

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on  
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

7-11-1996

## Meeting Notes 1996-07-11 [Part A]

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 1996-07-11 [Part A]" (1996). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 212.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact/212](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/212)

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 POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

Date: JULY 11, 1996

Day: THURSDAY

Time: 7:15 a.m.

Place: METRO, CONFERENCE ROOM 370A-B

- \*1. MEETING REPORT OF JUNE 13, 1996 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- \*2. RESOLUTION NO. 96-2327 - ADOPTING CHAPTER 1 OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN WITH AMENDMENTS - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno/Mike Hoglund.
- \*3. RESOLUTION NO. 96-2356 - AMENDING THE FY 1996 METROPOLITAN TIP TO UPDATE THE REGIONAL TRANSIT PROGRAM - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- \*4. STIP UPDATE OVERVIEW - INFORMATIONAL - Mike Hoglund.

Material enclosed.

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: June 13, 1996

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Rod Monroe and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Rob Drake, Cities of Washington County; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Dave Lohman (alt.), Port of Portland; Claudiette LaVert, Cities of Multnomah County; Mary Legry (alt.), WSDOT; Craig Lomnicki, Cities of Clackamas County; and Betty Sue Morris, Clark County

Guests: Dave Yaden and G.B. Arrington, Tri-Met; Dave Williams, ODOT; Rod Sandoz and John Rist, Clackamas County; Kathy Lehtola, Washington County; Howard Harris, DEQ; Neil Clough, City of Cornelius; Jay Mower, Hillsdale Vision Group; Kate Deane, Steve Dotterer, and Elsa Coleman, City of Portland; Maggie Collins, City of Milwaukie; Meeky Blizzard, Office of Congressman Blumenauer; and Pat Collmeyer, Office of Neil Goldschmidt

Staff: Mike Burton, Executive Officer; Andy Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Mike Hogle, Tom Kloster, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

### SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order on Thursday, June 13, by Chair Rod Monroe. Lacking a quorum at the onset of the meeting, consideration of the minutes was postponed until a quorum was established.

### GOVERNOR'S TRANSPORTATION INITIATIVE RAC

Andy Cotugno reported that the Governor's Transportation Initiative (GTI) is concluding the first phase of the process. All Regional Advisory Committees (RACs) have completed their reports and the preliminary recommendations have been made public. A follow-up meeting has been scheduled on June 27 to finalize the recommendations that will be consolidated into proposed legislation.

The GTI report addresses concerns relating to economic opportunity and livability. Andy felt the RAC's recommendations

JPACT

June 13, 1996

Page 2

reflect a priority for operations and maintenance and improvements focusing on integration with a compact region, access to Regional Centers, highway capacity and freight-related needs.

Andy spoke of the huge effort and amount of work involved in the process and the extension of that effort with the 12 legislators who attended the last GTI meeting.

The 12 priorities for transportation needs identified by the Portland Metro RAC were reviewed, with preservation topping the list. The others included improving access to the Central City and Regional Centers; faster and more convenient bus service; providing local and collector streets and sidewalks in the Central City and Regional Centers; truck choke points, optimizing use of the existing system; highway capacity expansion; deepening of the Columbia River channel; improving truck access to terminals and reload facilities; neighborhood traffic management; alleviating unpredictable congestion; and providing sidewalks along major bus corridors.

The issues of funding and system operating efficiencies and recommendations were also explored. There is a desire on the part of the committees to pursue those efficiencies and it is felt that receipt of state funds should be tied to a 1 percent cost savings. The state is recommending there be more cost sharing and contracting done as efficiency measures. There needs to be a reduction in some of the redundancies, and there is interest in addressing subregional access.

Andy also elaborated on some of the differences between the state and Portland RAC recommendations. He cited the local option concern noted by the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) and Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) and the Constitutional Amendment for revenue sources such as the vehicle registration fee, excluding the gas tax and trucks. Consideration of a possible regional system development charge on new growth was also recommended.

A handout was distributed from the GTI Statewide Advisory Committee representing final recommendations from three of the subcommittee work groups.

Mayor Lomnicki commented that the Portland area RAC was ahead of other areas in the state in identifying their transportation needs. The No. 1 priority of the SAC is a base level of funding that would provide roads in fair or better condition throughout the state. Craig expressed local governments' concern that they be given some assurance on funds for maintenance and preservation after contributing such funds. There is no discussion at the

JPACT

June 13, 1996

Page 3

state level on pre-emption of local taxing authority. He cited the need to supplement state funds, noting that the stakeholder group is discussing pre-emption.

Another issue raised was that of local access management which Craig stated was a key between state and local governments. He spoke of the state using state highways to get people through an area while local governments might use them as a main street. Mayor Lomnicki stated that the GTI process has raised the awareness level of how important transportation is. He noted that transportation falls in line with the Governor's other priorities of criminal justice and education.

The draft report will be reviewed by the SAC on June 27. Craig indicated there is concern at the city level regarding pre-emption of local taxing authority, and they will fight it. On certain pre-emptions, they want it to go before a vote of the local government. If the state can't take care of the local government's funding source, then the local government must supplement with local sources. There are groups such as the truckers and gas dealers that are asking the state to pre-empt local governments from other options.

Mayor Lomnicki indicated that the Governor and this region and other regions of the state will develop a strategy for the Legislature. He emphasized the need for a unified package.

Commissioner Rogers complimented Metro and Andy Cotugno on coordinating a difficult process in a short timeframe. He felt Andy had done a "magnificent" job. Andy extended that compliment to the rest of the jurisdictions who participated in the process. Commissioner Rogers emphasized the need for a contingency plan, noting there are parallel philosophies and difficulties in obtaining funding. He didn't feel it would be an easy process but suggested taking the work that was done to develop some contingency plans. He didn't feel we were moving in a deliberate fashion. He hoped that we would take the report and prepare a contingency plan in 1996 for implementation in 1997.

Further discussion centered on the November election and its impact on the plan's success or failure. A good mix of legislators could improve things. Commissioner Rogers proposed that a process be established to develop some parallel planning for a contingency plan that he hoped would begin immediately.

Commissioner Lindquist suggested letting the Legislature know the plan we will carry forward if the Legislature doesn't act. Dave Lohman agreed with Commissioners Rogers' and Lindquist's comments, noting the concerns raised by constituents. He reported

that the shippers in Seattle are starting to take a more active role as a watchdog group in their area and might do the same in Portland. He also cited the importance of someone working on the weight-mile tax.

Councilor McLain noted that, at the MPAC meeting, there was some discussion on level of service. She felt the general public does not want to accept level-of-service D-F and that the issue will be discussed further at the joint JPACT/MPAC meeting on June 20. Councilor McLain felt it is important to understand that the finances aren't there for anything above that level of service. She cited the need for an outreach effort to educate the public in that regard. She felt that Bruce Warner's presentation on the constrained financial package needs to be simplified and that we need to move forward with an educational process on such issues.

#### MEETING REPORT

Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Commissioner Lindquist, to approve the May 9 JPACT meeting report as submitted. The motion PASSED unanimously.

#### RTP CHAPTER 1 SCHEDULE

Andy Cotugno explained that the joint JPACT/MPAC meeting will reconvene on June 20 to discuss the RTP Chapter 1 policy issues identified by TPAC. Approximately 275 comments have been received to date. The focus for discussion will be on the 12 comments that represent significant issues and the remainder will be addressed by means of a "consent" agenda.

As Chapter 1 of the RTP moves forward for adoption, it will be considered for approval by MPAC on July 10 and JPACT at its July 11 meeting. The entire RTP will not be adopted by ordinance until the end of the *Framework Plan* process in December 1997. Approval by JPACT on July 11 constitutes an action to develop the rest of the plan and any requirements at the end of the process.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

Tom Walsh spoke on the statewide referendum and the campaign geared for the 1997 legislative session.

\*\*\*\*\*

Tom also commented on Dave Yaden's outreach effort in line with the 2040 process to determine transit expansion needs.

\*\*\*\*\*

Bob Post's resignation as Tri-Met's Deputy General Manager was announced. Tom spoke of his talent and contributions to the region, noting that Bob has decided to stay in the region. His expertise will be available to Tri-Met in a different way and form. Concerning any impact on the South/North light rail project, Tom assured the committee there would be none. He reported that Ron Higbee and the rest of the Tri-Met staff will stay in place and that the project will continue to move at the same pace and steady course. A replacement for Bob will not be sought. Four departments will stay intact and reassignments will be made to handle all tasks.

A discussion followed on whether another regional vote will be required following the negative vote taken in Clark County on light rail. It has been recognized that it is the first of multiple phases of light rail and the second phase may not require a new vote. The 1994 vote may still hold. Tom lauded Congressman Bunn's actions and efforts in securing support for the South/North light rail project as an extension of our existing light rail system. Initial approval by the House Transportation Subcommittee was secured, placing the project first in line and in contention for light rail funds. Committee members directed Andy Cotugno to draft a letter on JPACT's behalf acknowledging their appreciation of Congressman Bunn's efforts.

\*\*\*\*\*

Chair Monroe introduced and welcomed Betty Sue Morris, a Commissioner in Clark County, who replaced Commissioner John Magnano on JPACT.

\*\*\*\*\*

Andy Cotugno announced that the next regular JPACT meeting would be held on July 11. Committee members were reminded of the joint JPACT/MPAC meeting scheduled on June 20 at 5:00 p.m. to resolve RTP issues.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan  
COPIES TO: Mike Burton  
JPACT Members

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE

JPACT

DATE

7-11-96

NAME

AFFILIATION

NAME	AFFILIATION
GRACE Crumican (formerly known as <sup>ODOT</sup> Eleanor Roosevelt)	
Craig J. Tommichi	City of Clatsop Co.
TANYA COLLIER	MULTNOMAH COUNTY
David Lehman	Part of Portland
DON MORISSETTE	METRO
Royce POLLARD	VANCOUVER
Sean Lockingbill	RTC
GREG GREEN	SECO
Gerry Smith	WSDOT
Roy ROGERS	WASH. County
Tom Welsh	Greg's Cosmic Connections
Rad Morrow	Metro Council
Andy Cochran	Metro
CHARLIE HALES	Portland
ROB DRAKE	CITIES OF WASHINGTON CO.
Kim White	Metro
Pamela Peck	Metro
RON SANDOR	CLATSOP CO.
JOHN RIST	CLATSOP CO.
DAVE WILLIAMS	ODOT
BERNIE BOTHAULT	TRI-MET.
Phil Brand	Metro
Millie Bience	Metro



COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE ✓PACT

DATE 7-11-96

NAME

AFFILIATION

Les White

C-TRAN

RICH LEDBETTER

METRO

STEVE DOTTERER

CITY OF PORTLAND

CB Armstrong

TRI-MET ✓

Kathy Lehtola

Washington County

Kathy Busse

Mult County

Greg Hansen

Put

Dick Feeney

Grace's Guardian Angel

Elsa Coleman

PDOT

## STAFF REPORT

### CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 96-2327 FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING CHAPTER 1 OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Date: June 19, 1996

Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

## PROPOSED ACTION

Adoption of this resolution would establish the regional transportation policy framework for the *Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update*. The RTP update process will be the basis for the development of a new transportation system and for defining the transportation system improvements necessary to implement the Region 2040 Growth Concept through the *Regional Framework Plan*. The updated RTP will satisfy state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements for Transportation System Plans and Metro Charter requirements for a Transportation Element of the *Regional Framework Plan*.

TPAC has reviewed Chapter 1 of the *Regional Transportation Plan Update* and recommends approval of Resolution No. 96-2327.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

### **Context**

Chapter 1, Regional Transportation Policy, establishes guiding principles for a balanced regional transportation system as well as goals and objectives for various transportation modes and coordination between those modes. The chapter presents the overall policy framework for the specific transportation goals, objectives and actions contained in the RTP. It also sets a direction for future planning and decision-making by the Metro Council for the remainder of the RTP update, which will define the regional transportation systems and the 20-year improvements to those systems consistent with the state TPR.

More importantly, this RTP policy chapter provides the basis for coordinating the development of a complete RTP with the Region 2040 Growth Concept and the *Regional Framework Plan*. The chapter also provides the policy context and framework for transportation system planning required under the state TPR for cities and counties. Finally, the chapter updates the regional policy for consistency with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 and the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

This Chapter 1 Regional Transportation Policy will ultimately be combined with a new transportation system component, including proposed improvements, in a draft *Regional Transportation Plan Update*. That plan update will be the basis for compliance with the state TPR and begin public review in December 1996. This chapter also provides the basis for the policies contained in the Transportation Element of the *Regional Framework Plan*, scheduled for review in 1997.

## **Key Chapter 1 Elements**

The following is a summary of the key policy components contained in Chapter 1, Regional Transportation Policy:

1. **Regional Transportation Vision/Guiding Principles.** The new Chapter 1 provides a concise, clear vision for the RTP. The overriding concept is to strategically implement a multi-modal transportation system that facilitates development of the 2040 Growth Concept.
2. **Accessibility.** The concept of accessibility is introduced as a guiding principle as a supplement to mobility. Accessibility ties land use activities of places to the ability to travel to those places on the transportation system. The promotion of accessibility will lead to better balance between land uses and the transportation system.
3. **Urban Form.** The 2040 land use concepts (central city, regional centers, town centers, etc.) are incorporated into the RTP and complementary transportation system approaches are identified for each of the concept types.
4. **Systemwide Goals and Objectives.** Specific goals and objectives are listed to expand on the RTP Vision. Objectives relate to providing a safe, cost-efficient system that implements the 2040 Growth Concept and protects the region's natural environment.
5. **Street Design.** Regional street design goals and objectives are included to introduce the concept of providing street designs that support 2040 land uses.
6. **Modal Elements.** System goals and objectives and functional classification descriptions are provided for regional transportation modes relative to motor vehicles, public transportation, freight, bicycles, and pedestrians.
7. **Transportation System Management (TSM), Transportation Demand Management (TDM).** Better operation of the system through TSM strategies such as traffic signal coordination and managing demand through TDM strategies such as carpooling and flextime are emphasized through specific goals and objectives. Parking management objectives are included within this area.
8. **Congestion Level-of-Service.** The policy chapter recognizes the need for revised measures to evaluate congestion and methods to address it. Policies will be included to reflect this recognition.

## **Update Process**

The Chapter 1 Regional Transportation Policy document represents proposed policy changes as recommended by the 21-member RTP Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). The CAC has worked with Metro staff, the RTP work teams, and the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) to formulate their recommendations. In addition to the CAC recommendations, JPACT and the Metro Council will be asked to consider comments

from the public and TPAC prior to taking a final action.

Upon completion of the policy chapter, the CAC, Metro staff, TPAC, the inter-agency RTP work teams and the public will proceed to develop the full RTP over the next seven months. A draft of the full RTP is scheduled for release in December 1997.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING ) RESOLUTION NO. 96-2327  
CHAPTER 1 OF THE REGIONAL )  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE ) Introduced by Mike Burton  
Executive Officer

WHEREAS, The 1992 revision of the Regional Transportation Plan, adopted by Ordinance No. 92-433, remains in effect as the regional functional plan required by ORS 268.390 until it is replaced by the *Regional Transportation Plan Update* ordinance; and

WHEREAS, Portions of "Regional Transportation Policy," Chapter 1 of the 1992 *Regional Transportation Plan*, may be amended in September 1996 at the same time that a new *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* with land use and transportation policies is adopted by ordinance; and

WHEREAS, The full draft ordinance with the amended regional transportation system is scheduled to begin public review as the new regional functional plan, the regional Transportation System Plan (TSP) under the Transportation Planning Rule, and *Regional Framework Plan* transportation component in December 1996; and

WHEREAS, The 1995 *Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan*, adopted by Resolution No. 95-2138A, was adopted to meet federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 and Clean Air Act of 1990 requirements for a financially constrained and air quality-tested basis for federal transportation funds; and

WHEREAS, The 2040 Growth Concept policies of Metro's adopted regional goals and objectives connect land use and transportation in a new regional urban form; and

WHEREAS, The first phase of the *Regional Transportation Plan* update has focused on an amended policy framework that considers

the Transportation Planning Rule requirements for the regional TSP and transportation aspects of the 2040 Growth Concept; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Metro Council hereby declares:

1. That Chapter 1, entitled "Regional Transportation Policy" of the *Regional Transportation Plan Update*, attached and incorporated as Exhibit A as amended by the May 7, 1996 CAC memorandum attached as Exhibit B, is hereby adopted as the proposal for a new policy framework for the *Regional Transportation Plan Update* that will be the basis for development of the new transportation system and proposed improvements.

2. That JPACT recommendations for revisions in response to public comment, attached as Exhibit C, be incorporated into Exhibit A.

3. That Chapter 1 shall be combined with a new transportation system and proposed improvements in a draft *Regional Transportation Plan Update* for compliance with LCDC's Transportation Planning Rule to be adopted in 1997.

4. That any amendments to Chapter 1 suggested by the time the full draft *Regional Transportation Plan Update* shall be considered during JPACT and Metro Council consideration of a resolution to propose it at the time of RTP adoption.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE  
TEL 503 797 1700

PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736  
FAX 503 797 1794



**METRO**

Date: June 28, 1996  
To: JPACT, MPAC and Metro Council Members and Interested Parties  
From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director  
Subject: Regional Transportation Plan Update - CAC Chapter 1 Draft

\* \* \* \* \*

Attached, please find the following:

- Staff Report on the proposed CAC Chapter 1 Draft;
- Resolution on the draft; and
- Exhibits: A April 19, 1996 CAC Chapter 1 Draft (this document is not included in the packet, but copies are available at Metro, and will be provided at all meetings).
- B May 7, 1996 CAC Addendum to the April 19 Draft.
- C TPAC recommended amendments to the CAC April 19 draft based on public comments. This exhibit is divided into three sections:
  - Discussion items not previously discussed by MPAC and JPACT (purple)
  - Discussion items previously discussed by MPAC and JPACT (green)
  - Consent items (green)
- D Annotated version of Chapter 1 with the above referenced amendments (Exhibits B and C) incorporated.

This annotated version differs from revisions recommended in the CAC Addendum (see Exhibit B) in three areas. These differences are:

- (1) **CAC Recommendation:** Revise Goal 3 of the Bicycle System Goals and Objectives as follows:

"Goal 3: Ensure that all transportation projects include appropriate bicycle facilities using established design standards ~~appropriate to that reflect~~ regional land use and street classifications."

**TPAC Recommendation:** Do not make this change to Chapter 1. Keep language as written in the April 19 version of Chapter 1 which reads:

## ***EXHIBIT A***

### **April 19, 1996 CAC Draft of Chapter 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan**

*(Chapter 1 is not included in this packet;  
copies are available at Metro and will be provided at all meetings)*



***EXHIBIT B***

**May 7, 1996 CAC Addendum  
to the Chapter 1 Draft**

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



**METRO**

Date: May 23, 1996  
 To: JPACT/MPAC Members and Interested Parties  
 From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director  
 Subject: CAC Addendum to Chapter 1 Revisions

\* \* \* \* \*

On May 7, the RTP Citizen Advisory Committee moved to add several revisions to those included in the April 19 Chapter 1 draft. Most of these additional revisions are in response to issues forwarded to the CAC by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC). Recommended text additions are shown with underline and deletions shown as ~~strike thru~~:

## Introduction

1. Add a preface that explains what parts of Chapter 1 are binding (i.e., goals and objectives vs. more descriptive text), relationship to the Regional Framework Plan (RFP) and the timeline for adoption and subsequent local TSP timelines.

## Regional Street System

1. Add a matrix to page 1-12 of the street design section that summarizes the connection between street designs and the various 2040 land use components (similar to that shown on page 1-27 of the transit section).
2. Revise the introductory paragraph to street system implementation on page 1-19 as follows:

"...or preserve infrastructure. The purpose of this section is to establish these key issues as the most important criteria when selecting transportation projects and programs. The following goals and objectives..."

