

Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Transportation Planning Workshop
Date: Monday, September 24, 2012
Time: 1:00pm – 4:30pm
Place: Metro Council Chambers
Purpose: Discuss common questions arising when trying to meet requirements of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) within local Transportation System Plan (TSP) updates. Discuss new provisions from the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) that can be addressed within local transportation and comprehensive plans.

Introduction and meeting overview - John Mermin 15 min

Introduction of roundtable participants

Carl Springer, DKS
Shayna Rehberg, Angelo planning
Theresa Carr, CH2mHILL
Judith Gray, City of Tigard
Nancy Kraushaar, City of Wilsonville
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Matt Crall, DLCD
Steve Kautz, TriMet
Tom Kloster, Metro (facilitator)
John Mermin, Metro (facilitator)

Roundtable discussion of RTFP Questions & Staff responses - facilitated by Tom Kloster

- RTFP FAQ – John Mermin 5 min
- Discussion of needs/solutions on facilities not owned by local jurisdictions (Q.21) solutions hierarchy (Q.22-25), performance measures (Q.28-31), alternative mobility targets (Q.32-36) – Roundtable discussion with questions from audience 1 hr
- Other questions from audience 15 min

Break 10 min

TPR & OHP amendment presentations – Bill Holmstrom, DLCD, Erik Havig, ODOT 40 min

Reconvene roundtable for discussion of TPR & OHP amendments – facilitated by Tom Kloster 1 hr

- Questions from audience

Wrap up – John Mermin 5 min

Visit: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/tsp_guidance to provide feedback on our TSP guidance efforts

Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Frequently Asked Questions - Color coded by topic area - questions highlighted in black to be discussed at 9/24/12 workshop

ID	RTFP Provision	Question asked about the RTFP	Metro Response
1	3.08.110 Street System Design	Are there recent examples of TSPs/code revisions that detail an exemplary process for considering all the attributes of “livable” and green streets, including locational criteria for implementing? To what extent do jurisdictions need to “allow implementation of” green street design in particular?	Design standards and/or guidelines should include green street options, providing green elements within the right-of-way, such as curb extensions, buffer strips, and/or medians. Portland and Gresham have developed green street standards that could serve as a model.
2	3.08.110B Street System Design	Are there recent examples of TSPs/code revisions of definitions for “pedestrian through zones, “pedestrian buffer strips,” and “paved furnishing zones”? Considering typical local “planter strip” requirements, what more or what else are we trying to achieve?	Furnishing zones are important in centers and other mixed-use areas. Through zones and buffers from vehicle traffic are important everywhere for providing safety and comfort to people using the sidewalk. The Portland Pedestrian Design Guide http://www.portlandonline.com/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=84048) has standards for through zones and furnishing zones. ITE’s Context Sensitive Solutions manual does as well.
3	3.08.110 Street System Design	Are there examples of codes that have clear and objective standards re: traffic calming?	The Oregon Transportation & Growth Management (TGM) program provides a resource on traffic calming on their website: http://placemaking.pps.org/info/placemakingtools/casesforplaces/livememtraffic#THE%20TRAFFIC%20CALMING%20TOOLBOX . The City of Portland has been implementing traffic calming since the mid 1980s and could provide another resource.
4	3.08.110 Street System Design	What should a local jurisdiction adopt in a TSP update/amendment if the regional street design/spacing standards in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals conflict with adopted IAMP standards?	3.08.110G of the RTFP states that public street connections, consistent with regional street design and spacing standards shall be encouraged and shall supersede the OHP Access Management Standards restriction of streets in the vicinity of interchange ramps. However these public streets may be limited to "right-in/right-out" or other appropriate configuration. IAMP's are required to be consistent with the OHP.
5	3.08.110 D Street System Design	How specific should the local street connectivity map be in terms of identifying opportunities for extensions, either as a full street or as a non-motorized accessway?	This map just needs to show possible terminus points within contiguous areas of vacant and re-developable lots of 5+ acres zoned for residential or mixed-use development. See example in draft Oregon City TSP - technical memo 3: http://octransportationplan.org/drafttsp/ . The map is accompanied by a policy that supports connectivity for neighborhoods and encourages additional connections beyond those represented in the TSP connectivity map, as well as a set of development code guidelines to meet connectivity targets and allow site design flexibility to achieve it.
6	3.08.110 G Street System Design	Should the requirement to protect capacity and safety at state highway interchanges also apply to any facility that has a priority for long-trips, freight etc. such as city or county major arterials.	The intent of this requirement is to protect the scarce capacity at state highway interchanges. The state highway interchange could be connecting to a city/county road. However this requirement is not meant to be applied to an intersection of two city/county roads.
7	3.08.120 C Transit System Design	Does the transit agency need to "consider and document the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and EJ populations" when transit route upgrades are discussed within a TSP update?	This requirement is targeted toward service planning done by transit agencies. It does not need to be addressed within a TSP update.
8	3.08.130 A.5 Pedestrian System Design	How are jurisdictions showing compliance with the following requirement? “Provision for safe crossings of streets and controlled pedestrian crossings on major arterials.” Can this be done by policy and/or crossing siting criteria?	This can be done with policy language describing what constitutes a safe roadway crossing under various conditions. The variety of contexts of roadway crossings makes it challenging to identify practical guidelines for safe crossings. For example, the city of Portland has many marked but uncontrolled crossings along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, one the most heavily-travelled arterials in the region, that operate safely. The street’s moderate speeds, tempered by traffic calming elements like narrow lanes, medians, on-street parking, and enclosure created by street trees and street front buildings all contribute to the safety of the crossings. Such crosswalks may not be as effective without the supporting urban street elements. Things to consider when a jurisdiction is developing a working definition / policy of what constitutes a safe roadway crossing under certain conditions could include key traffic factors such as volume and speed, as well as geometric design and operation factors, e.g. signal timing, that facilitate safe crossings.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Frequently Asked Questions - Color coded by topic area - questions highlighted in black to be discussed at 9/24/12 workshop

ID	RTFP Provision	Question asked about the RTFP	Metro Response
9	3.08.140 A.5 Bicycle System Design	How should jurisdictions show compliance with the following requirement? "Provision for safe crossings of streets and controlled bicycle crossings on major arterials." Can this be done by policy and/or crossing siting criteria?	<p>This can be done with policy language describing what constitutes a safe roadway crossing under various conditions. The variety of contexts of roadway crossings makes it challenging to identify practical guidelines for safe crossings. For example, the city of Portland has many marked but uncontrolled crossings along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, one the most heavily-travelled arterials in the region, that operate safely. The street's moderate speeds, tempered by traffic calming elements like narrow lanes, medians, on-street parking, and enclosure created by street trees and street front buildings all contribute to the safety of the crossings. Such crosswalks may not be as effective without the supporting urban street elements.</p> <p>Things to consider when a jurisdiction is developing a working definition / policy of what constitutes a safe roadway crossing under certain conditions could include key traffic factors such as volume and speed, as well as geometric design and operation factors, e.g. signal timing, that facilitate safe crossings.</p>
10	3.08.140 A.5 Bicycle System Design	Are there any guidelines for spacing of safe crossings for bicycle crossings, especially along major arterials?	<p>The RTFP provision for "for safe crossing of streets and controlled bicycle crossings on major arterials" refers to providing safe crossings when designated bikeways cross busy streets. This begs the question - how far apart should designated bikeways be spaced at the local level? We don't have a specific recommendation for bikeway spacing in the RTP but plan to create one during the Regional Active Transportation Plan (currently underway). In the meantime, the Portland Bicycle Master Plan (p.41) found in its survey of best practices that bikeway should be provided every 800 ft in urban areas (about 3 Portland blocks). It acknowledges that this standard can't be achieved in many areas of Portland due to disconnected roadway networks, physical barriers or terrain constraints. In those cases, the bikeway corridors have been spaced as closely as possible while minimizing out-of-direction travel and steep slopes.</p>
11	3.08.150 A.3 Freight System Design	Please clarify what's expected for local freight planning?	<p>It's fine to simply show the regional freight routes in a local TSP, though a local jurisdiction may want to show some more localized freight routes as well. The freight reliability performance targets are only meant to apply to the regional freight network identified in the RTP. It's fine for a jurisdiction to adopt this target as is in their TSP. The jurisdiction could choose to adopt a target more or less aggressive than the RTP freight reliability target (as long as it heads in the same direction).</p>
12	3.08.160.A.2 Transportation System Management	<p>There is confusion about "A list of projects and strategies, consistent with the Regional TSMO Plan, based upon consideration of the following functional areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multimodal traffic management investments • Traveler Information investments • Traffic incident management investments • Transportation demand management investments" <p>For a local TSP we have TDM and basic TSMO tools, and traveler information maybe at transit stops/stations but traffic incident management in a COMET like fashion is less applicable. Similar not clear what is meant by the multimodal traffic management investments. This causes some confusion – is it how we're addressing congestion? That's a central feature of TSPs. Or is it something else? Could also be adaptive signal timing or coordinated signal timing – ITS components part of the TSPs too.</p>	<p>Local agencies can start to address the TSMO requirement by looking at projects identified in their local ITS Plans and the Regional TSMO Plan. Multimodal traffic management (MTM) includes strategies such as adaptive signal systems but it also refers to maintaining proper signal timing; updating equipment, communications, and software to bring signals into central traffic signal system; installing transit signal priority; truck safety (green light extension); bicycle detection, and pedestrian actuation or countdown heads. MTM is intended to help improve reliability for system users. It may have some congestion benefits but it's primary intention is increased reliability.</p> <p>With regard to incident management, there are solutions that can be employed by local agencies apart from the ODOT incident response vehicles. They can install and/or update Opticom that gives signal priority to the emergency vehicle. They can prepare incident/event management plans that can be activated when a major incident/event occurs, they can invest in operations centers that coordinate with emergency responders in their locale to improve response times. They can participate in ODOT's TripCheck Local Entry Tool to load information about crashes that blocked lanes/cause substantial traffic impacts. Not all of these solutions would be appropriate to a small jurisdiction, e.g. Tualatin or Sherwood, however some of these things they are doing already with Washington County.</p>
13	3.08.210 Transportation Needs	Are there good examples for demonstrating compliance with "Consideration and documentation of the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations within the city of county, including minorities and low-income families"?	<p>Three recent examples include Beaverton's TSP - p.3-60 "Environmental justice" section (including figure 3-17 "Transportation Disadvantaged"), Tigard's TSP - p.29 "Socioeconomic conditions" (including figure 4-2 "Environmental justice populations") and Oregon City's Draft TSP, technical memo #4, available here: http://octransportationplan.org/drafttsp/. Additionally, Metro developed a new equity methodology during the last Regional Flexible Fund Allocation. Composite maps were developed for environmental justice and underserved communities, essential services and proximity to transportation infrastructure; See "2014-2015 RFFA Transportation Equity Analysis" memo available on Metro's webpage: www.oregonmetro.gov/regionalflexiblefund</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Frequently Asked Questions - Color coded by topic area - questions highlighted in black to be discussed at 9/24/12 workshop

ID	RTFP Provision	Question asked about the RTFP	Metro Response
14	3.08.210 B.1. Transportation Needs	Can local TSPs look at a range of land use forecasts as long as it does include one future baseline that is consistent with the RTP?	We recommend using the best available forecast. (See administrative interpretation 2012-1 and 2012-2 at www.oregonmetro.gov/tsp). If you can wait until the end of 2012, use the "Gamma." If not, use the 2035 "Beta", since it's much more accurate than the 2035 RTP forecast since it includes impacts from the Great Recession and the Urban Reserves decisions).
15	3.08.210 B.1. Transportation Needs	Can local TSPs include scenario planning or a sensitivity test to better understand the priority or influence of an alternate future?	Yes, a jurisdiction is welcome to do scenario planning within a TSP, but it is not required by the RTFP.
16	3.08.210 B.3. Transportation Needs	We recall that the methodology for computing Non-SOV % changed when kids carpooling with parents now count as Non-SOV trip. This made Non-SOV%'s increase. Will the RTP non-sov modal targets be adjusted to reflect this.	We acknowledge the need to update Non-SOV targets. For now, just continue to do the modal target analysis as you have in the past. It's likely that the Climate Smart Communities work will make recommendations for new modal targets so Metro is not planning to adjust them at this time.
17	3.08.210 Transportation Needs	This section doesn't mention safety needs. How should TSPs deal with safety? Does the new Regional safety action plan and the adopted regional safety performance targets provide guidance?	Jurisdictions are required to adopt a safety performance target within their TSPs. The regional target is to reduce fatalities and serious injuries by 50%. The local target can be more or less aggressive, but should head in the same direction. There are other actions that the Regional safety plan recommends but are not required, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify high crash facilities, focusing on fatalities and severe injuries • Identify fatal and severe injury crashes involving alcohol and drugs, aggressive driving and speeding • Focus on improved pedestrian crossings, including lighting on multi-lane arterials • Focus on protected bicycle facilities along high volume and/or high speed roadways such as buffered bike lanes, cycle tracks, multi-use paths or low traffic alternative routes.
18	3.08.210 Transportation Needs	What is the distinction between gaps and deficiencies?	Gaps occur when no facility exists in the transportation network and thus travel by a given mode is not possible. Deficiencies occur when a performance, design or operational constraint limits but does not prevent travel by a given mode. For complete definitions see RTFP Title 7: Definitions.
19	3.08.210 Transportation Needs	What methods and tools are available to identify other types of needs beyond vehicle capacity deficiencies?	Needs can be determined through a combination of technical analysis and public engagement. Conducting a system inventory for each mode allows a jurisdiction to identify gaps in each of its modal systems. (Metro's RLIS provides data that can be useful for the pedestrian and bicycle system inventories.) Conducting an equity analysis allows a jurisdiction to identify areas where environmental justice and underserved communities exist in relation to existing transportation facilities. Metro's The Regional Active Transportation Plan Existing Condition Report provides emerging information on the status of bicycling and pedestrian conditions around the region.
20	3.08.210 Transportation Needs	What is the distinction between needs and solutions?	Needs are composed of system gaps and deficiencies as defined by policy. Solutions are projects and strategies that address the needs. For example, an arterial street that lacks a pedestrian facility and thus a person cannot walk on it safely is a need (gap). Building a sidewalk that completes the gap is one possible solution.
21	3.08.210 Transportation Needs	Do TSPs need to address needs and solutions on facilities not owned by the local jurisdiction, e.g. state highways?	The RTFP 3.08.210C states that when determining its transportation needs a jurisdiction should consider the "regional needs identified in the mobility corridor strategies in Chapter 4 of the RTP." Many of the regional needs identified in the mobility corridor strategies are gaps and deficiencies on state highways. If a plan exists for the facility, then the local jurisdiction should default to that plan. If no plan exists, then the local should work with the facility owner to develop solutions.
22	3.08.220 A. Transportation Solutions	The progression of solutions analysis presented in 3.08.220 is quite useful and very similar to the long standing OHP policy 1G (Oregon Highway Plan Major Improvements Policy). Is the primary application of this progression to demonstrate that all other cost effective options have been exhausted before making a finding that new roadway extensions or expansions are needed? Does its utility stop there? We have seen a few cases where this same solution paradigm has also been applied to group, rank and recommend funding for project construction. While this is a consistent way to tell the story, it seems to go well beyond the intent of this section. Is that correct?	This progression of solutions is a component of our federally mandated Congestion Management Process - which requires that alternatives to motor vehicle capacity increases be evaluated prior to adding single-occupant vehicle projects. <p>A jurisdiction is expected to first identify its needs and then consider this list of solutions/strategies, in the order listed, to meet these needs: TSMO, transit/bike/ped, traffic calming, land use, connectivity, motor vehicle capacity</p> <p>The RTFP does not require that jurisdictions use this solution hierarchy for grouping/ranking projects included within a TSP, but Metro is supportive of a local jurisdiction pursuing that.</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Frequently Asked Questions - Color coded by topic area - questions highlighted in black to be discussed at 9/24/12 workshop

