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REPORT
ON
PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION
IN THE
PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA

To the Board of Governors,
The City Club of Portland:

I. INTRODUCTION

The Metropolitan Transportation and Comprehensive Planning Committee of the City Club of Portland was established by the Board of Governors in February of 1965 “to study and recommend upon the preferred pattern of future transportation planning efforts for this metropolitan area, especially as they relate to comprehensive metropolitan planning and to the several single-purpose metropolitan-wide planning programs.” In its charge, the Committee was specifically directed to focus primarily upon problems of governmental organization for planning, rather than to formulate a transportation plan of its own, to recommend someone else’s plan, or to describe the preferred content of some future plan. Accordingly, this report is directed to the status of planning for transportation in the Portland Metropolitan Area, rather than the problems of transportation itself.

The Committee of fourteen members, drawn from a wide spectrum of business, government, and the professions, met for the first of more than 90 meetings on June 30, 1965. The Committee was impressed by—and acknowledges with gratitude—the willingness and frankness with which our many witnesses cooperated with the Committee in its investigation. (A list of persons interviewed is included in Appendix A of this report.) That several appeared and reappeared for interviews is testimony to their concern for the gravity of the problem and to their respect for the efforts of the City Club in studying it.

In addition to interviewing persons concerned with the planning process, the Committee visited a number of public planning agencies to observe and discuss their activities, procedures, and experience. Extensive research was undertaken in published sources in the fields of planning, law, transportation technology, and urban sociology. Finally, several work sessions were held to discuss and evaluate data and interviews, and to formulate conclusions and recommendations.

No attempt is made here to detail the total research of the Committee, although a selected bibliography has been prepared as Appendix B of this report for those interested in pursuing further information. Your Committee has instead sought to identify basic elements of the present planning process and to recommend means for improving it.

II. THE CHALLENGE OF THE STUDY

The Expansion of the Suburban Fringe

The Portland Metropolitan Area is fortunate in having a geographical and natural setting that makes possible the creation of an urban complex of unsurpassed beauty and livability. The area is changing rapidly, however, having doubled its population from 1930 to 1960, when the number of inhabitants exceeded 700,000. The increase in private automobiles has been even more spectacular, growing four-fold in the same period to a total of more than 250,000. Trends suggest that the population will increase by an additional 550,000 by 1990, while the number of automobiles will more than double to approximately 600,000.

Such growth will occur on the suburban fringes of the metropolitan area while the central city continues to lose residential land through expansion of business districts and through urban renewal and freeway projects. Thus, a recent projection
of population growth indicates that the population of Multnomah County, where the bulk of the area's population now lives, will in 1990, be only 42 per cent above its 1960 total, while the growth of the three suburban counties of Clackamas, Washington and Clark in the same period will be 149 per cent, 225 per cent and 103 per cent respectively.\(^1\)

The increase in numbers of people on the suburban fringe will represent a constant strain on public utilities and other urban facilities. The problems of providing adequate water supply and sewage services are already acute in newly developed and developing areas. However, the City of Portland itself is directly affected by the growth in its fringe areas. The residents of the suburbs are dependent on the city for a variety of functions, and an ever-increasing stream of automobiles is directed to the city center, to be absorbed by a fixed pattern of streets and a limited number of parking spaces. The resultant congestion not only creates distressing inconveniences for drivers in the downtown area, but also leads to significant business costs in the time lost by individuals and commercial vehicles serving the area.

**Threats to Livability**

The continuing increase in automobiles in Portland and its suburbs has an impact far beyond the problems of moving and parking them in the downtown area. Elements of the city's livability are being placed under greater strain. The increases in air pollution and noise are bound to diminish its health and aesthetic attractiveness; the building of freeways disrupts neighborhoods and depresses adjacent residential property values; the demand for more parking areas takes its toll of the city's architectural heritage and the coherence of its merchandising, financial, and professional zones. Another particularly serious consequence of the automobile revolution is the steadily shrinking service of public transportation. Infrequent scheduling and high fares must be endured by the significant segment of the population which uses public transportation. A burden of cost and inconvenience is thus cast on those who do not have access to automobiles—school children, the poor, and the aged.

Portland's problems are not yet as severe as those found in many other cities, though clogged freeways at rush hours and the lack of downtown parking spaces are increasingly evident. The existing situation reflects a program of traffic improvement undertaken by the City of Portland following the famous Moses Report of 1943.\(^2\) More than two decades have elapsed since that study, however, and new needs and problems have emerged. It is probable that, if the difficulties of access to and from the downtown area increase, there will be a further exodus of commercial and professional activities from the core district, with attendant loss of trade volume, building values, and availability of services. To these business losses will be joined losses to the public in the amenities of variety and competition in shopping and entertainment as well as direct losses in time and convenience. The suburban population will share these losses as much as those living in more central areas.

The gradualness of change until now has resulted in a lack of public concern about the nature and consequences of the transportation problems confronting the metropolitan area. This has occurred despite the crisis state which has been reached in a number of larger urban centers in the country, including Los Angeles, San Francisco, Washington, Boston, and Chicago. This lack of public concern is matched by a paucity of efforts by local government to minimize prospective problems through concerted action now.

---

\(^1\)These figures are based on projections in "Planning Analyses and Projections, Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study," by Wilbur Smith & Associates, June, 1968. County projections of population increase by 1980 in comparison with 1960 are: Multnomah—24%; Clackamas—96%; Washington—133%; and Clark—93%. Data are for the "urban area" as defined by the Metropolitan Planning Commission and described on page 267 of this report.

\(^2\)Portland Improvement, a report directed by Robert Moses and presented to the City Club of Portland, Multnomah County, School District No. 1 of Multnomah County, The Port of Portland, and the Commission of Public Docks, November 10, 1943.
Roadblocks to Action

Public officials and planning staffs in the metropolitan area are aware of current trends and potential problems, but their ability to act is limited by several factors. A major problem is the fragmentation of authority—the metropolitan area is divided among two states, five counties and more than three dozen incorporated cities. In addition, several state and federal agencies significantly affect the area's transportation planning. Local governments usually lack the funds necessary to plan and construct facilities to meet their problems, and must depend on financial aid from higher levels of government and the investments in streets and facilities by private land developers. Moreover, local officials tend to be reluctant to make decisions that might alienate blocs of citizens who would be adversely affected by new routes for freeways or the construction of parking and other transportation facilities.

The more politically-insulated state and federal levels have increasingly shown an interest in the transportation problems of cities, but their efforts have tended to lack local perspective and harmony. Thus, state and federal highway policy has had the effect of encouraging deconcentration of urban areas, while urban renewal and other federal housing policies have encouraged reinvigoration of the city core. Recent efforts by the Department of Transportation and other agencies to handle problems of transportation through an approach in which various forms of transport are encouraged to be integrated rather than competitive are gratifying, though their impact on Portland is yet to be felt.

Concern for potential transportation problems within the Portland metropolitan area and awareness of the diffused structure of governmental agencies responsible for meeting them led the Board of Governors to establish your Committee. In accepting its charge, the Committee has been chastened but not deterred by the conclusions of an eminent urbanologist that "attempts to articulate metropolitan needs are taken by self-appointed elites rarely possessing power resources of votes, money, or strategic positions." 3

III. THE NATURE OF PLANNING

Planning is a Process

City and regional planning, as it is now conceived by planners and public officials, differs somewhat from the conception of such planning held by the members of your Committee when they began their investigation. Too often the role of the planner is compared by the public to that of the architect, putting together a blueprint of future land uses and public facilities that will result in a scientifically and aesthetically sound "ideal" community.