## Regional Motor Vehicle System

1. Revise the fourth bullet in the Local Street section on page 1-23 to read:

"Direct freight access on the local residential street system should be discouraged, ~~except where alternatives would create an unusual burden on freight movement.~~"

2. Recognize special needs of motorcycles and mopeds through the following revisions:
  - revise the last sentence of the introductory paragraph on page 1-20 to read:

"... share of transit riders). Finally, motorcycles and mopeds also use the motor vehicle system, and provide more fuel-efficient alternatives to automobile travel. Although motorcycles and mopeds are governed by the same traffic laws as other motor vehicles, they have special parking and security needs.

### **Transit Goals and Objectives:**

1. Revise the first paragraph on page 1-24 to read:

"Public Transportation Transit service should be provided to serve the entire urban area, and the hierarchy of service types described in this section define what level of service is appropriate for specific areas. The transit section is divided into two parts. The first..."

2. Revise the "Other Transit Options" section on page 1-26 as follows:

#### "Other Public Transportation Transit Options

Other public transportation may serve transit options may become economically feasible for serving certain destinations in the metropolitan area. These services include commuter rail along existing heavy rail lines, passenger rail and bus connecting the region to other urban areas. In addition, private urban services may complement public transit within the urban area and other private services may inter-city bus service that provide statewide access to the region's inter-city bus, rail and air terminals."

3. Replace the word "reportable" with "avoidable" in the second objective of Goal 5 on page 1-29.
4. Revise the transit chart on page 1-27 to show "secondary bus" service to "employment areas" as a solid square (denoting best transit mode for a given land use type).

### **Freight Goals and Objectives:**

1. Delete the second bullet under the third objective of Goal 1 (redundant; freight monitoring will occur as part of IMS).
2. Delete the fourth objective under Goal 3; this change is based on the general principle of not including financial priority statements within the modal sections of Chapter 1.
3. Replace the word "Ensure" with "Promote" in Goal 4 to create a more flexible goal statement.
4. Revise the fourth bullet under Goal 4 to read "truck infiltration ~~traffic~~ in neighborhoods" to more clearly state the intent of this objective.
5. Note: the discussion draft omits two CAC revisions to the freight goals and objectives. The first is introductory text intended for the opening paragraph that elaborates on the

multi-modal and multi-commodity nature of freight movement in the region. The second add the word "enhance" to Goal 3 as follows:

**"Goal 3 - Protect and enhance the public and private investments in the freight network."**

These additional revisions will be incorporated into the final CAC text revisions.

### **Bicycle Goals and Objectives:**

1. Add the following wording to the second sentence of the introductory paragraph:

"Metro's 1994 travel behavior survey found that places in the region with good street continuity, ease of street crossing and gentle topography experience more than a three percent bicycle mode share while lower density areas experience around one percent bicycle mode share."

2. Revise Goal 3 as follows:

"Ensure that all transportation projects include appropriate bicycle facilities using established design standards ~~appropriate to that~~ reflect regional land use and street classifications."

3. Revise Objective 1, Goal 3 for consistency with the previous revision to the goal statement:

"1. Objective: Ensure that ~~bikeway projects, and~~ all transportation projects include appropriate bikeways, that bicycle parking and other end-of-trip facilities are designed using established standards, and that bikeways are connected with other jurisdictions and the regional bikeway network."

4. Revise the third objective under Goal 4 on page 1-33 as follows:

"Objective: Reduce the rate ~~number~~ of bicycle accidents in the region."

### **TDM Goals and Objectives:**

1. Add a reference to the Central City on page 37 in the first objective of Goal 1 (for consistency with the land use revisions already drafted for Chapter 1).
2. Add a new objective 6 to Goal 5 - "Allow use of HOV lanes by motorcycles with single riders in order to further reduce congestion."
3. Delete first objective of Goal 6 relating to public involvement policies (not an appropriate location for this text; duplicates the public involvement policy documents already in place).

## Parking Goals and Objectives:

1. Replace existing parking section in Chapter 1 of the RTP with the following new text. The introduction in the new text includes a discussion of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirement to reduce parking space per capita. Goal 1 and the objectives that follow this goal reflect the results of the Regional Parking Management study completed in December 1995. The study established the region's parking baseline for non-residential parking spaces per capita at 0.86 spaces. Goal 2 and Goal 3 reflect the Phase I Framework Plan interim parking measures for reducing parking minimum requirements and for establishing parking maximums. The proposed new text follows:

### Parking Management

The State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requires that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) include methods to reduce non-residential parking spaces per capita by 10 percent over the next 20 years (by 2015). The requirement is one aspect of the rule's overall objective to reduce per-capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT), promote alternative modes and encourage pedestrian and bicycle friendly development.

The mode of travel is directly influenced by the convenience and cost of parking. As auto parking in densely developed areas becomes less convenient and more costly, alternative modes of travel (e.g., transit, bicycle, walk and telecommute) become relatively more attractive. In addition, as alternative modes of travel are used more for work and non-work trips, the demand for scarce parking decreases. The reduction in demand will allow the region to develop more compactly and provide the opportunity for redevelopment of existing parking into other important and higher end uses.

The regional parking management program is designed to be complementary to the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) element of the RTP, meet the 10 percent reduction in parking spaces per capita required by the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), assist with implementation of the Department of Environmental Quality's voluntary parking ratio program contained in the region's Ozone Maintenance Plan, and support the implementation of the "Interim Parking" measures adopted in the Regional Framework Plan.

### Regional Parking Goals and Objectives

Goal 1 - Reduce the demand for parking by increasing the use of alternative modes for accessing the central city, regional centers, town centers, mainstreets and employment areas.

1. Objective: Encourage the designation of preferential parking stalls for carpool, vanpool, motorcycle and moped parking at major retail centers, institutions and employment centers.
2. Objective: Consider the redesignation of existing parking as park-n-ride spaces.
3. Objective: Consider the use of timed parking zones.

**Goal 2 - Reduce the number of off-street parking spaces per capita.**

1. Objective: Promote the use and development of shared parking spaces for commercial and retail land uses.
2. Objective: Require no more parking in designated land uses than the minimum as shown in the Regional Parking Standards Table shown in Title 2 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan
3. Objective: Establish parking maximums at ratios no greater than those listed in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan parking standards table under Zone A (Appendix 1)

*(note: Parking spaces are subject to the regional parking maximums. Parking spaces in structures may apply for limited increases in this ratio, not exceeding 20%. Parking for vehicles that are for sale, lease, or rent are exempt from the standard). The criteria for zone A is defined as:*

- within 1/4 mile of bus stops with 20 minute or less headways in the A.M. and P.M. peak hours with existing service or an adopted Tri-Met 5-year service plan; or
- within 1/2 mile of light rail stations; or
- within a 2040 Growth Concept design type (except neighborhoods).

*(Distances are calculated along public rights-of-way and discounted for steep slopes. It is recommended that cities or counties also include within Zone A non-residential areas with a good pedestrian environment within a 10-minute walk of residential areas with street and sidewalk designs and residential densities which can be shown to have significant non-auto mode choices. Zone B is the rest of the region)*

5. Objective: Establish parking maximums (see notation in Objective 2) at ratios no greater than those listed in the Regional Parking Standards Table under Zone B for areas outside of Zone A.

**Goal 3 - Provide regional support for implementation of the voluntary parking provisions of the Portland region's Ozone Maintenance Plan.**

1. Objective: Allow property owners who elect to use the minimum parking ratios shown in the Regional Parking Standards Table as maximum ratios to be exempted from the Employee Commute Options (ECO) program.
2. Objective: Provide priority DEO permit processing to land owners who elect to use the minimum parking ratios as maximum ratios.

**Goal 4 - Manage and optimize the efficient use of public and commercial parking in the central city, regional centers, town centers and mainstreets to support the 2040 Growth Concept and related RTP goals and objectives.**

1. Support local adoption of parking management plans within the central city, regional centers, town centers and mainstreets.

## **Glossary:**

1. Add definitions for the terms "transit" and "public transportation" as follows:

**Public Transportation** - includes both publicly and privately funded transportation serving the general public, including urban fixed route bus and rail service, inter-city passenger bus and rail service, dial-a-ride and demand responsive services, client transport services and commuter/rideshare programs. For the purposes of the RTP, school buses and taxi subsidy programs are not included in this definition.

**Transit** - for the purposes of the RTP, this term refers to publicly-funded and managed transportation services and programs within the urban area, including light rail, regional rapid bus, frequent bus, primary bus, secondary bus, mini-bus, paratransit and park-and-ride.

***EXHIBIT C***

**Public and Agency Comments on the  
CAC Draft of Chapter 1  
and TPAC Responses & Amendments**







METRO

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND TPAC RECOMMENDATIONS

on public comments received March 22 - May 23, 1996 regarding the  
Citizen Advisory Committee Policy Revisions to the Regional Transportation Plan

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**(not previously discussed by MPAC/JPACT)**

1. Comment: On page 1-16, Rural Roads section: In recent years, several rural areas surrounding our region have been experiencing the problem of infiltrating urban through traffic. As volumes increase, this high speed traffic is causing significant problems for the safety and viability of agricultural operations, and is leading to additional pressure to develop lands outside of the UGB with non-rural development. For these reasons, recommend that the discussion of rural roads on page 1-16 include the following addition:

"Because rural roads are intended to carry rural traffic, they should be designed to discourage through intra-urban traffic traveling from one part of the urban area to another."

(1000 Friends, 5/23/96)

2. Comment: It is important that the RTP reflect that some rural roads serve as important routes to connect urban traffic to throughways (such as Germantown Road, Scholls Sherwood/Scholls Ferry Road, etc.). In addition, rural roads are subject to Oregon's Basic Rule for legal speed and are generally posted no less than 45 miles per hour. These speeds would appear to be high and should be noted as such. Finally, does this language intend to make a distinction between "additional lanes" and the center turn lanes referred to in the last sentence? Amend the first paragraph of Rural Roads section on page 1-16 to read:

"Rural Roads are designed to carry rural traffic while accommodating limited transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel. In some cases rural roads serve to connect urban traffic to throughways. Rural roads This facilities serve urban reserves, rural reserves and green corridors, where development is widely scattered and usually located away from the road. These facilities are designed to allow moderate high motor vehicle speeds and usually consist of two to four motor vehicle lanes, with additional auxiliary lanes appropriate in some situations. Rural Roads have some street connections and few driveways. On-street parking occurs on an

unimproved shoulder, and is usually discouraged. These facilities may include center turn lanes, where appropriate.”

(Washington County, 4/17/96)

3. Comment: On page 1-16, Rural Roads discussion, fourth sentence: “These facilities are designed to allow moderate motor vehicle speeds and usually consist of two to four motor vehicle lanes, with additional non-continuous auxiliary lanes appropriate in some situations.” (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)
4. Comment: On page 1-16, Rural Roads discussion, second sentence: “Rural Roads are designed to carry rural traffic while accommodating limited transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel. Urban-to-urban travel on rural roads is limited and discouraged, but in some a few cases existing rural roads already serve to connect urban traffic to throughways.” (note: existing text includes changes Metro staff accepted from Washington County) (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)
5. Comment: Rural Reserves discussion, second and third sentences on page 1-8:  

“Roadways in these areas are intended to serve rural industry and needs, and urban travel on these routes is accommodated with designs that are sensitive to their basic rural function. Rural reserves will be protected from urbanization for the foreseeable future through county zoning ordinances, intergovernmental agreements and by limiting rural access to urban through-routes and discouraging urban-urban travel on rural routes.” (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 1-5:** Generally agree. The relatively small number of urban traffic routes that already exist on rural routes usually occur where no comparable urban route is possible, such as Glencoe Road (connecting the Hillsboro regional center to US 26), Stafford Road (connecting Lake Oswego to I-205) and Cornell Road (connecting Portland and Washington County through the West Hills). As pointed out in Comment 2, these routes generally provide access to throughways. As such, the rural road serves a freight function in the movement of farm products. Therefore, some capacity, design or safety-driven deficiencies must be addressed on rural roads. Most importantly, state highways that carry most urban traffic outside the urban area will be treated as green corridors, with specific land use protections and access controls enacted to limit the impacts of urban travel on the rural land use pattern.

Generally agree with text revisions proposed on Comment 2. However, the term “high speed” in context of street design refers to facilities posted at the maximum

limit (55-65 mph), while “moderate” refers to somewhat lower speeds (35-45 mph). Therefore, recommend revisions as proposed in Comment 2, except for the replacement of the word “moderate” with “high”, as follows:

“Rural Roads are designed to carry rural traffic while accommodating limited transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel. In some cases rural roads serve to connect urban traffic to throughways. Rural roads ~~This~~ facilities serve urban reserves, rural reserves and green corridors, where development is widely scattered and usually located away from the road. These facilities are designed to allow moderate motor vehicle speeds...”

Also, generally agree with adding the term “auxiliary” to this paragraph, but qualified to read “occasional” as follows:

“...from the road. These facilities are designed to allow moderate motor vehicle speeds and usually consist of two to four motor vehicle lanes, with ~~additional~~occasional auxiliary lanes appropriate in some situations. Rural Roads have some street...”

In addition, recommend revisions as proposed in Comment 5 with revised wording as follows:

“Roadways in these areas are intended to serve rural industry and needs, and urban travel on these routes is accommodated with designs that are sensitive to their basic rural function. Rural reserves will be protected from urbanization for the foreseeable future through county zoning ordinances, intergovernmental agreements and by limiting rural access to urban through-routes. Urban-to-urban travel is generally discouraged on most rural routes, with exceptions identified in this plan.”

## **Regional Public Transportation System**

6. Comment: Include a detailed policy regarding passenger rail in Chapter 1 of the RTP, as required by both the Oregon Transportation Plan and the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. (Cook, 5/9/96)
7. Comment: Passenger rail and its inter-connection to regional, statewide and national destinations should be listed as a component of the Regional Public Transportation system on page 1-24 and page 1-27. (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 6-7:** Agree. The concept of passenger rail has not been researched enough to be included as a detailed policy in the RTP at this time. However, it is appropriate to include a description of passenger rail issues in the public transportation section of the RTP. Chapter 1 was expanded at the request of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and public comment to define passenger rail, commuter rail, inter-city bus and heavy rail as other transit options that should be considered according to their economic feasibility and their ability to achieve regional goals. However, TPAC recommends further elevating those services that link the metropolitan area to areas outside of the region.

Therefore, TPAC recommends creating two major subsections within Regional Public Transportation section in Chapter 1, page 1-24, titled "Urban Public Transportation" and "Interurban Public Transportation," replacing the "Other Transit Options" section as follows:

### *Other Transit Public Transportation Options*

Other transit public transportation options may ~~become economically feasible for serving~~ serve certain destinations in the metropolitan areas. These services include commuter rail ~~along existing heavy rail lines, and streetcars.~~ passenger rail connecting the region to other urban areas, and inter-city bus service that provide statewide access to the region's rail and air terminals.

### *Interurban Public Transportation*

The federal ISTEA has identified interurban travel and passenger "intermodal" facilities (e.g., bus and train stations) as a new element of regional transportation planning. The following interurban components are important to the regional transportation system:

#### *Passenger Rail*

Inter-city high-speed rail is part of the state transportation system and will eventually extend from the Willamette Valley north to British Columbia. Amtrak already provides service south to California and east to the rest of the continental United States. These systems should be integrated with other public transportation services within the metropolitan region with connections to passenger intermodal facilities. High-speed rail needs to be complemented by urban transit systems within the region.

### Inter-city Bus

Inter-city bus connects points within the region to nearby destinations, including neighboring cities, recreational activities and tourist destinations. Several private inter-city bus services are currently provided in the region.

### Passenger Intermodal Facilities

Passenger intermodal facilities serve as the hub for various passenger modes and the transfer point between modes. These facilities are closely interconnected with urban public transportation service and highly accessible by all modes. They include Portland International Airport, Union Station and inter-city bus stations.

8. Comment: The format and choice of language in the "Transit Goals and Objectives" section on pages 1-27 through 1-29 is repetitive such that it is difficult to visualize what is being proposed in the plan. Consider integrating the following objectives (AORTA, 5/17/96):
- Connect all regional centers with each other and the central business district via direct or one-transfer regional rapid transit service.
  - Ensure that all regionally-oriented facilities (multi-modal passenger facilities, major educational and medical institutions, employment centers, etc.) have a station/stop on the regional Rapid Transit Network.
  - Ensure convenient, direct local transit access between residential, commercial and employment areas and the nearest Regional Center.

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 8:** Generally agree. Recommend incorporating the ideas proposed in these comments into the goals and objectives on page 1-28 of the Public Transportation System section as follows:

**Goal 1 - Develop a public transportation system that provides regional access to serves 2040 Growth Concept primary land use components (central city, regional centers, industrial areas, intermodal facilities) and special regional destinations (such as major colleges or entertainment facilities) with an appropriate level, quality and range of public transportation available.**

*new objective:*

5. Objective: Ensure that existing regional destinations located outside of the primary land use areas are served with LRT, rapid bus, frequent bus or primary bus.

**Goal 2 - Develop a public transportation system that provides community access to serve the 2040 Growth Concept secondary land use components (station communities, town centers, main streets, corridors) and special community destinations (such as local colleges or entertainment facilities) with high quality service.**

*new objective:*

5. Objective: Ensure that existing community destinations located outside of the secondary land use areas are served with frequent bus or primary bus.

**Goal 3 - Develop a reliable, convenient and accessible system of secondary public transportation that provides access to serve the 2040 Growth Concept "other urban components" (e.g., employment areas, outer neighborhoods and inner neighborhoods).**

## **Regional Bicycle System**

9. Comment: The Bicycle System Goals and Objectives' emphasis on regional solutions and connectivity is wrong. The problem is that most trips are local trips. We should first ensure that the means exists for safe and convenient local bicycle use. What rationale do we have that our population wants or will bike any distance in the typical 6 months of cold, wet weather? (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 9:** The vision statement of the Regional Transportation Plan "seeks to enhance the region's livability through implementation of the 2040 growth concept." Implementing 2040 includes bicycle accessibility to and within regional and town centers, which includes both short, local bike trips and bike trips connecting to the regional bikeway network. Therefore, it is important to emphasize both regional and local access and connectivity. However, the bicycle system goals and objectives are general policy direction, with recognition that additional research is needed to determine (1) how bicycle travel can help implement the 2040 growth concept, and (2) which aspects of the bicycle system are of a regional nature. To clarify this need for additional research, the following revisions to the bicycle system introductory text on page 1-32 are recommended:

"The bicycle is an important component in the region's strategy to provide a multi-modal transportation system. The 2040 growth concept focuses growth in the central city and regional centers, station communities, town centers and main streets. One way to meet the region's travel needs is to provide greater opportunity to use bicycles for shorter trips.

"The regional bikeway system identifies a network of bikeways throughout the region that provide for bicyclist mobility between and accessibility to and within the central city, regional centers and town centers. A complementary system of on-street regional bikeway corridors, regional multi-use trails and local bikeways is proposed to provide a continuous network. In addition to major bikeway corridors that create a network of regional through routes, the system provides accessibility to and within regional and town centers.

The adoption of the Regional Bicycle Plan element of the RTP continues the region's recognition of bicycling as an important transportation alternative.

"Metro's 1994 travel behavior survey found that places in the region with good street continuity, ease of street crossing and gentle topography experience more than a three percent bicycle mode share, while lower density areas experienced around one percent bicycle mode share. A greater understanding of bicycle travel is still needed, and development of a regional bicycle forecasting model is underway.

The implementation of the regional bicycle plan element of the RTP will provide for consistently designed, safe and convenient routes for bicyclists between jurisdictions and to major attractions throughout the region, will work toward increasing the modal share of bicycle trips, and will encourage bicyclists and motorists to share the road safely.