ID	RTFP Provision	Question asked about the RTFP	Metro Response
23	3.08.220 A. Transportation Solutions	Does the requirement for cities and counties to explain its choice of strategies apply to every project decision or just to roadway capacity projects?	It would be onerous to document the choice of strategies for every project in the TSP. This documentation should occur when the jurisdiction proposes adding auto capacity as its solution to a given need.
24	3.08.220 A. Transportation Solutions	Are projects that add turn lanes subject to this progression of analysis and declaration of decisions?	Double left and double right turn lanes have negative pedestrian and bicycle impacts. Projects that add turn lanes beyond what is shown in the regional design concepts (Table 2.6 in RTP) should be subject to this progression of analysis. For full list, please refer to the RTFP definitions - section 3.08.710 CCC. "Significant increase in Single Occupancy Vehicle Capacity"
25	3.08.220 A. Transportation Solutions	Does this progression of analysis apply to locally operated and maintained facilities or just facilities of regional significance (Fig 3.10 of RTP)?	It is a good practice to use this level of scrutiny for adding capacity to local facilities, but it's not required in the RTFP
26	3.08.220 Transportation Solutions	What analysis tools are available and appropriate for identifying safety and operational needs and corresponding "localized TDM, safety, operational and access mgmt improvements" or solutions as required in RTFP 3.08.220? What level of effort/detail is appropriate? What are examples of kinds of improvements that would fit under this category? Links to available resources?	The Regional TSMO Plan, the Regional Safety plan and the Regional Travel Options strategic plan are all sources for identifying these types of improvements. Additionally, Metro recommends that local planners speak with and seek ideas from their local system operations staff, TriMet and their local Transportation Management Association.
27	3.08.230A Performance Targets & Standards	What scale of benefit should be used for estimating the impact of TSMO or bike/ped projects? We've used 10% benefit for hourly link capacity for TSMO in the past.	10% is a good estimate for TSMO. Metro is open to other experiences/research demonstrating a larger benefit. Metro will continue to work on enhancing its tools, for example the dynamic traffic tool will be able to better model TSMO. Bicycle projects impact on congestion can now be better estimated (then in the past) with the new regional bike model tool.
28	3.08.230 A-E Performance targets & Standards	What are the requirements for adopting performance targets and the steps involved in meeting section 3.08.230 A-E?	<p>The 2035 RTP moved from a single, congestion-based system performance measure to a broader set of measures that consider all modes of travel. The purpose of the performance targets is to measure progress toward long-term outcomes when making planning decisions through a mix of qualitative and quantitative finding, depending on the measure.</p> <p>At a minimum, a jurisdiction should adopt the Metro targets found in RTFP Tables 3.08-1 (2040 modal targets), 3.08-2 (interim mobility targets), and RTP Table 2.3(the targets in this table that are required (as stated in RTFP 3.08.230D) are: safety, vmt per capita, freight reliability, congestion, walking / biking / transit mode shares). For the targets in Table 2.3, a local agency may adopt the same numerical target as in the RTP, or at a minimum choose targets that head in the same direction as the region (either more or less aggressive than the regional target).</p> <p>While not required, counties and cities with capacity to do transportation modeling are encouraged to conduct an analysis to see how its TSP is performing against the targets (comparing its base year with its future year) except safety which can't be forecasted) and report this in its TSP. A jurisdiction should make qualitative assertions in its TSP findings that the planned system in the TSP moves the city towards meeting the 2040 modal targets, e.g. provide pie charts showing how the make-up of the project list (% of projects (by number or cost) that are bike/ped/transit) changed from the last TSP, or % of arterials/collectors that have and/or are planed to have biking and walking facilities on both sides). Also, as cited in RTFP 3.08.230E - progress can be demonstrated by adopting parking minimum and maximum ratios, Title 1 system designs, TSMO projects and strategies, and land use actions pursuant to OAR 660-012-0035(2).</p>
29	3.08.230A Performance Targets & Standards	Incorporating Non-SOV modal targets consistent with the values in Table 3.08-1 the RTP might be a stretch for Metro edge cities. Are there any allowances for adjusting for an agency's location within the Metro region?	No. we recommend that those jurisdictions continue to make qualitative assertions that that their policies and projects are making progress toward the 2040 Non-SOV modal targets.
30	3.08.230.D Performance Targets & Standards	The RTP, Table 2.3, has 10 categories for regional performance. A few seem reasonable for local agencies to respond to (safety, congestion reliability, active transportation, VMT per capita, SOV targets) while the others seem to be more applicable at the regional level only. Can you add guidance about which ones must be addressed?	Of the 10 categories in RTP Table 2.3, a jurisdiction only needs to address the 7 categories that are described in RTFP 3.08.230D: safety, vmt per capita, freight reliability, congestion; and walking, biking, transit mode shares. Additionally, as mentioned in the answer to question #28, the longstanding 2040 Non-SOV modal targets (RTFP Table 3.08-1) and interim mobility targets (RTFP table 3.08-2) are still required to be addressed.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Frequently Asked Questions - Color coded by topic area - questions highlighted in black to be discussed at 9/24/12 workshop

ID	RTFP Provision	Question asked about the RTFP	Metro Response
31	3.08.230.D Performance Targets & Standards	Have jurisdictions developed local performance measures for safety, vehicle miles traveled per capita, freight reliability, congestion, and walking, bicycling and transit mode shares (required by the RTFP) other than those proposed in the RTP?	The Portland Climate Action Plan (2009) developed a bicycle mode share target of 30% by the year 2030. This has not yet been adopted in the City's TSP. The Climate Action plan also developed a target to reduce VMT by 30% between 2008 and 2030.
32	3.08.230B-C Performance Targets & Standards	Regional mobility policy now allows for alternative standards. Need more guidance about what form these alternative might take. If modifying the v/c ratio is not reasonable (e.g. the v/c target is already at or above the theoretical capacity of a facility), then should we consider more exotic and difficult to monitor and regulate measures such as: duration of congestion, travel time reliability, or something other?	No further guidance is available at this time. Metro encourages local jurisdictions to try out their own approach. Metro also recommends adopting a Multimodal Mixed-Use Area (MMA) designation per OAR 660-012-0060. These areas will be exempt from any mobility standards.
33	3.08.230B-C Performance Targets & Standards	If alternative mobility standards are recommended for facilities not maintained by the local jurisdiction, what is the protocol for local adoption?	If a local jurisdiction decides that it would like to do this within its TSP update, they should consult with the facility owner, TriMet, ODOT and Metro. Assuming it makes sense to the regional providers and the local jurisdiction, Metro would endorse it in its formal comments during the adoption phase, and commit to bringing it in to the next RTP update as a recommended change to the regional plan. If there were a reason to incorporate it earlier into the RTP (e.g., a corridor improvement driving it, for example), it could come into the RTP as an amendment.
34	3.08.230B-C Performance Targets & Standards	Must a local agency wait for the concurrence of the agency responsible for operating the substandard facility before adopting the plan, or is that expected to proceed on a separate time track?	Yes. The facility owner should be consulted. Metro also recommends adopting a Multimodal Mixed-Use Area (MMA) designation per Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012-0060. These areas will be exempt from any mobility standards.
35	3.08.230. B.3 Performance Targets & Standards	For a regionally significant proposed project that adds capacity , e.g. 7 lanes on TV Highway - advocated by the City of Hillsboro, is a separate model forecast to show how SOV rates shift required?	No, Metro is not requiring that you re-run the mode-choice step of the model. However you still must document that you have considered all of the other potential solutions in the list in 3.08.220A
36	3.08.230B-C Performance Targets & Standards	1. What are the risks for a local city that chooses to not adjust their mobility standards for city streets to comply with the 2035 RTP? a. Specifically, what opportunities will they lose if they retain a better Level of Service or lesser Volume-to-Capacity ratio than in RTP or OHP? b. Does the standard only apply to regional facilities, or also to local facilities?	A. If a jurisdiction retains a better Level of Service or lesser Volume-to-Capacity ratios then the standards in the RTP or OHP, the jurisdiction would be violating 3.08.230.B which states that any alternative standards cannot be 1) lower than the ratios in Table 3.08-2 and 2) can't result in a need for motor vehicle capacity improvements that are inconsistent with the RTP and 3) won't increase SOV travel to a degree inconsistent with the non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1. This would open the door for an appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals. B. Yes, the standards only apply to regional facilities.
37	3.08.410 Parking Management	Are there code examples of on-street freight loading and unloading areas at appropriate locations in centers?	Metro recommends checking out the City of Portland code: http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/index.cfm?c=28591#cid_16058
38	3.08.410 Parking Management	We are interested in more guidance regarding long-term bicycle parking requirements. Requiring long-term bike parking at transit stops or small-scale retail/office uses seems far reaching. Are there guidelines for long-term bicycle parking needed for specific uses and users (e.g., employee parking)? Also, long-term bicycle parking minimums are not in the RTFP parking ratio table or in recent drafts of TGM's Model Development Code for Small Cities (3rd Edition), so are there models for short-term and long-term bicycle parking minimums?	Metro has not developed specific guidance regarding long-term bicycle parking requirements, but recommends the following: TriMet Bike Facilities Plan (2009) and Bicycle Parking Guidelines (2011) provide guidance on amount, design and location of bicycle parking at transit facilities. The Association of Pedestrian & Bicycle Professionals (APBP) has published guidelines (2010) including model codes for short-term and long-term bicycle parking minimums and maximums.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Frequently Asked Questions - Color coded by topic area - questions highlighted in black to be discussed at 9/24/12 workshop

ID	RTFP Provision	Question asked about the RTFP	Metro Response
39	3.08.410 Parking Management	We could use tools to help communicate with suburban communities the necessity, merits, and appropriate components of a parking management plan for Centers and Station Communities.	Metro has applied for TGM funding to help engage local communities in the region on the topic of parking. If funded Metro would conduct parking audits in regional and town centers, tour best practices for parking management, policy and related development; and, convene a workshop to generate momentum for revising regional parking policies and requirements. In the interim Metro recommends reviewing the parking management plans adopted by the cities of Beaverton and Hillsboro. Copies of the plans are available at www.oregonmetro.gov/tsp .
41	3.08.510 A-B. Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans	<p>Are jurisdiction using these provisions?</p> <p>"A. When proposing an amendment to the comprehensive plan or to a zoning designation, consider the strategies in subsection 3.08.220A as part of the analysis required by OAR 660-012-0060.</p> <p>B. If a city or county adopts the actions set forth in 3.08.230E (parking ratios, designs for street, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, freight systems, TSMO projects and strategies, and land use actions) and section 3.07.630.B of Title 6 of the UGMFP, it shall be eligible for an automatic reduction of 30 percent below the vehicular trip generation rates recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers when analyzing the traffic impacts, pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060, of a plan amendment in a Center, Main Street, Corridor or Station Community."</p>	Metro is not aware of any local jurisdictions taking advantage of these new provision in the Title 6 of the UGMFP. Since these Title 6 provisions were adopted, the TPR and OHP have undergone major amendments which reframe both mobility policy within the highway plan and the application of mobility policy to plan amendments, as set forth in the TPR. In light of these changes, Metro expects to reassess its Title 6 requirements to ensure consistency with updated state policies including new provisions that provide for flexibility in meeting mobility goals.
42	Overall / General	What are the RTFP requirements for amendment/ adoption of local Development Code provisions	The RTFP checklist (available at www.oregonmetro.gov/tsp) addresses which requirements should be met within local development codes, e.g. Street system design (connectivity, street design, green streets), site design at major transit stops, parking standards)
43	Overall / General	Is demonstrating compliance with RTFP requirements sufficient for demonstrating compliance with the TPR, in whole or in part? Has anyone developed a way to show compliance with the TPR through the RTFP?	Metro does not make findings of consistency with the TPR. A local jurisdiction can use a Metro letter of consistency with the RTFP to help make its case to DLCD, but there are requirements in the TPR that go beyond the RTFP. Please see the Oregon TSP guidelines available here: http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files//odot_tsp_guidelines.pdf
44	Overall / General	Can higher resolution maps or GIS files of the RTP figures that show modal designations be made available online?	Metro is creating an online tool to view the RTP system maps in greater detail. This will allow the user to zoom in to see the map at a more legible scale than currently available through the PDFs of the RTP available on the Metro web page. Additionally, GIS files are available upon request.

Excerpts from the Regional Transportation Functional Plan
(Chapter 3.08 of Metro Code)

TITLE 2: DEVELOPMENT AND UPDATE OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS

3.08.210 Transportation Needs

- A. Each city and county shall update its TSP to incorporate regional and state transportation needs identified in the 2035 RTP and its own transportation needs. The determination of local transportation needs shall be based upon:
 - 1. System gaps and deficiencies identified in the inventories and analysis of transportation systems pursuant to Title 1;
 - 2. Identification of facilities that exceed the Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards in Table 3.08-2 or the alternative thresholds and standards established pursuant to section 3.08.230;
 - 3. Consideration and documentation of the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations within the city or county, including minorities and low-income families.

- B. A city or county determination of transportation needs must be consistent with the following elements of the RTP:
 - 1. The population and employment forecast and planning period of the RTP, except that a city or county may use an alternative forecast for the city or county, coordinated with Metro, to account for changes to comprehensive plan or land use regulations adopted after adoption of the RTP;
 - 2. System maps and functional classifications for street design, motor vehicles, transit, bicycles, pedestrians and freight in Chapter 2 of the RTP; and
 - 3. Regional non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 and the Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards in Table 3.08-2.

- C. When determining its transportation needs under this section, a city or county shall consider the regional needs identified in the mobility corridor strategies in Chapter 4 of the RTP.

Excerpts from the Regional Transportation Functional Plan
(Chapter 3.08 of Metro Code)

3.08.220 Transportation Solutions

- A. Each city and county shall consider the following strategies, in the order listed, to meet the transportation needs determined pursuant to section 3.08.210 and performance targets and standards pursuant to section 3.08.230. The city or county shall explain its choice of one or more of the strategies and why other strategies were not chosen:
1. TSMO strategies, including localized TDM, safety, operational and access management improvements;
 2. Transit, bicycle and pedestrian system improvements;
 3. Traffic-calming designs and devices;
 4. Land use strategies in OAR 660-012-0035(2) to help achieve the thresholds and standards in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 or alternative thresholds and standards established pursuant to section 3.08.230;
 5. Connectivity improvements to provide parallel arterials, collectors or local streets that include pedestrian and bicycle facilities, consistent with the connectivity standards in section 3.08.110 and design classifications in Table 2.6 of the RTP, in order to provide alternative routes and encourage walking, biking and access to transit; and
 6. Motor vehicle capacity improvements, consistent with the RTP Arterial and Throughway Design and Network Concepts in Table 2.6 and section 2.5.2 of the RTP, only upon a demonstration that other strategies in this subsection are not appropriate or cannot adequately address identified transportation needs.
- B. A city or county shall coordinate its consideration of the strategies in subsection A with the owner of the transportation facility affected by the strategy. Facility design is subject to the approval of the facility owner.
- C. If analysis under subsection 3.08.210A indicates a new regional or state need that has not been identified in the RTP, the city or county may propose one of the following actions:
1. Propose a project at the time of Metro review of the TSP to be incorporated into the RTP during the next RTP update; or
 2. Propose an amendment to the RTP for needs and projects if the amendment is necessary prior to the next RTP update.