The nature of decision-making in our society, the rapidity of technological change, and the lack of a consensus on values and goals within the planning profession itself all militate against the possibility of establishing a "master plan" for urban design. Instead, planning is viewed by a majority of its practitioners as a continuous process of evaluation, prediction, and recommendation that harmonizes the diverse currents of urban living and weighs initiatives for change against existing development and livability goals for the future. In a sense, because of the uncertainties and changing nature of the phenomena, planning tends to be as much of an art as it is a science; the planner's task should be compared to that of the meteorologist analyzing and forecasting the weather, as well as to the role of the architect or engineer.

In order for the planning process in a metropolitan area to be effective, several conditions must be met. It has to be comprehensive, areawide, susceptible to implementation and acceptable to the public.

The Need for "Comprehensiveness"

The "comprehensiveness" of planning refers to the necessity of weighing any decision against the totality of the urban environment. Transportation, utilities, land use and other elements cannot be planned individually without consideration

of their reciprocal relationships to each other. The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines comprehensive planning as

"... a systematic and continuing process designed to help solve current problems and provide for future needs. It includes provisions for identification and continuous refinement of objectives and criteria; collection and analysis of pertinent data; consideration of alternative courses of action; policy decisions on selected courses of action; coordination of local plans and of programs and activities affecting the development of the area; formulation, maintenance and updating of the comprehensive development plan; the improvement programming and other measures to implement the plan. Comprehensive planning covers land use, transportation, water and sewers, open space and recreation, housing, health and education facilities, community development and renewal, and other aspects of physical, economic and social development of significance to the particular urban area," (Urban Mass Transportation Planning Requirements Guide, Washington: HUD, February 1, 1966, p. 1.)

The Need to be "Area-Wide"

In addition to taking into account the diverse elements of the urban fabric, the planning process needs also to include all parts of the urbanized area. Although historical evolution has resulted in a multiplicity of governmental units in all metropolitan areas in the United States, it must be stressed that each metropolitan area is a coherent social and economic unit. All parts of the area are intimately linked to all other parts, as people cross city, county, and state boundaries to work, shop, seek cultural enrichment and entertainment, and make their homes. A problem existing in one area has its repercussions in all others. This is particularly true in the realm of transportation, where facilities and routes are shared by all citizens.

Defining the outer limits of a metropolitan area is not a simple task. It should include not only the region of continuously built-up housing and industry, but also adjacent open spaces and areas of low density of settlement into which the metropolis will probably expand in the future. In its requirements for mass transit planning, cited above, HUD specifies that areas likely to be urbanized within the next twenty years be included in plans, and recommends use of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas based on groups of entire counties sharing metropolitan growth. At times metropolitan planning must take into account an even wider perspective involving the broad region with which the city interacts as a center for distribution and collection, and to which it is bound by highway, rail, and airlines routes.

The Need to Assure Implementation

The ability to implement planning is as important as the comprehensiveness and area-wide scope of the planning itself. Plans without possibility of implementation are not worth very much. Implementation requires legal competency and financial resources on the part of a decision-making body having jurisdiction over the metropolitan area. Such a body may be a federated association of local governments, a general-purpose metropolitan city government, or a special district government for planning and providing services for the area as a whole. Whatever the form of such a body, however, its planning decisions should not be subject to veto or abandonment due to inaction by any local area within its jurisdiction. The function of planning should be to bring maximum benefits to the population of the entire metropolitan area, even though a minority may be affected adversely by any decision for change. In this regard, particular attention must be paid to the rights of citizens in all areas to have equitable representation in formulating and adopting plans.

The Need for Public Support

As a first step towards implementation, a planning agency must enjoy the confidence of the citizenry. To do this, it must maximize communication with the public. A policy of full and continuous information dissemination concerning activities and decisions of the planning body not only will help to break down the traditional apathy and fatalism concerning paths of urban development, but also will benefit the planners through increased "feedback" from the public on questions of goals and desires in areas where indecision exists.
IV. ELEMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

From the foregoing comments on the planning process in general, several considerations emerge for the specific task of planning for transportation (which your Committee defines in the broadest context as embracing the circulation or movement of people and goods within the metropolitan community by whatever means are appropriate). Decisions affecting transportation must be part of a comprehensive planning process, taking into account probable effects of transportation decisions upon land use, water supply, waste disposal, open space, and other aspects of urban development. Transportation planning must be from the perspective of the metropolitan area as a whole. Moreover, it must consider the region’s interchanges with adjacent areas, and with regional, national, and international transportation systems. It must be implemented for the area as a whole, and it must be achieved under continuous consultation with the public.

In addition to these features, good transportation planning particularly needs to keep abreast of the continuously evolving technology in private and public transport. Its decision makers also constantly need to look ahead to the social needs of the community in addition to resolving problems of traffic congestion and parking. The requirement of the poor, the aged, and others without automobiles for access to urban facilities and employment is a proper concern of planners.

A danger that must be avoided in planning is a bias toward one or another form of transportation. Foot traffic, automobiles, and public transit must be treated on their respective intrinsic merits for attaining a given goal. Objectivity in transport planning has been blurred by such elements as the availability of federal funds for freeway construction but not for mass transit, or by the political pressures of special interest groups, such as the railroad lobby in an earlier era, and the present complex of manufacturers, distributors, and service establishments seeking to preserve the primacy of the automobile.

It also should not be overlooked that the locating of transportation routes and facilities can play a special role in implementing desired ends in other aspects of planning. The choice of highway routes and the selection of transit terminals can advance or hinder plans for desirable areas for the expansion of industry and housing, or for the preservation of green belts and productive farmland. Transportation planning can and should be a means for shaping the community in optimum directions, and not simply a response to existing trends of land use development which more often than not are accidental, obsolescent, or speculative.

V. PROBLEMS OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
IN THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA

What is the Portland Metropolitan Area?

The Portland Metropolitan Area is not clearly or easily defined. It obviously extends far beyond the city limits of Portland itself. The region of continuously built-up area occupies portions of Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington counties in Oregon, and Clark County, Washington. The total population of this “Urbanized Area” as defined by the U. S. Census Bureau, was approximately 700,000 in 1960, of whom 327,000 lived in Portland. The four counties taken together constitute Portland’s Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, and it is probable that the bulk of future urban expansion will take place within their confines. However, people commute to Portland from an even wider area, and this commuting zone must be considered in any comprehensive transportation planning. Some recognition of this can be seen in the recent decision of the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG) to accept Columbia County, Oregon, as a constituent member. (CRAG is discussed in a later section of this report.)

A specific delineation of a Portland “urban area” was made by the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and this has been accepted by your Committee as a minimum basis for any future area-wide planning process. It extends eastward to Troutdale, southward beyond Oregon City, westward to include Tigard and Aloha, and north-
ward beyond the city limits of Vancouver, Washington. It has an approximate population of 735,000. 

The Complex of Planning Agencies

Within this metropolitan area, planning began in 1918 when the city of Portland initially created its planning commission. During the ensuing years, counties and municipalities have established at least 25 additional planning bodies within the region. To these should be added CRAG, the Clark County-Vancouver Regional Planning Commission, and the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study (P-V MTS)—all of which engage in planning activities affecting transportation.