## **Regional Vision and Guiding Principles**

10. Comment: To achieve a balanced transportation system as outlined in Chapter 1, requires what may be perceived as "unbalanced" investments in non-auto projects. (Weaver, 4/12/96)
11. Comment: There needs to be a mechanism for achieving the "balanced" transportation system called for in the RTP. How will the region even the playing field? How will the goal of balance be reflected in funding decisions? ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 10 and 11:** These issues will be addressed during the next phase of the RTP update, when implementation strategies will be developed in conjunction with a detailed system analysis. However, it is



appropriate for JPACT/MPAC to begin discussion of these issues, as implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept calls for a departure from past funding practice. To implement 2040, a balanced transportation investment strategy must benefit all modes of travel (discussed on pages 1-19 to 1-20) and support the growth concept. The revised Chapter 1 includes three broad goals that focus on 2040 implementation, safety and system maintenance/preservation needs. These goals recognize the need to address deficiencies that affect all modes. As part of the next phase of the update, detailed project selection criteria will be developed that consider all Chapter 1 policy provisions to varying degrees (see related comments 14, 15 and 16, below).

## **Systemwide Goals and Objectives**

12. Comment: The findings on mobility on page 1-3 recognize that the region's livability and economy is dependent upon the quality of surface transportation connections to the nation and Northwest. However, this theme is not reflected in the proposed goals and objectives. Recommend adding the following objective to System Goal 1:

Objective 5: Provide for high levels of multi-modal travel and mobility on major statewide and interstate surface transportation corridors (e.g. I-5, I-84, National Highway System routes). (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 12:** Agree, in part. Instead, recommend adding the following new goal and supporting objectives to the Systemwide section:

### **System Goal 6 - Provide for statewide, national and international connections to and from the region, consistent with the Oregon Transportation Plan.**

1. Objective: Provide for the movement of people and goods with an interconnected motor vehicle system.
2. Objective: Provide for the movement of people and goods through an interconnected system of air and rail systems, including passenger and freight intermodal facilities and air and water terminals.
3. Objective: Mitigate the effect of improved regional access outside the urban area.



## ***DISCUSSION ITEMS*** ***(previously discussed by MPAC/JPACT)***

### **General RTP Issues**

13. Comment: There should be some discussion regarding what adoption of these policies by Metro means to the region and to local governments. Specifically, what parts of Chapter 1 are binding, advisory or explanatory? (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 13:** It is premature to define what is binding until the RTP update is complete. This item will be addressed during the next phase of the RTP update. Chapter 1 will serve as a guide for Metro to develop the remaining chapters of the RTP. As such, Chapter 1 will be adopted by resolution and will, therefore, not be binding upon local governments until completion of the entire RTP update. At that time, the RTP as a whole will be evaluated to determine which elements are binding and which are advisory to local governments. In the interim, however, the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan will implement several RTP policies relating to Boulevard design, local street connectivity and traffic level-of-service standards.

### **Regional Street System & 2040 Implementation**

14. Comment: Page 1-19, Regional Street System Implementation," first sentence: The mission of the RTP is not just the implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. Therefore, Goal 1 and its three objectives should be deleted or restated so that the highest priority is not given to only the city center and regional centers. (City of Troutdale, 5/13/96)
15. Comment: On page 1-19, Goal 1, Objectives 1-3, The street system hierarchy and perhaps other modal hierarchies should be considered along with the land use hierarchy in establishing project and program priorities. Expressing priorities solely in terms of 2040 land use categories ignores some important variables. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

16. Comment: The implementation goals on pages 1-19 and 1-20 seem to imply conflicting priorities for transportation improvements. Use a matrix that considers all RTP goals in the selection of projects. (Washington County, 4/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 14-16:** Generally agree. The hierarchy of 2040 land use components within Goal 1 reflects the general hierarchy established within the land use section of Chapter 1, and reflects the need to focus regional transportation funds in those areas that are most critical to successful implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. However, within this hierarchy, all urban components would continue to receive transportation investments. Other factors will also be included in establishing priorities, such as air quality, safety and freight access considerations or completing gaps in existing networks. In addition, improvements intended to serve the primary 2040 components will commonly benefit other areas, as well (e.g., network improvements that link neighborhoods to centers).

The primary components include the central city, regional centers and industrial areas/intermodal facilities. They are elevated above other land use components for a number of reasons. The central city and regional centers serve regional needs. They have the highest development densities, the most diverse mix of land uses, the greatest concentration of commerce, offices and cultural amenities and the greatest use of alternative modes in the region. While they have different transportation needs, industrial areas and intermodal facilities are essential to the economic base of the region and as such are of regional concern.

The secondary components include town centers, station communities, main streets and corridors. These areas have the second highest densities and use of alternative modes, and serve more localized needs. Other urban components include employment centers and neighborhoods. These areas have the lowest densities and the least use of alternative transportation modes.

While the street system implementation goals on page 1-19 include 2040 implementation, they also address safety improvement and maintenance and preservation of the system. These goals identify three key areas of importance in the overall selection of transportation programs and projects, and are not necessarily weighted according to the order in which they appear. As part of the next phase of the RTP update, a detailed system for project selection will be developed. These broad implementation goals will provide the general structure for the project criteria, but more detailed policies from throughout Chapter 1 will also be factored in.

17. Comment: Major topographical constraints should be the only reason not to build a street connection. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 17:** Disagree. In addition to topographic limitations, street connections may also be precluded by development patterns, as stated in the last bullet on page 1-17. Based on the CAC's addendum to the April 19 Chapter 1 draft, and subsequent discussions of these issues by JPACT and MPAC, TPAC recommends clarifying this reference as follows:

"Closed street systems and cul-de-sac designs should be limited to situations where topography, or existing development patterns prevent full street extensions, or where connections would compromise local street functions. Environmental impacts should also be considered in the development of local street systems."

### **Regional Motor Vehicle System / Level-of-Service**

18. Comment: Several comments about proposed revisions to the current level-of-service (LOS) standards were submitted as part of the review of Chapter 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan. (Items 98 through 100 specifically relate to LOS.)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 18:** The current congestion LOS standard is proposed for review for a number of reasons. First, as currently used, the LOS standard has resulted in a list of road and highway projects that may be financially unattainable, even under the most optimistic revenue assumptions. Second, current LOS standards will likely conflict with the goal of increased densities in certain locations as proposed in the 2040 Growth Concept. Increased densities would likely create additional traffic congestion on roadways adjacent to these areas such that jurisdictions will be unable to comply with current Transportation Planning Rule LOS requirements in some key 2040 locations. Third, current LOS standards do not adequately address the duration and severity of congestion beyond the afternoon peak hour.

In recognition of these issues, a number of alternative congestion measures and standards are proposed for consideration. The LOS standard will be evaluated in two steps. In the long-term, Metro will continue to evaluate alternative LOS standards as part of the continuing RTP update. Specifically, the RTP process will evaluate the consequences of different LOS standards in terms of the investment needed to maintain varying levels of service and the subsequent benefits and impacts.

In the interim, Title 1 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan proposes significant increases in planned land use densities in the city center, regional centers, town centers, main streets, station communities and corridors. The revised

Functional Plan LOS standard will be limited to dense areas and will not involve adopting a broad-base change to existing RTP level-of-service standards.

19. Add the following objective to Goal 1 on page 1-21 of the Motor Vehicle System text:

5. Objective: Develop improved measures of traffic generation and parking patterns for regional centers, town centers, station communities and main streets.

(JPACT/MPAC Joint Discussion, 6/20/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 19:** Agree. Revise as proposed. In addition, TPAC recommends adding the following objective to Goal 1 on page 1-21:

6. Objective: Develop improved measures of freight movement as defined in the 2040 Growth Concept.

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND TPAC RECOMMENDATIONS

on public comments received March 22 - May 23, 1996 regarding the  
Citizen Advisory Committee Policy Revisions to the Regional Transportation Plan

### CONSENT ITEMS

#### General RTP Issues

20. Comment: Reevaluate references to "Pedestrian System" and "Bicycle System" terminology in light of the terminology used in the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Recommend replacing "Pedestrian System" with "Walkway System" and "Bicycle System" with "Bikeway System" in the forward section of the RTP. (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 20:** Disagree. The terms "Bikeway" and "Walkway" do not reference the mode of travel, rather they refer to the facility. All other "systems" discussed in Chapter 1 of the RTP reference the mode of travel.

21. Comment: Revise Goal 1 on page 1-36 to read: "Enhance mobility and support the use of alternative non-automotive transportation modes ..." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)
22. Comment: Revise System Goal 4, Objective 3 on page 1-9 to read: "Promote alternative non-automotive modes of travel that help meet air quality standards." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)
23. Revise Goal 2, Objective on page 1-36 to read: "Support efforts to provide maximum allowable tax benefits and subsidies to users of alternative non-automotive modes of transportation." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)
24. Revise goal 5 on page 1-37 to read "Implement TDM support programs to make it more convenient for people to use alternative non-automotive modes for all trips throughout the region." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 21-24:** Disagree. "Alternative transportation mode" is an accepted term that includes any alternative to the single-occupancy vehicle. Using the term "non-automotive transportation mode" would not clarify the distinction between single-occupancy vehicles and shared vehicles (e.g. carpools, vanpools) and would preclude carpooling and vanpooling as "alternative transportation modes." However, a definition of "alternative

transportation modes" that makes this distinction should be included in the glossary of the RTP. TPAC recommends the following:

(insert into "Chapter 1 Glossary")

Alternative Transportation Mode -This term refers to all modes of travel except for single occupancy vehicle, including bicycling, walking, public transportation, carpooling and vanpooling.

25. Comment: There needs to be more consideration given to open spaces and green spaces, neighbors, current residences, and the natural environment when deciding about transportation projects. Most citizens feel that they have little influence or control over decisions being made. (Toutesberry, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 25:** Generally agree. System Goals 3 and 4 on page 1-9 are intended to address this need, and include protecting and enhancing livability, protecting water and air quality and minimizing environmental impacts associated with transportation improvements and programs.

26. Comment: The RTP should acknowledge the cooperative effort underway with local jurisdictions. It should note that many local agencies are currently preparing a Transportation System Plan which will need to be consistent with the RTP. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 26:** Agree. This relationship is described in the Introduction and Implementation chapters of the Federal RTP (the plan currently in place), and will be expanded during the next phase of the RTP update.

27. Comment: On page 1-37, Goal 4, add an objective that states local jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt applicable portions of the Transportation Planning Rule in the local general plans or ordinances. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 27:** Disagree. The TPR already establishes local responsibilities and planning requirements.

28. Comment: On G-2 of the glossary, the reference for the ISTEA should be updated. As a result of the National Highway System bill, management systems are no longer mandated, except for congestion management system in Transportation Management Areas. In addition, the RTP could also note that one of the objectives of the ISTEA was to link the Clean Air Act Amendments with transportation planning, resulting in air quality conformity requirements. Air quality conformity could also be added to the glossary. Other important components of the ISTEA

include public involvement requirements and greater participation by transit operators in the metropolitan planning process. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 28:** Agree. Glossary will be revised to: 1) eliminate reference to management systems as mandatory in the ISTEA definition and add public participation and transit operator participation requirements to the definition; 2) link ISTEA and the Clean Air Act within the ISTEA definition; 3) add the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to the glossary; 4) add a definition of air quality conformity.

29. Comment: On G-3 of the glossary, the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan could also be referenced. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 29:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

### **Regional Vision and Guiding Principles**

30. Comment: Accessibility to green spaces should be addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan. (Hocker, 4/4/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 30:** Agree. Access to (but not within) green spaces will be addressed in the system development phase of the RTP update.

31. Comment: Chapter 1, Section B, makes references to possible increases in congestion in high activity centers and suggests congestion may be bad. Consider that congestion itself may not be bad as much as it is an indicator of a condition. (Weaver, 4/12/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 31:** Agree. The second and third sentences of this section (page 1-1 of the Final Draft) already make this point.

32. Comment: When considering the cost-effectiveness of transportation improvements, include environmental costs, accessibility costs and the financial burden to individuals and families in the region. (Weaver, 4/12/96)
33. Comment: Strongly urge Metro to update its cost effectiveness "formula" as part of the RTP policies. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)
34. Comment: Challenge the definition of "cost-effectiveness" on page 1-3. The current definition is biased against communities with inadequate connectivity. Recommend



that cost-effectiveness be defined in a more traditional manner, as in "How much improvement do we get for our dollar?" (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 32-34:** Regional policy for cost-effectiveness is set forth in System Goal 2 on page 1-9 of the RTP. The "System Cost" section is neutral toward the current level of connectivity in a given community, and instead frames cost-effectiveness in terms of improving connectivity, and adequate levels of accessibility and mobility in any situation. Therefore, the question posed in Comment 34 could be best phrased as "how far does our dollar move us toward regional goals?" Specific cost effectiveness of transportation projects is examined through analysis of the Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Metro is looking to update the cost effectiveness "formula" for the next MTIP. This issue will be addressed as part of the system component of the RTP and through the implementation and funding strategy related to the MTIP.

35. Comment: System Cost discussion, first sentence, last paragraph on page 1-3: "A cost-effective transportation system will provide adequate levels of accessibility and mobility while minimizing the need for public investment total cost, including full life cycle costs and costs to the community and the environment." (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)
36. Comment: Recommend amending System Goal 2, Objective 3 on page 1-9 to read: "Consider a full range of costs and benefits in the allocation of transportation funds, including full life cycle costs and community and environmental impacts." (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, Coalition for A Livable Future and STOP 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 35 and 36:** Disagree. The terminology reflects the current status of the discussion related to "full costs" versus "full benefits" of transportation systems and solutions. As part of the system development phase of the RTP, detailed project/need prioritization criteria will be developed that consider all Chapter 1 policy provisions to varying degrees, including both the quantitative and qualitative benefits of system improvements and system costs. As part of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Metro is participating with ODOT on developing a cost/benefit methodology for selecting projects for funding. Again, defining and valuing costs and benefits is a difficult task as part of that effort. Any cost/benefit methodology will require adoption through the Oregon Transportation Commission, JPACT and the Metro Council.

37. Comment: Environmental, Economic and Social Impacts discussion, last paragraph on page 1-4: "The RTP measures economic and quality of life impacts of the proposed system by evaluating key indicators, such as job and retail service accessibility, economic benefits to the ~~business~~ community and transportation for

the traditionally underserved, including low income and minority households and the disabled. Other key system indicators include reduction in VMT's, travel times, travel speeds, congestion, energy costs, protection of natural resources and air quality impacts. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 37:** Agree with recommendation to delete the term "business." It is not necessary to make the point and could be interpreted as limiting. Agree that travel time should be included as an indicator. Travel speed and travel time are two main components in the proposed accessibility measure to better evaluate the transportation system's ability to serve land uses. Regarding VMT/capita (vehicle miles of travel per capita) suggest adding that vehicle miles of travel are an indicator. In general, this paragraph should not address goals, objectives, or standards regarding any indicator.

Disagree with recommendation to remove "congestion." Congestion as an indicator will always be a concern of the public. The key questions are related to 1) how much congestion is tolerable on the system; and 2) if "unacceptable" congestion exists, how should it be addressed or managed. These issues will be discussed as part of the system component of the RTP.

38. Comment: Reconsider guiding principle which states "timely public notice, full access to key decisions and support(s) broad based, early and continuing involvement of the public..." to ensure that notice is given early enough to encourage comment to the CAC. (Weaver, 4/12/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 38:** Agree. The principle (page 1-2) already supports public involvement at the CAC level; however, the details of the public involvement process are set forth in the Regional Public Involvement Plan. All CAC meetings are scheduled in advance and open to public comment.

39. Comment: On page 1-2, Principle 1: "Provide complete information, timely public notice...and continuing involvement of the public in all aspects of transportation planning and development." This ensures the public is engaged as partners in defining needs and problems and in creating and implementing solutions - not just receiving information. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 39:** Generally agree. However, recommend revising to read "... and continuing involvement of the public in all aspects of the transportation planning process.".

40. Comment: Balance mobility and accessibility objectives such that "quality of life" is not measured merely based on how fast one can drive from point A to point B. (Weaver, 4/12/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 40:** Agree. This balance is stated or implied in the five system goals that appear on page 1-9. In particular, System Goal 1 emphasizes "high levels" of access over "adequate" levels of mobility.

41. Comment: Recommend change on page 1-4, Timing and Prioritization of System Improvements, second paragraph, last sentence: "These areas provide the best opportunity for public policy to shape new development, and are, therefore..." (AORTA, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 41:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

42. Comment: Insert new guiding principle on page 1-2: "Provide safe, convenient and affordable transportation choices that provide access throughout the region without dependence on the auto." Providing safe, convenient and affordable transportation choices is essential to achieving the balance called for in Transportation RUGGO 19.3. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 42:** Disagree. The Systemwide Goals on page 1-9, particularly Goal 1, Objective 4 already addresses this issue.

43. Comment: Principles discussion, last full paragraph on page 1-2: "Important measures of livability include mobility and safe, convenient and affordable access to jobs, schools, services and recreation for all people, movement of goods, conservation of resources and the natural environment and clean air. The RTP must address these needs by improving transportation choices for how people have for traveling within the region without reliance on the auto, while seeking a balance between among accessibility, system cost, strategic timing and prioritization of improvements and environmental impacts." (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 43:** Generally agree, with the following modification to the proposed language:

"...clean air. The RTP must address these needs by improving transportation alternatives to the automobile and choices for how people travel within the region; while seeking a balance between, accessibility, system cost, strategic timing and prioritization of improvements and environmental impacts."

44. Comment: Accessibility and Mobility discussion, second paragraph on page 1-3: “Mobility improves when the transportation network is refined or expanded, when travel mode shifts to more efficient modes, or when travel demand is reduced, to improve capacity, thus allowing people and goods to move more quickly toward a particular destination.” (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 44:** Disagree. However, recommend the following revisions to this text:

“Mobility improves when the transportation network is refined or expanded to improve capacity of one or more modes, thus allowing people and goods to move more quickly toward a particular destination.”

45. Comment: Request for further clarification and explanation of statement on page 1-1 which says “Concentrating development in high-density centers envisioned in the 2040 Growth Concept may produce levels of congestion that exceed existing standards, yet signal positive urban development for those areas.” How can congestion be considered positive? This should be further defined. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 45:** When congestion is the result of public demand to frequent a particular commercial center or district, it is a measure of the success of these places. Current examples of congestion as a positive signal of economic activity include downtown Portland, main streets like NW 23rd and SE Hawthorne and regional shopping centers like Washington Square and Clackamas Town Center. In each of these areas, congestion is a trade-off for the concentration of services and activities that exists. Of these examples, downtown Portland best fits the 2040 vision of a multi-modal transportation system that provides good transit and pedestrian alternatives to the automobile.

46. Comment: Policies for the region should require a clear representation of current usage by mode, an historical analysis by mode, desired up or down percentage changes in mode split and realistic expectations for achieving the change within a specified time line. (Washington Square, 5/22/96 and TVEDC, 5/23/96)
47. Comment: We must realistically deal with current modal splits and the mode splits anticipated in the near future (i.e. the motor vehicle is the now the dominant mode choice). This should then be used as a guide to (1) set goals for an achievable shift in mode split, (2) identify projects that help achieve that shift and (3) allocate dollars to get there. (Washington Square, 5/22/96 and TVEDC, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 46 and 47:** Agree. For each area, Metro will set targets for various mode shares, and compare these targets with current mode shares. Mode split "targets" will be based on this research, and will ultimately guide transportation project selection. During the next phase of the update, these issues will be addressed as part of system development and modeling. The "horizon" year for the updated plan will be 2015, and system development will be based upon Metro's population and employment forecast for that year. Metro's transportation model is based on travel behavior surveys, and therefore provides that most "realistic" approach possible in testing transportation alternatives for the future. The final RTP will apply to each mode and reflect available financial resources.

