

Regional Non-SOV Modal Targets (share of average weekday trips for the year 2035)

2040 Design Type	Non-drive alone modal target
Portland central city	60-70%
Regional centers Town centers Main streets Station communities Corridors Passenger intermodal facilities	45-55%
Industrial areas Freight intermodal facilities Employment areas Inner neighborhoods Outer neighborhoods	40-45%

Table 3.08-2
Interim Regional Mobility Policy
 Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards

Location	Standard Mid-Day One-Hour Peak ^A	Standard PM 2-Hour Peak ^A	
		1st Hour	2nd Hour
Central City Regional Centers Town Centers Main Streets Station Communities	.99	1.1	.99
Corridors Industrial Areas Intermodal Facilities Employment Areas Inner Neighborhoods Outer Neighborhoods	.90	.99	.99
I-84 (from I-5 to I-205)	.99	1.1	.99
I-5 North (from Marquam Bridge to Interstate Bridge)	.99	1.1	.99
OR 99E (from Lincoln Street to OR 224 interchange)	.99	1.1	.99
US 26 (from I-405 to Sylan interchange)	.99	1.1	.99
I-405 ^B (I-5 South to I-5 North)	.99	1.1	.99
Other Principal Arterial Routes I-205 ^B I-84 (east of I-205) I-5 (Marquam Bridge to Wilsonville) ^B OR 217 US 26 (west of Sylan) US 30 OR 8 (Murray Boulevard to Brookwood Avenue) ^B OR 212 OR 224 OR 47 OR 213	.90	.99	.99

A. The volume-to-capacity ratios in the table are for the highest two consecutive hours of weekday traffic volumes. The mid-day peak hour as the highest 60-minute period between the hours of 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. The 2nd hour is defined as the single 60-minute period either before or after the peak 60 minute period, whichever is highest.


B. Thresholds shown are for interim purposes only; a corridor refinement plan for these corridors is required in Chapter 6 of the RTP, and will include a recommended mobility policy for each corridor.

Table 3.08-3 - Regional Parking Ratios			
(parking ratios are based on spaces per 1,000 sq. ft of gross leasable area unless otherwise stated)			
Land Use	Minimum Parking Requirements (See Central City Transportation Management Plan for downtown Portland stds)	Maximum Permitted Parking - Zone A:	Maximum Permitted Parking Ratios - Zone B:
	Requirements May Not Exceed	Transit and Pedestrian Accessible Areas ¹	Rest of Region
General Office (includes Office Park, "Flex-Space", Government Office & misc. Services) (gsf)	2.7	3.4	4.1
Light Industrial Industrial Park Manufacturing (gsf)	1.6	None	None
Warehouse (gross square feet; parking ratios apply to warehouses 150,000 gsf or greater)	0.3	0.4	0.5
Schools: College/ University & High School (spaces/# of students and staff)	0.2	0.3	0.3
Tennis Racquetball Court	1.0	1.3	1.5
Sports Club/Recreation Facilities	4.3	5.4	6.5
Retail/Commercial, including shopping centers	4.1	5.1	6.2
Bank with Drive-In	4.3	5.4	6.5
Movie Theater (spaces/number of seats)	0.3	0.4	0.5
Fast Food with Drive Thru	9.9	12.4	14.9
Other Restaurants	15.3	19.1	23
Place of Worship (spaces/seats)	0.5	0.6	0.8
Medical/Dental Clinic	3.9	4.9	5.9
Residential Uses			
Hotel/Motel	1	none	none
Single Family Detached	1	none	none
Residential unit, less than 500 square feet per unit, one bedroom	1	none	none
Multi-family, townhouse, one bedroom	1.25	none	none
Multi-family, townhouse, two bedroom	1.5	none	none
Multi-family, townhouse, three bedroom	1.75	none	none

¹ Ratios for uses not included in this table would be determined by cities and counties. In the event that a local government proposes a different measure, for example, spaces per seating area for a restaurant instead of gross leasable area, Metro may grant approval upon a demonstration by the local government that the parking space requirement is substantially similar to the regional standard.

Exhibit E to Ordinance No. 10-1241
Parking Maximums
 Twenty Minute Bus Service and
 2040 Design Types

800 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2700
 TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



LEGEND

- Light Rail Stops
- ▨ ZONE A
Accessible areas with lower parking requirements
- ▨ ZONE B
All other areas.
- ~ 2040 Design Types

Exhibit F to Ordinance No. 10-1241

Exhibit F to Ordinance No. 10-1241

Title 2 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan is repealed.

~~TITLE 2: REGIONAL PARKING POLICY~~

~~3.07.210 Intent~~

~~The State's Transportation Planning Rule calls for reductions in vehicle miles traveled per capita and restrictions on construction of new parking spaces as a means of responding to transportation and land use impacts of growth. The Metro 2040 Growth Concept calls for more compact development as a means to encourage more efficient use of land, promote non auto trips and protect air quality. In addition, the federally mandated air quality plan adopted by the state relies on the 2040 Growth Concept fully achieving its transportation objectives. Notably, the air quality plan relies upon reducing vehicle trips per capita and related parking spaces through minimum and maximum parking ratios. This title addresses these state and federal requirements and preserves the quality of life of the region.~~

~~A compact urban form requires that each use of land is carefully considered and that more efficient forms are favored over less efficient ones. Parking, especially that provided in new developments, can result in a less efficient land usage and lower floor to area ratios. Parking also has implications for transportation. In areas where transit is provided or other non-auto modes (walking, biking) are convenient, less parking can be provided and still allow accessibility and mobility for all modes, including autos. Reductions in auto trips when substituted by non auto modes can reduce congestion and increase air quality.~~

~~3.07.220 Performance Standard~~

~~A. Cities and counties are hereby required to amend their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations, if necessary, to meet or exceed the following minimum standards:~~

- ~~1. Cities and counties shall require no more parking than the minimum as shown on Table 3.07-2, Regional Parking Ratios, attached hereto; and~~

Exhibit F to Ordinance No. 10-1241

~~2. Cities and counties shall establish parking maximums at ratios no greater than those listed in the Regional Parking Ratios Table and as illustrated in the Parking Maximum Map. The designation of A and B zones on the Parking Maximum Map should be reviewed after the completion of the Regional Transportation Plan and every three years thereafter. If 20 minute peak hour transit service has become available to an area within a one-quarter mile walking distance for bus transit or one-half mile walking distance for light rail transit, that area shall be added to Zone A. If 20 minute peak hour transit service is no longer available to an area within a one-quarter mile walking distance for bus transit or one-half mile walking distance for light rail transit, that area shall be removed from Zone A. Cities and counties should designate Zone A parking ratios in areas with good pedestrian access to commercial or employment areas (within 1/3 mile walk) from adjacent residential areas.~~

~~3. Cities and counties shall establish an administrative or public hearing process for considering ratios for individual or joint developments to allow a variance for parking when a development application is received which may result in approval of construction of parking spaces either in excess of the maximum parking ratios; or less than the minimum parking ratios.~~

~~Cities and counties may grant a variance from any maximum parking ratios through a variance process.~~

~~B. Free surface parking spaces shall be subject to the regional parking maximums provided for Zone A and Zone B. Parking spaces in parking structures, fleet parking, parking for vehicles that are for sale, lease, or rent, employee car pool parking spaces, dedicated valet parking spaces, spaces that are user paid, market rate parking or other high efficiency parking management alternatives may be exempted from maximum parking standards by cities and counties. Sites that are proposed for redevelopment may be allowed to phase in reductions as a local option. Where mixed land uses are proposed, cities and counties shall provide for blended parking rates. It is recommended that cities and counties count adjacent on-street parking spaces, nearby public parking and shared parking toward required parking minimum standards.~~

Exhibit F to Ordinance No. 10-1241

- ~~C. Cities and counties may use categories or measurement standards other than those in the Regional Parking Ratios Table, but must provide findings that the effect of the local regulations will be substantially the same as the application of the Regional Parking Ratios.~~
- ~~D. Cities and counties shall provide data to Metro on an annual basis that demonstrates compliance with the minimum and maximum parking standards, including the application of any variances to the regional standards in this title. Coordination with Metro collection of other building data should be encouraged.~~
- ~~E. Cities and counties shall provide for the designation of residential parking districts in local comprehensive plans or implementing ordinances.~~
- ~~F. Cities and counties shall amend their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations to require that parking lots more than 3 acres in size provide street like features along major driveways; including curbs, sidewalks, and street trees or planting strips. Major driveways in new residential and mixed use areas shall meet the connectivity standards for full street connections as described in Section 6.4.5 of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan.~~
- ~~G. Cities and counties shall amend their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations to incorporate the requirements contained in Section 3.07.220(A)-(E) within one year of adoption of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan.~~

Exhibit F to Ordinance No. 10-1241

Table 3.07-2-- Regional Parking Ratios			
(Section 3.07.220(A)(1))			
(parking ratios are based on spaces per 1,000 sq. ft of gross leasable area unless otherwise stated)			
Land Use	Minimum Parking Requirements (See Central City Transportation Management Plan for downtown Portland stds)	Maximum Permitted Parking --Zone A:	Maximum Permitted Parking Ratios --Zone B:
	Requirements May Not Exceed	Transit and Pedestrian Accessible Areas[†]	Rest of Region
General Office (includes Office Park, "Flex-Space", Government Office & misc. Services) (gsf)	2.7	3.4	4.1
Light Industrial Industrial Park Manufacturing (gsf)	1.6	None	None
Warehouse (gross square feet; parking ratios apply to warehouses 150,000 gsf or greater)	0.3	0.4	0.5
Schools: College/ University & High School (spaces/# of students and staff)	0.2	0.3	0.3
Tennis Racquetball Court	1.0	1.3	1.5
Sports Club/Recreation Facilities	4.3	5.4	6.5
Retail/Commercial, including shopping centers	4.1	5.1	6.2
Bank with Drive-In	4.3	5.4	6.5
Movie Theater (spaces/number of seats)	0.3	0.4	0.5
Fast Food with Drive Thru	9.9	12.4	14.9
Other Restaurants	15.3	19.1	23
Place of Worship (spaces/seats)	0.5	0.6	0.8
Medical/Dental Clinic	3.9	4.9	5.9
Residential Uses			
Hotel/Motel	1	none	none
Single Family Detached	1	none	none
Residential unit, less than 500 square feet per unit, one bedroom	1	none	none
Multi-family, townhouse, one bedroom	1.25	none	none
Multi-family, townhouse, two bedroom	1.5	none	none
Multi-family, townhouse, three bedroom	1.75	none	none

[†]-Ratios for uses not included in this table would be determined by cities and counties. In the event that a local government proposes a different measure, for example, spaces per seating area for a restaurant instead of gross leasable area, Metro may grant approval upon a demonstration by the local government that the parking space requirement is substantially similar to the regional standard.

Exhibit G to Ordinance No. 10-1241

Amendments to Chapter 2 of the Regional Framework Plan

Under development

Exhibit H to Ordinance No. 10-1241
Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Under development

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 10-1241 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO COMPLY WITH STATE LAW; TO ADD THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS ACTION PLAN, THE REGIONAL FREIGHT PLAN AND THE HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM PLAN; TO AMEND THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL PLAN AND ADD IT TO THE METRO CODE; TO AMEND THE REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN; AND TO AMEND THE URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN

Date: April 28, 2010

Prepared by: Kim Ellis, 503-797-1617

BACKGROUND

Metro is the regional government responsible for regional land use and transportation planning under state law and the federally-designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Portland metropolitan area. As the federally-designated MPO, Metro is responsible for updating the RTP every four years, which includes updating goals and policies to guide transportation investments, and compiling a financially constrained list of projects and programs to meet requirements for federal funding. Metro is also responsible for developing a regional transportation system plan (TSP), consistent with Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements.

Metro's jurisdictional boundary encompasses the urban portions of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas counties. Metro's planning partners include the 25 cities, three counties and affected special districts of the region, ODOT, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Port of Portland, South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART), TriMet and other interested community, business and advocacy groups as well as state and federal regulatory agencies such as the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Metro also coordinates with the City of Vancouver, Clark County Washington, the Port of Vancouver, the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), C-Tran, the Washington Department of Transportation, the Southwest Washington Air Pollution Control Authority and other Clark County governments on bi-state issues. The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council is the federally designated MPO for the Clark County portion of the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region.

2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The Metro Council initiated the 2035 RTP Update on September 22, 2005 with approval of Resolution No. 05-3610A (for the Purpose of Issuing a Request for Proposals to Develop a Work Scope for an Expanded 2005-08 Regional Transportation Plan Update that Incorporates the "Budgeting for Outcomes" Approach to Establishing Regional Transportation Priorities).

