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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.
A special meeting will be held to discuss the Regional Transportation Plan on Wednesday, April 9, at 5:30 p.m. A copy of the RTP is attached for your review.

Dinner will be served at the meeting. Please call Pam Juett (221-1646) by noon Tuesday, April 8, if you plan to attend.

Attached is Staff Report Number 66: Policy Considerations Emerging from the First Draft of the Regional Transportation Plan. Review of this document in advance will ensure meaningful discussion of the policy direction for the RTP.
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AGENDA

JOINT POLICY ALTERNATIVES
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: April 9, 1980
Day: Wednesday
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Place: Metro - Conference Room A1/A2

1. ACTION ITEMS

A. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FROM THE NORTHWEST RESERVE - N.W. Front (Glisan to 26th) and N.W. Portland Transportation Study

B. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FROM THE I-505 CITY RESERVE - Going Street Noise Mitigation Construction Project

C. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FOR THE ARTERIAL STREET OVERLAY PROGRAM IN THE CITY OF PORTLAND

2. STATUS REPORT

A. UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM (Scheduled for approval in May)

3. WORKSHOP ON THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

A. OVERALL POLICY DIRECTION (Refer to p. 2 of Staff Report 66)
   . Provide a conceptual basis for establishing objectives and investment programs

B. ALTERNATIVE PERFORMANCE MEASURES (Refer to p. 3 & 4 of Staff Report 66)
   . Describe the degree to which the policy direction would be pursued.

C. DETAILED PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES (Refer to pp. 5-8 of Staff Report 66)
   . Describe specific concerns to be addressed and resolved by the plan.
D. POPULATION/EMPLOYMENT GROWTH (Refer to p. 5 of Staff Report 66)

. Represents basic growth projections used to estimate travel.

E. FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (Refer to pp. 9-10 of Staff Report 66)

. To be used to define the role of various transportation facilities.

F. PROCESS FOR INVOLVING JURISDICTIONS AND CITIZENS IN THE RTP PREPARATION

CWO: pj
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: March 13, 1980

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Bob Bothman, Connie Kearney, Larry Cole, Dick Carroll, Charlie Williamson, John Frewing, Ernie Bonner, Lloyd Anderson,

Visitors: L. David Hill, Bebe Rucker, Donna Stuhr, Ted Spence, John MacGregor, Anne Sylvester, Paul Bay, G.B. Arrington, Bill Young, Bill Cameron

Staff: Bill Ockert, Denton Kent, Rick Gustafson, Bob Haas, Andy Cotugno, Steve Siegel, Jim Sitzman, Pam Juett

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

1. FUNDING AUTHORIZATION FOR THE NEW PROJECT - St. Helens Road WCL to N.W. Kittridge

Bill Ockert introduced the agenda item and noted that it had been reviewed by TPAC and authorization recommended. Bob Bothman indicated that the funds were not from the I-505 reserve as indicated in the Agenda Management Summary and Resolution, but from the reserve account for the N.W. Portland Projects. Larry Cole moved and was seconded to recommend approval in the amended form of this project. The MOTION passed unanimously.

2. TRANSFER OF FUNDS BETWEEN JURISDICTIONS - From 185th & TV Highway (Washington County) to S.W. Nyberg Rd. (Tualatin)

Bill Ockert reported that Metro's concerns have been fully addressed and the issue does not need to go before the Metro Council. Therefore JPACT action is not necessary.

3. WESTSIDE CORRIDOR WORK PROGRAM - Summary

Steve Siegel reported on the Westside Corridor Work Program. There was some discussion on eliminating some of the alternatives. Larry Cole moved and was seconded to approve the Westside Corridor Work Program. The MOTION passed unanimously.
4. FUNDING AUTHORIZATION FOR I-5 NORTH RIDESHARE PROPOSAL

Bob Haas reported on the I-5 North Rideshare Proposal. TPAC has reviewed the project and indicated their approval. Dick Carroll moved and was seconded to recommend the funding authorization. The MOTION was adopted unanimously.

5. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION FOR SAFER-OFF-SYSTEM FUNDS

Bill Ockert reported that approximately $100,000 of Safer-Off-System funds has been made available to this region and needed to be obligated by April 24. In addition the City of Portland has approximately $15,000 for authorized funds remaining from their projects. TPAC has recommended that three previously approved projects which are still uncompleted receive these funds. John Frewing moved and was seconded to adopt the resolution concerning Safer-Off-System funds. The MOTION was adopted unanimously.