48. Comment: Metro and local governments should elevate business/commercial transportation to a higher priority and the vision statement should acknowledge the importance of transportation to commerce. (Washington Square, 5/22/96 and TVEDC, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 48:** Generally agree. The importance of transportation to commerce is covered more broadly in the vision statement by the emphasis on implementing the 2040 Growth Concept. The more detailed discussion of the transportation elements of 2040 is included in the "Urban Form and Land Use" section that begins on page 1-5 of the Chapter 1 draft. In this section, each 2040 land use component is discussed according to its specific transportation needs. The freight goal and objectives on pages 1-30 and 1-31 also address commercial travel.

49. Comment: RTP policies should give a high priority to cross-UGB movement of people, goods and services and to accommodating the "growth industry" transportation system needs (i.e. tourism) that require efficient movement beyond the region's boundaries. (Washington Square, 5/22/96 and TVEDC, 5/23/96).

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 49:** Agree. This comment has been addressed by TPAC's response to Comment No. 4 on page 2 of the response document with proposed language that addresses statewide, national and international connections. Cross UGB travel in the region is addressed by System Goal 1 on page 1-9 of the Chapter 1 draft, which calls for major connections by multiple modes, including those crossing the UGB.

50. Comment: The RTP should contain an honest statement of current conditions and that the plan be revised annually to track changes in mode split over time. (Washington Square, 5/22/96 and TVEDC, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 50:** Disagree. Chapter 3 of the updated RTP will provide a detailed analysis of the impacts of forecast growth on the transportation system. This analysis routinely involves modeling the existing system with current and forecast populations. This work will be completed during the next several months, as part of the next phase of the RTP update. In general, the RTP is updated every 3 years to reflect changing conditions.

51. Comment: The RTP needs to address the issues of congestion and capacity in relation to the region's transition to higher density urban form over the next 20 years. (Washington Square, 5/22/96 and TVEDC, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 51:** Agree. This will occur during the next several months as part of the next phase of the RTP update.

52. Comment: The definitions of modes should go beyond motor vehicle, transit, bike and pedestrian to include: personal autos, light trucks for commercial, heavy trucks for commercial and autos for commercial. (TVEDC, 5/23/96)
53. Comment: Any policies related to commerce should differentiate between the types of commerce to which they refer (i.e. heavy trucks, light trucks, autos). Each type puts a different demand on the transportation system. (TVEDC, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 52 and 53:** Disagree. The modal definitions relate the physical street needs, and the motor vehicle category appropriately groups motorcycles, autos, light trucks, heavy trucks and buses, since these vehicles share the same travel lanes. In contrast, the separate freight and transit sections in Chapter 1 address special travel needs that are not shared by other motor vehicles.

## **Urban Form and Land Use**

54. Comment: Amend last sentence of Rural Reserve paragraph on page 1-8 to read (Washington County, 4/17/96):

*"Rural reserves will be protected from urbanization for the foreseeable future through state statutes and administrative rules, county zoning land use ordinances, intergovernmental agreements and by limiting rural access to urban through-routes whenever possible."*

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 54:** Generally agree. However, the reference to intergovernmental agreements should not be deleted because it reflects green corridor provisions in the Draft Urban Growth Management

Functional Plan and may be required for access management or other operational improvements.

55. Comment: Neighboring Cities and Green Corridors discussion, second to last sentence on page 1-8: "Growth of neighboring cities will ultimately affect through-travel ~~and could create a need for bypass routes.~~" The draft should not suggest bypasses are needed to provide through-travel. The plan should encourage and provide financial incentives for transit, high speed rail, and commuter rail; managing travel demand and improving the design of throughways. (Coalition for A Livable Future and STOP, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 55:** Disagree. Currently, the state highway through-routes in many of the neighboring cities travel through downtown districts. As these communities grow, congestion in these core areas can significantly impact through travel, and alternate through routes may be needed to "bypass" these districts. The "bypass" may be in the form of a new limited-access facility, or could be an alternative route that follows existing streets.

## **System-Wide Goals and Objectives**

56. Comment: Require all transportation system development to follow stringent guidelines to prevent and effectively mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts on the environment (e.g., soil erosion and sedimentation, flood plain and riparian and wetland system encroachment, storm water runoff, creation of impervious surfaces, landslides, and impacts on streams, open spaces, and wildlife habitat). (Coalition for a Livable Future, Weaver, 4/12/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 56:** Guidelines and procedures for transportation system development and construction activities, including environmental mitigation are covered by federal (NEPA), state and local laws, codes and practices. These protections are enforced in the local development review process.

57. Comment: In the introductory pages of Chapter 1, consider environmental impacts in any investment determinations or project designs. (Weaver, 4/12/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 57:** The need to consider environmental impacts in all stages of the transportation planning process is set forth in the fourth guiding principle on page 1-2, and tied to projects and construction in System Goal 4 on page 1-9.

58. Comment: Maintain multi-modal streets as much as possible. (Uchiyama, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 58:** Agree. All street designs (on pages 1-12 through 1-17), except Freeway designs, are fully multi-modal, serving motor vehicles, transit, pedestrians and bicycles.

59. Comment: Page 1-9, objectives under Goal 1 should be clarified to say that the access in each case may be qualitatively as well as quantitatively different. It is also unclear how these objectives will help resolve the conflict between access and mobility when they are competing values in the same location. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 59:** Agree with the need to clarify different levels of access. In fact, the introductory paragraph to the section on the bottom of page 1-8 states that this section will define "adequate" accessibility and mobility (among others). The RTP work program originally anticipated that performance measures and standards would be adopted as part of the Policy Component. That work will now be done as part of the system component and Chapter 1 will be updated, as necessary. Recommend adding a footnote to that effect on the bottom of page 1-9.

60. Comment: Page 1-9, Goal 1, there is no reference to future capacity needs and the definitions of accessibility and mobility are inadequate to determine if these needs are adequately addressed. Recommend further clarification of definitions for accessibility and mobility in the Glossary. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 60:** Agree. Accessibility and mobility definitions should be added to the glossary. However, adequate levels of accessibility and mobility will be addressed during the system component of the RTP. That discussion will also help define future capacity needs. Consequently, no reference to adequate capacity needs are recommended for the policy chapter.

61. Comment: Clarify of the definition of "appropriate level of mobility" on page 1-21, Goal 1. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 61:** This will be addressed as part of the system component and will involve a discussion and comparison between level of service (and resulting mobility) and system cost. It will also be integrated with discussions on "accessibility," and questions related to where and when various levels of mobility and accessibility are desirable and necessary.



62. Comment: On page 1-8, Goal 2, add an objective that states "Develop a transportation system necessary to implement planned land uses, consistent with the regional level of service standard." Additions to the existing system will be made as part of providing a cost-effective system (see page 1-17, Regional Street System Management section). As written, the objectives under Goal 2 only address the existing system. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 62:** Agree, but would revise to read "consistent with the regional level of service standards." The plural reference reflects the need for multi-modal performance standards.

63. Comment: Agree that transportation projects and programs need to enhance livability, but livability should be defined to include the livability of areas surrounding transportation improvements. Thus, recommend Objectives 1 and 2 under System Goal 3 on page 1-9 be rewritten as follows:

1. Objective: Enhance livability wWith all regional transportation projects and programs, enhance the livability of the region and the areas that surround such projects and programs.
2. Objective: Give priority to transportation projects and programs that best enhance regional and local livability.

(1000 Friends of Oregon and Coalition for a Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 63:** Disagree. The goal is intended to be broad, addressing the greater regional interest in transportation projects that sometimes outweigh local interests. An example is the Westside LRT, which serves regional transportation and land use objectives, but raised local concerns over specific alignments and corresponding land use planning.

64. Comment: Recommend that new goal include the following: "Reduce reliance on the single occupant vehicle as the principal transportation mode." Merely calling for "access by multiple modes" does not indicate the intention to encourage one mode over another. (System Goal 1, Objectives 1-3). (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 64:** No change recommended. All goals and objectives in Chapter 1 are intended to diversify travel alternatives and reduce reliance on the automobile. This issue is already addressed on page 1-36.

65. Comment: On pages 1-8 through 1-10, Systemwide Goals and Objectives section: Add a goal relating to VMT reduction. (It is currently in the TDM section on page 1-

36 and should be brought forward to this section.) (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 65:** Disagree. VMT per capita reduction strategies is appropriately addressed in the more detailed TDM section. The intent of the systemwide goals to set very broad direction that guides the more detailed sections that follow in Chapter 1.

66. Comment: Page 1-9 and 1-10, Systemwide Goals and Objectives, under Goal 1, add a new objective that speaks to regional transportation system connecting intra-regional travel. Recommended language:

5. Objective: Integrate the regional transportation system with transit services connecting the region to other areas in the state and beyond.

(AORTA and Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 66:** Agree, in part. This comment is best addressed by the recommended "Inter-regional Public Transportation" revisions (proposed in response to Comments 14 and 15).

67. Comment: Add a new objective to System Goal 2 on page 1-9 that allows surface transportation funding to be more flexible and be available for all modes. Recommended language:

4. Objective: Make surface transportation funding more flexible and available to all surface transportation modes.

(Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 67:** Disagree. Funding flexibility cannot be changed with the RTP. Instead, recommend the following text revision to page 1-9 address this issue:

System Goal 2

4. Objective: Use funding flexibility to the degree necessary to implement the adopted Regional Transportation Plan.

68. Comment: Systemwide Goals and Objectives, under Goal 2 on page 1-9, add a new objective: 8. Objective: Make transportation funding flexible and available to all transportation modes. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 68:** Disagree. Comment 67 already emphasizes the use of flexible funds to implement the adopted components of the RTP. Any further reference to funding flexibility requires extensive further discussion. As other studies address funding flexibility from a policy and need basis (e.g., RTP finance discussion, the Governor's Transportation Initiatives Program), the result may be an RTP policy revision.

69. Comment: Systemwide Goals and Objectives, under Goal 2 on page 1-9, add a new objective: 4. Objective: Develop a hierarchy of transportation management actions to be required before the capacity of regional facilities for auto travel is expanded. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 69:** This strategy of requiring management actions prior to capacity expansion has been proposed by Metro staff in conjunction with discussions on congestion levels of service. The strategy is an element of the work on the system component of the RTP. Congestion management prior to new construction is also being developed through the ISTEA mandated Congestion Management System (CMS). As those actions are developed, the policy section will be revised accordingly.

70. Comment: Systemwide Goals and Objectives, under Goal 2 on page 1-9, add a new objective: 5. Objective: Establish a set of criteria for project selection based on the full range of policies in this plan and fund projects in accordance with those selection criteria. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 70:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

71. Comment: Systemwide Goals and Objectives, under Goal 2 on page 1-9, add a new objective: 6. Objective: Link improvements in the regional transportation system with the development of supporting local transportation networks. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 71:** Disagree. Instead, add the following objective to page 1-21, Goal 4:

"4. Objective: Provide an adequate system of local and collector streets that supports the regional system."

72. Comment: Systemwide Goals and Objectives, under Goal 2 on page 1-9, add a new objective: 7. Objective: Adopt transportation system performance measures that

reflect the goals of this plan and use them to evaluate and improve transportation systems and projects. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 72:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

73. Comment: Systemwide Goals and Objectives, under Goal 4 on page 1-9, add a new objective: 1. Objective: Evaluate land use, environmental, and public health impacts in all transportation projects and analyze alternative transportation investments and programs for major transportation projects. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 73:** Disagree. These issues are already covered by other land use and environmental goals and objectives in this section.

74. Comment: Systemwide Goals and Objectives, under Goal 4 on page 1-9, Objective 2: “Prevent and effectively mitigate unavoidable adverse ~~Minimize the~~ environmental impacts associated with transportation project construction, operation and maintenance activities.” (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 74:** Disagree. These issues are already covered by other land use and environmental goals and objectives in this section.

75. Comment: Systemwide Goals and Objectives, under Goal 4 on page 1-9, add new objective: 4. Objective: Promote and design transportation systems and facilities that use energy and other resources efficiently. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 75:** Agree, in part. Revise as follows:

“4. Objective: Design transportation systems that promote efficient use of energy.”

76. Comment: Systemwide Goals and Objectives, on page 1-9, add new goal: Goal 6 - Provide government leadership by example in promoting and using alternative modes, reducing travel demand and conserving resources and the environment. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 76:** Agree in concept, but recommend adding the following language to Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Goal 6 (bottom of page 1-37):

3. Promote public sector involvement in employer based TDM programs and provide examples of successful programs.

77. Comment: Amend first sentence, on page 1-8, under Systemwide Goals and Objectives, to read "The overall goal of the RTP is to develop a safe, efficient and cost-effective transportation system that serves the region's current and future travel needs..." (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 77:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

78. Comment: Amend System Goal 1 on page 1-9 to read "Implement a transportation system that serves the region's current and future travel needs..." (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 78:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

79. Comment: Develop a methodology that weights the analysis for those factors that cannot be measured in a traditional cost/benefit analysis, but that does not overcompensate the system improvement decisions for these modes. (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 79:** Agree. TPAC's recommendation on Comment 70 created an objective under Goal 2 on page 1-9 of Chapter 1 which states:

5. Objective: Establish a set of criteria for project selection based on the full range of policies in this plan and fund projects in accordance with those selection criteria.

80. Comment: Add a definition of "intermodal" to the Chapter 1 Glossary. (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 80:** Agree. TPAC recommends the following be inserted into the Chapter 1 Glossary:

**Freight Intermodal Facility-** An intercity facility where freight is transferred between two or more modes (e.g., truck to rail, rail to ship, truck to air, etc.).

**Passenger Intermodal Facility -** The hub for various statewide, national and international passenger modes and transfer points between modes (e.g., airport, bus and train stations).

81. Comment: Re-examine the systemwide goals and objectives to measure future policy decisions impacts against the transportation needs of the agricultural industry. (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 81:** Disagree. The needs of the agricultural industry are already addressed in several sections of Chapter 1 as part of larger discussion of freight movement. More specifically, the Rural Road section on page 1-16 addresses farm-to-market travel. As part of the developing the system component of the RTP, some rural roads will be evaluated for their role in carrying urban-to-urban traffic, while urban travel will be discouraged on most rural routes.

82. Comment: Move System Goal 1, Objective 4 to the first position to assure that mobility remains the highest priority rather than access to specific areas. (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 82:** Disagree. The five system goals that appear on page 1-9 are intended to balance mobility and accessibility objectives. Adequate levels of mobility and accessibility will be addressed during the system component of the RTP update. It will also be integrated with discussions related to where and when various levels of mobility and accessibility are desirable and necessary.

83. Comment: Amend System Goal 1, Objectives 1-3 to replace "highest levels of access" with "best possible access to serve the mobility demand." (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 83:** Disagree. The intent of this goal is to define accessibility as it relates to the individual 2040 land use components and establish a priority between these land use components. The proposed revisions would eliminate this intent.

84. Comment: Amend System Goal 1, Objectives 1-3 to read "access by multiple cost-effective modes..." (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 84:** Disagree. The central theme of the state transportation planning rule (TPR) and federal ISTEA is to promote multi-modal transportation systems that provide many travel alternatives, and reduce the reliance on single modes of travel. The System Goal 1 and the objective that support the goal reflect this theme. Also, System Goal 2 specifically states "provide for a cost-effective" transportation system.

85. Comment: Add an objective to the System Goals that reads "Provide additional capacity to the transportation system in those areas of the region where quality of life is being negatively impacted by congestion." (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 85:** Disagree. The proposed language assumes that congestion is the result of insufficient capacity. The second objective

under System Goal 3 already “give(s) priority to transportation projects and programs that best enhance livability,” and therefore more broadly addresses the intent of this comment.

86. Comment: Amend System Goal 2, Objective 3 to read “Require a cost/benefit analysis ~~Consider a full range of costs and benefits~~ in the allocation of transportation funds.” (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 86:** Disagree. Current cost/benefit analysis techniques are not adequate at this time to consider the range of goals and objectives that are included in the RTP in individual funding decisions, and rely too heavily on connecting goals to financial impacts. However, Metro is working with ODOT to develop improved cost/benefit techniques that can be used in future funding allocations.

87. Comment: Add a definition of “livability” that includes specific criteria that enables the region to measure decisions that achieve System Goal 3. (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 87:** To the extent possible, performance measures will be developed during the next phase of the update that will help define this term for the purposes of the RTP. However, the term “livable” is highly subjective, and, therefore, the intent of this goal is to provide broad direction in the development of the transportation system. The 2040 Growth Concept will define livability and the RTP will incorporate that definition as it relates to transportation.

88. Comment: Include the natural environment goal in System Goal 3 to emphasize the importance of the natural environment to the region’s livability. (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 88:** Disagree. The natural environment is already discussed in System Goal 4.

89. Comment: Add a new System Goal to read “Protect the region’s economy.” Include objectives that address the need for a safe, cost-effective and efficient transportation system to assure living wage jobs in the region or incorporate the goal of protecting the economy in Goal 3 along with the natural environment goal. (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 89:** These themes are central to the 2040 Growth Concept, and therefore already are covered by System Goal 1. However, recommend including a discussion of the relationship between transportation and the economy be included in the Introduction chapter as part of the next phase of the RTP update.

90. Comment: Replace Objectives 1 and 3 under System Goal 4 with a new objective that reads "Promote transportation system improvement projects that help the region meet applicable air, water and noise quality standards." (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 90:** Disagree. The comment assumes that the system must be improved to meet environmental standards, while the objectives as written encompass both system improvements and better use of existing infrastructure.

91. Comment: Amend System Goal 4, Objective 2 to read "Balance ~~Minimize~~ the environmental impacts associated with transportation project construction, operations and maintenance activities." (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 91:** Disagree. The term "balance" is less proactive than "minimize", and therefore does not support the goal statement, which is to "protect the region's natural environment." Due to time constraints, operations of the transportation system will be discussed as part of the system component of the RTP update.

92. Comment: Add a definition and set of criteria to guide the region in assessing the environmental impacts referenced in System Goal 4, Objective 2. (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 92:** Agree. As part of the next phase of the RTP update, performance criteria for most goals and objectives will be developed for this purpose.

93. Comment: Combine Objectives 1 and 2 under System Goal 5 and change the language to read "Promote safety in the design and operation of the transportation system by reducing conflicts between modes." (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 93:** Disagree. By separating design and operating safety from modal conflicts, the current language acknowledges that many safety issues are the result of design or operating deficiencies, and not conflict between modes.

94. Comment: Delete System Goal 5, Objective 3 which states "~~Develop and implement regional safety and education programs.~~" This is best left to other agencies. (TVEDC, 6/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 94:** Disagree. The RTP is the region's transportation plan, not simply Metro's plan. Therefore agencies within the region, such as Tri-Met, must develop plans that are consistent with the RTP.



## Regional Motor Vehicle System

95. Comment: On page 1-21, Goal 1, Objective 3: Recommend modifying objective to state that the off-peak level of mobility will be higher than the peak-hour level. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 95:** Disagree. The level of service discussions occurring as part of the RTP system component will identify the appropriate "level of mobility" for both off-peak and peak hours.

96. Comment: On page 1-21, Motor Vehicle System Goals and Objectives section: Objectives under Goal 1 emphasize the need to maintain appropriate levels of mobility on principal arterials and other parts of the system during both peak and non-peak periods. However, increasing mobility is not the only objective for the region. Recommend the following changes:
1. Objective: Maintain a system of principal arterials for long distance, high speed, interstate, inter-region and intra-region travel, consistent with alternative mode objectives of surrounding land use types.
  2. Objective: Maintain an appropriate level of mobility on the motor vehicle system during periods of peak demand, consistent with alternative mode objectives of surrounding land use types.
  3. Objective: Maintain an appropriate level of mobility on the motor vehicle system during off-peak period demand, consistent with alternative mode objectives of surrounding land use types.

