
Metropolitan Service District

527 SW Hall Portland, Oregon 97201 503/221-1646

Memorandum

Date: November 1, 1979

To: TPAC Members and Participants of October 22 Regional Transportation Plan Meeting, See Below

From: Metro Staff

Subject: Regional Transportation Plan

Special TPAC Meeting - Transportation Plan

Participants

Tom Schwab
Dave Kline
Donna Stuhr
Philip Selinger
Gil Mallery
David Peach
Ben Altman
LeeAnne MacColl
Tom VanderZanden
Bill Parrish
Chuck Neumayer
Gerald Edwards
Ed Murphy
John Hankee
John MacGregor
Bebe Rucker
Mike Borreson
Frank Angelo
Richard Brandman
Richard Daniels
J. R. Forester
Dick Arenz
Paul Bay
Ted Spence
Michael Fisher
John Lang
Winston Kurth
Deanna Mueller-Crispin
Ann Batson
Doug Wentworth

Affiliation

ODOT
ODOT/Metro
Metro Council
Tri-Met
Regional Planning Council
USDOT
Wilsonville
Citizen
Clackamas County
Cities of Clackamas County
Clark County
USDOT
Cities of Multnomah County
Citizen
Port of Portland
Multnomah County
Washington Co. Public Works
Washington County
Metro
Gresham
Citizen
FHWA
Tri-Met
ODOT
City of Portland
City of Portland
Clackamas County
City of Portland
DEQ
Tri-Met

Process For Developing The December Discussion Draft

On October 22, a special TPAC meeting was held to discuss the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). It was generally agreed that the Interagency Coordinating Committee, would be the principal review body in guiding the development of the RTP. The ICC will meet at 9:00 a.m. on the following dates to review plan progress as an agenda item and to sort out outstanding issues as they develop.

November 8	(Thursday)
November 21	(Wednesday)
December 6	(Thursday)
December 20	(Thursday)
January 3	(Thursday)
January 17	(Thursday)
January 31	(Thursday)

The following persons are members of ICC and any person having an interest in attending their meetings to be updated on development of the RTP discussion draft and to provide comments on this process is encouraged to attend.

Bebe Rucker	Multnomah County
Tom VanderZanden	Clackamas County
John Rosenburger	Washington County
John Lang	City of Portland
Paul Bay	Tri-Met

It is also suggested that alternates be appointed to ICC in the event some members may not be able to attend.

PURPOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was called so that participants could discuss two fundamental questions. First, what generally should be the philosophy of the Regional Transportation Plan and what are its objectives? Second, what should the plan contain? That is, how will the plan's policy framework build on both the regional data base and on the aspirations of the jurisdictions in the Metro region?

The plan outline distributed earlier to meeting participants contains Metro's response to these questions. The outline is, therefore, a synthesis of our perception of jurisdictional needs and aspirations (culled from several years of staff reports and workshop findings) seen within the capabilities of Metro's data base.

The meeting was described as the beginning of a systematic effort to discover and confirm jurisdictional needs in relation to the RTP.

PLAN OBJECTIVES

Briefly listed, the overall plan objectives were identified as including:

1. To provide a dynamic, decision oriented document, responsive to changing conditions.
2. To provide a policy framework.
3. To identify transportation needs and constraints.
4. To respond to upcoming era of restricted resources.
5. To provide linkages with other planning areas such as land use, housing, public facilities, etc.
6. To spell out the regional intent regarding regional and local concerns.

DISCUSSION DRAFT OUTLINE

An outline of the RTP discussion draft was presented by Gary Spanovich and Dick Bolen of Metro and included the following major elements.

Chapter I: The General Plan Context

1. The Role of the Plan
 - A. Dynamic plan as opposed to a master plan.
 - B. Plan evolution over time.
2. Plan Organization
 - A. The five chapters.
 - B. Chapters will interrelate. For example, analysis provides the basis for policy directions.