Several state and federal agencies also make decisions that have a direct bearing on transportation in the Portland metropolitan region. The autonomous state-chartered Port of Portland is particularly significant because of its independent source of funds and its broad powers of planning and construction. The State Highway Commissions of Oregon and Washington are similarly powerful bodies with their own sources of funds and special authority. Federal agencies that have significant transportation functions affecting the local area include the Bureau of Public Roads and other agencies of the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. The chart on pages 274 and 275 indicates the multiplicity and overlapping relationships of this complex of local, state, and federal bodies.

The staffs and activities of these planning agencies are sizable. More than $650,000 is budgeted annually by counties and cities in the area to maintain their planning bodies, and this figure does not include substantial federal grants to these agencies, both to maintain their own staffs and to hire outside consultants. A 1968 study of future growth by the New Haven firm of Wilbur Smith and Associates for the P-V MTS cost $117,000 and a 1966 mass transit study for the same body by the San Francisco and Philadelphia firm of Simpson and Curtin cost $60,000. The Port of Portland paid $225,000 for a 1967 study of its Rivergate industrial site.

Your Committee is impressed by the professional competence and concern for problems among the planning personnel with whom it consulted. Many have made major contributions to an investigation of the urban community, and several have advanced sound and imaginative proposals for shaping the future of the area.

The Passiveness of Planning

Despite the extent of planning activity and the quality of planning staffs, however, the fact remains that transportation planning in the Portland Metropolitan Area is not part of a comprehensive planning process. There is coordination neither in function nor in area, especially in the aspect of implementation. Instead, the patterns of streets and freeways and other transportation facilities have emerged piecemeal under outside initiatives of state officials or private real estate developers. Planners have functioned largely in an advisory role, and frequently their advice has been overruled for trivial or narrow political reasons by the public officials over them. Roads and bridges have been designed by engineers and other technicians to meet specific problems in moving people and goods. Seldom has there been adequate consideration of other pressing needs of the community in the fields of housing, race relations, recreation, or other affairs. Moreover, no articulated set of goals exists for the future development of the community as a whole, against which any projects can be weighed.

The passive acceptance by local governments of routeway projects of the State Highway Commission and private developers results primarily from the fact that these bodies finance and construct the projects they present. Most local governments are hard-pressed for funds and seldom feel they can initiate projects themselves. For example, the Washington county highway department has annually constructed an average of only 2.5 miles of road, while in a representative year more than 19 miles of road were built by private developers.

One of the dangers of accepting the packaged proposals of state and federal government is the possibility of the imposition of general "guidelines" or "solutions"

(4) It is estimated that by 1980 the population will reach 917,500.
which are inappropriate to the unique setting and problems of the local region. A similar problem exists in the projects advanced by private developers who are understandably concerned primarily with their own highly localized problems and their desire to minimize out-of-pocket costs. They have little incentive to consider possible negative consequences of their projects upon adjacent areas in the form of increased traffic congestion, noise, or air pollution.

**The Absence of Unified Local Action**

The Oregon State Highway Commission has built a magnificent system of highways for which the State of Oregon is famous and can justly be proud. It has conformed to all statutes and regulatory guidelines laid down for it. In pursuing its assigned task, however, the Commission has been guided primarily by costs, engineering considerations, and federal mileage quotas. Community development goals have received a much lower priority, although there is evidence that the Commission has cooperated with local planning agencies when such bodies have confronted it with definite proposals. It appears, however, that in the Portland area, the competition between units of government, the lack of local initiative, and the vacillating support by political leaders for planning efforts have, on more than one occasion, forced the Highway Commission to reach its own decisions independently.

This is illustrated in the events associated with the adoption of a route for the projected I-205 eastside freeway. Under federal requirements it was necessary for the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study to establish as a recommending body for the new route a "Coordinating Committee" of local public officials to be guided by a "Technical Advisory Committee" (TAC). This latter body was composed of local planners, traffic engineers, and other experts from the metropolitan area. In an elaborate report the Coordinating Committee stressed that it had considered economic factors, population projections, land use, transportation facilities, travel patterns, zoning and similar regulations, and "social, economic, and community value factors" in its final decision, which was to establish a route west of the Portland International Airport. However, no local governments supported this proposal at the final hearings on the route.

The Oregon State Highway Commission finally adopted a route running mostly outside of the City of Portland through unincorporated areas to the east of the airport. The latter route was substantially lower in cost, though it had a number of negative features for the community which were detailed in the Coordinating Committee's report. Your Committee does not feel qualified to judge the relative merits of the two routes. However, it deplores the fact that the final decision had to be made at the state level because of the inability or unwillingness of the governments concerned to reach an accord at the local level, or, in the case of Portland, even to take a stand.

It should be stressed that similar decisions which the Highway Commission has felt it had to make on its own in the past have resulted in substantially improved flows of automobiles through the metropolitan area. Freeways have not only speeded traffic, but also have simplified access to the center of the city from several parts of the metropolitan periphery.

Your Committee is concerned, however, that planning for transportation requires more than smoothing the flow of automobiles. Thus, while access to the downtown area has been facilitated by the Highway Commission, it has not had any responsibilities for providing the additional parking spaces needed or for accommodating pedestrian and local traffic across the access routes. Similarly, it has not had to find new homes and business sites for those displaced by its construction. Freeway routes have divided distinctive, coherent neighborhood units. Some persons have viewed the route of the new I-205 freeway as a "Chinese Wall" which will form a permanent operational and psychological barrier to the expansion of the City of Portland into the urbanized area of Multnomah County. In another instance, requests by local planners to link the I-5 Minnesota freeway with the major east-west arterial routes of Killingsworth and Ainsworth streets, rather than with the less desirable Alberta Street and Portland Boulevard routes, were rejected by the Commission.
A responsible locally-based comprehensive planning agency which initiated and actively planned transportation development projects and not merely approved them presumably would have evaluated the various possibilities of freeway designs in the context of existing metropolitan needs and land uses and the furtherance of long-range community goals. It would have been in a position to use transportation planning for the promotion of desirable directions of growth for industry, housing and other land use. It would also have been able to weigh the value of a mass transit system or some other form of improved public transportation as an alternative or adjunct to the building of more routes for automobiles.

The Neglect of Public Transit

Present planning efforts in transportation are concerned almost exclusively with expediting the flow of automobiles, with little attention paid to the inadequacy of public transit. Only seven per cent of the population in the metropolitan area uses any of the five bus companies serving the region, and the number is declining. With decline in patronage, there is a decline in service and an increase in fares, which further discourages patronage in an ever-downward spiral. The fact that Portland’s system is one of the relatively few in the country to remain exclusively under private ownership has been cited by some as a contributing factor in the decline. Despite a reduction in paid fares from more than 90 million per year in 1947 to the 20 million today, a recent study has asserted that the rate of return on necessary invested capital in Rose City Transit Company was 28 per cent in 1967.(5)

Municipal ownership and subsidy might result in some improvement in the number of people riding busses, although it seems likely that substantial gains in this direction would require the creation of a special mass transit system beyond the present reliance on mere street transportation. If a comprehensive approach to planning would conclude that such a system is essential to the area’s future, the lack of mass transit planning now is a matter of serious concern. The experience of San Francisco and other cities has shown that twenty to thirty years is required from initial planning to final completion of a new transit system.

Disruption by Pressure Groups

A significant factor in the weakness of planning efforts is the unwillingness of public officials to support their planning staffs when any organized opposition manifests itself. The failure of the Portland City Council to endorse the I-205 route advocated by its own planners after homeowners in the projected route waged a campaign against it is an example. The blocking of projects by such pressure groups or the securing of unwarranted zoning variances by commercial interests against the recommendations of professional planners has occurred in every jurisdiction in the metropolitan area.

