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Introduction

In 1992, the region’s voters adopted a Charter for Metro which gave Metro jurisdiction over matters of metropolitan concern and required the adoption of a Regional Framework Plan. The Regional Framework Plan unites all of Metro’s adopted land use planning policies and requirements. The Charter directs Metro to address the following subjects in the Plan:

- Management and amendment of the Urban Growth Boundary
- Protection of lands outside the Urban Growth Boundary for natural resource use and conservation, future urban expansion or other uses
- Urban design and settlement patterns
- Housing densities
- Transportation and mass transit systems
- Parks, open spaces and recreational facilities
- Water sources and storage
- Coordination with Clark County, Washington
- Planning responsibilities mandated by state law
- Other issues of metropolitan concern

This document brings together these elements as well as previous regional policies including the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives, 2040 Growth Concept, Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan and Regional Transportation Plan, to create a coordinated, integrated Regional Framework Plan.

State law provides that the Regional Framework Plan must comply with statewide land use planning goals. The Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission acknowledged the Regional Framework Plan and its implementing ordinances on December 8, 2000.

Under the Metro Charter and state law, cities and counties within Metro’s boundaries are required to comply and be consistent with Metro’s adopted Urban Growth Management Functional Plans and the Regional Framework Plan.

The Charter also required adoption of a Future Vision. The relationship between the Future Vision and the Regional Framework Plan is that:

- The Future Vision statement provides a beginning point from which policy debate and analysis can begin.
- The Future Vision brings a broad, inclusive perspective to the Regional Framework Plan.
- The Future Vision establishes the approach that all of the issues and problems addressed in the Regional Framework Plan will require an ongoing process of monitoring, analysis and reform in order to meet the needs and expectations of this and future generations.
Regional Framework Plan Structure

Each chapter of this Plan contains an introduction followed by a list of relevant Fundamentals. Fundamentals are eight value statements adopted by the Metro Council that synthesize the 2040 Growth Concept and regional policies and are listed below:

**Fundamental 1:** Encourage a strong local economy by providing an orderly and efficient use of land, balancing economic growth around the region and supporting high quality education.

**Fundamental 2:** Encourage the efficient use of land within the UGB including buildable industrial and commercial land and focus development in 2040 mixed use centers and corridors.

**Fundamental 3:** Protect and restore the natural environment including fish and wildlife habitat, streams and wetlands, surface and ground water quality and quantity, and air quality.

**Fundamental 4:** Provide a balanced transportation system including safe, attractive facilities for bicycling, walking and transit as well as for motor vehicles and freight.

**Fundamental 5:** Maintain separation between the Metro UGB and neighboring cities by working actively with these cities and their respective counties.

**Fundamental 6:** Enable communities inside the Metro UGB to enhance their physical sense of place by using among other tools, greenways, natural areas, and built environment elements.

**Fundamental 7:** Enable communities to provide diverse housing options for all residents by providing a mix of housing types as well as affordable homes in every jurisdiction.

**Fundamental 8:** Create a vibrant place to live and work by providing sufficient and accessible parks and natural areas, improving access to community resources such as schools, community centers and libraries as well as by balancing the distribution of high quality jobs throughout the region, and providing attractive facilities for cultural and artistic performances and supporting arts and cultural organizations.

These Fundamentals are followed by policies of the Metro Council. Chapters 1 through 6 address substantive planning policies. Chapter 7 addresses how Metro will manage the plan and amendments to the plan. Chapter 8 addresses how the plan policies are to be implemented. Related documents and background information are contained in Appendices.
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Summary of 2040 Growth Concept

This section describes the 2040 Growth Concept, the unifying concept around which this Regional Framework Plan is based. This Growth Concept contains refinements to the original Growth Concept that was adopted in 1995. This Plan anticipates that the Growth Concept and the provisions of this Plan will continue to evolve.

The Growth Concept states the preferred form of regional growth and development and includes the Growth Concept map. The preferred form is to contain growth within a carefully managed Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Growth occurs inside the UGB in the form of infill and redevelopment with higher density developed in areas where it is appropriate. Expansions of the UGB are done carefully to allow for the need for additional land. This concept is adopted for the long-term growth management of the region including a general approach to approximately where and how much the UGB should be ultimately expanded, what ranges of density are estimated to accommodate projected growth within the boundary, and which areas should be protected as open space.

The basic philosophy of the Growth Concept is to preserve our access to nature and build better communities for the people who live here today and who will live here in the future. The Growth Concept is an integrated set of objectives, which guide all Regional Framework Plan policies.

The Growth Concept sets the direction for development of implementing policies in Metro’s existing functional plans and the Charter-required Regional Framework Plan. This direction will be refined, as well as implemented, in subsequent functional plan amendments and framework plan components. Additional planning will be done to test the Growth Concept and to determine implementation actions. Amendments to the Growth Concept and some Regional Framework Plan policies may be needed to reflect the results of additional planning to maintain the consistency of implementation actions with the stated policies.

Fundamental to the Growth Concept are:

- A hierarchy of mixed-use, pedestrian friendly centers that are well connected by high capacity transit and corridors
- A multi-modal transportation system that ensures continued mobility of more people and goods throughout the region, consistent with transportation policies
- Coordination of land uses and the transportation system, to embrace the region’s existing locational advantage as a relatively uncongested hub for trade
- A jobs-housing balance in centers and a jobs-housing balance by regional sub areas to account for the housing and employment outside of the Centers
- An urban to rural transition to reduce sprawl, keeping a clear distinction between urban and rural lands and balancing re-development
- Separation of urbanizable land from rural land by the UGB for the region’s 20-year projected need for urban land
- Rural reserves that are intended to assure that Metro and neighboring cities remain separate
The result is a compact urban form for the region coordinated with nearby cities to retain the region’s sense of place.

There are a number of components that make up the building blocks of the Growth Concept. These building blocks are discussed below.

**Centers**

Mixed-use urban centers inside the UGB are one key to the Growth Concept. Creating higher density centers of employment and housing and transit service with compact development, retail, cultural and recreational activities in a walkable environment is intended to provide efficient access to goods and services, enhance multi-modal transportation and create vital, attractive neighborhoods and communities. The Growth Concept uses interrelated types of centers:

- The central city is the largest market area, the region’s employment and cultural hub and accessible to millions of people.
- Regional centers serve large market areas outside the central city, connected to it by high-capacity transit and highways and are accessible by hundreds of thousands of people.
- Connected to each regional center, by road and transit, are smaller town centers with local shopping and employment opportunities within a local market area and accessible to tens of thousands of people.

Planning for all of these centers will seek a balance between jobs, housing and unique blends of urban amenities so that more transportation trips are likely to remain local and become more multi-modal.

Creating higher density centers of employment and housing provides many advantages to communities. These centers provide citizens with access to a variety of goods and services in a relatively small geographic area, creating an intense business climate. Having centers also makes sense from a transportation perspective, since most centers have an accessibility level that is conducive to transit, bicycling and walking. Centers also act as social gathering places and community centers, where people would find the cultural and recreational activities and “small-town atmosphere” they cherish.

The major benefits of centers in the marketplace are accessibility and the ability to concentrate goods and services in a relatively small area. The problem in developing centers, however, is that most of the existing centers are already developed and any increase in the density must be made through redeveloping existing land and buildings. Emphasizing redevelopment in centers over development of new areas of undeveloped land is a key strategy in the Growth Concept.

**The Central City**

Downtown Portland serves as the major regional center and functions well as an employment and cultural hub for the metropolitan area. It provides accessibility to the many businesses that require access to a large market area and also serves as the location for cultural and social functions that draw the region together. It is the center for local, regional, state and federal governments, financial institutions, commerce, the center for arts and culture, and for visitors to the region. In addition, downtown Portland
has a high percentage of travel other than by car - three times higher than the next most successful area. Jobs and housing are readily available there, without the need for a car. Maintaining and improving upon the strengths of the regional downtown shall remain a high priority.

Improvements to the transit system network, development of a multi-modal street system and maintenance of regional through routes (the highway system) would provide additional mobility to and from the city center.

**Regional Centers**
There are seven regional centers, serving four market areas (outside of the central city market area). Hillsboro serves the western portion of the region and Gresham the eastern. Gateway serves most of the Portland area outside the central city as a regional center. Downtown Beaverton and Washington Square serve the east Washington County area, and downtown Oregon City, Clackamas Town Center together serve Clackamas County and portions of outer southeast Portland.

These regional centers are the focus of compact development, redevelopment and high-quality transit service, multi-modal street networks and act as major nodes along regional through-routes.

Transit improvements will include light-rail connecting all regional centers to the central city. A dense network of multi-modal arterial and collector streets tie regional centers to surrounding neighborhoods and other centers. Regional through-routes are designed to connect regional centers and ensure that these centers are attractive places to conduct business. The relatively small number of centers reflects not only the limited market for new development at this density but also the limited transportation funding for the high-quality transit and roadway improvements envisioned in these areas.

**Town Centers**
Smaller than regional centers and serving populations of tens of thousands of people, town centers are the third type of center with compact development and transit service. Town centers provide local shopping, employment and cultural and recreational opportunities within a local market area. They are designed to provide local retail and services, at a minimum and vary greatly in character. Some will become traditional town centers, such as Lake Oswego, and Forest Grove, while others will change from an auto-oriented development into a more complete community, such as Hillsdale. Many also have regional specialties, such as office centers envisioned for the Cedar Mill town center. Several new town centers are designated, such as in Happy Valley and Damascus, to accommodate the retail and service needs of a growing population while reducing auto travel.

**Main Streets and Neighborhood Centers**
During the early decades of this century, main streets served by transit and characterized by a strong business and civic community were a major land-use pattern throughout the region. Examples remain in Hillsboro, Milwaukie, Oregon City and Gresham as well as the Westmoreland neighborhood and Hawthorne Boulevard. Today, these areas are undergoing a revival and provide an efficient and effective land-use and transportation alternative.
Main streets typically serve neighborhoods and may develop a regional specialization - such as antiques, fine dining, entertainment or specialty clothing - that draws people from other parts of the region.

Station Communities
Station communities are nodes of development centered around a light-rail or high-capacity transit station that feature a high-quality pedestrian environment. They provide for the highest density outside centers. Station communities encompass an area approximately one-half mile from a station stop.

Corridors
Corridors are not as dense as centers, but are located along good quality transit lines. They provide a place for increased densities and feature a high-quality pedestrian environment and convenient access to transit. Typical developments along corridors include rowhouses, duplexes and one- to three-story office and retail buildings. While some corridors may be continuous, narrow bands of higher intensity development along arterial roads, others may be more nodal, that is, a series of smaller centers at major intersections or other locations along the arterial that have high quality pedestrian environments, good connections to adjacent neighborhoods and good transit service. As long as increased densities and a range of uses are allowed and encouraged along the corridor, many different development patterns - nodal or linear - may meet the corridor objective.

Regionally Significant Industrial Areas, Industrial Areas and Employment Areas
The Portland metropolitan area economy is heavily dependent upon wholesale trade and the flow of commodities to national and international markets. The high quality of the freight transportation system and, in particular, the inter-modal freight facilities is essential to continued growth in trade. The inter-modal facilities (air and marine terminals, freight rail yards and common carrier truck terminals) are areas of regional concern, and a functional plan will identify and protect lands needed to meet their current and projected space requirements.

Regionally Significant Industrial Areas and Industrial areas are set aside primarily for industrial activities. Supporting uses, including some retail uses, may be allowed if limited to sizes and locations intended to serve the primary industrial uses. These areas include land-intensive employers, such as those around the Portland International Airport, the Hillsboro Airport and some areas along Highway 212/224. Areas of high agglomerative economic potential, such as the Sunset Corridor for electronics products and the Northwest industrial sanctuary for metal products, are supported with transportation planning and infrastructure development designed to meet their needs. Other employment centers are designated as employment areas, mixing various types of employment and including some residential development as well. These areas include limited retail commercial uses primarily to serve the needs of the people working or living in the immediate area.

Neighborhoods
Residential neighborhoods remain a key component of the Growth Concept and fall into two basic categories. Inner neighborhoods include areas such as Portland, Beaverton, Milwaukie and Lake Oswego, and include primarily residential areas that are accessible to employment. Lot sizes are smaller and provide better access to jobs and shopping.
Outer neighborhoods are farther away from large employment centers and have larger lot sizes and lower densities. Examples include cities such as Forest Grove, Sherwood and Oregon City, and some additions to the UGB.

**Transportation Facilities**

Adoption of the 2040 Growth Concept established a new direction for planning in the region by linking urban form to transportation. This new direction reflects a commitment to develop a regional form that is based on efficient use of land and a safe, efficient and cost-effective transportation system that supports the land uses in the 2040 Growth Concept and accommodates all forms of travel.

In this new relationship, the 2040 Growth Concept provides the desired urban form for the Regional Transportation Plan to support. The 2040 Growth Concept Map identifies one possible regional transportation system. Therefore, the 2040 Growth Concept Map does not prescribe or limit what the adopted regional transportation system will include. The Concept map shows some transportation facilities to illustrate new concepts, such as “green corridors,” and how land-use areas, such as centers, may be served based on agreements with affected agencies and jurisdictions. Neither the current regional system nor final alignment choices for future facilities are intended to be represented on the Concept map.

**Open Spaces and Trail Corridors**

Recognition and protection of open spaces both inside the UGB and in rural reserves are reflected in the Growth Concept. The areas designated open space on the Concept map are parks, stream and trail corridors, wetlands and floodplains, largely undeveloped upland areas and areas of compatible very low-density residential development. Many of these natural features already have significant land set aside as open space. The Tualatin Mountains, for example, contain major parks such as Forest Park and Tryon Creek State Park and numerous smaller parks such as Gabriel Park in Portland and Wilderness Park in West Linn. Other areas are oriented toward wetlands and streams.

Designating these areas as open spaces has several effects. First, it generally removes these lands from the category of urban land that is available for development. The capacity of the UGB then has to be calculated without these areas, and plans to accommodate housing and employment have to be made without them. Second, these natural areas, along with key rural reserve areas, receive a high priority for purchase as parks and open space, through programs such as Metro’s Open Spaces Acquisition program. Finally, regulations should be developed, to protect critical natural areas that would not conflict with housing and economic goals. This will provide protection of critical creek areas, compatible low-density development of sensitive areas and transfer of development rights from protected natural areas to other lands better suited for development.

**Neighbor Cities**

The Growth Concept recognizes that neighboring cities outside Metro’s boundaries are likely to grow rapidly. There are several such cities proximate to the Metro region. Metro will pursue discussion of cooperative efforts with neighboring cities. Neighbor city coordination will be achieved with the completion of intergovernmental agreements concerning key concepts. Communities such as Sandy, Canby and Newberg will be
affected by Metro, city and county decisions about managing growth within Metro. A significant number of people may be accommodated in these neighboring cities, and cooperation between Metro and these communities is necessary to coordinate planning to address common transportation and land-use issues.

Cooperative planning between a city outside the region and Metro could also be initiated on a more limited basis. These cooperative efforts could be completed to minimize the impact of growth on surrounding agriculture and natural resource lands, maintain a separation between a city and the Metro UGB, minimize the impact on state transportation facilities, match population growth to rural resource job and local urban job growth and coordinate land-use policies. Communities such as North Plains and other communities adjacent to the region such as Estacada and Scappoose may find this more limited approach suitable to their local situation.

Rural Reserves
Some rural lands adjacent to and nearby the regional UGB may be designated as rural reserves. This designation is intended as a policy statement by Metro to not extend the UGB into these areas and to support neighboring cities' efforts not to expand their urban growth boundaries into these areas in order to keep adjacent urban areas separate.

Rural reserves may be designated in areas that are most threatened by new development, in areas that separate communities, or in areas that exist as special resource areas. Rural reserves may also separate cities within the Metro boundary. Cornelius, Hillsboro, Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville all have existing areas of rural land that provide a break in urban patterns. The objectives for rural land planning in the region are to:

- Maintain the rural character of the landscape.
- Support and maintain our agricultural economy.
- Avoid or eliminate conflicts with farm and forest practices.
- Help meet regional needs for open space and wildlife habitat.
- Help to clearly separate urban from rural land.

Rural reserves are further protected from development pressures by the rural zoning of the counties. New rural commercial or industrial development is restricted.

The reserves may include some purchase of natural areas adjacent to rivers, streams and lakes to ensure that water quality is protected and wildlife habitat enhanced. Large natural features, such as hills and buttes, may be included as rural reserves because they buffer developed areas and are poor candidates for compact urban development.

The primary means of achieving rural reserves would be through the Regional Framework Plan for areas within the Metro boundary, and voluntary agreements among Metro, the counties, neighboring cities and the state for those areas outside the Metro boundary. Metro will seek agreements, which would prohibit extending urban growth into the rural reserves, and require that state agency actions be consistent with the rural reserve designation.
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Chapter 1  Land Use

Introduction
The Metro Charter requires that Metro address growth management and land use planning matters of metropolitan concern. This chapter contains the policies that guide Metro in urban design and settlement patterns; housing densities; management and amendment of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and protection of lands outside the UGB for natural resources, future urban or other uses.

This chapter also addresses land use planning matters that the Metro Council, with the consultation and advice of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), determines will benefit from regional planning, such as affordable housing.

A livable region is an economically strong region. This chapter contains policies that supports a strong economic climate through encouraging the development of a diverse and sufficient supply of jobs, especially family wage jobs, in appropriate locations throughout the region.

