

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on  
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

4-11-1996

## Meeting Notes 1996-04-11

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

### Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 1996-04-11 " (1996). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 209.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact/209](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/209)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).



**METRO**

Meeting: **JOINT JPACT/MPAC MEETING**  
Date: April 11, 1996  
Day: THURSDAY  
Time: 7:15 a.m.  
Place: METRO, COUNCIL CHAMBER/COUNCIL ANNEX

- \*1. MEETING REPORT OF MARCH 14, 1996 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- \*2. RESOLUTION NO. 96-2316 - ESTABLISHING A POSITION ON A THIRD COLUMBIA RIVER HIGHWAY BRIDGE - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Councilor Monroe.
- \*3. REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN PHASE I - REVIEW AND APPROVE FOR PUBLIC HEARING:
  - a. Title 2 - Parking: John Fregonese, Metro.
  - b. Title 6 - Transportation: Section 2 - Boulevard Design; and Section 3 - Street Connectivity; Andy Cotugno, Metro.
  - c. Title 6 - Transportation: Section 4 - Motor Vehicle Performance Standards; Andy Cotugno, Metro.

\*Material enclosed.

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: March 14, 1996

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Rod Monroe, Jon Kvistad (alt.) and Don Morissette, Metro Council; Dean Lookingbill (alt.), Southwest Washington RTC; Craig Lomnicki, Cities in Clackamas County; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Bruce Warner, ODOT; Mary Legry (alt.), WSDOT; and Claudiette LaVert, Cities in Multnomah County

Guests: David Yaden, Bernie Bottomly and G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Commissioner Peters and Jerry Parmenter, Washington County; John Rist and Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Daniel Kent, Dotten & Associates; Steve Dotterer, City of Portland; Nadine Smith, City of Tigard; Maureen Quaid, Oregon Environmental Council; Kathy Busse, Multnomah County; Howard Harris, DEQ; and Richard Ross, City of Gresham

Staff: Mike Burton, Metro Executive Officer; Andrew Cotugno, Mike Hogle, Tom Kloster, Pamela Peck, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

### SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Rod Monroe.

### MEETING REPORT

Bruce Warner moved, seconded by Mayor Lomnicki, to approve the February 8 JPACT meeting report as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

### RESOLUTION NO. 96-2281 - APPROVING THE FY 1997 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Andy Cotugno explained that the FY 97 Unified Work Program (UWP) includes all federally funded planning-related activities for the Portland metropolitan area. Regionally significant federally-funded activities included in the TIP are not included. The dollar amounts reflect the amounts previously approved for allocation through the 2040 process.

Andy noted one change to the dollar amounts that represents a \$50,000 increase for the Port's Commodity Flow Analysis that was recommended for an increase by TPAC but was never carried forward. In addition, Andy noted that the funding summary table reflects the fact that the Section 8 funds received an actual dollar amount of \$2,500 less than what was estimated.

A letter distributed by the City of Milwaukie requested incorporation of the McLoughlin Boulevard (ORE 99E) Feasibility Study in the UWP in the "regionally significant" category of projects. Federal share for the project is \$100,000 of STP funds for a total of \$125,000.

Action Taken: Commissioner Rogers moved, seconded by Bruce Warner, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 96-2281, approving the FY 1997 Unified Work Program with amendments as follows:

- . An additional \$50,000 to be added to the Port of Portland's Commodity Flow Analysis for a total of \$275,000; and
- . Incorporation of the City of Milwaukie's McLoughlin Boulevard (ORE 99E) Feasibility Study in the category of "regionally significant" projects for a total of \$125,000 (\$100,000 STP federal share). The purpose of the study is to review design options for improvements to a .5 mile segment of McLoughlin Boulevard in downtown Milwaukie, part of the integrated Milwaukie Regional Center Arterial/Street Improvement Program.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

#### UNION PACIFIC/SOUTHERN PACIFIC MERGER

Andy Cotugno reported on the significant benefits of the proposed Union Pacific/Southern Pacific (UP/SP) merger to the Portland area and the rest of the state. ODOT, on behalf of the State of Oregon, is a party of record to the comment process. The region's comments, as defined in a draft letter dated March 14 to Claudia Howells, ODOT's Railroad Services Coordinator, will be incorporated into that process. Andy highlighted the issues of concern to the region and elaborated on the benefits of having a direct single-line rail service from Canada to Mexico.

Concerns are related to rail facility access, rail operations, grade crossings, right-of-way for South/North light rail, the number of trains crossing the area, truck volumes to terminals, whether there would be any impact on current and proposed Amtrak passenger operations, and whether there are plans for any rail abandonments that might be considered for regional recreational trails.

The question was raised about use of the term "rationalization" in the letter and whether that was common usage. Mike Hوجلund reported that the terminology was common to railroad people. He noted that this represents the first of two comment periods. In about three months, a resolution will be introduced that outlines the comments in more detail and supports or conditions approval of the proposed merger.

A letter was introduced on behalf of the cities of Multnomah County requesting that alternate language be provided for the last bullet on Page 3 of the letter to Claudia Howells relating to impacts on Amtrak passenger operations.

Action Taken: Councilor LaVert moved, seconded by Bruce Warner, to approve the March 14 letter to Claudia Howells with the Gresham friendly amendment for a language change to the last bullet on Page 3 to read as follows:

- . Impacts, if any, on current and proposed (e.g., high-speed rail) Amtrak operations in the state.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

#### REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Andy Cotugno explained that Phase I of the Regional Transportation Plan update was the *Interim Federal RTP* adopted by JPACT/Metro Council on May 18 and May 25, 1995, respectively. He cited the need for a lot of work to take place to define how the transportation system will be integrated with the 2040 Growth Concept.

Chapter I of the current and proposed RTP comprises the policy component that will set transportation direction, define the land use/transportation connection, define what it takes to support the 2040 Growth Concept, and determine where facilities are needed and how to design them. The policy component will provide the basis for future planning and decision-making.

Phase II of the update will define the policy direction for the road and transit system and the bike/pedestrian system in compliance with the objectives of the 2040 Growth Concept and Transportation Planning Rule. The policy component of the RTP (Chapter 1) will be adopted by ordinance during this phase, scheduled for May 1996.

Phase III of the update will deal with system improvements over a 20-year period geared to funding scenarios that are financially committed, financially constrained, strategic and preferred. Andy spoke of determinations to be made on the kinds of direction to be pursued for funding improvements. In defining "strategic,"

he cited "projects for an Arterial Program," with a specific set of improvements and size, as one example.

Parallel to work on the RTP update is development of the Regional Framework Plan. Andy pointed out there's an integrated timeline to ensure that the transportation framework and the Regional Framework Plan are integrated and consistent with one another.

As part of the update process, Andy felt that the RTP Citizens Advisory Committee represented a good mix of people, had worked hard, and their recommendations for goals and objectives reflected a good effort. He then reviewed the chart summarizing CAC actions to date relating to the transit, freight, bicycle and pedestrian systems and transportation demand management.

Chapter I of the RTP will form part of the basis for the open houses scheduled in March/April to gain input for early implementation of the Regional Framework Plan. Adoption is proposed in May.

Andy reviewed the regional vision and guiding principles identified in Chapter I of the RTP that target accessibility and mobility, a cost-effective transportation system, and prioritized system improvements. He highlighted the primary and secondary components of the 2040 Growth Concept and their relationship to the transportation system. He emphasized the importance of identifying the highest priority components of the 2040 Growth Concept and the importance of system operations/maintenance and safety.

Andy cited the need to revisit and further discuss some of our performance standards.

A handout was distributed on the Metro Open House Schedule on livability issues. Electronic polling will take place every 45 minutes at these open houses in response to questions on land use and transportation issues. All jurisdictions are encouraged to participate in these open houses.

Bruce Warner commented that, from the state's perspective and for the purpose of planning, the RTP represents a financially committed, money-in-hand, constrained document in compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule. If projects are not included in the RTP, they can't be included in the TIP. The state TPR requirement and the local comprehensive plans define whatever transportation system is needed to support the land use and is reflective of the "preferred" system. Andy Cotugno indicated that the federal requirement is much more restrictive, based on what is perceived as revenues. The "strategic" system is an

attempt to be more targeted -- the amount of revenue you wish to raise to accomplish certain objectives. Bruce felt that this is an area that gets the public stirred up. He felt you have to justify why you should live in higher density when the state can't live up to its commitments with limited funds. He cited the need for more discussion on system performance and the requirements of the RTP. He asked where limited dollars should be placed to promote the elements of 2040.

Mike Burton spoke of the conflicting differences between the federal, state and regional transportation systems and cited the need to discuss what is reality and what is proposed. He noted that the decision-makers have a difficult planning process.

It was noted that Fred Eberle of ODOT presented a clear picture of the Oregon Transportation Plan, its program, and available funds for building at a recent CPO 8 meeting. Bruce Warner cited the importance of making it clear to the public that the projects are not fully funded. The level of congestion and what is tolerable needs to be discussed further. Bruce felt the basis of defining our framework of transportation investments should be in terms of the ability to fund the projects, being forthright and clear with the public, and strategically placing our investments to best realize our vision.

The survey will be tested at the March 19 CAC meeting and by a high school class at Marshall High School before being finalized.

Councilor Morissette and Commissioner Rogers emphasized the importance of how the questions are generated or posed. Councilor Morissette noted that people support higher density but want more property to fit that on. A discussion followed about the choices being made for living that may cause more congestion in the future. Commissioner Rogers expressed concern about what the expectations of our consultants might be because of the way some of the questions are posed (pertaining to questions 64 through 68 of the questionnaire). He asked whether we would still be willing to expand to create more growth opportunities if the outcome of the poll doesn't predict anything.

A discussion followed on the functionality of the Regional Transportation Plan. It is regarded as both a product and a process. The product is intended to satisfy the federal requirement but there is also need to use it as the organizing vehicle to engage the public. There was consensus that the 2040 framework is the right place to be in terms of shape of the region and livability. Dave Yaden suggested not separating the survey out by modes. He felt that the RTP represents not only the level of investment, the design of those elements that define how the streets are built and integrated with other modal aspects, but emphasizes the

need to make the right kinds of transportation investments. The public has an interest in understanding how the transportation investments would make a difference if there is more dense development.

Commissioner Peters felt that a good survey will lead people through a series of questions that arrive at finer distinctions in the same two to three areas. She was impressed with how well the survey was structured and encouraged comments. She indicated it recognized the factors affecting people's decisions on what is acceptable.

Commissioner Peters reported that MPAC is now reviewing public involvement for the Regional Framework Plan and has asked for a joint meeting with JPACT to consider the parking and transportation issues. The focus of the meeting would be on Title 3, the Regional Parking Policy; Title 7, Regional Accessibility; Title 8, the Narrow Streets Policy; and Title 9, Compliance Procedures. She noted that Commissioner Hales is the new Chair of MPAC.

JPACT Committee members agreed that the April 11 JPACT meeting will be jointly held with MPAC with focus on the above issues.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Mike Burton  
JPACT Members



**METRO**

Date: April 4, 1996  
To: JPACT  
From: Rod Monroe, Chair *RM*  
Re: Third Columbia River Bridge

As you know, following defeat of the C-TRAN ballot measure to fund South/North LRT, the Clark County Commission and Vancouver City Council appointed a Transportation Futures Committee to evaluate transportation needs throughout the county, including bi-state needs. To accomplish this charge, the committee is currently engaged in an effort to evaluate a broad range of alternatives, including the following:

- . South/North LRT
- . I-205 LRT
- . Commuter Rail
- . River Transit
- . I-5 Improvements in Oregon and Washington
- . Helicopters
- . A Third Columbia River Highway Crossing

Although their charge is to consider the merits of these alternatives relative to the needs of Clark County residents, I feel it is important that they take into consideration the position of Oregon jurisdictions, especially related to a third Columbia River highway crossing. As such, I propose to introduce to JPACT and the Metro Council a resolution defining our position on a third Columbia River bridge. I will have a draft of the proposed resolution available at the April 11, 1996 JPACT meeting.

RM:ACC:lmk

CC: Mike Burton, Executive Officer  
Metro Council

The Region 2040 process in Oregon and the Growth Management Act process in Clark County have provided both portions of the region with a long-range planning framework. Both third bridge locations currently under consideration are inconsistent with these long-range plans. The western alignment would operate largely outside of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and it would accelerate development pressure on communities in the U.S. 30 corridor such as Sauvie Island, Scappoose, and St. Helens.

The eastern alignment would be inconsistent with the long-range planning framework by increasing development pressure on communities such as Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview, Gresham, Boring and Sandy in the Highway 26/Mt. Hood corridor and by increasing development pressure on the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area.

Neither third bridge location would serve a significant existing travel market. The major travel movement served by the western alignment, Clark County to Washington County travel, represents less than 1 percent of regional work trips, and even less for all trip purposes. The eastern alignment would serve the periphery of the region, an area already served by I-84 and I-205.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING)  
A POSITION ON A THIRD COLUMBIA )  
RIVER HIGHWAY BRIDGE )

RESOLUTION NO. 96-2316  
Introduced by Rod Monroe,  
Chair, JPACT

WHEREAS, In 1995 the City of Vancouver, Clark County and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) established the Transportation Futures Committee to review a broad range of issues relating to travel within Clark County and between Clark County and the Oregon portion of the metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, The Clark County Transportation Futures Committee has recommended evaluating the costs and impacts of a range of transportation alternatives addressing bi-state travel, including two possible locations for a third highway crossing of the Columbia River; and

WHEREAS, One bridge location, around the west side of Vancouver Lake, crossing the Columbia River near Rivergate, then crossing the Willamette River near Linnton, crossing through Forest Park and continuing to Highway 26 in Washington County, raises the following concerns:

- It would be inconsistent with state, regional and local land use policies in Oregon and it would increase pressure to expand the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and accelerate growth pressures on satellite communities in the Highway 30 corridor such as Sauvie Island, Scappoose and St. Helens.
- It would raise extremely serious environmental issues with regard to threatened and endangered fish in the Columbia and

Willamette Rivers, impacts to Forest Park, a major scenic and recreational resource, and it would potentially sever the continuous wildlife corridor which links Forest Park with the coastal mountains.