(1000 Friends of Oregon and Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 96:** Disagree. Alternative mode and land use consistency are clearly stated elsewhere in the policy section.

97. Comment: Amend Goal 1, Objective 2 on page 1-21 to read: "Maintain an appropriate level of mobility on the motor vehicle system during periods of peak demand, taking into account the levels of mobility required for other modes, including public transit, freight, bicycles and pedestrians. Need to think about mobility for all modes, not just cars. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 97:** Disagree. Mobility required for other modes is discussed adequately in the public transit, freight, bicycle and pedestrian mode goals and objectives. Agree philosophically that mobility needs of all modes must be considered.

## Level of Service Standards

98. Comment: On page 1-20, potential changes to level of service standards are of concern to West Linn staff and staffs of small cities. If LOS standards are relaxed region-wide, smaller jurisdictions such as West Linn with RTP projects may find that those projects are no longer of the same relative priority. It would be helpful if all existing projects were grandfathered in and thus, could not be affected by LOS standards changes, or if new LOS standards were not applied in areas where the facility is not a regional street. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 98:** Disagree. The purpose of the level of service standard is to better measure the need for capacity improvements or other strategies in lieu of capacity. Therefore, the intent of the standard is to govern all improvements made to the regional system regardless of location. Furthermore, the interim federal RTP was adopted as an interim step in the development of an updated RTP. It was the full intent upon adoption that projects from previous plans would not be "grandfathered."

99. Comment: The proposed congestion measures of performance should not be incorporated into the RTP until further technical analysis has been completed and reviewed by local jurisdictions. (EMCTC, 5/14/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 99:** Agree. The level of service standard is currently proposed as part of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and will be refined over the next several months.

100. Comment: Revised level of service standards should be included in the RTP. The standards should be revised so that motor vehicle mobility is not the primary determinant of how well transportation system is functioning and does not limit flexibility in designing streets and land uses that support the goals of 2040. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 100:** Agree. The next phase of the RTP update will focus on developing performance measures. A regional discussion on revising level of service standards is currently underway.

## Regional Public Transportation System

101. Revise Goal 4, Objective 2 on page 1-28 to read: "Continue to work with local jurisdictions to make public transportation stops and walkway approaches within one-quarter mile of stops accessible." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 101:** Agree, except for distance distinction. Revise sentence to read "...to make public transportation stops and walkway approaches accessible." The distance distinction will be addressed in the system component of the RTP update.

102. On page 1-29, add a Goal 7 with objectives that address encouraging use of public transportation. (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 102:** Agree. See TPAC recommendation on comments 117 and 118 of this exhibit.

103. Comment: In terms of growth management, high speed rail in the Willamette Valley should be considered a vital concern of this region. Recommend adding a Goal 7 to the Regional Public Transportation System Goals and Objectives on page 1-29:

Goal 7: Support regional and state efforts to maintain and expand commuter and passenger rail and bus terminals and service, especially in the I-5 and I-84 corridors.  
(City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 103:** Agree somewhat. See TPAC recommendation on Comments 14 and 15 of this exhibit.

104. Comment: We need bus shelters on "highways," "roads," "boulevards" and "streets. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 104:** Agree. Additional bus shelters are included as a Transportation Demand Management strategy in Chapter 1 of the RTP. The recommendation is to include covered bus shelters in high volume transit corridors and at major stops in regional centers, town centers and main streets.

105. Comment: South/North light rail should run along existing railroad right-of-way in southeast, through the Brooklyn yards. (Mros, undated)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 105:** Specific alignments are being considered as part of the South/North LRT Study.

106. Comment: The city could create a feeder line out of the existing trolley line to downtown Portland. (Mros, undated)

**TPAC recommendation on Comment 106:** The South/North Study will consider this and other connections to the planned LRT line.

107. Comment: South/North light rail should stay on east side of the river. One transfer to cross river on west side line is not unreasonable. (Whitcomb, 3/30/96)

**TPAC recommendation on Comment 107:** Specific alignment issues are being considered as part of the South/North LRT Study.

108. Comment: Locating the S/N light rail on the transit mall would destroy much of the mall's benefit to the city. (Wentzien, 3/30/96)

**TPAC recommendation on Comment 108:** The proposed alignment for the S/N corridor transit study in downtown Portland is on SW 5<sup>th</sup> and SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenues. While other streets were considered during earlier portions of the corridor study, it was determined by the city and downtown coordinating committee that the proposed corridor would support the land use plan for the downtown (which has been in effect for twenty years) and be consistent with development decisions that have been made. The mall recommendation has been endorsed by the South/North Steering Group, JPACT, the Metro Council and the Portland City Council.

109. Comment: Increase MAX speed to downtown Portland to make MAX more competitive with the automobile. (Slichter, 4/1/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 109:** Agree. Tri-Met continues efforts to increase the operating speed of MAX both outside of and within downtown through schedule adjustment and the addition of service. The Primary Transit Network (PTN) calls for higher operating speeds on LRT to downtown and to regional centers. Policy frequencies will be established relative to the type of transit service and the land use served.

110. Comment: Increase frequency of bus service. (Ramette, 3/30/96)

111. Comment: Address personal safety issues of bus system. (Ramette, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 110 and 111:** The first issue is addressed in the primary and secondary transit networks, which would require higher levels of bus frequencies to serve 2040 growth concept land uses. However, transit funding

to meet that service will be a key element of the system component of the RTP. The second issue is already covered in transit goals that address transit safety.

112. Comment: All bus line headways should be more frequent and service should be expanded into late night hours. (Hull, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 112:** Agree. The RTP calls for more frequent and expanded service throughout the region. The goal is to provide public transportation service to everyone within the urban area. High speed and frequent service is provided as part of the Primary Transit Network. Transit funding to meet that service will be a key element of the system component of the RTP.

113. Comment: What specific plans are there for increasing bus service? (Hull, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 113:** The RTP defines the hierarchy of transit service to serve the 2040 growth concept land uses. Specific transit frequencies, span of service and operating speeds will be defined during system development. New concepts of rapid bus and frequent bus will be implemented. This type of bus service emulates LRT service in speed, reliability and comfort.

114. Comment: Ensure that real transit options are provided to residents other than those traveling to downtown Portland. For example, consider the inclusion of "transit hoppers," small buses which ferry riders between transit centers or major transfer points, to enhance transit options between such destinations as Lake Oswego, Tigard, Tualatin and Oregon City. (Weaver, 4/12/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 114:** Agree. The transit goals and objectives promote transit connections to locations in the region other than downtown. Regional centers, town centers, main streets, neighborhoods, employment centers and industrial areas are included in the transit hierarchy.

115. Comment: Coordinate transit routes, schedules, and operating intervals to ease transfers and decrease waiting time. (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 115:** These issues relate to design of the transit systems and will be discussed as part of the system component of the RTP Update. Detailed scheduling will follow through Tri-Met's Transit Development Plan and annual service plan processes.

116. Comment: Provide a variety of transportation modes and services (e.g., light rail, commuter rail, street car, buses, vans, taxis, water taxis, jitneys, fixed route, on-demand route). (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 116:** The CAC recently adopted a recommendation to revise the transit system goals and objectives to add other transit options, such as commuter rail and inter-city bus service. Development of new transit services, such as water taxis and jitneys, is encouraged as public/private partnerships (See TDM Program Goals and Objectives, Goal 5, Objective 1).

117. Comment: The primary focus of transit goals and objectives should be on increasing ridership and share of regional trips. (AORTA, 3/30/96)
118. Comment: Design transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities to safely and conveniently accommodate all people, including the very young, elderly, people with disabilities, and people without cars (e.g., wheelchair, stroller, grocery cart space; baggage areas; lighting; security). (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 117 and 118:** The primary focus of the transit goals and objectives is to help the region implement the 2040 growth concept and to meet regional mobility, accessibility, VMT and air quality goals. The goals and objectives provide specific direction on how to serve the 2040 growth concept land uses to achieve these broad goals. Increased transit ridership is the result of providing people an efficient alternative to the auto. Preliminary analysis of the 2040 Growth Concept showed it to be the most efficient alternative to maximize regional transportation and land use objectives. However, a system-wide objective that better frames the importance of increasing the use of alternative modes and serving special access needs is appropriate. TPAC recommends the following revision:

(insert after Objective 3 of System Goal 1, on page 1-9)

4. Objective: Provide more and better transportation choices to destinations throughout the region and serve special access needs for all people, including youth, elderly and disabled.

~~4.~~ 5. Objective: Provide adequate..."

119. Comment: On pages 1-27 and 1-29, Regional Public Transportation System Goals and Objectives section: There is no goal focused on the desire to increase transit patronage over current levels. Recommend the following change:
1. Develop a public transportation system that serves 2040 Growth Concept primary land use components (central city, regional centers, industrial areas,

intermodal facilities) with an appropriate level, quality and range of public transportation necessary to substantially increase transit ridership available.

(1000 Friends of Oregon and Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

120. Comment: Amend page 1-28, Regional Public Transportation System Goals and Objectives section, Goal 2: "Develop a public transportation system to serve the 2040 Growth Concept secondary land use components (station communities, town centers, main streets, corridors) with high quality service necessary to significantly increase transit ridership." (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 119 and 120:** Disagree. Ridership levels are important indicators of system performance and will be developed as part of system design in Chapter 4. The goals and policies in Chapter 1 are designed to serve the 2040 land uses and may focus more on accessibility and mobility rather than boarding rides per hour.

121. Comment: Consider the need to continue making transit less polluting to the regional airshed and to surrounding noise levels. To realize regional transit ridership expectations, it is necessary to replace those images with more friendly ones. Recommend the following changes on page 1-29:

Goal 5 - Continue efforts to maintain public transportation as the safest and most environmentally friendly forms of motorized transportation in the region.

4. Objective: Reduce the amount of air pollutants and noise generated by public transportation vehicles.

(1000 Friends of Oregon and Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 121:** Disagree. Goal 5 should remain as written in Chapter 1 with a focus on safety. TPAC does recommend that a new Goal 7 be added to address the environmental issue. The new text should read:

**"Goal 7: Continue efforts to make public transportation an environmentally friendly form of motorized transportation."**

**"1. Objective: Continue to reduce the amount of air pollutants and noise generated by public transportation vehicles."**

122. Comment: Use innovative transit technologies to provide schedules, routes, efficient transfers, and other service information to improve access to transit, particularly among underserved groups. (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 122:** Agree. Recommend the addition of the following objective to Goal 6 of the transit section on page 1-29:

3. Objective: Explore new technologies to improve the availability of schedule, route, transfer and other service information.

123. Comment: Why is mobility not an important factor as it related to regional public transportation. The frequency and schedule of public transportation to regional activities is important if public transportation is to be encouraged and better utilized to these destinations. (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 123:** Mobility is an important factor as it relates the regional transportation system. In reference to the regional public transportation system, the Primary Transit Network (PTN) identified in Chapter 1 of the RTP is defined as a "fast and frequent service," i.e. mobile.

124. Comment: On page 1-27, Regional Public Transportation Goals and Objectives: Does linkage of core service-type to 2040 land use districts alone provide adequate flexibility for service implementation? While the core service may generally be the most appropriate for the specified land uses, other variables should also guide service implementation. Therefore, the identified core service may not be appropriate in all cases. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 124:** Core service as defined in Chapter 1 represents the policy level of service that someone could expect to see serving a given land use. It represents the most efficient level of service to serve a given land use and to implement the growth concept. This is so people will not have false expectations about the type of transit service that will be available in the future. It does represent a very broad policy base and reflects a preferred hierarchy of transit service. The system component will identify those instances when the policy network will not work or is not feasible because of other considerations. It is recognized that these other considerations can include funding, alignments, ridership levels, etc.

125. Comment: On page 1-29, Goal 5, recommend changing statement to read "...public transportation safety as the safest forms of motorized transportation in the region." It seems more appropriate to address public transportation safety as an absolute rather than relative to other forms of transportation. (Washington County, 5/17/96)



**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 125:** Disagree. The goal is to keep public transportation as the safest form of motorized travel in the region, not public transportation safety.

126. Comment: On page 1-29, recommend adding a goal or goals to address system implementation and cost-effectiveness in order to further the proposed Systemwide Goals and Objectives. To some degree, implementation priorities are addressed in the hierarchy matrix laid out in Figure 1.1 on page 1-27. Perhaps this hierarchy and a description of its priorities could be laid out in a system implementation goal objectives statements. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 126:** Disagree. Chapter 1 provides broad policy goals and objectives. Actual implementation and cost considerations will be developed as part of the system component in Chapter 4. The hierarchy matrix on page 1-27 lays out the policy levels of service based on the primary, secondary and other land use components of the 2040 Growth Concept. As such, it does establish funding priorities that will be used in the design of the preferred, strategic and constrained transit networks.

127. Comment: Transit needs to focus on cross town travel rather than just downtown. If you don't work downtown, the bus is not an option. It takes too long to travel from suburb to suburb. (Parker, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 127:** Agree somewhat. Cross town travel by transit is important and there is good evidence of a growing demand for this type of travel. However, cross town travel is not the main focus of transit, but rather is seen as an important and necessary supplement to existing and future service in order to fully implement the growth concept. This type of service will focus on travel between regional centers, town centers, employment areas intermodal facilities and neighborhoods.

128. Comment: Recommend change on page 1-24, Primary Transit Network, first paragraph, as follows: "The Primary Transit Network (PTN) is a long range...in the 2040 Growth Concept and ensures competitive travel time between all parts of the region via transit. The PTN consists of four major transit modes (e.g., Light Rail Transit (LRT), commuter rail, Regional Rapid Bus,...etc.) (AORTA, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 128:** Disagree. This section defines the Primary Transit Network and its relationship to the 2040 growth concept land use components. It is not intended to include specific performance measures such as ridership and travel times. Frequency of service and operating speeds will be

included as performance measures to implement the objectives in Chapter 1 for each transit mode. This work is currently under development and will be completed along with the system design element.

129. Comment: Recommend change on page 1-26, Secondary Transit Network, first paragraph, as follows: "The secondary transit network ensures convenient, direct local transit access between residential, commercial and employment areas and the nearest Regional Center. It includes streetcar transit, is comprised of secondary bus, ...and park-and-ride service." It is important focus first on what we want the secondary network to accomplish and then describe some of the tools, technologies or vehicles that are available to meet these needs. (AORTA, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 129:** Disagree. A regional center is not necessarily a destination for the secondary transit components. As stated under the definition on page 1-26, secondary bus service generally is designed to serve travel with one-trip end occurring within a 2040 secondary land use component such as employment center, town center, main street or corridor.

130. Comment: Recommend change on page 1-26, Other Transit Options, first paragraph, as follows: "Other transit options may become economically feasible should be utilized for serving certain destinations in the metropolitan areas connecting the region to other urban centers outside of the region. These include commuter rail along existing heavy rail lines, passenger rail connecting the region to other urban areas, and inter-city bus service that provide statewide access to the region's rail and air terminals." (AORTA, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 130:** Reference to commuter and passenger rail has been included under "Other Transit Options" in Chapter 1 of the RTP. As addressed in other comments, a lot of questions need to be researched and answered before the use of commuter rail can be made a regional policy. The RTP promotes further investigation and use of commuter rail where it is shown to be economically feasible.

131. Comment: Commuter rail should be included in the PTN. Metro policy already supports continued improvements in the Cascadia Rail Passenger Corridor and its success and those of inter-city bus improvements will make important contributions to the success of the region's growth and transportation concepts. (AORTA, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 131:** Commuter rail has been included under "Other Transit Options" in Chapter 1 of the RTP. A lot of questions need to be researched and answered before the use of commuter rail can be made a regional

policy. The RTP promotes further investigation and use of commuter rail where it is shown to be economically feasible.

132. Comment: Request a more complete definition of "high-level" passenger amenities as described on page 1-25 under light rail transit. Wouldn't rest facilities, shelters and street vendors be more in line with the notion of "high-level"? (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 132:** Agree. Change third sentence to read: "A high level of passenger amenities are provided at transit stations and station communities including schedule information, ticket machines, lighting, benches, shelters, bicycle parking and commercial services."

133. Comment: Define existing or proposed "high-frequency" Regional Rapid Bus on page 1-25. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 133:** This service would be designed to operate with 10 - 15 minute service peak and off-peak. This information will be included in Chapter 4 as part of the system design component.

134. Comment: Define and give examples of "high frequency local service" and "transit preferential treatments" under Frequent Bus section on page 1-25. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 134:** These parameters are being developed and will be included in Chapter 4 as part of the system design component. Examples of "transit preferential treatments" are described on page 1-25 in the paragraph dealing with Frequent Bus.

135. Comment: Clearly define the differences between transit modes and establish goals for each mode (i.e. LRT is a different travel mode from buses). (TVEDC, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 135:** Transit mode refers to the hierarchy of transit service types including Light Rail Transit (LRT), Regional Rapid Bus, Frequent Bus, Primary Bus, Secondary Bus, Mini-bus, etc. Each mode will serve various 2040 growth concept land use components and will operate with different frequencies and operating speeds. The operational aspects of each mode will be designed as part of the system development component and will be geared to achieve specific transit goals in Chapter 1.

## Regional Freight System

136. Comment: Consider revising Goal 1, Objective 1, Regional Freight System Goals and Objectives on page 1-30 to read: "Include the movement of freight when conducting multimodal transportation studies, when appropriate." Multimodal transportation studies may occur in residential areas, for example, the City's current Lake Road Area Multimodal Connections Plan, where freight routes do not exist. Therefore, freight movements may not be appropriate to be included in all multimodal studies. (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 136:** Agree. However, recommend the following wording "Consider the movement of freight when conducting multimodal transportation studies, as identified in the RTP or local TSPs." The objective would only apply when a system-level study includes designated freight, mainlines, connectors or terminals or impacts a freight generation area. Those components will be updated during the system component of the RTP update and should be considered in local TSPs.

137. Comment: Define what "high quality access" means in Goal 2, Objective 1 on page 1-30: "Provide high-quality access between freight transportation corridors and the region's intermodal facilities and industrial sanctuaries." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 137:** Disagree. The principle of promoting "high quality" access is appropriate. This statement is simply a guide to development of the freight system. The IMS, when complete, will define "high quality" access based on identified performance measures and standards.

138. Comment: Define what "flexible public funding" means in Goal 3, Objective 3 on page 1-31: "Encourage efforts to provide flexible public funding for freight mobility investments." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 138:** "Flexible public funding" attempts to recognize that the best public investment in the freight system may not always result in traditional road projects. For example, separated rail crossings may benefit both truck and rail. However, funding flexibility cannot be changed with the RTP. A full discussion as to the benefits of such flexible funding will occur during the system component of the RTP update.

139. Comment: There appear to be multiple unrelated objectives in Goal 1, Objective 4 on page 1-30. Implementation of TSM improvements to enhance efficiency of the existing infrastructure is redundant with Regional Street System Management Goal

1 on pages 1-18 and 1-19. The remainder of this objective implies that freight mobility should be given priority over all other transportation modes and land use policies. Recommend deleting Goal 1, Objective 4 on page 1-30. Replace, if desired, with an objective encouraging land use policies that promote the preservation of industrial lands. (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 139:** Regarding the redundancy of TSM, agree, and recommend striking the first piece of Objective 4, "Implement TSM improvements that enhance the efficiency of the existing infrastructure." However, recommend adding a bullet to Goal 1, Objective 1 on page 1-19 that states:

- Freight Operation (such as weigh-in-motion, automated truck counts, enhanced signal timing on freight connectors)

Regarding the "priority" aspect, recommend retaining first bullet. The intent is that as density increases, public policies should be pro-active in anticipating conflicts. However, TPAC recommend changing second bullet in Goal 1, Objective 4 in Regional Freight System Goals and Objectives to read: "transportation and/or land use policies that reduce accessibility to terminal facilities or reduces the efficiency of the freight system result in lower speeds or less service on the freight network."