This chapter begins with the Fundamentals followed by specific policies adopted to guide Metro in future growth management land use planning decisions. This chapter refers to specific legal requirements for cities and counties as well as for Metro that are set forth in Chapter 8 of the RFP. These provisions are implemented in Metro Code Chapter 3.01 and in Chapter 3.07, the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

The Metro Code provisions, the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, a background discussion and policy analysis for this chapter are included in the Appendices of this plan.

Fundamentals

**Fundamental 1:** Encourage a strong local economy by providing an orderly and efficient use of land, balancing economic growth around the region and supporting high quality education.

**Fundamental 2:** Encourage the efficient use of land within the UGB including buildable industrial and commercial land and focus development in 2040 mixed use centers and corridors.

**Fundamental 5:** Maintain separation between the Metro UGB and neighboring cities by working actively with these cities and their respective counties.

**Fundamental 7:** Enable communities to provide diverse housing options for all residents by providing a mix of housing types as well as affordable homes in every jurisdiction.
Policies

The following section contains the policies for land use. It should be noted that implementation of these policies is through the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and Chapter 3.01 of the Metro Code (Urban Growth Boundary). Metro’s functional plans that include recommendations and requirements for cities and counties of the region.

1.1 Urban Form

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.1.1 Balance the region’s growth by:

a. Maintaining a compact urban form, with easy access to nature.

b. Preserving existing stable and distinct neighborhoods by focusing commercial and residential growth in mixed-use centers and corridors at a pedestrian scale.

c. Ensuring affordability and maintaining a variety of housing choices with good access to jobs and assuring that market-based preferences are not eliminated by regulation.

d. Targeting public investments to reinforce a compact urban form.

1.2 Built Environment

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.2.1 Ensure that development in the region occurs in a coordinated and balanced fashion as evidenced by:

a. Taking a regional “fair-share” approach to meeting the housing needs of the urban population.

b. Providing infrastructure and critical public services concurrent with the pace of urban growth and that support the 2040 Growth Concept.

c. Continuing growth of regional economic opportunity, balanced so as to provide an equitable distribution of jobs, income, investment and tax capacity throughout the region and to support other regional goals and objectives.

d. Coordinating public investment with local comprehensive and regional functional plans.

e. Creating a balanced transportation system, less dependent on the private automobile, supported by both the use of emerging technology and the location of jobs, housing, commercial activity, parks and open space.
1.3 **Housing and Affordable Housing**

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.3.1 Encourage affordable housing opportunities in the region by:

   a. Offering a diverse range of housing types, available within the region, and within cities and counties inside Metro's Urban Growth Boundary.

   b. Being available to households of all income levels that live or have a member working in each jurisdiction and subregion.

   c. Providing an appropriate balance of jobs and housing of all types within subregions.

   d. Addressing current and future need for and supply of affordable housing production goals.

   e. Minimizing any concentration of poverty.

1.3.2 Include in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan voluntary affordable housing production goals to be adopted by local jurisdictions in the region as well as land use and non-land use affordable housing tools and strategies.

1.3.3 Require local governments in the region to report progress towards increasing the supply of affordable housing.

1.3.4 Acknowledge that there is a need to create a housing fund available region wide in order to leverage other affordable housing resources, and that, if the region is to be successful in increasing the amount of affordable housing, such a housing fund would need the support of a wide range of interests including local government, state and business groups.

(RFP Policy 1.3 updated 9/10/98, Metro Ord. 98-769; Policies 1.3, 1.3.1 through 1.3.7. updated, Metro Ord. 00-882C; RFP Policies 1.3.1 through 1.3.4, updated 2/05.)

1.4 **Economic Opportunity**

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.4.1 Locate expansions of the UGB for industrial or commercial purposes in locations consistent with this plan and where, consistent with state statutes and statewide goals, an assessment of the type, mix and wages of existing and anticipated jobs within subregions justifies such expansion.

1.4.2 Balance the number and wage level of jobs within each subregion with housing cost and availability within that subregion. Strategies are to be coordinated with the planning and implementation activities of this element with Policy 1.3, Housing and Affordable Housing, and Policy 1.8, Developed Urban Land.

1.4.3 Designate, with the aid of leaders in the business and development community and local governments in the region, as Regionally Significant Industrial Areas those areas with site characteristics that make them especially suitable for the particular requirements of industries that offer the best opportunities for family-wage jobs.
1.4.4 Require, through the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, that local governments exercise their comprehensive planning and zoning authorities to protect Regionally Significant Industrial Areas from incompatible uses.

(RFP Policy 1.4 updated 10/26/00, Metro Ord. 00-879A; and Policies 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 added 12/05/02, Metro Ord. 02-969B-06; Policies 1.4.1 through 1.4.2 updated and 1.4.3 and 1.4.4 added 2/05)

1.5 Economic Vitality
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.5.1 Include all parts of the region in the region’s economic development, including areas and neighborhoods which have been experiencing increasing poverty and social needs, even during periods of a booming regional economy.

1.5.2 Recognize that to allow the kinds of social and economic decay in older suburbs and the central city that has occurred in other larger and older metro regions is a threat to our quality of life and the health of the regional economy.

1.5.3 Ensure that all neighborhoods and all people have access to opportunity and share the benefits, as well as the burdens, of economic and population growth in the region.

1.5.4 Support economic vitality throughout the entire region, by undertaking the following steps:
   a. Monitoring regional and subregional indicators of economic vitality, such as the balance of jobs, job compensation and housing availability.
   b. Facilitating collaborative regional approaches which better support economic vitality for all parts of the region if monitoring finds that existing efforts to promote and support economic vitality in all parts of the region are inadequate.

1.5.5 Promote, in cooperation with local governments and community residents, revitalization of existing city and neighborhood centers that have experienced disinvestment and/or are currently underutilized and/or populated by a disproportionately high percentage of people living at or below 80 percent of the region’s median income.

1.6 Growth Management
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.6.1 Manage the urban land supply in a manner consistent with state law by:
   a. Encouraging the evolution of an efficient urban growth form.
   b. Providing a clear distinction between urban and rural lands.
c. Supporting interconnected but distinct communities in the urban region.

d. Recognizing the inter-relationship between development of vacant land and redevelopment objectives in all parts of the urban region.

e. Being consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept and helping attain the region's objectives.

(RFP Policy 1.6 updated 10/26/00, Metro Ord. 00-879A; RFP Policy 1.6 updated 2/05.)

1.7 Urban/Rural Transition

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.7.1 Ensure that there is a clear transition between urban and rural land that makes best use of natural and built landscape features and that recognizes the likely long-term prospects for regional urban growth.

1.7.2 Locate the Metro UGB using natural and built features, including roads, rivers, creeks, streams, drainage basin boundaries, floodplains, power lines, major topographic features and historic patterns of land use or settlement.

1.7.3 Identify historic, cultural, topographic and biological features of the regional landscape that contribute significantly to this region's identity and "sense of place."

1.7.4 Manage the total urban land supply in a manner that supports the preservation of those features identified in 1.7.3, when designated, as growth occurs.

1.7.5 Designate "urban reserve areas," consistent with state law.

1.7.6 Designate urban reserve areas consistent with RFP policies and review the urban reserves at least every 15 years after adoption.

1.7.7 Base the priority for inclusion of land within an urban reserve area generally upon the locational factors of Statewide Planning Goal 14.

(RFP Policy 1.7 updated 10/26/00, Metro Ord. 00-879A, RFP Policy 1.7 updated 2/05.)

1.8 Developed Urban Land

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.8.1 Identify and actively address opportunities for and obstacles to the continued development and redevelopment of existing urban land using a combination of regulations and incentives to ensure that the prospect of living, working and doing business in those locations remains attractive to a wide range of households and employers.
1.8.2 Encourage, in coordination with affected agencies, the redevelopment and reuse of lands used in the past or already used for commercial or industrial purposes wherever economically viable and environmentally sound.

1.8.3 Assess redevelopment and infill potential in the region when Metro examines whether additional urban land is needed within the UGB, and include the potential for redevelopment and infill on existing urban land as an element when calculating the buildable land supply in the region, where it can be demonstrated that the infill and redevelopment can be reasonably expected to occur during the next 20 years.

1.8.4 Work with jurisdictions in the region to determine the extent to which redevelopment and infill can be relied on to meet the identified need for additional urban land.

1.8.5 Initiate an amendment to the UGB, after the analysis and review in 1.8.3, to meet that portion of the identified need for land not met through commitments for redevelopment and infill.

(RFP Policy 1.8 updated 2/05.)

1.9 Urban Growth Boundary
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.9.1 Ensure that expansions of the UGB help achieve the objectives of the 2040 Growth Concept.

1.9.2 Determine when the UGB is expanded, whether the expansion will enhance the roles of Centers and, to the extent practicable, ensure that it does.

1.9.3 Use the regional UGB, a long-term planning tool, to separate urbanizable from rural land, based in aggregate on the region's 20-year projected need for urban land.

1.9.4 Locate the UGB consistent with statewide planning goals and this plan and adopted Metro Council procedures for UGB amendment.

1.9.5 Improve the functional value of the UGB in the location, amendment and management of the regional UGB, as described in policies 1.9.6, 1.9.7, 1.9.8, 1.9.9.

1.9.6 Expand the UGB first within any adopted urban reserves, upon demonstrating a need for additional urban land, to the extent consistent with ORS 197.298 and Metro's acknowledged urban growth amendment process.

1.9.7 Adopt criteria for amending the UGB based on applicable state planning goals and relevant policies of this Plan:

a. Major Amendments: Amendments of the UGB may be made through a quasi-judicial or a legislative process. Metro will initiate the legislative
amendment process when it determines there is need to add land to the UGB following the analysis of buildable land supply required every five years by ORS 197.299(1). The process involves local governments, special districts, citizens and other interests. A local government, a special district or a property owner may initiate a quasi-judicial amendment process to add land to the UGB for public facilities, public schools, natural areas and those nonhousing needs that (a) were not accommodated in the most recent analysis of land supply conducted pursuant to state law and (b) must be addressed prior to the next analysis.

b. **Minor Adjustments**: Minor adjustments of the UGB may be brought to Metro by a local government, a special district or a property owner for siting public facility lines and roads, for land trades and to make the UGB coterminous with nearby property lines or natural or built features in order to make the UGB function more efficiently and effectively.

1.9.8 Require cities and counties to adopt conceptual land use plans and concept maps coordinated among affected jurisdictions for all areas added to the UGB as Major or Legislative amendments.

1.9.9 Establish criteria for concept plans and implementing ordinances.

1.9.10 Prepare a report on the effect of the proposed amendment on existing residential neighborhoods prior to approving any amendment or amendments of the urban growth boundary in excess of 100 acres.

1.9.11 Provide copies of the completed report to all households located within one mile of the proposed urban growth boundary amendment area and to all cities and counties within the district. The report shall address:

a. Traffic patterns and any resulting increase in traffic congestion, commute times and air quality.

b. Whether parks and open space protection in the area to be added will benefit existing residents of the district as well as future residents of the added territory.

c. The cost impacts on existing residents of providing needed public services and public infrastructure to the area to be added.

(RFP Policy Nos. 1.9.1 thru 1.9.4 updated to 1.9.1 thru 1.9.3, 10/26/00, Metro Ord. 00-879A; RFP Policy 1.9.3 regarding Measure 26-29 updated 5/15/03, Metro Ord. 03-1003; RFP Policies 1.9 through 1.9.3 updated 2/05 and RFP Policies 1.94 through 1.9.11 added 2/05.)

1.10 **Urban Design**

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.10.1 Support the identity and functioning of communities in the region through:
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a. Recognizing and protecting critical open space features in the region.

b. Developing public policies that encourage diversity and excellence in the design and development of settlement patterns, landscapes and structures.

c. Ensuring that incentives and regulations guiding the development and redevelopment of the urban area promote a settlement pattern that:

i) Links any public incentives to a commensurate public benefit received or expected and evidence of private needs.

ii) Is pedestrian "friendly," encourages transit use and reduces auto dependence.

iii) Provides access to neighborhood and community parks, trails and walkways, and other recreation and cultural areas and public facilities.

iv) Reinforces nodal, mixed-use, neighborhood-oriented design.

v) Includes concentrated, high-density, mixed-use urban centers developed in relation to the region's transit system;

vi) Is responsive to needs for privacy, community, sense of place and personal safety in an urban setting.

vii) Facilitates the development and preservation of affordable mixed-income neighborhoods.

1.10.2 Encourage pedestrian- and transit-supportive building patterns in order to minimize the need for auto trips and to create a development pattern conducive to face-to-face community interaction.

1.11 Neighbor Cities

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.11 Coordinate growth in cities outside the UGB, occurring in conjunction with the overall population and employment growth in the region, with Metro's growth management activities through cooperative agreements which provide for:

a. Separating communities within the Metro UGB, in neighbor cities and in the rural areas in between to benefit these places as growth occurs.

b. Pursuing coordination between neighboring cities, counties and Metro about the location of rural reserves and policies to maintain separation.

c. Pursuing the minimization of the generation of new automobile trips, a balance of sufficient number of jobs at wages consistent with housing
prices in communities both within the Metro UGB and in neighboring cities.

d. Using “green corridors” as transportation facilities through a rural reserve that serves as a link between the Metro Area and a neighbor city but also limits access to the farms and forests of the rural reserve in order to keep urban to urban accessibility high, but limit any adverse effect on the surrounding rural areas.

(RFP Policy 1.11.3 updated 10/26/00, Metro Ord. 00-879A; RFP Policy 1.9 updated 2/05.)

1.12 Protection of Agriculture and Forest Resource Lands

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.12.1 Agricultural and forest resource lands outside the UGB shall be protected from urbanization, and accounted for in regional economic and development plans, consistent with this Plan. However, Metro recognizes that all the statewide goals, including Statewide Planning Goal 10 Housing and Goal 14 Urbanization, are of equal importance to Goal 3 Agricultural Lands and Goal 4 Forest Lands which protect agriculture and forest resource lands. These goals represent competing and, some times, conflicting policy interests which need to be balanced.

1.12.2 When the Metro Council must choose among agricultural lands of the same soil classification for addition to the UGB, the Metro Council shall choose agricultural land deemed less important to the continuation of commercial agriculture in the region.

1.12.3 Metro shall enter into agreements with neighboring cities and counties to carry out Council policy on protection of agricultural and forest resource policy through the designation of Rural Reserves and other measures.

1.12.4 Metro shall work with neighboring counties to provide a high degree of certainty for investment in agriculture and forestry and to reduce conflicts between urbanization and agricultural and forest practices.

(RFP Policies 1.12.1 through 1.12.4 updated 9/22/04, Metro Ord. 04-1040B-01; RFP Policy 1.12 updated 2/05.)

1.13 Participation of Citizens

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.13.1 Encourage public participation in Metro land use planning.

1.13.2 Follow and promote the citizen participation values inherent in the RFP and the Metro Citizen Involvement Principles.
1.13.3 Encourage Local governments to provide opportunities for public involvement in land use planning and delivery of recreational facilities and services.

1.14 **School and Local Government Plan and Policy Coordination**

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.14.1 Coordinate plans among local governments, including cities, counties, special districts and school districts for adequate school facilities for already developed and urbanizing areas.

1.14.2 Consider school facilities to be “public facilities”, in the review of city and county comprehensive plans for compliance with the Regional Framework Plan.

1.14.3 Work with local governments and school districts on school facility plans to ensure that the Urban Growth Boundary contains a sufficient supply of land for school facility needs.

1.14.4 Use the appropriate means, including, but not limited to, public forums, open houses, symposiums, dialogues with state and local government officials, school district representatives, and the general public in order to identify funding sources necessary to acquire future school sites and commensurate capital construction to accommodate anticipated growth in school populations.

1.14.5 prepare a school siting and facilities functional plan with the advice of MPAC to implement the policies of this Plan.


1.15 **Centers**

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.15.1 Recognize that the success of the 2040 Growth Concept depends upon the maintenance and enhancement of the Central City, Regional and Town Centers, Station Communities and Main Streets as the principal centers of urban life in the region. Each Center has its own character and is at a different stage of development. Hence, each needs its own strategy for success.

1.15.2. Develop a regional strategy for enhancement of Centers, Station Communities and Main Streets in the region:

a. Recognizing the critical connection between transportation and these design types, and integrate policy direction from the Regional Transportation Plan.

b. Placing a high priority on investments in Centers by Metro and efforts by Metro to secure complementary investments by others.
1.15.3. Work with local governments, community leaders and state and federal agencies to develop an investment program that recognizes the stage of each Center's development, the readiness of each Center's leadership, and opportunities to combine resources to enhance results. To assist, Metro will maintain a database of investment and incentive tools and opportunities that may be appropriate for individual Centers.

1.15.4. Assist local governments and seek assistance from the state in the development and implementation of strategies for each of the Centers on the 2040 Growth Concept Map. The strategy for each Center will be tailored to the needs of the Center and include an appropriate mix of investments, incentives, removal of barriers and guidelines aimed to encourage the kinds of development that will add vitality to Centers and improve their functions as the hearts of their communities.

1.15.5. Determine whether strategies for Centers are succeeding. Metro will measure the success of Centers and report results to the region and the state. Metro will work with its partners to revise strategies over time to improve their results.

(RFP Policy 1.15 added 12/05/02, Metro Ord. 02-969B-06; RFP Policy 1.15 updated 2/05.)

1.16 Residential Neighborhoods

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

1.16.1 Recognize that the livability of existing residential neighborhoods is essential to the success of the 2040 Growth Concept.