- It would not serve a significant existing travel market; less than 1 percent of the current regional travel is between Clark County and Washington County.

WHEREAS, The second bridge location, through east Clark County west of Camas, crossing the Columbia River near Troutdale and with a possible connection to Highway 26, raises these concerns:

- It would be inconsistent with state, regional and local land use policies in Oregon and it would increase pressure to expand the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and accelerate growth pressures on communities such as Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview, Gresham, Boring, and Sandy.
- It would also increase growth pressure within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area in both Oregon and Washington.
- It would raise environmental issues with regard to threatened and endangered fish in the Columbia as well as to environmentally sensitive areas such as the Sandy River watershed.
- It would not serve a significant existing travel market; the Oregon portion of this corridor is currently served by I-205 and I-84.

WHEREAS, The two bridge concepts under consideration by the Clark County Futures Committee are inconsistent with state,

Clark County Futures Committee are inconsistent with state, regional and local land use policies in both Oregon and Washington which seek to develop communities served by a range of transportation options including transit; and

WHEREAS, The two bridge concepts under consideration by the Clark County Futures Committee are inconsistent with state, regional and local transportation policies which call for improved accessibility through the development of multi-modal facilities that address fundamental regional and community goals such as environmental protection and support of the regional economy; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Metro Council finds that the two Columbia River crossing concepts under consideration by the Clark County Futures Committee are inconsistent with long-range planning efforts in the Oregon portion of the metropolitan area, would not provide significant transportation benefits to residents of the region and should not be studied further.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1996.

Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

## PHASE 1 REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN ADOPTION

April 11.....Joint JPACT/MPAC Review/Draft Approval of  
Titles 2 and 6

April 24.....MPAC Approval of Full "Draft" Document for  
Public Review

May 9.....JPACT Discussion of "Level-of-Service"  
Standard

May 22.....Deadline for Local Government and Citizen  
Comments to MPAC

May 29.....MPAC Hearing on Draft Document

June 12.....MPAC Adoption of Final Recommendations to  
Metro Council

June 12-July 2.....Metro Growth Management Committee Review

June 13.....JPACT Adoption of Final Recommendations on  
Title 2/Title 6 to Metro Council

July 2.....Metro Growth Management Committee Recom-  
mendation to Metro Council

July 11-Sept. 12....Full Metro Council Review of Document

September 12.....Metro Council Adoption

This is a working draft to be reviewed by  
MTAC & TPAC, MPAC and JPACT, the  
Metro Growth Management Committee  
and the full Metro Council

---

## Phase I of the Regional Framework Plan

---

- Metro Staff Draft 2/14
  - MTAC/TPAC Draft 3 - 4/4
  - MPAC/JPACT Draft
  - Metro Growth Management Draft
  - Metro Council Draft
  - Adopted
- 

**A version of this document with revisions shown from the last draft is available on request. All discussion and deliberations will be made on this version and line number references.**



**METRO**





# Table of Contents

## Summary

Introduction	.....
The Meaning of Regional Functional Plan Adoption	.....
Regional Policy Basis	.....
Required Regional Framework Plan Phase 1 Elements	.....
<b>Title 1. Requirements for Accommodation of Growth</b>	.....
Section 1. Local Plan Accommodation of Allocated Growth Targets.	.....
Section 2. Growth Targets for Local Governments within the Metro Boundary	.....
Section 3. Review of Permitted Capacity of Housing Units and Employment.	.....
Section 4. Capacity Amendments to Comprehensive Plans and Development Regulations	.....
<b>Title 2. Regional Parking Policy</b>	.....
Section 1. Intent	.....
Section 2. Performanc Standards	.....
<b>Title 3. Stream Corridor Conservation</b>	.....
Section 1. Intent	.....
Section 2. Protection of Stream Corridors Required	.....
<b>Title 4. Retail in Employment and Industrial Areas.</b>	.....
Section 1. Intent	.....
Section 2. Comprehensive Plan and Implementing Ordinance Changes Required.	.....
Section 3. Exceptions	.....
<b>Title 5. Neighbor Cities and Rural Reserves</b>	.....
Section 1. Intent	.....
Section 2. Metro Intent with Regard to Rural Reserves	.....
Section 3. Invitations for Intergovernmental Agreements	.....
Section 4. Metro Intent with Regard to Green Corridors	.....
<b>Title 6. Regional Accessibility</b>	.....
Section 1. Intent	.....
Section 2. Boulevard Design	.....
Section 3. Design Standards for Street Connectivity	.....
<b>Title 7. Compliance Procedures</b>	.....
Section 1. Compliance Require	.....
Section 2. Compliance Procedures	.....
Section 3. Any Comprehensive Plan Change must Comply	.....
Section 4. Enforcement	.....
Section 5. Compliance Plan Assistance	.....
Section 6. Growth Concept Must be Addressed	.....
<b>Title 8. Definitions</b>	.....
<b>Appendix</b>	.....

Urban Growth Management Functional Plan  
A functional plan for early implementation of the Metro 2040 Growth Concept

**Introduction**

1 Metro was created after a vote of the citizens of the region as an elected regional government  
2 for addressing issues of regional significance in the metropolitan area, and is enabled by state  
3 law, adopted by the Oregon Legislature in 1977. In addition, the voters of the region adopted  
4 a Metro Charter in 1992, which describes additional responsibilities for the agency. Metro has  
5 an elected Executive Officer and a Metro Council which propose and determine region-wide  
6 policies.

7 The Metro Policy Advisory Committee, (MPAC), is comprised of local government elected  
8 officials and appointed citizens from throughout the region and was created to advise the  
9 regionally elected Metro Council on matters of metropolitan significance. It was included in  
10 the Metro Charter adopted by a vote of the citizens of the metropolitan area. MPAC has  
11 recommended specific policies to be included in a new functional plan to be adopted by the  
12 Metro Council as soon as practicable. This recommendation was made by MPAC to begin  
13 implementation of the regional policies of the Metro 2040 Growth Concept as adopted by the  
14 Metro Council by Ordinance No. 95-625-A. Early implementation is intended to take  
15 advantage of opportunities now, and avoid land use inconsistent with the long-term growth  
16 policy.

17 MPAC, as well as the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, (JPACT) and the  
18 Water Resource Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) have made recommendations which  
19 are the basis for this functional plan. All of the elements considered by MPAC, JPACT and  
20 WRPAC were deemed by the Metro Council to be of metropolitan significance. The follow-  
21 ing text states the scope of recommended regional policies which will apply to all 24 cities and  
22 3 counties within the Metro region for early implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. The  
23 legal form of this early implementation is a functional plan, not adoption as a "component" of  
24 the regional framework plan. The policies in this functional plan will be coordinated with  
25 policies to be readopted in official components of the Metro Charter mandated regional  
26 framework plan, on or before December 30, 1997.

27 It should also be noted that this functional plan relies on further actions, primarily changes to  
28 local government comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances, to effectuate the actions  
29 described below.

7 **The Meaning of Regional Functional Plan Adoption**

31 The following regional policies recommend and require changes to city and county plans to  
32 implement regional goals and objectives constituting the Urban Growth Management Func-  
33 tional Plan under ORS 268.390, RUGGO Goal I, and Resolution No.96-2288. The require-  
34 ments for plan changes, including implementing regulations, shall be adopted by all cities and  
35 counties in the Metro region within eighteen (18) months from the effective date of this  
36 ordinance.

37 Local determination not to incorporate functional plan policies into comprehensive plans shall  
38 be subject to the conflict resolution and mediation processes included within the RUGGO,  
39 Goal I provisions prior to the final adoption of inconsistent policies or actions. Local actions  
40 inconsistent with functional plan requirements are subject to appeal for violation of the  
41 functional plan.

42 **Regional Policy Basis**

43 The regional policies described below are formulated from, and consistent with the Regional  
44 Urban Growth Goals and Objectives, (RUGGO), including the Metro 2040 Growth Concept.  
45 These adopted Metro policies will be incorporated into the Regional Framework Plan. Also,  
46 the overall principles of the Greenspaces Master Plan are incorporated.

7 In addition, the 1996 Regional Transportation Plan<sup>1</sup>, when adopted, will serve as the transpor-  
48 tation element of the Framework Plan. It will be the primary transportation policy  
49 implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. However, early implementation land use  
50 policies in this functional plan are integrated with early implementation transportation policies  
51 derived from preparation of the 1996 Regional Transportation Plan, and consistent with the  
52 Metro 2040 Growth Concept.

53 **Structure of Requirements**

54 The Urban Growth Management Functional Plan is a regional functional plan with  
55 "requirements" binding on cities and counties of the region. It is structured so that local  
56 jurisdictions may pick from either performance standard requirements or prescriptive require-  
57 ments. The intent is to write these regulations so that local jurisdictions have a significant  
58 amount of flexibility as to how they meet requirements. Performance standards are included in  
59 all titles. If local jurisdictions can show that they meet the performance standard, they have  
60 met the requirement of the title. In addition, prescriptive standards are also included. They

---

<sup>1</sup> Metro has an adopted Regional Transportation Plan. However, because of changing local and regional conditions as well as state and Federal requirements, a new 1996 edition is being written.

1 are available to show one very specific way that jurisdictions may meet the title requirement,  
2 but are not the only way a city or county may show compliance.

### 63 **Regional Functional Plan Requirements**

#### 64 **Title 1 Requirements for Housing and Employment Accommodation**

##### 65 **Section 1. Intent**

66 State law and Metro code require that the Metro UGB have sufficient capacity to accommodate  
67 the expected growth for 20 years. It is Metro policy to minimize the amount of urban growth  
68 boundary expansion required for the expected population and employment growth by the year  
69 2015 consistent with all Statewide Goals. It is beneficial and desirable to increase the density  
70 permitted for development within the UGB consistent with the Metro 2040 Growth Concept.

##### 71 **Section 2. Local Plan Accommodation of Allocated Housing and Employment - Perfor-** 72 **mance Standard.**

73 Local governments must demonstrate that their regulations will permit the growth allocation  
74 contained in Section 3 of this Title to be built. Local governments must permit the expected  
75 development at densities likely to be achieved during the planning period by the private market  
76 or assisted housing programs, once all new regulations are effective.

##### 77 **Section 3. Growth Allocation for Local Governments within the Metro Boundary**

78 The Growth Allocation for Housing Units and Employment are contained in the Appendix and  
79 labeled Table 1. These include jurisdiction-wide allocations, as well as separate allocations for  
80 the Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Station Area and Main Streets.

##### 81 **Section 4. Review of Permitted Capacity of Housing Units and Employment.**

82 A) The purposes of this review are to determine the capacity of existing comprehensive  
83 plans and implementing ordinances to accommodate housing and employment and to determine  
84 whether amendments to existing plans are necessary to comply with Section 5 of this Title. All  
85 cities and counties within the Metro region are hereby required to review the permitted  
86 capacity<sup>2</sup> of their current comprehensive plans, and calculate the expected capacity of housing  
87 units and employment by the year 2015. These estimates shall be conducted using the  
88 following method:

89 B) Local governments shall use Metro estimates of vacant land, and land likely to  
90 redevelop, unless the local government has data which it believes is more accurate. In this

---

<sup>2</sup> See Title 8, Definitions, "permitted capacity" and "expected capacity".

1 case, the local government may use their data, subject to acceptance by the Metro Council or  
2 their designee, and shall include a justification for the data, including:

- 3 1) The source of the data;
- 4 2) The reasons that the locally developed data is a more accurate estimate than  
5 the Metro estimate of vacant and redevelopable land;
- 6 3) The database that the above were derived from;
- 7 4) The database of committed development lands.

8 C. In estimating expected capacity of existing comprehensive plans and implementing  
9 ordinances, local governments shall not estimate expected capacity at more than 79% of  
10 maximum permitted density, unless:

- 11 1) actual experience in the jurisdiction since 1990 has shown that development  
12 has occurred at density greater than 79% of permitted residential density or can  
13 be demonstrated or,
- 14 2) minimum density standards are adopted or proposed for adoption in the  
15 zoning code that require residential development at greater than 80% of maxi-  
16 mum permitted density.

17 D. Local governments shall determine the effect of each of the following on its overall  
18 development capacity;

- 19 1) required dedications for public streets, consistent with the regional accessibil-  
20 ity title;
- 21 2) off-street parking, consistent with this plan;
- 22 3) landscaping, setback, and maximum lot coverage requirements;
- 23 4) the effects of tree preservation ordinances, environmental protection ordi-  
24 nances, view preservation ordinances, solar access ordinances, or any other  
25 regulations that may have the effect of reducing the capacity of the land to  
26 develop at the permitted density.
- 27 5) the effects of areas dedicated to bio-swales, storm water retention, open  
28 space dedications, and other requirements of local codes that may reduce the  
29 development density.