6. STREET CROSSING STUDY

Paul Bay reported that significant budget cuts to the $1.8 million study had been made. He also stressed that it was very important to keep the project on schedule and that local jurisdictions have made commitments to maintain decision schedules.

7. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN - Work Program

Andy Cotugno related the details of the Work Program of the Regional Transportation Plan. The JPACT members discussed the plan and decided that an evening meeting would be held on April 9 at 5:30 p.m. to continue the discussions in more detail.

8. UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Bill Ockert mentioned that a draft of the UWP would be available in April with the work starting in July. the JPACT members discussed setting up a policy or contingency plan to deal with projects which fall behind schedule.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Pam Juett

COPIES TO: JPACT Members
Rick Gustafson
Denton Kent
Bill Ockert
Jim Sitzman
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AGENDA

Date: April 10, 1980
Day: Thursday
Time: 7:30 a.m.
Place: Metro - Conference Rooms A1/A2

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

AGENDA: Action Requested

* 1. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FROM THE NORTHWEST RESERVE - N.W. Front (Glisan to 26th) and N.W. Portland Transportation Study

* 2. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FROM THE I-505 CITY RESERVE - Going Street Noise Mitigation Construction Project

* 3. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FOR THE ARTERIAL STREET OVERLAY PROGRAM IN THE CITY OF PORTLAND

STATUS REPORTS:

4. UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

* Material enclosed
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Memorandum

Date: April 9, 1980

To: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

From: Staff

Subject: "Interim 2": Population/Employment Forecasts -- Year 2000

The purpose of long-range forecasts is to give the region a platform on which to base long-range investment decisions, anticipate problems and needs and develop policies and strategies to deal with these.

These forecasts, by their very nature, can never be regarded as "correct" or "accurate" -- only adjectives such as "reasonable" or "desirable" or "policy consistent" can be used.

Such forecasts, being the basis of infrastructure investment decisions (roads, mass transit, telephones, sewer, water treatment plants, etc.), are important, primarily in obtaining consistency in investments. In a reverse approach, investment decisions can be used to affect the quantity and location of growth.

In this region the major forecasts of growth location over the past few years have been the Portland Vancouver Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (PVMATS) forecasts of the late 1960's, the Interim Transportation Plan (1975 -- to the year 1990), the water quality "208" forecasts (1976 -- to the year 2000) and a recent series of projections at Metro -- "Round 1," "Round 2," and Interim 1 for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

This allocation of expected growth is "Interim 2" and follows directly on the heels of "Round 2" and "Interim 1," in a continuing attempt to obtain a regional consensus on an acceptable set of "reasonable" numbers, which can be used for future planning or as a jumping-off point in the development of a policy-based forecast.

PURPOSE: To set a reasonable forecast of growth and its location, based on existing plans, past trends and a set of fairly modest assumptions. This forecast to be used by ODOT and others in determining project justification until such time as this region changes its consensus. This set of forecasts will also be used as the base or "jumping-off point" in the Westside Transitway Alternatives Analysis.
It is possible, that during the development of the RTP, a better sense of policy direction for land use will become apparent. In this case, this forecast would serve as the "base" against which to evaluate the effects of alternate land use futures.

PROBLEMS

1. A stable and unchanging base is needed for the Westside Transitway evaluation, at least through the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) phase.

2. A part of the Westside analysis will be to analyze the impacts of transit supportive land use changes. Any changes which are used as a part of the Westside EIS package will have to be reflected in changes to this base forecast and the RTP.

3. Clark County, while being appraised of this work, has been very short-staffed with a heavy workload and probably needs more coordination. The problem here is two-fold:
   a. The state of Washington has recently produced a very high forecast of growth for the State and for Clark County (Clark County to 350,000 in the year 2000; c.f. "208" projection of 231,300, and our own projections of 237,000 to 253,000 for a slightly smaller area). This tends to raise expectations in that part of the region.
   b. The Regional Planning Council of Clark County is just beginning its own review, with citizen input, of possible growth to the year 2000, with some resolution expected by August. Because of this, it is difficult for them to react to the Interim forecast other than to say they are not ready to react yet.