Excerpts from the Regional Transportation Functional Plan
(Chapter 3.08 of Metro Code)

3.08.230 Performance Targets and Standards

- A. Each city and county shall demonstrate that solutions adopted pursuant to section 3.08.220 will achieve progress toward the targets and standards in Tables 3.08-1, and 3.08-2 and measures in subsection D, or toward alternative targets and standards adopted by the city or county pursuant to subsections B and, C. The city or county shall include the regional targets and standards or its alternatives in its TSP.
- B. A city or county may adopt alternative targets or standards in place of the regional targets and standards prescribed in subsection A upon a demonstration that the alternative targets or standards:
 - 1. Are no lower than the modal targets in Table 3.08-1 and no lower than the ratios in Table 3.08-2;
 - 2. Will not result in a need for motor vehicle capacity improvements that go beyond the planned arterial and throughway network defined in Figure 2.12 of the RTP and that are not recommended in, or are inconsistent with, the RTP; and
 - 3. Will not increase SOV travel to a degree inconsistent with the non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1.
- C. If the city or county adopts mobility standards for state highways different from those in Table 3.08-2, it shall demonstrate that the standards have been approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission.
- D. Each city and county shall also include performance measures for safety, vehicle miles traveled per capita, freight reliability, congestion, and walking, bicycling and transit mode shares to evaluate and monitor performance of the TSP.
- E. To demonstrate progress toward achievement of performance targets in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 and to improve performance of state highways within its jurisdiction as much as feasible and avoid their further degradation, the city or county shall adopt the following:
 - 1. Parking minimum and maximum ratios in Centers and Station Communities consistent with subsection 3.08.410A;
 - 2. Designs for street, transit, bicycle, freight and pedestrian systems consistent with Title 1; and
 - 3. TSMO projects and strategies consistent with section 3.08.160; and
 - 4. Land use actions pursuant to OAR 660-012-0035(2).



Date: June 21, 2012
To: TPAC, MTAC and interested parties
From: Robin McArthur, AICP, Planning and Development Director
Subject: Regional Parking Management Requirements

PURPOSE

This memo provides guidance on how Metro will administer new parking management requirements in the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP).

BACKGROUND

Parking plays a large role in achieving region and community goals of vibrant downtowns and mainstreets, clean air and water, access to nature, and transportation choice. Within centers and corridors the amount of parking provided, its design and location have a great impact on both urban form and our ability to meet regional mode share targets. Reducing the amount of land dedicated to parking provides land for development and helps to create vibrant commercial districts with continuous storefronts and engaging ground-floor uses. At the same time, Metro acknowledges the difficulty of managing parking at the local level given apprehension surrounding the issue from businesses and residents.

Metro adopted the RTFP in June, 2010, codifying requirements that will help implement the goals and policies of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. As part of RTFP adoption, existing regional parking requirements (minimum/maximum ratios) were moved from the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) to the RTFP. During this process a new requirement to adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities was added to regional code (3.08.410 (I.)):

“Cities and counties shall adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities. The policies, plans and regulations shall be consistent with subsection A through H. Plans may be adopted in TSPs or other adopted policy documents and may focus on sub-areas of Centers. Plans shall include an inventory of parking supply and usage, an evaluation of bicycle parking needs with consideration of *TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines*. Policies shall be adopted in the TSP. Policies, plans and regulations must consider and may include the following range of strategies:

1. By-right exemptions from minimum parking requirements;
2. Parking districts;
3. Shared parking;
4. Structured parking;
5. Bicycle parking;
6. Timed parking;
7. Differentiation between employee parking and parking for customers, visitors and patients;
8. Real-time parking information;
9. Priced parking;
10. Parking enforcement”

Also, as per UGMFP Title 6, jurisdictions need to adopt parking management programs consistent with 3.08.410 in order for Center, Corridors, Station Communities and Main Streets to be eligible

for regional investments (3.07.620.D.4.c), or for taking a 30% reduction in assumed vehicle trip generation rates for purposes of plan amendments subject to section -0060 of the Transportation Planning Rule (3.07.630.B.3.c)

IMPLEMENTATION OF PARKING MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENT (RTFP 3.08.410(I.))

The regional parking management requirement was developed in part, to address compliance with the non-Single Occupancy Vehicle modal targets which Metro adopted to achieve compliance with section 0035 of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and consistency with the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) mobility policy for the Metro region. Since RTFP adoption, the TPR and OHP have both undergone major amendments which reframe both mobility policy within the highway plan and the application of mobility policy to plan amendments, as set forth in the TPR.

In light of these changes, Metro expects to reassess its parking management requirements to ensure consistency with updated state policies, and to take advantage of new provisions that provide for flexibility in meeting mobility goals.

In the meantime, Metro will require local jurisdiction to include parking policies in Transportation System plans (TSP) and to map out how parking management plans will be addressed if not part of the TSP update process. Metro encourages local jurisdictions to innovate, following the example of cities like Beaverton and Hillsboro who have adopted parking management plans for their downtowns.

NEXT STEPS

Metro recognizes the need to provide more guidance on parking management, building on our Community Investment Toolkit (Volume 2 – Innovative Design and Development Codes). Metro intends to apply for state and federal grants to complete this work, including an update of regional parking policies and requirements.

New Provisions in the OHP & TPR:
Metro Transportation System Planning Workshop

Presentation by:
Erik Havig, ODOT
Bill Holmstrom, DLCD



September 24, 2012



Session Outline

- Background and context
- Oregon Highway Plan
- Transportation Planning Rule
 - Focus on Multimodal Mixed-Use Areas
- Other questions and discussion



Background and Context

Why recent changes to the TPR and OHP?

- Concerns in two themes:
 - “**economic development** objectives should be better balanced with transportation performance”
 - “difficult to increase development intensities, even though the statewide planning goals call for **compact development**”
- Joint Subcommittee Report
- Legislation



Background and Context

State of the practice

- Many of the applications are new
 - Some examples are available
 - Many more are in progress
- Focus session on some select areas
 - What have we learned so far from case studies
 - What still needs to be tried or completed

Oregon Highway Plan

OHP Policy 1F:
Highway Mobility Policy



Oregon Highway Plan

- Oregon Highway Plan (OHP)
 - State modal plan adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC)
 - Establishes policies and actions for planning and management of the state highway system
 - Policy 1F – Highway Mobility Policy

OHP Policy 1F

- Policy and background that balances highway mobility with multimodal, community and other objectives
- System planning targets for mobility
- Thresholds for “small increases in traffic”



OHP Policy 1F

- Alternative mobility targets
- Options for other performance measures: outside of volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios
- Modified v/c tables: plan for (and recognize) more congestion inside urban areas
- Policy assessment

Oregon Highway Plan

OHP Policy 1F Focus Area: Alternative Mobility Targets



Alternative Mobility Targets

- OHP Action 1F.3 – developing alternative mobility targets
 - Evolving framework
 - OHP Mobility Standard Guidelines: 2009
 - Revised OHP Policy 1F: 2011



Alternative Mobility Targets

- Infeasible or impractical to meet existing mobility targets
 - Areas with high seasonal traffic
 - Areas with severe environmental or land use constraints
 - Areas with adopted policies balancing multiple objectives – consistent with OTP and OHP goals
 - Significant financial limitations to improvements

Alternative Mobility Targets

- Typically considered and developed through system or facility planning
- Consider elements that include
 - Local street and multimodal network
 - Managing operations and/or access - safety
 - Demand management and land use considerations



Alternative Mobility Targets

- Stakeholder process and public discussion
- Corridor consideration and consistency
- OTC adoption of new target
- Local incorporation of appropriate actions
- Future applicability to design (likely)

Alternative Mobility Targets

- What can new thresholds look like?
 - Change in the v/c number (e.g. 0.85 to 0.95)
 - Duration (e.g. peak two-hours at 1.0)
 - Time of year, day of the week or seasonal average (e.g. annual average)
 - New measure all together?

Alternative Mobility Targets

- Examples
 - Seaside Transportation System Plan
 - Portland Metropolitan Area / Regional Transportation Plan
 - Interchange areas and IAMPs
 - Many others being considered now!

Alternative Mobility Targets

- Objectives
 - ODOT commitment to work with local governments
 - Flexibility in OHP policy
 - Transparent, locally (or regionally) driven or locally framed process
 - Partnership and agreements



Oregon Highway Plan

**OHP Policy 1F Focus Area:
Small Increases in Traffic**



Small Increases in Traffic

- OHP Action 1F.5 – TPR 0060 implementation
 - Legislative direction
Thresholds for required analysis of transportation impacts of project proposals
 - Subcommittee direction
Exempt proposals with small increase in traffic

Small Increases in Traffic

- Concept
 - Consistent with changes to traffic impact analysis requirements for access management program
 - Establishes thresholds for increases in site traffic that are not considered as degrading state facilities – under TPR
 - Focuses resources toward working with proposals that have a higher system impact

Small Increases in Traffic

- A small increase in traffic is defined as
 - Under 400 average daily trips (ADT)
 - More than 400 ADT but less than 1,001 for state facilities with certain traffic and lane characteristics
 - More than 1,000 increase in ADT is not considered a small increase in traffic

Transportation Planning Rules

TPR



Transportation Planning Rules

- Adopted by Land Conservation & Development Commission (LCDC)
- Implements Statewide Planning Goal 12 – Transportation
- TPR 0060 must be considered when local governments:
 - Amend a comprehensive plan
 - Amend a land use regulation, including a zoning map

Transportation Planning Rules

- Must determine if action would result in a “significant effect” on the transportation system
- If there will be a significant effect
 - There are many options available to mitigate the significant effect
- Several new tools now available in TPR 0060
 - Some new considerations when performing a TSP update

Transportation Planning Rules

(9) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rezoning consistent with comp plan designation	(10) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mixed-use multimodal areas (MMAs)	(11) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Partial mitigation for economic development
---	---	---

Transportation Planning Rules

- TPR 0060 Section (9) added this year
- Allows local governments to rezone land without considering if there is a “significant effect”
 - The new zone must be consistent with the underlying plan designation
 - The new zone must be consistent with the TSP
- When developing TSP, consider how future rezoning will review the TSP for consistency

Transportation Planning Rules

- TPR 0060 Section (11) added this year
- Allows local governments to approve amendments with partial mitigation of a “significant effect” for certain economic development purposes
- Anticipating issues in the TSP may avoid dealing with Section (11) in future actions

TPR Focus: MMAs

- TPR 0060 Section (10) added this year
- Allows local governments to designate multimodal mixed-use areas (MMAs)
 - Local governments adopt an MMA as a plan amendment
- MMAs are densely developed areas, *e.g.*, town centers, downtowns, or main streets
 - MMAs have distinct boundaries

TPR Focus: MMAs

- Within a designated MMA, a local government does not have to consider auto congestion performance standards when upzoning
 - Provides incentive for dense, pedestrian-oriented development
 - Must still consider performance standards aside from congestion (*e.g.* multimodal, safety, connectivity, or freight mobility)
- Applies to map or text amendments within the MMA boundary

TPR Focus: MMAs

- A local government has to demonstrate that an area meets MMA standards in order to designate the area, including:
 - Allow urban uses and densities
 - Multi-story buildings permitted
 - Connectivity within the MMA
 - Connectivity to/from surrounding areas
 - Transit stops
 - Limit low-intensity, industrial, and auto-centered uses
 - Lower off-street parking requirements

TPR Focus: MMAs

- 2040 Centers are good candidates for implementing the MMA designation
- 2040 Centers do not necessarily meet all of the MMA requirements
- Local jurisdictions should review the MMA requirements for an MMA designation for each center
- Consider additional/supplementary performance measures in TSP

TPR Focus: MMAs

- Proposed MMAs within ¼ mile of a freeway interchange must coordinate with the mainline facility provider (e.g. ODOT)
 - The provider must consider certain operational and safety factors
 - If there are operational or safety effects, the local government and facility provider may enter into an agreement to mitigate
 - Facility provider must provide written concurrence

TPR Focus: MMAs

- Areas that do not meet all of the requirements for an MMA may be designated if the local government makes the necessary plan & land use regulation changes concurrently
 - This action itself does not need to be reviewed against congestion performance standards

TPR Focus: MMAs

- This is an important decision for the community about balance
 - Until now, the system focused on traffic congestion, sometimes at the expense of additional density
 - Adoption of an MMA may ease development of urban centers, potentially making congestion more likely in and around the area
- Start planning now, don't wait for impending development

Further Information

- Transportation Planning Rule
http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/Rulemaking_TPR_2011.shtml
- Oregon Highway Plan
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/OHP2011.shtml>



Other Discussion?



Additional Background and Focus Area Slides (Use as Needed)



Background

Joint Subcommittee Recommendation

- TPR items – DLCD and LCDC
 - Exempt rezonings consistent with comprehensive plan map
 - Practical mitigation for economic development projects
 - Exempt upzonings in urban centers
 - Address traffic at time of UGB expansion
 - Technical clarifications



Background

Joint Subcommittee Recommendation

- OHP items – ODOT and OTC
 - Exempt proposals with small increase in traffic
 - Average trip generation assumptions
 - Alternate mobility standard development
 - Corridor or area mobility standards
 - Consider measures outside of volume to capacity ratios



OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN POLICY 1F REVISIONS (MOBILITY POLICY)

Effective December 21, 2011

OVERVIEW *[April 2012 Staff Working Draft]*



Background: Why Amendments?

- The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) formed a Joint Subcommittee in response to stakeholder concerns regarding Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) 0060 and Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) mobility standards (Policy 1F).
- Stakeholder testimony indicated that economic development, transportation and land use objectives needed to be better balanced. The perception was that in practice, transportation mobility took precedence over other critical objectives. Additionally, stakeholders felt that transportation requirements made it difficult to increase development intensities, especially within urban centers, which was contrary to statewide planning goals and many community objectives.
- In response to these concerns, the Joint Subcommittee developed a Recommendations Report identifying priority work areas for both the TPR and OHP.
- TPR and OHP issues were also an interest area of the 2011 Oregon Legislature. Senate Bill (SB) 795 was passed and required TPR and OHP amendments reflective of the Joint Subcommittee's recommendations by January 1, 2012.
- The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) implemented a coordinated process to amend the OHP and TPR consistent with the Joint Subcommittee recommendations and SB 795. The OTC and LCDC, respectively, adopted amendments to the OHP and TPR in December 2011.

Summary of OHP Amendments: What's Changed?

- OHP Policy 1F is broadened to not only implement and balance other OHP policies, but to also better consider and balance the policy objectives in the multimodal Oregon Transportation Plan, and community objectives for economic development, community development and livability.
- The policy revisions change the term "mobility standards" to "mobility targets" as a way to enhance implementation and flexibility of the mobility policy and balance other state, regional and local objectives. The intent of this change is for mobility objectives to be thought of as "target" levels when developing system and facility plans (where the state and local jurisdictions jointly take a broad look at what is viable for an area). This terminology change reinforces the concept that mobility targets are considered the start of the discussion rather than a required end result or a required solution during system and facility planning efforts. However, the mobility targets are defined and treated as standards for many implementation purposes in order to

ensure compliance with applicable administrative rules and to provide legal certainty during implementation. This includes for determining compliance with the TPR.