1.16.2 Take measures, in order to protect and improve the region's existing residential neighborhoods, by:

   a. Protecting residential neighborhoods from air and water pollution, noise and crime.

   b. Making community services accessible to residents of neighborhoods by walking, bicycle and transit, where possible.

   c. Facilitating the provision of affordable government utilities and services to residential neighborhoods.

1.16.3 Not require local governments to increase the density of existing single-family neighborhoods identified solely as Inner or Outer Neighborhoods.

(RFP Policy 1.16 added 12/05/02, Metro Ord. 02-969B-06, pursuant to Measure 26-29, enacted by the Metro Area voters on 5/21/02.)
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Chapter 2 Transportation

Introduction

In 1992, the region’s voters approved a charter for Metro that formally gave responsibility for regional land use planning to the agency, and requires adoption of a Regional Framework Plan that integrates land use, transportation and other regional planning mandates. The combined policies of this framework plan establish a new framework for planning in the region by linking land use and transportation plans. Fundamental to this plan is a transportation system that integrates goods and people movement with the surrounding land uses.

This chapter of the Regional Framework Plan presents the overall policy framework for the specific transportation goals, objectives and actions contained in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). It also sets a direction for future transportation planning and decision-making by the Metro Council and the implementing agencies, counties and cities.

The policies are grouped into seven (7) subject areas:

1. Public process
2. Connecting land use
3. Equal access and safety
4. Protecting the environment
5. Designing the transportation system
6. Managing the transportation system
7. Implementing the transportation system

The policies aim to implement the 2040 Growth Concept and:

• Protect the economic health and livability of the region.
• Improve the safety of the transportation system.
• Provide a transportation system that is efficient and cost-effective, investing our limited resources wisely.
• Provide access to more and better choices for travel in this region and serve special access needs for all people, including youth, elderly and disabled.
• Provide adequate levels of mobility for people and goods within the region.
• Protect air and water quality and promote energy conservation.
• Provide transportation facilities that support a balance of jobs and housing.
• Limit dependence on any single mode of travel and increase the use of transit, bicycling, walking and carpooling and vanpooling.
• Provide for the movement of people and goods through an interconnected system of highway, air, marine and rail systems, including passenger and freight intermodal facilities and air and water terminals.

• Integrate land use, automobile, bicycle, pedestrian, freight and public transportation needs in regional and local street designs.

• Use transportation demand management and system management strategies.

• Limit the impact of urban travel on rural land through use of green corridors.

Fundamentals

Fundamental 4: Provide a balanced transportation system including safe, attractive facilities for bicycling, walking and transit as well as for motor vehicles and freight

Policies

The following section contains the policies for regional transportation. It should be noted that implementation of these policies is through the Regional Transportation Plan, a Metro functional plan that includes both recommendations and requirements for cities and counties of the region.

2.1 Public Involvement

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.1.1 Provide complete information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions and support broad-based, early and continuing involvement of the public in all aspects of the transportation planning process that is consistent with Metro's adopted local public involvement policy for transportation planning. This includes involving those traditionally under-served by the existing system, those traditionally under-represented in the transportation process, the general public, and local, regional and state jurisdictions that own and operate the region's transportation system.

2.2 Intergovernmental Coordination

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.2.1 Coordinate among the local, regional and state jurisdictions that own and operate the region's transportation system to better provide for state and regional transportation needs.
2.3 Urban Form
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.3.1 Facilitate implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept with specific strategies that address mobility and accessibility needs and use transportation investments to leverage the 2040 Growth Concept.

2.4 Consistency Between Land Use and Transportation Planning
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.4.1 Ensure the identified function, capacity and level of service of transportation facilities are consistent with applicable regional land use and transportation policies as well as the adjacent land use patterns.

2.5 Barrier-Free Transportation
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.5.1 Provide access to more and better transportation choices for travel throughout the region and serve special access needs for all people, including youth, elderly and disabled.

2.6 Interim Job Access and Reverse Commute Policy
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.6.1 Serve the transit and transportation needs of the economically disadvantaged in the region by connecting low-income populations with employment areas and related social services.

2.7 Transportation Safety and Education
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.7.1 Improve the safety of the transportation system. Encourage bicyclists, motorists and pedestrians to share the road safely.

2.8 The Natural Environment
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.8.1 Protect the region's natural environment.

2.9 Water Quality
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.9.1 Protect the region's water quality.

2.10 Clean Air
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:
2.10.1 Protect and enhance air quality so that as growth occurs, human health and visibility of the Cascades and the Coast Range from within the region is maintained.

2.11 Energy Efficiency
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.11.1 Plan transportation systems that promote efficient use of energy.

2.12 Regional Street Design
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.12.1 Plan regional streets with a modal orientation that reflects the function and character of surrounding land uses, consistent with regional street design concepts.

2.13 Local Street Design
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.13.1 Plan local street systems to complement planned land uses and to reduce dependence on major streets for local circulation, consistent with Section 6.4.5 in Chapter 6 of this plan.

2.14 Regional Motor Vehicle System
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.14.1 Plan for a regional motor vehicle system of arterials and collectors that connect the central city, regional centers, industrial areas and intermodal facilities, and other regional destinations, and provide mobility within and through the region.

2.15 Regional Public Transportation System
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.15.1 Plan for an appropriate level, quality and range of public transportation options to serve this region and support implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept.

2.16 Public Transportation Awareness and Education
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.16.1 Expand the amount of information available about public transportation to allow more people to use the system.

2.17 Public Transportation Safety and Environmental Impacts
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.17.1 Continue efforts to make public transportation an environmentally friendly and safe form of motorized transportation.
2.18 **Regional Public Transportation Performance**
   It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

   2.18.1 Plan for transit service that is fast, reliable and has competitive travel times compared to the automobile.

2.19 **Special Needs Public Transportation**
   It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

   2.19.1 Provide an appropriate level, quality and range of public transportation options to serve the variety of special needs individuals in this region and support the implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept.

   2.19.2 Provide a seamless and coordinated public transportation system for the special needs population.

   2.19.3 Encourage the location of elderly and disabled facilities in areas with existing transportation services and pedestrian amenities.

2.20 **Regional Freight System**
   It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

   2.20.1 Plan for efficient, cost-effective and safe movement of freight in and through the region.

2.21 **Regional Freight System Investments**
   It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

   2.21.1 Protect and enhance public and private investments in the freight network.

2.22 **Regional Bicycle System Connectivity**
   It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

   2.22.1 Plan for a continuous regional network of safe and convenient bikeways connected to other transportation modes and local bikeway systems, consistent with regional street design guidelines.

2.23 **Regional Bicycle System Mode Share and Accessibility**
   It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

   2.23.1 Increase the bicycle mode share throughout the region and improve bicycle access to the region's public transportation system.
2.24 Regional Pedestrian System
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.24.1 Plan the pedestrian environment to be safe, direct, convenient, attractive and accessible for all users.

2.25 Regional Pedestrian Mode Share
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.25.1 Increase walking for short trips and improve pedestrian access to the region's public transportation system through pedestrian improvements and changes in land use patterns, designs and densities.

2.26 Regional Pedestrian Access and Connectivity
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.26.1 Plan for direct pedestrian access, appropriate to existing and planned land uses, street design classification and public transportation, as a part of all transportation projects.

2.27 Transportation System Management
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.27.1 Use transportation system management techniques to optimize performance of the region's transportation systems. Mobility will be emphasized on corridor segments between 2040 Growth Concept primary land-use components. Access and livability will be emphasized within such designations. Selection of appropriate transportation system techniques will be according to the functional classification of corridor segments.

2.28 Regional Transportation Demand Management
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.28.1 Enhance mobility and support the use of alternative transportation modes by improving regional accessibility to public transportation, carpooling, telecommuting, bicycling and walking options.

2.29 Regional Parking Management
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.29.1 Manage and optimize the efficient use of public and commercial parking in the central city, regional centers, town centers, main streets and employment centers to support the 2040 Growth Concept and related RTP policies and objectives.
2.30 **Peak Period Pricing**
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.30.1 Manage and optimize the use of highways in the region to reduce congestion, improve mobility and maintain accessibility within limited financial resources.

2.31 **Transportation Funding**
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.31.1 Ensure that the allocation of fiscal resources is driven by both land use and transportation benefits.

2.32 **2040 Growth Concept Implementation**
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.32.1 Implement a regional transportation system that supports the 2040 Growth Concept through the selection of complementary transportation projects and programs.

2.33 **Transportation System Maintenance and Preservation**
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.33.1 Emphasize the maintenance, preservation and effective use of transportation infrastructure in the selection of the RTP projects and programs.

2.34 **Transportation Safety**
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

2.34.1 Anticipate and address system deficiencies that threaten the safety of the traveling public in the implementation of the RTP.
### Legal Antecedents – Resolutions Updating RTP Amendments - By Adoption Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution No.</th>
<th>Adoption Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-3186B</td>
<td>06/20/2002</td>
<td>FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO INCLUDE STATE BOND FUNDS; PROGRAMMING PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING FUNDS FOR US 26 WIDENING, AND APPROVING A CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR THESE ACTIONS AND THOSE OF ORDINANCE NO. 02-945 THAT AMENDS THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-3351</td>
<td>08/14/2003</td>
<td>FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE REVISED SOUTH CORRIDOR LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT PROJECT AND DEMONSTRATING CONFORMITY OF THE PROJECT, THE AMENDED REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND AMENDED METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM WITH THE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 3 Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Trails and Recreational Facilities

Introduction

The Metro Charter, approved by the region's voters in 1992, authorizes Metro to acquire, develop, maintain, and operate a system of parks, open space, and recreational facilities of metropolitan concern. This chapter of the Regional Framework Plan outlines the policies that guide Metro in providing these services and outlines Metro's roles and responsibilities. These policies include the inventory, protection, management and use of these resources at the regional and local levels. The policies have been derived from the Greenspaces Master Plan, the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs), the Future Vision Report, recommendations from the Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee, the Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee, and from citizens of the region.

The importance of the region's natural landscape and its recreation facilities cannot be understated. They support the air we breathe, the water we drink and define the look and feel of our communities. They ensure that natural resources and habitats are protected and that citizens have recreational opportunities close to where they work and live.

Citizens throughout the region have demonstrated the importance of parks, natural areas, trails and recreation services through their support of funding measures, participation in recreational activities and volunteer community service and from what they have said in public opinion surveys. Metro recognizes the desire of citizens to have high-quality natural areas, trails and parks close to home. Metro is working with federal, state, and local governments, non-profit organizations and citizens to address and meet the park and recreation needs of the Portland metropolitan area.

Fundamentals

Fundamental 3: Protect and restore the natural environment including fish and wildlife habitat, streams and wetlands, surface and ground water quality and quantity, and air quality.

Fundamental 6: Enable communities inside the Metro UGB to enhance their physical sense of place by using among other tools, greenways, natural areas, and built environment elements.

Fundamental 8: Create a vibrant place to live and work by providing sufficient and accessible parks and natural areas, improving access to community resources such as schools, community centers and libraries as well as by balancing the distribution of high quality jobs throughout the region, and providing attractive facilities for cultural
Policies

3.1 Inventory of Park Facilities and Identification and Inventory of Regionally Significant Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Trails and Greenways

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

3.1.1 Ensure coordinated protection and enhancement of natural functions such as water quality and wildlife habitat across jurisdictional boundaries by inventorying and identifying regionally significant parks, natural areas, open spaces, vacant lands, trails and greenways at the watershed level using topographical, geologic and biologic functions and features, i.e., "landscape ecology."

3.1.2 Identify natural corridors that connect regionally significant parks, natural areas, open spaces, trails and greenways. River and stream corridors, utility corridors, abandoned roads, and railroad rights-of-way will provide primary linkages.

3.1.3 Inventory lands outside the Urban Growth Boundary and Metro's jurisdictional boundary and identify them as prospective components of the Regional System when protection of these lands is determined to be of direct benefit to the region.

3.1.4 Identify urban areas which are deficient in natural areas and identify opportunities for acquisition and restoration.

3.1.5 Update the parks inventory (first completed in 1988) every five (5) years, including acreage, facilities, environmental education programs, cultural resources, existing school sites and other information as determined by Metro.

3.1.6 Inventory the urban forestry canopy, using appropriate landscape level techniques, such as remote sensing or aerial photo interpretation, on a periodic basis and provide inventory information to local jurisdictions.

3.2 Protection of Regionally Significant Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Trail and Greenways

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

3.2.1 Continue developing a Regional System of Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Trails, and Greenways (the Regional System) to achieve the following objectives:

a. Protect the region's biodiversity;

b. Provide citizens opportunities for, primarily, natural resource dependent recreation and education;
c. Contribute to the protection of air and water quality; and

d. Provide natural buffers and connections between communities.

3.2.2 Finance and coordinate protection and management of the Regional System across jurisdictional boundaries upon the advice of citizens, and in coordination with local governments and state and federal resource agencies and appropriate non-profit organizations.

3.2.3 Use strategies to protect and manage the Regional System and regional Goal 5 resources including, but not be limited to, acquisition, education, incentives, land use and environmental regulations.

3.2.4 Include lands inside and outside the UGB and Metro’s jurisdiction in the Regional System when protection of these lands are determined to be of direct benefit to the region.

3.2.5 Collect and evaluate baseline data related to natural resource values of the regional system to identify trends and to guide management decisions.

3.2.6 Seek to avoid fragmentation and degradation of components of the Regional System caused by new transportation and utility projects. If avoidance is infeasible, impacts shall be minimized and mitigated.

3.2.7 Work with the State of Oregon to update, reinvigorate and implement a Willamette River Greenway Plan for the metropolitan region, in conjunction with affected local governments.

3.3 Management of the Publicly-Owned Portion of the Regional System of Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Trails and Greenways

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

3.3.1 Assume management responsibility for elements of the publicly owned portion of the Regional System, as outlined in a functional plan to be developed.

3.3.2 Assume financial responsibility related to those portions of the publicly owned system which are managed by Metro.

3.3.3 Give local governments an opportunity to transfer existing publicly owned components of the Regional System to Metro and to acquire components of the Regional System with local resources.

3.3.4 Manage the publicly owned portion of the Regional System to protect fish, wildlife, and botanic values and to provide, primarily, natural resource dependent recreational and educational opportunities.
3.3.5 Acquire portions of the Regional System as financial resources allow by negotiating with willing sellers and using the power of eminent domain only in extraordinary circumstances.

3.3.6 Insure that public use is compatible with natural and cultural resource protection for components of the Regional System by creating Master/Management plans that strive to achieve that objective prior to formal public use.

3.3.7 Be responsive to recreation demands and trends identified in the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), along with local government cooperators in the Regional System.

3.3.8 Develop master planning guidelines to assure consistency in the management of the Regional System.

3.3.9 Convene local government park providers to share information, review and analyze issues from time to time or in conjunction with the periodic update of the region-wide parks inventory and, if appropriate, develop recommendations related to:

a. Roles and responsibilities

b. Funding

c. Levels of service

d. Information needs

e. User trends and preferences

f. Technical assistance

g. Interagency coordination

h. Public involvement

i. Other topics as determined by Metro and local park providers

3.3.10 Pursue the identification and implementation of a long term, stable funding source to support the planning, acquisition, development, management and maintenance of the Regional System in cooperation with local governments.
3.4 Protection, Establishment and Management of a Regional Trails System

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

3.4.1 Identify a Regional Trails System which shall be included in the Regional Transportation Plan.

3.4.2 Provide access to publicly owned parks, natural areas, open spaces, and greenways, where appropriate via the Regional Trail System.

3.4.3 Coordinate planning for the Regional Trail System with local governments, federal and state agencies, utility providers, and appropriate non-profit organizations.

3.4.4 Cooperate with citizens and other trail providers to identify and secure funding for development and operation of the Regional Trails System.

3.4.5 Encourage local governments to integrate local and neighborhood trail systems with the Regional Trail System.

3.5 Provision of Community and Neighborhood Parks, Open Spaces, Natural Areas, Trails and Recreation Programs

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

3.5.1 Recognize that local governments remain responsible for the planning and provision of community and neighborhood parks, local open spaces, natural areas, sports fields, recreational centers, trails, and associated programs within their jurisdictions.

3.5.2 Encourage local governments to (i) adopt level of service standards for provision of parks, natural areas, trails, and recreational facilities in their local comprehensive plans and (ii) locate and orient such parks, open spaces, natural areas, trails, etc., to the extent practical, in a manner which promotes non-vehicular access.

3.5.3 Encourage local governments to be responsive to recreation demand trends identified in the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP).

3.5.4 Encourage local governments to develop, adopt and implement Master Plans for local parks and trail systems, natural areas, and recreational programs.

3.5.5 Work in cooperation with local governments, state government, and private industry to establish a supplemental funding source for parks and open space acquisition, operations and maintenance.

3.5.6 Encourage local governments to identify opportunities for cooperation and cost efficiencies with non-profit organizations, other governmental entities, and local school districts.
3.5.7 Require that no urban reserve areas be brought into the UGB unless the Urban Reserve master plans demonstrate that planning requirements for the acquisition and protection of adequate land to meet or exceed locally adopted levels of service standards for the provision of public parks, natural areas, trails, and recreational facilities, be adopted in the local comprehensive plans.

3.5.8 Develop a functional plan in cooperation with local governments establishing the criteria which local governments address in adopting a locally determined "level of service standard," establishing region-wide goals for the provision of parks and open space in various urban design types identified in the 2040 regional growth concept and applying this to the portion of the region within the UGB and the urban reserves within Metro’s jurisdiction when urban reserve conceptual plans are approved.