4. The last census was 1970, and the 1980 census results will not be available for use until 1981-82. At that time, a full re-evaluation may be needed.

5. We cannot (and should not) declare a planning or project moratorium while waiting for final consensus. Such an action may result in our missing the due dates for project initiation for projects using (e) 4 funds (Interstate Withdrawal), and a resulting loss of these funds to the region.
SUGGESTED ACTION

1. That we complete this set of "Interim 2" forecasts and hold it as a base until the new census is available for reappraisal, with the possible exceptions detailed under 2 and 3 of this section.

2. That following the development of a new Westside allocation, using control totals defined in the Westside analysis (changing the Westside only), this new allocation be reflected in the Interim forecast.

3. That following the Clark County reappraisal, we accommodate changes caused by this by amending the regional control totals within the range of control totals currently forecast in Technical Memorandum #23. In this case, a regional re-evaluation will become mandatory following receipt of the 1980 census results.

INTERIM 2 FORECAST

The following charts and tables highlight the Interim 2 forecasts. Charts 1 & 2 indicate the control total ranges for the year 2000 as shown in Technical Memorandum #23.

Table 1 shows the allocation of population by county for the SMSA and the TSA. Table 2 gives comparisons of various forecasts of population for the TSA. Table 3 compares household forecasts in a similar manner. Table 4 shows the current forecast of employment allocation by major jurisdictional groups and Table 5 shows the change in employment between 1977 and 2000 for allocation subgroups.

It should be noted that the figures given for the City of Portland are not exact, but are an approximation based on showing census tract and allocation district boundaries which closely match the City boundaries.
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### Table 1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>Interim 2 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSA*</td>
<td>OUTSIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah Co.</td>
<td>548,737</td>
<td>4,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Co.</td>
<td>190,407</td>
<td>8,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas Co.</td>
<td>167,962</td>
<td>40,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Co.</td>
<td>147,771</td>
<td>16,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,054,877</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,112</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TSA Transportation Study Area  
# SMSA Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area

### Table 2: Population - Forecast Comparisons - TSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Interim 1</th>
<th>Interim 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>382,416</td>
<td>387,000</td>
<td>400,342</td>
<td>437,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Multnomah Co.</td>
<td>166,321</td>
<td>255,050</td>
<td>237,285</td>
<td>239,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Co.</td>
<td>190,407</td>
<td>328,575</td>
<td>298,876</td>
<td>310,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas Co.</td>
<td>167,962</td>
<td>300,950</td>
<td>231,200</td>
<td>249,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>147,771</td>
<td>231,257</td>
<td>237,385</td>
<td>252,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,054,877</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,502,832</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,405,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,488,916</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Households - Forecast Comparisons - TSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Interim 1</th>
<th>Interim 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>156,877</td>
<td>164,335</td>
<td>183,605</td>
<td>172,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Multnomah Co.</td>
<td>64,235</td>
<td>93,621</td>
<td>91,363</td>
<td>93,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Co.</td>
<td>71,300</td>
<td>116,399</td>
<td>119,741</td>
<td>127,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas Co.</td>
<td>59,180</td>
<td>88,307</td>
<td>95,452</td>
<td>102,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>54,552</td>
<td>92,589</td>
<td>97,929</td>
<td>91,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>406,144</strong></td>
<td><strong>555,251</strong></td>
<td><strong>588,090</strong></td>
<td><strong>587,949</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 4