The lack of political support for planning has reduced planning efforts in a number of communities to little more than an administrative role. Most of the time of planners is taken up in reviewing proposals to change existing land use zoning, and they know that even here a substantial portion of their decisions will ultimately be overruled. When planners have pursued a more active role, it has largely been in the less controversial realm of data collection or development of general theory, rather than in a direct attack on the specific problems of the Portland urban environment. The former Metropolitan Planning Commission was particularly subject to criticism for this tendency.


(6) The recommendation in favor of the so-called “52nd Avenue Route” is embodied in the Portland City Planning Commission’s Report to the Portland City Council, Interstate 205 Freeway, March, 1965, 36 pp., including maps.
The failure of public officials to accept and implement the proposals of their planning commission reflects in part the indifference of leading citizens in the Portland metropolitan area to the need for a sound, comprehensive planning process. Such indifference is to be seen in the admitted inability of Metropolitan Area Perspective (MAP), a citizens group dedicated to improvement of the greater Portland area, to attract the support of major business, industrial, labor, and government leaders in its activities.

**Multiplicity of Local Governmental Units**

The lack of a comprehensive approach to planning and the acquiescence of public officials to proposals from private developers and state government is attributable in large part to the fragmentation of the metropolitan area into more than 400 local governments. Many of these, to be sure, are special service districts concerned with provision of water, light, sanitary facilities, and fire protection to unincorporated areas, but even these districts at times must make decisions affecting traffic congestion and facilities.

More significant to the problem of transportation planning, however, are the more than three dozen general purpose municipal and county governments which fragment the metropolitan area. The majority of these are a legacy of the nineteenth century when community life and governmental needs were vastly different than at present. A few are of more recent origin.\(^7\)

The multiplicity of local governments affects comprehensive planning in several ways. Local needs and capabilities necessarily take precedence over the impact of decisions on adjacent jurisdictions. Initiatives by one government to speed traffic flow may not be continued by a neighbor. The difference between the improved arterial routes through unincorporated areas of Multnomah County, such as Division and Stark streets, and their narrow, congested counterparts in the City of Portland is a case in point.

**Competition for Tax Bases**

Another consequence of the existence of so many units of government in a functionally unified metropolitan area is their competition for improved tax bases. The competition for new industry and residential development often leads to acquiescence to the demands of developers for modifications of zoning ordinances and other special privileges which are detrimental not only to the metropolitan area as a whole, but also to the livability of the local community itself. The Portland area's future slums are now being built in suburban districts where local governments have decided to accept excessive density, inadequate service facilities, and even sub-standard construction techniques. The Bonny Slope and Marlene Village areas are legacies of similar acquiescence in earlier periods.

Some persons interviewed by your Committee have suggested that state and federal government agencies have also utilized the competitive relationships between communities to achieve their own project goals which may lack harmony with regional and local needs. Another negative consequence of the multiplicity of governmental units in the metropolitan area is the duplication of staffs and facilities and the loss in economies of scale where several small facilities are built instead of a single large unit which would be more efficient. The string of small sewage treatment plants along the Tualatin river is perhaps the most glaring example.

---

\(^7\)One city, for instance, was recently incorporated as a direct result of highway planning decisions. When it was decided by the State Highway Commission to reroute I-205 through the unincorporated Maywood Park area on the east side, local homeowners formed a new city as a device to force adoption of an alternate route, although the effectiveness of this strategem is still in doubt. A somewhat similar situation occurred in the Durham community, in the southwestern part of the metropolitan area, which was incorporated by homeowners to resist industrial development adjacent to their residences. The surrounding rural land had suddenly become a prime area for manufacturing plants because of the completion of the Interstate 5 freeway.
MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL UNITS IN THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA
(Parentheses mean the respective cities are not members of their county planning commissions.)
VI. STEPS TOWARD COMPREHENSIVE, AREAWIDE PLANNING FOR TRANSPORTATION

Local Efforts

The preceding observations have indicated some of the major handicaps in the Portland Metropolitan Area toward achieving a comprehensive, area-wide transportation planning process which is susceptible to implementation and enjoys the confidence and support of the citizenry. The present state of affairs is not a new one, and numerous groups and individuals have sought to remedy it with varying degrees of success. The League of Women Voters stressed the problems of political fragmentation in its 1956 report, A Tale of Three Counties. Later, a voluntary civic action group, Metropolitan Area Perspectives (MAP) was formed to seek solutions to urban problems. Largely through the efforts of MAP, the League of Women Voters, and the Portland Chamber of Commerce, the state legislature in 1963 created the Portland Metropolitan Study Commission.

The Commission's announced purpose was to provide a method for people of the area to adopt local solutions to common problems. Although the main thrust of the enabling legislation was to establish a plan for providing metropolitan services, the Commission was encouraged to recommend a suitable governmental framework for providing such services. It submitted a number of proposals to the 1965 and 1967 Legislatures, although its most significant recommendations were not adopted. These included bills to encourage consolidations of municipalities and special districts and to permit the formation of metropolitan service districts. It is currently planning to submit a revised proposal to create metropolitan service districts which would include public transportation as a major function. The Study Commission also had a role in the formation of CRAG.

Other groups which have been interested in the study and encouragement of a unified approach to comprehensive planning, including transportation, are the Urban Studies Center of Portland State College and the newly-formed Metropolitan Action Council.

State and Federal Efforts

Credit should be given to the state and federal governments for seeking a greater degree of coordination in their own efforts of transportation planning and regulation, and also for their efforts in promoting unified action at the local level. A bill has been prepared to coordinate Oregon state agencies through a new Department of Transportation. The governor has also announced a framework for regional coordination of all state agencies. Under this program, the four counties in the metropolitan area would be grouped into a single region to be serviced by field offices located in Portland.

The state has created an Oregon Port Authorities Commission to study and report on "the most appropriate and practical ways and means to develop a comprehensive state-wide plan for the most orderly, efficient, and economical development of an integrated series of ports, waterways, and marine terminal facilities, major airports, interstate bridges, and related transportation facilities and/or services on a coordinated and balanced basis."(8) The Commission is also authorized to embark on studies of the role which the Port of Portland can play in providing public terminal facilities for air, rail, bus, and truck transportation, and the operation of mass transit systems and belt line railroads. The Commission has focused its attention on a study of the problems of lower Columbia river ports, and has not explored the terminal, mass transit, and belt line possibilities noted above.

The establishment of a new federal Department of Transportation has been an important step in minimizing the general practice of planning and regulating transportation according to individual modes. Representatives of the Department have also assured your Committee of their interest in promoting local solutions to local transportation problems. It is evident that the Department will have funds for metropolitan transportation planning, and the Portland area should be prepared to utilize them when they become available.

The activities of these various groups have not been without a degree of success in encouraging comprehensive planning in the Portland Metropolitan Area, although as detailed above, much needs to be done. In particular, three bodies have been established that include metropolitan transportation planning among their responsibilities: the Portland Metropolitan Planning Commission, the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study, and the Columbia Region Association of Governments.

The Metropolitan Planning Commission

The first major effort to coordinate planning in the Portland area was the creation of the Metropolitan Planning Commission in 1958 by the City of Portland and Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties, on a voluntary, non-statutory basis. Although the sizable part of the metropolitan area lying in the State of Washington was excluded, the new commission performed a number of needed services that local agencies had been unable to do. Using proportionate funds from the four local governments plus federal matching funds, the commission collected and summarized an impressive array of data about the region.

