

MEETING REPORT
JPACT/MPAC/TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE WORKSESSION
SEPTEMBER 17, 1997

The joint meeting of JPACT/MPAC and the Transportation Planning Committee was called to order by JPACT Chair Jon Kvistad for the purpose of receiving an overview and reviewing the Subcommittee Report on Chapter 2 of the Regional Framework Plan and the Committee's recommendations.

Committee members present included: Chair: Rob Drake, Mayor of Beaverton; Jon Kvistad, Ed Washington, Susan McLain, Lisa Naito, Metro Councilors; Grace Crunican, ODOT; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County Commissioner; John Hartsock, Clackamas County Special District; Tom Lowery, Clackamas County; Chuck Petersen, Clackamas County; Jean Schreiber, Clackamas County; Jill Thorn, Clackamas County; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met, General Manager; Dean Lookingbill, City of Vancouver (SW RTC); Bob Baker, Vancouver, WA Councilor; Richard Benner, Growth Council State Agency; Charlie Hales, City of Portland Commissioner; Scott Leeding, (Appointment Pending); Robert Mitchell, Washington County; Lou Ogden, Washington County; Linda Peters, Washington County Commissioner; David Ripma, Multnomah County; Dan Saltzman, Multnomah County; Bud Farm, Multnomah County Special Districts; Gussie McRobert, Multnomah County; Jim Zehren, Citizens of Metro

Guests present from MCCI included: Bob Bothman, Peggy Neff, Holly Isaak, Bob Wiggin, Jim Robison, Kay Durtschi, Patty Mamula, Aleta Woodruff, Jerry Penk, Stefan Stent, Jason Franklin, Ray Sherwood, Bob Stacey, Kim Vandehey, Bebe Schindler. Other guests included: Doug Bollam, Citizen; Maureen Murphy, Citizen; Cindy Sturm, Citizen; G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Paige Norris, David Evans & Assoc.; Jim Peterson, Multnomah NA; Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Meeky Blizzard, Sens. Transp. Op. For the People; Chris Wrench, CAC to RTP Update; Dan Layden, ODOT; Paul Silver, City of Wilsonville; W. James Kuhl, Rosemont Property Owners; Betty Atteberry, SCH, Maggie Collins, City of Milwaukie; Fred Nussfaun, AORIA; Rebecca Ocken, City of Gresham; Gary Katsion, Kittelson & Assoc.; Scott Rice, Cornelius City Council

Staff present included: Mike Burton, Metro Executive Officer; Andy Cotugno; Richard Brandman; Larry Shaw; John Fregonese; Tom Kloster; Pamela Peck; Kim White; Rich Ledbetter; Mark Turpel; Beth Anne Steele; Emily Kaplan; Marjorie Taylor; and Jana Brey, Recording Secretary

Media representation included: Gordon Oliver, The Oregonian

The minutes from the last meeting, July 16, 1997 were approved unanimously.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON CHAPTER 2

Mayor Lou Ogden explained that the Subcommittee met three times to review Chapter 2 of the RFP. The Subcommittee's focus was to ensure the policies and information were consistent with the RTP. Concerns were raised in those meetings in regards to motor vehicle levels of service and street design guidelines versus requirements. The

Subcommittee in the end, was in general concurrence with the recommendations of the staff. The Subcommittee was thanked for their time and for eliminating vague language.

OVERVIEW OF CHAPTER 2 OF REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN

Andy Cotugno reiterated the goals being accomplished and the timeline for adoption of the RFP. The Metro Council is mandated to adopt the RFP by the end of the calendar year. Currently the RFP is undergoing changes and amendments are being incorporated that are necessary to finalize it as a recommendation from MPAC and JPACT. Chapter 2, per the timeline, must be approved by the joint committees at this meeting. Once the draft is approved, the RFP is scheduled for public hearings before the Metro Council. All comments from the general public and jurisdictions will be considered, incorporated and then brought back to the joint committee for final comment and approval. After the Council finishes their hearing process but before it's scheduled for final adoption, the Committee will have a final opportunity to comment on any potential amendments the Metro Council may have under consideration at that time.

Both Committees were involved last year in drafting Chapter 1 of the RFP that sets the substantive direction of transportation. Chapter 2 of the RFP adapts what was set forth in Chapter 1 of the RFP. Andy focused his briefing on the major areas that no consensus of direction had previously been reached. These areas were highlighted in a handout that compiled the issues, comments and proposed changes received during the review process with the staff's recommendations.

1. Relationship between RFP and the RTP. The question was raised in how to deal with inconsistencies between the two documents. The RFP will be the governing policy document. However, the RTP adoption process will likely produce amendments to the RFP.
2. Motor Vehicle Levels of Service Standards. The standards for Motor Vehicle levels of service were included in the Functional Plan last fall for the regional centers and mixed-use areas. Other 2040 areas had been decided yet. The standards work on the basis that if you don't have good transportation alternatives, then a higher level of motor vehicle level of service is appropriate. It was recommended that on some selected regional highway corridors, no standard should be set, but instead work with ODOT on a case-by-case basis to see what is appropriate. Discussion centered on the issue that lower standards region-wide would cause all parts of the region to be equally congested and the areas that didn't fall below the standards, wouldn't get any funding. While others argued that the Committee spends money where there is the greatest problems or the greatest opportunities. If the standards are lowered, the focus will switch to transit levels of service and mixed-use. The RTP's purpose is to define how to do a project, be financially strategic and to maximize resources.
3. Transit Levels of Service Standards. There has never been a transit level of service standard before. Alternatives to transportation are becoming increasingly