The update involves a new approach that included:

- (1) A strong education component to increase community and stakeholder awareness of the issues facing the region, including a growing population, climate change and economic instability.
- (2) An outcomes-based approach linked to public values to assess implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept and to evaluate and prioritize transportation investments. This approach more fully integrates land use, economic, environmental and transportation objectives in the decision-making process. Central to the RTP is an overall emphasis on outcomes, system completeness and measurable performance to hold the region accountable for making progress toward the region's desired outcomes and state goals for reductions in drive alone trips, vehicle miles

traveled and corresponding GHG emissions. The RTP includes specific performance targets and indicators that will be monitored over time, using this information to determine whether future adjustments to policies and strategies are needed.

- (3) Collaboration with regional partners and key stakeholders to resolve the complex issues inherent in realizing the region's 2040 Growth Concept.

The 2035 RTP updates the policies, projects and strategies for implementing the 2040 Growth Concept and meeting the statewide greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets at the regional and local levels. By 2035, the metro region and surrounding counties are expected to grow by more than one million people and add more than 500,000 jobs, doubling trips on the transportation system.

Through its policies, projects and strategies, the 2035 RTP aims to:

- support the region's vision to use land inside the UGB as efficiently as possible to reduce the need for costly new infrastructure and protect farm and forest lands
- attract jobs and housing to downtowns, main streets and employment areas
- increase safety for all transportation system users
- increase the use of public transit and reduce travel distances and the need to travel by car to help reduce air pollution and our carbon footprint
- complete gaps in existing roads, bridges, transit service, sidewalks and bike facilities
- improve interchanges and strategically add capacity to the region's highway system
- build trails and other connections to make it safer and more convenient to walk and bike
- use technology to make travel safer, more efficient and reliable for cars, trucks and transit

All of these strategies and investments will help the region make the most out of what we have, address growing congestion more comprehensively and make travel more convenient, affordable and reliable for everyone – including businesses and freight shippers. They will also provide real options for walking, biking and using transit and help the region's businesses and industries create and retain jobs and remain competitive.

The following outcomes, endorsed by the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) in May 2008 and adopted by the Metro Council in Resolution No. 08-3940, provided the framework for the updated policies, projects and strategies:

Desired outcomes for a successful region

1. People live and work in vibrant communities where they can choose to walk for pleasure and to meet everyday needs.
2. Current and future residents benefit from the region's sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity.
3. People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life.
4. The region is a leader in minimizing contributions to global warming.
5. Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems.
6. The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.

SUMMARY OF DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Metro's transportation planning activities are guided by a federally mandated decision-making framework known as the metropolitan transportation planning process. Metro leads this process in consultation and coordination with federal, state and local governments, and engagement of other stakeholders with an interest in or who are affected by this planning effort. Metro facilitates this consultation and coordination through four advisory committee bodies—the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), MPAC, the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC).

The 2035 RTP update process relied on this existing decision-making structure for development, review and adoption of the plan. MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council made recommendations at key decision points based on input from TPAC, MTAC, the Council-appointed Regional Freight Plan Task Force and the public participation process.

Technical work groups were formed to advise Metro staff on the development of work products throughout the process. Metro technical staff also worked with the Regional Travel Options Subcommittee to TPAC, the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Subcommittee to TPAC and the Regional Trails Working Group throughout the update process. The Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement provided advice on public engagement activities.

THE 2035 RTP UPDATE PROCESS AND DECISION TIMETABLE

Federal component: 2005-2008

Metro began the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan update in fall 2005, with early scoping that involved regional partners, community organizations and other stakeholders. Work from fall 2006 through fall 2007 included considerable stakeholder and public involvement to determine needs and develop policies that provided a framework to guide the update of the RTP. In fall 2006, Metro held nine stakeholder workshops that engaged 127 individuals and 50 different community organizations and government entities to help shape policy goals. Four of the workshops were held with Metro's existing advisory committees. The other five workshops were held with business and community groups that represented specific public interests, public responsibilities or groups historically underrepresented in transportation planning and decision-making.

To meet planning requirements in the most recent transportation authorization act, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), Metro consulted with state and federal resource agencies through the collaborative Environmental Transportation Agreement for Streamlining work group. The CETAS group consultation, which was held on October 16, 2007, included representatives from tribal groups, ODOT and 10 state and federal transportation, natural resource, cultural resource and land use planning agencies.

Other work through fall 2007 included technical workshops, informal feedback cards and questionnaires, scientific public opinion surveys, and a formal, 30-day public comment period with open houses and public hearings.

In December 2007, the Metro Council adopted the federal component of the 2035 RTP to meet planning requirements in the most recent transportation authorization act, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The U.S. Department of Transportation approved the federal component of the 2035 RTP on March 5, 2008.

State component: 2008-2010

Following approval of the federal RTP, the focus turned to the completion of a final RTP to meet regional and state land use goals and the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule. On May 1, 2008, the LCDC accepted the RTP in the manner of periodic review and approved the work program and timeline for the state component of the RTP, which called for its completion by December 2009.

During 2008 and 2009, RTP work focused on framing and refining transportation and land-use choices as part of the broader *Making the Greatest Place* effort. This comprehensive effort seeks to integrate local and regional land use and transportation investments to focus future population and employment growth in centers, corridors, and employment areas, consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept. This work included the evaluation of different land-use and transportation investment scenarios.

To provide a forum for discussions, MPAC and JPACT held three joint meetings between October and December 2008, to discuss transportation and investment policy choices that would be made in the next year or two. More than 100 people attended the joint meetings, which included the elected officials who are members of those committees, other elected officials, local government staff, non-government partners and members of the interested public. The results of those meetings helped prioritize transportation investments that would best support desired land uses and reduce travel distances.

During January 2009, Metro and Oregon Department of Transportation staff conducted 14 coordination interviews with local transportation agencies to provide information about the RTP's mobility corridor concept and to identify issues within each of the 24 corridors in preparation for future workshops.

Through March and April 2009, Metro and ODOT hosted seven mobility corridor workshops by geographic region to identify common mobility gaps and deficiencies and discuss the desired function of each corridor and individual transportation facilities. These meetings helped to develop a new Mobility Corridor Atlas and identify priority projects.

Metro also convened a bicycle work group to identify policy refinements to respond to public comments received during the federal component of the RTP update and to incorporate active transportation policy recommendations identified by the Blue Ribbon Committee for Trails.

At the same time, Metro and its regional partners continued to work on related planning efforts that will be included in the RTP: the Sunrise Corridor project, the I-5/99W connector study, the Sellwood Bridge study, the High-Capacity Transit (HCT) system plan, the Regional Freight Plan and the Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) plan. Metro also worked with communities around the region to identify their local land use, transportation and public infrastructure-related aspirations for managing growth and the investments needed to support them.

The technical analysis and policy development guided further system development and refinement before soliciting projects and funding strategies from the region's 25 cities, three counties, TriMet, South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART), Port of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) – the region's transportation providers. On June 15, 2009, the Metro Council, in conjunction with JPACT and MPAC, issued a "call for projects" to refine RTP investment priorities. The RTP goals, performance targets and refinement criteria provided policy direction for investment priorities to be brought forward for consideration in the final 2035 RTP.

JPACT-ENDORSED CRITERIA TO REFINE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES

- Make multi-modal travel safe and reliable
- Target investments to support local aspiration and the 2040 Growth Concept
- Provide multi-modal freight mobility and access
- Expand transit coverage and frequency
- Expand active transportation options
- Reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions
- Address transportation needs of underserved communities

Projects were solicited from county coordinating committees, the city of Portland, TriMet, SMART, the Port of Portland and ODOT. Each project sponsor was requested to identify investment priorities consistent with the draft RTP performance targets and criteria, and within the funding target established by JPACT. Projects and programs were requested to come from plans or studies that had been developed through a public process. The solicitation resulted in 1,058 proposed projects with a total estimated cost of \$19.6 billion.

The draft RTP and projects, draft TSMO Plan, draft Regional Freight Plan and draft HCT System Plan summary report and complete list of projects were released for a 30-day public comment period that was held from September 15 to October 15, 2009. The RTP comment package was released as part of the Making the Greatest Place effort and Metro's chief operating officer's recommendation titled "Strategies for a sustainable and prosperous region."

Forty-five days before the opening of the public comment period, electronic notices were distributed to all regional neighborhood associations, citizen participation organizations and interested parties who had asked to be included in Metro's notification lists. The notices included information on how to access the review draft online, dates and times of public open houses and hearings, and instructions on different options for submitting comments.

During the comment period, seven open houses and five public hearings were held. A Spanish interpreter was present at events held in Hillsboro, Gresham and North Portland, where large concentrations of Spanish speakers are known to live. The ability to engage an interpreter at any of the events was promoted in display ads and through a flyer in Spanish that was distributed to organizations that serve Spanish-speaking people in those communities.

On December 17, 2010, the Metro Council approved Resolution No. 09-4099, directing staff to:

- incorporate amendments recommended to respond to public comments received in a final draft RTP
- conduct a final analysis for conformity with the federal Clean Air Act
- prepare findings, and the functional plan amendments needed to implement the new policies and strategies.
- release the final draft RTP 45 days of public comment beginning in March 2010, before MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council consider approval by ordinance in June 2010.

In early 2010, staff prepared documents to be released for a third and final 45-day public comment period and hearings. Forty-five days before the comment periods opened, electronic notices were sent to all neighborhood associations, citizen participation organizations, jurisdictions, tribes with any potential interest in the area, business and community stakeholders, and all individuals who asked to be included in our list of interested parties announcing the comment period and providing information on how to comment. A second notice was sent when the comment period opened. A public notice was published in *The Oregonian*, the newspaper of record for the metro area, and display ads were published in all ethnic newspapers and community newspapers. A press release was published on the Metro web site and sent to all area media.

Attachment 1 summarizes specific comments and recommendations from the most recent public comment period held from March 22 to May 6, 2010. Attachment 2 is a full public comment report that provides a more detailed summary of the stakeholder and public involvement conducted from Spring 2006 to Spring 2010, including documentation of specific comments received during the most recent public comment period. MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council considered public comments received prior to action on this ordinance.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition:** None known.
2. **Legal Antecedents:** Several Federal, State and regional laws and actions relate to this action.

Federal regulations include:

- Clean Air Act, as amended [42 U.S. C. 7401 and 23 U.S.C. 109(j)], as amended].
- US EPA transportation conformity rules (40 CFR, parts 51 and 93).
- USDOT rules that require Metro to update RTPs on a four-year cycle [23 CFR 450.322(a)].

State regulations include:

- Statewide planning goals.
- Oregon Administrative Rules for Transportation Planning (OAR Chapter 660, Division 12).
- Oregon Transportation Plan and implementing modal plans, including the Oregon Highway Plan.
- Oregon Administrative Rules for Transportation Conformity, (OAR Chapter 340, Division 252).
- 2006 State Implementation Plan (SIP).
- 2006 Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan and 2007 Portland Area Ozone Maintenance Plan.

Metro legislation includes:

- Resolution 05-3610A, “For the Purpose of Issuing a Request for Proposals to Develop a Work Scope for an Expanded 2005-08 Regional Transportation Plan Update that Incorporates the “Budgeting for Outcomes” Approach to Establishing Regional Transportation Priorities” adopted by the Metro Council on September 22, 2005.
- Resolution No. 06-3661, “For the Purpose of Approving A Work Program For the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update and Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Amend Contract No. 926975)” adopted by the Metro Council on June 15, 2006.
- Resolution No. 07-3793, “For the Purpose of Accepting the Chapter 1 Regional Transportation Policy Framework as the Provisional Draft For the Purpose Of Completing Phase 3 of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update” adopted by the Metro Council on March 15, 2007.
- Resolution 07-3831B, “For the Purpose of Approving The Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update, Pending Air Quality Conformity Analysis” adopted by the Metro Council on December 13, 2007.
- Resolution No. 08-3911, “For the Purpose of Approving the Air Quality Conformity Determination For the Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and Reconfirming the 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program” adopted by the Metro Council on February 28, 2008.
- Resolution No. 08-3940, “For the Purpose of Affirming a Definition of a ‘Successful Region’ and Committing Metro to Work With Regional Partners to Identify Performance Indicators and Targets and to Develop a Decision-Making Process to Create Successful Communities” adopted by the Metro Council on June 26, 2008.
- Resolution No. 09-4052, “For the Purpose of Accepting the Regional High Capacity Transit System Tiers and Corridors, System Expansion Policy Framework and Policy Amendments” adopted by the Metro Council on July 9, 2009.

- Resolution No. 09-4099 “For the Purpose of Accepting the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, With the Following Elements, For Final Review and Analysis For Air Quality Conformance: The Transportation System Management and Operations Plan; The Regional Freight Plan; The High Capacity Transit System Plan; and The Regional Transportation Functional Plan” adopted by the Metro Council on December 17, 2009.
 - Resolution No. 10-4150, “For the Purpose of Approving the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and the 2010-2013 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program” adopted by the Metro Council on June 10, 2010.
3. **Anticipated Effects:** With approval, staff will submit the final RTP and findings to LCDC in the manner of periodic review.
 4. **Budget Impacts:** There is no financial impact to approval of this ordinance.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends approval of Ordinance No. 10-1241.