## 30 **Section 5. Permitted Capacity Amendments to Comprehensive Plans and Development** 31 **Regulations Required**

32 A. If the capacity estimates developed under Section 4 above are less than the  
33 jurisdiction's Growth Allocation, then the jurisdiction is hereby required to amend its  
34 comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances to provide the capacity for the population  
35 and employment allocation contained in Section 3, or request an exception according to Title  
36 7. The capacity calculation shall be made according to the same methodology the jurisdiction  
37 used in Section 4. The jurisdiction shall demonstrate the following in providing capacity for  
38 housing and employment:

- 129 1) The permitted densities are at locations and densities that the market is likely to  
130 build; and  
131 2) The capacity calculation used only those development types that are a permitted use  
132 in the development code. Any discretionary decision must not diminish the permitted  
133 density if it is to be counted as a part of expected capacity; and  
134 3) expected capacity has been determined by accounting for all public requirements  
135 which may have the effect of reducing capacity, including those listed in Section 4c)  
136 above; and  
137 4) Local governments have adopted minimum permitted densities for housing units, or  
138 minimum permitted floor-area ratios in all zoning designations that provide more than  
139 10% of that jurisdiction's expected capacity for housing units or employment; and  
140 5) local governments have reviewed their public facility capacities and plans and have,  
141 or can provide, planned public facilities to accommodate growth within the plan period;  
142 and  
143 6) Local governments permit flag lots or other means of partitioning in those urban  
144 areas of the city or county where existing lot sizes are two or more times that of the  
145 minimum lot size.

146  
147 **Title 2 - Regional Parking Policy**  
148

149 **Section 1 Intent**

150 The State's Transportation Planning rule calls for reductions of vehicle miles traveled and per  
151 capita parking as means of responding to transportation and land use impacts of growth. The  
152 Metro 2040 Growth Concept calls for more compact development as means to encourage more  
153 efficient use of land, promote non-auto trips and protect air quality. In addition, the federally  
154 mandated air quality plan relies on the 2040 Growth Concept fully achieving it's transportation  
155 objectives. This title is provided to address these statutory requirements and preserve the quality  
156 of life of the region.

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

4 **Section 2. Performance Standard**

165 A. Local Governments are hereby required to adopt amendments if necessary to insure  
166 that their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations meet the following minimum  
167 standards:

- 168 1) Require no more parking than the minimum as shown on Regional Parking Stan-  
169 dards Table, attached hereto, and;
- 170 2) Establish parking maximums at ratios no greater than those listed in the Parking Table  
171 and as illustrated in the Parking Maximum Map. For all urban areas outside Zone A,  
172 cities and counties shall establish parking space maximums no greater than those listed in  
173 Zone B in the Parking Table and as illustrated in the Parking Maximum map. Local  
174 governments should designate Zone A parking ratio in areas with good pedestrian access  
175 to commercial or employment areas (within 1/3 mile walk) from adjacent residential areas.
- 176 3) Establish an administrative or public hearing process for considering ratios for individ-  
177 ual or joint developments which are: (I) in excess of the maximum parking ratios, and (ii)  
178 less than the minimum parking ratios. Local governments may grant an adjustment from  
179 maximum parking ratios or minimum parking ratios through an adjustment or variance  
180 process.

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

190 C. Local Governments may use categories or measurement standards other than those  
191 in the Parking Table, but must provide findings that the effect of the local regulations will be  
192 substantially the same as the application of the Regional Parking Ratios.

193 D. Local governments shall monitor and provide the following data to Metro on an  
194 annual basis:  
195 1) the number and location of actual parking spaces developed, and  
196 2) demonstration of compliance with the minimum and maximum parking standards,  
197 including the application of any local adjustments to the regional standards in this title.  
198 Coordination with Metro collection of other building data should be encouraged.

9 **Title 3. Stream Corridor Conservation**

200 **Section 1. Intent.**

201 To protect the beneficial uses and functional values of resources within the Stream Corridor  
202 Conservation Areas by limiting or mitigating the impact on Conservation Areas from development  
203 activities.

204 **Section 2. Requirement.**

205 Cities and counties shall insure that their comprehensive plans and implementing regula-  
206 tions to protect stream corridor conservation areas pursuant to Section 4 as shown on the  
207 adopted Metro Stream Corridor Conservation Area Map, attached hereto. Exceptions to this  
208 requirement will be considered under the provisions of Title 7.

209 **Section 3. Implementation Process for Local Governments**

210 Cities and counties are hereby required to amend, if nessessary, their local plans and implementing  
211 ordinances to insure that they comply with this Title in one of the following ways:

212 A. Adopt the relevant provisions of the Metro Stream Corridor Conservation model  
213 ordinance; or

214 B. Demonstrate that the local plans and implementing ordinances substantially complies  
215 with the performance standards contained in Section 5; or

216 C. Any combination of A and B above which substantially complies with all performance  
217 standards in Section 4.  
218

219 **Section 4. Performance Standards**

220 The following performance standards must be met by the plans and implementing ordinances of  
221 cities and counties:

222 A. Flood Mitigation. The purpose of these standards are to protect against flooding, and  
223 prevent or reduce risk to human life and properties, by allowing for the storage and conveyance of  
224 stormwater runoff through these natural systems.

225 Standards: Local jurisdictions shall;



- 7  
228  
229  
230  
231
1. Either prohibit development within the Stream Corridor Conservation Area or limits development in a manner that requires balanced cut and fill, minimum finished floor elevations, and prohibitions or limits on the use and/or storage of hazardous materials for developments in the remaining portion of the Stream Corridor Conservation Area.
  2. Allow unbalanced cut and fill only if a hydraulic study, prepared by a registered professional engineer shows that the proposed fill will not increase flood elevations.

232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238

B. Water Quality. The purpose of these standards is to protect and allow for enhancement of water quality associated with beneficial uses as defined by the Oregon Water Resources Department and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

239

Standards: Local jurisdictions shall;

- 240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
5  
247  
248
1. Require erosion and sediment control for all ground disturbing activities and development within or adjacent to the Stream Corridor Conservation Area. Erosion prevention and sediment control measures shall meet the requirements outlined in the Oregon DEQ NPDES Permit No. 1200C, but shall apply to all parcels over 10,000 square feet; or
  2. Require erosion prevention and sediment control measures which meet the requirements outlined in the "Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plans technical Guidance Handbook" (City of Portland and United Sewerage Agency, Feb. 1994); and
  3. Require water quality protection facilities for all new development and redevelopment in the Stream Corridor Conservation Area and those adjacent that discharge runoff to the area; and
  4. Prohibit use or storage of hazardous materials in the Stream Corridor Conservation Areas.
  5. Insure that for new development, post-development runoff conditions must not exceed pre-development runoff conditions.

249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258

C. Fish and Wildlife Conservation. The purpose of these standards is to protect and allow for enhancement of fish and wildlife within the Stream Corridor Conservation Areas.

259

Standards: Local jurisdictions shall;

- 260  
261  
^62
1. Restrict the clearing or removal of native vegetation from the Stream Corridor Conservation Area. Limit the removal of non-native, non-invasive vegetation that substantially contributes to fish and wildlife habitat.

- 263 2. Disturbed areas shall be replanted with native plants on the Metro Plant List.  
264 Planting or propagation of plants listed on the Metro Prohibited Plant List within  
265 the Conservation Area shall be prohibited.
- 266 3. Require compliance with ODF&W seasonal restrictions for in stream work. Limit  
267 development activities that would impair fish and wildlife during key life-cycle  
268 events.

269 **D. Protect the long term regional continuity and integrity of Stream Conservation Corridors.**

270 Standards: Local jurisdictions shall Establish or adopt transfer of density within owner-  
271 ship to mitigate the effects of Stream Corridor Conservation, or through Transferable  
272 Development Rights (TDR's) which have substantially equivalent effect as the Metro  
273 Stream Corridor Conservation Model Ordinance.

- 274
- 275 2. Metro encourages local government to require approvals of applications for minor  
276 partitions, subdivisions and design review actions must be conditioned with  
277 protecting Stream Corridor Conservation Areas with a conservation easement,  
278 platted as a common open space, or through purchase or donation of fee simple  
279 ownership where feasible.

280 **Section 5. Metro Model Ordinance Required.**

281 Metro shall adopt a Stream Corridor Conservation Area Model Ordinance for use by local  
282 jurisdictions to comply with this section. This title shall not become effective until the Metro  
283 Council has adopted a Model Code which addresses all of the provisions of this title.  
284

285 **Section 6. Variances.** City and County comprehensive plans and implementing regulations  
286 are hereby required to include procedures to consider claims of map error and hardship  
287 variances to reduce or remove stream corridor protection for any property demonstrated to be  
288 converted to an unbuildable lot by application of stream corridor protections."

289 **Title 4. Retail in Employment and Industrial Areas.**

290 **Section 1 Intent**

291 It is the intent of the Metro 2040 Growth Concept that Employment and Industrial Areas  
292 contain very little retail development. Employment and Industrial areas would be expected to  
293 include some limited retail commercial uses primarily to serve the needs of people working or  
294 living in the immediate employment areas, not larger market areas outside the employment  
295 area. Exceptions to this general policy for Employment and Industrial Areas can be made for  
296 certain areas.

7 **Section 2. Comprehensive Plan and Implementing Ordinance Changes Required.**

298 Cities and counties are hereby required to amend their comprehensive plans and implementing  
299 regulations to prohibit retail uses larger than 50,000 feet of gross leasable area per building or  
300 business in the Employment and Industrial Areas specifically designated on the 2040 Growth  
301 Concept Map.

302 **Section 3. Exceptions**

303 Exceptions to this standard may be included for:

304 A. Low traffic generating, land-consumptive commercial uses with low parking  
305 demand which have a community or region wide market, or

306 B. Specific Employment or Industrial Areas which already have developed a substan-  
307 tial amount of retailing may allow new or redeveloped retail uses.

308 **Title 5. Neighbor Cities and Rural Reserves**

309 **Section 1. Intent**

310 The intent of this title is to clearly define Metro policy with regard to areas outside the Metro  
311 urban growth boundary. **NO PORTION OF THIS TITLE CAN REQUIRE ANY AC-**  
312 **TIONS BY NEIGHBORING CITIES.** Metro, if neighboring cities jointly agree, will adopt  
313 or sign rural reserve agreements for those areas designated rural reserve in the Metro 2040  
314 Growth Concept with Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington County, and Neighbor City  
315 Agreements with Sandy, Canby, and North Plains. Metro would welcome discussion about  
316 agreements with other cities if they request such agreements.

317 In addition, counties and cities within the Metro boundary are hereby required to amend their  
318 comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances within eighteen months of the adoption of  
319 this ordinance to reflect the rural reserves and green corridors policies described in the Metro  
320 2040 Growth Concept.

321 **Section 2. Metro Intent with Regard to Rural Reserves**

322 Metro shall attempt to designate and protect common rural reserves between Metro's urban  
323 growth boundary and designated urban reserve areas and each neighbor city's urban growth  
324 boundary and designated urban reserves, and designate and protect common locations for  
325 green corridors along transportation corridors connecting the Metro region and each neighbor-  
326 ing city. For areas within the Metro boundary, counties are hereby required to amend their  
327 comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances to identify and protect the rural reserves  
328 and green corridors described in the Metro 2040 Growth Concept and shown on the 2040  
329 Growth Concept Map. For areas outside the Metro boundary, Metro shall encourage  
330 intergovernmental agreements with the cities of Sandy, Canby and North Plains.

1 **Section 3. Invitations for Intergovernmental Agreements**

2 Metro shall invite the local governments outside the Metro boundary and named in Section 1  
3 of this title to sign an Intergovernmental Agreement, similar to the draft agreements attached  
4 hereto.

5 **Section 4. Metro Intent with Regard to Green Corridors**

6 Metro shall attempt to negotiate a Green Corridor Intergovernmental Agreement with ODOT  
7 and the three counties (Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington) to designate and protect areas  
8 along transportation corridors connecting Metro and neighboring cities.

9 **Title 6 Regional Accessibility**

10 **Section 1. Intent**

11 Early implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept must acknowledge that focusing develop-  
12 ment in the most concentrated activity centers, including the central city, regional centers, and  
13 station communities, may produce levels of congestion that exceed existing standards, yet  
14 signal positive urban development for these locales. Conversely, the continued economic  
15 vitality of industrial areas and intermodal facilities is largely dependent on preserving or  
16 improving access to these areas and maintaining reasonable levels of freight mobility on the  
17 region's main throughways. Therefore, regional congestion standards and other regional  
18 system performance measures shall be tailored to reinforce the specific development needs of  
19 the individual 2040 Growth Concept land use components.

20 These regional standards will be linked to a series of regional street design concepts that fully  
21 integrate transportation and land use needs for each of the 2040 land use components. The  
22 designs generally form a continuum; a network of throughways (*freeway* and *highway* designs)  
23 will emphasize auto and freight mobility and connect major activity centers. Slower-speed  
24 *boulevard* designs within concentrated activity centers will balance the multi-modal travel  
25 demands of these areas. *Street* and *road* designs will complete the continuum, with  
26 multi-modal designs that reflect the land uses they serve, but also serving as moderate-speed  
27 vehicle connections between activity centers that complement the throughway system. While  
28 these designs are under development, it is important that improvements in the most concen-  
29 trated activity centers are designed to lessen the negative effects of motor vehicle traffic on  
30 other modes of travel. Therefore, the need to implement amenity-oriented *boulevard treatment*  
31 that better serves pedestrian and transit travel in the central city, regional centers main street,  
32 town centers, and station areas is a key step in the overall implementation of the Metro 2040  
33 Growth Concept.