3.5.9 Work with local governments to promote a broader understanding of the importance of open space to the success of the 2040 Growth Concept and develop tools to assess open space on a parity with jobs, housing, and transportation targets in the Regional Framework Plan.


It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

3.6.1 Encourage public participation in natural, cultural and recreation resource management decisions related to the Regional System.

3.6.2 Provide educational opportunities to enhance understanding, enjoyment and informed use of natural, cultural, and recreational resources.

3.6.3 Provide and promote opportunities for the public to engage in stewardship activities on publicly owned natural resource lands and encourage cooperative efforts between Metro and private non-profit groups, community groups, schools and other public agencies.

3.6.4 Provide opportunities for technical assistance to private landowners for stewardship of components of the Regional System.

3.6.5 Work together with local governments with state, federal, non-profit and private partners to facilitate stewardship and educational opportunities on publicly owned natural resource lands.

3.6.6 Encourage local governments to provide opportunities for public involvement in the planning and delivery of recreational facilities and services.

3.6.7 Follow and promote the citizen participation values inherent in RUGGO Goal 1, Objective 1 and the Metro Citizen Involvement Principles.
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Chapter 4 Water Management

Introduction

Watershed management and clean water are essential for healthy communities, a sound economy and habitat for fish and wildlife. They are also keys to a region’s livability and future growth, as well as the quality of drinking water. The interconnected web of rivers and streams, which have played an important role in the region’s history and economic success, are also important to the commerce, agriculture and economic vitality of the region.

This chapter contains policies related to maintaining watershed health to benefit people, fish and wildlife, focused in the following areas:

- **Water Supply.** Clean and sufficient quantities of water are essential to the people of the region, as well as their commerce, agriculture and economic viability. It is not only important to have adequate supply, but that supply must reach people throughout the region. How water is supplied can impact fish and wildlife habitats by reducing the amount of water in streams and rivers. This highlights the important linkage between growth management and water supply planning. The Metro Council has communicated to the region’s water providers that its main interests in water supply planning and implementation are water conservation and the link between land use and water supply. Metro has not assumed any function related to transmission, storage and distribution of drinking water.

- **Water Quality.** Tremendous advances have been made in the last 25 years to improve regional water quality and protect natural resources and open space. Future growth and development, however, will place increasing demands on the region’s natural resources and affect water quality. Metro recognizes this inherent conflict and strives to implement policies that protect natural resources and water quality while the region grows.

- **Watershed Management.** Watershed management is a planning tool that recognizes the dynamic connectivity between different components of a watershed. It identifies land use and management activities that protect the functions of natural systems while achieving desired land use patterns. Metro recognizes that citizens are concerned about protecting resources and maintaining open space to enhance the region’s livability.

- **Stormwater Management.** Management of stormwater as the region grows is crucial to the protection of urban water resources. Stormwater is both a valuable resource and a management problem. As a resource, it is potentially beneficial to critical fish and wildlife habitat, recharges groundwater, and may contribute to cooler water to urban waterways during hotter, low flow summer months. As a management challenge, it can add to flooding, destroy fish and wildlife habitat, and pollute groundwater and surface waters.

These policies strive to address the inherent conflict between the function of natural systems and the effects of growth and development in the region. In order to meet the
challenge of formulating policy in coordination with local jurisdictions and citizens, it is essential to acknowledge the dynamic process whereby such policies will continue to be developed and refined.

This chapter includes the specific policies adopted to guide Metro in future planning for watershed health, including water supply, water quality, and fish and wildlife habitat.

Fundamentals

Fundamental 2: Protect and restore the natural environment through actions such as protecting and restoring streams and wetlands, improving surface and ground water quality, and reducing air emissions.

Fundamental 5: Enable communities inside the Metro urban growth boundary to preserve their physical sense of place by using, among other tools, greenways, natural areas, and built environment elements.

Policies

4.1 Water Supply

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

4.1.1 Promote and achieve regional water conservation and demand management goals as defined in the Regional Water Supply Plan.

4.1.2 Promote the coordination between regional growth management programs and water supply planning.

4.1.3 Promote the coordination between land use planning and achieving the goals of the Regional Water Supply Plan.

4.1.4 Set benchmarks and evaluate achievement of the targets and goals established in the Regional Water Supply Plan in coordination with the region’s water providers.

4.1.5 Evaluate Metro’s role in encouraging conservation on a regional basis to promote the efficient use of water resources and develop any necessary regional plans/programs to address Metro’s role in coordination with the region’s water providers.

4.2 Overall Watershed Management

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

4.2.1 Develop a long-term regional strategy for comprehensive water resource management, created in partnership with the jurisdictions and agencies charged
with planning and managing groundwater resources and terrestrial and aquatic habitats by:

a. Managing watersheds to protect, restore and ensure to the maximum extent practicable the integrity of streams, wetlands and floodplains, and their multiple biological, physical and social values;

b. Complying with state and federal water quality requirements;

c. Protecting designated beneficial water uses;

d. Promoting multi-objective management of the region's watershed to the maximum extent practicable; and

e. Encouraging the use of techniques relying on natural processes to address flood control, stormwater management, abnormally high winter and low summer stream flows and nonpoint pollution reduction.

4.3 Water Quality

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

4.3.1 Protect, enhance, and restore the water quality of the region by:

a. Implementing watershed-wide planning.

b. Promoting the protection of natural areas along waterways and encouraging continuous improvement of water quantity and quality through liaison with agencies that influence changes along streams, rivers and wetlands in the Metro region.

c. Establishing vegetative corridors along streams.

d. Encouraging urban development practices that minimize soil erosion.

e. Implementing best management practices (BMPs).

f. Maintaining vegetated buffers along riparian areas.

g. Protecting wetlands values with sufficient buffers to maintain their water quality and hydrologic function.
4.4 Stormwater Management
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

4.4.1 Encourage the following regional policies for stormwater management by:

a. Ensuring that as development and redevelopment occur increases in stormwater runoff are avoided to the maximum extent practicable.

b. Managing stormwater so that runoff is retained as close as practicable to the site at which development or redevelopment occurs, in a manner that avoids negative quality and quantity impacts on adjacent streams, wetlands, groundwater and other water bodies.

c. Ensuring that, to the maximum extent practicable, the quality of stormwater leaving a site after development is equal to or better than before development.

d. Ensuring that, to the maximum extent practicable, the quantity of stormwater leaving a site after development is equal to or less than before development.

e. Ensuring that stormwater quantity and quality issues are addressed during design of transportation facilities.

4.5 Urban Planning and Natural Systems
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

4.5.1 Promote the incorporation of natural watershed systems into future planning and design processes and balance their contributions to environmental improvement with recreational and other uses.

4.5.2 Address the interrelatedness of greenspace protection, land use, transportation and water resources management issues.

4.6 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

4.6.1 Establish standards to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife habitat by:

a. Identifying regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat.

b. Determining performance standards for habitat protection.

c. Promoting coordination of regional watershed planning.
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Introduction

Natural hazards provide a “reality check” to growth in any region, a yardstick against which we can ask, “Has the region’s future been built on solid ground?” This chapter includes policies concerning hazard mitigation, emergency preparedness, disaster response, and recovery.

Natural hazards that could potentially pose a risk in the Metro region include earthquakes, floods, landslides, volcanic events, wildfires, severe weather, and biological hazards. The risk of loss or damage from an earthquake depends on both the presence of seismically hazardous land (land subject to failure or strong effects from an earthquake) and the types of land uses occurring in those areas. Natural disasters such as a major earthquake will cause significant loss of life, injury and property damage. While vulnerability to hazards cannot be eliminated, implementation of the hazard mitigation policies described in this chapter will reduce human misery and property loss following a natural disaster. Metro has played an important role in assisting local emergency management agencies with disaster planning related to regional functions, such as disaster debris management and emergency transportation route designation.

This chapter includes the specific policies adopted to guide Metro in future planning for natural hazards. It addresses known regional natural hazards, and offers policy guidance for a comprehensive planning process that will help minimize the risks associated with such hazards to communities.

Fundamentals

Fundamental 2: Protect and restore the natural environment through actions such as protecting and restoring streams and wetlands, improving surface and ground water quality, and reducing air emissions.

Fundamental 8: Encourage a strong local economy by providing an orderly and efficient use of land, balancing economic growth around the region and supporting high quality education.

Policies

5.1 Earthquake Hazard Mitigation Measures

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

5.1.1 Utilize the relative earthquake hazard maps for a variety of regional planning purposes, including:

a. Urban Growth Boundary selection.
b. Public facility plans.

c. Transportation planning.

d. Solid waste management plans.

e. Natural hazard mitigation programs.

f. Parks and greenspaces planning.

5.1.2 Encourage local governments to utilize the relative earthquake hazard maps in developed and undeveloped areas as they undertake planning actions, including:

a. Comprehensive land use plans updates.

b. Redevelopment plans updates.

c. Subdivision reviews.

d. Zoning.

e. Infrastructure plans updates.

f. Siting of new public facilities.

g. Siting of new public and private utility facilities.

h. Public and private facility emergency plan updates.

i. Developing retrofit and other mitigation programs.

j. Emergency response planning.

5.1.3 Encourage local governments to set requirements for where site-specific seismic hazard evaluation is needed.

5.2 Flood Hazard Mitigation Measures

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

5.2.1 Protect the function of floodplains to safely convey floodwaters in the region by:
a. Collaborating with federal agencies and local governments to use the February 1996 flood elevation and other relevant data to update the existing 100-year floodplain map.

b. Requiring local governments to maintain or increase the flood storage and conveyance capacity of floodplains through such measures as balancing fill in the floodplain with an equal or greater amount of soil material removal.

5.2.2 Encourage local governments to implement approaches for mitigating flood hazards such as:

a. Acquisition, relocation or flood proofing of vulnerable facilities.

b. Changing local development ordinances related to height requirement above base flood elevation.

c. Allowing cluster or planned unit development that keep buildings out of floodplains.

d. Overlay zoning that sets public health, safety or welfare requirements.

e. Subdivision development requirements for locating public utilities and facilities (such as sewer and water systems) to minimize flood damage.

f. Construction of levees and floodwalls to mitigate flood hazards, particularly in densely developed urban areas, but should only be utilized when potential upstream and downstream damage is expected to be minimal.

g. Plans to leverage federal, state and local disaster assistance and hazard mitigation funds that may become available following a flood event.

h. Long-term capital improvement plans should be prepared and include provisions to elevate above the floodplain essential buildings for public health, safety and welfare services.

i. Flood threat recognition and/or warning systems should be investigated for cost-effectiveness.

5.2.3 Encourage the avoidance of floodplain development and other non-structural flood mitigation measures instead of using levee and dike construction and other structural flood mitigation techniques.
5.3 Landslide Hazard Mitigation Measures
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

5.3.1 Encourage local governments to adopt landslide mitigation measures including:
   a. Logging regulations on steep slopes.
   b. Landscape requirements.
   c. Drainage controls.
   d. Pre-development geotechnical studies.

5.3.2 Encourage local governments to limit development in the areas of greatest landslide hazard, except where development contributes to mitigation of the hazard. Such development should include appropriate safeguards and facilitate disaster response in the event it becomes necessary.

5.3.3 Encourage local governments to investigate and take part in Federal Emergency Management Agency "mudslide" and "mudflow" insurance programs through the National Flood Insurance Program.

5.4 Volcanic Hazard Mitigation Measures
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

5.4.1 Collaborate with federal, state and local agencies to evaluate the regional risks of pyroclastic events, and encourage local governments to adopt appropriate hazard mitigation measures.

5.5 Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Mitigation Measures
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

5.5.1 Collaborate with federal, state and local agencies to evaluate the regional risks of wildland-urban interface fires, and encourage state and local governments to adopt appropriate hazard mitigation measures which may include:
   a. Collecting data related to fuel load and mapping vulnerable areas.
   b. Identifying areas of steep slopes with limited year-around water availability.
   c. Regulating highly flammable material on structures, for example wooden roof shingles.
d. Adequate roadway requirements to assure response by fire protection agencies.

e. Adequate placement of fire suppression water hydrants.

f. Landscaping regulation to improve fire resistance.

5.6 Severe Weather Hazard Mitigation Measures

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

5.6.1 Collaborate with federal, state and local agencies to evaluate the regional risks of severe weather events, and encourage local governments and private organizations to adopt appropriate hazard mitigation measures which may include:

a. Encouraging replanting with wind-resistant trees near power lines and other sensitive facilities.

b. Incentives to retain larger stands of trees in newly developed areas, rather than preserve widely separated trees which are more vulnerable to wind fall.

c. Incentives for drought-resistant landscaping.

d. Improving public understanding of severe weather warnings and improving implementation of protective actions by governments, businesses and individuals.

e. Encouraging vegetation management programs by utilities and local jurisdictions to reduce potential damages from the effects of severe weather events.

5.7 Biological Hazard Mitigation Measures

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

5.7.1 Collaborate with federal, state and local agencies to evaluate the regional risks of biological hazards, and encourage local governments to adopt appropriate hazard mitigation measures which may include:

a. Support for existing insect and vector control programs to reduce the population of mosquitoes, flies, rats, etc., for disease prevention.

b. Regulatory structure to create or preserve habitat for appropriate urban wildlife, while discouraging inappropriate urban wildlife such as large predators.
5.8 Other Hazard Mitigation Measures
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

5.8.1 Collaborate with federal, state and local agencies to evaluate the regional risks of other natural hazards, and encourage local governments to adopt appropriate hazard mitigation measures.

5.9 Natural Disaster Response Coordination
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

5.9.1 Provide leadership and support to the Regional Emergency Management Group (REMG) and encourage local governments to participate in the existing intergovernmental agreement and to provide the resources required to develop a regional disaster response plan.

5.9.2 Collaborate with federal, state and local agencies, businesses and individuals to utilize the resources of Metro's Regional Land Information System and Natural Hazards Program data in developing a region-wide emergency management information system to improve disaster response coordination.
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Introduction

The Metro Charter, adopted by the voters within the Metro boundary, requires that the Regional Framework Plan address:

"... coordination, to the extent feasible, of Metro growth management and land use planning policies with those of Clark County, Washington . . ."

The Future Vision Commission recognized that decisions made in the Metro area could have a much wider impact. The Future Vision Commission concluded that:

"The bi-state metropolitan area has effects on, and is affected by, a much bigger region than the land inside Metro's boundaries. Our ecologic and economic region stretches from the Cascades to the Coastal Range, from Longview to Salem."

Established frameworks for planning coordination exist between Clark County jurisdictions and the Metro region. Representatives from the County and Vancouver, Washington are members of several Metro policy advisory committees including the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) as well as two technical committees (Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC). The Future Vision Commission, required by the Metro Charter to complete a broad vision statement about the region, also included the past Chair of the Clark County Commissioners. Metro and representatives of the City of Vancouver and Clark County serve on the Bi-State Coordination Committee, which makes recommendations to local governments in the larger region on land use, economic development, transportation and environmental justice. Representatives from Metro and ODOT are also full voting members on the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) and Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC).

This chapter documents policies and coordination efforts addressing bi-state issues. Only after review and discussion with representatives from Clark County can new actions, if any, be considered.

Fundamentals:

Fundamental 1: Encourage a strong local economy by providing an orderly and efficient use of land, balancing economic growth around the region and supporting high quality education.
**Fundamental 5:** Maintain separation between the Metro UGB and neighboring cities by working actively with these cities and their respective counties.

**Policies**

6.1 **Coordination with Clark County**

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

6.1.1 Communicate on a regular basis with Clark County and its cities to ensure coordination regarding growth management issues.

6.1.2 Work with Clark County governments and agencies to involve citizen groups and promote public outreach and education with respect to regional growth management.

6.1.3 Include Clark County and its cities parks departments and citizen groups in an ongoing parks forum to develop a regional bi-state natural areas system.

6.1.4 Continue and strengthen coordination and cooperation in regional transportation planning.

6.1.5 Encourage cooperative efforts to promote business location throughout the region, including Clark County, in order to improve the job/housing balance in the metropolitan area.

6.1.6 Include Clark County and its cities in all emergency preparedness planning and coordination strategies for the region.
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Introduction
Any plan put into effect is only a set of policies or actions based on what is known at the time. Actual conditions can and do change. Accordingly, any plan which is intended to be useful over a period of time must include ways of addressing new circumstances. To this end, this chapter includes policies and processes that will be used to keep the Regional Framework Plan (Plan) abreast of current conditions and a forward thinking document.

In addition, this Plan includes disparate subjects, ones that, while interconnected, at times suggest conflicting policy actions. This chapter describes the ways in which such conflicts can be resolved.

The policies included in Chapters 1-6 of this Plan are regional goals and objectives consistent with ORS 268.380(1). Many of these policies were originally adopted and acknowledged as the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives and have been superseded by the policies of this Plan. The specific policies included in this Plan are neither a comprehensive plan under ORS 197.015(5), nor a functional plan under ORS 268.390(2).

Policies

7.1 Citizen Participation
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.1.1 Develop and implement an ongoing program for citizen participation in all aspects of the regional planning effort.

7.1.2 Coordinate such a program with local programs to support citizen involvement in planning processes and avoid duplicating the local programs.

7.1.3 Establish a Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement to assist with the development, implementation and evaluation of its citizen involvement program and to advise the Metro Council regarding ways to best involve citizens in regional planning activities.