- The revised policy provides less stringent requirements and establishes thresholds for plan amendments that have a small increase in traffic on congested facilities and expands flexibility for determining some levels of mitigation in TPR applications.
- Policy revisions require consideration of “planned development” assumptions, consistent with the community’s comprehensive plan, rather than “full development/build out” assumptions.
- Policy revisions describe circumstances where constraints to meeting mobility objectives exist and under what conditions alternative mobility targets could be developed and implemented. ODOT is considering streamlining concepts through research and enhanced guidance for the application of alternative mobility targets.
- While initial mobility targets remain volume-to-capacity (v/c)-based, policy revisions allow consideration of measures other than v/c, encourage consideration of mobility across modes, and more clearly allow corridor or area mobility targets when developing alternatives. This is in addition to options for changing v/c-based target levels or using other v/c based-methodologies such as changing the hour of the day measured or considering multiple hour traffic measures.
- OHP mobility targets continue to play a role in transportation system planning, plan amendment and development review analyses, and operational decisions, although this role has been revised to consider mobility more broadly. The revised policy and new action statements clarify the roles and applicability of OHP mobility targets across different application areas, including better coordinating mobility expectations for planning and design.
- Revisions to OHP Table 6 (establishing v/c ratio targets across most of the state) reflect today’s transportation reality, including increased traffic levels and current financial challenges and constraints not seen when Table 6 was developed in 1999. In recognition of the important functions, requirements and safety considerations of rural facilities, no changes were made to the v/c ratio targets for facilities outside of urban growth boundaries.
- New OHP Action 1F.10 requires an evaluation (within three years of adoption) to assess the effectiveness of the revised policy in meeting overall objectives, impacts on transportation performance and goals, and any unintended consequences as a result of the changes.

For More Information

- OHP Policy 1F amendments and background information is available on the OHP project website at: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/OHP2011.shtml>.
- Information on the TPR revisions can be found on DLCD’s project website: http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/Rulemaking_TPR_2011.shtml.
- Additional detail is provided in related “Fact Sheet” and “Frequently Asked Questions” documents on both the OHP and TPR amendments.

OHP Policy 1F Revisions
Adopted by Oregon Transportation Commission: December 21, 2011

1 **1999 OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN**

2
3
4 **HIGHWAY MOBILITY POLICY**

5
6 **Background**

7
8 The Highway Mobility Policy establishes state highway mobility targets that implement
9 the objectives of the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and other OHP policies. The
10 policy does not rely on a single approach to determine transportation needs necessary to
11 maintain acceptable and reliable levels of mobility on the state highway system. It offers
12 the flexibility to consider and develop methodologies to measure mobility that are
13 reflective of current and anticipated land use, transportation and economic conditions of
14 the state and in a community.

15
16 While ODOT measures vehicular highway mobility performance through volume to
17 capacity (v/c) ratios (see Tables 6 and 7) when making initial determinations of facility
18 needs necessary to maintain acceptable and reliable levels of mobility on the state
19 highway system, achieving v/c targets will not necessarily be the determinant of the
20 transportation solution(s). Policy 1F recognizes and emphasizes opportunities for
21 developing alternative mobility targets (including measures that are not v/c-based) that
22 provide a more effective tool to identify transportation needs and solutions and better
23 balance state and local community needs and objectives. Through this policy, the state
24 acknowledges that achieving important community goals may impact mobility
25 performance and that higher levels of congestion may result in certain areas.

26
27 Several policies in the OHP establish general mobility objectives and approaches for
28 maintaining mobility.

- 29
- 30 • Policy 1A (State Highway Classification System) describes in general the
31 functions and objectives for several categories of state highways. Greater mobility
32 is expected on Interstate and Statewide Highways than on Regional and District
33 Highways.
 - 34
35 • Policy 1B (Land Use and Transportation) has an objective of coordinating land
36 use and transportation decisions to maintain the mobility of the highway system.
37 The policy identifies several land use types and describes in general the levels of
38 mobility objectives appropriate for each.
 - 39
40 • Policy 1C (State Highway Freight System) has an objective of maintaining
41 efficient through movement on major truck Freight Routes. The policy identifies
42 the highways that are Freight Routes.

- Policy 1G (Major Improvements) has the purpose of maintaining highway performance and improving highway safety by improving system efficiency and management before adding capacity.

Although each of these policies addresses mobility, none provide measures by which to describe and understand levels of mobility and evaluate what levels are acceptable for the various classifications of state highway facilities.

The Highway Mobility Policy identifies how the state measures mobility and establishes targets that are reasonable and consistent with the direction of the OTP and OHP policies. This policy carries out Policies 1A and 1C by establishing mobility targets for Interstate Highways, Freight Routes and other Statewide Highways that reflect the expectation that these facilities maintain a level of mobility to safely and efficiently support statewide economic development while balancing available financial resources. It carries out Policy 1B by acknowledging that lower vehicular mobility in Special Transportation Areas (STAs) and highly developed urban areas is the expectation and assigns a mobility target that accepts a higher level of congestion in these situations. The targets set for Regional and District Highways in STAs and highly urbanized areas allow for lower vehicular mobility to better balance other objectives, including achieving a multimodal system. In these areas, traffic congestion will regularly reach levels where peak hour traffic flow is highly unstable and greater traffic congestion will occur. In order to better support state and local economic activity, targets for Freight Routes are set to provide for less congestion than would be acceptable for other state highways. Interstate Highways and Expressways are incompatible with slower traffic and higher level of vehicular congestion and therefore, STA designations will not be applied to these highway classifications. For Interstate and Expressway facilities it will be important to manage congestion to support regional and state economic development goals.

The mobility targets are contained in Tables 6 and 7 and in Action 1F.1. Tables 6 and 7 refer only to vehicle mobility on the state highway system. At the same time, it is recognized that other transportation modes and regional and local planning objectives need to be considered and balanced when evaluating performance, operation and improvements to the state highway system. Implementation of the Highway Mobility Policy will require state, regional and local agencies to assess mobility targets and balance actions within the context of multiple technical and policy objectives. While the mobility targets are important tools for assessing the transportation condition of the system, mobility is only one of a number of objectives that will be considered when planning transportation solutions.

The highway mobility targets are used in three distinct ways:

- Transportation System Planning: Mobility targets identify state highway mobility performance expectations and provide a measure by which the existing and future performance of the highway system can be evaluated. Plan development may necessitate adopting methodologies and targets that deviate from adopted mobility targets in order to balance regional and local performance expectations. For

1 purposes of compliance with OAR 660-012, the Transportation Planning Rule,
2 mobility targets are considered performance standards.
3

- 4 • Plan Amendments and Development Review: Mobility targets are used to review
5 amendments to comprehensive plans and land use regulations pursuant to the
6 Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) to assess if the proposed changes are
7 consistent with the planned function, capacity and performance standards of state
8 highway facilities. Unless the Oregon Transportation Commission has adopted an
9 alternative mobility target for the impacted facility, the mobility targets in Tables
10 6 and 7 are considered standards for purposes of determining compliance with
11 OAR 660-012-0060.
12
- 13 • Operations: Mobility targets assist in making traffic operations decisions such as
14 managing access and traffic control systems to maintain acceptable highway
15 performance.
16

17 The Highway Mobility Policy applies primarily to transportation and land use planning
18 decisions. By defining targeted levels of highway system mobility, the policy provides
19 direction for identifying (vehicular) highway system deficiencies. The policy does not,
20 however, determine what actions should be taken to address the deficiencies.
21

22 Mobility in the policy is measured using a volume to capacity ratio or v/c. This policy
23 also provides opportunities to seek Oregon Transportation Commission approval for
24 alternative mobility targets that are not v/c-based.
25

26 It is also important to note that regardless of the performance measure, v/c or other, the
27 Highway Mobility Policy recognizes the importance of considering the performance of
28 other modes of travel. While the policy does not prescribe mobility targets for other
29 modes of travel, it does allow and encourage ODOT and local jurisdictions to consider
30 mobility broadly – through multimodal measures or within the context of regional or
31 local land use objectives. Providing for better multimodal operations is a legitimate
32 justification for developing alternatives to established OHP mobility targets.
33

34 The Highway Mobility Policy will affect land use decisions through the requirements of
35 the TPR. The TPR requires that regional and local transportation system plans be
36 consistent with plans adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission. The TPR also
37 requires that local governments ensure that comprehensive plan amendments, zone
38 changes and amendments to land use regulations that significantly affect a transportation
39 facility are consistent with the identified function, capacity and performance of the
40 affected state facility. The Highway Mobility Policy establishes ODOT's mobility targets
41 for state highways as the standards for system performance in compliance with the TPR
42 (OAR 660-012) and are to be used to determine significant affect specifically related to
43 Section -0060 of the TPR.
44

45 Policy 1F does not apply to highway design. Separate design mobility standards are
46 contained in ODOT's Highway Design Manual (HDM). While HDM design standards

1 and OHP mobility targets in Policy 1F may not be the same, ODOT's intention is to
2 continue to balance statewide mobility and economic development objectives with
3 community mobility, livability and economic development objectives through enhanced
4 coordination between planning and design. Where the Oregon Transportation
5 Commission adopts alternative mobility targets in accordance with this policy, they are
6 establishing an agreement with the local jurisdiction to manage and develop the state
7 system to the expected and planned levels of performance, consistent with the
8 jurisdiction's underlying planning objectives (as set out in local comprehensive plan
9 policy and land use regulations). However, coordination on exceptions to design mobility
10 standards may still be required.

11
12 ODOT's intention is that the mobility targets be used to identify system mobility
13 deficiencies over the course of a reasonable planning horizon. The planning horizon shall
14 be:

- 15
16 • At least 20 years for the development of state, regional and local transportation
17 plans, including ODOT's corridor plans; and
- 18
19 • The greater of 15 years or the planning horizon of the applicable local and
20 regional transportation system plans for amendments to transportation plans,
21 comprehensive plans or land use regulations.

22
23 ODOT measures vehicular highway mobility performance through v/c ratios. The v/c
24 ratio was selected after an extensive analysis of highway performance measures prior to
25 adoption of the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan. The review included the effectiveness of the
26 measure to achieve other policies (particularly OHP Policy 1B, Land Use and
27 Transportation), implications for growth patterns, how specifically ODOT should
28 integrate transportation policy with land use, flexibility for modifying targets, and the
29 effects of Portland metro area targets on the major state highways in the region. ODOT
30 uses v/c-based measures for reasons of application consistency and flexibility,
31 manageable data requirements, forecasting accuracy, and the ability to aggregate into
32 area-wide targets that are fairly easy to understand and specify. In addition, since v/c is
33 responsive to changes in demand as well as in capacity, it reflects the results of demand
34 management, land use and multimodal policies. However, it is recognized that there are
35 limitations in applying v/c, especially in highly congested conditions and in a multimodal
36 environment. OHP policies allow options for other measures, or combinations of
37 measures, to be considered.

38
39 Mobility targets are a measure by which the state assesses the functionality of a facility
40 and are used, along with consideration of other policy objectives, to plan for system
41 improvements. These mobility targets are shown in Table 6 and vary, depending on the
42 category of highway, the location of the facility – within a STA, MPO, UGB,
43 unincorporated community or rural lands – and the posted speed of the facility. Table 6
44 also reflects Policy 1B (Land Use and Transportation) and the state's commitment to
45 support increased density and development activities in urban areas. Through higher v/c
46 ratios and allowing consideration of alternative mobility targets, the state acknowledges

1 that it is appropriate and anticipated that certain areas will have more traffic congestion
2 because of the land use pattern that a region or local jurisdiction has committed to
3 through adopted local policy.

4
5 Separate mobility targets for the Portland metropolitan area have been included in the
6 policy (Table 7). These targets have been adopted with an understanding of the unique
7 context and policy choices that have been made by local governments in that area
8 including:

- 9
10 • A regional plan that links land use and transportation decisions and investments to
11 support land uses in urban centers and corridors and supports multi-modal
12 transportation options;
- 13
14 • Implementation of Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO)
15 strategies, including freeway ramp meters, real time traffic monitoring and
16 incident response to maintain adequate traffic flow; and
- 17
18 • An air quality attainment/maintenance plan that relies heavily on reducing auto
19 trips through land use changes and increases in transit service.

20
21 The Portland Metro targets have been adopted specifically for the Portland metropolitan
22 area with a mutual understanding that these mobility targets better reflect the congestion
23 that already exists within the constraints of the metro area's transportation system and
24 which will not be alleviated by state highway improvements. The targets contained in
25 Table 7 are meant for interim use only. The Oregon Transportation Commission expects
26 the Portland Metro area to work with ODOT and stakeholders to explore a variety of
27 measures to assess mobility and to develop alternative targets that best reflect the
28 multiple transportation, land use and economic objectives of the region.

29
30 The mobility targets included in the Highway Mobility Policy must be used for the initial
31 deficiency analysis of state highways. However, where it can be shown that it is
32 infeasible or impractical to meet the targets, local governments may work with ODOT
33 and stakeholders to consider and evaluate alternatives to the mobility targets in Tables 6
34 and 7. Any variance from the targets in Tables 6 and 7 will require Oregon
35 Transportation Commission adoption. Increasingly, urban and urbanizing areas are facing
36 traffic and land use pressures due to population growth, aging infrastructure, and reduced
37 revenues for roadway and related infrastructure projects. In response to state funding
38 constraints and the need to balance multiple objectives, system management solutions
39 and enhancement of alternative modes of travel, rather than major highway
40 improvements, are increasingly relied upon to address congestion issues. Developing
41 mobility targets that are tailored to specific facility needs, consistent with local
42 expectations, values and land use context will need to be part of the solution for some
43 highway locations. Furthermore, certain urban areas may need area-specific targets to
44 better balance state and local policies pertaining to land use and economic development.
45 Examples where conditions may not match state mobility targets include metropolitan

1 areas, STAs, areas with high seasonal traffic, and areas constrained by the existing built
2 or natural environment.

3
4 Alternatives to the mobility targets and methodologies in the tables must be adopted
5 through an amendment to the OHP. The Oregon Transportation Commission must adopt
6 the new targets supported by findings that explain and justify the supporting
7 methodology.

8
9 Policy 1F is not the only transportation policy that influences how the state assesses the
10 adequacy of a highway facility and vehicle mobility is not the only objective. Facilitating
11 state, regional and local economic development, enhancing livability for Oregon's
12 communities, and encouraging multiple modes are also important policy areas that guide
13 state transportation investment and planning. Policy 1B recognizes that the state will
14 coordinate land use and transportation decisions to efficiently use public infrastructure
15 investments to enhance economic competitiveness, livability and other objectives.
16 Economic viability considerations help define when to make major transportation
17 investments (Policy 1G). Goal 4, Travel Alternatives, articulates the state's goal to
18 maintain a well-coordinated and integrated multimodal system that accommodates
19 efficient inter-modal connections for people and freight and promotes appropriate multi-
20 modal choices. Making decisions about the appropriate level of mobility for any given
21 part of the statewide highway system must be balanced by these, and other relevant OTP
22 and OHP policies.

