

**INFORMATION FROM REGIONAL GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
TO CHARTER COMMITTEE  
REGARDING LAND TRANSPORTATION ISSUES**

**October 24, 1991**

The Regional Governance Committee (RGC) appreciates the opportunity to offer the following thoughts regarding land transportation issues for the consideration of the Charter Committee.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This document includes the following key points:

- The existing planning and service delivery system for land transportation functions well.
- J-PACT is an excellent example of cooperative decision-making between local governments and regional interests and should be continued as the primary planning and decision-making entity for land transportation issues in the region.
- The new state transportation rule is a new and powerful tool which will affect future transportation and land use planning in this region. The transportation elements of the regional response to the rule's requirements can be effectively handled by J-PACT through the currently planned update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
- To meet the transportation rule's requirements for vehicle miles travelled (VMT) effectively and at the least cost possible it will be necessary to set performance standards where regional interests are identifiable. These performance standards may in some cases affect planning for local arterials, collectors, streets, bike routes and demand management programs. This is appropriate so long as the regional performance standards are clear, identified in advance, and local governments retain the flexibility to determine how best to meet those standards through local development regulations. This flexibility is important in order to be responsive to unique local conditions and to retain community diversity and identity.
- The current separation of planning and service delivery functions for the transit system should continue.

**SUMMARY OF RGC PROCESS**

As you know, for each major functional issue the Charter Committee addresses the RGC is using two matrices to organize and summarize our information. The first matrix simply describes the current system as we understand it. We tried to describe the current system as the law requires it; common practice is sometimes different. The second matrix describes our current thinking on what the future system should be.

Horizontal Axis/ Major Transportation Systems: Along the horizontal axis we have organized the two land transportation matrices according to the major types of transportation systems: 1) major highway corridors; 2) major arterials and minor arterials of regional significance; 3)

public transit (bus and light rail) 4) local minor arterials and collectors; 5) local streets; 6) bicycle routes; and 7) demand management techniques.

Vertical Axis/functions: Along the vertical axis we have identified a number of types of functions, from "approval authority" to "service delivery". A category for primary funding sources has been added because funding is such a major issue in transportation planning. "Approval authority" means the body or bodies who must approve a plan before it can be implemented. "Planning lead" means the entity responsible for preparing a long-range plan for approval. "Coordination lead" means the entity responsible for pulling together all of the parties who must prepare a plan. "Information gathering, analysis and support" means the entity responsible for conducting staff functions to support the planning process (e.g. research studies, computer modeling). "Service delivery" means the entity responsible to execute the plan. In the transportation field to date this usually has meant building something (roads, light rail lines). It could also mean implementing a demand management program such as ride sharing.

Partnership Sought: As with all other elements of the RGC's process at this time we are proceeding on the assumption that the governance structure included in the Charter will successfully implement a true partnership between Metro and local governments. The partnership we are after can not be captured in a simple matrix identifying the lead agency, but it is fundamental to our support for a strong regional role in certain planning areas. Certainly J-PACT (Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation), which is constituted from a group of local government and regional interests, is an excellent working example of that partnership. The official designation by the Federal Government of J-PACT as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region institutionalizes this cooperative partnership.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS: BUILD ON STRENGTH OF EXISTING SYSTEM**

The highlights of matrix B describing the recommended future system are briefly described below. We would be happy to provide additional detail or verbal testimony if the opportunity can be provided.

Power of Existing Planning Tools/Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and State Transportation Rule (Goal 12): We have organized the land transportation matrices according to major types of transportation systems (arterials, public transit, etc.) instead of planning tools (RTP, Transportation Rule). However, the process of developing and implementing the RTP has an overriding impact on the existing transportation system in the region; and we believe that implementation of the new Transportation Rule for state land use goal 12 will have a major impact as well. The RTP is currently scheduled for a major update to respond to the new transportation rule.

Continue to Make Better Use of Existing Tools: The transportation field is an excellent case study for other functions, because the current system is functioning quite well. With some enhancements to the existing planning processes the region will have an effective system for dealing with the transportation elements of growth management.

Transportation planning and service delivery are complex, in part because of the confusing multi-layered system of funding transportation system improvements. J-PACT has done a good job of stitching regional planning together in a manner which has allowed the region to continue to benefit from federal and state funding for major portions of the regional

transportation system. Any major changes to this system might threaten such funding relationships, and should be avoided.

While there are many benefits to the current planning process, the current planning documents will need to be updated to meet future needs. The implementation of the new state transportation rule will provide a large part of the motivation for these changes. That rule requires the creation of new state, regional and local plans which are consistent with each other. The primary purposes of those plans will be to: 1) better integrate land use and transportation planning; and 2) reduce vehicle miles travelled per capita (VMT) substantially (20%) over the next 30 years. Will believe that the effective functioning of a regional planning entity will be important if this region is to achieve these two primary purposes of the transportation rule.

The primary enhancements to the existing transportation plans need to be made in the following areas: 1) creation of a true long-range transit plan for the region (we do not believe one currently exists); 2) better identification of the impacts that local decisions regarding the local arterial and collector system and local streets have on goal 12 issues; and 3) more attention to the regional aspects of demand management as a tool for reducing VMT.

Need for Both Regional Perspective and Local Identify: New authorities or rearrangements of existing relationships are not necessary to make the needed enhancements to the existing system. What is needed is a more pro-active role at the regional level, working in partnership with local governments, to develop the clear standards to be met as local decisions are made regarding arterials, collectors, streets, bike routes and demand management programs. Local governments have many of the tools necessary to integrate land use and transportation and reduce VMT. However, as in the RGC's position on land use issues, we appreciate the importance of the regional aspect of these transportation issues. That is why Metro is listed as having a role in the "Analysis, Information Gathering and Support" column for these issues in our second matrix. Cost savings through economies of scale and valuable, additional perspective are gained through regional analysis. New authorities are not needed, just additional support.