7.1.4 Develop programs for public notification, especially for, but not limited to, proposed legislative actions that ensure a high level of awareness of potential consequences as well as opportunities for involvement on the part of affected citizens, both inside and outside of Metro’s boundaries.
7.2 Metro Policy Advisory Committee and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.2.1 Work with the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), consistent with the Metro Charter.

7.2.2 Choose the composition of MPAC according to the Metro Charter and according to any changes approved by majorities of MPAC and the Metro Council.

7.2.3 Ensure that the composition of MPAC reflects the partnership that must exist among implementing jurisdictions in order to effectively address areas and activities of metropolitan concern and includes elected and appointed officials and citizens of Metro, cities, counties, school districts and states consistent with Section 27 of the Metro Charter.

7.2.4 Appoint technical advisory committees as the Metro Council or MPAC determines a need for such bodies, consistent with MPAC By-laws.

7.2.5 Perform, with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), the functions of the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization as required by federal transportation planning regulations.

7.2.6 Develop a coordinated process for JPACT and MPAC, to assure that regional land use and transportation planning remains consistent with these goals and objectives and with each other.

7.3 Applicability of Regional Framework Plan Policies

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.3.1 Ensure that all functional plans adopted by the Metro Council are consistent with the policies of this Plan.

7.3.2 Guide Metro's management of the UGB through standards and procedures that are consistent with policies in Chapters 1-6 of this Plan. These policies do not apply directly to site-specific land use actions, such as amendments of the UGB.

7.3.3 Apply the policies in Chapters 1-6 of this Plan to adopted and acknowledged comprehensive land use plans as follows:

a. Components of this Plan that are adopted as functional plans, or other functional plans, shall be consistent with these policies.

b. The management and periodic review of Metro's acknowledged UGB Plan, shall be consistent with these policies.

c. Metro may, after consultation with MPAC, identify and propose issues of regional concern, related to or derived from these policies, as recommendations but not requirements, for consideration by cities and
counties at the time of periodic review of their adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plans.

7.3.4 Apply the policies of this Plan to Metro land use, transportation and greenspace activities as follows:

a. The UGB, other functional plans, and other land use activities shall be consistent with these policies.

b. To the extent that a proposed action may be compatible with some policies and incompatible with others, consistency with this Plan may involve a balancing of applicable goals, sub-goals and objectives by the Metro Council that considers the relative impacts of a particular action on applicable policies.

7.3.5 Adopt a periodic update process of this Plan’s policies.

7.3.6 Require MPAC to consider the regular updating of these policies and recommend based on the adopted periodic update process.

7.3.7 Seek acknowledgement of the Plan, consistent with ORS 197.015(16).

7.4 Urban Growth Boundary Management Plan

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.4.1 Manage the UGB consistent with Metro Code 3.01 and the policies of this Plan and in compliance with applicable statewide planning goals and laws.

7.5 Functional Plans

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.5.1 Develop functional plans that are limited purpose plans, consistent with this Plan, which addresses designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern.

7.5.2 Use functional plans as the identified vehicle for requiring changes in city and county comprehensive plans in order to achieve consistence and compliance with this Plan.

7.5.3 Adopt policies of this Plan as functional plans if the policies contain recommendations or requirements for changes in comprehensive plans and to submit the functional plans to LCDC for acknowledgment of their compliance with the statewide planning goals.

7.5.4 Continue to use existing or new functional plans to recommend or require changes in comprehensive plans until these Plan components are adopted.

7.5.5 Continue to develop, amend and implement, with the assistance of cities, counties, special districts and the state, state-required functional plans for air,
water and transportation, as directed by ORS 268.390(1) and for land use planning aspects of solid waste management, as mandated by ORS Ch. 459.

7.5.6 Propose new functional plans from one of two sources:
   a. MPAC may recommend that the Metro Council designate an area or activity of metropolitan concern for which a functional plan should be prepared.
   b. The Metro Council may propose the preparation of a functional plan to designate an area or activity of metropolitan concern and refer that proposal to MPAC.

7.5.7 Use the matters required by the Charter to be addressed in this Plan to constitute sufficient factual reasons for the development of a functional plan under ORS 268.390 and make the adoption of a functional plan subject to the procedures specified above.

7.5.8 Ensure the participation of MPAC in the preparation of the functional plan, consistent with the policies of this Plan and the reasons cited by the Metro Council.

7.5.9 Require that MPAC review the functional plan and make a recommendation to the Metro Council after preparation of the Plan and broad public and local government consensus, using existing citizen involvement processes established by cities, counties and Metro.

7.5.10 Resolve conflicts or problems impeding the development of a new functional plan and complete the functional plan if MPAC is unable to complete its review in a timely manner.

7.5.11 Hold a public hearing on the proposed functional plan and afterwards either:
   a. Adopt the proposed functional plan.
   b. Refer the proposed functional plan to MPAC in order to consider amendments to the proposed plan prior to adoption.
   c. Amend and adopt the proposed functional plan.
   d. Reject the proposed functional plan.

7.5.12 Adopt functional plans by ordinance and include findings of consistency with this Plans policies.

7.5.13 Ensure that adopted functional plans are regionally coordinated policies, facilities and/or approaches to addressing a designated area or activity of metropolitan concern, to be considered by cities and counties for incorporation in their comprehensive land use plans.
7.5.14 Review any apparent inconsistencies if a city or county determines that a functional plan requirement should not or cannot be incorporated into its comprehensive plan, by the following process:

a. Metro and affected local governments notify each other of apparent or potential comprehensive plan inconsistencies.

b. After Metro staff review, MPAC consult the affected jurisdictions and attempt to resolve any apparent or potential inconsistencies.

c. MPAC may conduct a public hearing and make a report to the Metro Council regarding instances and reasons why a city or county has not adopted changes consistent with requirements in a regional functional plan.

d. The Metro Council review the MPAC report and hold a public hearing on any unresolved issues. The Council may decide either to:

   i. Amend the adopted regional functional plan.

   ii. Initiate proceedings to require a comprehensive plan change.

   iii. Find there is no inconsistency between the comprehensive plan(s) and the functional plan.

   iv. Grant an exception to the functional plan requirement.

7.6 Periodic Review of Comprehensive Land Use Plans

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.6.1 Require MPAC, at the time of LCDC-initiated periodic review of comprehensive plans of cities and counties in the region, to assist Metro with the identification of the Plan elements, functional plan provisions or changes in functional plans adopted since the last periodic review as changes in law to be included in periodic review notices.

7.6.2 Encourage MPAC, at the time of LCDC-initiated periodic review of comprehensive plans in the region, to provide comments during the review on issues of regional concern.

7.7 Implementation Roles

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.7.1 Recognize the inter-relationships between cities, counties, special districts, Metro, regional agencies and the State, and their unique capabilities and roles in regional planning and the implementation of this Plan.
7.7.2 Recognize the role of the cities to:
   a. Adopt and amend comprehensive plans to conform to functional plans adopted by Metro.
   b. Identify potential areas and activities of metropolitan concern through a broad-based local discussion.
   c. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern.
   d. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

7.7.3 Recognize the role of counties to:
   a. Adopt and amend comprehensive plans to conform to functional plans adopted by Metro.
   b. Identify potential areas and activities of metropolitan concern through a broad-based local discussion.
   c. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern.
   d. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

7.7.4 Recognize the role of Special Service Districts to:
   a. Assist Metro, through a broad-based local discussion, with the identification of areas and activities of metropolitan concern and the development of strategies to address them, and participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives. Special Service Districts will conduct their operations in conformance with acknowledged comprehensive plans affecting their service territories.

7.7.5 Recognize the role of School Districts to:
   a. Advise Metro regarding the identification of areas and activities of school district concern.
   b. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and activities of school district concern.
   c. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

7.7.6 Recognize the role of the State of Oregon to:
   a. Advise Metro regarding the identification of areas and activities of metropolitan concern.
b. Cooperatively develop strategies for responding to designated areas and activities of metropolitan concern.

c. Review state plans, regulations, activities and related funding to consider changes in order to enhance implementation of the Plan and functional plans, and employ state agencies and programs to promote and implement these goals and objectives and the Regional Framework Plan.

d. Participate in the review and refinement of these goals and objectives.

7.7.7 Recognize the role of Metro to:

a. Identify and designate areas and activities of metropolitan concern.

b. Provide staff and technical resources to support the activities of MPAC within the constraints established by Metro Council.

c. Serve as a technical resource for cities, counties, school districts and other jurisdictions and agencies.

d. Facilitate a broad-based regional discussion to identify appropriate strategies for responding to those issues of metropolitan concern.

e. Adopt functional plans necessary and appropriate for the implementation of the Regional Framework Plan.

f. Coordinate the efforts of cities, counties, special districts and the state to implement adopted strategies.

g. Amend the Future Vision for the region, consistent with Objective 9. (See Ordinance No. 95-604A "For the Purpose of Adopting a Future Vision for the Region," adopted June 15, 1995.)

7.8 Performance Measures

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.8.1 Develop performance measures designed for considering the policies of this Plan in consultation with MPAC and the public.

7.8.2 Use state benchmarks for performance measures to the extent possible or develop, in consultation with MPAC and the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement, new performance measures.

7.8.3 Measure performance for Chapters 2-6 of this Plan by using several different geographies, including by region, jurisdiction, 2040 design type and market area.
7.8.4 Include the following performance measures for Chapters 2-6 of this Plan:

   a. Vacant land conversion;
   b. Housing development, density, rate and price;
   c. Job creation;
   d. Infill and redevelopment;
   e. Environmentally sensitive lands;
   f. Price of land;
   g. Residential vacancy rates;
   h. Access to open space;
   i. Transportation measures.

7.8.5 Direct these measures to be completed every two years.

7.8.6 Take corrective actions if anticipated progress is found to be lacking or if Metro goals or policies need adjustment in order to allow adjustments soon after any problem arises and so that relatively stable conditions can be maintained.

7.9 Monitoring and Updating

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.9.1 Review this Plan and all functional plans every seven years, or at other times as determined by the Metro Council after consultation with or upon the advice of MPAC.

7.9.2 Involve a broad cross-section of citizen and jurisdictional interests, and MPAC consistent with Policy 7.1 Citizen Participation, of this Plan in any review and amendment process.

7.9.3 Provide for broad public and local government review of proposed amendments prior to final Metro Council action.

7.9.4 Determine whether amendments to adopted this Plan, functional plans or the acknowledged regional UGB are necessary. If amendments prove to be necessary, the Metro Council will:

   a. Act on amendments to applicable functional plans.
   b. Request recommendations from MPAC before taking action.
   c. Include date and method through which proposed amendments will become effective if adopted.
d. Consider amendments to the UGB under UGB amendment procedures in the Metro Code.

7.9.5 Inform, in writing, any affected cities and counties of any amendment to this Plan or a functional plan, including amendments that are advisory in nature, that recommend changes in comprehensive land use plans, and that require changes in plans, and the effective date of amendments.

7.10 Environmental Education
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

7.10.1 Provide education to the community on the principles and foundation of this Plan in order to maintain it as a living document and to ensure that the citizens of the region understand the decision making mechanisms, the principles that guide sound planning and the effect of decisions and changes on the livability of the community.

7.10.2 Provide an unbiased source of environmental education that does not advocate for one viewpoint, that invites and involves diverse viewpoints and that gives everyone opportunities to participate in all aspects of the learning process.

7.10.3 Ensure that education for this Plan is enriched by and relevant to all points of view.

7.10.4 Develop and implement an ongoing partnership with cultural, environmental and educational organizations to keep abreast of current conditions and maintain this Plan as a forward-looking document.

7.10.5 Coordinate with local programs for supporting education that involves citizens in the analysis of critical environmental issues related to regional growth and environmental quality in order to help citizens gain awareness, knowledge and skills to make connections between the issues of regional growth and the creation of livable communities.

7.10.6 Provide citizens with the information needed and the opportunity to:

a. Analyze critical environmental issues related to regional growth.

b. Understand the effects of their choices on the urban and natural systems used to manage growth, natural areas and transportation, process waste and provide water and energy.

c. Engage in decisions which affect the livability of their communities.

d. Take actions which reflect the region's plan.

e. Cooperatively develop strategies with citizens to provide regional environmental education.
f. Identify cultural, environmental and educational organizations which currently provide education about issues related to livable communities.

g. Identify sites and facilities that currently and potentially provide education about issues related to livable communities.

h. Function as a clearinghouse for educational organizations and facilitate educational partnerships in the community.

7.10.7 Enable individuals and communities to challenge and discuss the rural and urban systems and policies responsible for creating livable communities in order to achieve the policies of this Plan.
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Chapter 8 Implementation

Introduction

Chapter 8 explains how the Regional Framework Plan and all of its components help achieve the Future Vision and the 2040 Growth Concept. The chapter also sets forth how the policies in the Regional Framework Plan are to be implemented.

Metro is an unusual unit of local government. Its form and functions have changed over the years since its predecessor - the Metropolitan Service District - was established by voters in 1970. Metro's current functions and authorities are set forth in three different laws: the Oregon Constitution; Oregon Revised Statutes chapter 268; and a voter-adopted charter. As a result, Metro did not adopt all the various parts of the Regional Framework Plan at the same time. In fact, Metro adopted some components of the Plan even before the Plan was adopted. So, it is important to describe the various components of the Regional Framework Plan and how they relate to one another.

Metro's voter-approved 1992 Charter directed it to adopt a "Future Vision" that would look ahead 50 years and describe how the region could accommodate expected growth and achieve a desired quality of life. Metro adopted its Future Vision in 1995. A copy of the Vision may be found in Appendix C.

Almost simultaneously with the Future Vision, Metro adopted the 2040 Growth Concept, a 50-year plan for the future of the region that will help achieve the Future Vision. The Growth Concept is described at the beginning of this Plan, and is depicted on a map to help people of the region visualize the Concept (available at www.metro-region.org).

The Future Vision and the 2040 Growth Concept comprise a bold vision for the future of the region. Without more, however, the vision may have remained on a shelf, soon to be forgotten. Not wanting that to happen, the people of the region directed Metro, in the 1992 Charter, to adopt a Regional Framework Plan to make the Future Vision and the 2040 Growth Concept a reality. The Metro Council adopted the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The Plan sets forth the policies that guide the decisions by the Metro Council toward realization of the Growth Concept.

It takes much more than policies alone to achieve the 2040 Growth Concept. It takes concerted effort by cities and counties, other public entities, businesses, private organizations and the people of the region. So the Regional Framework Plan contains a number components that call for action to carry out the policies of the Plan. One component - the Parks and Greenspaces Master Plan - calls for action by Metro itself to provide regional parks and open space (see Chapter 3 of this Plan). Another component - the Regional Transportation Plan - sets forth a long-range plan for transportation in the region and calls for local, regional, state and federal investments to make the necessary improvements (see Chapter 2 of this Plan). Two other components - the Open Spaces Bond Measure of 1995 and the biennial Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program - make the investments that help "build" the outstanding systems of regional parks, greenspaces and transportation facilities the region enjoys.
One kind of component of the Regional Framework Plan is called a “functional plan.” These plans, described in Metro’s statute (ORS chapter 268), address particular matters of significance in the region that require action by cities and counties of the region in order to implement the policies of the Regional Framework Plan. The Metro Council has adopted three functional plans.

The Urban Growth Boundary is the most well-known functional plan. The boundary separates the urban part of the region from the rural part. The boundary, the 2040 Growth Concept Map which depicts the boundary, and a set of criteria that govern how the boundary is changed (Metro Code chapter 301) comprise the Urban Growth Boundary Functional Plan. A copy of the urban growth boundary criteria may be found in Appendix B.

The Urban Growth Management Functional Plan implements those policies in the Framework Plan that address the use of land inside the urban growth boundary. It prescribes how cities and counties of the region accommodate housing and employment of the future and provides basic standards for protection of natural resources, for example. The 2040 Growth Concept Map, which designates all land inside the urban growth boundary for general kinds of uses (mixed-use Centers and Light Rail Station Communities, residential areas and employment areas), is part of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. A copy of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan may be found in Appendix A.

The Regional Transportation Functional Plan is the part of the Regional Transportation Plan that is carried out by cities and counties of the region. The functional plan establishes criteria and standards for streets, roads and other transportation facilities and calls upon cities and counties to provide for all modes of transportation: auto, pedestrian, bicycle and transit.

The diagram on page 7 shows how these various components of the Regional Framework Plan fit together. A chart at the end of this chapter shows which functional plan provisions implement specific policies of the Regional Framework Plan.

8.1 Implementation

It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

8.1.1 Enforce implementation procedures for those provisions of this Plan that are identified as functional plans as follows:

a. The effective date section of the ordinance adopting this Plan requires city and county comprehensive plans and land use regulations to comply with this Plan within two years after adoption and compliance acknowledgment of this Plan by the Land Conservation and Development Commission.

b. The Metro Council shall adopt provisions to adjudicate and determine the consistency of local plans with other functional plans as necessary.

c. The effective date section of the ordinance adopting this Plan requires each city and county within the jurisdiction of Metro to begin making its
land use decisions consistent with this Plan one year after compliance acknowledgment of this Plan by the Land Conservation and Development Commission until its comprehensive plan has been determined to be consistent with this Plan.