23 24 25 **Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Policy**

26
27 *It is the policy of the State of Oregon to maintain acceptable and reliable levels of*
28 *mobility on the state highway system, consistent with the expectations for each facility*
29 *type, location and functional objectives. Highway mobility targets will be the initial tool*
30 *to identify deficiencies and consider solutions for vehicular mobility on the state system.*
31 *Specifically, mobility targets shall be used for:*

- 32
33 • *Identifying state highway mobility performance expectations for planning and*
34 *plan implementation;*
- 35
36 • *Evaluating the impacts on state highways of amendments to transportation plans,*
37 *acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations pursuant to the*
38 *Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12-0060); and*
- 39
40 • *Guiding operational decisions such as managing access and traffic control*
41 *systems to maintain acceptable highway performance.*

42
43 *Mobility targets for state highways, as established in this policy or as otherwise adopted*
44 *by the Oregon Transportation Commission as alternative mobility targets, are considered*
45 *the highway system performance standards in compliance with the TPR (OAR 660-012),*
46 *including applicability for actions that fall under Section -0060 of the TPR.*

1
2 *Where it is infeasible or impractical to meet the mobility targets, acceptable and reliable*
3 *levels of mobility for a specific facility, corridor or area will be determined through an*
4 *efficient, collaborative planning process between ODOT and the local jurisdiction(s)*
5 *with land use authority. The resulting mobility targets will reflect the balance between*
6 *relevant objectives related to land use, economic development, social equity, and mobility*
7 *and safety for all modes of transportation. Alternative mobility targets for the specific*
8 *facility shall be adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission as part of the OHP.*
9

10 *Oregon Transportation Commission adoption of alternative mobility targets through*
11 *system and facility plans should be accompanied by acknowledgement in local policy that*
12 *state highway improvements to further reduce congestion and improve traffic mobility*
13 *conditions in the subject area are not expected.*
14

15 *Traffic mobility exemptions in compliance with the TPR do not obligate state highway*
16 *improvements that further reduce congestion and improve traffic mobility conditions in*
17 *the subject area.*
18

19 ***Action 1F.1***
20

21 Mobility targets are the measure by which the state assesses the existing or forecasted
22 operational conditions of a facility and, as such, are a key component ODOT uses to
23 determine the need for or feasibility of providing highway or other transportation system
24 improvements. These mobility targets are shown in Table 6 and Table 7. For purposes of
25 assessing state highway performance:
26

- 27 • Use the mobility targets below and in Table 6 when initially assessing all state
28 highway sections located outside of the Portland metropolitan area urban growth
29 boundary.
30
- 31 • Use the mobility targets below and in Table 7 when initially assessing all state
32 highway sections located within the Portland metropolitan area urban growth
33 boundary.
34
- 35 • For highways segments where there are no intersections, achieving the volume to
36 capacity ratios in Tables 6 and 7 for either direction of travel on the highway
37 demonstrates that state mobility targets are being met.
38
- 39 • For unsignalized intersections, achieving the volume to capacity ratios in Tables 6
40 and 7 for the state highway approaches indicates that state mobility targets are
41 being met. In order to maintain safe operation of the intersection, non-state
42 highway approaches are expected to meet or not to exceed the volume to capacity
43 ratios for District/Local Interest Roads in Table 6, except within the Portland
44 metropolitan area UGB where non-state highway approaches are expected to meet
45 or not to exceed a v/c of 0.99.
46

- 1 • At signalized intersections other than interchange ramp terminals (see below), the
2 overall intersection v/c ratio is expected to meet or not to exceed the volume to
3 capacity ratios in Tables 6 and 7. Where Tables 6 and 7 v/c ratios differ by legs of
4 the intersection, the more restrictive of the volume to capacity ratios in the tables
5 shall apply. Where a state highway intersects with a local road or street, the
6 volume to capacity ratio for the state highway shall apply.
7
- 8 • Although an interchange serves both the mainline and the crossroad to which it
9 connects, it is important that the interchange be managed to maintain safe and
10 efficient operation of the mainline through the interchange area. The main
11 objective is to avoid the formation of traffic queues on off-ramps which back up
12 into the portions of the ramps needed for safe deceleration from mainline speeds
13 or onto the mainline itself. This is a significant traffic safety concern. The primary
14 cause of traffic queuing at off-ramps is inadequate capacity at the intersections of
15 the ramps with the crossroad. These intersections are referred to as ramp
16 terminals. In many instances where ramp terminals connect with another state
17 highway, the mobility target for the connecting highway will generally signify
18 that traffic backups onto the mainline can be avoided. However, in some instances
19 where the crossroad is another state highway or a local road, the mobility target
20 will not be a good indicator of possible future queuing problems. Therefore, the
21 better indication is a maximum volume to capacity ratio for the ramp terminals of
22 interchange ramps that is the more restrictive volume to capacity ratio for the
23 crossroad, or 0.85.
24
- 25 • At an interchange within an urban area the mobility target used may be increased
26 to as much as 0.90 v/c, but no higher than the target for the crossroad, if:
27
- 28 1. It can be determined, with a probability equal to or greater than 95
29 percent, that vehicle queues would not extend onto the mainline or into the
30 portion of the ramp needed to safely accommodate deceleration; and
31
- 32 2. An adopted Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) is present, or
33 through an IAMP adoption process, which must be approved by the
34 Oregon Transportation Commission.
35
- 36 • Because the ramps serve as an area where vehicles accelerate or decelerate to or
37 from mainline speeds, the mobility target for the interchange ramps exclusive of
38 the crossroad terminals is the same as that for the mainline. Metered on-ramps,
39 where entering traffic is managed to maintain efficient operation of the mainline
40 through the interchange area, may allow for greater volume to capacity ratios.
41

1 **Action 1F.2**

- 2
- 3 • Apply mobility targets over at least a 20-year planning horizon when developing
- 4 state, regional or local transportation system plans, including ODOT’s corridor
- 5 plans.
- 6
- 7 • When evaluating highway mobility for amendments to transportation system
- 8 plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations, use the
- 9 planning horizons in adopted local and regional transportation system plans or a
- 10 planning horizon of 15 years from the proposed date of amendment adoption,
- 11 whichever is greater. To determine the effect that an amendment to an
- 12 acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulation has on a state facility,
- 13 the capacity analysis shall include the forecasted growth of traffic on the state
- 14 highway due to regional and intercity travel and consistent with levels of planned
- 15 development according to the applicable acknowledged comprehensive plan over
- 16 the planning period. Planned development, for the purposes of this policy, means
- 17 the amount of population and employment growth and associated travel
- 18 anticipated by the community’s acknowledged comprehensive plan over the
- 19 planning period. The Oregon Transportation Commission encourages
- 20 communities to consider and adopt land use plan amendments that would
- 21 reallocate expected population and employment growth to designated community
- 22 centers as a means to help create conditions that increase the use of transit and
- 23 bicycles, encourage pedestrian activity, reduce reliance on single occupant vehicle
- 24 travel and minimize local traffic on state highways.
- 25

26 **Action 1F.3**

27

28 In the development of transportation system plans or ODOT facility plans, where it is

29 infeasible or impractical to meet the mobility targets in Table 6 or Table 7, or those

30 otherwise approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission, ODOT and local

31 jurisdictions may explore different target levels, methodologies and measures for

32 assessing mobility and consider adopting alternative mobility targets for the facility.

33 While v/c remains the initial methodology to measure system performance, measures

34 other than those based on v/c may be developed through a multi-modal transportation

35 system planning process that seeks to balance overall transportation system efficiency

36 with multiple objectives of the area being addressed.

37

38 Examples of where state mobility targets may not match local expectations for a specific

39 facility or may not reflect the surrounding land use, environmental or financial conditions

40 include:

- 41
- 42 • Metropolitan areas or portions thereof where mobility expectations cannot be
- 43 achieved and where they are in conflict with an adopted integrated land use and
- 44 transportation plan for promoting compact development, reducing the use of
- 45 automobiles and increasing the use of other modes of transportation, promoting

1 efficient use of transportation infrastructure, improving air quality, and supporting
2 greenhouse gas reduction objectives;

- 3
- 4 • When financial considerations or limitations preclude the opportunity to provide a
5 planned system improvement within the planning horizon;
- 6
- 7 • When other locally adopted policies must be balanced with vehicular mobility and
8 it can be shown that these policies are consistent with the broader goals and
9 objectives of OTP and OHP policy;
- 10
- 11 • Facilities with high seasonal traffic;
- 12
- 13 • Special Transportation Areas; and
- 14
- 15 • Areas where severe environmental or land use constraints¹¹ make infeasible or
16 impractical the transportation improvements necessary to accommodate planned
17 land uses or to accommodate comprehensive plan changes that carry out the Land
18 Use and Transportation Policy (1B).
- 19

20 Any proposed mobility target that deviates from the mobility targets in Table 6 or Table
21 7, or those otherwise approved by the Commission, shall be clear and objective and shall
22 provide standardized procedures to ensure consistent application of the selected measure.
23 The alternative mobility target(s) shall be adopted by the Oregon Transportation
24 Commission as an amendment to the OHP. Consideration of alternative mobility targets
25 shall be coordinated with other local jurisdictions in the affected corridor, consistent with
26 OTC Policy 11- Public Involvement.

27

28 The Transportation Commission has sole authority to adopt mobility targets for state
29 highways. It will be necessary for affected local jurisdictions to agree to the alternative
30 mobility target for the state highway facility as part of a local transportation system plan
31 and regional plan (MPO) as applicable. Findings shall demonstrate why the particular
32 mobility target is necessary, including the finding that it is infeasible or impractical to
33 meet the mobility targets in Table 6 or Table 7, or those otherwise approved by the
34 Commission.

35

36 If alternative targets are needed but cannot be established through the system planning
37 process prior to adoption of a new or updated transportation system plan, they should be
38 identified as necessary and committed to as a future refinement plan work item with an
39 associated timeframe for completion and adoption. In this case, the mobility targets in
40 Table 6 or Table 7, or those otherwise approved by the Commission, shall continue to
41 apply until the alternative mobility targets are formally adopted by the Oregon
42 Transportation Commission.

43

44 ¹¹Examples of severe environmental and land use constraints include, but are not limited to, endangered
45 species, sensitive wetlands, areas with severe or unstable slopes, river or bay crossings, and historic
46 districts.

1
2 Modifications to the mobility targets could include changing the hour measured from the
3 30th highest hour, using multiple hour measures, or considering weekday or seasonal
4 adjustments. Development of corridor or area mobility targets is also allowed. ODOT's
5 policy is to utilize a v/c based target and methodology as the initial measure, as this will
6 standardize and simplify implementation issues throughout the state. Where v/c-based
7 approaches may not meet all needs and objectives, developing alternative mobility targets
8 using non v-c-based measures, may also be pursued.

9
10
11
12 In support of establishing the alternative mobility target, the plan shall include feasible
13 actions for:

- 14
15 • Providing a network of local streets, collectors and arterials to relieve traffic
16 demand on state highways and to provide convenient pedestrian and bicycle
17 ways;
- 18
19 • Managing access and traffic operations to minimize traffic accidents, avoid traffic
20 backups on ramps, accommodate freight vehicles and make the most efficient use
21 of existing and planned highway capacity;
- 22
23 • Managing traffic demand and incorporating transportation system management
24 tools and information, where feasible, to manage peak hour traffic loads on state
25 highways;
- 26
27 • Providing and enhancing multiple modes of transportation; and
- 28
29 • Managing land use to limit vehicular demand on state highways consistent with
30 Policy 1B (Land Use and Transportation Policy).

31
32 The plan shall include a financially feasible implementation program and shall
33 demonstrate that the proposed mobility target(s) are consistent with and support locally
34 adopted land use, economic development, and multimodal transportation policy and
35 objectives. In addition, the plan shall demonstrate strong local commitment, through
36 adopted policy and implementation strategies, to carry out the identified improvements
37 and other actions.

38
39 ODOT understands that in certain areas of the state, achieving the established mobility
40 targets will be difficult and that regional and local policies must be balanced with
41 transportation system performance. ODOT is committed to work with MPOs and local
42 jurisdictions on system-level analysis of alternative mobility targets and to participate in
43 public policy-level discussions where balancing mobility and other regional and
44 community objectives can be adequately addressed.

45
46 In developing and applying alternative mobility targets and methodologies for facilities
47 throughout the state, ODOT will consider tools and methods that have been successfully
48 used previously for a particular facility and/or within a specific metropolitan area or

1 region. Specific mobility targets may vary from one community or area to another
2 depending on local circumstances. It is the objective of this policy to maintain
3 consistency in the selection and application of analysis and implementation
4 methodologies over time as they are applied to a specific facility or to a system of related
5 facilities within a defined community or region.

6
7 ODOT will provide guidance documents and will work with local jurisdictions and others
8 to apply best practices that streamline development of alternative mobility targets.

9
10 ***Action 1F.4***

11
12 Alternative mobility targets may also be developed for facilities where an investment has
13 been, or is planned to be, made that provide significantly more capacity than is needed to
14 serve the forecasted traffic demand based on the existing adopted local comprehensive
15 plan. In these situations, it is possible to preserve that excess capacity for traffic growth
16 beyond the established planning horizon or traffic growth resulting from local legislative
17 plan amendments or plan amendments associated with OAR 731-017.

18
19 ***Action 1F.5***

20
21 For purposes of evaluating amendments to transportation system plans, acknowledged
22 comprehensive plans and land use regulations subject to OAR 660-12-0060, in situations
23 where the volume to capacity ratio or alternative mobility target for a highway segment,
24 intersection or interchange is currently above the mobility targets in Table 6 or Table 7 or
25 those otherwise approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission, or is projected to
26 be above the mobility targets at the planning horizon, and transportation improvements
27 are not planned within the planning horizon to bring performance to the established
28 target, the mobility target is to avoid further degradation. If an amendment subject to
29 OAR 660-012-0060 increases the volume to capacity ratio further, or degrades the
30 performance of a facility so that it does not meet an adopted mobility target at the
31 planning horizon, it will significantly affect the facility unless it falls within the
32 thresholds listed below for a small increase in traffic.

33
34 In addition to the capacity increasing improvements that may be required to mitigate
35 impacts, other performance improving actions to consider include, but are not limited to:

- 36
37
- System connectivity improvements for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians.
 - Transportation demand management (TDM) methods to reduce the need for additional capacity.
 - Multi-modal (bicycle, pedestrian, transit) opportunities to reduce vehicle demand.
 - Operational improvements to maximize use of the existing system.
 - Land use techniques such as trip caps / budgets to manage trip generation.
- 38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

1
2 In applying “avoid further degradation” for state highway facilities already operating
3 above the mobility targets in Table 6 or Table 7 or those otherwise approved by the
4 Oregon Transportation Commission, or facilities projected to be above the mobility
5 targets at the planning horizon, a small increase in traffic does not cause “further
6 degradation” of the facility.