**EMPLOYMENT - Forecast Comparisons - TSA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977 Emp.</th>
<th>1000 Pop</th>
<th>Round 2 Emp.</th>
<th>1000 Pop</th>
<th>Interim 1 Emp.</th>
<th>1000 Pop</th>
<th>Interim 2 Emp.</th>
<th>1000 Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>73986</td>
<td></td>
<td>89600</td>
<td></td>
<td>118300</td>
<td></td>
<td>118092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland w/o CBD</td>
<td>212498</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>248355</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>250550</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>243426</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Mult.</td>
<td>46047</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>85128</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>87150</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>92639</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>332531</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>423083</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>456000</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>454157</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>72362</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>140164</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>144501</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>146022</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>52578</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>98068</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>101443</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>106074</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>44118</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>92957</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>100119</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>97218</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA</td>
<td>501589</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>754272</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>802063</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>803471</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Portland w/o CBD</td>
<td>East Mult.</td>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>TSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>27300</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39106</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9529</td>
<td>5464</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>4184</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>5084</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>29461</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15146</td>
<td>15991</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>3203</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>42004</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24675</td>
<td>22165</td>
<td>31933</td>
<td>12848</td>
<td>6761</td>
<td>8496</td>
<td>4773</td>
<td>110651</td>
<td>5194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18059</td>
<td>27849</td>
<td>4284</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>5367</td>
<td>3463</td>
<td>5630</td>
<td>65965</td>
<td>6772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12328</td>
<td>19906</td>
<td>2194</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>3862</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>3162</td>
<td>45202</td>
<td>4840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9747</td>
<td>19538</td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>3809</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>8495</td>
<td>47589</td>
<td>4751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64809</td>
<td>89458</td>
<td>40852</td>
<td>17419</td>
<td>19801</td>
<td>16004</td>
<td>21060</td>
<td>269409</td>
<td>21557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Young</td>
<td>PEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Clark</td>
<td>Mult. Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Anderson</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Carroll</td>
<td>Wash. Dept. Transpo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Schadean</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Williams</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wm. Odent</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Speere</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Cole</td>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Studer</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sorensen</td>
<td>TRIMET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Thoresen</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bay</td>
<td>TRI-MET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Holstrom</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton U. Spirt</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Brunton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Daniels</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Haas</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Biles</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Bolstad</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ogan</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dotterrer</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Cotugno</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Title: POLICY CONSIDERATIONS EMERGING FROM THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR TRANSPORTATION (JPACT) AT THEIR APRIL 9, WORKSHOP

Transportation Department
Metropolitan Service District
In January, 1980, Metro published the first draft of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The draft presented:

a. A suggested regional policy direction,
b. A description of committed transportation improvements strategies, and
c. A projection of travel demands over the next two decades under different energy conditions and an evaluation of the performance of the transportation system.

The material presented in the first draft was intended to initiate public and local jurisdiction response. This will assist in reaching a consensus on a final plan for adoption in November, 1980.

Since release of the first draft, the Interagency Coordinating Committee (ICC) met six times to assist Metro staff to further develop several key components of the plan. The conclusions of these discussions were subsequently reviewed by Metro's Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC).

This Staff Report is a summary of the staff, ICC and TPAC effort for consideration by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter One:</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Two:</td>
<td>Overall Regional Transportation Policy Direction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Three:</td>
<td>Policy Alternatives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Four:</td>
<td>Detailed Policies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Five:</td>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. INTRODUCTION

This Staff Report recommends for consideration by JPACT:

- a refined regional policy direction which more clearly describes the overall emphasis to be addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan,
- a study strategy to evaluate alternative regional improvement strategies to achieve the policy direction,
- proposed population and employment forecasts to use in estimating travel demand, and
- proposed transportation functional classification categories to describe corridor improvement strategies.

The refinements to the regional policy direction represents a reformatting of the policy framework presented in the first draft of the RTP. A concise overall policy direction has been developed to serve as the overall guideline for the RTP. The detailed objectives have been reorganized to directly achieve the overall direction.

The proposed population and employment forecasts are revisions from those presented in the first draft of the RTP. The regional totals have been maintained but a refined distribution methodology has resulted in shifts throughout the region.

The proposed functional classification system is an expansion of the system presented in the first draft of the RTP. The new categories serve as a guide for determining the types of transportation improvements appropriate for various facilities.

Based upon the review of this report by JPACT, staff will produce the second draft of the RTP. The second draft will contain a recommended policy framework, alternative improvement strategies to achieve the policy direction and an evaluation of the performance of the transportation system for each alternative.
II. OVERALL REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY DIRECTION

General Problems Dealt With in the Plan

The citizens of the Portland metropolitan area face many critical transportation problems. The expected 50 percent increase in population will place a burden on the liveability of the area. Unless checked, congestion problems will limit personal mobility thus reducing employment, shopping and leisure opportunities. Business and industry will be severely impacted by inadequate access for workers and customers. Neighborhoods, small business districts and other sensitive areas will especially be impacted by excession infiltration of traffic and noise. Increases in auto travel will also aggravate air pollution and energy problems. It is essential that a comprehensive transportation system be developed which corrects or avoids these problems.