Note: Both terminal accessibility and system efficiency will be defined in the system component of the RTP update by using new IMS freight measures and standards.

140. Comment: On page 1-31, Goal 4, it could be added that one objective of the freight movement system would be to encourage through traffic to utilize interstate highways when possible. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 140:** Disagree. Though use of interstate routes by freight traffic may reduce safety conflicts on connector or local routes, freight movement safety issues would remain on the interstate system. Policies proposed in Goal 4 address safety issues on the interstate system.

141. Comment: Reconsider Goal 3, Regional Freight System Goals and Objectives on page 1-31. Consider policy that dedicates some investments to the exclusive use of freight or provide preferential treatment to freight a particular congestion "choke points" that would allow freight to move more freely through intersections that are frequently clogged with automobile traffic. Recommend addition of another bullet under Goal 3, Objective 4:

- Where appropriate, consider improvements that are dedicated to freight travel only.

(1000 Friends of Oregon and Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 141:** Agree, however recommend including this new policy regarding improvements dedicated to freight travel only in Goal 1 as another technique to provide efficient, cost-effective and safe movement of freight.

142. Comment: On page 1-31, Regional Freight section, Goal 3, delete Objective 3: “3. **Objective:** Encourage efforts to provide flexible public funding for freight mobility investments.” See recommendation for new Objective 6, Systemwide Goal 2 calling for flexible funding for all modes. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 142:** Disagree. As currently written, the objective is intended to encourage flexibility in funding through public and private partnerships in addition to flexible funding between modes.

### **Regional Bicycle System**

143. Comment: Revise title on page 1-32 to read: “Regional Bicycle Bikeways System.” (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 143:** Disagree. See TPAC recommendation for Comment 19 of this exhibit.

144. Comment: Revise Goal 4, Objective 4 on page 1-33 to read: “Identify and improve high-frequency...accident locations, as appropriate.” (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 144:** Disagree. All high frequency accident locations should identified and improved. Recommend further elaboration of this language in Chapter 4 of the RTP during the system component update.

Add a reference to bikes in the following sections:

145. Comment: Page 1-12, second bullet, “*Boulevards* that serve major...and emphasize transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel...” ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 4/29/96)
146. Comment: Page 1-12, third bullet, “*Streets* that serve transit corridors...and provide easy pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel.” ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 4/29/96)
147. Page 1-13, “*Boulevards* are designed with special amenities that promote pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel...” ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 4/29/96)

148. Comment: Page 1-13, "As such, these facilities may benefit from access management, traffic calming...that reinforce pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel." ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 4/29/96)
149. Comment: Page 1-14, first sentence under Streets section, "Streets are designed with amenities that promote pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel..." ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 4/29/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 145-149:** Agree. Make revisions as requested. The bicycle is an important component in the region's strategy to provide a multi-modal transportation system. One way the region's quality of life can be maintained is by increased reliance on the bicycle for shorter distance trips.

150. Comment: Page 1-13, under Regional Boulevards, strike language - "These facilities have striped ~~or shared~~ bikeways." ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 4/29/96)

Shared bikeways are not appropriate on moderate speed, high volume facilities. ODOT design guidelines call for striped bike lanes when ADTs are above 3,000 vehicles per day. Sharing is a possible strategy when facilities are designed for or operated at low speeds (<20 mph). Therefore, strike the reference to shared bikeways unless there are clear guidelines in the RTP as to their proper use.

151. Comment: Page 1-15, under Regional Streets section, strike reference to shared bikeways for reasons stated in Comment 150, above. "These facilities have striped ~~or shared~~ bikeways." ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 4/29/96)
152. Comment: Page 1-15, under Community Streets section, strike reference to shared bikeways for reasons stated in Comment 150, above. "These facilities have striped ~~or shared~~ bikeways." ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 4/29/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 150-152:** Agree that bikeway design guidelines in the RTP should be more clear. Bikeway design, along with regional street design, will be discussed in more specific detail in Chapter 4 in the RTP. On moderate speed, high volume facilities, bike lanes are preferred, but wide outside lanes may be the appropriate design treatment under certain conditions on some retrofit projects. Appropriate design guidelines from both the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the City of Portland Bicycle Master Plan that may be incorporated into Chapter 4 of the RTP are described below.

Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan planning principles (pages 52 and 53) state that bike lanes are the appropriate urban bikeway design for arterials and major

collectors. The Plan further states that on retrofit projects, where it is not physically possible to provide bike lanes due to constraints such as existing buildings or environmentally sensitive areas, a wide outside lane may be substituted.

The City of Portland Bicycle Master Plan (page A2) states that wide outside lanes may be provided on neighborhood collector and higher classifications where it is not possible to eliminate motor vehicle lanes or reduce lane widths, where topographical constraints exist, or where parking is essential to serve adjacent land uses or to improve the character of the pedestrian environment. Also, construction of a parallel bikeway within one-quarter mile is an acceptable alternative where the above constraints exist, as long as the parallel bikeway provides an equally convenient route to local destinations.

Recommend changing the wording on pages 1-13, under Regional Boulevards, and 1-15, under Regional Streets and Community Streets, to read:

"These facilities have striped bike lanes, or wide outside lanes where bike lanes are not physically possible, or are shared roadways bikeways where motor vehicle speeds are low.

153. Comment: Add more bike lanes on bridges. (Stern, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 153:** Agree. River crossings without appropriate bicycle facilities are a barrier to bicyclists. This issue relates to design of the bicycle systems and will be discussed as part of the system component of the RTP Update.

154. Comment: Mixing motorized and non-motorized vehicles will not work. Consider designating bike zones in areas where this mode would work and seems to be prevalent. Also consider dedicated bike streets, dedicated bike hours and enforcement of traffic rules. (Moss, 3/21/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 154:** Disagree. Bicycles are legally classified as vehicles and are ridden on most public roads in Oregon, with the exception of some freeways in the Portland metropolitan area. To better separate modes, the regional bikeway network includes a number of design treatments, including striped bike lanes, bicycle boulevards and wide outside lanes. Separate bicycle/pedestrian paths (multi-use paths) constitute a layer of the regional bikeway network. However, they are rarely completely separate because of the need to cross intersections and driveways. Dedicated bicycle streets and bicycle hours would limit accessibility. Agree that traffic rules should be enforced, both for motorized and non-motorized modes.



155. Comment: An increase in bike trips should not be promoted because: there is no incentive for bicyclists to obey the law, bicyclists do not have fiscal liability when they cause accidents, bicyclists do not pay for their use and upkeep of bikeways, roads or streets, bicycles are not useful when shopping, many disabilities and infirmities cannot be accommodated on a bicycle, bicycles are dangerous in rainy weather or at night, bicycles do not accommodate taking friends out or wearing certain apparel and bicycles cause congestion because they cannot keep up with the speed of traffic. (Tamura, 3/21/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 155:** Disagree. Bicycles have been shown to be a viable alternative the automobile and can capture a significant number of trips in certain areas or corridors. Bicycles are legally classified as vehicles and bicyclists have a responsibility to obey traffic rules. Traffic rules should be enforced for bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists. Many bicyclists own cars, and pay the same fees and gas taxes of other motorists. Bicycles can be and are used for some shopping trips. There are existing examples of bicycles designed to accommodate people with disabilities. Implementation of bicycle safety, enforcement and encouragement goals and objectives in RTP Chapter 1 will provide information on bicycling in the rain and at night. The regional bikeway network includes design treatments such as bike lanes and multi-use paths which do not require the bicyclist to keep up with the speed of traffic.

156. Comment: Encouraging bicyclists and motorists to share the road safely may be hazardous to bicyclists' health as well as joggers and walkers because of the noise and air pollution created by motor vehicles. (Saunders, 4/8/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 156:** From a technical standpoint, general traffic noise does not pose a health hazard for bicyclists, pedestrians or joggers. Traffic noise is below federal standards and localized carbon monoxide violations have been eliminated in the Metro region. The latter is due to cleaner cars and the fact that people are choosing to bike, walk, carpool and use public transportation.

157. Comment: Complete well-developed networks of bicycle ways connecting all parts of communities and the region. (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 157:** Agree. The RTP system component will focus on bicycle and pedestrian connections of regional interest. Local TSPs will include the regional systems as well as bicycle and pedestrian connections to local destinations, such as grade schools and parks.

158. Comment: Provide bicycle access to all schools. (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 158:** The RTP focuses on bicycle and pedestrian connections of regional interest. Local TSPs will include the regional systems as well as bicycle and pedestrian connections to local destinations, such as grade schools and parks.

159. Comment: Safety should be considered above all else as increased bicycle trips are encouraged, even if it means installing low barriers similar to (but higher than) those installed along the south side of Farmington Road in Aloha. Bikes and autos should be separated for safety. (Kinzle, 3/24/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 159:** Agree that safety is important, along with encouraging more bicycle trips and providing a continuous bikeway network. Disagree that bikes and autos should be separated, because complete separation is not feasible. The regional bikeway network includes a mix of shared roadways on streets with low speeds or low traffic volumes, bike lanes that designate a portion of the roadway for preferential use by bicyclists, and multi-use paths that are separated from motor vehicle traffic by an open space or barrier. Multi-use paths are also used by pedestrians, joggers and skaters. Multi-use paths are only completely separate for short distances because of the need to cross intersections and driveways.

The example of low barriers (also known as extruded curbs) along the south side of Farmington Road in the Aloha area has proven to be a poor design practice, because either the motor vehicle or the bicycle may hit the curb and lose control, with the motor vehicle crossing onto the bikeway or the cyclist falling onto the roadway. Rumble strips to alert motorists when they are wandering off the travel lane are an alternative to extruded curbs. Another design concept is raised bike lanes, which incorporate the convenience of riding on the street with the psychological separation of a barrier.

160. Comment: On page 1-32, Goal 1, one objective could be added that would provide for connectivity between major activity centers. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 160:** Disagree. Goal 2, Objective 1 addresses connectivity between activity centers as identified in the 2040 Growth Concept.

161. Comment: On page 1-32, Goal 2, one objective could be to encourage and facilitate the use of bicycles as a viable and practical commute mode. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 161:** Disagree. Goal 2, Objective 2, "Promote increased bicycle use for all travel purposes," addresses this comment.

162. Comment: On page 1-33, Goal 4, add an objective that all bicycle lanes and bicycle routes be appropriately signed and marked so as to give the bicyclist a sense of comfort when using these facilities. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 162:** Disagree. Goal 3, Objective 2, "Ensure that jurisdictions implement bikeways in accordance with established design standards," addresses this comment.

163. Comment: On page 1-32, Goal 4, Objective 3, recommend an absolute reduction of accidents should not be the desired outcome. The number of accidents might be normalized (e.g., accidents per mile, per trip, etc.) to achieve relative improvement. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 163:** Agree. At the May 7th CAC meeting, this objective was edited to read: "Reduce the rate number of bicycle accidents in the region.

164. Comment: There should be bicycle taxes for bicycle uses, bicyclists should be required to be licensed and insured and there should be enforcement of bicyclists who do not follow traffic rules. (Parker, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 164:** Disagree. Chapter 1 of the RTP is not the appropriate forum for assessing fees. This issue may be included as part of the next phase of the RTP update, when system finance is addressed.

165. Comment: Bike routes should be placed on parallel streets not arterials. (Parker, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 165:** Disagree. Bicycles are legally classified as vehicles and are ridden on most public roads in Oregon, with the exception of some freeways in the Portland metropolitan area. Routing bicyclists away from arterial streets will be addressed in the regional street design study.

166. Comment: Recommend further consideration of the potential conflict between requiring bike lanes and diminishing the pedestrian environment. Required bike lanes either necessitate street widening or the elimination of on-street parking, which are inconsistent in many locations with the need to preserve on-street parking or maintain narrow streets to foster a safe, convenient and pleasant pedestrian environment. (Whitlow, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 166:** Agree. Further consideration of bikeway design, along with regional street design, will be discussed in more specific detail in Chapter 4. Balancing bicycle mode needs with pedestrian and on-street parking needs will be a challenging task.

167. Comment: Add an Objective 5 to Goal 2 of the Regional Bicycle System on page 1-32:

5. Objective: Encourage mass transit authority to ensure adequate bicycle carrying capacity on all bus and LRT routes and during all hours of operation.

(City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 167:** Disagree. This change is not necessary, because work is currently in progress at Tri-Met to expand bike-on-transit carrying capacity. The addition of Westside MAX will add more light rail vehicles to the system. As peak-hour over-crowding diminishes, the peak direction restriction on carrying bikes may be reduced. Current carrying capacity on all buses is two bikes during all hours of operation. With new low-floor buses it may be possible to allow bikes inside the bus. Also, Tri-Met is upgrading to a "sports work" bike rack on buses that is simpler to use.

## **Regional Pedestrian Program**

168. Comment: In reference to the title, "Regional Pedestrian Program," on page 1-33: Request clarification on why is this a program and not a plan or a system? (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

169. Comment: Recommend changing "Pedestrian Program" to "Pedestrian System." The pedestrian network is a system, not just a program to be applied in selected places. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 168 and 169:** Agree. Revise to read "Pedestrian Program System".

170. Comment: Replace pedestrian with walkway in first sentence of first paragraph and last sentence of second paragraph on Page 1-33. See adopted Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for terminology. (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 170:** Disagree. The pedestrian system is comprised of more than just walkways. The pedestrian system also includes such

amenities as street lighting, curb extensions, benches, landscaping and street crossings.

171. Comment: Revise Goal 1, Objective 2 on page 1-34 to read: "Improve pedestrian walkway networks serving those transit centers, stations and stops with high frequency transit service." (City of Milwaukee, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 171:** Agree. Make revisions as requested.

172. Comment: On page 1-34, Pedestrian Program section, Goal 1, Objective 2: "Improve pedestrian networks serving those transit centers, stations and stops with high frequency transit service." (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

173. Comment: Amend page 1-34, Regional Pedestrian Program section, Goal 2, Objective 1: "Complete pedestrian facilities ... and to the region's primary transit network." (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 172 and 173:** Agree. Make revisions as requested.

174. Comment: Build new pedestrian and bicycle bridge north of Broadway Bridge. (Lent, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 174:** A county-sponsored bridge study recommended improving existing bridges. The system component phase of the RTP update will evaluate other system gaps.

175. Comment: Beeping pedestrian signals are needed at intersections to allow the blind to cross the street safely. (Edwards, 3/21/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 175:** This sort of specialized crossing equipment is best implemented at the local level as they usually apply to special local situations. This comment will be forwarded to the local jurisdictions.

176. Comment: Curbs need to be fixed so people in wheelchairs can get around. (Edwards, 3/21/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 176:** Agree. The need for installation of curb ramps is identified in Goal 2, Objective 1 of the Pedestrian element. Also, Goal 4 of the transit policies addresses accessibility for the disabled. Curb ramps are appropriate in every sidewalk design and a significant region-wide need exists to

retrofit existing sidewalks to this basic standard. For this reason, curb ramps have been identified as a regional issue.

177. Comment: Pedestrians improvements are needed, particularly crosswalks to allow people to access bus stops safely. (Enroth, 3/25/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 177:** Agree. Goal 1 of the Pedestrian element identifies this need as well as several sections of the street design concepts.

178. Comment: Complete well-developed networks of pedestrian ways connecting all parts of communities and the region. (Coalition for a Livable Future)
179. Comment: Provide pedestrian access to all schools. (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 178-179:** The RTP focuses on bicycle and pedestrian connections of regional interest. Local TSPs will include the regional systems as well as bicycle and pedestrian connections to local destinations, such as grade schools and parks.

180. Comment: Recommend moving Goal 4, Regional Pedestrian Program, on page 1-34 to the Motor Vehicle system Goals and Objectives. It should not be incumbent upon the pedestrian program to "encourage motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians to share the road safely." It will be the education of motorists that will have the greatest impact, not only on pedestrian fatalities and injuries, but on making pedestrians feel they can safely step out to cross the road. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 180:** Disagree. The concept of "sharing the road" is repeated in most of the modal sections in Chapter 1.

181. Comment: What is the purpose of landscaping and wide planting strips that create a buffer for pedestrians between the curb and the sidewalk? The most pedestrian friendly environment in the region (downtown Portland) does not have these improvements. Why add these costs throughout the region when experience indicates that they are not necessary for creating pedestrian friendly environments? (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 181:** The existence of a planting or landscaping strip between the curb and sidewalk greatly enhances the pedestrian environment. For example, the planting strip helps buffer pedestrians from moving traffic, provides space for street trees and other landscaping (to make the street space more aesthetically pleasing), and provides a place to put sign posts, utility and signal poles, etc., where they will not interfere with pedestrian movement. A

planting strip also allows sidewalks crossing a driveway to be kept at a constant side slope, making it easier for those in wheelchairs to move down the sidewalk. In built-up commercial areas oriented to the street, such as downtown Portland, the extra width of the sidewalk performs these same functions while allowing for unobstructed pedestrian movement. Transit stops and station platforms and commercial streets with on-street parking also need hard surfaced areas at the curb where people will be entering and exiting transit vehicles and automobiles. ODOT's 1995 *Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan* encourages the use of planting strips in street design and contains more information on their benefits and suggested design.

182. Comment: Assumptions that underlie the demand for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure should be clarified. For example, is there data to support the assumption that if the region builds infrastructure, usage will increase significantly. (TVEDC, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 182:** Agree. TPAC has recommended new language which clarifies the assumptions underlying the demand and need for bicycle infrastructure on a regional basis. The new language includes a recognition that additional research is needed to determine (1) how bicycle travel can help implement the 2040 growth concept and (2) which aspects of the bicycle system are regional in nature. (See TPAC recommendation on Comment 17.)

183. Comment: How do we get from bike/pedestrian mode levels of today to what is envisioned? (TVEDC, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 183:** The regional bicycle and pedestrian systems are an important component in the region's strategy to provide a multi-modal transportation system. The implementation of the regional bicycle and pedestrian plan elements of the RTP will provide for consistently designed, safe and convenient routes for bicycle and pedestrian travel throughout the region, and will encourage motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists to share the road safely. However, while Chapter 1 sets a vision for how the bicycle system will function, it does not set specific "targets" for mode shares. These targets will be developed as part of the system component of the RTP.

## **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program**

184. Revise Goal 1, Objective 2 on page 1-36 to read: "Develop and encourage local access to Tri-Met's regional carpool matching database." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 184:** Agree. Make revision as requested.

185. Revise Goal 4, Objective 2 on page 1-37 to read: "Provide TDM materials that outline available regional programs and services to the public and to all local jurisdictions in the region." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 185:** Agree. Make revision as requested, except eliminate the word "all." Some local jurisdictions will be the providers of this information, not just Metro and Tri-Met.

186. Comment: If ATMS involves congestion pricing, carefully study the impact of such a program on low-income individuals and families who may be severely impacted. (Weaver, 4/12/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 186:** ATMS does not involve congestion pricing. However, over the next two years, Metro will conduct a two-phase pre-project congestion pricing study, which may include strategies, including a demonstration project, for adoption in the RTP. The overall goals of the pre-project study are to: (1) develop a process for gaining public and political understanding of congestion pricing; (2) provide for a comprehensive evaluation of congestion pricing alternatives to determine costs and benefits; and (3) design appropriate measures to mitigate any unintended socioeconomic and/or environmental impacts that arise, including negative impacts on neighborhoods and businesses, and economic impacts on lower income drivers.

187. Comment: Congestion pricing should be implemented. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 187:** Although congestion pricing has been recommended by transportation economists for many years, it has not been used extensively enough on public roads anywhere in the world to answer questions as to its technical and political feasibility for reducing congestion. As noted, Metro will conduct a two-year pre-project congestion pricing study to help answer these important questions.