7
8 The threshold for a small increase in traffic between the existing plan and the proposed
9 amendment is defined in terms of the increase in total average daily trip volumes as
10 follows:

- 11
- 12 • Any proposed amendment that does not increase the average daily trips by more
13 than 400.
- 14
- 15 • Any proposed amendment that increases the average daily trips by more than 400
16 but less than 1001 for state facilities where:
 - 17 ○ The annual average daily traffic is less than 5,000 for a two-lane highway
 - 18 ○ The annual average daily traffic is less than 15,000 for a three-lane
19 highway
 - 20 ○ The annual average daily traffic is less than 10,000 for a four-lane
21 highway
 - 22 ○ The annual average daily traffic is less than 25,000 for a five-lane
23 highway
- 24
- 25 • If the increase in traffic between the existing plan and the proposed amendment is
26 more than 1000 average daily trips, then it is not considered a small increase in
27 traffic and the amendment causes further degradation of the facility and would be
28 subject to existing processes for resolution.
- 29

30 In applying OHP mobility targets to analyze mitigation, ODOT recognizes that there are
31 many variables and levels of uncertainty in calculating volume-to-capacity ratios,
32 particularly over a specified planning horizon. After negotiating reasonable levels of
33 mitigation for actions required under OAR 660-012-0060, ODOT considers calculated
34 values for v/c ratios that are within 0.03 of the adopted target in the OHP to be considered
35 in compliance with the target. The adopted mobility target still applies for determining
36 significant affect under OAR 660-012-0060.

37
38 ***Action 1F.6***

39
40 When making recommendations to local governments about development permit
41 applications and potential actions for mitigation related to local development proposals
42 and criteria consider and balance the following:

- 43
- 44 • OHP mobility targets;
- 45
- 46 • Community livability objectives;

- 1
2
- State and local economic development objectives;
 - 3
 - 4 • Safety for all modes of travel; and
 - 5
 - 6 • Opportunities to meet mobility needs for all modes of travel.
 - 7

8 Encourage local jurisdictions to consider OHP mobility targets when preparing local
9 development ordinances and approval criteria to evaluate proposed development
10 applications that do not trigger Section 660-012-0060 of the TPR.

11
12 ***Action 1F.7***

13
14 Consider OHP mobility targets as guidance to ODOT’s highway access management
15 program. Balance economic development objectives of properties abutting state highways
16 with transportation safety and access management objectives of state highways in a
17 manner consistent with local transportation system plans and the land uses permitted in
18 acknowledged local comprehensive plans.

19
20 When evaluating OHP mobility targets in access management decisions for unsignalized
21 intersections consider the following:

- 22
- The highest priority for the use of OHP mobility targets in guiding access
23 management practices is to address the state highway through traffic movements
24 and the movements exiting the state highway facility.
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27 • When evaluating traffic movements from an approach entering or crossing a state
28 highway, the priority is to consider the safety of the movements. While a v/c ratio
29 for a specific movement greater than 1.0 is an indication of a capacity problem, it
30 does not necessarily mean the traffic movement is unsafe. Apply engineering
31 practices and disciplines in the analysis and design of highway approaches to
32 ensure traffic movements meet safety objectives for the program.
 - 33

34 Private approaches at signalized intersections will be treated as all other signalized
35 intersections under OHP Action 1F.1.

36
37 ***Action 1F.8***

38
39 Consider OHP mobility targets when implementing operational improvements such as
40 traffic signals and ITS improvements on the state highway system. The OHP mobility
41 targets are meant to be used as a guide to compare the relative benefits of potential
42 operational solutions rather than as a firm standard to be met. The main goal of
43 operational projects is to improve system performance - which may include mobility,
44 safety or other factors - from current or projected conditions.

1 ***Action 1F.9***

2
3 Enhance coordination and consistency between planning and project design decisions
4 whenever possible. Ensure that project development processes and design decisions take
5 into account statewide mobility and economic objectives, including design standards,
6 while balancing community mobility, livability and economic development objectives
7 and expectations. Consider practical design principles that take a systematic approach to
8 transportation solutions in planning and project development processes. Practical design
9 principles strive to deliver the broadest benefits to the transportation system possible
10 within expected resources.

11
12 ***Action 1F.10***

13
14 The 2011 amendments to OHP Policy 1F and associated amendments to the TPR may
15 lead to impacts in traffic mobility in specific corridors and on the overall state highway
16 system that cannot be fully anticipated. ODOT shall evaluate the effectiveness of the
17 policy in meeting broad objectives, the impacts on transportation system performance and
18 safety, and any unintended consequences resulting from implementation within three
19 years of adoption of this Action. Following the initial review, the mobility targets and
20 associated policies will be reviewed periodically based on a schedule determined by the
21 Oregon Transportation Commission.

Table 6: Volume to Capacity Ratio Targets for Peak Hour Operating Conditions

VOLUME TO CAPACITY RATIO TARGETS OUTSIDE METRO ^{A,B,C,D}							
Highway Category	Inside Urban Growth Boundary					Outside Urban Growth Boundary	
	STA ^E	MPO	Non-MPO Outside of STAs where non-freeway posted speed <= 35 mph, or a Designated UBA	Non-MPO outside of STAs where non-freeway speed > 35 mph, but <45 mph	Non-MPO where non-freeway speed limit >= 45 mph	Unincorporated Communities ^F	Rural Lands
Interstate Highways	N/A	0.85	N/A	N/A	0.80	0.70	0.70
Statewide Expressways	N/A	0.85	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.70	0.70
Freight Route on a Statewide Highway	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.80	0.80	0.70	0.70
Statewide (not a Freight Route)	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.85	0.80	0.75	0.70
Freight Route on a Regional or District Highway	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.75	0.70
Expressway on a Regional or District Highway	N/A	0.90	N/A	0.85	0.85	0.75	0.70
Regional Highways	1.0	0.95	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.75	0.70
District / Local Interest Roads	1.0	0.95	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.80	0.75

Notes for Table 6

^A Unless the Oregon Transportation Commission has adopted an alternative mobility target for the impacted facility, the mobility targets in Tables 6 are considered standards for purposes of determining compliance with OAR 660-012, the Transportation Planning Rule.

^B For the purposes of this policy, the peak hour shall be the 30th highest annual hour. This approximates weekday peak hour traffic in larger urban areas. Alternatives to the 30th highest annual hour may be considered and established through alternative mobility target processes.

^C Highway design requirements are addressed in the Highway Design Manual (HDM).

^D See Action 1F.1 for additional technical details.

^E Interstates and Expressways shall not be identified as Special Transportation Areas.

^F For unincorporated communities inside MPO boundaries, MPO mobility targets shall apply.

Table 7: Volume to Capacity Ratio Targets within Portland Metropolitan Region

VOLUME TO CAPACITY RATIO TARGETS INSIDE METRO ^{A,B}		
Location	Target	
	1 st hour	2 nd hour
Central City Regional Centers Town Centers Main Streets Station Communities	1.1	.99
Corridors Industrial Areas Intermodal Facilities Employment Areas Inner Neighborhoods Outer Neighborhoods	.99	.99
I-84 (from I-5 to I-205)	1.1	.99
I-5 North (from Marquam Bridge to Interstate Bridge)	1.1	.99
OR 99E (from Lincoln Street to OR 224 Interchange)	1.1	.99
US 26 (from I-405 to Sylvan Interchange)	1.1	.99
I-405 ^C (I-5 South to I-5 North)	1.1	.99
Other Principal Arterial Routes I-205 ^C I-84 (east of I-205) I-5 (Marquam Bridge to Wilsonville) ^C OR 217 US 26 (west of Sylvan) US 30 OR 8 (Murray Blvd to Brookwood Avenue) ^C OR 224 OR 47 OR 213 242 nd /US26 in Gresham OR 99W	.99	.99

Notes for Table 7: Deficiency thresholds for two hour peak operating conditions through the planning horizon for state highway sections within the Portland metropolitan area urban growth boundary.

^A Unless the Oregon Transportation Commission has adopted an alternative mobility target for the impacted facility, the mobility targets in Tables 7 are considered standards for purposes of determining compliance with OAR 660-012, the Transportation Planning Rule.

^B The volume-to-capacity ratios in Table 7 are for the highest two consecutive hours of weekday traffic volumes. The second hour is defined as the single 60-minute period either before or after the peak 60-minute period, whichever is highest. See Action 1.F.1 for additional technical details.

^C A corridor refinement plan, which will likely include a tailored mobility policy, is required by the Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Plan for this corridor.



Summary of Amendments to the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Regarding Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments



Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012-0060

Summary of New Sections

Rezoning Consistent with Comprehensive Plan Map – Section (9)

If a proposed rezoning is consistent with the existing comprehensive plan map designation, and consistent with the acknowledged transportation system plan, then it can be approved without considering the effect on the transportation system. Special provisions in subsection (c) apply if the area was added to the urban growth boundary (UGB).

Compact Urban Development – Section (10)

Local governments can designate areas where traffic congestion (e.g., v/c ratio) does not have to be considered when rezoning property, amending comprehensive plan designations or amending development regulations.

- Subsection (b) lists the requirements for these multimodal mixed-use areas (MMA):
 - Must allow a range of uses, including residential (allowing at least 12 units per acre), offices, retail, services, restaurants, parks, plazas, civic, cultural and multi-story commercial buildings.
 - Must have appropriate development standards, including building entrances oriented to the street, a connected street network within and to the MMA, pedestrian-oriented street design, transit stops (if transit exists) and reduced requirements for off-street parking.
 - Must limit or prohibit low-intensity uses such as industrial, automobile sales, automobile services and drive-throughs.
 - Must be entirely within a UGB.
- If the MMA is near a freeway interchange, then the potential for backups on the off-ramps must be considered (see subsection (c)) and concurrence from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is required.

Economic Development – Section (11)

If a proposed rezoning qualifies as economic development, then it can be approved without mitigating the full effect on traffic.

- Two definitions of economic development in subsection (a):
 - General definition: “Industrial or traded-sector jobs created or retained,” with details for these terms in paragraph (a)(C).
 - Smaller cities outside the Willamette Valley can use a broader definition that adds “prime industrial land” and “other employment uses” (which could include retail).
- Subsection (b) allows “partial mitigation,” but does not define how much mitigation is required because it will be different in every case based on the balance of economic benefit and traffic impacts.
 - Local government determines if benefits outweigh negative effects on the local system.
 - ODOT, coordinating with Business Oregon, makes the determination for the state system.
- Subsection (c) requires coordination with state, regional and other local governments.

Summary of Changes within Existing Sections

Transportation Demand Management – Subsection (1)(c)

When determining whether or not there is a “significant effect,” transportation demand management – or any other enforceable, ongoing condition of approval that would reduce the amount of traffic generated – can be factored in to eliminate or diminish the significant effect.

Other Modes, Facilities or Locations – Subsection (2)(e)

- Three new options for addressing a significant effect, including improvements to:
 - Other modes (example: the significant effect is motor vehicle traffic congestion, the mitigation could be adding sidewalks and bicycle lanes).
 - Other facilities (example: the significant effect occurs along one street, the mitigation could be on another parallel street).
 - Other locations (example: the significant effect occurs at one intersection, the mitigation could be at other intersections along the same highway).
- If the significant effect occurs on a state highway, then these options are only allowed with ODOT concurrence. If on a county road within a city, then county concurrence is required.

Failing Facilities – Subsection (3)(a)

If a facility is projected to fail to meet the performance standards at the planning horizon, and if there are no funded improvements that would fix this, then a proposed rezoning must avoid further degradation at the time of development, but is not required to provide mitigation to meet the performance standards.

Additional Information

Complete Rule Text as Amended

www.oregon.gov/LCD/docs/rulemaking/2009-11/TPR/TPR_Amendments-Legislative_Style.pdf

Rulemaking Process

These amendments were adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission December 8, 2011 and took effect January 1, 2012.

www.oregon.gov/LCD/Rulemaking_TPR_2011.shtml

Oregon Highway Plan

The Oregon Transportation Commission adopted amendments to Oregon Highway Plan in coordination with the TPR amendments.

www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/OHP2011.shtml

Staff Contact

Matt Crall, Land Use and Transportation Planner
matthew.crall@state.or.us – 503-373-0050 x272

Disclaimer

This brief summary does not explain all of the requirements. Applying these rules to any specific situation requires careful consideration of the full text of the rule, other administrative rules, local regulations, the Oregon Highway Plan and relevant case law.

January 18, 2012

Amendments to the Transportation Planning Rules Oregon Administrative Rules 660-012-0005 & 0060

Adopted by the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission December 9, 2011.
Filed with the Secretary of State December 30, 2011. Effective January 1, 2012.
Additions are **bold and underlined**. Deletions are [~~struck through in brackets~~].

660-012-0005

Definitions

....

(7) "Demand Management" means actions which are designed to change travel behavior in order to improve performance of transportation facilities and to reduce need for additional road capacity. Methods may include, but are not limited to, the use of alternative modes, ride-sharing and vanpool programs, [~~and~~]trip-reduction ordinances, **shifting to off-peak periods, and reduced or paid parking**.

...

660-012-0060

Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments

(1) [~~Where~~]**If** an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation (**including a zoning map**) would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, **then** the local government **must** [~~shall~~] put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule, **unless the amendment is allowed under section (3), (9) or (10) of this rule** [~~to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility~~]. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:

(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);

(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or

(c) **Result in any of the effects listed in paragraphs (A) through (C) of this subsection based on projected conditions** [~~As~~]measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted [~~transportation system plan~~]**TSP. As part of evaluating projected conditions, the amount of traffic projected to be generated within the area of the amendment may be reduced if the amendment includes an enforceable, ongoing requirement that would demonstrably limit traffic generation, including, but not limited to, transportation demand management. This reduction may diminish or completely eliminate the significant effect of the amendment.**[~~;~~]

(A) [~~Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in t~~]**Types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;**

(B) **Degrade** [~~Reduce~~] the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility **such that it would not meet the** [~~below the minimum acceptable~~]-performance standards identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or

(C) **Degrade** [~~Worsen~~] the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to **not meet the** [~~perform below the minimum acceptable~~]performance standards identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.

(2) [~~Where~~]**If** a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, [~~compliance with section (1) shall be accomplished~~]**then the local government must ensure that allowed**

land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards of the facility measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP through one or a combination of the [following:] remedies listed in (a) through (e) below, unless the amendment meets the balancing test in subsection (2)(e) of this section or qualifies for partial mitigation in section (11) of this rule. A local government using subsection (2)(e), section (3), section (10) or section (11) to approve an amendment recognizes that additional motor vehicle traffic congestion may result and that other facility providers would not be expected to provide additional capacity for motor vehicles in response to this congestion.

- (a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.
- (b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.
- ~~(c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.]~~
- ~~(c)[d]~~) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
- ~~(d)[e]~~) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including, **but not limited to**, transportation system management measures ~~[, demand management]~~ or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall, as part of the amendment, specify when

measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.

(e) Providing improvements that would benefit modes other than the significantly affected mode, improvements to facilities other than the significantly affected facility, or improvements at other locations, if the provider of the significantly affected facility provides a written statement that the system-wide benefits are sufficient to balance the significant effect, even though the improvements would not result in consistency for all performance standards.

(3) Notwithstanding sections (1) and (2) of this rule, a local government may approve an amendment that would significantly affect an existing transportation facility without assuring that the allowed land uses are consistent with the function, capacity and performance standards of the facility where:

~~[(a) The facility is already performing below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan on the date the amendment application is submitted;]~~

- ~~(a)[b]~~) In the absence of the amendment, planned transportation facilities, improvements and services as set forth in section (4) of this rule would not be adequate to achieve consistency with the identified function, capacity or performance standard for that facility by the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP;
- ~~(b)[e]~~) Development resulting from the amendment will, at a minimum, mitigate the impacts of the amendment in a manner that avoids further degradation to the performance of the facility by the time of the development through one or a combination of transportation improvements or measures;
- ~~(c)[d]~~) The amendment does not involve property located in an interchange area as defined in paragraph (4)(d)(C); and
- ~~(d)[e]~~) For affected state highways, ODOT provides a written statement that the proposed funding and timing for the identified mitigation improvements or measures are, at a

minimum, sufficient to avoid further degradation to the performance of the affected state highway. However, if a local government provides the appropriate ODOT regional office with written notice of a proposed amendment in a manner that provides ODOT reasonable opportunity to submit a written statement into the record of the local government proceeding, and ODOT does not provide a written statement, then the local government may proceed with applying subsections (a) through (c) of this section.