8.2 Regional Funding and Fiscal Policy
It is the Policy of the Metro Council to:

8.2.1 Adopt a Regional Funding and Fiscal section to be included in Chapter 8 (Implementation) of this Plan with the consultation and advice of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). In formulating and adopting the Regional Funding and Fiscal Policies, the following should be considered:

a. General regional funding and fiscal policies which support implementation of this Plan and related functional plans including but not limited to a policy requiring Metro, in approving or commenting on the expenditure of regional, state, and federal monies in the metropolitan area, to give priority to programs, projects, and expenditures that support implementation of this Plan and related functional plans unless there are compelling reasons to do otherwise.

b. Development of a regional systems capital investment plan for the regional systems needed to implement this Plan and related functional plans.

c. Regular periodic reports comparing the overall rates of property taxes, and business and development fees and charges assessed in each city and county in the region, the extent of fiscal disparities in the region, and the likely effects of these factors on implementation of this Plan and related functional plans.

d. Review of pricing of infrastructure and its likely effect on implementation of this Plan and related functional plans.

e. Regular periodic reports identifying state and federal funding and fiscal statutes, regulations, policies, programs, and decisions that significantly support or significantly undermine implementation of this Plan and related functional plans.

f. Other policies, plans, and actions relating to funding and fiscal factors which the Metro Council, with the consultation and advice of the MPAC, determines are of metropolitan concern and will support implementation of this Plan and related functional plans.

8.3 Schools
It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

8.3.1 Create a standing Advisory Committee on School Facility Planning Coordination to advise Metro on implementation of this Plan’s School Facilities policies in
order to prepare and implement an action plan for establishing Local School Facilities Site Planning Committees for school districts in the region serving 5,000 or more students made up of local school board, local government and local business representatives to advise their local governments on whether local comprehensive plans provide for adequate school facilities.

8.3.2 Provide to local governments a forecast of population by subarea to be used by local governments and school districts as a basis for their facilities planning.

8.3.3 Encourage park providers and school districts, in preparing capital improvement plans and land acquisitions, to the maximum extent feasible, to coordinate their site selections and facility plans with one another and to encourage that, wherever feasible, contiguous park/school sites be obtained by means of shared purchase or options, land exchange or other means.

8.3.4 Establish a region-wide acquisition fund using a variety of sources in order to assure that school sites exist within our communities that encourage walking or biking for elementary and middle school students and connect to public transit whenever possible for high school and middle school students to be distributed to actual need and utilize specific criteria.

8.3.5 Base any allocation of funds to sites which reflect regional and local policies for urban design and school sites that meet more of the following desired criteria may receive greater funding:

a. Require less land area than standard practice due to multi-story construction, mixed uses in building and shared use of playing fields with local park providers.

b. Located sufficiently close to concentrations of population in the school’s attendance area so as to minimize the need for school bus transportation or private auto transportation.

c. Well connected by the local street system and by established or planned pedestrian and bicycle ways.

d. High school sites that are well served by established or planned transit routes (need to include a Tri-Met coordination requirement).

e. Multi-school district collaborative projects.

8.3.6 Include discussions with the local school district to ensure that sufficient schools are provided for the children generated by large-scale development or redevelopment in local jurisdictions.

8.3.7 Encourage local jurisdictions to prioritize development applications and streamline processes for public agencies, including schools, to ensure that public needs are met without jeopardizing opportunities for citizen input or oversight for health and safety or environmental protection.
8.3.8 Encourage local jurisdictions to partner (including funding) with school districts to jointly use school sites for the public good (such as combined libraries, parks, connections with local services such as police, neighborhood centers, senior centers, etc.)

8.3.9 Require to prioritize their transportation spending to ensure bicycle and pedestrian connections are provided and the local road and land use plans encourage Tri-Met service in order to help ensure transportation connections with public buildings, local governments.

8.3.10 Recognize efforts described in 8.4.9 as it allocates federal transportation dollars.

8.3.11 Require local jurisdictions to engage local school districts and inform them of any density increases which may affect school populations as a part of compliance with the Urban Growth Management Functional Planning effort.

8.3.12 Require local governments and school districts to review codes related to the construction of schools.

8.3.13 Establish performance measures, after consultation with the school districts, related to the school policies of this Plan to help determine whether state goals are met. Measures may include:

   a. Number of elementary and middle school children who walk or bike to school.

   b. Number of high school students who take public transit.

   c. Amount of land used for new schools.

8.4 Administration

   It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

8.4.1 Adopt implementing ordinances to administer this Plan as follows:

   a. Establish a procedure for each city and county to make land use decisions which apply this Plan beginning one year after this Plan is acknowledged.

   b. Establish a process to assure that local plans and regulations comply with this Plan within two years of acknowledgment by LCDC.

8.5 Enforcement

   It is the policy of the Metro Council to:

8.5.1 Adopt implementing ordinances to enforce this Plan as follows:

   a. Establish a process for Metro to adjudicate and determine consistency of local comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances with this Plan.
b. Establish a process for Metro to determine whether changes in local land use standards and procedures are necessary to remedy patterns and practices of decision-making inconsistent with this Plan.
Diagram of Various Components of the Regional Framework Plan

[Placeholder]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Framework Policy</th>
<th>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.1 Urban Form            | • Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) Titles 1, 2, 6 and 11  
                          | • MTIP program                                  
                          | • TOD program                                   |
| 1.2 Built Environment    | • Metro Code 3.07, UGMFP                         
                          | • Titles 1 through 7, 11, and 12                
                          | • Regional Transportation Plan                  |
| 1.3 Housing and Affordable Housing | • Metro Code 3.01, Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserve Procedures  
                          | • Metro Code 3.07, UGMFP Titles 1, 7 and 11    |
| 1.4 Economic Opportunity | • Metro Code 3.07, UGMFP                         
                          | • Titles 1 and 4                                |
| 1.5 Economic Vitality    | Title 1 of the UGMFP Metro Code 3.07             |
| 1.6 Growth Management    | • Metro Code 3.01 UGB Amendment Procedures  
                          | • 3.01.005 UGB Amendment Procedures            
                          | • 3.01.020 Legislative Amendment Criteria     
                          | • Metro Code 3.06 Policy & Purpose: Designating Functional Planning Areas 
                          | • Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan: Titles 1 to 7, 11 and 12 |
| 1.7 Urban/Rural Transition | • Metro Code Chapter 3.01, UGB Amendment Procedures  
                          | • 3.01.005 UGB Amendment Procedures              
                          | • 3.01.020 Legislative Amendment Criteria       
                          | • Metro Code 3.06 Policy & Purpose: Designating Functional Planning Areas  
                          | • Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan  
<pre><code>                      | • Title 5                                       |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Framework Policy</th>
<th>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.8 Developed Urban Land                                       | • Metro Code 3.01, UGB Amendment Procedures  
• 3.01.005 UGB Amendment Procedures  
• 3.01.020 Legislative Amendment Criteria  
• Metro Code 3.06, Policy & Purpose: Designating Functional Planning Areas  
• Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan  
• Titles 1 to 7                                                                 |
| 1.9 Urban Growth Boundary                                      | • Metro Code 3.01, UGB Amendment Procedures  
• 3.01.005 UGB Amendment Procedures  
• 3.01.020 Legislative Amendment Criteria                                                                 |
| 1.10 Urban Design                                              | • Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan  
• Title 1                                                                 |
| 1.11 Neighbor Cities                                           | • Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan  
• Title 5  
• Signed Intergovernmental Agreements                                                                 |
| 1.12 Protection of Agriculture                                 | • Metro Code Chapter 3.01 UGB Amendment Procedures  
• 3.01.005  
• 3.01.020 Legislative Amendment Criteria                                                                 |
| 1.13 Participation of Citizens                                 | • Resolution No. 97-2433  
• Metro Code 2.12 Office of Citizen Involvement                                                                 |
| 1.14 School and Local Government Plan and Policy Coordination  | • Metro Code 3.01.005.c(4), 3.01.030.a, UGB Amendment Procedures  
• Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, Title 1                                                                 |
| 1.15 Centers                                                   | • Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan  
• Title 6                                                                 |
| 1.16 Residential Neighborhoods                                 | • Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan  
• Title 12                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Framework Policy</th>
<th>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Public Involvement</td>
<td>• Transportation Planning Public Involvement Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metro Code 2.12.010, Office of Citizen Involvement: Creation and Purpose Regional Transportation Plan Policy 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Intergovernmental Coordination</td>
<td>• Regional Transportation Plan Policy 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metro Code, 3.07, Title 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Urban Form</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Consistency between Land Use and Transportation Planning</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Barrier-Free Transportation</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Interim Job Access and Reverse Commute Policy</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Transportation Safety and Education</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Natural Environment</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Water Quality</td>
<td>• Regional Transportation Plan Policy 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metro Code, 3.07, Title 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Clean Air</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12 Regional Street Design</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13 Local Street Design</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14 Regional Motor Vehicle System</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 Regional Public Transportation System</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16 Public Transportation Awareness and Education</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17 Public Transportation Safety and Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18 Regional Public Transportation Performance</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Framework Policy</td>
<td>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19 Special Needs Public Transportation</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policies 14.4, 14.5 and 14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 Regional Freight System</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21 Regional Freight System Investments</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Regional Bicycle System Connectivity</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Regional Bicycle System Mode Share and Accessibility</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24 Regional Pedestrian System</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 Regional Pedestrian Mode Share</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26 Regional Pedestrian Mode Share</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27 Transportation System Management</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28 Regional Transportation Demand Management</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29 Regional Parking Management</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro Code, 3.07, Title 2 Regional Parking Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 Peak Period Parking</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.31 Transportation Funding</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32 2040 Growth Concept Implementation</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33 Transportation System Maintenance and Preservation</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34 Transportation Safety</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan Policy 20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Framework Policy</td>
<td>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Inventory of Park Facilities and Identification and Inventory of Regionally Significant Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Trails and Greenways</td>
<td>• Parks Inventory completed, 1998, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Natural Areas Inventory conducted, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Protection of Regionally Significant Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Trails and Greenways</td>
<td>Resolution 02-3253, Regional Greenspaces System Concept Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Management of the Publicly Owned Portion of the Regional System of Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, Trails and Greenways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Protection, Establishment and Management of a Regional Trails System</td>
<td>Resolution 02-3192, Regional Trails Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Provision of Community and Neighborhood Parks, Open Spaces, Natural Areas, Trails and Recreation Programs</td>
<td>MPAC Report to Council, April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Framework Policy</td>
<td>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.1 Water Supply         | • Metro Code, 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, Title 3 Water Quality, Flood Management and Fish and Wildlife Conservation  
                          | • Regional Water Supply Plan: Chapter XII Recommended Final Plan Concept and Implementation Actions |
| 4.2 Overall Watershed Management | Regional Water Supply Plan: Chapter XII Recommended Final Plan Concept and Implementation Actions |
| 4.3 Water Quality        | • Regional Water Supply Plan: Chapter XII Table XII  
                          | • Title 3 Water Quality, Flood Management and Fish and Wildlife Habitat |
| 4.4 Stormwater Management | • Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan  
                          | • Title 3 Water Quality, Flood Management and Fish and Wildlife Conservation Regional Water Supply Plan: Chapter XII |
| 4.5 Urban Planning and Natural Systems | Regional Water Supply Plan: Chapter XII |
| 4.6 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation | • Metro Code 3.07, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan  
                                          | • Title 3, Water Quality, Flood Management and Fish and Wildlife Conservation |
### Natural Hazards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Framework Policy</th>
<th>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Earthquake Hazard Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Flood Hazard Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Landslide Hazard Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Volcanic Hazard Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Severe Weather Hazard Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Biological Hazard Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Other Hazard Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 Natural Disaster Response Coordination</td>
<td>Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clark County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Framework Policy</th>
<th>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.1 Coordination with Clark County | • Resolution No. 03-3388, Endorsing a Bi-State Coordination Committee to discuss and make recommendations about Land Use, Economic Development, Transportation and Environmental Justice Issues of Bi-state Significance; Bi-State Coordination Committee Charter and Bylaws  
• Resolution 03-3352 – Intergovernmental Agreement for Regional Emergency Management |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Framework Policy</th>
<th>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Citizen Participation</td>
<td>• Metro Code section 2.12.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (Office of Citizen Involvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Metro Policy Advisory Committee and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation</td>
<td>Metro Charter Section 27, MPAC by-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Applicability of Regional Framework Plan Policies</td>
<td>Metro Charter, Chapter II, Section 5(2), ORS 268.380(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Urban Growth Boundary Management Plan</td>
<td>METRO CODE 3.01.005 ET SEQ., UGB AND URBAN RESERVE PROCEDURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Functional Plans</td>
<td>• Metro Code 3.06.010 et seq.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning Procedure for Designating Functional Planning Areas and Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ORS 268.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Periodic Review of Comprehensive Land Use Plans</td>
<td>METRO CODE 3.01.005 ET SEQ., UGB AND URBAN RESERVE PROCEDURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Implementation Roles</td>
<td>• ORS 268.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metro Charter, Chapter II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Performance Measures</td>
<td>Title 9 of the UGMFP, Metro Code 3.07.910 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 Monitoring and Updating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10 Environmental Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Framework Policy</td>
<td>Implementation Recommendation(s) or Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.1 Implementation</strong></td>
<td>• Metro Charter, Chapter II, Section 5(2)(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metro Code 3.01, UGB and Urban Reserve Procedures and 3.07, UGMFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.2 Regional Funding and Fiscal Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.3 Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.4 Administration</strong></td>
<td>Title 8 of the UGMFP, Metro Code 3.07.810 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.5 Enforcement</strong></td>
<td>Title 8 of the UGMFP, Metro Code 3.07.810 et seq.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE RESOLUTION NO. 05-3589
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO Introduced by: Councilor Rex Burkholder
MOVE THE I-205 NORTHBOUND ON-
RAMP/AIRPORT WAY INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT FROM THE ILLUSTRATIVE LIST TO THE
FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LIST

WHEREAS, the City of Portland, TriMet, the Port of Portland and Cascade Station Development Company (private developers) entered into a $180 million public/private partnership to extend light rail to the airport and to develop the 463 acres now known as Cascade Station/Portland International Center (CS/PIC); and

WHEREAS, in 1999, the Portland City Council adopted the first CS/PIC Plan District, intended to create a large-scale mixed-use employment center to support thousands of direct new jobs; and

WHEREAS, a series of infrastructure improvement have been completed, including the construction of Airport MAX, the Mt. Hood Avenue overcrossing, Airport Way Widening, the Cascade Station Primary Infrastructure, and Alderwood Road Extension in anticipation of development in Cascade Station/Portland International Center; and

WHEREAS, Metro incorporated the employment characteristics of CS/PIC projected at build-out into its 2020 and 2025 Regional Travel Models; and

WHEREAS, the Portland City Council amended the CS/PIC Plan District in April 2005 to spur development to ultimately employ over 7,000 workers within the district, by increasing retail square footage and reducing hotel and to a lesser extent, office development in Cascade Station and by increasing industrial square footage in PIC; and

WHEREAS, the transportation impact projected from full build-out of the 2005 amended CS/PIC Plan District is no greater than that projected from full build-out of the CS/PIC Plan District as defined prior to 2005; and

WHEREAS, CS/PIC lands are part of Portland International Airport; and therefore under the review and approval authority of the FAA for airport operations and safety; and

WHEREAS, the Port has undertaken an Environmental Assessment (EA) on behalf of the FAA for all further CS/PIC development to satisfy NEPA requirements; and

WHEREAS, transportation analysis in support of the EA has identified the need for an improvement allowing free-flow eastbound to northbound movement at I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way by 2014; and

WHEREAS, this project, previously identified in the 2000 RTP update, was included in the RTP Illustrative System to meet the growing needs of regional traffic using I-205 as well as the airport and development trips; and
WHEREAS, in order for the FAA to support a Finding of No Significant Impact, the project I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way improvement must be considered in the No Action Alternative analysis; and

WHEREAS, without FAA approval under NEPA, no further development will be allowed in CS/PIC; and

WHEREAS, the Port of Portland and the City of Portland have identified a combination of unanticipated funds and removal of the construction portion of Project 4037, Lombard-Columbia Connection near MLK Jr. Boulevard within the City of Portland's jurisdiction from the Financially Constrained List of the RTP to provide the financial capacity for inclusion of the I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way improvement; and

WHEREAS, the temporary removal of the construction portion of Project 4037 from the RTP Financially Constrained List until the next RTP update is not expected to impact the timing or scope of its funding or construction; and

WHEREAS, the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) federal air quality conformity analysis includes an improvement allowing free-flow eastbound to northbound movement at I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the Metro Council;

1. There is reasonable assurance that the I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way improvement project will be constructed by 2015.

2. The I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way improvement currently included in the RTP Illustrative System as Project 2069 be considered in the No Action Alternative of the Portland International Center Environmental Assessment, with construction occurring in the 2010-2015 time frame.

3. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) be amended to include the full I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way project in the Financially Constrained List, as that project is described in the RTP Illustrative List as Project 2069, for the 2010-2015 time frame, and to include other changes reflected in Exhibit A.

4. The amendment of the RTP to include the full I-205 Northbound Ramp/Airport Way project in the Financially Constrained System list will be concluded with the completion and USDOT approval of an air quality conformity determination.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____________ day of ____________________, 2005.

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

David Bragdon, Council President
STAFF REPORT TO RESOLUTION NO. 05-3589

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO MOVE THE 1-205 NORTHBOUND ON-RAMP/AIRPORT WAY INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT FROM THE ILLUSTRATIVE LIST TO THE FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LIST

Date: May 20, 2005 Prepared by: Tom Kloster

The purpose of this amendment is to include the 1-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way Improvement in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Illustrative List in the Financially Constrained System for the 2010-2015 time frame to allow development to begin immediately in Cascade Station, to continue development in Portland International Center, and to improve mobility in the vicinity of Portland International Airport.