188. Comment: Toll roads and other user fees should go toward all impact costs, current and future, of operating a motor vehicle. (Duell, 3/21/96)

189. Comment: The only place that should be able to charge a toll would be downtown. The charge should be based on the number tires on a vehicle. (Parker, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 188 and 189:** The concept of charging drivers their true cost of driving will be studied in conjunction with Metro's two-year pre-project study of congestion pricing. This study will identify how and where charges



should be used if it is determined they are feasible in the Portland region. (See Comments 186 and 187.)

190. Comment: Increase tax on gasoline to discourage driving and encourage use of public transportation. (Uchiyama, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 190:** Past Metro analyses of price elasticity of gasoline have estimated that the gas tax would have to be raised by approximately \$4 to significantly discourage driving (a reduction of approximately 12%). The region is more inclined to first examine congestion pricing together with improvements to and incentives for use of alternative modes.

191. Comment: The Regional Transportation Plan includes nothing about economics and who should pay for changes. System development and permit charges for buildings should cover the net costs of their construction and future use, including traffic and pollution generated and the need for more schools. (Duell, 3/21/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 191:** All reference to financial impacts and cost of the transportation system will be included in Chapter 7 of the RTP as part of the system component of the RTP update. Metro's intent is to have that discussion with the public and decision-makers.

192. Comment: Discourage subsidies that favor auto over other forms of transportation (e.g., parking allowances without equivalent subsidies for transit, walking, bicycling). (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 192:** The CAC discussed the issue of automobile subsidies and recommended the following language in Goal 2, Objective 2 of the TDM Program Goals and Objectives: "Support efforts to provide maximum allowable tax benefits and subsidies to users of alternative modes of transportation."

193. Comment: Provide incentives for development and use of innovative materials - and energy efficient transportation systems (e.g., alternative fuels and electric buses and fleets, energy efficient and light weight vehicles). (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 193:** Agree. During the system component of the RTP Update process, the TDM Program will identify options and strategies for increased use of alternative fuel and energy efficient vehicles.

194. Comment: On page 1-36, Goal 3: Providing incentives to help achieve 2040 goals is a good idea. However, it seems appropriate to focus mostly on transportation-related

incentives in the RTP. Things like density bonuses and design guidelines might be better placed in the RFP. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 194:** Disagree. This particular goal and three objectives were discussed at lengths by the TDM subcommittee. The subcommittee agreed that it is important to include incentives that will help change travel behavior and that help implement the 2040 growth concept and comply with specific elements of the Transportation Planning Rule. The TDM element of Chapter 1 seemed to be an appropriate place to include some design incentives to promote more compact development, reduce trip lengths and promote alternative modes.

195. Comment: On page 1-37, Goal 3, Objective 2: Replace "...reduce the average..." with "...provide lower than average..." (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 195:** Agree. Make revisions as requested.

196. Comment: Reminder that LCD will later this year re-evaluate the continued utilization of VMTs as a standard in achieving reduced reliance on the automobile and the TPR requirements for a reduction in the number of parking spaces per capita. Related Chapter 1 policy should be weighed accordingly. (Whitlow, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 196:** Agree. Policies have been written in a broad sense to be flexible if changes like this occur.

197. Comment: Amend page 1-35, Demand Management Program section, last paragraph, first sentence: "The following describes the region's TDM program goals, and objectives and performance measures." (This draft did not include the performance measures.) (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 197:** Agree. Delete "and performance measures" from page 1-35. Performance measures will be developed in conjunction with the system design component.

198. Comment: Amend page 1-36, TDM Goals and Objectives, first paragraph: "The function of TDM support programs are to...non-SOV modes, and (4) reduce the need and demand to travel." (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 198:** Agree. Eliminate the word and just prior to (3) and add a fourth reason to read: and (4) reduce travel demand.

199. Comment: Amend page 1-36, Goal 2, Objective 2: “Support efforts to provide maximum...alternative modes of transportation and to reduce subsidies for auto use. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 199:** Disagree. Objective 2 is intended to provide benefits and subsidies as incentives to use alternative modes. Reducing auto subsidies is covered under objective 1 and objective 3.

200. Comment: Amend page 1-36, Goal 2, Objective 3: “Conduct further study of market-based strategies...increase alternative mode shares and to reduce VMT, and encourage more efficient use of resources. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 200:** Agree. Change Objective 3 to read: “Conduct further study of market-based strategies such as parking pricing, congestion pricing and parking-cash out as measures to promote more compact land use development, increase alternative modes shares, reduce VMT and encourage more efficient use of resources.

201. Comment: Amend page 1-36, Goal 2, Objective 4: “Investigate the use of HOV lanes and other traffic management measures to reduce roadway congestion, and to reduce impacts of congestion on transit operations. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 201:** Disagree. The objective as written encompasses the same idea. Any time congestion is reduced on roadways, transit benefits because buses use the same roads.

202. Comment: On page 1-36, Goal 2, add new objective 5: 5. Objective: Ensure measures adopted are equitable and incorporate adjustments to ensure all residents can meet their basic transportation needs. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 202:** Disagree. Goal 2 is designed to meet the TPR requirements for VMT and parking per capita reduction goals, not ensure basic transportation needs are met.

203. Comment: Amend page 1-37, Goal 5: “Implement TDM support programs to reduce the need and the demand to travel and to make it more convenient for people to use alternative modes for all trips throughout the region.” (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 203:** Agree. Change Goal 5 to read: “Implement TDM support programs to reduce the need to travel, and to make it

more convenient for people to use alternative modes for all trips throughout the region."

204. Comment: Define the term "parking cash-out" as used in TDM Goal 2, Objective 3 on page 1-36 and explain how the measures described in that objective promote "compact land use." (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 204:** "Parking cash-out" refers to a strategy where the market value of a parking space is offered to an employee by the employer. The employee can either spend the money for the parking space, or pocket it and then use an alternative mode to travel to work. Measures such as parking-cash out, congestion pricing and parking pricing provide disincentives for commuting by single-occupant auto and instead, promote travel by alternative modes. In some cases, people may move closer to work to reduce commuting costs, thus reducing trip length, increasing densities and improving the jobs-housing balance.

205. Comment: Define "HOV" as used in TDM Goal 2, Objective 4, on page 1-36. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 205:** The term "HOV" is an acronym for "high occupancy vehicle." It refers to vehicles that are carrying two or more persons. In practice, only vehicles with two or three or more persons would be able to use a designated "HOV" lane to travel.

206. Comment: Explain "density bonus" as used on page 1-37, TDM Goal 3, Objective 1. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 206:** As used in Goal 3, Objective 1, "density bonus" refers to allowing developers to build at higher densities than stated in the local zoning code. This more compact development would be promoted in key 2040 land use components such as central city, regional centers, town centers and station communities.

207. Comment: Consider changing the word "telecommute" to "telecommuting" in TDM Goal 5, Objective 5 on page 1-37. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 207:** Agree. Make revision as requested.

208. Comment: Amend TDM Goal 6, Objective 1 on page 1-37 to read "Encourage Expand Tri-Met's to expand their public outreach and education program." Metro

does not have the jurisdiction to expand Tri-Met's programs. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 208:** The CAC recommended deleting this objective in their May 23, 1996 CAC Addendum to Chapter 1 revisions because the objective duplicates the public involvement policies already in place. TPAC agrees with their recommendation.

## **Parking Management Program**

209. Comment: A draft Goal section was discussed at April 25 TPAC, with agreement to add an additional goal. Add a goal to the Parking Management section on page 1-38:

Goal 1: Manage and optimize the efficient use of public and commercial parking in the central city, regional centers, town centers and main streets to support 2040/Framework Plan goals and the related goals of this section.

1. Objective: Support local adoption of public parking management plans within the central city, regional centers, town centers and main streets. (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 209:** Agree if the word "employment centers" is included in the goal and objective after the word "main streets."

210. Comment: On-street parking should be provided for all collectors and arterials, roads, boulevards and streets. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 210:** Disagree. While regional parking policies included in Phase I of the Regional Framework Plan support on-street parking in areas planned for increased densities (e.g., regional centers, town centers and main streets), some right-of-way limitations exist where on-street parking cannot be provided. Further, some designs, such as roads are not appropriate for on-street parking. The regional street design map, to be developed as part of the RTP system component, will identify streets most appropriate for on-street parking.

211. Comment: Where do churches fit in with respect to the parking policies currently being developed by Metro? (Funk, 3/22/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 211:** Regional parking policies currently being considered in Phase 2 of Metro's Regional Framework Plan will require local governments to meet the following minimum standards with regard to churches in the region:

- require no more than 0.5 parking spaces per spaces/seats in the church;
- establish a parking maximum at ratios no greater than 0.6 parking spaces per spaces/seat in the church located in Zone A and 0.8 parking spaces per spaces/ seat in churches in the rest of the region.

Zone A refers to areas with good pedestrian access to commercial or employment areas (within 1/3 mile walk) from adjacent residential areas. For all areas outside of Zone A, Zone B parking ratios apply.

212. Comment: Parking standards should be designed to provide adequate parking for 80% of the shoppers, rather than 80% of the time. This could be addressed using parking garages. (Linn, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendations on Comment 212:** Parking standards for retail are currently designed to accommodate 85 percent of the shoppers plus an additional 5 to 10 percent. The draft framework plan's parking ratios are designed to eliminate the peak period parking demand excess. Regional parking policies included in Phase I of the draft framework plan support the idea of parking garages/structures where economically feasible. Less land is consumed for a given amount of parking. Parking policies that promote more compact development such as shared parking and preferential parking are being promoted in the RTP.

213. Comment: Less parking is needed in areas served by Tri-met. (Edwards, 3/21/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 213:** Agree. The regional parking policy included in Phase I of the Regional Framework Plan states, "In areas where transit is provided or other non-auto modes (walking, biking) are convenient, less parking can be provided and still allow accessibility and mobility for all modes, including autos."

214. Comment: Recommend an inverse price structure for parking in Fareless Square. (Parker, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 214:** Disagree. The current price structure for downtown has been a positive force in shaping travel demand to the downtown and for increasing the use of alternative modes and transit. Reduced parking fees would tend to lessen transit ridership and just promote more auto travel. This is not what we want.

## Land Use Issues

215. Comment: Require commercial/retail/office buildings, etc. to have lush landscaping. (Clark, 4/3/96).

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 215:** Landscape requirements are addressed in local zoning codes.

216. Comment: Do not restrict superstores in industrial areas, rather put them in the most efficient location. (Linn, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 216:** The issue of retail superstores will be addressed in local comprehensive plans and zoning maps, which will be updated over the next few years to meet consistency requirements with Metro's framework plan when adopted. The draft Urban Growth Management Functional Plan prohibits "big box" retail in industrial areas and allows local jurisdictions to identify employment areas that are not appropriate for this type of retail. These policies reflect the need to (1) preserve industrial land for industrial uses, (2) direct commercial activity to regional and town centers, and (3) reduce vehicle miles traveled by locating shopping opportunities closer to where people live.

### **Local Issues**

217. Comment: Unimproved side streets in SE Portland need attention. (Frimoth, 4/6/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 217:** This issue is within the jurisdiction of the City of Portland, and will be referred to them for their consideration.

218. Comment: Schools should be located near green space areas so they can share parking facilities. (Hocker, 4/4/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 218:** This issue is within the jurisdiction of the City of Tigard, and will be referred to them for their consideration.

### **Other Issues To Be Address in the System Component of RTP Update**

219. Comment: No Sunrise Corridor. (Lent, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 219:** Proposed projects will be addressed during the System Component phase of the Regional Transportation Plan update.

220. Comment: Consider plans for improving the location of rural roads in the Tualatin Valley. (Hostetter, 4/4/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 220:** The regional policy in rural reserves is to protect rural activities by mitigating the impacts of adjacent urban activities, including discouraging urban traffic on rural roads. This comment will be addressed during the System Component phase of the Regional Transportation Plan update.

221. Comment: Consider planning for the location of a future four or six-lane highway connecting Tigard and Sherwood to Hillsboro and the Sunset Highway. (Hostetter, 4/4/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 221:** The Western Bypass Study concluded that a four-lane express type facility is warranted between Tualatin and Sherwood, along with other arterial improvements in south-central Washington County. The study also recognized the need for an additional lane in each direction on Highway 217. A new road from Sherwood to Hillsboro was not recommended.

222. Comment: Without major freeway improvements to Highway 217, I-5/217 Interchange and the western bypass, well connected roads and a funded transit system, Washington County cannot accommodate the population growth projected by Metro. (Johnson, 4/4/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 222:** This comment will be addressed during the System Component phase of the Regional Transportation Plan update.

223. Comment: Never widen roads or build new freeways. New capacity must only be offered through public transit. New development needs to minimize paved auto access routes. (Cole, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 223:** This comment will be addressed during the System Component phase of the Regional Transportation Plan update.

224. Comment: Close the Sellwood and Hawthorne Bridges to vehicles (just for pedestrians and bicycles) and build new vehicle bridges. (Lent, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 224:** This comment will be addressed during the System Component phase of the Regional Transportation Plan update.

225. Comment: Alternate (parallel) route on Wiegnot instead of Sandy from 99<sup>th</sup> to 115<sup>th</sup> in the Parkrose district. (Paproke, 4/1/96)



**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 225:** This comment will be addressed during the System Component phase of the Regional Transportation Plan update.

226. Comment: Use public transportation investments to leverage private sector investments that support the Region 2040 urban growth concept. (Coalition for a Livable Future)
227. Comment: Encourage cooperative partnerships among transportation agencies, community organizations, and businesses to take advantage of the economic development potential in transportation investments. (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 226 and 227:** The vision statement on page 1-2 states this intent. Implementation of this intent will be addressed during the system component of the RTP Update process.

228. Comment: Make transportation funding flexible and available to all transportation modes. (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 228:** State funding issues are being addressed in conjunction with the Governor's Transportation Initiative. Other funding issues will be addressed during the system component of the RTP Update process.

229. Comment: Evaluate all transportation investments based on full life cycle costs and benefits, including lifetime maintenance, repairs, and operations; and social, cultural, community health, and environmental impacts. (Coalition for a Livable Future)
230. Comment: Develop project selection criteria to ensure that the transportation projects which are funded answer transportation needs, are cost-effective based on full costs, use resources efficiently and advance the well-being of the communities affected. (Coalition for a Livable Future)
231. Comment: Adopt transportation system performance measures that reflect the full range of transportation goals, and use them to evaluate and improve transportation systems and projects. (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 229-231:** Disagree. Attempting to measure broad policy goals in terms of cost and benefits is beyond the current state-of-the-art. However, the 2040 Growth Concept is an attempt to balance land use and transportation benefits, and serves as the primary policy guide for the RTP. Metro is

also working with ODOT on improved cost-benefit calculations and a congestion pricing analysis that will attempt to define the true cost of driving.

232. Comment: Finance road systems with user fees that reflect actual costs, with adjustments to ensure all residents can meet their basic transportation needs. (Coalition for a Livable Future)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 232:** Funding issues will be addressed during the system component of the RTP Update process.

233. Comment: Freight on I-5 should be routed around Portland. It was a mistake to build the interstate through the city, causing interurban traffic to compete with local. (Patterson, 4/11/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 233:** Through freight truck traffic is encouraged to use I-205. Discussions with trucking firms indicates that almost all drivers avoid I-5 if they can during rush hours and most try to avoid it at all times of the day. However, I-5 serves as a direct access to much of the region's industrial land and to most marine, rail and intermodal terminals. As a result, it will always carry significant freight volumes.

234. Comment: Recommend light rail either along Barbur Boulevard from Portland or from Lake Oswego, through Tigard along Route 217 to connect with the west-side light rail in Beaverton (or both). (Patterson, 4/11/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 234:** A light rail extension connecting downtown Portland with Tigard via Barbur Boulevard or Highway 217 is one of four "potential" long-term extensions under consideration in the current RTP. The phasing of proposed extensions will be addressed in Chapter 4 during the system component phase of the RTP update.

235. Comment: Include motorcycles and mopeds in projects that are more likely to receive funding due to their efficiency (i.e., park-and-ride facilities, parking structures, regional and town centers, corridors and central city plans). (Rayburn-Hieronimus, 5/13/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 235:** Funding issues will be addressed during the system component of the RTP update process.

236. Comment: Some bike lane retrofits are too narrow. (Reynolds, 4/1/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 236:** As identified in the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, preferred bike lane widths are 5 to 6 feet. Minimum bike lane widths are: 5 feet against a curb or adjacent to a parking lane or 4 feet on uncurbed shoulders or when physical constraints exist. The appropriateness of these standards will be considered as part of the system component of the RTP update.

## **Regional Street System and 2040 Implementation**

237. Comment: Reconsider rural access management provisions in Goal 1, Objective 2 on page 1-19 and 4th bullet under Principal Arterials section on page 1-22 and their potential impact on accepted farm/forest related uses (i.e., moving farm equipment across a road) (Washington County, 4/17/96).

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 237:** Disagree. Access management objectives set forth in these sections refer to the regional through-routes that connect the urban area to points beyond the region (by definition, Green Corridors are located along state highways), and many of these facilities already have controlled or partially controlled access. This language would not affect the current use of local roads serving the rural area, except where they connect to state highways.

238. Comment: Revise Goal 1, Objective 2, second bullet on page 1-11 to read: "...be consistent with the regional motor vehicle, transit, freight, bicycle bikeway and pedestrian walkway system maps in Chapter 4 of this plan; and..." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 238:** Disagree. The modal definition (i.e. bicycle and pedestrian) is more all inclusive of the mode of travel. For example, the bicycle system includes bikeways, multi-purpose paths, shared bike lanes, bike racks and bike lockers. The pedestrian system includes sidewalks, multi-purpose paths, private walkways, pedestrian districts, and such amenities as special crossing features, street lighting, benches and wide planting strips as buffers.

239. Comment: In reference to page 1-13, Highways, last sentence: "Improved pedestrian crossings are located on overpasses and at same-grade intersections." Why is there not an option for grade level pedestrian crossings with the highway below-grade for separation? This option should be included. (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC recommendation on Comment 239:** Agree. Revise sentence to read: "...overpasses, underpasses and at same-grade intersections."

240. Comment: In reference to page 1-15, Urban Roads, second sentence: "Urban roads serve industrial areas, intermodal facilities and employment centers where buildings are rarely oriented toward the street." This statement should be reviewed and revised if necessary, based on the most recent changes to the TPR. For employment centers and industrial areas located along major transit stops, building orientation may be required by local jurisdictions. (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96 and Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 5/23/96)

**TPAC recommendation on Comment 240:** Disagree. The term "rarely" would allow such exceptions, while describing the predominate development pattern in these areas.

241. Comment: On page 1-15, Urban Roads discussion, second sentence: "Urban Roads serve industrial areas, intermodal facilities and employment centers ~~where buildings are rarely oriented toward the street.~~" The deleted section adds little definition to urban roads and may be read as an assumption that current building orientation in these areas should and will continue into the future. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 241:** Disagree. However, recommend the following revisions to clarify this section:

"Urban Roads serve low density industrial areas, intermodal facilities and employment centers where buildings are rarely less oriented toward the street."

242. In reference to pages 1-17 and 1-19, Regional Street System Management: TDM should be included in this section as it is a means to TSM. See Glossary in this draft for definition of the TSM term. It includes TDM techniques as an approach to managing existing transportation facilities rather than expanding existing or building new roadways. A new objective should be created that includes TDM techniques as an approach to implementing TSM. (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 242:** Disagree. However, the comment exposes the need to revise the glossary to eliminate TDM measures from the TSM definition. TSM is to improve efficiency through relatively low-cost system revisions. TDM is related to managing demand on a system. Recommend deleting references to "programs that encourage transit, carpooling, telecommuting, alternative work hours, bicycling, and walking" from the TSM definition.

243. Revise second to last sentence in Minor Arterials section on page 1-22 to read: Minor arterials can serve as freight route, providing both access and mobility."

Recommend not assuming freight routes on all minor arterials streets, especially when minor arterials are located in residential areas. (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 243:** Agree, but recommend using the word "may" instead of "can".