Chapter II: The Policy Framework

1. Purpose: To provide a policy basis for decision making.

2. Strategy: To provide a "discussion draft" which presents alternative policy paths for development of a regional consensus on the appropriate policy directions.
3. Chapter Objectives
 - A. To initiate a regionwide dialogue.
 - B. To provide a vehicle for involvement.
 - C. To secure regional consensus.
4. Synthesis of needs and constraints into goals, objectives, and policies.
 - A. Goals - according to need and constraint categories.
 - B. Alternative objectives and policies.

Chapter III: The Regional Transportation Strategy

1. Purpose: To identify the "systems plan" for the regional system for both the long-range and the short-range time frames.
2. Major Questions to be Answered:
 - A. Will improvements to the major regional corridors solve all of our problems?
 - B. If corridor improvements are insufficient, what then should the region do?
 - C. What additional level of financial resources is required?
 - D. What effect will significant energy, air quality, and funding constraints have?
3. Strategy and Basic Concept
 - A. Identify a "backbone" regional system as a basis for evaluating policy and improvement alternatives.
 - B. Recognize that the plan will not result in an "end state" master plan.
 - C. Recognize that the December discussion draft will make recommendations and lay out the agenda for future discussions.

- D. The plan will prioritize all commitments for future decisions.
- E. Short-range strategies will support long-range strategies.

4. Organization

- A. The Long-Range Strategy
 - a. Evaluation of the 1995 network
 - b. Corridor strategies
 - c. Energy strategy
 - d. Air quality strategy
- B. The Short-Range Strategy
 - a. Functional classification issues
 - b. TSME
 - TDP
 - Special transportation
 - The major arterials
 - Operational strategies (carpooling, etc.)
- C. The Metro data base
 - a. General projections
 - b. Trip inventories
 - c. Land use

Chapter IV: Regional Transportation Improvements

1. Purpose: Implementation of the system strategy and attainment of plan objectives.
2. Objective: To determine the costs of short and long-range strategies, identify funding sources, and develop an implementation strategy.
3. Organization:
 - A. Facility improvement requirements

B. Policy and program requirements

C. Financial resources analysis

Chapter V: The Regional Planning Process

1. Purpose: To devise a process for revising the RTP into a "dynamic" plan.
2. Objectives:
 - A. To identify the forces of change.
 - B. To devise a process for responding to these forces.
3. Organization:
 - A. Formal adoption process.
 - B. Amendment process.
 - C. Continuing evaluation.

MAJOR NEED CATEGORIES AS PERCEIVED BY METRO STAFF

Metro also outlined the major needs which must be addressed in the RTP. These, along with local staff input, form the basic core toward which the RTP is directed and include:

1. The Need for Accessibility
 - a. Regional corridor mobility
 - b. Subregional mobility
 - c. Transit service
 - d. Goods movement
 - e. New technology
 - f. Special needs
2. The Need for Supportive Land Use Development Patterns
 - a. Transportation and land use compatability

3. The Need to Minimize Air Quality Degredation
 - a. Air quality impacts
4. The Need to Maximize Energy Efficiency
 - a. Energy conservation
5. The Need to Allocate Scarce Fiscal Resources Effectively
 - a. Resource allocation
 - b. Generation of funds
6. The Need for Timely Decision Making and Effective Policy Implementation
 - a. Institutional responsibility

FEDERAL AND STATE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Following the Metro staff presentation, representatives of state and federal agencies discussed the requirements of their respective jurisdictions governing the Regional Transportation Plan.

Dick Arenz, from the Federal Highway Administration, was the first speaker. His presentation on federal planning requirements stressed the need for a long-range element in the Plan, the inclusion of a transitway map in addition to a highway network, and continued coordination with and among local jurisdictions.

Ted Spence, representing the Oregon Department of Transportation, called for prioritization of major investments based on needs. In relation to this, he asked for a strong data base and an assessment of new facility impacts on the area and on other facilities. Since ODOT is required to evaluate local plans, detailed information is needed. Finally, he stressed the necessity of a joint process including regional, state and local agencies.

LOCAL JURISDICTIONAL NEEDS:

There followed several prepared presentations of local transportation planning needs by representatives of the planning staffs of the City of Portland, Washington County/Cities, Clackamas County/Cities, Multnomah County/Cities, and Tri-Met.