4 **Section 2. Boulevard Design**

365 For regional routes in the central city, regional centers, station communities, main streets and  
366 town centers designated on the Boulevard Design Map, all cities and counties within the Metro  
367 region are hereby required to implement *boulevard* design elements as improvements are  
368 made to these facilities. Each jurisdiction shall adopt amendments, if necessary, to ensure that  
369 their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances require consideration of the following  
370 *boulevard* design elements when proceeding with right-of-way improvements on regional  
371 routes designated on the boulevard design map. In general, pedestrian and transit oriented  
372 design elements are the priority in the central city and regional centers, while pedestrian and  
373 transit features are more balanced with motor vehicle design needs in station communities,  
374 main streets and town centers:

375 A. Wide sidewalks with pedestrian amenities such as benches, awnings and special  
376 lighting;

377 B. Landscape strips, street trees and other design features that create a pedestrian  
378 buffer between curb and sidewalk;

379 C. Marked pedestrian crossings at all intersections, and mid-block crossings where  
380 intersection spacing is excessive;

381 D. The use of medians and curb extensions to enhance pedestrian crossings where  
382 wide streets make crossing difficult

383 E. Bikeways;

384 F. On-street parking whenever possible;

385 G. Motor vehicle lane widths that consider the above improvements.

386 H. Use of landscaped medians where appropriate to enhance the visual quality of  
387 the streetscape.

388 **Section 3. Design Standards for Street Connectivity**

389 The design of local street systems, including "local" and "collector" functional classifications,  
390 is generally beyond the scope of the Regional Transportation Plan. However, the aggregate  
391 effect of local street design impacts the effectiveness of the regional system when local travel  
392 is restricted by a lack of connecting routes, and local trips are forced onto the regional  
393 network. Therefore, the RTP will include design standards for connectivity aimed at improv-  
394 ing local circulation in a manner that protects the integrity of the regional system.

5 Local jurisdictions within the Metro region are hereby required to amend their comprehensive  
396 plans and implementing ordinances, if necessary, to comply with one of the following options  
397 in the development review process:

398 A. Design Option

399 Cities and counties shall ensure that their comprehensive plans, implementing ordinances and  
400 administrative codes require demonstration of compliance with the following:

401 1) New residential and mixed-use developments must include local street plans that:

402 a) encourage pedestrian travel by providing short, direct public right-of-way  
403 routes to connect residential uses with nearby existing and planned commercial  
404 services, schools, parks and other neighborhood facilities; and

405 b) include no cul-de-sac streets longer than 200 feet, and no more than 25 dwelling  
406 units on a closed-end street system; and

407 c) provide bike and pedestrian connections on public easements or right-of-way  
408 when full street connections are not possible, with a minimum spacing of no more  
409 than 330 feet; and

410 d) consider opportunities to incrementally extend and connect local streets in  
411 primarily developed areas; and

412 e) serve a mix of land uses on contiguous local streets; and

413 f) support posted speed limits; and

414 g) consider narrow street design alternatives that feature pavement widths of no  
415 more than 28 feet, curb-face to curb-face, sidewalk widths of at least 5 feet and  
416 landscaped pedestrian buffer strips that include street trees; and

417 h) limit the use of cul-de-sac designs and closed street systems to situations where  
418 topography, development patterns or environmental constraints prevent full street  
419 extensions.

420 2) For developments on vacant or primarily undeveloped contiguous parcels of five  
421 acres or larger, also prepare:

422 a) a map which identifies possible local street connections to adjacent developing  
423 areas. The map should include connecting streets at intervals of no more than

4 660 feet, with more frequent connections in areas planned for mixed use or dense  
425 development. .

426 **B. Performance Option**

427 Cities and counties shall ensure that their comprehensive plans, implementing ordinances and  
428 administrative codes require demonstration of compliance with performance criteria. Approval  
429 of new developments shall include local street designs with street intersection spacing to occur  
430 at intervals of no less than 8 per mile, the number of street connections coordinated and  
431 consistent with increased density and mixed land uses. Local street designs for new develop-  
432 ments shall satisfy both of the following additional criteria:

433 1) Performance Criterion: minimize local traffic on the regional motor vehicle  
434 system, by demonstrating that local vehicle trips on a given regional facility do not  
435 exceed the 1995 arithmetic median of regional trips for facilities of the same motor  
436 vehicle system classification by more than 25 %.

437 2) Performance Criterion: everyday local travel needs are served by direct, connected  
438 local street systems where: (1) the shortest motor vehicle trip over public streets from a  
439 local origin to a collector or greater facility is no more than twice the straight-line  
440 distance; and (2) the shortest pedestrian trip on public right-of-way is no more than one  
441 and one-half the straight-line distance.

442 **Title 7 Compliance Procedures**

443 **Section 1. Compliance Required**

444 All local governments within the Metro boundary are hereby required to amend their compre-  
445 hensive plans and implementing ordinances to comply with the provisions of this functional  
446 plan within eighteen months of the effective date of this ordinance.

447 **Section 2. Compliance Procedures**

448 1. On or before the deadline established in Section 1, local governments shall transmit to  
449 Metro the following:

450 a) An evaluation of their local plans, including public facility capacities and the  
451 amendments necessary to comply with this functional plan;

2 b) Copies of all applicable comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances and  
453 public facility plans, as proposed to be amended;

454 c) Findings that explain how the amended local comprehensive plans will achieve the  
455 standards required in titles 1 through 6 of this functional plan.

456 2. Exemptions from all or any portion of any of the above titles may be granted by the Metro  
457 Council, as provided for in the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives, Section 5.3,  
458 after MPAC review, based on city or county submittal of the following:

459 A. General

460 In developing its compliance plan, the local jurisdiction must address the Metro 2040 Growth  
461 Concept, and explain how the compliance plan relates to the Growth Concept.

462 B. Population and Employment Allocations

463 1) A demonstration of substantial evidence of the economic infeasibility to provide  
464 sanitary sewer, water, stormwater or transportation facilities to an area or areas; or

465 2) Substantial areas which have prior commitments to development at densities  
466 inconsistent with Metro growth targets; or;

467 3) The households and employment growth allocations cannot be accommodated at  
8 densities or locations the market or assisted programs will likely build during the  
469 planning period; and

470 3) The amount of households or employment that cannot be accommodated; and

471 4) A recommendation for where the unaccommodated growth could be located adjacent  
472 to the city or county.

473 C. Parking Measures. Subject to the provisions of Title 2, local jurisdictions may request  
474 relief from the parking measures. Metro may consider a local government request to allow  
475 areas from Zone A to be subject to Zone B maximum parking ratio where they can demon-  
476 strate:

477 1. No foreseeable 20 minute transit service; and

478 2. No adjacent neighborhoods close enough to generate sufficient pedestrian  
479 activity; and

480 3. No significant pedestrian activity within the present business district.

481 The burden of proof for adjustments shall increase as the quality and timing of transit service  
482 improves. Any adjustment granted must include a demonstration of how future conversion of  
483 excess parking is feasible.

484 D. Stream Corridor Conservation. Cities and counties may request areas to be added or deleted  
485 from the Metro Stream Corridor Conservation Area based on a finding that the area identified on



6 the map is not riparian, as defined in this functional plan. Findings shall be supported by evidence,  
-87 including the results of field investigations.

#### 488 489 E. Regional Accessibility

490 Local jurisdictions may request relief from the requirements of Title 6, Regional Accessibility  
491 where they can show that a street system or connection is not feasible for reasons of topo-  
492 graphic constraints or natural or built environment considerations.

493 F. In addition to the above procedures, local determination not to incorporate functional plan  
494 policies into comprehensive plans shall be subject to the conflict resolution and mediation  
495 processes included within the RUGGO, Goal I provisions prior to the final adoption of  
496 inconsistent policies or actions. Local actions inconsistent with functional plan requirements  
497 are subject to appeal for violation of the functional plan.

#### 498 499 Section 3. Any Comprehensive Plan Change must Comply

500 After the effective date of this ordinance, any change to a comprehensive plan or implementing  
501 ordinance shall be consistent with the functional plan requirements contained in titles 1 through  
502 8. Metro shall assist the local government in achieving compliance with all applicable  
503 functional plan requirements. Upon request, Metro will review proposed comprehensive plan  
504 and implementing ordinances for functional plan compliance prior to city or county adoption.

#### 505 Section 4. Enforcement

506 City or county actions to amend a comprehensive plan or implementing ordinance in violation  
507 of this functional plan shall be subject to appeal or other legal action for violation of a regional  
508 functional plan requirement. Prior to a final action to amend a comprehensive plan or  
509 implementing ordinance, a local determination that a functional plan should not or cannot be  
510 implemented shall be subject to the conflict resolution process provided for in the Regional  
511 Urban Growth Goals and Objectives, Goal I.

#### 512 Section 5. Compliance Plan Assistance

513 Any local government may request of Metro a compliance plan which contains the following:

514 A. An analysis of the local government's comprehensive plan and implementing  
515 ordinances, and what sections require change to comply with the performance standards.

516 B. Specific amendments that would bring the jurisdiction into compliance with the  
517 requirements of Sections 1 to 8, if necessary.

3  
519 C. Jurisdictions must make the request within four months of the effective date of this ordinance. The request shall be signed by the highest elected official of the jurisdiction.

520 D. Metro shall deliver a compliance plan within four months of the request date. The  
521 compliance plan shall be a recommendation from the Executive Officer. The compliance plan  
522 shall be filed with the Metro Council two weeks before it is transmitted, for possible review  
523 and comment.

1 **Title 8. Definitions** (To be developed)

525 **Expected Capacity** means the

526 **DHB** means the

527 **Local Trip** means a trip 2 ½ miles or less in length.

528 **Metro** means the

529 **Metro Boundary** means the

530 **Metro Urban Growth Boundary** means the

531 **Permitted Capacity** means the

532 **Perennial Streams** means all primary and secondary perennial water ways as mapped by the U.S.  
533 Geological Survey.

534 **Stream corridor conservation area** means an area defined on the Metro Stream Corridor  
535 Conservation Area Map, attached hereto. This area has been mapped to generally include the  
536 following: stream or river channels, associated wetlands, areas with floodprone soils adjacent  
537 to the stream, floodplains, and associated riparian area. The riparian areas are generally  
538 defined as between 50 and 200 feet on each side of the center line of streams, depending on  
539 local conditions.

540 **Riparian area** means the water influenced area adjacent to a river, lake or stream consisting  
541 of the area of transition from an hydric ecosystem to a terrestrial ecosystem where the presence  
542 of water directly influences the soil-vegetation complex and the soil- vegetation  
543 complex directly influences the water body. It can be identified primarily by a combination of  
544 geomorphologic and ecologic characteristics.

545 **Development** means any man made change defined as buildings or other structures, mining,  
546 dredging, filling, or grading in amounts greater than fifty (50) cubic yards on any lot,  
547 paving, or excavation. In addition, any other activity that results in the removal of more than  
548 50% of the existing vegetation is defined as development, for the purposes of this Title.  
549

550 **Designated Beneficial Water Uses** means the same as the term as defined by the Oregon  
551 Department of Environmental Quality.

552 **Functions and Values of Stream Corridors** means stream corridors have the following  
553 functions and values: water quality retention and enhancement, flood attenuation, fish and  
554 wildlife habitat, recreation, erosion control, education, aesthetic, open space and wildlife  
555 corridor.

556 **Floodplain** means the 100-year floodplain as defined by FEMA Flood Insurance Studies.

558 **Vacant Land:** Land identified in the Metro or local government inventory as undeveloped  
559 with permanant structures.

560

## APPENDIX

561

Table 1 - Additional Household &amp; Job Capacity - Year 2015

562

563

City or County	Household Increase to be Accommodated	Single Family / Townhouse / Multi-family Split	Job Increase to be Accommodated	Mixed Use Areas		Centers and Station Communities	
				HH, SF/TH/MF	Job Increase	Housing Capacity	Job Capacity
564 Beaverton							
565 Cornelius							
566 Durham							
567 Fairview							
568 Forest Grove							
569 Gladstone							
570 Gresham							
571 Happy Valley							
572 Hillsboro							
573 Johnson City							
574 King City							
575 Lake Oswego							
576 Maywood Park							
577 Milwaukie							
578 Oregon City							
579 Portland							
580 River Grove							

581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594

Sherwood							
Tigard							
Troutdale							
Tualatin							
West Linn							
Wilsonville							
Wood Village							
Clackamas County*							
Multnomah County*							
Washington County*							

\*Standards apply to the urban unincorporated portion of the county only. At the request of cities, Metro may also supply targets for planning areas for cities in addition to the existing boundary targets cited above.

\*Capacity must be shown to be met by each jurisdiction for their combined station areas. Station areas may vary substantially one from another as long as the jurisdictional total is met.

## Regional Parking Ratios<sup>1</sup>

*(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:
	<i>Requirements may Not Exceed</i>	<i>Transit and Pedestrian Accessible Areas<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Rest of Region</i>
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

## Regional Parking Ratios<sup>1</sup>

*(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:
	<i>Requirements may Not Exceed</i>	<i>Transit and Pedestrian Accessible Areas<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Rest of Region</i>
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
<b>Residential Uses</b>			
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

Note: Ratios for uses not included in this table would be determined by local governments. 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,



638  
639

Metro may grant approval upon a demonstration by the local government that the parking space requirement is substantially similar to the regional standard.

640  
641  
642  
643

1. Ratios for uses not included in this table would be determined by local governments. 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.



## METRO

TO: Councilor Rod Monroe, Chair, JPACT and members  
Commissioner Charlie Hales, Chair, MRAC

FROM: Mike Burton, Executive Officer *MBurton*

DATE: April 4, 1996

SUBJECT: April 4 redraft of *Phase I of the Regional Framework Plan*

Attached please find the latest draft of the *Phase I of the Regional Framework Plan*. This document reflects the latest revisions recommended by TPAC and MTAC members.