BACKGROUND

In 1997, the City of Portland, Trimet, the Port of Portland (as the property owner) and Cascade Station Development Company (private developers) entered into a public/private partnership to extend light rail to the airport and to develop a portion of the 463 acres now known as Cascade Station/Portland International Center (CS/PIC). Public and private entities provided $144 million and $36 million, respectively, toward infrastructure investment needed to bring both the light rail extension and property development to fruition.

In 1999, the Portland City Council adopted the first CS/PIC Plan District, intended to create a large-scale mixed-use employment center. The north portion of the plan district, largely Cascade Station, was intended as an urban setting with office, retail and hospitality uses around two light rail stations and a series of linear park blocks. The southern portion of the plan district was also intended to support light rail ridership, but focused on industrial, office and aviation uses. The Plan District identified no off-site transportation mitigation, given the commitment of the public/private partnership to provide specific development infrastructure, including support for the light rail extension.

After Portland’s adoption of the Plan District, Metro incorporated the employment characteristics of CS/PIC projected at build-out into its 2020 Regional Travel Model. That and subsequent transportation and air quality analyses performed by Metro have assumed full build-out of CS/PIC by 2020.

In 2001, Airport Max opened to the public. While it’s been a transportation success for the region, and some development has occurred in the Portland International Center, development at Cascade Station, particularly around the transit stations, has not materialized. To spur development, in 2005, Portland City Council adopted the most recent amendment to the CS/PIC Plan District. That amendment increases the amount of allowable retail development, including up to three retail uses larger than 60,000 square feet and reduces hotel and to a lesser extent, office development in Cascade Station. Because the site lacks residences (per FAA regulation), developers have contended that the development needs retail anchors to attract the market base necessary to support other retail, office and hotel development. The City’s amendment also increases PIC industrial use square footage, recognizing that the trips generated by the roughly 1,000,000 square feet of industrial space already developed are well below that projected in 1999. Build-out of the revised plan district is projected to create over 7,000 direct jobs.

Transportation analysis for the revised (2005) CS/PIC Plan District projected a slight decrease in PM peak outbound trips from the site (the measure of traffic used in the original Plan District and in
subsequent amendment processes) at full build-out, compared to full build-out of the Plan District as previously adopted. The analysis also identified a range of locations where intersection performance in 2024 was projected to operate below City of Portland and Oregon Department of Transportation acceptable performance standards. The deterioration of the transportation network identified between the 2015 analysis performed for the 1999 Plan District and the 2024 analysis performed for the 2005 amendment resulted primarily from the increase in projected background traffic between 2015 and 2024, not from an increase in trip generation from the Plan District. Therefore, the Plan District amendment was found to have met Transportation Planning Rule requirements without additional mitigation requirements.

Because CS/PIC lands are part of Portland International Airport, the Port of Portland is seeking Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval to allow development to proceed per the 2005 CS/PIC Plan District amendment. Although the Port of Portland owns Portland International Airport (PDX), which includes CS/PIC, it must operate the airport according to FAA regulations. FAA requires review and approval of all facilities and development to ensure consistency with airport operations and safety.

The Port of Portland purchased the property designated for CS/PIC development using federal monies during the 1960's and 1970's for the purpose of protecting the aircraft approach to Runway 28L and to prevent incompatible development. This use of federal funds and the requisite FAA authorization for development in CS/PIC make the proposed development subject to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), which requires federal agencies to consider potential environmental effects of their proposed projects.

In response, the Port of Portland has undertaken development of an Environmental Assessment (EA) on behalf of the Federal Aviation Administration for all further CS/PIC development. The EA transportation analysis has identified a series of mitigation requirements related to developing CS/PIC in accordance with the 2005 Plan District, primarily signal installation, intersection reconfiguration, and in the case of I-205 southbound to Airport Way, a ramp widening. These will be funded using private and Port aviation funds. The transportation analysis also identified one large-scale mitigation at I-205 northbound on-ramp/Airport Way.

The region has been aware of the long-term need for an improvement at this location. The Airport Area Transportation Study (DKS, 1998), which provided the traffic analysis for the Airport Max environmental assessment, identified improvements at I-205, needed between 2010 and 2020. These included an interchange improvement supporting eastbound to northbound movement, as well as braided ramps on I-205 northbound between Killingsworth Street and Airport Way. These projects have been in the Illustrative list of the RTP since the 2000 update. While PDX-related trips contribute to congestion at I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way, the majority of traffic is generated off the airport, which includes approximately a third of the PM peak traffic traveling eastbound on Airport Way between 82nd and I-205.

If not for the EA process, the Port would submit the I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way improvement for inclusion in the RTP Financially Constrained List in the next regular RTP update. However, for the FAA, to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), they require assurance that all mitigations will be constructed. Two actions are proposed to meet that assurance in the shortest time frame feasible: 1. JPACT and Metro Council endorse inclusion of the I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way improvement for consideration in the No Action Alternative of the (Cascade Station/) Portland International Center EA; and 2. the RTP Financially Constrained List be amended to include this project. Without these assurances, the FAA would refuse to support a FONSI, effectively placing a
moratorium on development in CS/PIC for at least two years. Such a delay would ensure that the current retail and industrial market window for this development would be missed and the region would risk losing a significant economic development opportunity.

Fortunately, a portion of the I-205 northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way improvement is in the RTP Financially Constrained List, and the entire project was modeled in the federal air quality conformity analysis. However, to meet FAA requirements, the full project must have reasonable assurance of being constructed. In order to move the I-205 Northbound On-Ramp/Airport Way improvement into the RTP Financially Constrained Network, the Port of Portland and the City of Portland have agreed to offset state and federal funds assigned to the Port of Portland and City of Portland portions of the list through the recognition of other increased contributions and the removal of the construction portion of Project 4037 Lombard-Columbia Connection near MLK Jr. Boulevard from the Financially Constrained List, as shown in Exhibit A. The City of Portland intends to resubmit this project for inclusion in the RTP Financially Constrained System during the next regular RTP update. It is not expected that temporary removal of this project will affect its funding or construction schedule, nor does the temporary shift reflect reduced support for this project from either agency.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition.** There is no known opposition to this proposal.

2. **Legal Antecedents.** Metro is charged by TEA-21 with assuring that all projects of regional significance, warranted and financially feasible, are reflected in the Region’s Transportation Plan and that projects that are counted for construction in the near term are in the Financially Constrained List and are air quality conformed.

3. **Anticipated Effects.** None

4. **Budget Impacts.** None.
The following changes to the RTP Financially Constrained List retain the balance of state and federal funding assumed in the 2004 Federal Update to the RTP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>$ Impact to Financially Constrained List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2069 I-205 Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>Add to Financially Constrained List</td>
<td>Needed to satisfy FAA requirements</td>
<td>-$23,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution from private and Port funds not previously anticipated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4037 Lombard-Columbia Connection</td>
<td>Remove construction phase from</td>
<td>Project is funded into PE, construction phase will be resubmitted for the RTP Financially Constrained List at the next Regular RTP update</td>
<td>$14,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near MLK Jr. Boulevard</td>
<td>Financially Constrained List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4082 Ramsey Rail Complex</td>
<td>Maintain on Financially Constrained List</td>
<td>Part of project will be constructed using private funds</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net impact to Financially Constrained List

$ 0
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING ) RESOLUTION NO. 05-3588
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE OREGON ) Introduced by Councilor Burkholder
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND TO )
THE WASHINGTON STATE )
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION )
CONCERNING HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE )
LANES ON INTERSTATE 5 IN THE VICINITY )
OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER )

WHEREAS, in 2000, after completion of HOV operational analysis and policy
discussion, the Bi-State Transportation Committee recommended: 1) an HOV pilot project on
Interstate 5 in Southwest Washington from 99th Street south to the vicinity of the Interstate
Bridge across the Columbia River, 2) that because of safety and operational concerns, an HOV
lane should not be pursued across the existing Interstate Bridge at that time, and that 3) a
southbound HOV land in Oregon south of the Interstate Bridge to the vicinity of Lombard should
be pursued as a part of the design for the Delta Park project; and

WHEREAS, an Environmental Assessment of the widening of the Interstate 5 Delta Park
to Lombard segment, assessing expansion from the current two lanes to three lanes, including a
possible HOV lane is now underway; and,

WHEREAS, an HOV lane built in the Delta Park to Lombard segment of Interstate 5, the
HOV lane would meet the minimum threshold of 500-600 eligible HOV vehicles per hour,
however, the significant benefit to HOV lane users also results in significant impacts to freight
mobility and other non HOV lane users; and,

WHEREAS, a managed lane, which could include some additional vehicles, including,
for example, some smaller freight delivery vehicles, could more fully utilize the lane, meet needs
and improve operational characteristics in the Delta Park to Lombard segment of Interstate 5; and

WHEREAS, at its March 31, 2005 meeting the Bi-State Coordination Committee, a
committee comprised of elected representatives from Southwest Washington and the Metro area
as well as executives of the Ports, transit and metropolitan planning organizations from both
sides of the Columbia River, recommended support of operating an HOV lane in Oregon as part
of the I-5 Delta Park to Lombard project, with a further recommendation that the prospects and
priorities for operating the lane as a managed lane should be collaboratively explored with the
State of Washington; and,

WHEREAS, in 2000 the Washington State Transportation Commission approved a pilot
HOV lane in Southwest Washington on Interstate 5 between 99th Street and Mill Plain
Boulevard; and
WHEREAS, on October 29, 2001, a new High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane opened on Interstate 5 between 99th Street and Mill Plain Boulevard in Southwest Washington with the lane reserved between the hours of 6am and 9am (now operating from 6am to 8am) for vehicles with two or more passengers (carpools, vanpools and buses) as well as motorcycles only; and

WHEREAS, criteria to evaluate the operations of the HOV lane were approved, evaluation reports were required to be completed and six reports have been finished since the HOV lane's inception; and,

WHEREAS, the latest evaluation report, the Vancouver HOV Lane Pilot Project Evaluation Report #6, concluded that six of the eight criteria for HOV lane operation had been met; and,

WHEREAS, at its March 31, 2005 meeting, the Bi-State Coordination Committee recommended to the Washington State Department of Transportation to continue the pilot project for Washington's HOV lane with direction to staff to work collaboratively with Oregon to examine prospects and priorities for operating the lane in the future as a managed lane; now therefore;

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. The Metro Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation recommend to the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Oregon Transportation Commission that as part of the ongoing Environmental Assessment process for this project, an HOV lane in Oregon continue to be included as an alternative for further analysis of the Interstate 5/Delta Park to Lombard project and that the prospects and priorities for operating the lane as a managed lane be collaboratively examined with the State of Washington,

2. The Metro Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation request that the Washington State Department of Transportation continue to work collaboratively with the State of Oregon on the functioning of the entire I-5 corridor, from 99th Street in Vancouver Washington to the Fremont Bridge in Oregon, including the potential of a managed lane, especially in light of upcoming decisions related to the Columbia River Crossing.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ____ day of June 2005.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney
IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-3588, FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE OREGON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND THE WASHINGTON STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION CONCERNING HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANES ON INTERSTATE 5 IN THE VICINITY OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER

Date: May 16, 2005
Prepared by: Mark Turpel

BACKGROUND

Interstate 5 is a vital surface transportation link between and through the Metro region and southwest Washington. These areas function as one economy and share a common airshed, and have other shared interests. Accordingly, policies concerning the design and operation of Interstate 5 are critical to the transportation and land use conditions in Northwest Oregon and Southwest Washington.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is currently completing an Environmental Assessment of a project that proposes to add a third lane along the southbound portion of the Delta Park to Lombard segment of Interstate 5, including the option that this lane could be an high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane during peak hour usage.

In Southwest Washington, an HOV lane has been in operation as a pilot project since 2001 for the segment from 99th Street to Mill Plain Boulevard in the southbound portion of Interstate 5. Six HOV evaluation reports have been completed and the latest report has found that six of the eight criteria have been met. Currently, the Interstate 5 bridge has no HOV lane, as an HOV lane on the bridge has been considered an operational and safety concern.

General purpose lanes allow and encourage single occupant vehicle use and accommodate freight movement via trucks. Neighborhoods adjacent to Interstate 5 have expressed concern with the impacts of traffic along Interstate 5, citing noise, air pollution, loss of homes and businesses and dislocation as concerns, both with the existing Interstate 5 design as well as potential future designs.

HOV lanes are intended to provide a tool to address peak hour demand for road capacity, providing an incentive for more efficient use of a scarce resource by allowing carpools and transit vehicles exclusive use of the lane during greatest demand times. HOV lanes commonly do not allow trucks and the existing HOV lane on Interstate 5 in southwest Washington does not allow trucks and ODOT has modeled the HOV lane option for the Delta Park to Lombard segment as a lane that does not allow trucks. HOV lanes can accommodate more people than a general purpose lane if the seating capacity of the autos and transit vehicles is utilized and enough carpools and transit vehicles use the lane. Carpools and transit use can reduce transportation operating costs per person and improve air quality (as would allowing cleaner air emission vehicles). Generally speaking, transit is utilized more when it can serve a more compact urban form, while single occupant vehicle use is consistent with more expansive land use patterns.

The concept of managed lanes is to adjust the number of vehicles in the lane so that flow remains free. Several methods exist to manage lanes. For example, a managed lane could allow some additional vehicles beyond carpools and transit vehicles. Observed demand along the HOV lane in Southwest...
Washington and forecast demand for an HOV on Interstate 5 in Oregon suggests that in addition to carpool and transit usage, allowing some additional vehicles could improve the HOV lane operation while still providing higher speeds. Possible additional vehicles could include smaller delivery trucks to address some of the freight movement concerns and/or hybrid or other cleaner air emission vehicles could be allowed to address, in part, air pollution concerns of adjacent neighborhoods. Another managed lane technique could be the use of tolls during peak hour usage, where the use of the lane would be priced according to demand. Whatever the method, managed lanes would strive to maximize the number of people using the lane during peak hours while maintaining traffic flow and speed - to get the highest achievable efficiency.

Approval of Resolution 05-3588, FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE OREGON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND THE WASHINGTON STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION CONCERNING HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANES ON INTERSTATE 5 IN THE VICINITY OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER, would recommend to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Oregon Transportation Commission that the I-5 Delta Park to Lombard Project include an HOV lane and that ODOT collaboratively work with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) on examining whether a managed lane might be superior to even an HOV lane. Additionally, approval of the resolution would recommend to the Washington State Transportation Commission that the pilot HOV lane from 99th Street to Mill Plain Boulevard be continued and encourage that ODOT work collaboratively with Washington State Transportation Department on the examination of a managed lane for the current HOV lane.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. Known Opposition

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), by a vote of six to five, recommended against continuing the HOV lane pilot project on Interstate 5 between 99th Street and Mill Plain in southwest Washington. The RTC did not make a recommendation concerning the HOV lane along the Delta Park to Lombard segment of Interstate 5.

2. Legal Antecedents

Resolution 98-2625, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO APPROVE A SIX-MONTH HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE (HOV) LANE DEMONSTRATION ON I-5 NORTHBOUND AND ASSOCIATED FINANCING. (This HOV lane was approved on a temporary basis to address emergency repairs to the Interstate Bridge trunnion)

3. Anticipated Effects

In Washington, the resolution would further provide another perspective about the HOV pilot project between 99th Street and Mill Plain along Interstate 5. In Oregon, the resolution would provide support for further investigation of an HOV in the Delta Park to Lombard segment of Interstate 5.

4. Budget Impacts

None
RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approval of Resolution No. 3588, FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE OREGON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND THE WASHINGTON STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION CONCERNING HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE LANES ON INTERSTATE 5 IN THE VICINITY OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bi-State Coordination Committee
FROM: Dean Lookingbill, RTC
        Mark Turpel, Metro
DATE: March 24, 2005
SUBJECT: HOV Lanes in the I-5 Corridor

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this memorandum is first to brief the Bi-State Coordination Committee in regard to the latest data available on the performance of the Vancouver I-5 HOV Pilot Project and second to discuss and to present a staff recommended action on extending the HOV lane into Oregon based on the traffic evaluations of the Delta Park/Lombard Environmental Assessment.

The bi-state coordination on the I-5 HOV Pilot Project and its extension into Oregon dates back to an April 2000 resolution by the Bi-State Transportation Committee. The key policy recommendations in the resolution stated that: 1) a southbound HOV lane should be pursued by adding HOV capacity in Washington from 99th Street to the vicinity of the north end of the Interstate Bridge, 2) because of safety and operational concerns, an HOV lane should not be pursued across the existing Interstate Bridge at this time, and 3) a southbound HOV lane in Oregon south of the Interstate Bridge to the vicinity of Lombard should be pursued as a part of the design for the Delta Park project.

The Vancouver I-5 HOV pilot lane was opened in October of 2001. Prior to the opening of the HOV lane, RTC conducted a series of analysis and HOV policy decisions. These are outlined as follows:

- A Clark County Regional HOV System Study was completed in December 1998. The Study contained recommendations for regional HOV goals and policies and included the recommendation that the I-5 corridor should be the first facility considered for HOV implementation because of its high traffic congestion level, high transit and carpool usage, and that it would have the best travel time savings for the users of an HOV facility.