244. Comment: Revise second to last sentence in Collectors paragraph on page 1-23 to read: "Some Collectors are appropriate to should serve as freight access routes, providing local connections to the arterial network." (City of Milwaukie, 4/19/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 244:** Agree to some extent. Recommend changing proposed language to read "Collectors may should serve as freight access routes,..."

245. Comment: Page 1-15, "Community Streets" and page 1-16, "Local Street Design": Because these streets are normally not part of the RTP, standards for such streets should not be included in the RTP. (City of Troutdale, 5/13/96)

246. Comment: Page 1-23, "Local Street System Design Criteria": This section exceeds the scope of the RTP and should be deleted. Local street design criteria should be set by local jurisdictions. (City of Troutdale, 5/13/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 245 and 246:** Disagree. Local streets are included in the RTP with the recognition that local street design -- especially lack of local street connections -- can significantly impact the regional system.

247. Comment: It is not appropriate to require the installation of center medians on all Regional and Community Boulevards and Streets. Left turns may be warranted at locations other than intersections to provide adequate access. If access management plans are to be consistent with regional street design concepts (TSM Objective 2 on page 1-19), it is important that the design concept description not imply that center medians are required between intersections on all Regional Streets, Community Streets, Urban Roads and Regional Boulevards. (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

Recommend adding "Where appropriate" after all references to center medians in the descriptions of design types on pages 1-12 through 1-16. (City of Gresham, 5/17/96).

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 247:** Disagree. This issue will be addressed in the Regional Street Design Study.

248. Comment: On-street loading facilities are not appropriate on Regional Boulevards where typically no parking lane is provided - they would conflict with bike lanes. Recommend deleting "...and often include loading facilities within the street design..." from Regional Boulevards description on page 1-13 or change "often" to "may." (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 248:** Agree. Recommend replacing the word "often" with "may" on page 1-13.

249. Comment: The range of vehicle design speeds and volumes appropriate for each design type should be stated numerically in miles per hour and average daily traffic. There is no common understanding of what constitutes low, moderate and high speed. Recommend adding average daily traffic ranges to descriptions of design types on pages 1-12 through 1-16. Also recommend replacing reference to high, moderate and low motor vehicle speeds with design speeds range in miles per hour. (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 249:** Agree. The relative terms of "low", "moderate" and "high" will be further defined as part of the system phase of the RTP update, and will be refined as part of the Regional Street Design Study.

250. Comment: Modify Goal 2, Objective 4 on page 1-11 to read: "Consider safety, right-of-way, environmental and topographic constraints, while satisfying the general intent of the regional design concepts." Safety should be a primary consideration in developing street design concepts. (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 250:** Agree. Recommend adding "safety" to Goal 2, Objective 4 on page 1-11, and to the last bullet of the local street design section on page 1-17.

251. Comment: The descriptions of Regional and Community Streets and Boulevards may raise the expectation that transit and pedestrian amenities, freight loading facilities, bicycle lanes, travel and turn lanes, on-street parking and landscaped medians can all be accommodated within the 80 to 100 foot rights-of-way commonly available for arterial streets. (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 251:** Disagree. The upcoming system element of the RTP update will include Regional Street Design Study recommendations for accommodating these needs within limited rights-of-way.

252. Comment: Regional Street Design Concepts on pages 1-10 through 1-20 should: build on or reference the Functional Classification Model developed by the Joint

Regional Accessway Classification Project; establish priorities between modes for each classification; identify clear and objective distinguishing characteristics for each classification; include a better description of how conflicts between modes will be resolved. (City of Gresham, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 252:** Agree, in part. The model referenced here was a staff and work team reference in the development of the design concepts, but is more oriented toward traffic function than design. The design concepts will be further developed as part of the Regional Street Design Study, with specific design options and modal priorities proposed.

253. Comment: Increase permeable street surface and better control of surface run-off and potential soil erosion along the street. (Uchiyama, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 253:** Agree. While the regional interest in this level of street design detail is not defined, Metro is actively involved in storm water issues. TPAC recommends adding "storm water management" to objective 4 of Goal 2 of the regional street design section on page 1-11. The role of the RTP in this area will be further defined in the system component of the RTP update.

254. Comment: Intersections should be as small as possible. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 254:** The Metro Regional Street Design Study will provide recommendations for local plans, particularly in densely developed areas where street designs must integrate various travel modes. Some street design recommendations may be included later in the RTP as standards where a regional interest exists.

255. Comment: Double turn lanes (left or right) should not be permitted. (Klotz, 3/30/96 and 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 255:** The Regional Street Design Study will provide recommendations on the appropriateness of such designs as they relate to surrounding land uses.

256. Comment: Trees should always be in the planting strip between the sidewalk and the curb. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 256:** Agree in most situations. The street design text on pages 1-10 through 1-17 includes varying degrees of pedestrian buffering in most of the design types, but the method of buffering is not limited to

street trees. The Regional Street Design Study will provide recommendations on the best pedestrian buffering methods for specific urban settings.

257. Comment: A fifteen foot wide center median in the "streets" drawing is a waste of space. Left turn lanes are also not needed. (Klotz, 3/30/96)
258. Comment: "Streets" do not always need to have center medians and they do not need left turn lanes. (Klotz, 3/30/96)
259. Comment: "Boulevards" should not have continuous two-way left turn lanes. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 257-259:** Disagree. There are many situations where local jurisdictions have used alternating landscaped medians/left turn lanes in appropriate and effective street designs. In several instances, for example, local designs have used left turn lanes on formerly four-lane streets to reduce the number of vehicle travel lanes and allow bicycle lanes or parking in the remaining space. The Regional Street Design Study will provide recommendations on the best use of medians and turn lanes in specific urban settings.

260. Comment: "Roads" should have sidewalks, whether "urban" or "rural" as long as they are inside of the urban growth boundary. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 260:** Agree. Regional Urban Road designs are described on page 1-15 as having sidewalks. Rural Road designs do not apply to facilities within the urban growth boundary.

261. Comment: Curb radii on local streets should be 10 feet or 12 feet. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 261:** This is generally a local issue. However, the Regional Street Design Study will provide recommendations for local plans, particularly in densely developed areas where street designs must integrate various travel modes.

262. Comment: Wheelchair ramps should be built on each corner, with their center lines parallel to the crosswalks they serve. (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 262:** This is a local issue, and is best addressed in local transportation system plans. Metro supports Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements with good design to meet the spirit of the law.



263. Comment: "Highways" should not have continuous left turn lanes. While the lane may be perceived as a pedestrian refuge by some drivers, it is in fact a dangerous place to stand. (Klotz, 3/30/96 and 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 263:** Agree. Under the proposed RTP street design concepts, highways are generally divided by a non-auto median (e.g., landscaped) and have left turn lanes where at-grade intersections exist.

264. Comment: Why do roads need to be different from streets? (Klotz, 3/30/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 264:** Road designs serve traffic-oriented areas where little pedestrian activity occurs (such as industrial areas), and therefore warrant less pedestrian infrastructure than street designs where walking is encouraged (such as transit corridors and urban neighborhoods).

265. Comment: Address street safety issues such as blind corners and excess speed. (Frimoth, 4/6/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 265:** These are generally local issues, and best addressed in local transportation system plans.

266. Comment: Page 1-15, "Community Streets," fourth line: Should "Regional Street..." be "Community Street..."? (City of Troutdale, 5/13/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 266:** Agree. Revise as noted.

267. Comment: On page 1-11, the RTP should recognize that regional streets may have different characteristics in individual jurisdictions. For example, if Highway 43 is thought of as a "regional street," it has a different function within the West Linn and Lake Oswego city limits than it does in the Portland city limits and also serves a different function between Portland and Lake Oswego. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

268. Comment: In reference to the Regional Street Design Goals and Objectives described on page 1-11: It should not be Metro's role to impose a "one-size-fits-all" design upon the region. Local governments should have the flexibility to achieve the intent of 2040 while still accommodating that which makes every community unique. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

269. Comment: On page 1-13, the RTP identifies community boulevards as "usually including four lanes." At the May 8 MPAC meeting, MPAC member Peggy Lynch noted that some communities, especially those identified as town centers, may want the option of having fewer than four lanes. The city of West Linn, as a proposed

town center, has identified a policy in its vision document of keeping Willamette Drive (Highway 43) to no more than three lanes. RTP language should give local jurisdictions flexibility to accommodate facilities consistent with standards identified in their current policies. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 267-269:** Agree. The definition of "regional" and "community" reflects the traffic function of a street or boulevard as a "major" or "minor" arterial, respectively. The appropriateness of more or less than the "usual" four lanes will be based on system analysis as individual projects are developed. The classification of arterials as "major" and "minor", including Highway 43 in West Linn, will be reviewed as part of developing the motor vehicle network during the next phase of the RTP update.

270. Comment: On page 1-11, Goal 1, Objective 2, bullet 3, the term "parcel specific" may be too finite at this point. Recommend changing wording to "geographically specific" to allow some freedom later to determine the right unit of geography. (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 270:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

271. Comment: On page 1-11, Goal 1, Objective 3, will they be "...standards for appropriate transition..." or "...guidelines for appropriate transition..." (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 271:** Agree. Replace the word "standards" with "guidelines."

272. Comment: On page 1-11, Goal 2 calls for street performance standards while the objectives all call for street designs, design guidelines and design standards. Street designs, design guidelines and design standards provide one type of means to an end and performance standards another. How does achieving the objectives necessarily achieve the goal in this case? (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 272:** Agree. Recommend revising goal to read "Support local ~~Develop~~ street performance standards for implementation of regional street design..."

273. Comment: On page 1-11, Goal 3, Objective 1, request for clarification. What are "efficient travel speeds"? Recommend changing this to "high travel speeds." (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 273:** Disagree, but revise to read:

**"1. Objective:** Provide for through travel on major routes that connect major regional destinations and emphasize efficient travel speeds."

274. Comment: On page 1-11, Goal 3, Objective 2, recommend changing "...adjacent regional or community-scale..." to "...nearby regional or community-scale..." (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 274:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

275. Comment: On pages 1-14 and 1-15, Design Concept for Streets: the introduction to the design concept for Streets states that they are "designed with amenities that promote pedestrian and transit travel." The first sentences under both the Regional Streets and Community Streets sections, however, state that they are designed to carry (significant) vehicle traffic "...while providing for transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel." "Providing for" is different from "promoting." The objective should promote alternative modes. Thus, recommend the first sentences under Regional Streets and Community Streets be amended as follows:

1. "Regional Streets are designed to carry significant vehicle traffic while also providing for promoting transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel."
2. "Community Streets are designed to carry vehicle traffic while also providing for promoting transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel."

(Coalition for a Livable Future and 1000 Friends of Oregon, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 275:** Disagree. The intent of the Street section is to provide a graduated level of pedestrian and transit amenities that is tied to land use and development density. Therefore, pedestrian and transit improvements in Street designs are intended to be less substantial than in Boulevard designs, while still providing for these travel alternatives.

276. Comment: Street widths are a concern as is the willingness to continue adding vehicle travel and turning lanes to the street cross-sections. Pedestrians are treated well, but a street with more than four lanes, with "additional lanes in some situations" are likely to be an unfriendly place for pedestrians. It causes you to lose the scale. Recommend the addition of more specific limits on the number of lanes in many of the street sections and descriptions. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 276:** Disagree. Regional facilities, by definition, are major traffic routes. Most are currently designed with four motor

vehicle travel lanes, with both smaller and larger exceptions tailored to special situations. However, the traffic function of different routes will be re-evaluated as part of updating the motor vehicle network in the next phase of the RTP update.

277. Comment: Reconsider that sidewalk buffering for "Highways" and "Urban Roads" is optional. These are often crucial links between pedestrian destinations, thus some form of buffering should be required on these streets. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 5/23/96)

278. Comment: Reconsider streets descriptions as they relate to industrial areas and employment areas. For example, the "Urban Roads" description should acknowledge that job bases in these areas should be better served by transit, bicycling and walking facilities. Buffering should be included along sidewalks, and protected pedestrian street crossing, with medians, should be provided at all bus stops and entrances to larger employment generators. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 277 and 278:** Disagree. These routes are not "critical links", but instead serve low-density, industrial or intermodal areas. As such, Urban Road designs include basic sidewalks and bikeways, but do not have the pedestrian emphasis of Street and Boulevard designs, which serve higher density, more transit-oriented mixed-use neighborhoods.

279. Comment: Street design standards and guidelines should be included in the RTP as they are necessary to ensure the street design concepts are implemented. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 279:** The Regional Street Design Study will assist local governments in implementing the RTP street design requirements.

280. Comment: The local street design connectivity principles on pages 1-16 and 1-17 should be incorporated into the street design standards and guidelines. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 280:** Agree. Improved guidelines for connectivity will be developed as part of the Regional Street Design Study during the next phase of the RTP update.

281. Comment: The street design standards and guidelines should address land and resource conservation and environmental protection along with function. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 281:** These issues may be incorporated into the next phase of the RTP update, when more detailed implementation strategies are developed.

282a. Comment: On page 1-17, Local Street Design section: There is significant public interest in reducing street widths for safety, land use efficiency and water quality purposes, and Metro should insist on it. Also, where cul-de-sacs are allowable, direct through pedestrian and bicycle connections should be required. Recommend the following amendments on page 1-17:

1. "Where appropriate, local design codes should ~~allow~~ require narrow street designs to conserve land, calm traffic or promote connectivity; and
2. Closed street systems and cul-de-sac designs should be limited to situations where topography or development patterns prevent full street extensions, and in all cases should provide for direct through routes for pedestrians and bicycles.

(1000 Friends, 5/23/96)

282b. Comment: On page 1-17, Local Street Design section, fifth and sixth bullets:

- ~~Where appropriate, local design codes should allow~~ require narrow street designs to conserve land, calm traffic or promote connectivity, with limited exceptions; and
- Closed street systems and cul-de-sac designs should be limited to situations where topography or development patterns prevent full street extensions, and in all case should provide for direct through routes for pedestrian and bicycles.

(Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 282a and 282b:** Disagree. The first issue regarding narrow street designs is appropriately described in Chapter 1 as an option, with application of the concept tailored to local needs through local design codes. The second issue regarding connectivity is already addressed in the fourth bullet of this section (on page 1-17).

283. Comment: Clarify bullet 5 on page 1-16 under local street design to acknowledge the necessity of adequate surrounding regional connects in order to prevent local street system and neighborhoods from being overwhelmed by cut-through traffic.  
(City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 283:** Generally agree. Specific standards for local street connectivity will be studied during the next phase of the RTP update as part of the Regional Street Design Study. The “minimum” standard for connections will assume an adequate traffic network of arterials and collectors, but will be based on a series of case studies throughout the region. The adequacy of the arterial and collector network will be evaluated during the next phase of the update, as well.

284. Comment: On page 1-18, under ATMS strategies, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology could be identified as another potential strategy, particularly for regional routes. Highway 43 is one facility that could utilize this technology. (City of West Linn, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 284:** Agree. Section and glossary will be revised to note that ATMS is a subset of ITS and must be addressed as one of the 16 ISTEA planning factors.

285. Comment: On page 1-19, Goal 1, Objective 3, recommend changing objective to read “Integrate traffic calming elements into new street designs as appropriate, consistent with...” (Washington County, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 285:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

286. Comment: On page 1-19, Arterial Signal Coordination section: As part of the first objective under TSM, the draft plan states that signal coordination on arterials should be set to minimize stop-and-go travel. Consider that signal timing to minimize traffic stops could work against pedestrians and bicyclists who are trying to cross the street. For this reason, recommend the language be amended to read:

“Arterial Signal Coordination (Such as comprehensive adjustments of signal timing to minimize stop-and-go travel, consistent with adjacent land use and the needs of non-automobile modes, and which coordinates with freeway and interchange operations.”

(1000 Friends of Oregon and Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 286:** Agree in concept, but recommend the following: “consistent with adjacent land use, street design type and function, etc.”

287. Comment: On page 1-18, Regional Street System Management section, traffic calming discussion, second sentence: “These “retrofit” techniques ... and are rarely appropriate for use have not been typically used on larger regional facilities. (Coalition for a Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 287:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

288. Comment: Amend page 1-19, Regional Street System Implementation section, opening paragraph: "~~While t~~The primary mission of the RTP is implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept, including reinvestment in existing communities and their infrastructure, the plan must also address other important transportation issues that ~~may not directly assist in implementing the growth concept~~. The plan must also protect the region's existing investments by placing a high priority on projects or programs that maintain or preserve existing infrastructure. The following goals and objectives reflect this priority need to integrate 2040 Growth Concept objectives with other important transportation needs or deficiencies in the development of the preferred, financially constrained and strategic RTP systems..." Reinvesting in existing communities is a key underpinning of the 2040 Growth Concept. This includes reinvestment in existing infrastructure. (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 288:** Disagree. The purpose of this section is to balance 2040 implementation with equally important needs for maintenance and preservation of the system and to make safety improvements. The proposed revisions would therefore be inconsistent with these broader goals (that follow the referenced introductory text).

289. Comment: Amend pages 1-19 and 1-20, Regional Street System Implementation section, Goal 1, Objectives 1-3:
1. Objective: Place the highest priority weight on projects and programs that best serve the transportation needs of the central city, regional centers, intermodal facilities and industrial areas.
  2. Objective: Place a high priority weight on projects and programs that best serve the transportation needs of station communities, town centers, main streets and corridors.
  3. Objective: Place less priority weight on transportation projects and programs that serve the remaining components of the 2040 Growth Concept.

(Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

290. Comment: On page 1-20, Regional Street System Implementation section, Goal 3, Objectives 1-2:
1. Objective: Place a the highest priority weight on projects and programs that address safety-related deficiencies in the region's transportation infrastructure.

2. Objective: Place less priority weight on projects and programs that address other deficiencies in the region's transportation infrastructure.

(Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 289 and 290:** Disagree. The proposed revisions do not enhance the basic intent of these objectives, which is to provide broad decision-making policy for the development of regional transportation projects and programs.

291. Comment: On page 1-20, Goal 1, add new objective:

4. Objective: Emphasize projects that provide or help promote a wider range of transportation choices.

(Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 291:** Agree, but with the following modification:

4. Objective: Emphasize projects and programs that provide or help promote a wider range of transportation choices.

292. Comment: What is Multi-Modal Traveler Information Services on page 1-19. This should be further defined. (City of Beaverton, 5/17/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 292:** Agree. Recommend adding the following explanation:

Multi-Modal Traveler Information Services (such as broadcast radio and television; highway advisory radio; variable message signs; on-line road reports; and on-board vehicle navigation aids).

293. Comment: Amend page 1-20, Goal 2: "Emphasize the maintenance, and preservation and effective use of transportation infrastructure in the selection of the RTP projects and programs." (Coalition for A Livable Future, 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 293:** Agree. Revise as proposed.

294. Comment: Adopt language creating a mechanism whereby regional investment in a corridor is tied to the development of local street networks and connections. Inter-governmental agreements are needed to require that local jurisdictions complete local street networks before improvements are made to a regional facility. Too



many regional facilities are failing in their primary function because they are full of local traffic. ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 5/17/96 and 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 294:** Disagree. Regional funds can already be used to leverage the development of local street networks and connections. However, the proposed policy would discriminate against already developed areas where few opportunities exist to change local street connectivity.

295. Comment: Adopt a policy for recovering the full cost of transportation projects through user charges. There is a tremendous imbalance in the distribution of costs and benefits such that motor vehicles derive tremendous economic and personal benefit from decades of regional investment in roadways, yet do not pay for the tremendous costs imposed on society through air pollution, congestion, loss of productive land to roadways and parking, etc. ( Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 5/17/96 and 5/23/96)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 295:** Disagree. The intent of the RTP is to promote alternative modes of travel. However, there are practical limits to collecting user fees as proposed (i.e., pedestrian travel).