However, there are three areas within Title 6, Regional Accessibility, with which I have concerns and would like to recommend that you change. While these changes may be supported by your technical committees, they have not be discussed or endorsed by them. In brief, my recommended changes would:

- ❖ **remove the hierarchy that emphasizes pedestrian and transit features over automobiles only in the central city and regional centers and replace it with a general direction to incorporate more pedestrian and transit features in station communities, main streets and town centers as well as the central city and regional centers. (This would revise lines 371 through 373, see below)**
- ❖ **require that cities and counties take responsibility for master street plans to ensure connectivity, rather than have the development community take responsibility for connectivity at the time of development. (This would revise text starting at lines 421 and 428)**
- ❖ **set congestion standards by adding a new section. (to be added after line 441)**

More specifically, I would revise the text as follows:

Lines 371 through 373 would read as follows:

~~In general, pedestrian and transit oriented design elements are the priority in the central city and regional centers, while pedestrian and transit features are more balanced with motor vehicle design needs in station communities, main streets and town centers:~~ **The intent of this section is to ensure that in the central city, regional centers, station communities, main streets and town centers, pedestrian and transit features are more balanced with motor vehicle design needs.**

At line 421, revise as follows:

~~2) For developments on vacant or primarily undeveloped contiguous parcels of five acres or larger, also prepare: All contiguous areas of vacant and primarily undeveloped land of five acres or more should be identified by cities and counties and the following will be prepared~~

At line 428, revise as follows:

1) ~~Approval of new developments~~ ~~Cities and counties~~ shall include ~~develop~~ a local street designs map with street intersection spacing to occur at intervals of no less than 8 per mile, the number of street connections coordinated and consistent with increased density and mixed land uses.

In addition, I believe that there are concerns that current standards for addressing congestion are too high. Continuing to use the current standards would likely have the following consequences:

- ❖ The list of transportation projects in the Interim RTP would be unattainable even with the most optimistic revenue assumptions. The 20-year "financially constrained" component of the plan (based on a "reasonable" forecast of anticipated revenues) has a road and highway funding shortfall in excess of \$2 Billion. The majority of projects are for congestion relief using current congestion standards.

- ❖ The current congestion standard could conflict with proposed use changes called for in the adopted Metro 2040 Growth Concept. The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requires that comprehensive plan amendments to change land uses be balanced with adequate transportation services. The current congestion standard is likely to result in inadequate transportation services, thereby prohibiting a change in comprehensive plans to increased densities.

- ❖ Congestion and mobility is a key component of the public's attitudes about liveability and therefore a major area of concern about growth. The policy issue to be addressed is should we ensure that the road system simply slows down or is stop-and-go traffic for some period of time to be expected? Should the peak hour be expected to last 30 minutes, 1 hour or 2 hours? (see attached memo to Andy Cotugno dated April 4 for more discussion and analysis)

Accordingly, I would add after line 441 the following:

#### **Section 4. Motor Vehicle Performance Standards**

~~Motor vehicle level-of-service performance standards are used to identify new or expanded regional road needs and to calculate the vehicle design capacity for subsequent projects. Setting regional~~

congestion standards is important since congestion is a key livability measure. Congestion standards must be set to ensure that roads provide adequate degrees of accessibility and mobility, to ensure the integration of modes, and to ensure that the highway system is not overbuilt.

Elsewhere, regional level-of-service performance standards are needed to ensure an adequate balance between transportation service and local land use designations, particularly those areas where densities are proposed to increase.

Each jurisdiction shall adopt amendments, if necessary, to ensure that their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances will include the following motor vehicle performance standards and methods related to *congestion analysis* and *congestion management* when planning for new or expanded roadways in areas proposed for higher densities.

#### A. Congestion Analysis

- 1) **Level-of-service.** The following table shall be incorporated into local comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances to replace current methods of determining congestion on regional facilities:

*General Performance Standards (using LOS\*)*

	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
<b>Mid-Day one-hour</b>	C or better	D	E or worse
<b>Peak two-hour</b>	E/E or better	F/E	F/F or worse

\* Level-of-Service is determined by using either the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board) or through volume to capacity ratio equivalencies as follows: LOS C = .8 or better, LOS D = .8 to .9, LOS E = .9 to 1.0, and LOS F = greater than 1.0.

- 2) **Accessibility.** If a congestion standard is exceeded as identified in 4.A.1, local governments shall evaluate the impact of the congestion on regional accessibility using the best available methods (quantitative or qualitative). If a determination is made that the congestion negatively impacts regional accessibility, local jurisdictions shall follow the congestion management procedures identified in 4.B. below.

#### B. Congestion Management

Prior to recommending a significant capacity expansion to a regional facility, or including such an expansion in a city or county comprehensive plan, the following actions shall be

Rod Monroe, Charlie Hales

April 4, 1996

page 4

applied.

- 1) Transportation system management techniques.
- 2) Transit solutions if the mode split is below the identified target for that particular corridor or area.
- 3) T.M. solutions must be considered if the Average Vehicle Occupancy (AVO) is below the corridor or area target.
- 4) Grid and/or parallel facilities if local trips on the congested regional facility exceed 25% of the regional median for facilities of the same motor vehicle classification.

Only if the above considerations do not adequately address the problem, may capacity improvements may be included in the comprehensive plan.

I would be happy to discuss any aspect of these recommendations with you at your meeting or at your convenience.

## Level of Service (LOS) Definitions for Freeways, Arterials and Signalized Intersections

LOS	FREEWAYS (average travel speed assuming 70 mph design speed)	ARTERIALS (average travel speed assuming a typical free flow speed of 40 mph)	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS (stopped delay per vehicle)	TRAFFIC FLOW CHARACTERISTICS
A	Greater than 60 mph  Average spacing: 22 car-lengths	Greater than 35 mph	Less than 5 seconds; most vehicles do not stop at all	Virtually free flow; completely unimpeded  Volume/capacity ratio less than or equal to .60
B	57 to 60 mph  Average spacing: 13 car-lengths	28 to 35 mph	5.1 to 15 seconds; more vehicles stop than for LOS A	Stable flow with slight delays; reasonably unimpeded  Volume/capacity ratio .61 to .70
C	54 to 57 mph  Average spacing: 9 car-lengths	22 to 28 mph	15.1 to 25 seconds; individual cycle failures may begin to appear	Stable flow with delays; less freedom to maneuver  Volume/capacity ratio of .71 to .80
D	46 to 54 mph  Average spacing: 6 car-lengths	17 to 22 mph	25.1 to 40 seconds; individual cycle failures are noticeable	High density but stable flow  Volume/capacity ratio of .81 to .90
E	30 to 46 mph  Average spacing: 4 car-lengths	13 to 17 mph	40.1 to 60 seconds; individual cycle failures are frequent; poor progression	Operating conditions at or near capacity; unstable flow  Volume/capacity ratio of .91 to 1.00
F	Less than 30 mph  bumper-to-bumper	Less than 13 mph	Greater than 60 seconds; not acceptable for most drivers	Forced flow, breakdown conditions  Volume/capacity ratio of greater than 1.00
>F	Demand exceeds roadway capacity, limiting volume that can be carried and forcing excess demand onto parallel routes and extending the peak period			Demand/capacity ratios of greater than 1.10

Source: 1985 Highway Capacity Manual (A through F Descriptions)  
Metro (>F Description)

## Region 2040: Selected Performance Measures

	1990	Base Case	Recommended Alternative
VMT/Capita	12.40	13.04	11.06
VMT % Change from 1990	n/a	+5.16%	-10.28%
Total Lane Miles (freeway/arterial)	5,304	6,777	6,038
Congested Lane Miles	150	506	454

*Metro Travel Forecasting Data*



1333 N.W. Eastman Parkway  
Gresham, Oregon 97030-3813  
(503) 618-2306  
Fax (503) 665-7692

4/2/96

To: JPACT-MPAC Members  
From: Mayor Gussie McRobert  
RE: Interim Measures Parking Standards and Clean Air Act

The options for this region to comply with federal clean air mandates are:

1. Oregon Legislature sets standards to enforce the Ozone Maintenance Plan. Input would be at Legislative Committee meetings and through direct legislator contacts. The result could be implementation of the recommendations or a hybrid of those made by a DEQ advisory committee which met from April 1994 to December 1995 to address the region's air shed ozone problem and requirements of HB 2214 (1993 legislative session). Parking ratios would be established and businesses allowed to buy and sell parking spaces in the same way they now buy and sell air pollution rights. Local governments would have to track these parking space transactions.

Parking would be addressed strictly as an air quality issue since that is the issue DEQ and the Legislature must resolve. There will be no consideration of the effect of marketing parking spaces on land use. Buying and selling parking spaces jeopardizes the potential success of regional and town centers by taking away any leverage to get companies to do business differently.

2. Approve proposed parking standards which are the result of months of work with DEQ, local governments, commercial realtors and big box retailers. These standards help DEQ comply with the Ozone Maintenance Plan and avoid federal intervention. They have also gained support of most industry representatives and local governments. The standards provide for specific exemptions where necessary and give more local control than federal or state mandates.

c: City of Cornelius  
c: City of Durham  
c: City of Fairview  
c: City of Troutdale  
c: City of Forest Grove  
c: City of Gladstone  
c: City of Happy Valley  
c: City of Hillsboro  
c: City of Johnson City  
c: City of King City  
c: City of Maywood Park  
c: City of Oregon City  
c: City of Rivergrove  
c: City of Sherwood

c: City of Tigard  
c: City of West Linn  
c: City of Wilsonville  
c: City of Wood Village  
c: Langdon Marsh, DEQ  
c: Mike Burton, Metro  
c: Representative Tom Brian



State of Oregon  
Department of Environmental Quality

Memorandum

Date: April 2, 1996

To: Gussie McRoberts  
From: John Kowalczyk  
Subject: Title 2 - Regional Parking Policy (3/25/96 Metro document):  
comments and suggested language amendments

Gussie: Here are my thoughts. I hope this is what you are looking for and if not, please let me know.

- Section 1 Intent: First paragraph, I recommend the following:

*The State's Transportation Planning rule calls for reductions of vehicle miles travelled and per capita parking as means of responding to transportation and land use impacts of growth. The Metro 2040 Growth Concept calls for more compact development as means to encourage more efficient use of land, promote non-auto trips and protect air quality. In addition, the federally mandated air quality plan relies on the 2040 Growth Concept fully achieving it's transportation objectives. Notably, reducing vehicle trips and related parking spaces through minimum and maximum parking ratios. This title is provided to address these statutory requirements and preserve the quality of life of the region.*

- Section 1 Intent: Under third paragraph, "D", I recommend the following:

*Allow areas from Zone A to be subject to Zone B maximum parking ratios where they can demonstrate: ....etc.*

- The following language from your February 29, 1996 memo (Measure 3 Parking: Amended Language) was not included in the Section 1 Intent language and it is critical. I recommend the following language be included under the third paragraph as "F". I have changed "may" to "should" as a means of encouraging and broadening Zone A areas.

*"E" Local governments should designate Zone A parking ratio standards in areas with good pedestrian access to commercial or employment areas (within 1/3 mile walk from adjacent residential areas).*

RE: Regional Parking Policy

As included in the JPACT/MPAC packet, a memo from DEQ to Mayor Gussie McRobert included clarifying language to be added to the draft Phase I of the Regional Framework Plan. However, one sentence of the text was not included. Specifically, the following sentence highlighted in italics, below, is proposed to be added to the intent section of Title 2 at line 155, as follows:

*Objectives. Notably, it relies upon reducing vehicle trips and related parking spaces through minimum and maximum parking ratios.* This title is provided....

March 21, 1996

The Honorable Gussie McRobert  
Mayor, City Of Gresham  
1313 NW Eastman Parkway  
Gresham, OR 97030

Governor Kitzhaber asked that I respond on his behalf to your letter of February 28 and clarify the State's position on what is a very contentious issue-- requiring the reduction in the amount of parking as an MPO area tool to aid in achieving our land use and transportation goals..

The State of Oregon has already weighed in on this issue with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) which states that, in order to reduce reliance on the automobile, local governments in MPO areas are required to implement parking plans which achieve a ten percent reduction of parking spaces per capita.

The principal behind this requirement in the TPR recognizes that--looking for ways to reduce the abundant amounts of parking associated with low density auto-oriented land use is one important aspect of achieving compact, pedestrian and transit-oriented urban environments. Being able to reduce the amount of parking will free more land for development inside Urban Growth Boundaries and reduce the pressure to develop on resource lands outside UGB's.

I will continue to push the region to fully implement these concepts as a member of JPACT and the Westside Corridor Project management.

I hope this clarification will be helpful to you. If you have any further questions, please call.



Bruce A. Warner, P.E.  
Region Manager

BW:LH:hrm  
mcrobert.doc

cc: Governor John Kitzhaber  
Ken Husby/Ben Wallace  
Leo Huff

RECEIVED  
MAR 26 1996

John A. Kitzhaber  
Governor



123 NW Flanders  
Portland, OR 97209-4037

# M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736  
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



**METRO**

Date: April 4, 1996  
To: Andy Cotugno, Transportation Director  
From: Michael Hoglund, Transportation Planning Manager *MH*  
Subject: **Motor Vehicle Performance Measures**

This memo provides background for upcoming discussions on motor vehicle performance measures related to congestion on regional roads and highways. Included is information on transportation performance measures in general; the current practice in evaluating congestion; alternative methods for evaluating congestion; and a summary of our preliminary proposal for a new congestion analysis method.

### *Transportation Performance Measures - Background*

As part of the current update to the RTP, new and revised performance measures are being developed. The measures will be the analysis tools used to determine whether transportation goals and objectives are being met. The proposed measures fall into two categories:

1. General system measures for analyzing the overall regional effects of alternative transportation system impacts on mobility, accessibility, air quality, cost effectiveness, and travel; and
2. Specific measures related to individual transportation modes such as motor vehicles, trucks, bicycles, pedestrians, transit, or transportation system and demand management programs and techniques.