**2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
Summary of Comments Received and Recommendations**

(comments received March 22 through April 28, 2010)

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Final Public Review Draft and regional plans for freight, transportation system management and operations and high capacity transit were released for final public review from March 22 through May 6, 2010. TPAC and MTAC reviewed the draft regional transportation functional plan on March 26 and April 5, respectively. In addition, members submitted additional comments subsequent to the advisory committee discussions. This document summarizes recommended changes to respond to comments received to date. Additional comments and recommendations may be added to respond to comments received between April 29 and May 6, 2010. New wording is shown in **bold**; deleted words are *crossed out in italics*.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
1	RTFP Title 1: Street System Design	Section 3.08.110: add a description of intent of this section.	TPAC	3/26/10	Amend as requested.
2	RTFP Title 1: Street System Design	Add the following language to Section 3.08.110, "To improve the walking environment along the region's arterial system, each city and county shall incorporate into its TSP a sidewalk network that includes a minimum 5ft sidewalk with a minimum 3ft planted buffer or furnishings zone between the sidewalk and the curb."	TriMet	4/9/10	Amend to add a new section to 3.08.110A to direct local codes to allow for implementation of the regional street design guidelines for all streets (e.g., local, collector, arterial) as follows, " <u>To ensure that new street construction and re-construction projects are designed to improve safety, support adjacent land use and balance the needs of all users, including bicyclists, transit vehicles, motorists, freight delivery vehicles and pedestrians of all ages and abilities, city and county street design regulations shall allow implementation of:</u> <u>1. Complete street designs as set forth in Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040 (2nd Edition, 2002), or similar resources consistent with regional street design policies;</u> <u>2. Green street designs such as bio-swales, street trees, and other techniques to manage stormwater within the public right-of-way as set forth in Green Streets: Innovative Solutions for Stormwater and Street Crossings (2002) and Trees for Green Streets: An Illustrated Guide (2002) or similar resources consistent with federal regulations for stream protection; and</u> <u>3. Transit-supportive street designs that facilitate existing and planned transit service pursuant subsection 3.08.120B."</u>
3	RTFP Title 1: Street System Design	Section 3.08.110 - the arterial and collector spacing provisions are too rigid; many areas of the region will not be able to meet them due to the constraints listed in this section.	City of Tigard	4/11/10	Amend as follows, "each city and county shall incorporate into its TSP, to the extent practicable , a network of four-lane major arterial street..." The intent of this provision is to have local governments attempt to meet the spacing, recognizing it will not be possible in many areas.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
4	RTFP Title 1: Street System Design	Section 3.08.110D(3) - Provide an additional exception from the road spacing standards for streams that support species listed in the Endangered Species Act (ESA).	City of West Linn	4/9/10	Amend 3.08110D as follows, " <u>7. Best practices and designs as set forth in Green Streets: Innovative Solutions for Stormwater, Street Crossings (2002) and Trees for Green Streets: An Illustrated Guide (2002), Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040 (2nd Edition, 2002), and state or locally-adopted plans and best practices for protecting natural resources and natural areas.</u> " The functional plan requires locals to complete a street connectivity plan in their TSPs that implements street connections across stream corridors at 800 to 1,200 foot spacing unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing width prevents a connection. Title 3 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan maps high quality habitat areas and regulations, and includes ESA listed stream corridors. No other changes are recommended at this time pending completion of the following efforts: (1) development of a wildlife corridors map for the region; (2) development of a Regional Conservation Framework for biodiversity; (3) completion of updates to the Livable Streets and Green Streets Best Practices in Transportation Design handbooks and (4) completion of the Lower Columbia River Salmon and Steelhead Conservation and Recovery Plan. The current language provides flexibility for local governments to assess the appropriateness of increasing connectivity on a site-by-site and project-by-project basis, pending completion of a number of efforts that are underway in this region.
5	RTFP Title 1: Street System Design	3.08.110 D.5 and 6- define what is meant by "pursuant to Title 3 of the UGMFP." Water way crossings every 530 feet seems like a lot, but the caveat for when "the length of the crossing prevents a connection" is also vague.	City of Tigard	4/11/10	Amend as follows, "3. If streets must cross water features <u>identified-protected</u> pursuant to Title 3 UGMFP, provides a crossing every 800 to 1,200 feet unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a full street connection;" No other changes are recommended at this time pending completion of the following efforts: (1) development of a wildlife corridors map for the region; (2) development of a Regional Conservation Framework for biodiversity; (3) completion of updates to the Livable Streets and Green Streets Best Practices in Transportation Design handbooks and (4) completion of the Lower Columbia River Salmon and Steelhead Conservation and Recovery Plan. The current language provides flexibility for local governments to assess the appropriateness of increasing connectivity on a site-by-site and project-by-project basis, pending completion of a number of efforts that are underway in this region.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
6	RTFP Title 1: Street System Design	Section 3.08.110E - This section discusses "redevelopment of existing land uses" where locals are to "encourage" adequate connectivity. But in C above, it requires conceptual street maps (which implies a connectivity requirement) for all redevelopable parcels over five acres. Clarify whether this provision applies to parcels under five acres.	ODOT, City of Tigard	4/9/2010, 4/11/10	Amend as requested. This provision is intended to apply to parcels less than five acres in size.
7	RTFP Title 1: Street System Design	Section 3.08.110F: Add language to clarify the following: (1) the intent of this provision is for local codes to allow for narrow street designs as described in 1-10, and (2) greater total right-of-way dimensions should be allowed for green street designs.	TPAC, Washington County, City of Sherwood	3/26/10, 4/9/2010 and 4/9/10	Amend as requested, deleting the provision " 1. Local streets of no more than 50 feet of total right-of-way, including: " because the individual design elements are addressed through subsequent provisions. The intent of this section was to require local codes to allow for implementation of narrower street designs, not to limit the maximum width of street designs and elements.
8	RTFP Title 1: Street System Design	3.08.110F(2) The maximum 28' curb to curb width is too restricting. For example, if a local street is a bike boulevard with on-street parking. 6' parking (two-sided) plus two 10' travel lanes should be allowable, at least (32').	City of Milwaukie	4/9/10	No change recommended. The intent of this section was to require local codes to allow for implementation of narrower street designs, not to limit the maximum width of street designs and elements.
9	RTFP Title 1: Transit Design	3.08.120A - Change references to passenger "environment," bicycle "environment" and waiting "environments" to "facilities" to be more specific about what the provisions apply to.	TPAC	3/26/10	Amend to simplify this section to read as follows, "City and county TSPs and or other land use appropriate regulations shall include projects investments , policies, standards and strategies regulations criteria to improve provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to all transit stops where regional transit service exists at the time of TSP development or update and , passenger environments within one-half mile of all transit stops, bicycle environments within three miles of all transit stops, waiting environments at all transit stops and transit service speed and reliability for all existing or planned Station Communities. high capacity transit station areas, on-street bus rapid transit and frequent service bus corridors, and regional bus corridors where service exists at the time of TSP development or updates. " The use of the term "environment" and specific distances unnecessarily narrowed the focus of where these kinds of investments and regulations should apply.
10	RTFP Title 1: Transit Design	3.08.120 A - clarify sentence to better describe intent, including improve the "speed and reliability" of station areas	City of Milwaukie	4/9/10	Amend to remove references to improving the speed and reliability of station areas. This is already addressed through transportation system management and operations strategies in Title 1.
11	RTFP Title 1: Transit Design	3.08.120 B1e - Revise to read as follows "crossing at <u>OR</u> NEAR all transit stops..." It is not feasible to ensure crossings at all transit stops.	City of Milwaukie	4/9/10	No change recommended. "At" as defined in the Transportation Planning Rule and Title 7 of the RTFP as being within 200 feet. If it is not feasible to provide a crossing within that spacing, it may not be appropriate to have a transit stop in that particular location.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
12	RTFP Title 1: Transit Design	3.08.120 B(1)a - Expanding this requirement from only Major Transit Stops to include "or on transit routes designated in the RTP" could be subject to challenges.	Washington County, City of Sherwood	4/9/10	Amend to remove reference to "along transit routes" to be consistent with the Transportation Planning Rule provision.
13	RTFP Title 1: Transit Design	3.08.120B(1)b - In some cases (i.e. MAX stops along freeways) it is not appropriate to locate buildings within 20 feet of transit stops or provide a pedestrian plaza at transit stops.	ODOT	4/9/10	Amend section to clarify this provision applies to major transit stops, which by definition (in the Title 7 and the Transportation Planning Rule) could be located within 200 feet.
14	RTFP Title 1: Transit Design	For providing lighting at transit stops, consider additional/ more stringent standards for HCT stations versus bus stops. Look at the draft HCT SEP Guidance, specifically the "urban form measures" which includes building orientation, building frontage, average block size, sidewalk coverage, and bicycle facility coverage. Earlier versions also included measures for pedestrian network connectivity (intersection density, safe access to stations, mitigation of topographic challenges and physical barriers) and bicycle network connectivity (miles of bike facilities within 2 miles of station areas) .	ODOT	4/9/10	No change recommended. This language is consistent with the Transportation Planning Rule. TriMet can provide additional guidance to local governments on this issue.
15	RTFP Title 1: Pedestrian System Design	3.08.130B 4 - Parking Management does not belong in this section. Parking does impact pedestrian conditions. Parking management should be covered well enough in Title 6.	City of Tigard	4/11/10	Amend introduction to clarify these these actions and strategies are intended to support transit within designated pedestrian districts. Parking management is an important strategy to accomplish this.
16	RTFP Title 1: Pedestrian System Design	What is "interconnection" and how does one provide it?	ODOT	4/9/10	No change recommended. As defined by Webster's dictionary, this term means "to connect with one another," and is intended to mean providing sidewalks and bike facility connections to transit stops or stations.
17	RTFP Title 1: Bicycle Design	3.08.140 A(4) - Revise to read, "...along arterials and major collectors and/or along nearby parallel routes."	City of Milwaukie	4/9/10	Amend as follows, "...along arterials and major collectors and nearby parallel routes. "
18	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Needs	3.08.210 A - This suggests that local governments need to reconfirm state and regional needs are adequately supported and to take remedial action if they are not.	TPAC, Washington County	4/9/10	Amend to clarify that local TSPs should incorporate regional needs as identified in the RTP, as follows, " Each city and county shall update its TSP to incorporate regional and state transportation needs identified in the 2035 RTP, and determine its own transportation needs for consistency with and support of regional and state transportation needs in the 2035 RTP and to complete the transportation system plans developed under Title 1. The determination of local transportation needs shall be based upon..." Local TSPs are not required to reassess regional needs, but may identify unaddressed regional needs in the more detailed analysis of the local system. If that occurs, this provision provides a process for forwarding the regional need to Metro for amendment into the RTP, reflecting the iterative nature of the regional and local TSP process.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
19	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Needs	3.08.210C - Currently, state rules that require us to take an exception for most improvements outside the UGB. The state is in a rulemaking process to address how to providing services in urban reserves. Allow the state process continue with the understanding that counties, which work directly with state rules now, will adjust to modifications that may come out.	Washington County	4/9/10	Amend section to delete this provision. Existing state law already directs that local governments must request an exception for transportation facilities located outside of the urban growth boundary. OAR 660-012-0070 provides criteria and standards for requesting an exception. In addition, Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (see Section 3.07.1110) directs concept planning in urban reserve areas.
20	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Solutions	3.08.220A - Specify what it means for a city or county "to consider" the strategies listed.	TPAC	3/26/10	No change is recommended The intent is for the city or county to document this provision in writing in the TSP document and in their "findings of fact" adopted as part of the TSP ordinance.
21	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Solutions	3.08.220 - This specifies that the City shall consider specific strategies in priority order to meet the transportation needs. It is still unclear as to why the strategies must be evaluated in this particular priority order. Hypothetically, it may be that strategy 2 and 5 work well together but 3 does little or is impractical. Rather, strategies 1-5 in combination should be considered fully, with discussion on why certain strategies were not deemed the most appropriate.	MTAC, City of Sherwood	4/5/10, 4/9/2010	Amend to better describe the intent of this section, "Each city and county shall consideration of the following strategies, listed in the order listed of priority , to meet the transportation needs determined pursuant to section 3.08.210 and performance targets and standards pursuant to section 3.08.230. The city or county shall explain its choice of a lower priority strategy over a higher priority strategy of one or more of the following strategies:.." A city or county may consider combinations of the strategies listed as part of this analysis. This approach is consistent with the federally-required Congestion Management Process (CMP) steps and the Oregon Highway Plan Major Improvement Policy 1G which requires actions to maintain performance and improve safety through system efficiency and management before adding capacity.
22	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Solutions	Revise 3.08.220A to add a reference to the targets and standards in Table 3.08-1 and Table 3.08-2 in the first sentence; the strategies also serve as a basis for achieving the performance targets and standards in these tables.	TPAC	3/26/10	Amend as requested.
23	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Solutions	Revise 3.08.220A(6) as follows, "Motor vehicle capacity improvements...only upon a demonstration that other strategies in this subsection <u>are not appropriate or cannot adequately address identified transportation needs.</u> "	TPAC	3/26/10	Amend as requested.
24	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Solutions	3.08.220B - Add the following language, " <u>Facility design is subject to the approval of the facility owner.</u> "	ODOT	4/9/10	Amend as requested.
25	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	3.08.220D - Corridor refinement plans or local TSPs may result in alternative mobility standards for entire corridors or segments. The Areas of Special Concern designation is no longer needed and can be managed either under the "no further degradation" standard or through an alternative mobility standard.	ODOT	4/9/10	Amend as requested to eliminate the areas of special concern designation. In addition, convert the mobility standard letter grades to volume/capacity ratios that match the Oregon Highway Plan Table 7 ratios to more clearly define the standard.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
26	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	3.08.230A - This section suggests the only purpose of the performance targets and standards is to improve performance of state highways as much as feasible. This is one desired outcome. In addition, Locals should not need to make findings of meeting state system performance standards separately as suggested by this provision. The RTP findings need to make this demonstration. Revise this subsection to include state highway performance in Subsection F to link to other performance targets and desired outcomes.	TPAC, Washington County	3/26/10	Amend to move the highway performance provision to subsection E as follows, "To demonstrate progress toward achievement of performance targets in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 and to maintain performance of state highways within its jurisdiction as much as feasible and avoid their further degradation , the city or county shall adopt the following actions..." By adopting the actions, a local government can demonstrate through findings they are making progress toward the targets and maintaining state highway performance as much as feasible.
27	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	3.08.230C(1) - Add reference to Table 3.08-2 (Motor vehicle performance standard).	TPAC	3/26/10	Amend as requested.
28	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	3.08.230 - It is unclear how a local government can assess whether a capacity improvement would shift unacceptable levels of congestion into neighboring jurisdictions along shared regional facilities.	ODOT	4/7/10	Amend to delete the following provision, " Will not result in motor vehicle capacity improvements that shift unacceptable levels of congestion into neighboring jurisdictions along shared regional facilities; ..." The regional mobility corridor strategies in Chapter 4 of the RTP provide a framework for making this determination through amendments and updates to the RTP.
29	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	3.08.230D - This reads as though local governments need to pre-authorize alternative mobility standards with the Oregon Transportation Commission.	TPAC, Washington County	3/26/10 4/9/2010	Amend as follows, "If the city or county adopts mobility standards for state highways different from those in Table 3.08-2..." to clarify that this provision only applies to state-owned facilities.
30	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	3.08.230E - Concern with having to evaluate accessibility and safety at the TSP level; these are more appropriate for regional level analysis like Metro conducts for air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.	TPAC, City of Tigard	3/26/2010, 4/11/10	Amend to direct TSPs to include a broader set of performance measures for evaluating and monitoring TSP performance, and to eliminate the accessibility measure.
31	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	3.08.230E - Clarify what this is intended to say" that reduce parking ratios <u>as</u> required by 3.08.410" or below what is required.	ODOT	4/9/10	Amend as follows, " Parking development and management plans that reduce the parking minimum and maximum ratios in Centers and Station Communities as required by consistent with subsection 3.08.410A;
32	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	3.08.230F - It is important to have parking development and management plans and street design standards, but not necessarily as part of a TSP. This language suggests they must be included in the TSP.	City of Tigard	4/11/10	Amend to allow parking management plans to be adopted as a separate policy document and not necessarily as part of the TSP.
33	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	3.08.230F(2) - Revise to include reference to all of the Transportation System Design provisions in Title 1, Section 3.08-110 to Section 3.08.160.	TPAC	3/26/10	Amend as follows, " Designs for street, transit, bicycle, freight and pedestrian systems consistent with Title 1. Street design standards in section 3.08.110'