- An I-5 HOV Operational Study was completed in April of 2000. The purpose of the study was to analyze a range of options and to develop an HOV alternative that could be implemented in the I-5 corridor without replacing the Interstate Bridge and resulted in a
recommendation to implement the first phase of a bi-state HOV facility that would operate southbound on I-5 in Vancouver during the morning commute period. It was also recommended that the second phase of the southbound HOV lane, the segment in Oregon, would be implemented with the planned widening of Delta Park.

- Following the Bi-State Transportation Committee's recommendations on the I-5 HOV Operational Study recommendations, both the RTC Board and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) adopted resolutions to support and implement the Vancouver segment of the I-5 HOV facility. In September of 2000, the Washington Transportation Commission also adopted a resolution in support of the Vancouver HOV lane. In October 2001, the southbound HOV lane opened in conjunction with the completion of the I-5 widening project.

- The policy objectives of the HOV project were to: 1) help manage traffic congestion, 2) make more efficient use of existing facilities by carrying more people in the HOV lane than the general purpose lanes, 3) encourage more carpools, vanpools, and transit ridership, and 4) provide travel time savings and better travel time reliability for HOV users.

A total of six evaluation reports have been conducted on the I-5 Pilot HOV lane since its opening in 2001. The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has led the development of these reports. Eight performance goals were set prior to the opening of the HOV lane. These goals include the following:

1. Move more people in the HOV lane than in either of the adjacent general-purpose lanes.
2. Reduce peak period travel time for HOV lane users and for all users.
3. Minimize impacts to other traffic on other facilities.
4. Increase the use of carpools, vanpools, and transit.
5. Maintain safety by not increasing the accident and incident rate in the corridor during HOV lane operating periods.
6. Maintain the HOV lane's effectiveness with appropriate enforcement.
7. Maintain or improve travel time reliability for carpools, vanpools, and transit.
8. Maintain or improve public opinion.
VANCOUVER I-5 HOV LANE PILOT PROJECT: DATA REPORT #6

The complete data report is on RTC’s web site at: www.rtc.wa.gov/hov/evaluation.htm. The key findings of the report are listed below.

Of the eight HOV goals established for this specific project, the Vancouver HOV pilot project is meeting six goals. The pilot project is meeting Goals 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. This is the first time the pilot project has met Goal 1 (note that the HOV lane meets the 2-hour goal, but is still carrying fewer people than either adjacent general purpose lane during the peak hour). Goal 2 contains two components. The pilot project is meeting one of the two components. No recent data has been collected to determine whether Goal 8 is being met.

- **Goal #1**: Move more people per lane in the HOV lane during the AM 2-hour period than in either of the adjacent general-purpose lanes.
  - For the first time, the Vancouver HOV lane is carrying more people per lane than either of the adjacent lanes for the 2-hour peak period. During the one-hour peak, the HOV lane carries 86% of the GP lane average.
  - The ability of the HOV lane to carry more people is constrained by the level of bus service and park-and-ride spaces provided along the corridor. This artificial cap may not be remedied for another year until the 99th Street Park-and-Ride facility is open.
  - The Vancouver HOV lane has contributed to I-5 carrying more people in fewer vehicles compared to the Baseline and is steadily increasing in demand.

- **Goal #2**: Reduce peak period travel time for HOV lane users and reduce the average per-person travel time for all users.
  - Goal 2 contains two components. First, peak hour travel times for HOV lanes users remains below the baseline, HOV travel times for the 2-hour, however, have increased compared to the baseline. Second, average per-person travel times for all users have increased during the peak period and peak hour travel periods compared to the Baseline reporting period.

- **Goal #3**: Minimize impacts to other traffic in the corridor and on parallel facilities.
  - Compared to the Baseline, the share of traffic on I-205 increased slightly. The share of traffic on Highway 99, Hazel Dell Avenue, and Lakeshore Drive decreased slightly. For all
evaluations, the share of traffic on Main Street increased compared to the Baseline, but much of the increase is likely attributable to the completion of construction at the Main Street interchange in October 2001, after the Baseline data was collected.

- Goal #4: Increase the use of carpools, vanpools, and transit.
  - The number of carpools and transit ridership has increased since the Baseline reporting period.

- Goal #5: Maintain safety by not increasing the accident and incident rate in the corridor during HOV lane operating periods.
  - The number of on-roadway and off-roadway incidents has fluctuated during each reporting period. Based on this data, it could be implied that the HOV lane has not negatively impacted corridor safety.

- Goal #6: Maintain the HOV lane's effectiveness with appropriate enforcement.
  - The 2-hour period violation rate was 12 percent during the October 2004 reporting period, a violation rate higher than prior reporting periods, while during the peak hour, the violation rate was 9 percent, virtually unchanged from the April 2004 reporting period. There is a general trend toward a higher violation rate during the 2-hour peak.
  - The national violation rate average is in the 10-15% range. The Portland HOV lane has a violation rate of 10%, which is also within the national guidelines. The Vancouver lane has a violation rate of 12%, which is well within acceptable guidelines.
  - Washington State Patrol (WSP) reduced lane enforcement after the October 2002 reporting period and has only sporadically provided an enforcement presence. In other regions, a correlation exists between the level of enforcement and the violation rate. The lack of regular enforcement is likely contributing to the increased violation rate.

- Goal #7: Maintain or improve travel time reliability for carpools, vanpools, and transit.
  - Travel times during the two-hour period for C-TRAN Route 134 (from the 134th St. Park and Ride to downtown Portland) have remained relatively constant since July 2002. The presence of the HOV lane has resulted in predictable peak period travel times for C-TRAN.
Travel times during the peak hour for C-TRAN Route 134 have decreased compared to all prior reporting periods.

The Vancouver HOV lane is maintaining at least 45 mph along its entire length both during peak hours and overall during the two-hour period.

- Goal #8: Maintain or improve public opinion as to the effectiveness of HOV lanes.
  - Public opinion polling was not conducted for this evaluation report. As a result, it cannot be determined whether Goal 8 is being met. Three public opinion surveys were conducted concurrent with prior evaluation reports.
  - WSDOT received less than 15 comments during the past 18 months (January 2003 to October 2004). The comments were received via e-mail and phone calls. All comments received were negative. Comments received were generally from GP lane users concerned about the perceived lack of HOV lane usage and the HOV lane violation rate as well as the impact on General Purpose lane users.

DELTA PARK/LOMBARD HOV LANE

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is in the process of preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) associated with widening the existing two-lane section of southbound I-5 through Delta Park in Portland to add a third travel lane. ODOT is developing this project to be consistent with state and regional policies supporting: reducing congestion, providing for a safe and balanced transportation system, maintaining freight access, mobility, and competitiveness, and improving the reliability of the transportation network. As a part of the Environmental Assessment, an HOV analysis was undertaken to examine the potential impacts and benefits of operating the third southbound lane as an AM peak-period HOV lane.

The evaluation measures and performance goals for the I-5 Delta Park HOV analysis are consistent with those used in previous studies and evaluations of HOV in the I-5 corridor.

Findings From the I-5 Delta Park HOV Analysis

- If an HOV lane were to be built today in the Delta Park/Lombard section of I-5 and the current mode splits remained static, the potential exists that an HOV lane would meet the minimum threshold of 500-600 eligible HOV vehicles per hour in the HOV lane. However, the HOV lane in this case would not be carrying as many persons per hour as either of the general-purpose lanes.
From this we have concluded that if a lane were in place today, we would be getting similar performance results to the existing I-5 southbound HOV lane in Washington.

- HOV modeling for 2025 indicates that the presence of an HOV lane in Oregon, in combination with the existing Washington HOV lane, would result in measurable shift from drive-alone to carpooling, vanpooling, and transit. All performance goals for the lane would be met.

- In 2025, HOV users are estimated to travel between SR 500 and I-84 approximately 12 minutes faster than the users of the adjacent general-purpose lanes. Average vehicle occupancy is estimated to be approximately 1.41 persons per vehicle, compared to 1.25 persons per vehicle without an HOV lane. The presence of an HOV lane in both Oregon and Washington also results in the highest overall persons per lane per hour; approximately 100 persons more per hour than without HOV. HOV users save approximately 6 minutes in their trip between SR 500 and I-84 compared to no HOV in the I-5 corridor.

- While the HOV lane would provide significant benefits for users of the lane, the trade-off is substantially increased travel times and traffic back-ups for SOV and freight.

- HOV modeling indicates that in 2025, vehicles in the general purpose lanes will experience travel times that are approximately 12 minutes longer than the HOV lane and approximately 6 minutes longer than if no HOV were provided in the corridor (travel times are between SR 500 and I-84). Approximately 1000 fewer vehicles will move through the corridor in the AM peak hour. Traffic analysis indicates that there will be significant queuing in Vancouver on I-5, SR 500, and SR 14 with an HOV lane in the I-5 corridor compared to no HOV lane in the corridor. As a result of the queuing and congestion, the morning peak period is expected to last longer than it would without an HOV lane, further impacting the freight users of the corridor.

- In a policy context, providing an HOV lane in the corridor rather than a general-purpose lane is consistent with regional, statewide, and federal goals and policies. However, the increase in overall travel time adversely affects freight mobility and serves to increase congestion overall, which is not consistent with regional, state, and federal policies.
DISCUSSION - CONCLUSIONS

As was mentioned earlier, Washington and Oregon have a variety of state and regional transportation policies that guide the management and operation of I-5. These policies generally support a safe, efficient, and balanced transportation system for all users including freight movement and alternative mode movement. As Washington and Oregon move forward over the next few months, recommendations/feedback from the Bi-State Committee on the future of the HOV lane in the I-5 corridor is desired. Bi-state staff, with the input from a national expert on HOV lanes, has examined evaluation findings for the current Washington HOV lane and the proposed Oregon HOV lane. To be consistent with the state and regional policies, it is proposed that the region consider operating the third southbound lane on I-5 as a managed lane with HOV use as its first priority. Staff are making this recommendation given the excess capacity that ODOT expects in the HOV lane in its early years of operation, the excess capacity that currently exists in the Washington HOV lane, and the significant difference in benefits to HOV users and impacts to general purpose users that are forecast to occur as the region grows.

Key Discussion Points

- A managed lane is a lane that is operated to maximize the effectiveness of the freeway corridor consistent with the policy objectives of the state and region.

- Managing a lane in the I-5 corridor would involve allowing HOV and other user groups to travel in a lane that would have a reasonable time advantage compared to the general purpose lanes. A managed lane would also reduce the impact on the general-purpose lanes and provide for improved person and vehicle throughput compared to HOV-only use.

- Moving to a managed lane would have a particular benefit to freight movement, as the lane and the corridor as a whole would be managed to ensure that disproportionate impacts do not occur for this class of user.

- Moving towards a managed lane would require proactively evaluating the use of the lane over time and changing policies for the use of the lane as needed to achieve lane and corridor performance goals.
Ideas for other user groups that the region may want to consider allowing into the managed lane include: hybrid vehicles, small delivery trucks, and toll-paying SOVs.

Regardless of how the lane is managed, for HOVs only or with the addition of other user groups, enforcement of the lane is a significant issue. A commitment to enforcing the lane will be needed to ensure the long-term success of the managed lane.

**Recommended Action**

Possible recommended action by the Bi-State Coordinating Committee on the existing Washington and proposed Oregon HOV lanes could be as follows:

- **Existing Washington HOV Lane:** Recommend to the RTC and WSDOT to continue the pilot project for Washington's HOV lane with direction to staff to work collaboratively with Oregon to examine prospects and priorities for operating the lane in the future as a managed lane.

- **Proposed Oregon HOV Lane:** Recommend to JPACT and ODOT support of operating an HOV lane in Oregon as a part of the I-5 Delta Park project with direction to staff to work collaboratively with Washington to examine prospects and priorities for operating the lane as a managed lane. (Note: Final decisions about HOV will be made as a part of the Environmental Assessment process.)
May 13, 2005

David Bragdon, Metro Council President
600 Northeast Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Rex Burkholder, Metro Councilor
600 Northeast Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Re: May 3, 2005 letter regarding the Transportation Planning Rule

Dear Chair Bragdon and Councilor Burkholder:

Thank you for your letter of May 3, 2005 (which we received May 10), in follow-up to our meeting (also attended by Bob Cortright and Craig Greenleaf) concerning the Land Conservation and Development Commission's recent amendments to the Transportation Planning Rule.

I appreciate your concerns about the amendments, as well as your willingness to continue to work with the department and the Oregon Department of Transportation (and the Transportation Commission) to address them. I also acknowledge your memorialization of our conversation as substantially accurate. I would only quibble with your characterization of the options for going forward that you identified in your letter as being "essential in remedying the recent LCDC action."

I can't agree that the recent LCDC action needs "remedying," but I do accept and agree that the steps you have outlined are appropriate and in keeping with our conversation. We are in particular accord with your interest in seeing that the rule amendments facilitate compact, mixed-use development as envisioned in Metro’s 2040 Growth Concept.

Thank you again for your willingness to address your concerns to us, and your commitment to continue working in good faith with us, the Transportation Commission and ODOT. We also appreciate your willingness to participate in the ongoing technical TPR work group.
I will reaffirm our commitment to likewise work in good faith with you to achieve a mutually satisfactory outcome for the benefit of the people and communities we serve.

Best regards.

Yours very truly,

LANE SHETTERLY
Director

cc: LCDC Commissioners
    Oregon Transportation Commission
    Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
    Metro Policy Advisory Committee
    Oregon MPO Consortium
    League of Oregon Cities

  lps://sw/Bragdon.051105
**JPACT:** Thursday, June 9th  
**LOCATION:** Council Chambers  
**TIME:** 7:30am  
**CONTACT INFORMATION HIDDEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rex</td>
<td>Burkholder</td>
<td>Metro Council District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Metro Council District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>Metro Council District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>MAYOR OF THE CITY OF BEAVERTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>ODOT REGION 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Hallock</td>
<td>OREGON DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Pedersen</td>
<td>OREGON DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Ginsburg</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Liebe</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>TRIMET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>McFarlane</td>
<td>TRIMET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Kennemer</td>
<td>CLACKAMAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Schrader</td>
<td>CLACKAMAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>Fairview City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Shields</td>
<td>Gresham City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>LYNN PETERSON CONSULTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Milwaukie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce</td>
<td>Pollard</td>
<td>MAYOR OF THE CITY OF VANCOUVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Lookingbill</td>
<td>SW WASH REG'L TRANSP COUNCIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Washington County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Washington County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Rojo de Steffey</td>
<td>Multnomah County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonnie</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Multnomah County Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Clark County, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Capell</td>
<td>CLARK COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Ficco</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Wyatt</td>
<td>PORT OF PORTLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie</td>
<td>Lahnene</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Waldron</td>
<td>PORT OF PORTLAND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Handwritten notes and signatures are not legible.*
Implementing a long range (under 1000km with "flat" earth) efficient energy source (therefore reducing the need for fossil fuels)

- Low energy requirements (hypothesis) if previous energy sources
- Reduced environmental impact by removing the need for greenhouse gases
- Can support a new level of civilization

Surface transportation can have yet another benefit, to shorter routes, which means more efficiency in industry and open systems

From balance of power: (as a means of frustration, strategy)

\[
\frac{\text{med}}{g^3} = \text{realize 20} \text{th} \frac{\text{thirteenth 6-9} \left( \frac{n}{1} \right)}{91 - 8 - 9 \left( \frac{1}{9} \right)}
\]

- Implement the "smart" economy (hybrid, multi-hybrid)
- Comprehensive, integrated

- "Power Wish" (where, where, how, where, where, where... integrate)
- "Power Wish" (where, where, where... integrate)
- Where a different system

For those, those people...
**Metro sign-in sheet**

Please be aware that all information submitted here will become public record, per state law, and will be made available to those who request it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jon Mast</td>
<td>ETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Strickler</td>
<td>CRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Rhames</td>
<td>WSOET Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja Axter</td>
<td>CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Wells</td>
<td>TCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Schilling</td>
<td>Mult. Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Neidseger</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Papadakis</td>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin McCaffrey</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Wentworth</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lainie Smith</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Leahy</td>
<td>BPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Delia</td>
<td>City Councilor of Cornelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hayden</td>
<td>Mayor City of Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Deane</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Winkel</td>
<td>City of Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bernard</td>
<td>Millennium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Hastings</td>
<td>TriNet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Adler</td>
<td>Metro Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Trupel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>JURISDICTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Rex Burkholder</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair Rod Park</td>
<td>Metro Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Sam Adams</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Tom Potter</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Rob Drake</td>
<td>City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Lou Ogden</td>
<td>City of Tualatin, representing Cities of Washington Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Matthew Garrett</td>
<td>ODOT - Region 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Elaine Smith</td>
<td>ODOT - Region 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stephanie Hallock</td>
<td>Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dick Pedersen</td>
<td>Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Annette Liebe</td>
<td>Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Andy Ginsburg</td>
<td>Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fred Hansen</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Neil McFarlane</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Bill Kennemer</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Martha Schrader</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Steve Owens</td>
<td>City of Fairview, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Dave Shields</td>
<td>City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Lynn Peterson</td>
<td>City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor James Bernard</td>
<td>City of Milwaukie, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Royce Pollard</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dean Lookingbill</td>
<td>SW Washington RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Roy Rogers</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Tom Brian</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Maria Rojo de</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Lonnie Roberts</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Steve Stuart</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Peter Capell</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Don Wagner</td>
<td>Washington State Dept. of Transportation (WSDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Doug Ficco</td>
<td>Washington State Dept. of Transportation (WSDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill Wyatt</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Susie Lahsene</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Jay Waldron</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>