Regional Intent

In order to maintain the region's mobility, economic viability and environmental quality, the dependency on the single-occupant automobile needs to be reduced. This will be accomplished by improving transit service and developing incentives for ridesharing for longer trips and improving conditions for bicycle and pedestrian travel for shorter trips.

The existing transportation system should be used as efficiently as possible. Before considering major capital investments, less costly improvements to increase the person-carrying capacity of the system such as increased transit service and minor intersection improvements, will be investigated. When capital investments are deemed necessary in the major regional travel corridors, priority consideration will be given to facilitating the movement of transit, carpools and vanpools. Major highway improvements which primarily benefit auto travel will only be made to serve areas which cannot be served by transit in a cost-effective manner. Cost effective improvement projects shall also emphasize economic development objectives and the transportation needs of growth areas. Metro will involve affected citizens and ensure a timely decision-making process to identify necessary policies, service improvements and capital investments which:

- reduce long-distance travel by locating jobs, shopping and homes in close proximity to one another;
- concentrate development with high trip making rates near transit with convenient pedestrian access;
- improve transit for a wider variety of trip purposes, destinations and times of day;
- uses the existing auto capacity more effectively by encouraging more riders per car and reducing the high rush-hour peaks;
- limit major highway widenings to locations where it is found to be the most appropriate solution and in harmony with enviromental and energy objectives;
- increase the convenience and safety of bicycle use and walking for a greater share of the shorter trips, particularly for transit access.
Performance Measures

The key overall measure of the degree to which the regional policy direction is achieved is "vehicle-miles-of-travel." Decreased auto dependency, increased attractiveness of transit, decreased travel in single occupant automobiles, and increased travel by bike and pedestrians will all result in fewer and shorter vehicle trips.

Other specific regional performance measures are:

- reduction of air pollution emissions from vehicles to achieve the state ozone standard of .08 ppm and the carbon monoxide standard of 9 ppm.
- reduction in energy consumption below today's level
- increases in overall transit ridership
- increases in average auto occupancy, particularly for work trips
- maintenance of an adequate level of traffic service on the arterial highway system in the peak-hours of the day.
III. POLICY ALTERNATIVES

It is recommended that three alternative strategies which achieve different regional "vehicle-miles-of-travel" targets be presented in the May draft of the RTP:

Base Case - 23.4 million vehicle-miles-of-travel per weekday

Alt. 1 - 10 percent reduction to 21.1 million vehicle-miles-of-travel per weekday

Alt. 2 - 20 percent reduction to 18.7 million vehicle-miles-of-travel per weekday

These alternatives build from the material presented in the first draft of the RTP. As described in the first draft, if travel were not constrained by energy supplies and price, the resultant travel demand would result in 24.0 vehicle-miles-of-travel. Due to improved vehicle efficiency from 13.4 mpg to 20.2 mpg, gasoline consumption would rise 3.4 percent from today's level of 1.16 million to 1.19 million gallons per day. The recommended "Base Case" involves a slight reduction in travel as compared to the "unconstrained" demand under an assumption that fuel availability in the year 2000 will not exceed fuel consumption in 1977. This assumption results in a year 2000 vehicle-miles-of-travel figure of 23.4 million. The targets to reduce vehicle travel by 10 percent and 20 percent are set forth to provide alternative guidelines for achieving the overall policy direction.

Table 1 shows the energy and travel implications of the policy alternatives. The "Base Case" alternative involves an increase in vehicle travel per person and the two reduction targets represent a five percent and 15 percent reduction in vehicle travel per person from current levels. Achievement of these reductions in vehicle travel will in turn produce reductions in air pollution emissions, increased transit ridership, increased auto occupancy, less traffic infiltration into neighborhoods and improved level of traffic service on the arterial highway system.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td>Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>15.5 million</td>
<td>23.4 million</td>
<td>21.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Reduction</td>
<td>1.04 &quot;</td>
<td>1.484 &quot;</td>
<td>1.484 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Reduction</td>
<td>1.11 gal.</td>
<td>0.78 gal.</td>
<td>0.70 gal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure modified from published data to reflect differences between sketch and detailed highway networks.
IV. DETAILED POLICIES

Population and Employment Growth

The region is expected to experience a 42 percent increase in population over the next 20 years. This will produce a significant increase in travel demand placing a severe burden on the transportation system and potentially threatening the liveability of the region. It is recommended that the travel demand for which transportation policies, service improvements and capital investments be developed based upon the "Interim 2" population growth projections in Table 2. Revised employment projections are currently being developed.