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
34	RTFP Title 4: Parking Management	3.08.410H – this seems overly prescriptive and does not respect that one size does not fit all. Bicycle parking demand in a center with close proximity to transit and higher density is going to be vastly different than areas further out and will also vary by use. Suggestions for making this more applicable region-wide would be to apply the 5% bicycle parking minimum to commercial zones or uses only, with specific allowances that if the use does not cater to the public or is typically a car oriented use (drive-through restaurant or auto repair for example) the bicycle parking minimum could be reduced further. Alternatively, consider <u>adding something similar to 3.08.410.B for this section.</u>	City of Sherwood	4/9/10	Amend as follows to provide more flexibility for different land use types, " <u>To encourage the use of bicycles and ensure adequate bicycle parking for different land uses,</u> cities and counties shall establish <u>short-term and long-term</u> bicycle parking minimums at, or above five percent of off-street motor vehicle parking provided for: ..." and to add OAR 660-012-0045(3)(a) provisions.
35	RTFP Title 4: Parking Management	3.08.410I - Parking Overall - Allow a broader array of potential solutions so a jurisdiction can decide which areas warrant the more detailed study as follows, " <u>Cities and counties shall adopt parking policies, plans, or regulations for Centers and existing HCT corridors. Such actions shall be designed to constrain surface off-street auto parking supply, and manage use of this limited supply to support active places. Parking management plans may focus on sub-areas of Centers, and shall include an inventory of parking supply and usage, a range of strategies for managing supply and demand, and an evaluation of bicycle parking needs. Policies and regulations should include by-right exemptions from minimum parking requirements, or policies to encourage shared and structured parking.</u> "	City of Milwaukie	4/9/10	Amend as follows, " Cities and counties shall adopt parking <u>policies, management plans and regulations</u> for Centers and Station Communities as defined in Title 6 of the UGMFP and high-capacity transit corridors, and designated in the RTP. The policies, plans and regulations shall be consistent with subsection A through H. <u>Plans may be adopted in TSPs or other adopted policy documents and may focus on sub-areas of Centers.</u> Plans shall include an inventory of parking <u>supply</u> and usage, a range of strategies for managing parking supply and demand and an evaluation of bicycle parking needs with consideration of TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines. <u>Policies shall be adopted in the TSP. Policies, plans and regulations</u> must consider and may include the following range of strategies:.." This change directs TSPs to include a range of parking policies to manage parking demand and supply, and allows parking management plans to be adopted as a separate policy document and for subareas of centers.
36	RTFP Title 4: Parking Management	3.08.410A, Revise to read, "Cities and county parking regulations shall meet or set lower minimums and maximums as per the following:"	City of Milwaukie	4/9/10	Amend as requested.
37	RTFP Title 4: Parking Management	3.08.410B - Revise to state local governments "should" establish a process for various and clarify to whom parking variances should be reported. The reporting requirement seems overly burdensome.	City of Milwaukie, City of Tigard	4/9/2010, 4/11/10	Amend as follows to remove the reporting requirement, " Cities and counties may establish a process to consider for variances from minimum and maximum parking ratios <u>that includes criteria for variances.</u> "
38	RTFP Title 4: Parking Management	3.08.410C - Revise last sentence to use the word "may" instead of "should" to allow for consideration of a broader set of parking practices.	City of Milwaukie, City of Tigard	4/9/10, 4/11/10	Amend as requested.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
39	RTFP Title 5: Amendment of Comprehensive Plans	3.08.510C - The TPR -0060(8) considers the 2040 Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers and Main Streets as "mixed use, pedestrian -friendly centers or neighborhoods" that may take a 10% trip reduction – not corridors. The Title 6 UGMFP discussion is still ongoing, but should determine which design concept areas may qualify for a 30% trip reduction credit. The draft UGMFP Title 6 does not so far include specific standards for levels of densities and intensities appropriate to support HCT and other levels of transit. ODOT supports the incentive versus regulation approach, but not with offering the 30% trip reduction and the lower mobility standards incentives for Station Communities without higher density targets for these areas. ODOT supports transit-supportive mixed use and higher densities in Corridors, but justification for a 30% reduction in vehicle trips is just not there because of the significantly lower density, mix and design expectations and the lack of parking management requirements in 2040 Corridorst. ODOT supports jurisdictions taking a 30% vehicular trip reduction credit if they have met all of the system design and TSMO requirements of Title 1 of the RTFP, plus the parking management plans of section 3.08.410.I, plus the land use requirements of Title 6 of the UGMFP (provided Title 6 itself is acceptable, which must include language prohibiting new auto-dependent uses and setting adequate density targets).Section 3.08.510.B: the reference to section 3.08.230.E should be added back in, as well as the requirement to do a parking management plan per section 3.08.410.I (not just the parking ratios per section 3.08.410A). In other words: to get the 30% trip reduction "credit" jurisdictions have to meet specific RTFP as well as UGMFP requirements. In the RTFP, Cities and Counties are required to adopt Parking Management Plans for Centers and Station Communities but not for Corridors. In the current UGMFP Title 1, the "prescribed" density in Corridors is only 25 persons per acre (compared to 45 ppa in Station Communities, 40 in Town Centers, and 39 in Main Streets).	ODOT	4/9/2010, 4/22/10	No change recommended. The 2040 Corridors and Station Communities are defined as mixed-use areas in the 2040 Growth Concept. In most cases they are currently served by regional transit service, and the 2040 Growth Concept calls for all corridors to have high quality transit service to support mixed-use growth. In addition, the RTP analysis for these areas assumes a mix of housing and jobs consistent with local comprehensive plan designations. The analysis is based on a level of mixed-use that is consistent with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). OAR 660-012-0060(8)(b) does not distinguish between different kinds of mixed-use areas, but does provide a list of characteristics that could be present in a station community or along a 2040 corridor. If these characteristics exist, the area should be considered mixed-use, and should be eligible for the trip reduction credit if the actions identified in 3.08.230E and in Title 6 of the UGMFP are adopted, and the area meets the other mixed-use characteristics identified in the TPR. Title 6 of the UGMFP references back to the provisions with the RTFP that must be adopted for local governments to be eligible for the lower mobility standards and 30 percent trip reduction credit to ensure consistency between the UGMFP and RTFP.
40	RTFP Title 5: Amendment of Comprehensive Plans	3.08.510C - Why does the 30% apply only in centers? If these practices/actions are effective for reducing vehicle trip generation, then the credit should apply to areas that have implemented them. I'm thinking the Tigard Triangle, but there could be many examples.	City of Tigard	4/11/10	No change recommended. This provision provides a "safe harbor" for Centers, Corridors and Station Communities if the actions identified in Title 6 of the UGMFP are adopted. OAR 660-012-0060 allows for a local government to make a case for a trip reduction credit in other mixed-use areas.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
41	RTFP Title 5: Amendment of Comprehensive Plans	Section 3.08.510C - Revise as follows, "If a city or county adopts the actions set forth in subsection E <u>3.08-230E</u> and the land use actions..."	TPAC	3/26/10	Amend as follows, "If a city or county adopts the actions set forth in <i>subsection E and the land use actions set forth in</i> section ____ of Title 6 of the UGMFP, it shall be eligible for an automatic reduction of 30 percent below the vehicular trip generation rates..." This amendment links back to the land use actions proposed in Title 6 to the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. The Title 6 section reference will be added upon adoption of Title 6 in December 2010.
42	RTFP Title 6: Compliance procedures	An amendment to a TSP is not the same as an Update. An amendment does not change the forecast year for the plan. It would be good to clarify.	City of Tigard	4/11/10	No change recommended. An update is an amendment of a TSP. However, a definition of "update" has been added to Title 7 (Definitions) to better define an "update" amendment. Most TSPs in the region will need to be "updated" to a 2035 planning horizon.
43	RTFP Title 6: Compliance procedures	Section 3.08.610F - Revise to require a city or county to submit an analysis of compliance of the amendment with the RTFP.	ODOT	4/9/10	No change recommended. This provision applies to notification of the first hearing on a proposed amendment. The staff report provided by local governments oftentimes includes documentation of how the proposed amendment is consistent with the RTFP. If insufficient information is provided to assist Metro staff review, the COO will request additional information. The compliance of the amendment will be documented in the Findings of Fact that will be adopted as part of the local TSP ordinance. Local governments are required to submit the adopted ordinance to Metro within 14 days of final adoption per 3.08.610J.
44	RTFP Title 6: Compliance procedures	Section 3.08.610H - It does not seem appropriate for local governments to appeal to JPACT as part of the enforcement for local compliance with the RTP.	ODOT	4/9/10	No change recommended. All transportation-related actions (including federal MPO actions) are recommended by JPACT to the Metro Council. The Metro Council can approve the recommendations or refer them back to JPACT with a specific concern for reconsideration. Final approval of each item, therefore, requires the concurrence of both bodies.
45	RTFP Title 6: Compliance procedures	3.08.610A - Two years seems unrealistic for completing TSP update. It could easily take 2 years to get funding if it's through TGM. TGM may not have enough funding for needed updates along with corridor refinement planning work that has been defined in the RTP.	City of Tigard	4/11/10	No change recommended. Metro staff has begun working with local governments to develop a compliance schedule that will take into account local aspirations for completing TSP updates. Section 3.08.620 also provides a process for requesting an extension to the compliance deadline. The TSP schedule may be adopted as part of the RTP ordinance.
46	RTFP Title 7 Definitions	Add the following definitions - "Major transit stop," "Major driveway," "At" a major transit stop, and "near" a major transit stop	City of Sherwood	4/9/10	Amend as requested.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
47	RTP Title 7 Definitions	Definition of Significant increase in Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) capacity for multi-modal arterials - This defines general purpose lanes as through travel lanes or multiple turn lanes. Generally turn lanes are not considered general purpose lanes. They may have the side effect of adding capacity, but they have important safety benefits.	ODOT	4/9/10	Amend the definition as follows, "...General purpose lanes are defined as through travel lanes or multiple turn lanes. This also includes the construction of a new general purpose <i>highway arterial</i> -facility on a new location... An increase in SOV capacity associated with a safety project is considered significant only if the safety deficiency is totally related to traffic congestion... " This mirrors the definition for "significant increase in SOV capacity for regional through-routes freeways."
48	Table 3.08-1	Table 3.08 - 1 Clarify whether the Regional Non-SOV modal targets apply to peak hour or 24-hour period	ODOT, City of Tigard	4/9/2010, 4/11/10	Amend as requested to clarify the targets are for the average weekday 24-hour period for the year 2035.
49	Throughout RTP	Clarify what provisions apply to TSP and/or land use regulations.	TPAC	3/26/10	Amend as requested.
50	RTP Bicycle & Pedestrian System Maps	Show proposed regional trail along Sunrise Highway corridor (I-205 to Rock Creek Junction); this is a proposed project in the RTP.	Clackamas County	4/10/10	Amend as requested.
51	RTP Project List Map	Based on the draft TSP work for the City of Damascus, the alignment and modeling assumptions for RTP Project #10076 SE Sunnyside Rd. Extension have changed. Please update the project list map to reflect the changes based on the TSP work.	City of Damascus	4/22/10	Amend as requested.
52	RTP Chapter 2: System Maps	Amend the Regional Bike and Regional Pedestrian Network maps to show the Morrison bridge bike/ped path as solid instead of dashed on the bike/ped system maps. This project was recently completed.	Metro staff	4/28/10	Amend as requested.
53	RTP Chapter 2: System Maps	There is a discrepancy between the vehicular functional classification and the street design classification that we have on Tualatin Valley Highway and OR 212 - Principal Arterial is not supposed to go with Regional Street (plus, the street design classification just ends in the middle of Damascus...). Either revise the designations to be Principal Arterial and Highway in the RTP, based on the OHP Statewide/NHS designation, or let the Tualatin Valley Highway TGM study and the OR 212 Corridor Plan/Damascus TSP make recommendations for changing the designations.	ODOT	4/28/10	No change recommended. The Tualatin Valley Highway TGM study and the OR 212 Corridor Plan/Damascus TSP will make recommendations for changing the designations based on the analysis conducted through those efforts.
54	RTP Chapter 2	Amend Table 2.6 of the RTP to title the last column "number of <u>typical</u> planned travel lanes."	ODOT	4/26/10	Amend as requested.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
55	RTP Chapter 4 - Mobility Corridor Strategies	The name of this mobility corridor is Tigard to Sherwood & Sherwood to Newburg, but the corridor analysis falls drastically short of providing any analysis of Highway 99W through Sherwood, and ignores completely the section between Sherwood and Newburg.	City of Sherwood	4/26/10	No change recommended. The 2035 RTP does not conduct an intersection level of analysis. The corridor analysis area for Mobility Corridor #20 as shown on page 4-145 of the 2035 RTP includes OR 99W through Sherwood to the Newburg city limits. Intersection level analysis through the City of Sherwood could be examined as part of the City's TSP update, if desired by the City.
56	RTP Chapter 4 - Mobility Corridor Strategies	Sherwood has four major roadways which intersect with Highway 99W: Roy Rogers Road/Tualatin-Sherwood Road, Edy Road, Meinecke Road, and Kruger-Elwert/Sunset Road. Of these intersections only Roy Rogers/Tualatin-Sherwood Road was provided a basic analysis. The other roads mentioned act as by-pass routes for traffic trying to avoid travelling along Highway 99W. These intersections should also be included in the corridor analysis as they are directly impacted by Highway 99W traffic flows.	City of Sherwood	4/26/10	No change recommended. The needs assessment conducted for each mobility corridor strategy focused on facilities identified on the regional system maps included in Chapter 2 of the RTP. Roy Rogers Road and Tualatin-Sherwood Road are on the regional roadway system map. The roads mentioned are not on the regional roadway system map; analysis of those facilities should be examined as part of the City's TSP update.
57	RTP Chapter 4 - Mobility Corridor Strategies	Under the Safety Deficiencies (page 4-149), Highway 99W is rated as Category 4 and 5 based on the ODOT SPIS listing. Does this rating stop before Sherwood or does it continue on through Sherwood to Newburg? This analysis does not specify the limits where the rating of 4 and 5 occur. A discussion of the limits of the SPIS listing needs to be provided for the extent of Corridor #20 through to Newburg.	City of Sherwood	4/26/10	Amend as requested to clarify the extent of the SPIS information for OR 99W from Tigard through Sherwood to Newburg.
58	RTP Chapter 4 - Mobility Corridor Strategies	The emphasis of HCT for the near term solution to the traffic problems along Highway 99W through Sherwood, and from Sherwood to Newburg does not provide an adequate solution of the issues surrounding the intersections listed above. The HCT goal should be placed secondary to correcting the more immediate needs, issues and problems faced by traffic along Highway 99W at the intersections listed above.	City of Sherwood	4/26/10	No change recommended. Appropriateness of HCT will be examined through the Southwest Corridor Refinement Plan. Other traffic issues identified in the comment should be examined as part of the City's TSP update. This will also allow for development of solutions to address more immediate needs.
59	RTP Chapter 4 - Mobility Corridor Strategies	Based on review of the mobility corridor strategies for corridors, #19, #21, and #22, we have provided comments and recommended information for strategies to address needs.	City of Beaverton	3/29/10	Amend as requested.
60	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Needs	Add back in the following provision 3.08.210C - A. If a city or county identifies transportation needs in an urban reserve, it shall ensure planned improvements in the reserve are contingent upon addition of the reserve to the UGB and link to transportation facilities within the UGB.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	No change recommended. This is adequately addressed in Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (see Section 3.07.1110), which directs concept planning in urban reserve areas. In addition, existing state law already directs local governments to request an exception for certain types of transportation facilities if they are located outside of the urban growth boundary. OAR 660-012-0070 provides criteria and standards for requesting the exception.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
61	RTPF Purpose: 3.08.010	The objectives of the RTP listed in this section do not match the vision for the RTP, or the RTP goals or objectives, listed in Chapter 2. The objectives listed also do not mention addressing the transportation needs of underserved communities. <u>Recommendation:</u> Change outcomes to reflect the approved RTP goals and objectives	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend as requested to reference the full set of goals included in the RTP.
62	RTPF Title 2: Transportation Needs	Timeframe for TSPs is not spelled out. Statute may require that TSPs encompass the same time horizon as the RTP, but it would be clearer if it were spell out in the RTPF.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend Title 2, 3.08.210B(1) as follows, "The population and employment forecast and planning period... " to clarify the TSP must be consistent with the RTP planning horizon.
63	RTPF Title 1: Transportation System Design	Revise 3.08.110D to include additional language needed to inform the local agency of the unique opportunities or considerations to protect or enhance a particular site or resource. Green streets and other guides are referenced in 3.08.110A, but the language does not clearly make them part of the consideration when deciding the appropriateness of a road network. Further, current language does not consider best practices for protecting natural resources and natural areas. <u>Recommendation:</u> Add conformity with the guides listed in 3.08.110A; add conformity with locally adopted watershed plans; add "best practices for protecting natural resources and natural areas, which would include consultation with surface water management agencies and local watershed councils" as additional considerations for creation of a network of streets.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend 3.08.110D as follows, " <u>7. Best practices and designs as set forth in Green Streets: Innovative Solutions for Stormwater, Street Crossings (2002) and Trees for Green Streets: An Illustrated Guide (2002), Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040 (2nd Edition, 2002), and state or locally-adopted plans and best practices for protecting natural resources and natural areas.</u> " The functional plan requires locals to complete a street connectivity plan in their TSPs that implements street connections across stream corridors at 800 to 1,200 foot spacing unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing width prevents a connection. Title 3 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan maps high quality habitat areas and regulations, and includes ESA listed stream corridors. No other changes are recommended at this time pending completion of the following efforts: (1) development of a wildlife corridors map for the region; (2) development of a Regional Conservation Framework for biodiversity; (3) completion of updates to the Livable Streets and Green Streets Best Practices in Transportation Design handbooks and (4) completion of the Lower Columbia River Salmon and Steelhead Conservation and Recovery Plan. The current language provides flexibility for local governments to assess the appropriateness of increasing connectivity on a site-by-site and project-by-project basis, pending completion of a number of efforts that are underway
64	RTPF Title 1: Transit System Design	Revise 3.08.120C to require jurisdictions to report how they have considered the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations within the city or county, including minorities and low-income families.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend 3.08.120C as follows, "C. Providers of public transit service shall consider and document the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations, including minorities and low-income families, when planning levels of service, transit facilities and hours of operation."