Persons interviewed by your Committee were divided about the effectiveness of the commission. Although there was general appreciation of its collection and presentation of basic data on the area, the commission was faulted on four grounds: (1) it was not truly metropolitan, since suburban cities, the Port of Portland, and other bodies were not represented; (2) it did not actually engage in planning, but because of its shaky political base confined its activities to non-controversial data collection; (3) it existed by virtue of yearly contracts, and thus had difficulty in keeping good personnel; (4) it did not have sufficient contacts with local planning agencies. The functions of the commission have subsequently been absorbed by CRAG.

Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study (P-V MTS)

A more specialized effort to engage in transportation planning began in late 1959 when the Oregon State Highway Commission initiated the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study. Participating in the study were the Bureau of Municipal Research and Service of the University of Oregon, the Port of Portland, the Oregon counties of Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington, and the cities of Portland, Gresham, Wood Village, Troutdale, Fairview, Lake Oswego, Milwaukie, Oregon City, Gladstone, West Linn, Beaverton, Tigard, and Tualatin. The Metropolitan Planning Commission also took part in the study, and provision was made for representation of the interests of the Washington State Highway Commission, Clark county and its cities, the Washington State Planning and Community Affairs Agency, and other bodies which are limited by Washington state law in their ability to participate formally in interstate projects.

In 1965 the Oregon members of the P-V MTS study signed an agreement that would enable the study to conform to a 1962 amendment to the Federal Highway Act which stated:

> It is in the national interest to promote the development of transportation systems, embracing various modes of transport in a manner that will serve the State and local communities efficiently and effectively. Long-range plans are to be developed which are coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation and which consider their probable effect on the future development of urban areas of more than 50,000 population. After July 1, 1965, no interstate highway in such an urban area is to be approved, unless the project is based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by States and local communities in conformance with the objectives stated in this section. (Sec. 134, Title 23, United States Code.)

P-V MTS has a Coordinating Committee that is advised by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) whose first major task was to investigate the alignment of the I-205 freeway. More recently, the activities of P-V MTS have been brought under the wing of CRAG, although the relationships are not direct. In August of 1967 the coordinating committee of P-V MTS was made an advisory body to CRAG, and CRAG delegated authority to this committee to develop a master transportation plan. According to the agreement, the executive committee of CRAG is to review the proposed master plan to see that it is in harmony with all other master planning
done by CRAG. Moreover, the secretary of CRAG is to be chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee of P-V MTS. It should be noted however that the present executive director of CRAG is not a professional planner, nor does CRAG have a planning director.

Although in its early stages P-V MTS maintained its own staff and drew on the resources of local planning agencies, its principal work has been done by private consultants and the Oregon State Highway Commission. The Metropolitan Planning Commission projected the results of a 1960 survey of travel in the area to 1980. Since then the New Haven and San Francisco firm of Wilbur Smith and Associates has updated the estimate to 1990.

Some serious questions can be raised about the validity of the original data and the assumptions involved in its projection for the future. The methodology is based upon a presumed continuation of present trends of land use and transportation, without consideration of alternatives brought about by any coordinated effort to shape the future development of the area such as by the introduction of a rapid transit system. It appears that the Technical Advisory Committee is in the process of approving a master plan for transportation which relies primarily upon the conclusions and proposals of the Oregon State Highway Commission based on the 1960 data. The P-V MTS did authorize a study of mass transit possibilities based on the data, but has not yet finally accepted the conclusions of the consultants, Simpson & Curtin.

The work of P-V MTS cannot be termed part of a comprehensive planning process, because there is no set of articulated planning goals yet in existence for the metropolitan area against which it can be weighed and integrated. It is area-wide in scope, a commendable feature required by the Bureau of Public Roads in order to be eligible for public funds. It is susceptible to implementation, and in fact the I-205 section of it is already being implemented before the study is completed. Although the study held two public meetings in its early stages in an effort to involve the public in the formulation of policy, the subsequent role of the public has largely been a formalistic one.

Columbia Region Association of Governments

CRAG was established by public officials in 1966 with the aid of the Metropolitan Study Commission to meet many of the problems that had originally prompted the creation of your Committee. The specific impetus for CRAG's formation was the federal government's demand for coordinated local planning. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Federal Highway Act required that any further aid to local communities and metropolitan areas after July 1, 1965 had to be related to a coordinated program of continuous, comprehensive planning directed by locally-elected officials to reflect the needs and desires of the people. CRAG was designed to serve as the required reviewing agency for all applications for federal grants from communities in the metropolitan area. It should be noted, however, that the federal government is not bound by CRAG's decisions when awarding grants.

CRAG's constitution also specifies that it is to "serve as a forum in which local officials can identify problems of mutual concern and to recommend courses of action to solve these problems" and to "prepare comprehensive regional plans". The official policies of CRAG toward comprehensive planning are expressed in its "Resolution No. 5" which is reprinted in Appendix C of this report. These policies in the main meet your Committee's criteria for comprehensive and area-wide planning. It should be noted that the "short range program" to have been accomplished by July 1, 1968, has not yet been fully implemented.

CRAG is open to membership by each city and county in the Portland Metropolitan Area. Presently its membership includes the counties of Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington, and Clark, with their cities. Recently Columbia county was also declared eligible by the association. Governments with appointed rather

(9) Cities currently members of CRAG are: Beaverton, Camas, Cornelius, Fairview, Forest Grove, Gladstone, Gresham, Happy Valley, Hillsboro, Lake Oswego, Milwaukie, North Plains, Oregon City, Portland, Sherwood, Tigard, Troutdale, Tualatin, Vancouver, Washougal, West Linn, and Wood Village. Cities in the four-county area which are currently NOT members of CRAG are: Banks, Barlow, Battleground, Canby, Durham, Estacada, Gaston, King City, La Center, Molalla, Ridgefield, Sandy, and Yacolt.
than elected executives were intentionally left out. The most important effect of this was to exclude the Port of Portland, an autonomous state agency whose powers and finances are significantly greater than several of the local governments which are included. There is also no representation of school districts and special service districts in the organization, although some of these bodies too have functions of far greater magnitude than smaller incorporated cities.

Policy for CRAG is established by a General Assembly that is required to meet at least twice a year. The execution of policies is supervised by an executive committee composed of one elected official from each county plus a representative of the City of Portland and one city official from each county chosen at a meeting of the city representatives from each county. The executive committee appoints an executive secretary who in turn is responsible for appointment of a staff. The current staff is divided into sections concerned with physical planning, public works, transportation, environmental planning, and general services. Each of these has an advisory committee of experts.

During its first year of operations CRAG has been active in its three announced functions of planning, reviewing, and serving as a forum on local problems. Thus far its planning activities have largely been in the field of extending efforts already begun. As noted above, it has absorbed the staff and projects of the former Metropolitan Planning Commission, and it is continuing the commission’s work in the collection of basic data and the preparation of economic and population forecasts. It has assumed overall responsibility for planning transportation facilities and joined forces with P-V MTS. It has also entered into an agreement with the Port of Portland to develop a study of regional aviation needs. In its first six months of operation CRAG reviewed 36 applications for federal grants totaling approximately nine million dollars. The meetings of its General Assembly and its executive committee have provided the formal and informal forum for exchanging views of local governments on mutual problems that was intended.

CRAG represents a substantial start in the direction of area-wide, comprehensive planning. It has been able to achieve a degree of cooperation among local officials in areas where none existed before. It has assembled a qualified staff with the background and potential to achieve excellence in planning. However, it suffers from a number of handicaps in achieving such excellence, particularly in the field of implementation.