(4) Determinations under sections (1)-(3) of this rule shall be coordinated with affected transportation facility and service providers and other affected local governments.

(a) In determining whether an amendment has a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation facility under subsection (1)(c) of this rule, local governments shall rely on existing transportation facilities and services and on the planned transportation facilities, improvements and services set forth in subsections (b) and (c) below.

(b) Outside of interstate interchange areas, the following are considered planned facilities, improvements and services:

(A) Transportation facilities, improvements or services that are funded for construction or implementation in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program or a locally or regionally adopted transportation improvement program or capital improvement plan or program of a transportation service provider.

(B) Transportation facilities, improvements or services that are authorized in a local transportation system plan and for which a funding plan or mechanism is in place or approved. These include, but are not limited to, transportation facilities, improvements or services for which: transportation systems development charge revenues are being collected; a local improvement district or reimbursement district has been established or will be established prior to

development; a development agreement has been adopted; or conditions of approval to fund the improvement have been adopted.

(C) Transportation facilities, improvements or services in a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) area that are part of the area's federally-approved, financially constrained regional transportation system plan.

(D) Improvements to state highways that are included as planned improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when ODOT provides a written statement that the improvements are reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the planning period.

(E) Improvements to regional and local roads, streets or other transportation facilities or services that are included as planned improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when the local government(s) or transportation service provider(s) responsible for the facility, improvement or service provides a written statement that the facility, improvement or service is reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the planning period.

(c) Within interstate interchange areas, the improvements included in (b)(A)-(C) are considered planned facilities, improvements and services, except where:

(A) ODOT provides a written statement that the proposed funding and timing of mitigation measures are sufficient to avoid a significant adverse impact on the Interstate Highway system, then local governments may also rely on the improvements identified in paragraphs (b)(D) and (E) of this section; or

(B) There is an adopted interchange area management plan, then local governments may also rely on the improvements identified in that plan and which are also

identified in paragraphs (b)(D) and (E) of this section.

(d) As used in this section and section (3):

(A) Planned interchange means new interchanges and relocation of existing interchanges that are authorized in an adopted transportation system plan or comprehensive plan;

(B) Interstate highway means Interstates 5, 82, 84, 105, 205 and 405; and

(C) Interstate interchange area means:

(i) Property within **one-quarter**~~[one-half]~~ mile **of the ramp terminal intersection** of an existing or planned interchange on an Interstate Highway~~[as measured from the center point of the interchange]~~; or

(ii) The interchange area as defined in the Interchange Area Management Plan adopted as an amendment to the Oregon Highway Plan.

(e) For purposes of this section, a written statement provided pursuant to paragraphs (b)(D), (b)(E) or (c)(A) provided by ODOT, a local government or transportation facility provider, as appropriate, shall be conclusive in determining whether a transportation facility, improvement or service is a planned transportation facility, improvement or service. In the absence of a written statement, a local government can only rely upon planned transportation facilities, improvements and services identified in paragraphs (b)(A)-(C) to determine whether there is a significant effect that requires application of the remedies in section (2).

(5) The presence of a transportation facility or improvement shall not be a basis for an exception to allow residential, commercial, institutional or industrial development on rural lands under this division or OAR 660-004-0022 and 660-004-0028.

(6) In determining whether proposed land uses would affect or be consistent with planned transportation facilities as provided in **sections** ~~[0060]~~(1) and (2), local governments shall give

full credit for potential reduction in vehicle trips for uses located in mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly centers, and neighborhoods as provided in **subsections** (a)-(d) below;

(a) Absent adopted local standards or detailed information about the vehicle trip reduction benefits of mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly development, local governments shall assume that uses located within a mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly center, or neighborhood, will generate 10% fewer daily and peak hour trips than are specified in available published estimates, such as those provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual that do not specifically account for the effects of mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly development. The 10% reduction allowed for by this section shall be available only if uses which rely solely on auto trips, such as gas stations, car washes, storage facilities, and motels are prohibited;

(b) Local governments shall use detailed or local information about the trip reduction benefits of mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly development where such information is available and presented to the local government. Local governments may, based on such information, allow reductions greater than the 10% reduction required in **subsection** (a) **above**;

(c) Where a local government assumes or estimates lower vehicle trip generation as provided in **subsection** (a) or (b) above, it shall assure through conditions of approval, site plans, or approval standards that subsequent development approvals support the development of a mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly center or neighborhood and provide for on-site bike and pedestrian connectivity and access to transit as provided for in **OAR 660-012-0045(3) and (4)**. The provision of on-site bike and pedestrian connectivity and access to transit may be accomplished through application of acknowledged ordinance provisions which comply with **OAR 660-012-0045(3) and (4)** or through conditions of approval or findings adopted with the plan

amendment that assure compliance with these rule requirements at the time of development approval; and

(d) The purpose of this section is to provide an incentive for the designation and implementation of pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use centers and neighborhoods by lowering the regulatory barriers to plan amendments which accomplish this type of development. The actual trip reduction benefits of mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly development will vary from case to case and may be somewhat higher or lower than presumed pursuant to **subsection** (a) above. The Commission concludes that this assumption is warranted given general information about the expected effects of mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly development and its intent to encourage changes to plans and development patterns. Nothing in this section is intended to affect the application of provisions in local plans or ordinances which provide for the calculation or assessment of systems development charges or in preparing conformity determinations required under the federal Clean Air Act.

(7) Amendments to acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations which meet all of the criteria listed in **subsections** (a)-(c) below shall include an amendment to the comprehensive plan, transportation system plan the adoption of a local street plan, access management plan, future street plan or other binding local transportation plan to provide for on-site alignment of streets or accessways with existing and planned arterial, collector, and local streets surrounding the site as necessary to implement the requirements in [Section] **OAR 660-012-0020(2)(b)** and [Section] **660-012-0045(3)** [~~of this division~~]:

- (a) The plan or land use regulation amendment results in designation of two or more acres of land for commercial use;
- (b) The local government has not adopted a TSP or local street plan which complies with [Section] **OAR 660-012-0020(2)(b)** or, in the Portland Metropolitan Area, has not complied with Metro's requirement for street connectivity as contained in Title 6, Section 3

of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan; and

(c) The proposed amendment would significantly affect a transportation facility as provided in **section** ~~0060~~(1).

(8) A "mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly center or neighborhood" for the purposes of this rule, means:

(a) Any one of the following:

- (A) An existing central business district or downtown;
- (B) An area designated as a central city, regional center, town center or main street in the Portland Metro 2040 Regional Growth Concept;
- (C) An area designated in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as a transit oriented development or a pedestrian district; or
- (D) An area designated as a special transportation area as provided for in the Oregon Highway Plan.

(b) An area other than those listed in **subsection** (a) **above** which includes or is planned to include the following characteristics:

- (A) A concentration of a variety of land uses in a well-defined area, including the following:
 - (i) Medium to high density residential development (12 or more units per acre);
 - (ii) Offices or office buildings;
 - (iii) Retail stores and services;
 - (iv) Restaurants; and
 - (v) Public open space or private open space which is available for public use, such as a park or plaza.
- (B) Generally include civic or cultural uses;
- (C) A core commercial area where multi-story buildings are permitted;
- (D) Buildings and building entrances oriented to streets;
- (E) Street connections and crossings that make the center safe and conveniently accessible from adjacent areas;

- (F) A network of streets and, where appropriate, accessways and major driveways that make it attractive and highly convenient for people to walk between uses within the center or neighborhood, including streets and major driveways within the center with wide sidewalks and other features, including pedestrian-oriented street crossings, street trees, pedestrian-scale lighting and on-street parking;
- (G) One or more transit stops (in urban areas with fixed route transit service); and
- (H) Limit or do not allow low-intensity or land extensive uses, such as most industrial uses, automobile sales and services, and drive-through services.

(9) Notwithstanding section (1) of this rule, a local government may find that an amendment to a zoning map does not significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility if all of the following requirements are met.

- (a) The proposed zoning is consistent with the existing comprehensive plan map designation and the amendment does not change the comprehensive plan map;**
- (b) The local government has an acknowledged TSP and the proposed zoning is consistent with the TSP; and**
- (c) The area subject to the zoning map amendment was not exempted from this rule at the time of an urban growth boundary amendment as permitted in OAR 660-024-0020(1)(d), or the area was exempted from this rule but the local government has a subsequently acknowledged TSP amendment that accounted for urbanization of the area.**

(10) Notwithstanding sections (1) and (2) of this rule, a local government may amend a functional plan, a comprehensive plan or a land use regulation without applying performance standards related to motor vehicle traffic congestion (e.g. volume to capacity ratio or V/C), delay or travel time if the amendment meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section. This section does not exempt a proposed amendment from other transportation performance standards or

policies that may apply including, but not limited to, safety for all modes, network connectivity for all modes (e.g. sidewalks, bicycle lanes) and accessibility for freight vehicles of a size and frequency required by the development.

(a) A proposed amendment qualifies for this section if it:

(A) is a map or text amendment affecting only land entirely within a multimodal mixed-use area (MMA); and

(B) is consistent with the definition of an MMA and consistent with the function of the MMA as described in the findings designating the MMA.

(b) For the purpose of this rule, “multimodal mixed-use area” or “MMA” means an area:

(A) with a boundary adopted by a local government as provided in subsection (d) or (e) of this section and that has been acknowledged;

(B) entirely within an urban growth boundary;

(C) with adopted plans and development regulations that allow the uses listed in paragraphs (8)(b)(A) through (C) of this rule and that require new development to be consistent with the characteristics listed in paragraphs (8)(b)(D) through (H) of this rule;

(D) with land use regulations that do not require the provision of off-street parking, or regulations that require lower levels of off-street parking than required in other areas and allow flexibility to meet the parking requirements (e.g. count on-street parking, allow long-term leases, allow shared parking); and

(E) located in one or more of the categories below:

(i) at least one-quarter mile from any ramp terminal intersection of existing or planned interchanges;

(ii) within the area of an adopted Interchange Area Management Plan

(IAMP) and consistent with the IAMP; or

(iii) within one-quarter mile of a ramp terminal intersection of an existing or planned interchange if the mainline facility provider has provided written concurrence with the MMA designation as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

(c) When a mainline facility provider reviews an MMA designation as provided in subparagraph (b)(E)(iii) of this section, the provider must consider the factors listed in paragraph (A) of this subsection.

(A) The potential for operational or safety effects to the interchange area and the mainline highway, specifically considering:

(i) whether the interchange area has a crash rate that is higher than the statewide crash rate for similar facilities;

(ii) whether the interchange area is in the top ten percent of locations identified by the safety priority index system (SPIS) developed by ODOT; and

(iii) whether existing or potential future traffic queues on the interchange exit ramps extend onto the mainline highway or the portion of the ramp needed to safely accommodate deceleration.

(B) If there are operational or safety effects as described in paragraph (A) of this subsection, the effects may be addressed by an agreement between the local government and the facility provider regarding traffic management plans favoring traffic movements away from the interchange, particularly those facilitating clearing traffic queues on the interchange exit ramps.

(d) A local government may designate an MMA by adopting an amendment to the comprehensive plan or land use regulations to delineate the boundary following an existing zone, multiple existing zones, an urban renewal area, other existing

boundary, or establishing a new boundary. The designation must be accompanied by findings showing how the area meets the definition of an MMA. Designation of an MMA is not subject to the requirements in sections (1) and (2) of this rule.

(e) A local government may designate an MMA on an area where comprehensive plan map designations or land use regulations do not meet the definition, if all of the other elements meet the definition, by concurrently adopting comprehensive plan or land use regulation amendments necessary to meet the definition. Such amendments are not subject to performance standards related to motor vehicle traffic congestion, delay or travel time.

(11) A local government may approve an amendment with partial mitigation as provided in section (2) of this rule if the amendment complies with subsection (a) of this section, the amendment meets the balancing test in subsection (b) of this section, and the local government coordinates as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

(a) The amendment must meet paragraphs (A) and (B) of this subsection or meet paragraph (D) of this subsection.

(A) Create direct benefits in terms of industrial or traded-sector jobs created or retained by limiting uses to industrial or traded-sector industries.

(B) Not allow retail uses, except limited retail incidental to industrial or traded sector development, not to exceed five percent of the net developable area.

(C) For the purpose of this section:

(i) "industrial" means employment activities generating income from the production, handling or distribution of goods including, but not limited to, manufacturing, assembly, fabrication, processing, storage, logistics, warehousing, importation, distribution and

transshipment and research and development.

(ii) “traded-sector” means industries in which member firms sell their goods or services into markets for which national or international competition exists.

(D) Notwithstanding paragraphs (A) and (B) of this subsection, an amendment complies with subsection (a) if all of the following conditions are met:

(i) The amendment is within a city with a population less than 10,000 and outside of a Metropolitan Planning Organization.

(ii) The amendment would provide land for “Other Employment Use” or “Prime Industrial Land” as those terms are defined in OAR 660-009-0005.

(iii) The amendment is located outside of the Willamette Valley as defined in ORS 215.010.

(E) The provisions of paragraph (D) of this subsection are repealed on January 1, 2017.

(b) A local government may accept partial mitigation only if the local government determines that the benefits outweigh the negative effects on local transportation facilities and the local government receives from the provider of any transportation facility that would be significantly affected written concurrence that the benefits outweigh the negative effects on their transportation facilities. If the amendment significantly affects a state highway, then ODOT must coordinate with the Oregon Business Development Department regarding the economic and job creation benefits of the proposed amendment as defined in subsection (a) of this section. The requirement to obtain concurrence from a provider is satisfied if the local government provides notice as required by subsection (c) of this section and the provider does not

respond in writing (either concurring or non-concurring) within forty-five days.

(c) A local government that proposes to use this section must coordinate with Oregon Business Development Department, Department of Land Conservation and Development, area commission on transportation, metropolitan planning organization, and transportation providers and local governments directly impacted by the proposal to allow opportunities for comments on whether the proposed amendment meets the definition of economic development, how it would affect transportation facilities and the adequacy of proposed mitigation. Informal consultation is encouraged throughout the process starting with pre-application meetings. Coordination has the meaning given in ORS 197.015 and Goal 2 and must include notice at least 45 days before the first evidentiary hearing. Notice must include the following:

(A) Proposed amendment.

(B) Proposed mitigating actions from section (2) of this rule.

(C) Analysis and projections of the extent to which the proposed amendment in combination with proposed mitigating actions would fall short of being consistent with the function, capacity, and performance standards of transportation facilities.

(D) Findings showing how the proposed amendment meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section.

(E) Findings showing that the benefits of the proposed amendment outweigh the negative effects on transportation facilities.