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
65	RTFP Title 2: Transportaiothn Needs	Revise 3.08.210A(3) to require jurisdictions to report how they have considered the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations within the city or county, including minorities and low-income families.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend 3.08.210A as follows, "3. Consideration and documentation of the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations within the city or county, including minorities and low-income families."
66	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Solutions	The language change in the 4/16 draft regarding consideration of multiple strategies should not apply to situations when jurisdictions determine that a capacity increase is necessary. Jurisdictions should still need to explain more specifically why strategies other than a capacity increase are not appropriate or would not address the issue. Recommendation: "...The city or county shall explain its choice of one or more of strategies below, <u>including its decision to increase capacity over use of a higher priority strategy.</u> "	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	No change recommended. The provision as written already directs a local government to explain its choice of one or more of strategies below, including its decision to increase capacity over use of a higher priority strategy.
67	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	As written in Subsection A, performance targets in Subsection D are one of the alternatives to conformance with Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 even though language in Subsection D indicates that the performance measures are additional requirements. Recommendation: Limit alternative standards to Subsections B and C, and clarify that Subsection D is an additional requirement and that jurisdictions must show that their solutions achieve progress toward these solutions as well.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend 3.08.230A to read as follows, "A. Each city and county shall demonstrate that solutions adopted pursuant to section 3.08.220 will achieve progress toward the targets and standards in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 and performance measures in subsection D or toward alternative targets and standards adopted by the city or county pursuant to subsections B, C and D . The city or county shall include the regional targets and standards or its alternatives in its TSP."
68	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	Subsection A refers to targets and standards, but does not mention performance measures, which is the term used in Subsection D. Recommendation: Correct language in either Subsection A or D to make the language consistent. (Chapter 2 of the RTP refers to the elements of Subsection D as targets.)	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend 3.08.230A to read as follows, "A. Each city and county shall demonstrate that solutions adopted pursuant to section 3.08.220 will achieve progress toward the targets and standards in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 and performance measures in subsection D or toward alternative targets and standards adopted by the city or county pursuant to subsections B and C and D . The city or county shall include the regional targets and standards or its alternatives in its TSP."