important. Questions being asked include: what constitutes reasonable transit service? What parts of the region should expect to have reasonable transit service? This section defines inadequate transit and provides the basis for developing a plan to make it better. Three basic categories: 1) Neighborhoods and households - which are the most important and more viable. Need thresholds for when transit is not adequate. First priority is to have good quality service for households and employment that are within a quarter mile of those areas in the central city, and regional centers; 2) the routes that provide coverage should be competitive with the automobile. Routes should go into all regional centers; 3) And you should have access into the regional center or central city. In areas that have another 2040 designation, like industrial areas or town centers, there is a much lower density. Therefore some degree of service per the density threshold should be provided but not as high quality as for regional centers. Information provided includes both speed and frequency. TPAC's recommendation is to propose something and try it out. Several comments were also made regarding too much jargon in the Framework Plan. It needs to be made easier to read and understand. The transit standard states a traveler's total commute trip time should not be worse more than two times that of the time it would take a traveler by car. The peak hour on major transit corridors needs to beat 1 1/2 times off-peak auto commute time.

4. Transit Map. Andy briefed the Committee on questions that were raised and amendments suggested to better the public transit map that is included in the Framework Plan. The map changes better reflect the direction of transportation in terms of high capacity transit and rail systems. "High Capacity Transit" should designate where high quality, high speed transit should be considered, such as light rail, commuter rail or express bus. "Proposed" should designate those corridors that we have decided the mode. "Planned" should designate those corridors that we have decided the financing.
5. Local Street Connectivity. The Functional Plan adopted last fall calls for street connectivity between 8 and 20 streets per mile in developing areas. The consultant's case study found that the most benefit from traffic circulation point of view was between 10-16 connections per mile. The staff is proposing that both Functional Plan and Title 6 be amended to incorporate the 10-16 range. When possible, more connections should be provided for pedestrians.
6. Street Design Guidelines. The consultant presented Street Design Guidelines and a manual that proposes treatments for pedestrians, medians, buffer strips, etc. for a design classification system that is defined in both the RTP and RFP. The classifications include boulevards, streets, roads, and throughways. The recommendation was to consider guidelines across all classifications of streets and that they continue to be just guidelines. In addition, the "boulevard" map in Title 6 with Draft 3.0 of the Street Design map provides design designations for all regional facilities. The standards set last year are no longer valid.
7. Modal Targets. The Functional Plan adopted last year states that local governments should set targets for non-single-occupant vehicle. However, no

guidelines are set and there is no indication what numbers are needed. Networks have been designed to guide the RTP around meeting the state's 10% reduction in VMT per capita. Draft targets, by different geographic modes and trip length, were set to determine how to scale down the traffic. These targets would not be an absolute number but a range to give people an idea of order of magnitude it takes to get to that 10% reduction level. Again concerns were raised in regards to money allocation. JPACT's criteria, adopted in the past, includes criteria for support of the 2040 Growth Concept.

8. Local Plan Compliance. Recommendation is that concurrent with Council's adoption of the Framework Plan, there be an amendment to Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to include three issues: the motor vehicle level of service, street design guidelines and revised connectivity requirements. The concurrent amendments are therefore applicable to local governments upon their adoption. Larry Shaw explained that the RFP completed by the Charter Committee didn't look into regional law. RUGGO has changed since 1991. The first eight chapters are similar to RUGGOs and are only Metro related. Individual Functional plans will be inside the RFP and everything will comply with the Framework Plan. The portion of the RFP summarized in Chapter 9 affects local government.

A vote was taken on the final changes to Chapter 2 to be released for public review.

Grace Crunican moved the following change:

"2.18.7. Mode split will be used as ~~the~~ a key regional measure for transportation effectiveness in this region. Metro shall establish an alternative mode split target (defined as non-Single Occupancy Vehicle person trips as a percentage of all person trips for all modes of transportation) for each of the 2040 Design Types identified in Table 3, below."

Her motion failed for lack of a second.

Commissioner Charlie Hales moved to approve Chapter 2 with the "Discussion" and "Consent" amendments reflected in the staff report plus amend the language of 2.28. Motor Vehicle Level of Service to the following:

One-hour of significant congestion is expected in both the a.m. peak-hour of the day and the p.m. peak-hour of the day within the Central City, Regional Centers, Main Streets and Station Communities because of the level of activity expected to occur in these areas. ~~This one-hour-of-significant-level-of~~ congestion is acceptable in these 2040 Design Types because the opportunity to use alternative modes of travel is greatest in these areas. However, more than one-hour of significant congestion in either the a.m. peak-hour of the day or p.m. peak-hour of the day is unacceptable, with the preference being that these areas remain substantially uncongested for the remainder of the day.

In favor were the following:

Commissioner Dan Saltzman
Councilor Susan McLain
Commissioner Linda Peters
Mayor Lou Ogden
Commissioner Charlie Hales
Mayor Rob Drake
Councilor Ed Washington
Councilor Jon Kvistad
Commissioner Ed Lindquist
Dean Lookingbill

Against: Grace Crunican

It was passed unanimously by the MPAC Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the worksession was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Jana Brey

COPIES TO: JPACT Members
MPAC Members
Transportation Planning Committee Members