TABLE 2
Population Projections for Year 2000
for the Transportation Service Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>208 (Draft #1, RTP)</th>
<th>Interim #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Multnomah</td>
<td>166,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>239,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>382,000</td>
<td>387,000</td>
<td>438,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td>296,000</td>
<td>244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>329,000</td>
<td>310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>253,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Total</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>1,497,532</td>
<td>1,484,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problem Overview

Transportation planning should be directed at overcoming problems, many of which will be exacerbated by population and employment growth. The following is a summary of the key problem areas to be addressed in the RTP.

Mobility and Accessibility

1. Congested highways.
2. Overloaded buses.
3. Decreasing access to job, shopping and leisure opportunities due to increasing travel times.
4. Transit delays due to highway congestion.
5. Lack of good transit connections for cross-town trips.
6. Conflicts between regional and local trips.
7. Poorly developed local street systems.
8. Poor environment for pedestrians and bicyclists.
9. Over-use of facilities in the peak travel hours and under-use in the off-peak hours.
10. Decreasing accessibility to port, airport, medical centers and regional parks.
11. Special mobility problems for handicapped, poor and elderly.
12. Inadequate provisions for the movement of goods and services.
Land Use Compatibility

1. Less-than-adequate coordination between transportation facilities and growth patterns.
2. Inefficient existing development patterns.
3. Conflicts between traffic service and property access.

Environment

1. High fuel prices and uncertain energy supplies.
2. Air pollution.
3. Noise pollution.
4. Overburdened regional facilities spilling over resulting in traffic in neighborhoods causing safety, noise and air quality problems.

Financing

1. Deadlines for spending federal funds.
2. Inadequate financial resources to fund many needed transit and highway improvements.
3. Difficulty of raising local match.
4. Rapidly escalating construction costs.

Objectives

The objectives of the RTP are intended to provide further details of the overall regional policy direction. These objectives would serve as the guidelines for developing detailed policies, strategies service improvements and capital investments.

Mobility and Accessibility

1. Reduce the use of the single-occupant automobile, (this would be done by making transit service, ride-share, bicycle and pedestrian travel more attractive).
2. Improve mobility for the transportation disadvantaged.
3. Maintain accessibility to jobs and shopping and major regional facilities such as the port, airport, regional park and cultural facilities, colleges and medical centers.
4. Ensure convenient movement of goods.
5. Increase the use of transit by a greater variety of trip purposes, destinations and times of day. Transit service will be categorized according to the functions listed in Chapter V.
6. Highways should be categorized according to the functions listed in Chapter V.
7. Emphasize the use of the expressway and principal arterial system for long distance, higher speed, regional and inter-regional travel; limit or prohibit direct access to adjacent property. Maintain an adequate level of traffic service during peak-hours on expressways and principal arterials (this is to be done primarily by improving transit service, increasing ridesharing and flextime and eliminating capacity bottlenecks).

8. Develop a system of secondary highway routes to connect neighborhoods and major facilities to the expressway and principal arterial system and provide direct property access.

9. Improvements which add highway capacity should emphasize service to transit, carpools and vanpools. They should provide access for economic development and newly developing areas and serve travel not conducive to ridesharing and transit. Highway upgrading to improve traffic flow, eliminate bottlenecks, improve safety and upgrade facilities to urban standards without a capacity increase will be encouraged throughout the system.

10. Regional Bikeways will be identified in the RTP to provide an overall system for bicycle movements. Local Bike Routes will be developed by local jurisdictions to serve local travel demands and provide connections to the Regional Bikeways.

Land Use Compatibility

1. Locate housing development, employment, commercial centers and public facilities in close proximity to reduce the need for long-distance auto travel.

2. Utilize transportation to maintain the strength of downtown Portland and major suburban employment, retail and transit centers.