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
69	RTP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	<p>In the present draft, TSPs do not need to include performance measures/targets for all of the performance targets in the RTP.</p> <p>The targets missing are for climate change, clean air, affordability, and access to daily needs. They are all categorized under environment and equity, and the current draft includes no measures/ targets that address equity considerations. This omission goes against the current direction of the RTP and of Metro's six elements of a successful region. The region needs to start addressing issues of equity, access for all populations, air quality, and climate change, and many of the decisions on these issues happen at the local level.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Require TSPs to include all of the regional performance targets, but to analyze only the ones presently included. For the other targets, jurisdictions can utilize Metro's data.</p>	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	No change recommended. The regional performance targets were intended to apply to the Regional Transportation Plan, with the expectation that if local governments adopted specific actions in the RTP and Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, this would be sufficient to demonstrate progress toward the RTP targets. Each local government has a role in helping the region achieve the RTP targets, but it is unreasonable to expect all local governments to equally achieve the RTP targets due to differences in land use capacity. In lieu of requiring local governments to adopt the RTP targets, the RTP requires TSPs to include performance measures for safety, VMT per capita, freight reliability, congestion and walking, biking and transit mode shares to evaluate and monitor TSP performance. This can be revisited as part of the next RTP update as methodologies and tools for analysis of equity, access to daily needs, greenhouse gas emissions, and affordability are further developed. Prior to the next RTP update, Metro staff will research and recommend improved evaluation tools and criteria for policy-making and priority-setting in order to better understand how low-income, minority, disabled and elderly populations are being served by transportation policies and investment decisions.
70	RTP Title 4: Parking Management	<p>As the region considers developing BRT lines, parking ratios referencing transit should clarify that BRT be treated like LRT rather than like other buses. <u>Recommendation:</u> Language should read "one half-mile from an HCT station" rather than light rail (two instances), and language on buses should be clarified to exclude BRT.</p>	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend 3.08.410A(2) as follows, "...a one-quarter mile walking distance for bus transit or one-half mile walking distance for light rail high capacity transit station , that area shall be added to Zone A. If 20-minute peak hour transit service is no longer available to an area within a one-quarter mile walking distance for bus transit or one-half mile walking distance for from a high capacity light rail transit station ,
71	RTP Title 4: Parking Management	<p>Zone A parking ratios are mandatory ("shall") in some parts of the paragraph, but are weaker in other parts. To be clear and consistent about requirements, language regarding pedestrian accessible areas should be mandatory. <u>Recommendation:</u> Change language to "Cities and counties shall designate Zone A Parking Area Ratios in areas with good pedestrian access..."</p>	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	No change recommended. A more detailed review and analysis of the regional parking management requirements will be conducted prior to the next RTP update to provide a stronger technical basis for strengthening the existing parking management requirements beyond what has been identified to date.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
72	RTFP Title 4: Parking Management	This language provides a very big loophole that could potentially blow out Parking Area Ratios. <u>Recommendation:</u> Provide more specific regional guidelines for exempting parking facilities from the parking standards.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Revise 3.08.410C as follows, "Free surface parking shall be subject to the regional parking maximums for Zones A and B from in Table 3.08-3. Following an adopted exemption process and criteria, Cities and counties may exempt parking structures; fleet parking..." Metro staff would the process and criteria for their adequacy as part of the local adoption process. More work is needed to determine what parking management strategies should be implemented in this region and where they could be applied. This effort could define how to tailor the application of these strategies to recognize different levels of development, transit service provision and freight parking needs. This work could include updating and expanding the existing inventory of parking practices in the Metro region, and developing a parking model code and a parking "best practices" handbook to guide local implementation in the region. Functional plan amendments may also be developed as part of this effort.
73	RTFP Title 7: Definitions	The definition of chicane is incomplete and does not reflect its use as a design to slow down traffic.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend as follows, "H. "Chicane" means a movable or permanent barrier used to create extra turns in a roadway to reduce motor vehicle speeds or to prevent cars from driving across a pedestrian or bicycle accessway. "
74	RTFP Title 7: Definitions	The definition of deficiency is overly broad. As used in the RTFP, whether a deficiency exists depends on how a facility functions, including whether it meets operating standards in Table 3.08-2. Yet the definition of "deficiency" unnecessarily includes any time a throughway or arterial has fewer lanes than indicated in the system concept. ("Examples include throughway portions with less than six through lanes of capacity; arterial portions with less than four through lanes of capacity....") <u>Recommendation:</u> Change definition so deficiency is based on performance, not road capacity. Change examples and/or order of examples to de-emphasize capacity increase as the primary way to address deficiencies.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	No change recommended. Deficiencies should be based on both performance and whether the facility meets the "typical planned number of lanes" shown in Table 2.6 of the RTP. It is not intended that road capacity must be added if the facility falls below the standards in Table 3.08-2 or planned system in Table 2.6. Other provisions in the RTFP will guide whether that is the appropriate solution to address identified deficiencies.
75	RTFP Title 7: Definitions	Include a definition of High Capacity Transit.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend as requested.
76	RTFP Title 7: Definitions	The definition of low-income families is ambiguous. Oregon DHS uses the Federal Poverty Line (FPL) as its base and has different standards depending on the program. The FPL itself is a very high threshold to be considered low-income, as it requires significantly lower income than the eligibility requirements for a number of programs. For example, Oregon WIC requires an income below 185% of FPL; CHIP is 200% of FPL.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend as follows, "Low-income families" means households <i>with incomes at or below the Oregon Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines, who earned between 0 and 1.99 times the federal Poverty Level in 1999.</i> This definition is consistent with the U.S. census definition used to identify low-income populations in the RTP background report, "Environmental Justice in Metro's Transportation Planning Process."

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
77	RTFP Title 7: Definitions	Projects defined as safety projects should come under the definition when the capacity increase is due to traffic congestion in whole or in part (definition now requires that safety deficiency be totally related to traffic congestion). Possibilities: use >10% increase test, or >50% due to congestion.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	This comment is under consideration, pending further direction from Federal Highway staff.
78	RTFP Title 7: Definitions	The definition of Significant increase in SOV capacity on throughway - A greater than 10% increase in capacity to alleviate a bottleneck should not be excluded from the definition because the increase is due to auxiliary lanes (definition is now limited to general purpose lanes).	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	This comment is under consideration, pending further direction from Federal Highway staff.
79	RTFP Title 7: Definitions	Definition for bottlenecks should include downstream effects as well as upstream.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	This comment is under consideration, pending further direction from Federal Highway staff.
80	RTFP Title 7: Definitions	Definition of Significant increase in SOV capacity on multimodal arterial - Projects defined as safety projects should come under the definition when the capacity increase is partly due to traffic congestion (definition now requires that safety deficiency be totally related to traffic congestion). Could use >10% increase test as with a bottleneck.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	This comment is under consideration, pending further direction from Federal Highway staff.
81	RTFP Title 7: Definitions	Definition of SOV is broad enough to encompass bicycles, wheelchairs, etc. <u>Recommendation:</u> limit to motorized vehicles to be used in roadway.	Coalition for a Livable Future	4/27/10	Amend as requested.
82	RTFP Title 1: Transit System Design	Check the formatting of section 3.08.120B.2 - everything there applies to <i>major</i> transit stops, so the sub-sections should be labeled a through f rather than a through c with sub-sections c. i through iv.	ODOT	4/22/10	No change recommended. As written, subsection 3.08120B2(a) and (b) apply to all transit stops and (c) applies to major transit stops.
83	RTFP Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards	Section 3.08.230E: changing the land use reference from Title 6 of the UGMFP to section 0035(2) of the TPR, which is much more general, may be OK for purposes of "demonstrating progress" (or "doing the best they can"), but it is not sufficient to be eligible for the 30% trip reduction and lower V/C ratios.	ODOT	4/22/10	No change recommended.
84	RTFP Table 3.08-2: Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards	Table 3.08.-2 - footnote C: has not been amended since the 2004 RTP (except for changing the chapter reference). In this (2010) RTP, mobility corridor refinement plans are no longer anticipated for the specific facilities listed in the Table, with the exception of I-405 ("Stadium Freeway"). Footnote C should be removed from the Banfield (I-84), I-5 North, OR 99E, and the Sunset Hwy (US 26). Corridor Refinement Plans are still expected to consider alternative mobility corridor standards for a different set of mobility corridors.	ODOT	4/26/10	Amend as requested to delete reference to footnote C for I-5 North, OR 99E and Sunset Highway). The footnote C then would only apply to I-405 loop, I-5 (Marquam Bridge to Wilsonville), OR 8, and I-205. The mobility corridor concept is evolving and future RTP updates will reorganize Table 3.08-2 to more closely reflect the multi-modal concept established in this RTP, and recommended mobility policy for each corridor.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
85	RTFP Table 3.08-2: Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards	Table 3.08-2 - portions of some of the highways listed in footnote B are no longer State highways. This is true for Sandy Boulevard (we still own the segment east of I-205 within the Portland City limits), Farmington Road (we still own a small segment outside the City of Beaverton), and BH Hwy (we still own the segment in Washington County). We no longer own any segment of Hall Blvd in Beaverton, but we do own Hall Blvd in Tigard, which then changes name to Durham Rd and Boones Ferry Rd. These could be listed as "Urban Arterials that are in full or in part state highways....." since jurisdictional boundaries may change again, and some are difficult or lengthy to describe exactly (ODOT uses milepoints, not the names of intersecting streets).	ODOT	4/26/10	Amend as requested to delete footnote B – it is not needed because the mobility standard for corridors is the same whether it is an ODOT facility or a local facility.
86	RTFP Table 3.08-2: Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards	Table 3.08-2 - Footnote A - Revise the 2nd hour definition to be consistent with current practice, the single 60 minute period either before or after the peak 60 minute period, whichever is highest.	ODOT	4/26/10	Amend as requested.
87	RTFP Table 3.08-2: Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards	Table 3.08-2 - Define mid-day peak hour, such as noon-1pm or the highest 60 minute period between the hours of 10 am and 2pm.	ODOT	4/26/10	Amend as requested to define the mid-day peak hour as the highest 60-minute period between the hours of 9 am and 3pm as this is the time of day that is important to monitor to protect freight reliability. This is the evaluation period local governments are required to analysis pursuant to Title 4 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.
88	RTFP Table 3.08-2: Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards	Table 3.08-2 - Revise state highway references to consistently refer to route numbers and/or common names.	ODOT	4/26/10	Amend as requested to consistently refer to state route numbers.
89	RTFP Table 3.08-2: Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards	Table 3.08-2 - Add a table note to refer to the OHP Action 1F1, which includes language about V/C standards for interchanges - basically .85 or .90. The ODOT Mobility Standards Guidelines affirms that these interchange standards apply in the Metro area, and that Table 7 applies to the mainlines.	ODOT	4/26/10	No change recommended. As a comprehensive system plan, the RTP level of analysis is at a broad system-level, and does not attempt to address localized congestion at intersections or interchanges and ramps, and as a result does not include standards for this level of analysis. In addition, the region requests the Oregon Transportation Commission and Land Conservation and Development Commission to work with Metro and other stakeholders to conduct a comprehensive and coordinated review and update to the Transportation Planning Rule, Oregon Highway Plan and mobility standards, and state procedures manuals and guidelines to more fully integrate the Oregon Transportation Plan policies and state greenhouse gas goals.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Recommendation
90	RTFP Title 2: Transportation Needs	RTFP section 3.08.210A(2): add some language in here that clarifies that "identification of facilities that exceed the deficiency thresholds" requires an operational level of analysis. the regional model on which the RTP is based does not identify intersection level deficiencies and solutions such as turn lanes and signal improvements, which are part of TSMO strategies and which are often implemented as plan amendments and development occur through SDCs. Solutions for needs identified through the intersection-level operational analysis should be included in TSPs and on lists of improvements eligible to be funded through SDCs etc, and eventually in the RTP project list. Last year's memo to the OTC about alternative mobility strategies included the principle that ODOT should still be able to require identification and implementation of such localized needs and solutions through development review.	ODOT	4/26/10	No change recommended. The TPR already defines the proportionality of the analysis required for a local and regional transportation system plans versus plan amendments. As a comprehensive system plan, the RTP level of analysis is at a broad system-level, and does not attempt to address localized congestion at intersections or interchanges. The TPR places a higher burden of proof on plan amendments to demonstrate through an operational level of analysis that the effect of the amendment will not result in further degradation from the baseline. Therefore, local governments use the RTP model as a base for an operational level of analysis to simulate the impact of the proposed land use change on the transportation system to determine the effect of the plan amendment. A local government may choose to conduct an intersection level of operational analysis as part of their TSP update to identify needs and solutions.
91	RTFP Title 1: Street System Design	Amend section 3.08.110 in RTFP to add the following, " <u>To protect the capacity, function and safe operation of existing and planned state highway interchanges, or planned improvements to interchanges, cities and counties shall, to the extent feasible, restrict driveway and street access in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals consistent with Oregon Highway Plan Access Management Standards and accommodate local circulation on the local system to improve safety and minimize congestion and conflicts in the interchange area.</u> "	ODOT	4/28/10	Amend as requested with the following additional language in double underscore, " <u>To protect the capacity, function and safe operation of existing and planned state highway interchanges, or planned improvements to interchanges, cities and counties shall, to the extent feasible, restrict driveway and street access in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals consistent with Oregon Highway Plan Access Management Standards and accommodate local circulation on the local system to improve safety and minimize congestion and conflicts in the interchange area. Public street connections, consistent with regional street design and spacing standards in Section 3.08.110, shall be encouraged and shall supercede this access restriction, though such access may be limited to right-in/right-out or other appropriate configuration in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals. Multimodal street design features including pedestrian crossings and on-street parking shall be allowed where appropriate.</u> " The Oregon Highway Plan does not clearly define how to balance connectivity and access management objectives; the additional language provides additional guidance to ensure consistency with regional connectivity and street design policies that are being implemented through the RTFP, Section 3.08.110.

Attachment 2 to Staff Report to Ordinance No. 10-1241

Public Comment Summary Report

Under development

Agenda Item Number 5.1

Resolution No. 10-4148, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Amend An Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Forest Grove for Trail Development.