It should be noted that the final pressure for creating CRAG came from the federal government, not the local community. The officials of local governments who established CRAG to meet federal requirements incorporated in its structure many elements which weaken or negate its ability to conduct truly comprehensive planning.

These limiting features include its voluntary membership, its lack of powers to implement its decisions, and its insecure financial basis. As it is now constituted, CRAG is not a federation of governments, but a voluntary confederation in which the members have given up none of their authority and prerogatives, and from which they may withdraw at any time. Although its present membership realizes that their participation is desirable to secure federal funds, the organization is weak in determining policy when the interest of two or more members are in conflict. Vital questions have been side-stepped to avoid the risk of secession by a local government that might feel aggrieved by a decision with which it disagrees.

Any decisions CRAG may make in regard to transportation and other concerns of planning rest upon voluntary implementation by its constituent members. There has been no delegation of authority to it by the cities and counties, which retain the right to veto any proposal affecting their respective territories. Area-wide planning can thus be negated either in the decision-making stage through avoidance of confrontations, or in the implementing stage through failure of local bodies to act.

The achievement of area-wide comprehensive planning is also handicapped by the same lack of control by CRAG over the extensive planning activities of the Port of Portland, school districts, and special districts in the metropolitan area.

The dependence of the organization on voluntary contributions of its members and year-to-year grants from the federal government is a precarious base upon which to assemble and maintain a top-flight planning staff. This was one of the most serious weaknesses of its predecessor, the Metropolitan Planning Commission. The
potential threat to withdraw funds when the local officials are not pleased with its findings weakens the role CRAG should have as an impartial body that can identify present and potential needs of the metropolitan region and can effect proper solutions.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The Needs
Transportation difficulties in the Portland Metropolitan Area have not reached a stage of general crisis, but problems are evident and they promise to increase as the area grows. Traffic congestion, inadequate parking facilities, declining transit service, and freeways out of harmony with community interests are with us now and the experience of other cities suggests that the situation will become worse.

Change in the nature and problems of transportation is bound to occur, just as change must be anticipated in all other aspects of urban living. Change guided by a sound planning process is preferable to change occurring under weak or non-existent planning. Not only the direct problems of urban traffic congestion, but also its indirect effects of sprawl, decentralization of urban life, and intolerable levels of noise and pollution need not be inevitable, if steps can be taken soon enough to avoid them.

2. Requirements for a Sound Planning Structure
The key elements for a sound metropolitan planning structure are that it be area-wide, comprehensive, susceptible to implementation, and in accord with public wishes.

It is essential that the government framework for meeting problems extend over an area as great as the territory covered by the problems themselves. Transportation is a continuous activity linking every home and business with every other home and business in the community, country, continent, and eventually, the world. Although this implies several levels of magnitude, the lowest, most irreducible level for handling transportation problems must be the metropolitan community as a whole. Despite its fragmentation into many cities and "rural" housing and industrial districts, the Portland metropolitan area is a single organism with mutually interdependent parts. We cannot afford to maintain the illusion of separateness of local communities from the common whole.

Transportation planning must be part of a comprehensive planning process which integrates decision-making about any type of transportation with all other forms of planning, and, especially, with all other modes of transportation. Land uses and social needs particularly must be taken into account. Moreover, transportation planning must be in advance of anticipated needs wherever possible, as much guiding future development as responding to problems already in existence. Also, the planning process needs to involve local personnel intimately aware of community problems and developments who are in communication with the public, rather than being dependent on decisions by federal- or state-level technical staffs or by consultants essentially unfamiliar with the area.

Plans must be susceptible to implementation in both a physical sense and a political one. New proposals must be related to existing patterns of development and to available financial resources. If plans are to be comprehensive and area-wide, they must be subject to implementation by a governmental organization which is also area-wide and comprehensive in its powers.

Finally, the public must be kept abreast of planning, both to ensure that sound planning is not frustrated by vocal minorities with special interests, and also to provide the essential feedback to the planners of the needs and desires of the public.

3. The Present Structure of Transportation Planning
Transportation planning in the Portland Metropolitan Area does not measure up well to these considerations. Transportation routes and facilities are of necessity planned by local governments, but not as part of an area-wide comprehensive process. The transportation planning efforts of CRAG to date are inadequate. Too many decisions for improving or extending roads or building traffic-generating facilities are approved as they are proposed by developers and the Highway Commission without reference to the overall needs of the region as a whole. There is in fact no specific statement of goals for the metropolitan area against which such decisions can be weighed. No agreement exists on what should be the directions
of growth of the urbanized area, its internal arrangement, or the elements of livability in the present scene that should be preserved for the future at all costs.

Despite announcements and proposals to the contrary, transportation planning undertaken by local governments, CRAG, and the State Highway Commission is comprehensive neither in the integration of modes of transportation nor in the interrelation of transportation with other aspects of planning. Presently most transportation planning is concerned only with moving automobiles. Little real attention is paid to the integration of rail, bus, water-borne and air traffic as they relate to the metropolitan area, particularly in the matter of terminals. Despite some completed, ongoing, authorized, or proposed studies of mass transit for the area, almost no serious planning is taking place in this realm. The elaborate studies upon which decisions are being made for a 1990 traffic plan by the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Traffic Study are essentially sophisticated projections of current trends. As noted above, they cannot be based on any community goals of urban form or content, since such goals do not yet exist. Likely changes in trends are not considered, particularly the effect of the introduction of mass transit. The needs of the poor, the aged, and others without access to their own automobiles are ignored.

The role of transportation in achieving land use and social goals is almost non-existent. This is due not only to the lack of articulation of such goals, but also to the fact that local governments have been abdicating responsibilities for planning transportation to the State Highway Commission and other agencies remote from the region's problems. This is particularly true when touchy political situations have developed. Moreover, most transportation planning that has been done at the local level has been a response to existing needs rather than being part of an integrated attack on anticipated problems of the future.

Implementation of planning is generally weak. The existing area-wide planning body, CRAG, has no powers to ensure that any decisions it makes in the field of transportation will be carried out. Planning at the local level is frustrated by pressure groups and the apathy of the public. The universal inadequacy of revenues has led local governments to accept the funded proposals of the State Highway Commission and other public and private agencies, even in the face of strong opposition by their own planners and planning commissions.

Finally, involvement with the public is not sufficient. It is too easy for small pressure groups to frustrate plans. Citizens are not continuously informed about the existing status of planning and alternatives open for the future. Present mechanisms for public hearings are not adequate to involve the public as a whole in major policy decisions.

4. Alternatives for Improvement

Most of the inadequacies of transportation planning in the Portland Metropolitan Area derive from the lack of a single body for planning and implementing decisions. As the chart on pages 274-275 indicates, at least two dozen separate local planning agencies are now in operation, in addition to P-V MTS, CRAG, and several state- and federal-level agencies. A fundamental prerequisite to any improvement in transportation planning is the consolidation of their efforts. It should be stressed that such consolidation is necessary, but not in itself sufficient to assure sound planning in transportation and other fields. Even within a locally unified structure there can be unsatisfactory transportation planning, as witness Portland's loss of its river front.