Together with each measure, a corresponding standard or threshold will also be identified. The standard represents the minimum acceptable and reasonable target of performance relative to each measure. Simply stated, falling below a standard triggers a system deficiency and the need for an improvement to address that deficiency.

Further, performance measures and standards are also used in funding decisions. The measures and standards are refined into specific criteria for use in determining project funding priorities through the Metro Transportation Improvement Program.

In sum, developing the performance measures and identifying the corresponding standards will be an extremely important RTP exercise. The exercise will result in the methods for evaluating RTP sufficiency (particularly related to the 2040 Growth Concept); for identifying system deficiencies and projects; and for setting transportation funding priorities.

### *Congestion Analysis - Current Practice*

The motor vehicle level-of-service (LOS) congestion measure and standard has traditionally been a key transportation planning analysis tool. The measure and corresponding standard is used to identify the perceived level of "intolerable" congestion on the regional transportation system. When congestion reaches a level where the standard is exceeded, a transportation project is triggered.

The LOS congestion *measure* is based on a simple A-F grading scale for a one-hour period, generally the afternoon peak hour. Under this scale, conditions are best at LOS A, which generally represents free-flowing traffic with few vehicles on the road. Conditions incrementally deteriorate to the worst condition, LOS F, characterized by average freeway operating speeds under 30 mph and some stop-and-go traffic where lane mergers and other bottlenecks occur. On arterials, LOS F is characterized by speeds of less than one-third to as low as one-fourth free-flow speeds.

The current adopted congestion *standard* recognizes a system deficiency when LOS D is exceeded in the afternoon peak. Exceeding D conditions represent freeway operating speeds between 30 and 40 mph and arterial speeds down to one-third free-flow conditions. The attached chart compares the current RTP standard with those included in the ODOT Highway Plan and a Metro staff proposal for further discussion (discussed below). For the most part, a project is triggered when LOS D is exceeded in both the current RTP and ODOT Highway Plan. Some exceptions are allowed for lesser service standards under special conditions (e.g., availability of light rail in a travel corridor).

This current measure and standard has been the primary technique used by transportation planners and engineers to identify road and highway expansion projects for the last 30 to 40 years. As noted above, the standard has resulted in over a \$2 billion shortfall in road and highway revenue over the next 20 years as reflected in the RTP.

### *Alternative Measures and Standards of Congestion*

Recognizing the inherent problems with the current congestion measures and standards, a number of alternatives are being examined at both the national and local level. The goal of these efforts is to first better understand the true public perception of, and tolerance for, congestion and to develop more thoughtful and financially realistic methods of addressing congestion problems. In the Portland metro area, congestion as it relates to land use is also being considered. Examples of alternatives include (as identified by an inter-agency work group headed by Washington County staff):

1. Utilize the Existing Standard, But Over a Longer Period of Time. This measure would evaluate the duration of congestion on particular facilities and recognize that the peak hour is naturally spreading beyond a single-hour. An example of this concept would be to not trigger a need until a two-hour standard has been exceeded.
2. Consider Different Level-of-Service Standards for Different Areas. Typically, this standard would allow for greater congestion in higher density areas such as the Central City and Regional Centers.

3. Expand the Range of Definitions for Level-of-Service. This option proposes new LOS of G and H to reflect longer and more severe periods of congestion (similar to alternative one, above).
4. Focus on Accessibility. Accessibility is a measure which attempts to measure both the available transportation system in terms of travel time, but also available land uses (work, shopping, etc.) that the transportation system provides access to in terms of density of activity. Accessibility is governed by both land use patterns and the number of travel alternatives provided in the regional transportation system. This is a very promising measure which ties together land use and transportation. However, the quantitative methods are still being developed. It is likely an accessibility measure could be used to supplement other measures.
5. Use Accessibility Measures in Areas and Mobility (Congestion) Measures in Corridors. This concept concludes that accessibility is most important near and within high density areas such as the Central City, Regional Centers and Town Centers, and that mobility is necessary between major activity centers. Consequently, two different measures would be used for different locations.

### *Metro Staff Proposal*

Metro staff is proposing for further consideration a congestion analysis methodology which recognizes the following:

- Current congestion measures and standards will likely conflict with the goal of increased densities in certain locations.
- Current congestion measures and standards are unrealistically high, have resulted in a list of road and highway projects which are financially unattainable, even under the most optimistic revenue assumptions, and are likely better than the public reasonably expects.
- Current congestion measures do not address the duration or severity of congestion beyond the afternoon peak hour.

To address these issues, Metro staff proposes a two-step process to first determine the severity and impact of congestion through a *congestion analysis* phase and then to identify appropriate actions through a *congestion management* phase.

### Congestion Analysis

Congestion analysis involves two steps to determine the severity and extent of actual congestion. The first step is to analyze both a peak two-hour period and an off-peak (mid-day) one-hour period (as shown on the attached chart). Unacceptable congestion would exist if LOS F extends beyond one hour in the peak or if LOS E is reached in the off-peak. This method assumes some congestion will be tolerated in the peak hour. The off-peak service level, if achieved, recognizes the need to accommodate commercial, business, and personal trips on relatively uncongested facilities throughout the normal work day.

If congestion is present, a second step analysis is conducted to evaluate accessibility. The accessibility measure would be used to determine whether access to various activities is affected by the congestion. As noted, this measure ties the land use activities of places to the ability to travel to those places on the transportation system.

When fully developed, this measure will provide better information as to where congestion can be tolerated since good access will be maintained to employment and shopping areas and from households.

### Congestion Management

If the above analysis results in both unacceptable congestion and diminished accessibility, a congestion management methodology is proposed in order to determine the appropriate congestion solution. Prior to recommending a road or highway expansion on a regional facility, the following alternatives must be addressed:

1. Transportation system management techniques.
2. Transit solutions if the mode split is below the identified target for that particular corridor or area.
3. TDM solutions if the Average Vehicle Occupancy (AVO) is below the corridor or area target.
4. Grid and/or parallel facilities if local trips on the congested regional facility exceed 25% of the regional median for facilities of the same motor vehicle classification.

This congestion management process will require a more thoughtful analysis of the causes and potential solutions to congestion. If the above methods do not adequately address the congestion problem, new regional road and highway capacity can be pursued. Finally, these requirements would not be used for road and highway improvements that serve other regional objectives, such as safety and economic development.

Metro staff recommends forwarding this proposal for discussion through the RTP update process and through the public comment and hearings process on the Regional Framework Plan - Phase I.

Attachment



**METRO**

**Comparison of Motor Vehicle Performance Standards for:  
 ODOT Highway Plan; Current RTP; Metro Proposed**

*General Performance Standards.* The following table identifies the minimum acceptable level-of-service standards contained in the adopted RTP, the adopted ODOT Highway Plan, and a Metro staff proposal for new standards currently being discussed as part of the RTP update. Exceedences to these standards are generally indicated with *red* on transportation level-of-service analysis maps.

	Current RTP	ODOT Highway Plan	Metro Proposed	
	<i>Peak Hour Only</i>	<i>Peak Hour Only</i>	<i>Peak Two-Hours<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Off Peak<sup>2</sup></i>
<b>LRT Corridor</b>	D <sup>3</sup>	D/E	F-E	C
<b>Special Districts</b>	D <sup>3</sup>	E	F-E	C
<b>Urban</b>	D	D	F-E	C
<b>Urbanizing</b>	D	C	F-E	C

MH  
 4/2/96

<sup>1</sup> Two-hour analysis period. 'F' level of congestion is acceptable for one-hour. 'E' level of congestion is acceptable for the second hour of the peak. Two hours of 'F' represents an exceedence.

<sup>2</sup> One hour analysis. This measure represents the first attempt to ensure uncongested conditions in the off-peak period to accommodate commercial and other regular personal business.

<sup>3</sup> The RTP allows in some instances (policy, impact, cost or other constraints), decisions to accept lower level of service on segments of particular facilities. This has traditionally been applied to facilities which parallel LRT corridors or in areas where their would be significant impact on the built or natural environment.





WASHINGTON  
COUNTY,  
OREGON

**APRIL 10, 1996**

## **OVERVIEW OF WASHINGTON COUNTY LEVEL OF SERVICE WORKSHOPS**

### **Purpose:**

**Examine issues and clarify direction associated with balancing our land use and transportation systems under current level-of-service ("los") standards and policy. Develop alternatives to current "los" standard considering mobility and accessibility.**

### **Some Participants:**

**Mike Hogle, Metro  
Larry Shaw, Metro  
G. B. Arrington, Tri-Met  
Sam Seskin, Parsons  
Brinckerhoff**

**Gary Katsion, Kittleson & Assoc.  
Randy McCourt, DKS Associates  
Frank Angelo, W&H Pacific  
Roger Millar, Otak**

**Mark Greenfield, Attorney at Law  
Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County  
Leo Huff, ODOT  
Fred Eberle, ODOT  
Howard Roll, City of Beaverton  
Wink Brooks, City of Hillsboro  
Brent Curtis, Washington County  
Mark Brown, Washington County  
Dan Seeman, Kittleson & Assoc.**

### **Some Alternatives Discussed:**

- Utilize Current Standard, but over a longer period of time**
- Consider different level of service standards for different areas**
- Expand the range of definitions for level of service**

**(over)**

- **Focus on land use accessibility rather than level of service**
- **Focus on the average travel speed over a longer segment of roadway**

**Some Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations:**

- **Current standard has limitations. Existing measure is too coarse and doesn't differentiate major problems from minor problems. Also, land use plan amendments implementing 2040 are difficult because the State Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12-060) requires plan amendments to be consistent with "function, capacity and level of service" of transportation facilities.**
- **Ultimate standard will reflect both mobility and accessibility needs.**
- **Developing and selecting one or several standards will require significant effort.**
- **Funding needs to be part of the discussion**
- **Need to consider implementation as well as a long-term strategy.**

**FINAL REPORT FROM THE**  
**METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**BOUNDARY COMMISSION WORKGROUP**

Introduction

This report summarizes the work and recommendations of the Boundary Commission Workgroup of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). The workgroup was established in June 1995, following a request by the Metro Council that MPAC develop recommendations concerning the future status and operations of the Portland Metropolitan Area Local Government Boundary Commission (the commission). The request was made to implement the provisions of the 1992 Metro Charter which require that the Council "undertake and complete a study of the Portland Metropolitan Area Local Government Boundary Commission with advice of the MPAC." The charter further authorizes the Council to "implement the results of the study and seek any legislative action needed for implementation."

The six-member work group was chaired by County Commissioner Judie Hammerstad from Clackamas County. Other workgroup members included: Portland City Commissioner Charlie Hales, Tualatin Valley Water District Board Member Rob Mitchell, Cornelius City Councilor Jeannine Murrell, Washington County Commissioner Linda Peters, and Lake Oswego Mayor Alice Schlenker. All of the workgroup members are members of MPAC. Metro Councilor Susan McLain attended the workgroup meetings and served as the liaison with the Metro Council.

Staff was provided by the Metro Council Office. The staff of the commission provided summaries of the early workgroup meetings and promptly responded to all information requests from the workgroup. The workgroup also was assisted by the McKeever/Morris consulting firm and in the development of funding proposals by Kent Squires, General Manager, Oak Grove Sanitary District.

Commission History

As early as the mid 1950s, the Legislative Assembly recognized that local government response to the rapid growth of suburban areas throughout the state was fragmented and resulted in the ineffective provision of urban services in metropolitan areas. Legislation was introduced, but not adopted, in the 1957 Legislative Assembly to create a statewide local government boundary commission.

Following the work of the Portland Metropolitan Study Commission, legislation to establish boundary commissions in certain local areas was introduced in the 1967 Legislative Assembly. The legislation passed in the House but died in a Senate committee. Similar legislation was reintroduced and passed in the 1969 Assembly.

This legislation created the Portland Metropolitan Area Local Government Boundary Commission with a jurisdiction of all of Clackamas, Columbia, Multnomah and Washington Counties (Columbia County was removed from commission jurisdiction in 1979). By the time the commission was created, the number of local governmental units within its jurisdiction had reached over 300. Many small cities had been created to avoid annexation to larger cities. These cities had no capacity to provide urban services. Suburban areas were generally served by a patchwork of special districts. Fragmentation and a lack of planning for the provision of urban services were commonplace. One study concluded that the average citizen in the Portland metropolitan area was subject to decisions made by 11 separate units of government. During its 27 years of operation, the number of units of government has declined from 290 to 105.

### Current Commission Role

The following discussion outlines how the commission defines its purposes and jurisdiction, the types of actions subject to commission review, its decision-making processes and the criteria used in the decisionmaking process.

Purposes. Though there have been a number of technical and procedural changes enacted since 1969, the essential purpose and role of the commission have remained unchanged. The Law defines these purposes to be:

- 1) guide the creation and growth of local jurisdictions to prevent illogical boundary extensions and encourage restructuring of overlapping units;
- 2) assure service quantity and quality and financial integrity of local jurisdictions;
- 3) provide impartial forum for resolution of local issues;
- 4) provide decisions consistent with local comprehensive plans and statewide planning goals;
- 5) reduce fragmented service delivery by encouraging single agency service delivery.

Jurisdiction. The commission's jurisdiction includes all cities and thirteen of the most common types of special districts. These include water, sanitary, fire, county service and park and recreation districts. Notable exemptions to the commission's jurisdiction include school districts and people's utility districts.

Local Actions Subject to Review. The following types of actions by local jurisdictions are subject to commission review:

- 1) incorporation, dissolution, merger or consolidation of a city or district;
- 2) initiation of a new function by a district;
- 3) annexation to or withdrawal from a city or district;
- 4) formation or expansion of privately-owned community water or sewer system with certain exceptions;
- 5) extraterritorial water or sewer line extensions.