RESOLUTIONS
COUNCILOR HARRINGTON

Metro Council Meeting
Thursday, May 6, 2010
Metro Council Chamber

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

AUTHORIZING THE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER) RESOLUTION NO. 10-4148
TO AMEND AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL)
AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF FOREST) Introduced by Chief Operating Officer
GROVE FOR TRAIL DEVELOPMENT) Michael J. Jordan, with the concurrence of
) Council President David Bragdon

WHEREAS, the City of Forest Grove and Metro entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement effective June 9, 2008, (“IGA”) to allow the City to construct a pedestrian and bicycle trail across Metro property and along the city property (the “Trail”), and, upon completion of Trail construction, for Metro to grant to the City a permanent, recordable pedestrian and bicycle trail easement across the Metro Property providing for the ongoing uses, maintenance, repair, and reconstruction of the Trail; and

WHEREAS, the IGA was authorized by the Metro Council’s approval on May 15, 2008, of Resolution No. 08-3935, “Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Execute an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Forest Grove for Trail Development,” and was authorized by the City of Forest Grove Council’s approval on February 11, 2008, of Resolution No. 2008-16, “Resolution of the City of Forest Grove Authorizing an Intergovernmental Agreement Between the City of Forest Grove and Metro for Trail Development ;” and

WHEREAS, the City of Forest Grove and Metro entered into an Amendment to the IGA effective September 23, 2009, to extend the effective date of the IGA until March 31, 2011;

WHEREAS, the trail location has shifted during trail design to align the trail with the most appropriate location for a bridge to cross over Gales Creek, and the new alignment places significantly more of the trail and part of the bridge over Gales Creek on Metro’s property than did the originally-proposed trail location;

WHEREAS, the parties wish to enter into this Second Amendment to reflect and authorize the new location of the trail;

WHEREAS, the Metro Council concludes that the trail use on the Metro Property described in Exhibit A to this resolution is a park use and is consistent with Metro’s Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan and, more specifically, with Metro’s easement policy as described in Metro Resolution No. 97-2539B, approved on November 6, 1997; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby authorizes the Chief Operating Officer to execute an amendment to the existing intergovernmental agreement with the City of Forest Grove, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A, to allow for the new trail alignment.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____, 2010.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

**SECOND AMENDMENT TO
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT**

This Second Amendment to Intergovernmental Agreement (“Second Amendment”) is by and between Metro, an Oregon municipal government, located at 600 Northeast Grand Avenue, Portland, Oregon, 97232-2736 (“Metro”), and the City of Forest Grove, an Oregon municipal corporation, located at 1924 Council Street, Forest Grove, Oregon 97116-0326 (“the City”). This Second Amendment shall be effective on the last date of signature of a party, below (the “Effective Date”).

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the City and Metro entered into an intergovernmental agreement (“IGA”) effective June 9, 2008, regarding the City’s construction of a trail on Metro-owned property;

WHEREAS, the City and Metro entered into an Amendment to the IGA effective September 23, 2009, to extend the effective date of the IGA;

WHEREAS, the trail location has shifted during trail design to align the trail with the most appropriate location for a bridge to cross over Gales Creek, and the new alignment places significantly more of the trail and part of the bridge over Gales Creek on Metro’s property than did the originally-proposed trail location;

WHEREAS, the parties wish to enter into this Second Amendment to reflect the new location of the trail;

Now, therefore, the parties agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. Exhibit A to the IGA shall be deleted and replaced with Exhibit A to this Second Amendment.
2. As provided in the IGA, the Trail Construction Area shall be as depicted in Exhibit A to this Second Amendment; provided, however, that the Trail Construction Area shall not extend further than 60 feet from any point on the western boundary of the Metro Property.
3. As depicted in Exhibit A, one bridge abutment and part of the bridge over Gales Creek will be located on the Metro Property (the “Bridge”). All references in the IGA to the “Trail” or “trail” shall be read and interpreted to include the Bridge, including all Bridge-related surface and subsurface utilities and Bridge-related safety improvements.
4. Section 2 of the IGA the words “375 feet long” shall be deleted and replaced with the words “1,350 feet long” and the following text shall be inserted between the first and second sentences of Section 2 of the IGA:

The city shall construct the Trail and Bridge substantially in conformance with the design as presented in the project Bid/Permit Set plans prepared by Group Mackenzie dated February 11, 2010, as amended

by Addendum No. 1 dated February 18, 2010, and Addendums No. 2 and 3 dated March 1, 2010, and as subsequently amended as reasonably necessary in the normal course of final project design and construction.

- 5. Exhibit B to the IGA shall be amended and replaced as shown on Exhibit B to this Second Amendment.
- 6. Except as provided for in this Second Amendment, all the terms and conditions of the IGA remain unchanged and are hereby ratified and confirmed by all of the undersigned. Capitalized terms used in this Second Amendment and not defined shall have the meanings set forth in the IGA.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have set their hands on the day and year set forth below.

CITY OF FOREST GROVE

METRO

By: _____

Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer

Print Name: _____


Title: _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

M:\attorney\confidential\14 Open Spaces\27 EASEMENT REQUESTS\26 Forest Grove Trail\IGA Trail Amendment Second final 031910.doc

Exhibit A
Depiction of Trail Construction Area and Trail Corridor



**Exhibit B
Form of Easement**

GRANTOR: METRO
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736

GRANTEE: THE CITY OF FOREST GROVE, OREGON
1924 Council Street
Forest Grove, Oregon 97116-0326

Until a change is requested, all tax statements should be sent to:
METRO
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736

After Recording Return to:
The City of Forest Grove, Oregon
P.O. Box 326
Forest Grove, Oregon 97116-0326

GRANT OF BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRAIL EASEMENT

METRO, an Oregon municipal corporation ("Grantor"), for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, hereby grants, subject to the terms hereof, to THE CITY OF FOREST GROVE, OREGON, an Oregon municipal corporation ("Grantee" or "City"), an exclusive, perpetual, public bicycle and pedestrian trail easement and right-of-way over and through that certain real property commonly known as Tax Lot 2700 in Township 1 South, Range 3 West, Section 6C, as more fully described in the legal description attached hereto as Exhibit 1 (the "Metro Property"), for the purposes outlined herein and within an area not more than 400 feet long and 15 feet wide, as more fully described and depicted in Exhibit 2, attached hereto and incorporated herein (the "Easement Area").

The cash consideration paid for this grant is \$0; however, the true and actual consideration includes other value given or promised which is the whole of the consideration.

PURPOSE. The purpose of this Easement is for Metro to grant the City the right to use, maintain, repair, and reconstruct an all-weather, paved bicycle and pedestrian trail, including without limitation a portion of a bridge over Gales Creek (the "Bridge") over which such trail shall pass, within the Easement Area (the "Trail"). As used herein, references to the "Trail" shall be interpreted to include the Bridge and all portions of the bicycle and pedestrian trail, including on and over the ground and on and over the Bridge.

1. **RIGHTS GRANTED.** This Easement hereby grants to Grantee and the public the perpetual, exclusive right of ingress and egress to and from, over and across the Easement Area along the Trail for all-hours public bicycle and pedestrian access. Forest Grove shall have the right to access the Easement Area to use, maintain, repair, and reconstruct the Trail.

2. LIMITATIONS. Except as specifically authorized by this Easement, no other use may be made of the Easement Area without the prior written approval of Grantor. Except for fuel and lubricants stored within equipment necessary and incidental to the authorized use of the Easement Area pursuant to this Easement, no Hazardous Substances may be used, handled, stored, or transported on, to, or from the Easement Area. Under no circumstances shall any use be made of, or conduct occur on, the Easement Area which would cause such areas, or any part thereof, to be deemed a hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facility requiring a permit, interim status, or any other special authorization under any applicable law, rule, or regulation.
3. GRANTEE SHALL MAINTAIN TRAIL AND BRIDGE. Grantee shall construct, maintain, repair, reconstruct, replace, remove (if necessary), and operate the trail in a prompt and workmanlike manner. The Trail and Bridge shall be operated and maintained so that it remains open to the public, safe, and free from hazards.
4. SURFACE DAMAGES. Grantee shall compensate Grantor for all damages to Grantor's real and/or personal property improvements, including all damages and impacts to the Metro Property and to any agricultural activities occurring on the Metro Property, caused by the construction, maintenance, repair, replacement, or removal of the Trail in the Easement Area or, in the event that the damages relate to removal of native vegetation, landscaping, or landscaping material, Grantee shall restore the vegetation and landscaping as provided below. In making any installation in the Easement Area, the Grantee shall restore any landscaping to its condition and size prior to such installation, as well as replace, as applicable, any sidewalks, pavement, curbs, driveways, signs, irrigation systems, or other improvements affected by the installation. Grantee shall perform any work in the Easement Area in a prompt and workmanlike manner.
5. RELEASE OF LIABILITY. By granting this Easement, the Grantor shall have no liability or responsibility for the costs of any installation made by Grantee in the Easement Area, including the cost of constructing, maintaining, repairing, replacing, reconstructing, or removing the Trail. Grantor is hereby released from all liability for damages to any improvements, utilities, or systems installed in the Easement Area caused by members of the public entering on the Easement Area, except to the extent such damages arise from or are caused by Grantor's negligence or willful misconduct.
6. INDEMNITY. To the maximum extent permitted by law and subject to the Oregon Constitution and the Oregon Tort Claims Act, Grantee shall fully indemnify, hold harmless, and defend the Grantor and Grantor's officers, employees, and agents from and against all actual or alleged claims, actions, demands, judgments, and damages, and all costs, expenses, and fees incidental to the investigation and defense thereof, including, but not limited to, attorney, accountant, paralegal, and expert fees through all appeals, based upon or arising out of: (a) an intentional or negligent act or omission of Grantee or Grantee's officers, employees, agents, invitees, contractors, or subcontractors acting within the scope of their employment or duties occurring on the Easement Area; (2) the installation, construction, maintenance, repair, or operation of any improvements, utilities, or other systems installed in the Easement Area, including the installation, construction, maintenance, or operation of the Trail; and (3) any breach, violation, or failure to perform any of Grantee's obligations

under this Easement.

7. DAMAGE TO TRAIL OR BRIDGE. In the event that that portion of the Trail or the Bridge over Gales Creek constructed within the Easement Area is ever structurally damaged by high water, an earthquake, or a similar event, the CITY shall be solely responsible for any liability resulting from downstream damage caused by any part of such Trail or Bridge and for removing any damaged parts of such Trail or Bridge from wherever they come to rest. In the event of such an occurrence, the CITY's responsibility for surface damages, the release of liability, and the indemnification provisions set forth in Sections 4, 5 and 6 of this Easement shall apply to such an occurrence.
8. ENVIRONMENTAL INDEMNITY. To the maximum extent permitted by law and subject to the Oregon Constitution and the Oregon Tort Claims Act, Grantee shall fully indemnify, hold harmless, and defend the Grantor, its officers, and employees from and against the costs of any necessary or required sampling, testing, study, remediation, cleanup, or monitoring, and against all actual or alleged claims, actions, demands, judgments, and damages, and all costs, expenses, and fees incidental to the investigation and defense thereof, including, but not limited to attorney, accountant, paralegal and expert fees through all appeals, arising out of or related to Grantee's activities on the Metro Property authorized herein and based upon or arising out of the release, disposal, generation, or transport within the Easement Area of Hazardous or Toxic Materials or Substances, as those terms are defined in ORS chapters 465 and 466, as amended, or the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"), Toxic Substances Control Act ("TSCA"), Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), as amended 42 USC § 960 et seq., or any other federal, state, or local law, ordinance, rule, or regulation pertaining to the protection of the environment; provided, however, that by accepting this Easement, Grantee is not accepting liability for any preexisting release of hazardous substances onto or from the Easement Area, and Grantor is not attempting to convey any such liability.
9. RIGHT OF RE-ENTRY; TERMINATION. This Easement is granted on the express condition that the Grantee use the Easement solely for the purposes stated in Sections 1 and 2, above. In the event the Grantee uses the Easement for another purpose or fails to use the Easement Area for a continuous period of one (1) year at any time after the initial Trail construction authorized by this Easement, or, in the event the parties mutually agree to terminate this Easement, then Grantor may re-enter and terminate this Easement. Within ninety (90) days from the date of written notice from Grantor upon non-continuous use for the one (1) year period or mutual termination of this Easement, the Grantee shall remove any installation from the Easement Area, including the Trail, shall restore the land to a grade consistent with the surrounding area, said restoration to be at Grantee's sole cost as directed by and to the satisfaction of the Grantor, and shall deliver to the Grantor a recordable document or documents sufficient to remove this Easement as an encumbrance on the Easement Area.
10. RESERVATIONS. Grantor reserves the right to use and enjoy the Easement Area provided that such use shall not hinder, conflict with, or interfere with Grantee's rights hereunder or disturb its installations within the Easement Area, and Grantor shall neither authorize nor

construct, create, or maintain any road, reservoir, excavation, change in surface grade, obstruction, or structure on, over, along, or within the Easement Area without Grantee's prior written consent.