Numerous alternatives are possible for a governmental structure which would permit a more comprehensive and area-wide approach to planning. The enabling legislation that led to the formation of the Portland Metropolitan Study Commission listed the following possible courses of action for preparing and implementing a comprehensive plan for metropolitan services: consolidation of cities, city-county consolidation, consolidation of special districts, annexation to existing cities, creation of a federation of existing local governments, creation of a metropolitan service district, provision of metropolitan services by county governments, consolidation of specified metropolitan services (by transfer of functions, by creation of joint administrative agencies, or by contractual agreements), or creation of a permanent urban area council of governments.(10)

(10)ORS 199.230.
In evaluating these and other alternatives to the present situation your Committee has been guided by the following considerations:

a) Drastic reform in local government such as the establishment of a metropolitan city, however desirable such a step might be, does not seem politically feasible in the immediate future, nor is it absolutely essential for achieving a satisfactory planning structure. Necessary improvement can be sought within the existing constellation of governments, and should be pursued at once.

b) The various possible consolidations of cities, cities and counties, or special districts have undoubted merit for bringing economy and efficiency to many aspects of local government. However, for planning transportation the essential thing is that it be possible to make decisions for the metropolitan area as a whole. Even a greatly simplified pattern of local governments would retain the competitiveness and lack of coordination that is so deplorable now.

c) A metropolitan-wide special district for transportation planning or the expansion of authority of one government body by statutory or contractual arrangement to embrace the entire metropolitan region could remedy some of the present ills, particularly in the field of planning public transportation. However, any body that could plan roads and transit lines but not have responsibilities for planning land use and public services would lack a basic requirement that planning be comprehensive. Similar considerations would make undesirable the granting of expanded powers for metropolitan transportation planning to the State Highway Department or to other state or federal single-purpose agencies.

5. Conclusion

Your Committee has come to the conclusion that the best hope for immediate improvement lies in strengthening the Columbia Region Association of Governments so that it can become an active, comprehensive planning agency. It is already an area-wide organization, with a competent staff nucleus and responsibilities in the planning of federally-funded projects. If it is to become a body able to make decisions and implement them for the metropolitan area as a whole, however, it must be strengthened in its present structure, financing and authority.

First, CRAG must become a permanent, area-wide institution. It cannot remain a voluntary association dependent on compromise and consensus in order to hold its members. All city and county governments in the Portland Metropolitan Area should automatically be members of the organization under a state charter. To assure participation by Clark county and its cities, an interstate compact may be necessary.

A commendable feature of CRAG is that its general assembly and executive committee are composed of elected officials from its member governments. This has encouraged a degree of active cooperation which is essential for reaching and implementing decisions. Local elected officials should continue to constitute CRAG's legislative body. A separately elected or appointed governing body would simply be another contribution to the present complex mosaic of governments with dangers of competitiveness and stalemate that would outweigh any possible benefits. The often hostile relationships between the governments of Multnomah county and the city of Portland are illustrative of the problem.

The need for representation on CRAG's policy-making bodies by the Port of Portland, and other port districts, school districts, state highway commissions, and other special purpose local governments or branches of the state governments has been advocated by several persons interviewed by your Committee. They have stressed the benefits to be derived from cooperation based upon active participation in decision-making. Although such an enlarged membership would be desirable, if not essential, if CRAG were to continue in its present voluntary form, there are some arguments against expansion of a strengthened CRAG beyond the inclusion of all general-purpose county and municipal governments in the Portland Metropolitan Region.

A principal concern is that the general assembly of the organization would become unwieldy. The more than 400 potential additional members would expand the body's size drastically. This objection could be allayed under a system of consolidated representation or simple exclusion of some of the more limited governments such as the special districts for street lighting. However, there would remain valid concern that any expansion in this direction would serve to place CRAG
further from the electorate than it already is under its present and anticipated structure of indirect representation through delegates from general-purpose governments. The appointed officials of the port commissions and highway commissions do not stand for election and thus need not have the same responsiveness to the public will as elected officials do. Since the officials of special purpose governments have an understandable focus of attention on the technical problems of the bodies to which they belong, the more general concerns of the public as represented by a consensus of county and city government officials could well be diluted. It should be noted that inclusion of special-purpose governments in CRAG's policy-making bodies would not make that organization more area-wide, since the people in their constituencies would already be entirely represented by county and city government officials.

While your Committee thus does not believe that it is essential or desirable that special-purpose governments have representation in policy matters, it is imperative that their plans be subject to review by CRAG, and it would be desirable from both economic and planning considerations for the planning staff of CRAG to have a substantial role in the formulation of their plans.

Second, in the question of finances, CRAG must have a more stable base than the present year-to-year project grants from the federal government and the voluntary contributions of its member bodies. Your Committee is disturbed by the fact that a disproportionate amount of staff time of CRAG in fact has been devoted solely to the preparation of requests for more federal funds. CRAG should have its own per capita tax base collected through its member county governments, or there should be an equitable mandatory assessment of its constituent bodies. In the latter case, the required finances could largely be derived at little additional cost to the public by simply transferring a share of the already sizable funds now budgeted for planning by the local general-purpose governments. Additional savings to the public at large could also be achieved by allowing the CRAG staff, as noted above, to perform under a contract relationship many of the activities now done by the staffs of special-purpose local governments and branches of state government such as the Port of Portland and the highway departments. In this manner, much unnecessary duplication could be eliminated and savings in such areas as computer usage could be achieved through a larger scale of operation.

Third, the role of CRAG in planning must be expanded and strengthened. If it is to be comprehensive, it must have final authority for all metropolitan planning. It already has such authority for most federally-funded projects. Ideally, its expert staff should be entrusted with much of the actual formulating of long-range plans, particularly in the realm of transportation. Short-range planning and the administration of zoning laws could be left to the local governments, much as at present. At a minimum, no local government should be able to effectuate a plan without review and approval by CRAG to make certain that the overall objectives are being observed. All plans for the metropolitan area by state agencies similarly should be required to have CRAG approval before being put into effect.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Your Committee submits the following recommendations for steps that can be taken to bring immediate improvement:

(1) All transportation planning for the Portland Metropolitan Area must be approved by a single body, responsible for area-wide and comprehensive planning. In the absence of a single metropolitan government, the most appropriate existing organization to be vested with this responsibility is the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG).

(2) In order for CRAG to perform this function, it must be suitably strengthened in its structure, financing and authority. To give it the greatest effectiveness, the Oregon and Washington legislatures should jointly charter CRAG as a metropolitan planning body with provisions for the following:

(a) All local general-purpose city and county governments in the Portland Metropolitan Area must be required to participate in CRAG under an equitable system of representation. Delegates from the member governments to the general assembly and executive committee should continue to be elected officials.
(b) CRAG should be financed by a stable source of funds, such as a direct property tax or upon equitable per capita assessment of participating governments.

(c) All decisions in the field of planning by CRAG must be binding upon all general- and special-purpose local government units in the metropolitan region, and also upon the state highway commissions, the Port of Portland, and other arms of state government.

(3) Greater economies and efficiencies in planning should be realized by delegation to the CRAG planning staff of duplicative activities now performed by the more than two dozen separate planning departments in the region.

(4) For effective comprehensive planning CRAG must obtain a metropolitan-wide consensus on goals for future development. Such goals should include consideration of the preferred form and content of the future city and features to be preserved at all costs in the area’s livability and historical heritage.

(5) CRAG should consider without further delay the appropriateness of establishing a mass transit system for the metropolitan area. If such a system is deemed essential to meet future transportation needs, a special transportation authority or an existing agency such as the Port of Portland must be empowered by state government to undertake its design and construction in conformity with the comprehensive plan.

(6) CRAG must follow a policy and develop a program that will insure maximum citizen participation in the planning process. This should include, as a minimum:

(a) An active information program designed to keep the public abreast of the activities and proposals;

(b) Periodic forums throughout the Metropolitan Area to encourage “feedback” from the public on plans and proposals; and

(c) Methods for determining citizen preference for alternative proposals and other aspects of its programs.