Memorandum
November 1, 1979
Page 8

Representing the City of Portland, Mike Fisher noted that City's arterial street policy and downtown parking and circulation policy as well as presenting transportation goals for specific areas of the City. In regard to the RTP, Fisher said the City seeks cooperation from Metro in the establishment of a consistent regionwide functional classification policy and improved transit accessibility to non-downtown destination.

Mike Borresen, representing Washington County, noted the poor condition of nearly all Washington County roads. He pointed out that little consideration was taken of the increased traffic generated by local developments having inter-jurisdictional impacts such as Forest Park Estates. He also called for realistic modal splits and a plan that would be applicable for future projects so that an EIS would not be needed in each instance. Borresen's comments also raised the suggestion of a "conflict resolution" section in the RTP to be applied when local desires conflict with regional goals.

Bebe Rucker and Ed Murphy, representing Multnomah County/Cities suggested that a balanced regional network include both major and minor arterials, and transit routes. In addition, future land uses should be included, and better accounting of regional through trips and goods movement.

Murphy called for better north/south access in East Multnomah County and a gridiron bus network. He pointed to particular problems in the County and noted that conflicts in economic development policies existed between Portland's effort to concentrate job opportunities and the County's tendency to disperse employment centers. This raised the issue of Metro's role in prioritizing competing regional projects.

Tom VanderZanden, representing Clackamas County requested Metro comments on proposed transit improvements in the County as well as a more efficient process for the review leading to project financing. In general, he asked that the RTP be a "vision for the future" written in language comprehensible to the public. He also called for a consideration of alternative technologies, including those not presently in wide use. Goods movement, both highway and rail, should also be addressed.

Paul Bay, from Tri-Met, said his agency seeks assistance in the coordination of policy issues. For example, relevant political boundaries, service boundaries, tax district boundaries, and the Urban Growth Boundary do not coincide. This situation results in several anomalies such as Reynolds Aluminum, whose employees pay a tax to fund Tri-Met yet receive no service, and

Vancouver, Washington, whose employers are not taxed yet receive bus service. The RTP could also guide in the establishment of service priorities.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES AND CONCERNS:

During the course of the meeting several additional issues and concerns were raised by meeting participants. In general, these included the following:

- . That throughout the RTP development process, frequent opportunities for review and comment be provided. Consensus was reached that the ICC be used in the review process with meetings to be regularly scheduled. Initial topics for review were to include (1) which new transit and highway facilities would be included in the future year network, (2) which highway facilities are to be included on the regional network for analysis purposes, (3) what assumptions on future year travel characteristics would be used, and (4) the need to review the future year highway assignment to check for any errors.
- . Meeting participants expressed a strong desire for the RTP to rely for evaluative purposes on an extensive highway network which would include not only freeways and principal arterials but would also take minor arterials into consideration. There is a need to provide local jurisdictions with more detailed information for help in developing their local strategies. A need was also expressed that the plan consider not only regional corridors but also provide strategies for sub-regional corridors and travel movements.
- . A desire was expressed to revise the existing land use forecasts and to meet with local jurisdictions prior to arriving at a final forecast which would be used for simulation.
- . The question was also raised of how Clark County would interface with the Plan. Issues such as transit service to Clark County, carpooling and the third bridge would be addressed along with any problems which might be identified. However, a separate Bi-State Transportation Coordinating Committee is being set up and will deal with these issues.
- . An additional concern was that a draft discussion plan be released early for local review. This would allow additional opportunities to reformulate the RTP to respond to local concerns and interests.

Memorandum
November 1, 1979
Page 10

- . A question was raised regarding Metro's legal mandate for regional transportation planning. The Oregon Revised Statutes, Chapter 665, Section 18, empowers Metro to define and apply planning procedures for activities "having significant impact upon the orderly and responsible development of the metropolitan area." Transportation is identified as one of these activities. These powers include the preparation and adoption of a transportation plan and the review of city and county comprehensive plans.

In conjunction with this review responsibility, Metro can "require cities and counties, as it considers necessary, to make changes in any plan to assure that the plan and any action taken under it conform to the district's functional plans."

GS:ss
5770A
0077A