11. COVENANTS. The rights granted herein shall be covenants running with the land and be binding upon Grantor, its successors and assigns in perpetuity, except as otherwise set forth herein. Grantee covenants and agrees to maintain and repair all improvements, utilities, and systems installed within the Easement Area by Grantee, including the Trail. Grantee covenants and agrees that, in the conduct of any and all of its activities and operations hereunder, it will comply strictly with all present and future rules and regulations of all federal, state, and local government bodies having jurisdiction over the construction activities occurring within the Easement Area and, if applicable, on adjacent real property owned by Grantor.

12. GRANTOR'S RIGHT TO GRANT EASEMENT. Grantor represents and warrants that it is the owner of the Easement Area having the full right and power to grant the rights provided in this Easement, subject to liens and encumbrances of record as of the date of execution set forth below.

THIS EASEMENT is executed this _____ day of _____ 2008.

METRO, GRANTOR

By: _____
Name: Michael J. Jordan
Title: Chief Operating Officer

State of Oregon)
 ss.
County of Multnomah)

This instrument was acknowledged before me on _____, 20____
by _____ as Chief Operating Officer of Metro.

Notary Public - State of Oregon

ACCEPTANCE

THIS EASEMENT is hereby accepted this _____ day of _____ 2008.

CITY OF FOREST GROVE, GRANTEE

By: _____
Name: _____
Title: _____

STATE OF OREGON)
) ss.
County of _____)

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the ____ day of _____
2008 by _____, the _____ of the City of
Forest Grove, Oregon.

NOTARY PUBLIC FOR OREGON
My Commission Expires: _____

**Easement Exhibit 1
Metro Property Legal Description**

Parcel No. 1, according to PARTITION PLAT NO. 1994-96, in the City of Forest Grove, filed December 12, 1994, Records of the County of Washington and State of Oregon.

Easement Exhibit 2
Easement Area Legal Description and Survey Depiction
[to be appended upon completion of survey]

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 10-4148, AUTHORIZING THE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER TO AMEND AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF FOREST GROVE FOR TRAIL DEVELOPMENT.

Date: May 6, 2010

Prepared by: Kathleen Brennan-Hunter, 503-797-1948

BACKGROUND

Metro and the City of Forest Grove entered into an intergovernmental agreement effective June 9, 2008 regarding the City's construction of a trail on Metro-owned and managed property. This agreement was amended September 23, 2009 to extend the effective date of the IGA to allow extra time necessary for trail construction.

Due to requisite design changes, a second amendment is now necessary. During the design phase, it became apparent that the alignment of the trail must be shifted to allow for the most appropriate location for a bridge to cross over Gales Creek. This new alignment places an additional 975 feet of trail on Metro property. This will include one bridge abutment and part of the bridge over Gales Creek to be located on Metro-owned property.

Metro staff reviewed the design as presented in the project Bid/Permit Set plans prepared by Group Mackenzie dated February 11, 2010, as amended by Addendum No. 1 dated February 18, 2010, and Addendums No. 2 and 3 dated March 1, 2010, and as subsequently amended as reasonably necessary in the normal course of final project design and construction.

Metro staff has been present on site for pre-bid construction meetings and feel that all potential concerns with the new alignment, and accompanying revised bridge design, have been met. Furthermore, the Metro scientist responsible for the restoration of the natural area has reviewed all materials and does not feel that this alignment and design change will have an adverse affect on the natural resource components of the site, nor affect restoration in progress.

Other than the alignment shift and design changes to the original trail development project, the terms and conditions of the original IGA remain unchanged.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. Known Opposition

None identified.

2. Legal Antecedents

On November 6, 1997, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 97-2539B, "For the Purpose of Approving General Policies Related to the Review of Easements, Right of Ways, and Leases for Non-Park Uses Through Properties Managed by the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department."

On May 15, 2008, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 08-3935, "Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Execute an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Forest Grove for Trail Development."

On September 23rd, 2009, the City of Forest Grove and Metro approved an amendment to the agreement to extend the effective date.

3. **Anticipated Effects**

Allowing the trail to be built in the revised location is the best possible outcome, given Metro and the City's previously expressed intent to partner on a trail construction adjacent to the Metro-owned property. The new location is the most stable in terms of periodic stream flooding and will have the least impact on Metro-sponsored restoration efforts. Further, the trail will allow the public to have more access to nature and offers the potential for conservation education.

4. **Budget Impacts**

None.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Chief Operating Officer recommends approval of Resolution 10-4148.

Agenda Item Number 5.2

Resolution No. 10-4150, For the Purpose of Approving the Air Quality
Conformity Determination for the 2035 Regional Transportation
Plan and the 2010-2013 Metropolitan Transportation
Improvement Program.

RESOLUTIONS
PUBLIC HEARING, NO ACTION TAKEN

Metro Council Meeting
Thursday, May 6, 2010
Metro Council Chamber

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE AIR)	RESOLUTION NO. 10- 4150
QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION)	
FOR THE 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION)	Introduced by Chief Operating Officer
PLAN AND THE 2010-2013 METROPOLITAN)	Michael Jordan with the Concurrence of
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT)	Council President David Bragdon
PROGRAM.)	

WHEREAS, clean air contributes to the health of Metro residents and their quality of life; and

WHEREAS, the federal Clean Air Act and other federal laws, including CFR 93.100 through CFR 93.128 contain air quality standards designed to ensure that federally supported activities meet air quality standards, and these federal standards apply to on-road transportation plans, programs and activities in the Metro area; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 340, Division 252, Transportation Conformity, of Oregon Administrative Rules was adopted to implement section 176(c) of the federal Clean Air Act, as amended, and these rules also apply to Metro area on-road transportation plans, programs and activities; and

WHEREAS, these federal and state regulations require an air quality conformity determination whenever the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is updated and require that the transportation improvement program conform to the air quality regulations consistent with the 2035 RTP; and

WHEREAS, in December, 2009, the Metro Council approved, subject to air quality conformity determination, the update of the 2035 RTP, as stated in Resolution No. 09-4099, For the Purpose of Accepting the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, with the Following Elements for Final Review and Analysis for Air Quality Conformance: the Transportation Systems Management and Operations Action Plan; the Regional Freight Plan; the High Capacity Transit System Plan and the Regional Transportation Functional Plan; and

WHEREAS, in August, 2007, the 2008 - 2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) was approved by the Metro Council by Resolution No. 07-3824, For the Purpose of Approving an Air Quality Conformity Determination For the 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement, assuming the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Financially-Constrained System; and

WHEREAS, the Air Quality Conformity Determination dated March 22, 2010, included in Exhibit "A" and attached hereto, demonstrates that the financially-constrained system of the 2035 RTP and the timing and design of the projects included in the 2010-2013 MTIP can be built and the resulting total air quality emissions, to the year 2035, are forecast to be substantially less than the motor vehicle emission budgets, or maximum transportation source emission levels; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby:

1. Approves the air quality conformity determination attached to this resolution as Exhibit "A."

2. Directs the Chief Operating Officer to forward the Air Quality Conformity Determination dated March 22, 2010, to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration for approval.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 10th day of June, 2010.

Approved as to form:

David Bragdon, Council President

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

CLICK HERE FOR FULL REPORT



Exhibit A to Resolution No. 10-4150

Air Quality Conformity Determination

March 22, 2010

2035

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

and

2010–13

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM



Metro | *People places. Open spaces.*

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 10- 4150, FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR THE 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND THE 2010-2013 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

Date: April 29, 2010

Prepared by: Mark Turpel

BACKGROUND

Overview

Federal regulations require that at least every four years the transportation plan be updated with a new time horizon, updated jobs and housing forecasts and updated information about available funds, including federal funds, for the new time period. The updated transportation plan, (know as the Regional Transportation Plan, or RTP, in the Metro area) with these new factors taken into consideration, must then be tested to see if it meets the federal Clean Air Act and state air quality regulations. In addition, the transportation improvement program (called the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program or MTIP in the Metro area) must be re-conformed, or re-tested, against the air quality standards within six months of the adoption of the new transportation plan. These air quality analyses – known as air quality conformity determinations - must demonstrate compliance with all federal and state determined air pollutants for the area so that the region, the Oregon Department of Transportation and local jurisdictions can continue to be eligible to receive federal funds for transportation projects within the region.

The Metro area is in compliance with the standards for all air pollutants regulated by federal and state regulations. However, the current status of air quality in the Metro region is that it is a “maintenance” area for Carbon Monoxide. That is, while the region has greatly reduced Carbon Monoxide levels and has not exceeded maximum levels since 1989, it still must monitor Carbon Monoxide levels and complete air quality conformity determinations for Carbon Monoxide emissions from on-road transportation sources. The way that this analysis is done is that the region’s projected growth to the transportation plan horizon year (2035) and the transportation investments included in the financially constrained RTP (of which the MTIP is a subset) are estimated in Metro’s travel forecast model. These travel results are then used with the Environmental Protection Agency’s approved MOBILE6.2 air quality model to determine air pollutant levels from on-road sources. These emission levels are then compared with the motor vehicle emission budgets, or maximum air pollution levels of Carbon Monoxide from on-road transportation sources, as determined by the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission based on the analysis and recommendations of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

Carbon Monoxide Conformity Determination

Exhibit "A" to Resolution No. 10- 4150, “For the Purpose of Approving the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and the 2010-2013 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program,” is the March 22, 2010 Air Quality Conformity Determination that includes a Carbon Monoxide emission analysis of on-road transportation sources from the region based on the 2035 RTP and 2008-2011 MTIP.

The analysis shows that federal and state air quality standards for Carbon Monoxide can easily be met now and in the future in the Metro region considering the combined emissions generated from on-road vehicles using: 1) the existing transportation system, and, 2) the projects included in the 2008-2011

Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program; and, 3) all of the other improvements included in the financially constrained system of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan; and 4) all other local transportation projects that are considered regionally significant.

Accordingly, approval of the air quality conformity determination can be considered.

If approved, the conformity determination must be forwarded to the Federal Highways Administration and Federal Transit Administration, who, after conferring with the EPA, may approve the conformity determination.

Compliance with SAFETEA-LU

In December 2009 with the Metro Council adoption of Resolution No. 09-4099, For the Purpose of Accepting the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, with the Following Elements for Final Review and Analysis for Air Quality Conformance: the Transportation Systems Management and Operations Action Plan; the Regional Freight Plan; the High Capacity Transit System Plan and the Regional Transportation Functional Plan, the region took action, in part, based on following the requirements of the federal transportation act. The lone outstanding gap is the air quality conformity determination.

Now that the air quality conformity analysis has been completed by the region, final action on the 2035 RTP and 2010-2013 MTIP may be considered consistent with all federal transportation regulations.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None.

2. Legal Antecedents

Federal regulations include:

- Clean Air Act, as amended [42 U.S. C. 7401 and 23 U.S.C. 109(j)], as amended].
- US EPA transportation conformity rules (40 CFR, parts 51 and 93).

State regulations include:

- Oregon Administrative Rules for Transportation Conformity, (OAR Chapter 340, Division 252).
- 2006 State Implementation Plan (SIP).
- 2006 Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan and 2007 Portland Area Ozone Maintenance Plan.

Metro legislation includes:

- Resolution No. 03-3381A, “For the Purpose of Adopting the 2004-2007 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland Metropolitan Area” adopted by the Metro Council on December 11, 2003.
- Resolution No. 03-3382A-02, “For the Purpose of Adopting the Portland Area Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan and 2004-2007 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program” adopted by the Metro Council on January 15, 2004.

- Resolution No. 05-3529A, “For the Purpose of Allocating \$62.2 Million of Transportation Priorities Funding for the Years 2008 and 2009, Pending Air Quality Conformity Determination” adopted by the Metro Council on March 24, 2005.
 - Resolution No. 05-3589A, “For the Purpose of Amending the Regional Transportation Plan to Move the I-205 Northbound Onramp/Airport Way Interchange Improvement From the Illustrative List to the Financially Constrained List” adopted by the Metro Council on June 9, 2005.
 - Resolution No. 07-3824, “For the Purpose of Approving An Air Quality conformity Determination for the 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program” adopted by the Metro Council on August 16, 2007.
 - Resolution 07-3831B, “For the Purpose of Approving The Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update, Pending Air Quality Conformity Analysis” adopted by the Metro Council on December 13, 2007.
 - Resolution No. 09-4099 “For the Purpose of Accepting the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, With the Following Elements, For Final Review and Analysis For Air Quality Conformance: The Transportation System Management and Operations Plan; The Regional Freight Plan; The High Capacity Transit System Plan; and The Regional Transportation Functional Plan” adopted by the Metro Council on December 17, 2009.
3. **Anticipated Effects:** Approval of this resolution allows for funding of proposed transportation projects in the 2010-2013 MTIP and advancing the goals of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. With approval, staff will submit the Air Quality Conformity Determination and findings to the U.S. Department of Transportation for approval.
 4. **Budget Impacts:** None directly by this action. Upon approval of this action, the some of the projects included in the 2010-2013 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program would provide partial funding support for some of the region’s transportation planning activities that might otherwise have a reduced scope, be delayed or not be undertaken.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends approval of Resolution No. 10- 4150.