3. Promote land development patterns, densities and site development standards which result in greater transit use.

4. Promote improvement of the streetside environment confronting the transit user, bicyclist or pedestrian.

5. Develop access control policies consistent with the functional purpose of each element of the highway system.

6. Transportation improvements will be provided in rapidly growing portions of the region consistent with emerging needs; however, improvements will not be made in areas where regional or local policy restricts urban development.
Environment

1. Reduce total energy consumption and air pollution emissions through improved auto efficiencies and increased travel by transit, rideshare, bicycle and pedestrian.

2. Remove through regional traffic from neighborhood streets, parks, business centers and other sensitive areas.

3. Reduce noise impacts on sensitive areas.

Financing

1. Minimize the total cost of operating, maintaining or improving the transportation system.

2. Identify transportation funding sources to ensure those that benefit from new facilities and services equitably bear the cost of providing such services.

3. Develop a transportation improvement strategy which provides for utilization of committed federal funds by the 1986 target date.

Citizen Involvement and Decision-Making

1. Involve affected citizens to the degree necessary to generate broad public support for both the policies specified in the plan and the funding necessary to implement them.

2. Ensure timely decision-making to ensure a response to citizen and local official concerns.
V. FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

As described in the regional objectives, components the transportation system should be categorized according to their auto, transit, bicycle and property access function. The recommended functional categories to define the transportation system are as follows:

1. **Freeways and Expressways** -- Major traffic routes connecting other major cities in the Northwest. Direct service to abutting properties would be prohibited.

2. **Principal Arterials** -- Major interconnected traffic routes for intra-urban and inter-city travel connecting major subregions and regional facilities. Access to abutting land uses would be a minor role.

3. **Secondary Routes** -- (Combines the categories of Minor Arterial and Collector.) Connects subregional facilities and major neighborhoods to the Expressway and Principal Arterial system. Provides frequent property access.

4. **Local Streets** -- Minor roads providing a high level of access within local neighborhoods.

5. **Regional Bikeway Routes** -- Bicycle facilities, separated from, adjacent to or sharing roadways which serve commuter-oriented, recreation or touring bicycle movements.

6. **Local Bike Routes** -- Bicycle facilities and route serving community needs and connecting to the Regional Bikeway Routes.

7. **Regional Transit Trunk Route** -- Connects downtown Portland and major suburban activity centers; serves longer trips with high speed, high capacity service; preferential treatment for buses or upgrading to an exclusive transitway will be considered as needed for speed or capacity.

8. **Subregional Transit Trunk Routes** -- Connects major concentrations of development to downtown Portland and suburban activity centers; serves intermediate length trips.

9. **Feeder Transit Routes** -- Connects all lower density areas to transit stations or trunk routes.

Local streets, local bike routes and feeder bus routes are a local responsibility to plan and implement. The remaining categories are those that will be addressed in the RTP and will be covered by the adopted policies. Furthermore, the categories of Freeways and Expressways, Principal Arterials and Regional Transit Trunk Routes are the categories that serve the most important regional function and, therefore, have the greatest emphasis in the RTP.
Table 3 depicts initial criteria for delineating the highway functional classification system. Similar criteria must be developed to define criteria for locating Regional and Subregional Transit Trunk Routes and establishing policies for speed and capacity. Finally, the functional classification system will be expanded to include criteria for:

- allocating sources of funding
- establishing functional interrelationships between transit and highway categories
- establishing land use density and access control criteria.

It is recommended that the "Base Case" alternative to be presented in the second draft of the RTP include Regional and Subregional Transit Trunk Routes as depicted in the Tri-Met 5-year Transit Development Program. (see Map 1) Alternatives 1 and 2 will include expansion to this system to achieve objectives to reduce auto dependency, increase transit ridership, decrease vehicle travel and decrease energy consumption and air pollution.