While it is important to know ahead of time through the functional transportation plan what regional standards affect local governments, it is equally important that the local governments retain the flexibility to determine how best to meet those standards for their communities. This approach makes it possible to simultaneously serve the regional interest as well as preserve community identity and diversity.

#### Retain Current Transit Planning and Service Delivery System

We believe the existing relationship which splits planning and service delivery functions for public transit between Metro and Tri-Met should continue.

Transportation Functional Plan and State Planning Goals: The RGC expressed concern in its position on land use issues that functional plans currently did not require acknowledgement by the State as consistent with statewide planning goals. Our concern regarding this issue continues for the RTP, which is a functional plan. In this case, the existing RTP states that it should not require any actions at the local level which are inconsistent with state planning goals, and provides a procedure for reconciling such potential conflicts after the fact. However, no state finding before the fact that the RTP is consistent with state planning goals is required. We believe this creates the potential for long-range problems, and that the new transportation rule makes it even more important for state involvement before rather than after the fact.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments.

**LAND TRANSPORTATION**

**MATRIX A: SUMMARY OF CURRENT SYSTEM**

	FUNDING	APPROVAL AUTHORITY	PLANNING LEAD	COORDINATION LEAD	ANALYSIS, INFO. GATHER., SUPPORT	SERVICE DEL. LEAD
<b>MAJOR HIGHWAY CORRIDORS</b> • Federal Interstate • State	Federal, State Fed, State, Local	Fed, St, J-PACT State, J-PACT	State State/J-PACT	J-PACT/State State	State/Metro State/Metro	State State
<b>MAJOR ARTERIALS/MINOR ARTERIALS OF REG. SIGN.</b>	Fed, State, Local	J-PACT/Local	J-PACT/State/ Local*	J-PACT/State/ Local*	Metro/State/ Local*	State/Local Govt.
<b>PUBLIC TRANSIT</b> • Bus	Fed/St/Local/ Tri-Met	J-PACT	J-PACT/Tri-Met	Tri-Met	Tri-Met	Tri-Met
• Light Rail Transit	Fed/St/Local/ Tri-Met	J-PACT/Tri-Met	J-Pact/Tri-Met Local (Portland)	J-PACT/Tri-Met	Metro/Tri-Met State/Local	Tri-Met
<b>LOCAL MINOR ARTERIALS AND COLLECTOR SYSTEM</b>	Local/St/Fed	Local	Local	Local	Local	Local
<b>LOCAL STREETS</b>	Local/Federal	Local	Local	Local	Local	Local
<b>BICYCLE ROUTES</b>	State/Local	State/J-Pact/ Local	State/J-PACT/ Local	St/J-PACT/ Local	St/Metro/ Local	St/Local
<b>DEMAND MANAGEMENT</b>	Fed/St/ J-Pact/Local	Local	Local	Local	Local	Local/Tri-Met

\*Note: Local governments involved in active partnership throughout decision-making process.

Key: Fed = Federal Government    J-Pact = Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Trans.    Tri-Met = Tri-Met  
 St = State Government    Local = Local Governments    Metro = Metro staff

**LAND TRANSPORTATION**

**MATRIX B: SUMMARY OF PREFERRED FUTURE SYSTEM**

	FUNDING	APPROVAL AUTHORITY	PLANNING LEAD	COORDINATION LEAD	ANALYSIS, INFO. GATHER, SUPPORT	SERVICE DEL. LEAD
<b>MAJOR HIGHWAY CORRIDORS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal Interstate</li> <li>• State</li> </ul>	Federal, State Fed, State, Local	Fed, St, J-PACT State, J-PACT	State State/J-PACT	J-PACT/State State	State/Metro State/Metro	State State
<b>MAJOR ARTERIALS/MINOR ARTERIALS OF REG. SIGN.</b>	Fed, State, Local	J-PACT/Local	J-PACT/State/ Local*	J-PACT/State/ Local*	Metro/State/ Local*	State/Local Govt.
<b>PUBLIC TRANSIT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus</li> </ul>	Fed/St/Local/ Tri-Met	J-PACT	J-PACT/Tri-Met	Tri-Met	Tri-Met	Tri-Met
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Light Rail Transit</li> </ul>	Fed/St/Local/ Tri-Met	J-PACT/Tri-Me	J-Pact/Tri-Met	J-PACT/Tri-Met	Metro/Tri-Met State/Local	Tri-Met
<b>LOCAL MINOR ARTERIALS AND COLLECTOR SYSTEM</b>	Local/St/Fed	Local	Local	Local	Local/Metro	Local
<b>LOCAL STREETS</b>	Local/Federal	Local	Local	Local	Local/Metro	Local
<b>BICYCLE ROUTES</b>	State/Local	State/J-Pact/ Local	State/J-PACT/ Local	St/J-PACT/ Local	St/Metro/ Local	St/Local
<b>DEMAND MANAGEMENT</b>	Fed/St/ J-Pact/Local	Local	Local	Local	Local/Metro	Local/Tri-Met

\*Note: Local Governments should continue active partnership.

Key: Fed = Federal Government    J-Pact = Joint Policy Advisory Committee for Trans.    Tri-Met = Tri-Met  
 St = State Government    Local = Local Governments    Metro = Metro staff