### Decision-making Process

The general commission process for the consideration of actions subject to its review is as follows:

- 1) submittal of the proposed action to the commission by the initiating local jurisdiction, or by citizens requesting an action;
- 2) scheduling a commission hearing;
- 3) preparation of a commission staff report, including recommendations;
- 4) holding of a public hearing by the commission;
- 5) commission decision, which may include approval, denial or modification of the proposed action;
- 6) issuance of a commission final order.

The commission has up to 120 days to take action on major proposals, such as the initiation, merger or consolidation of a city or district. Commission action on all other types of actions, such as annexations, must be completed within 90 days. The law also has established a 25-day expedited process for the consideration of small non-contested actions.

The effective date of the commission's final orders depends on the type of action under consideration. All commission decisions are appealable to the state Court of Appeals.

### Decision-making Criteria

The state statute governing the commission does not clearly and separately define the criteria that are to be applied by the commission to the action items that it must review. The policy

section of the statute (ORS 199.410) provides that "a single governmental agency, rather than several governmental agencies is in most cases better able to assess the financial resources and therefore is the best mechanism for establishing community services." The commission has interpreted this language to mean that it should give a preference to cities as service providers.

Other examples of language in the governing statute include a provision of the policy section which provides that the intent of the commission is "to create a governmental structure that promotes efficiency and economy in providing the widest range of necessary services in a manner that encourages and provides planned, well-ordered and efficient development patterns." ORS 199.462 provides that the commission "consider local comprehensive planning for the area, economic, demographic and sociological trends and projections pertinent to the proposal, past and prospective physical development of land that would directly or indirectly be affected by the proposed boundary change."

The commission has utilized the general policy and intent statements throughout its government statute to develop a series of 17 general decision-making criteria. These include:

- 1) Avoid fragmentation of public services.
- 2) Orderly development of urban area is in the best interest of the citizens of this state.
- 3) Effect of the growth of one unit of government on other units of government.
- 4) Insure orderly determination of local government boundaries.
- 5) Determine the local service provider when local comprehensive plans are unclear.
- 6) Preference for single agency provision of urban services (cities as preferred providers).
- 7) Promote efficiency and economy in providing urban services.
- 8) Encourage planned, well-ordered and efficient development patterns.
- 9) Guide creation and growth of units of government to prevent illogical boundaries.
- 10) Encourage reorganization of overlapping units of government.
- 11) Assure adequate quality and quantity of urban services.

- 12) Assure financial integrity of units of government affected by a boundary change.
13. Serve as an impartial forum.
- 14) Make decisions consistent with local plans and statewide goals.
- 15) Consider timing, phasing and availability of services.
- 16) Reduce fragmentation by encouraging single agency service delivery.
- 17) Consider economic, demographic, and sociological trends and past, present and future development of the land.

### Workgroup Review Process

Initial workgroup meetings in July and August 1995 focused on the identification of issues and concerns related to the current operation of the commission. The workgroup also extensively discussed the current local and regional land use planning process and how these activities relate to the commission.

In September, the workgroup finalized a list of issues that would become the focus of its review. These included:

- 1) the purpose of the commission
- 2) the authority of the commission
- 3) policy framework for decision-making (including criteria)
- 4) commission governance
- 5) funding
- 6) status of the commission advisory committee
- 7) commission decision-making process
- 8) appellate review, and
- 9) the expedited consideration process.

A discussion paper outlining these issues and identifying related policy questions was sent to local jurisdictions subject to the commission. The workgroup then held a series of three public hearings in October. Written and oral testimony was received from the commission (including current and former commissioners and staff), cities, counties, special districts and the general public.

Workgroup meetings during November and December reviewed the information received during the hearing process and refined the nature of the issues and policy options that would receive further consideration. During a series of worksessions in January, February and March, the workgroup developed its preliminary and final recommendations and approved its final report to MPAC.

### Workgroup Findings and Recommendations

The workgroup has developed recommendations in four principal areas related to the commission. These include: 1) function and structure, 2) criteria, 3) geographic boundaries, and 4) funding. Each of these areas are addressed below.

#### Function and Structure

Discussion. The commission and its supporters contend that the existing functions and structure should be retained with only a few minor changes. They argue that, while the commission has reduced fragmentation and inefficient service provision, its continuation in its present form is necessary to maintain the status quo. They note that "the easy recreation of confusion and inefficiency is only avoided by the presence of the Commission."

Supporters contend that the commission provides timeliness, centralized processing efficiency, impartial fairness and uniformity to the boundary change decision-making process. They argue that returning many boundary change decision-making functions to local jurisdictions would increase costs and result in decisions based on political considerations.

Actions by one jurisdiction could have significant impact on another jurisdiction and it would be more difficult to insure the state and regional interests are addressed. For example, they note that the state shares a variety of revenue sources with local jurisdictions and therefore has a significant interest in the development of efficient and economical local government structures.

Commission supporters recognize that there are many new mechanisms that may assist local jurisdictions in resolving boundary and service provision issues among themselves. These could include the SB 122 (ORS 195.020-195.080) intergovernmental service agreement process, Metro's 2040 early implementation measures and the development of the Regional Framework Plan. But they contend that the agreement and planning process are still evolving and there is no assurance they will fully address all boundary and service delivery issues.

Supporters also contend the existence of comprehensive land use plans and intergovernmental service provision agreements do not address many issues addressed in the commission's decision-making



criteria. For example, while such plans and agreements may set service area boundaries, they often do not address issues related to the timing, availability and financing of service provision. In addition, they may not address the question of whether an area outside a city boundary is to be annexed.

The commission proposed potential statutory changes to address its relationship with the SB 122 process and the implementation of the Regional Framework Plan. These included a commission-administered process for setting urban service boundaries based on SB 122 agreements and with clear statutory direction that the commission's decisions should be consistent with adopted regional plans.

The workgroup also received extensive testimony from several local jurisdictions which advocated a substantial reduction in the scope of the commission's functions. These suggested changes were based on two principal assumptions: 1) that a large percentage of the local boundary and service provision decisions subject to commission review are minor and have only a limited local impact, and 2) there are extensive state, regional and local planning processes now in place that reduce the need for the commission.

Some jurisdictions have established local processes for the consideration of annexations. These procedures generally include a local planning commission and city public hearing process. Other jurisdictions file annexation proposals directly with the boundary commission. In addition, property owners may choose to file annexation proposals directly with the commission.

A large majority of the commission's work involves the review of proposed city annexations. Such annexations often involve a single parcel or a small number of parcels that are being annexed at the request of the landowner. In many cases there is no opposition to the proposal. Testimony suggested that commission review of such cases is costly and time consuming. It was noted that most commission hearings on these types of actions are noncontested. Some of those offering testimony to the workgroup suggested that only "contested" cases be subject to review at the regional level.

It is generally agreed that at the time the commission was originally established, the governmental landscape in the metropolitan region was characterized by a proliferation of small units of governments, distrust and competition between governments and an almost total lack of intergovernmental cooperation and planning. However, many of those testifying before the workgroup noted that in recent years new regional and local intergovernmental planning processes have been mandated. They contended that the completion of these processes will significantly reduce the need for a boundary commission.

At the regional level, the 1992 Metro Charter requires the development of a regional framework plan by December 1997. The

plan will address transportation and mass transit systems, administration of the urban growth boundary, housing densities, urban design and settlement, open spaces, and water sources and storage. Cities and counties will be required to make land use decisions consistent with the framework plan, and the Metro Council will adjudicate and determine the consistency of local comprehensive plans with the framework. In addition, Metro is completing a review of the urban growth boundary under the 2040 process that will result in boundary adjustments and the creation of urban reserves outside of the boundary.

At the local level, the Legislative Assembly has enacted legislation (SB 122) requiring local governments to develop urban service agreements for areas inside an urban growth boundary. These SB 122 agreements must address who will provide each urban service, the functional role of each service provider, determination of service areas, and assign responsibilities for planning and administration of urban services. Such agreements would be required for sanitary sewer, water, fire protection, parks, open space, recreation and street, road and mass transit services. A variety of economic, financial, feasibility, cost allocation, demographic and sociological factors must be addressed in developing the agreements. The agreements will be required to be in place by the time of the city's next comprehensive plan acknowledgement by the state Land Conservation and Development Commission. In the metropolitan region, Metro has been designated as the review, advisory and coordinative agency.

Several jurisdictions also contended that there is now a much higher level of intergovernmental cooperation related to service delivery issues. They noted that there are numerous agreements affecting police, fire, emergency and library services. In addition, they noted the recent regional study effort on future water source and delivery issues that involved all of the region's water providers.

In conclusion, those who support reducing the scope of regional boundary adjudication functions argue that many of the functions now performed by the current commission will be addressed through other types of regional or local planning processes. In most cases, the commission's role would be reduced to simply reviewing noncontested cases or confirming that a local action is consistent with the regional framework plan or a local SB 122 agreement.

Recommendation. The workgroup makes the following recommendations concerning the scope of the regional boundary change review and adjudication process and its administrative structure.

1) The scope of the boundary change review process be substantially reduced to include only "contested" cases. A contested case would include any action in which there is a dispute

between two or more jurisdictions or when a staff review of the action concludes that it may violate any regional plans or local urban service agreements. This criteria would apply to any type of local action that is currently subject to review by the boundary commission.

The workgroup concluded that many local annexations involve small areas that have no regional interest or significance. Under the workgroup's proposal, these types of will be handled at the local level. Local jurisdictions will establish processes for soliciting public input concerning these actions. Local citizens and property owners can participate in this process and attempt to influence their local decisionmakers. There are adequate provisions in existing law that provide procedures for legal appeal or electoral remonstrance procedures for those who may object to a decision. In addition such decisions in the future will be governed by existing SB 122 urban service agreements and the provisions of the framework plan.

Major decisions related to the initiation, merger, consolidation or dissolution of a unit of government occur infrequently. In recent years, these actions have generally involved the merger or consolidation of special districts. In most cases, these mergers and consolidations have proceeded only after extensive economic analysis and a local public hearing process. Under the workgroup's proposed recommendation, if such actions were not objected to by another jurisdiction or did not violate regional or local plans or agreements, local approval by the affected jurisdictions and administrative review at Metro would be all that is necessary to validate the proposed action.

2) The boundary review function be transferred to Metro. This recommendation is based on two factors. First, it is anticipated the number of local decisions that will be contested will represent only a small percentage of the cases currently considered by the commission. This reduced workload would not be sufficient to support an independent agency with a five-person staff.

Second, several mechanisms have been put in place in recent years to facilitate local management of the region's growth management process. Metro now administers many aspects of this process including management of the urban growth boundary, development and administration of the regional framework plan and serving as the coordinator of the local SB 122 urban service agreement process. Transfer of the regional boundary review function would be a logical extension of these regional planning functions.

3) Boundary Review Process and the Structure and Role of a Metro Boundary Review Office. The workgroup recommends the establishment of separate boundary review processes for "noncontested" and "contested" cases. These processes would apply

to all types of local actions that are currently subject to boundary commission review.

Non-contested cases. The non-contested case process would include the following steps:

1) Proposed actions would be developed by a local jurisdiction.

2) The jurisdiction would conduct an analysis and public input process based on the nature of the proposal.

3) The jurisdiction would consult with Metro boundary review staff to determine the necessary legal requirements for filing the proposal with Metro.

4) The jurisdiction would make a decision to file the proposal.

5) Metro staff would review the proposal to insure it complies with necessary legal requirements (ie. including an accurate metes and bounds description of lands proposed for annexation). Legislative change will be necessary to rely on computerized maps for determining metes and bounds. If deficiencies are identified, the proposal would be returned to the local jurisdiction for correction.

6) Metro staff would review the proposal to determine if it qualified as a contested case. If it is determined that the proposal is not contested, the staff would notify the jurisdiction that the filing of the proposal had been accepted. The jurisdiction would be authorized to proceed with the proposed action subject to statutory appellate procedures.

7) Metro staff would provide required information to affected local offices (ie. elections and assessment and taxation departments). The boundary commission currently provides this information.

Contested cases. The first five steps of the contested case process would be the same as the non-contested process. If Metro staff determines that a proposed action is a contested case, the following process would be followed.

1) The proposing jurisdiction would be notified. The jurisdiction would have the opportunity to eliminate those elements of the proposal that caused it to become contested. For example, if another jurisdiction objected, there would be an opportunity to negotiate a solution. If Metro staff determined that the proposal violated a regional plan, the proposing jurisdiction would have an opportunity to address these issues.

2) If a proposal retains its contested status following step 1, it would be referred for a hearing before a hearings officer. The hearings officer would render a decision on the proposal. (Note: The workgroup considered used either a hearings officer or a citizen review board to hear contested cases. The workgroup is recommending the use of a hearings officer for several reasons. These include: 1) a hearings officer would have knowledge of applicable laws and local and regional plans and agreements, 2) a hearings officer would provide constant and objective decisions, and 3) a hearings officer would be more cost-effective. It is recommended that the hearings officer serve on a contract basis to preserve objectivity and as a least-cost option.

3) The decision of the hearings officer may be accepted or the proposal modified to comply with the decision. If not, the proposal may be dropped or the decision appealed to the Metro Council.

4) The decision of the Metro Council may be accepted or the proposal modified to comply with the decision. If not, the proposal may be dropped or the decision appealed to the state Court of Appeals.

5) If at any point during the contested case process, the objecting jurisdiction withdraws its objection or Metro staff determines the proposal has been modified to comply with applicable regional plans, Metro would accept the filing of the proposal, and the proposing jurisdiction could proceed with the proposed action.