Complete agreement between Metro and the local jurisdictions on the function of the highway system is not currently possible. Map 2 identifies areas of conflict on the categories of Freeways and Expressways and Principal Arterials. These are to resolved to the greatest extent possible for adoption in the RTP in November.
REGIONAL TRANSITWAYS
REGIONAL TRUNK ROUTES
SUB-REGIONAL TRUNK ROUTES

URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

April 1980
TRANSIT FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
LOCAL DESIGNATION HIGHER THAN RTP CLASSIFICATION

METRO
April 1980

HIGHWAY FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION (FREeways & PRINCIPAL ARTERIALS)
TABLE 3
RTP HIGHWAY FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY/FUNCTIONAL CLASS</th>
<th>SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>NO. OF LANES</th>
<th>PARKING</th>
<th>TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT)</th>
<th>ROUTE CONTINUITY</th>
<th>FUNDING ELIGIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Freeway Expressway</td>
<td>Line haul function for all trips</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>Emergency only</td>
<td>25,000 and above heavy</td>
<td>Continuous over urbanized area</td>
<td>Interstate, Interstate Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Principal Arterials</td>
<td>Line haul function for all trips</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>Restricted zone in peak-hour</td>
<td>10,000 and above moderate to heavy</td>
<td>Continuous over urbanized area</td>
<td>Federal Aid Primary, Interstate Transfer, Federal Aid Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Secondary Routes</td>
<td>Line haul function for subregional travel and collector and distribution function</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Usually provided</td>
<td>3,000-15,000 moderate</td>
<td>Continuous between two individual subregions and within subregions, discontinuous on edges of neighborhoods</td>
<td>Interstate Transfer, Federal Aid Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Local Routes</td>
<td>Almost exclusively collection and distribution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Maximum 3,000 light</td>
<td>Discontinuous</td>
<td>Safer Off System Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Regional Bikeways</td>
<td>Line haul and collection and distribution as necessary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Continuous over urbanized area</td>
<td>State Highway Fund, Interstate Transfer, Interstate, Federal Aid Urban where applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 9, 1980

Mr. Charles R. Williamson, Chairman
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metropolitan Service District
527 S.W. Hall Street
Portland, OR 97212

Dear Charlie:

As you requested at the March JPACT meeting, I have summarized below what I feel to be major issues in the continuing management of the federal interstate transfer funds.

Now that the METRO Regional Reserve has nearly all been allocated to area jurisdictions, I would like to again stress the importance of METRO's efforts to manage the expenditure of Portland's interstate transfer funds. Recent steps taken by METRO will make this job easier:

- The quarterly Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) has been improved and now contains year-by-year accounting of federal and local funding requirements. This allows us to see what projects are "slipping."

- The METRO Council recently approved a streamlined approval system that allows METRO-controlled funds to flow to and between jurisdictions with a minimum of red tape.

This is a good start toward a comprehensive financial management program. However, additional procedures and strong policies will be needed to insure that all of our allocated funds are spent. I am suggesting below three measures that might help in the process.

**Funds Management**

The Transportation Improvement Program at METRO only describes the planned expenditures of withdrawal money. ODOT maintains a separate accounting of funds as they are actually used. It seems that both of these records should be combined (perhaps as a regular verbal presentation to JPACT) to give a better picture of the financial condition of the projects.

As a beginning, ODOT or METRO should compare each successive TIP and document all projects whose funding or work plan has slipped. Where remedial project management cannot restore an acceptable timetable for a given project, the METRO Council, following review by its committees, should drop the project and reassign the funds. Substitute projects should be available to take up any slack.
Pledge of Match

The "pledge" of local match support remains a potential weak link in the interstate withdrawal process. Some projects are now dragging for want of local funds. The trend of high construction cost inflation could make the situation worse.

To correct this problem, perhaps local jurisdictions should be required to program their "match requirements" at the same time they submit their funding plan for inclusion in the TIP. When federal funds are available, the local funds should be placed in some form of trust. The funds could be invested to provide a partial hedge against cost overruns. Under this procedure, delays in projects will, in turn, tie up the local funds. This creates a strong incentive to move promptly and to voluntarily terminate projects that become undesirable or impractical.

New Federal Legislation

Much of the region's troubles stem from federal legislation and the underlying capabilities of the General and Highway Trust funds. Jurisdictions have federal obligations of funds that must be exercised by 1986. Yet all commitments cannot be supported by authorized general fund outlays or by the trust fund, as has recently been proposed. As it now stands the Portland region alone will be requesting over one half of all available nationwide transfer funds between now and 1986.

METRO and the local jurisdictions must communicate the approaching crisis with clarity and strongly advise that reforms be implemented. Our congressional delegation and the Department of Transportation should be continually reminded of the problem.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Anderson
Executive Director

cc: Bill Ockert
    Metropolitan Service District

Bob Bothman
Oregon Department of Transportation
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