Respectfully submitted,
Jack E. Day
Roland A. Haertl
Philip Dean Janney
Abbott W. Lawrence*
Warren H. Marple
Thomas M. Poulsen
Arno Reifenberg
Hubert E. Walker
Ben F. Walling
Arnold N. Bodtker, Chairman

*Deceased

Approved by the Research Board November 7, 1968 and submitted to the Board of Governors.

Received by the Board of Governors November 18, 1968 and ordered printed and submitted to the membership for discussion and action.
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PERSONS INTERVIEWED

(In order of appearance)

Roy F. Bessey, Planning Consultant, Federal Water Pollution Control Agency
Lewis Ross, Director, Metropolitan Planning Commission
Robert Blakesley, Information Systems Director, CRAG
David Eccles, Multnomah County Commissioner, Vice Chairman, CRAG
George M. Baldwin, Manager, Port of Portland
W. S. Dirker, Manager, Research Planning and Information, Port of Portland
Arnold N. Cogan, then Planning Director, Port of Portland
H. W. Bahls, Research Director, Port of Portland
Margaret Gribskov, then Chairman, Transportation Committee, Metropolitan Study Commission
George Lewis, President, Metropolitan Study Commission
A. McKay Rich, Executive Secretary, Metropolitan Study Commission
Glenn Jackson, Chairman, Oregon State Highway Commission
Forrest Cooper, State Highway Engineer, Oregon State Highway Commission
Lloyd Anderson, Planning Consultant and Portland Manager, Cornell, Howland, Hayes and Merrifield
Don Morin, Urban Transportation Planning Engineer, U. S. Bureau of Public Roads
Lloyd Keefe, City Planning Director, City of Portland
Robert Keith, Associate Director, Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Oregon
Cyrus Nims, Planning Consultant, Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Oregon
Dwight L. Haugen, Member of Governor's Advisory Committee for Coordination for Planning
Howard Glazer, Member, Metropolitan Study Commission
Robert Krebs, President, Pacific Northwest Electric Railway Association
Kenneth E. Teter, then Commissioner, Clark County, Washington
Bill Kingman, Clark County, Washington
Tom McLellan, Clark County, Washington
Darrell Jones, Commissioner, Clackamas County, Oregon
Don Morton, Planning Director, Clackamas County, Washington
John Keeley, County Engineer, Clackamas County, Oregon
Clayton Nyberg, Commissioner, Washington County, Oregon
Carl Jonasson, Engineer, former Vice Chairman, Technical Advisory Committee to the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study
C. A. Crosser, Executive Secretary, Municipal League, Seattle
John Porter, Director, Puget Sound Governmental Conference
Bud Donahue, Executive Secretary, Forward Thrust, Seattle
Derek Woolfall, Engineer, De Leuw, Cather & Company, Forward Thrust, Seattle
Clifford Campbell, former Deputy Commissioner of Planning, Chicago and N. E. Illinois Metropolitan Area
Francis Staten, former Regional Planner, Federal Housing Authority
Thomas Guerin, Manager, Commission of Public Docks, Portland
Col. Al Eschbach, Engineer, Commission of Public Docks, Portland
R. L. Thomas, Engineer, Portland Terminal Railroad Company
William A. Bugge, Project Director, Bay Area Rapid Transit Department, San Francisco, California
F. W. Beichley, Engineer for Development and Planning, Tektronix, Inc.
Raymond Perkins, General Manager, Rose City Transit Co.
William A. Bowes, Commissioner, City of Portland
Fred T. Fowler, Highway Coordinator, City of Portland
Carl Wendt, Public Works Coordinator, City of Portland
Richard C. Speer, Assistant Traffic Engineer, City of Portland
John Merrill, Planning Requirements Officer, Housing and Urban Development Agency
Dr. Lyndon R. Musolf, Director of Urban Studies Center, Portland State College
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**APPENDIX C**

"RESOLUTION NO. 5"
(Adopted at initial meeting of CRAG)

Whereas Federal aid to local communities and metropolitan areas require a coordinated program of continuous comprehensive planning directed by local elected officials to reflect the needs and desires of the people, and
Whereas, the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG) has been formed for the purpose of coordinating area-wide planning for the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Area, and
Whereas, it is necessary and desirable to adopt policies and programs in order to guide the conduct of comprehensive planning to assure the proper scheduling of projects and facilities and the effective coordination and review of all proposals for implementation, therefore be it resolved that the following be adopted:

**Policies**

1. Comprehensive planning is recognized as a continuing process requiring formulation, programming, coordination and implementation by all affected agencies and groups.
2. Comprehensive planning includes land use, transportation, sewer, water and like facilities, parks, recreation and open space, urban beautification, housing, health and education facilities, community development and renewal and other aspects of physical, economic and social development of significance to the urban area.
3. The comprehensive planning process shall be related to the stated goals and objectives of the community, including the efficient and orderly growth and development of the urban area.
4. Comprehensive planning shall encompass the entire urban and urbanizing area and shall consider all relevant elements on an area-wide basis.
5. Appropriate agreements and arrangements shall be entered into by the members of CRAG and designed to assure that systems and facilities are planned, programmed, developed and operated to meet the needs of the entire area in accord with the plan.
6. The development of plans and programs shall be assisted by the administrative officials and technicians of the member agencies, other public agencies, and private interests in the form of advisory committees.

7. In order to accomplish the furtherance of Comprehensive Planning, the work of CRAG shall be divided into the development of a long-range planning program and a short-range planning program to be accomplished prior to July 1, 1968, as hereafter described.

8. The Comprehensive Plans, related programs, policies, and implementation shall be referred by the Executive Committee to the General Assembly of CRAG.

9. Each project for implementation of the Comprehensive Plan shall be reviewed by the Executive Committee for consistency with the Plan.

**Short-Range Program**

The Short-Range Program, to be implemented in stages, but fully accomplished prior to July 1, 1968, shall consist of the following elements with a five to ten-year projection:

1. A Land Use element consisting of open, agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, and supporting uses, and recognizing the existing comprehensive land use plans of the member agencies.

2. A Transportation element consisting of trafficways, mass transit, rail, water and air facilities, and recognizing the existing plans of the member agencies and the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study.

3. A Sewer and Water facilities plan consisting of the collection, treatment and disposition of sewage and wastes and the sources, treatment, storage and distribution of water and recognizing the existing plans and programs of the member agencies.

4. A park, recreation and open-space plan, recognizing the existing plans and programs of the member agencies and the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

5. Data collection and analysis including population forecasts and distribution, economic and sociological factors, recognizing the existing work of the member agencies, and other sources.

6. Preparation of goals and objectives.

The above elements, where appropriate, shall include:

1. A schedule of priorities
2. Estimates of costs
3. Recommended means of financing
4. The allocation of responsibilities for implementing the programs
5. Maps and supporting data indicating location and service areas
6. Plans for integration with existing systems
7. Programs for the coordinated operation of the area-wide system or facilities

**Long-Range Program**

In addition to the elements of the Short-Range Program, the Long-Range Program shall consist of, but not limited to, the following, all with at least a twenty-year projection:

1. Community Renewal Program
2. Urban Beautification
3. Air Pollution Control
4. Water Resources Development
5. Integrated Codes and Ordinances
6. Capital Improvement Program
7. Continuous refinement of goals and objectives
8. Consideration of alternative courses of action
9. Continued development and unification of the Databank
10. Examination and development of other implementation measures
11. Other aspects of physical, economic, and social development.