#### Decision-making Criteria

Discussion. The commission and its supporters argue the existing statute provides general policy and intent statements that are sufficient for the development of decisionmaking criteria. They note the commission has used this statutory direction to develop 17 more specific criteria which are outlined in its administrative rules. They contend that these criteria give the commission flexibility in addressing the often unique aspects of individual proposals. In addition, the criteria give the commission the opportunity to examine important issues that extend beyond compliance with an applicable land use plan. The commission noted that issues related to the adequacy of services or governmental structure are frequently the most critical to be examined.

The workgroup also received testimony from local jurisdictions that expressed concern about the current criteria. This concern focused on three principal issues.

First, some special districts objected to the statutory and criteria language which gives a preference to cities as service providers. They noted that as some special districts have merged

in recent years, they have become the most efficient service providers in many areas of the region.

Second, it was argued that the general language of the current criteria may be subject to multiple interpretations that has resulted in a lack of consistency in commission decisions. For example, testimony from one special district questioned how the language "most efficient service provider" could be interpreted.

Third, some contended that the current criteria work against the development of regional and subregional approaches to service delivery. It was suggested that existing regional efforts to quantify the quality and quantity of public services and identify service provision areas be utilized to develop sounder boundary change decision-making criteria.

Recommendation. The workgroup recommends that, as part of the transfer of the boundary change review process to Metro, statutory language be enacted to give Metro the authority to establish clear and objective criteria that will be used to examine local proposals. Metro would consult with MPAC and local jurisdictions in developing these criteria.

The workgroup also adopted four specific recommended criteria. These include: 1) compliance with provisions of the regional framework plan, 2) a presumption that all territory within the urban growth boundary will ultimately be within a city, 3) consideration of the economic and financial effects of the proposed action, and 4) compliance with existing SB 122 agreements.

### Geographic Boundaries

Discussion. Since 1979 the jurisdiction of the commission has included all of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties. The workgroup received some testimony that questioned the need to include the rural portions of these counties within the commission's jurisdiction. They noted that the municipalities in rural Clackamas and Washington Counties are distinct communities. The effect of boundary changes in these areas is generally limited to the individual city and possibly an adjacent special district. They noted that the larger communities, such as Sandy and Canby, would be subject to the same SB 122 urban service agreement requirements as more urbanized cities.

The commission and its supporters expressed several concerns about removing more rural areas from its jurisdiction. They noted that growth management and boundary change policies within the region's urban growth boundary could impact nearby rural areas. In addition, growth policies in nearby cities, such as Sandy and Canby could have impact inside the urban growth boundary. They also

contended the commission had been effective in addressing service delivery and the proliferation of service providers in the Mt. Hood Corridor. It was also noted that the removal of a large geographic area would reduce the funding base for the commission.

Recommendation. The workgroup recommends that, as part of the transfer of the boundary change review process to Metro, the jurisdiction should be limited to units of government that are wholly or partly within Metro's boundaries. Proposed changes outside the Metro boundary would be processed using existing statutory procedures that apply in areas of the state that do not have boundary commissions.

### Funding

Discussion. The commission's funding is currently provided through the collection of assessments from cities, counties and special districts and from filing fees collected from jurisdictions submitting proposals for commission review. Cities and counties pay a per capita assessment and special districts pay an assessment based on the assessed value of property within the district. Large entities such as Metro, the Unified Sewerage Agency and several larger special districts pay a flat fee. A total of 42 percent of the commission's funding comes from cities, 31 percent from districts, and 27 percent from filing fees.

Several special districts testified that the current assessment system unfairly penalizes those who live in unincorporated urban areas that are served by several special districts. They noted that each special district pays an assessment and the county pays an additional assessment. For example, the Oak Lodge Fire District testified that governments in its area pay a total of 41 cents per capita in commission assessments. By comparison, residents of nearby cities paid 10 cents per capita.

The commission responded by explaining that its funding is based on the potential for providing services to local units of governments. They noted that in areas served by multiple special districts, each of the districts may receive services and therefore each district should pay its fair share.

Recommendation. Adoption of the entire package of workgroup recommendations should reduce the cost of providing necessary boundary review services. The commission currently processes about 125-150 proposals annually. If the boundary review function is transferred to Metro and the geographic boundaries are reduced, the workgroup assumes the number of proposals received will decline. In addition, if the hearing process is limited to contested cases only, staffing needs will be reduced.

The current commission budget is \$349,022 for FY 95-96. The commission has a 4+FTE staff and is housed in the State Office

Building. It is difficult to precisely forecast the funding needs for a Metro-based boundary review process. This is primarily due to the difficulty in estimating the number of local proposals that will result in contested cases and the associated hearing and appellate costs related to these cases.

Workgroup staff developed two potential staffing scenarios. The first scenario assumed the workload reduction would result in a two-person staff with a total budget of \$194,608. The second scenario assumed a three-person staff with an estimated cost of \$287,550. The actual budget will need to be determined by Metro at the time the transfer of the commission's functions actually occurs.

The workgroup recommends that funding for Metro's boundary review office be provided from three sources. These would include: 1) a minimal assessment collected from all jurisdictions subject to the revised boundary review process, 2) a system of fees for the filing of proposed actions, and 3) payments for the costs of a contested case review by the party initiating the case. A specific funding proposal should be developed by Metro in consultation with MPAC and the affected units of government. The proposal should address the funding equity concern raised by jurisdictions that serve unincorporated areas. In addition, the workgroup recommends that, due to the uncertainty of the office's workload, the methods of funding should be reviewed after two years of operation.

The workgroup also recommends that when Metro assumes the boundary review function, the transfer shall include all current commission contingency and capital reserve fund balances, files and equipment. These fund balances were estimated to be \$52,482 in FY 95-96. These funds would provide a necessary cushion should Metro initially underestimate the costs of processing contested cases and implementing the new review procedure.





# Rail~Volution

**Building Successful Communities with Rail**

Rail ~ Volution

1120 S.W. 5th Avenue, Room 702

Portland, Oregon 97204

(800) 788-7077

FAX (302) 436-1911

e-mail [Convene@aol.com](mailto:Convene@aol.com)

■ ■ ■ ■

### Conference Partners

Bi-State Development (St. Louis, Missouri)

Capital Metro (Austin, Texas)

City of Portland, Oregon

RTD (Denver, Colorado)

Federal Transit Administration

Metro (Portland, Oregon)

Surface Transportation Policy Project

Tri-Met (Portland, Oregon)

Utah Transit Authority

### Conference Affiliates

American Association of Retired Persons

American Public Transit Association

Local Government Commission

Maryland Transit Authority

New Jersey Transit

New Starts Coalition

Oregon Department of Transportation

Washington Metro Area Transit Authority

Dear Colleague:

You are cordially invited to submit a proposal for a workshop/panel at Rail~Volution '96!

A national rail and community building conference, Rail~Volution '96 is the successor to the exciting Rail~Volution conference held last year in Portland, Oregon. Attended by over 800 planners, developers, financiers, citizens, elected officials, and transportation professionals from 87 cities in 26 states, Rail~Volution was hailed for its useful information, unique coalition of sponsors, broad range of attendees, and community feel.

This year, Rail~Volution will be held in Washington, D.C. on September 8 - 10 and will showcase success stories of communities from around the country that have used rail systems to improve mobility, stimulate local economies, and revitalize neighborhoods. Holding the conference in our nation's capital will give us the opportunity to meet face-to-face with members of Congress and their staffs to reiterate the importance of ISTEA and the role of state, local and private investments in transportation. Our objective is to engage a broader base of constituents while educating Congress on the critical need for strong national policy and appropriations to support rail transit.

To accomplish this ambitious agenda, we need your input. If you have a story to tell, please complete the attached Program Nomination Solicitation form and return it to the address indicated by May 15. We want to have a varied curriculum with some panels, workshops and trainings varying from 90 minutes to 3 hours. Let us know how your expertise or success story might fit into this format. Please keep in mind that conference attendees will include citizen activists, planners, developers, financiers, and elected officials as well as transportation professionals.

Thank you — and we hope to see you in September!

Earl Blumenauer  
Commissioner of Public Works  
City of Portland

Tom Walsh  
General Manager  
Tri-Met

Mike Burton  
Executive Officer  
Metro

**R a i l ~ V o l u t i o n ' 9 6**  
**Building Successful Communities With Rail**  
September 8-10 ~ Omni-Shoreham Hotel ~ Washington, DC

**Program Nomination Solicitation**

Name of Presenter \_\_\_\_\_  
Job Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Organization \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone \_\_\_\_\_ FAX \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**Program Track**

- Riding the Rail to Revitalized Communities
  - A Metropolitan Agenda for America: ISTEA
  - Getting Everyone on Track : Building Coalitions
- 
- 

**Presentation Title** \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**Abstract (150 to 300 words)**

---

---

**Return by May 15, 1996 to: G.B. Arrington, Rail -Volution Program Chair / Tri-Met**  
4012 S.E. 17th Avenue / Portland, Oregon 97202 / FAX 503-239-6469

## Rail~Volution'96

Building Successful Communities With Rail  
September 8-10 ~ Omni-Shoreham Hotel ~ Washington, DC

### TRACK 1 ~ RIDING THE RAIL TO REVITALIZED COMMUNITIES

Rail Investments together with land use planning can serve as the means to the end of creating a livable community. This track will showcase local success stories integrating community development, economic growth and rail investments to create livable communities.

We are looking for program sessions on:

- Transit and Livable Communities
- Transit Oriented Development
  - Case Studies
  - Financing and Marketing
  - The Developers Perspective
  - Making the Ridership Promise Real
- Reinvesting in Community: Redevelopment and Infill
- Public-Private Partnerships
- Station Area Planning and Development
- Regional Strategies for Transportation and Land Use
- Repairing the Suburbs: Putting a There There
- Transit Based Housing
- Leveraging Growth Management with Rail

## TRACK 2 ~ A METROPOLITAN AGENDA FOR AMERICA

---

ISTEA is an opportunity to reinvest in American's Cities by channeling transportation dollars. This track will look at reauthorization of ISTEA and showcase examples of flexible funds leveraging a broad urban agenda of housing, economic development and community revitalization.

We are looking for program sessions on:

- "Flexing" ISTEA funds for Rail and Livable Communities
- Innovative Finance -- New Opportunities
- Success Stories: ISTEA Funding for Transit Based Housing, Day Care ...
- Flexible Funding -- What Difference Has It Made?
- Partnerships to Build Livable Communities under ISTEA
- ISTEA II -- Why Should Anyone Care?
- Inside and Outside the Beltway -- Making ISTEA Work For You
- Where has all the money gone?
- Creative Financing -- Is there private money out there?
- Regional Solutions

## TRACK 3 ~GETTING EVERYONE ON TRACK

---

Building Livable Communities is an enormous undertaking cutting across levels of government, involving diverse groups and interests. This track focuses on the importance of building local and national coalitions to leverage transit investments as a tool to create Livable Communities.

We are looking for program sessions on:

- Grass Roots Groups to Advocate for Transit
- "Unusual Coalitions" -- The Alliance may not be Obvious
- Building a National Coalition
- How to -- Build Influence, Get Your Message Out
- Delivering the Message to Congress
- Connecting Governments With Activists
- Building a Coalition for Rail and Livability
- Making Government Accountable to the People
- Dealing Successfully With Critics
- Building a Coalition Improves the Product

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE Joint JPACT/MPAC

DATE 4-11-96

NAME	AFFILIATION
<del>Ed Lindquist</del>	Clackamas County
Roy Rogers	WASHINGTON County
E. E. Fallow	VANCOUVER, WA
Henry Smith	WSDOT
Peggy Lynch	Citizen/MPAC
JEANNINE MURREN	COUNSELLOR, CITY OF CORNELIUS MPAC, SMALL CITIES WASH. CO.
Linda Peters	Wash Co - MPAC; JPACT alternate
Susan McLean	Metro
John Kawalazgh	DEQ
TOM WALSH	TRI-MET
David Lohman	Port of Portland
Match Wall	CITIZEN - MPAC
JIM ZAREN	CITIZEN - MPAC
Judith McRobert	Gresham
Heather Chapman	Clackamas City
DEWE WARNER	ODOT
Bud Jones	Species Restoration, Multnomah Co.
Chuck Petersen	MPAC Special Districts - Clackamas Co.
Jean Schreiber	MPAC Clackamas Cities
Jude Hammetstad	MPAC Clackamas Co. Commissioner
TANYA COLLIER	JPACT MULTNOMAH COUNTY
Jill Shorn	MPAC West Linn
Rad Monroe	Metro Council

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

NAME	AFFILIATION
✓ CHARUE HAYES	City of Portland
✓ Mike Burton	metro Exec. office
✓ Gretchen Miller Kabony	City of PDX
✓ John C. Magranda	Clark County WASH.
✓ ROB DRAKE	CITY OF BEAVERTON & CITIES OF WASH. CO.
✓ Phil Bogue	Tri-Met
✓ Carl Blum	Portlan
✓ Mary Henry	WSDOT
✓ Ken Bergman	Clatsop County Public Works
✓ Les White	C-TRAN
✓ Dean Lookingbill	RTC
✓ STEVE DOTERRER	City of Portland
✓ Meeky Blizzard	City of Portland
✓ Bob Clay	City of Portland - Planning
✓ GB ARIZWOTN	TRI-MET
✓ Andy Priche	Tualatin Hills Park & Rec. District
✓ Andy Back	Washington County
✓ Brent Curtis	Wash CO
✓ Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
✓ Kimi Woshi	McKeever/Morris
✓ Richard Ross	CITY OF GRESHAM / TRAC CITIES OF MULT CO.
✓ Duke Mabrey	City of Gresham
✓ Jim Cumley	City of Happy Valley