Stat. Auth.: ORS 183 & 197.040

Stats. Implemented: ORS 195.025, 197.040, 197.230, 197.245, 197.610 - 197.625, 197.628 - 197.646, 197.712, 197.717 & 197.732



INFORMATION SHEET

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE 0060 SECTION (10): MULTIMODAL MIXED-USE AREAS



[September 18, 2012: Working Draft]

Overview

Within urban growth boundaries, local jurisdictions may adopt a Multimodal Mixed-use Area (MMA), where a local jurisdiction does not need to apply congestion performance standards (state or local) to proposed plan amendments. The act of designating a MMA is also not subject to significant effect evaluation requirements. For proposed MMA designations near highway interchanges, the local jurisdiction must obtain written concurrence from the impacted facility provider, often the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

Potential Actions and Considerations for MMA Designation

- Designating a MMA requires a local legislative land use action to amend the local comprehensive plan to adopt the boundary and if necessary, adopt implementation measures through ordinance amendments (e.g., permitted land uses, on- and off-site development standards, transportation adequacy and design standards). Legislatively adopting a MMA is subject to a local jurisdiction's noticing requirements and must be supported by Statewide Planning Goal findings, including findings for Goal 12 – Transportation, with attention to TPR Sections 0060(8) and (10), and findings of compliance with their own local Comprehensive Plan.
- Notices of proposed and adopted MMAs need to be sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) using the same procedures that apply for any plan amendment. A basic checklist of MMA considerations, Frequently Asked Questions, and sample findings have been developed by DLCD to assist local jurisdictions. (See Attachments).
- It is recommended to coordinate with DLCD and ODOT early in the local planning process, particularly when the potential MMA designation may impact a state facility. ODOT staff can assist the local jurisdiction with identifying any safety or operational concerns on state facilities.
- The decision to designate a MMA does not need to consider local congestion standards or the mobility performance targets in Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) Tables 6 and 7. However, transportation facility providers retain a role for assessing operational and safety performance on their facilities.
- When MMAs are proposed within one-quarter mile of an interchange's ramp terminal intersection, the jurisdiction adopting the MMA designation must obtain

concurrence from the facility provider. The facility provider, often ODOT, must consider safety, including crash rates and top 10 percent Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) locations, and the potential for exit ramp backups onto the mainline in current conditions or those anticipated under current plans, rather than mobility performance standards or targets. Safety or operational concerns would not prohibit ODOT's concurrence; rather they would be a consideration in the designation process and any resulting management agreement to ensure the system is managed safely given multiple objectives.

- ODOT concurrence with the MMA designation within a quarter mile of an interchange ramp terminal will be in the form of a letter from the applicable Region Manager.
- If ODOT finds that there are interchange-related operational or safety issues, these concerns may be addressed in an agreement, often formalized in an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between ODOT and the local jurisdiction. The analysis of operational and safety issues should consider:
 - Recent history on safety for all modes in the impacted area,
 - Recent or current data on queuing on the exit ramps, and
 - Readily available traffic projections, often from the Transportation System Plan (TSP), given current land use assumptions for the area.

Given the speculative nature of potential development in a MMA area, it is unlikely that traffic analysis of potential future conditions can be performed at the time of MMA designation. However, the IGA could include potential triggers and actions and/or management strategies that could be implemented if future conditions are different than expected.

- The TPR does not require that the impacts to the interchange or mainline facility be fully mitigated at the time of MMA designation. Potential impacts can be addressed in the future as specified in an agreement and management plan that address current and potential future operational and safety issues.
- The agreement may include a monitoring element and agreed upon triggers for improvements or management strategies to address safety and operational issues that arise in future years as identified through system monitoring. The agreement may also include funding strategies and identification of responsibilities for funding and implementation.
- The agreement may consider and address issues on the local transportation system, for modes other than motor vehicles, and other strategies that ensure continued compliance with -0060(8) (E) through (H).

- ODOT will also have a role in reviewing proposed MMA designations within the management area of an adopted Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP). In these cases, ODOT will review how the proposed MMA boundaries relate to the IAMP management area and whether any amendments to proposed land uses and development requirements are consistent with the land use and transportation assumptions and recommendations in the IAMP. If the MMA is determined to be consistent with the adopted IAMP or includes local requirements for IAMP consistency, ODOT can support the designation. If inconsistencies are found, ODOT and the jurisdiction will need to take steps to either address inconsistencies through mitigation, such as a traffic management plan, or suggest amendments to the IAMP to provide consistency.

DRAFT

MMA Designation Checklist

This is a basic checklist that local communities can use to help determine if an area meets the basic definition of an MMA. This sheet includes only a summary of each requirement. For complete requirements, please see OAR 660-012-0060.

<input type="checkbox"/> An MMA must meet EACH requirement in this column	
<input type="checkbox"/>	MMA Boundary (10)(b)(A)
<input type="checkbox"/>	MMA entirely within a UGB (10)(b)(B)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adopted plans & regulations that allow specified uses and require certain development standards: (10)(b)(C)
<input type="checkbox"/> An MMA must meet EACH requirement in this column	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow a concentration of a variety of uses, including: (8)(b)(A)
<input type="checkbox"/> An MMA must meet EACH requirement in this column	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow medium to high density residential development at 12 units per acre or more (8)(b)(A)(i)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow offices or office buildings (8)(b)(A)(ii)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow retail stores and services (8)(b)(A)(iii)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow restaurants (8)(b)(A)(iv)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow public open space or private open space open to the public (8)(b)(A)(v)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow civic or cultural uses (8)(b)(B)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Allow core commercial area with multi-story buildings (8)(b)(C)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Require buildings and building entrances to be oriented to streets (8)(b)(D)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Require street connections & crossings to access center (8)(b)(E)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Require pedestrian-centric network of streets & ways within center (8)(b)(F)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Require one or more transit stops in areas with transit service (8)(b)(G)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Limit or prohibit low-intensity uses e.g. drive through services (8)(b)(H)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do not require off-street parking, or require less parking than other areas (10)(b)(D)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Located at least ¼ mile from an interchange, adopted in an IAMP, or with concurrence (10)(b)(E)
<input type="checkbox"/> An MMA must meet AT LEAST ONE requirement in this column	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Located at least ¼ mile from a ramp terminal intersection (10)(b)(E)(i)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Located within the area of, and consistent with an adopted IAMP (10)(b)(E)(ii)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Written concurrence with the MMA provided by the mainline facility provider (10)(b)(E)(iii)

MMA Sample Findings

These sample findings are for the quaint (and fictional) Oregon town of Planwell, which has decided to adopt a multimodal mixed-use area (MMA) designation for their downtown area. Planwell has a lovely little pedestrian-friendly main street with historic commercial buildings. However, a part of downtown Planwell within the proposed MMA is currently underdeveloped, and the city anticipates demand for more mixed-use development in and near downtown. There is a freeway interchange located near downtown Planwell.

There is currently enough transportation capacity, but in a few years, with additional development, there might be some traffic capacity issues at a few intersections. Planwell wants to strengthen their downtown and provide for additional development, but is concerned that current rules would require more automobile capacity than they want, or can afford to build.

Planwell has adopted the TGM Model Development Code, 3rd Edition. Code references below are to the Model Code. In cases where the Model Code provides for options, Planwell generally chose the most favorable option for implementing an MMA.

The proposed MMA boundary around downtown Planwell includes all land within the Downtown (D) zone district, and no land outside of the D zone district.

The findings reference two exhibits which are not reproduced here. Exhibit A includes all of the necessary maps. These maps show the MMA boundary, local streets and sidewalks, UGB, location of the freeway interchange, and transit routes and stops. Exhibit B includes the interchange monitoring and implementation plan negotiated by the city and ODOT and the concurrence letter from ODOT.

Section references to the TPR refer to OAR 660-012-0060.

These are sample findings and do not necessarily constitute adequate findings for any non-fictional community.

- I. **(10)(b)(A)** Requires the MMA to be an area “With a boundary adopted by a local government as provided in subsection (d) or (e) of this section and that has been acknowledged.”

Findings: Exhibit A includes a map of the proposed boundary around downtown Planwell. The boundary generally follows Second Street on the north, Beech Avenue on the east, Planwell Creek to the south, and Ivy Avenue to the west. The proposed boundary is identical to the limits of the city’s Downtown (D) zoning district.

Conclusion: This requirement can be met through the adoption and acknowledgement of the proposed MMA boundary in the Planwell Comprehensive Plan.

- II. **(10)(b)(B)** Requires MMAs to be located “*Entirely within an urban growth boundary.*”

Findings: Exhibit A includes a map of the proposed MMA boundary within the Planwell UGB.

Conclusion: The proposed MMA boundary is located entirely within the city’s UGB. This requirement is met.

- III. **(10)(b)(C)** Requires MMAs to have “*adopted plans and development regulations that allow the uses listed in paragraphs (8)(b)(A) through (C) of this rule and that require new development to be consistent with the characteristics listed in paragraphs (8)(b)(D) through (H) of this rule.*”

- A. (8)(b)(A) Requires MMAs to allow “*A concentration of a variety of land uses in a well-defined area, including the following:*”

Findings: The MMA is centered on Main Street, which includes a variety of businesses, civic uses, and some residences located on upper stories. These uses are more densely located than in other parts of Planwell.

1. (8)(b)(A)(i) Requires MMAs to allow “*Medium to high density residential development (12 or more units per acre).*”

Findings: The D zone allows multifamily residential development in Section 2.2.030 subject to special standards in Section 2.3.080 requiring residences to not be located on the ground floor on Main Street. There are some structure setback requirements set out in Table 2.2.040E pertaining to buildings along alleys and adjacent to residential zones. There is a 60 foot height limit, with a 15 foot bonus allowed if the top story is residential. The height may be increased through a Conditional Use process. Within these limits there is no restriction on the density of residential units that may be developed.

2. (8)(b)(A)(ii) Requires MMAs to allow “*Offices or office buildings.*”

Findings: Offices are permitted outright in the D zone in Section 2.2.030.

3. (8)(b)(A)(iii) Requires MMAs to allow “*Retail stores and services.*”

Findings: Commercial retail sales and services are permitted outright in the D zone in Section 2.2.030.

4. (8)(b)(A)(vi) Requires MMAs to allow “*Restaurants*”

Findings: Restaurants are permitted outright as a commercial retail service use in the D zone in Section 2.2.030.

5. (8)(b)(A)(v) Requires MMAs to allow “*Public open space or private open space which is available for public use, such as a park or plaza.*”

Findings: Parks and open spaces are allowed in the D zone in Section 2.2.030 subject to special standards in Section 2.3.200.

- B. (8)(b)(B) Requires MMAs to “*Generally include civic or cultural uses.*”

Findings: Civic and cultural uses are allowed in the D zone in section 2.2.030. The proposed MMA currently includes Planwell’s City Hall, Post Office, Library, and Community Center.

- C. (8)(b)(C) Requires MMAs to allow “*A core commercial area where multi-story buildings are permitted.*”

Findings: The proposed MMA is centered on Downtown Planwell, which includes the Main Street core commercial area. There are buildings of up to 4 stories on Main Street. The D zone permits buildings of up to 60 feet in height in Section 2.2.040.D, with a 15 foot height bonus available if the top story is residential. The height may be further increased through a Conditional Use process.

- D. (8)(b)(D) Requires MMAs to have development standards where “*buildings and building entrances oriented to streets.*”

Findings: Buildings within the D zone have a build-to line of zero feet along streets (Table 2.2.040.E), and 80% of the building abutting street frontage must be built to the build-to line (Section 3.2.040.B.1.). Building entrances are required to face an abutting street (Section 3.2.040.B.2.), or if this configuration is not possible, have a pedestrian walkway connect the primary entrance to the street.

- E. (8)(b)(E) Requires MMAs to have “*street connections and crossings that make the center safe and conveniently accessible from adjacent areas.*”

Findings: The proposed MMA is located within an existing neighborhood composed of a series of blocks within a street grid. The MMA is surrounded on three sides by this street network. Each of the streets adjacent to the MMA has sidewalks on both sides of the street. There are crosswalks at each intersection adjacent to the MMA. A map of the MMA and nearby areas showing the local street network is included in Exhibit A.

- F. (8)(b)(F) Requires MMAs to have “*a network of streets and, where appropriate, accessways and major driveways that make it attractive and highly convenient for people to walk between uses within the center or neighborhood, including streets and major driveways within the center with wide sidewalks and other features, including pedestrian-oriented street crossings, street trees, pedestrian-scale lighting and on-street parking.*”

Findings: The proposed MMA is a series of blocks within a street grid. The proposed MMA is seven blocks long and approximately 4 blocks wide. 90 percent of the streets have sidewalks on both sides of the street. Construction of the missing sidewalks within the MMA have been prioritized in the Planwell TSP. There are crosswalks at each intersection, most marked, some unmarked. There are alleys located in the middle of several blocks which provide for pedestrian circulation. A map of the proposed MMA showing the local street network is included in Exhibit A.

- G. (8)(b)(G) Requires MMAs to have “*one or more transit stops (in urban areas with fixed route transit service).*”

Findings: Planwell Transit serves the proposed MMA with all routes making stops along Main Street, and several routes stopping at the Planwell Library. A map of the proposed MMA with Planwell Transit routes is located in Exhibit A.

- H. **(8)(b)(H)** Requires regulations within MMAs to “*limit or do not allow low-intensity or land extensive uses, such as most industrial uses, automobile sales and services, and drive-through services.*”

Findings: Industrial uses are not permitted in the D zone district (Table 2.2.030.D.), except newspaper printing and publishing with a Conditional Use. Certain artisanal/light manufacturing uses, *i.e.* brewpubs or artist studios, (Table 2.2.030.C.) are permitted under specific special standards (Section 2.3.040). Automotive sales, service, rental and repair are not allowed (Table 2.2.030.C.). Drive-Through services are not allowed (Table 2.2.030.C.).

Conclusion: The proposed MMA includes development regulations and adopted plans that allow the uses required and compel new development to meet the required development standards. This requirement is met.

- IV. **(10)(b)(D)** requires MMAs to have “*land use regulations that do not require the provision of off-street parking, or regulations that require lower levels of off-street parking than required in other areas and allow flexibility to meet the parking requirements (e.g. count on-street parking, allow long-term leases, allow shared parking).*”

Findings: There is no minimum off-street parking requirement in the D zone (Section 3.5.030.B.1).

Conclusion: The provision of off-street parking is not required within the proposed MMA. This requirement is met.

- V. **(10)(b)(E)** Requires the MMA to be “*located in one or more of the categories below:*

- (i) *At least one-quarter mile from any ramp terminal intersection of existing or planned interchanges;*
- (ii) *Within the area of an adopted Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) and consistent with the IAMP; or*
- (iii) *Within one-quarter mile of a ramp terminal intersection of an existing or planned interchange if the mainline facility provider has provided written concurrence with the MMA designation as provided in subsection (c) of this section.”*

Findings: A portion of the proposed MMA is located within one-quarter mile of the Planwell interchange on Oregon Route 33, as shown on the map included in Exhibit A. The city has worked with ODOT Region 6 to assess current conditions and those reasonably projected under current assumptions. The city and ODOT have developed an interchange monitoring & implementation plan, attached as Exhibit B and implemented through an Intergovernmental Agreement. The interchange monitoring & implementation plan evaluated the current interchange operating conditions (no issues were found), requires the city to monitor the queue length of the northbound off-ramp on an annual basis, and to notify ODOT once it reaches a certain threshold. At that time, the city and ODOT will jointly begin work on funding and constructing mitigation measures. Some initial mitigation concepts (such as signal timing measures that move traffic away from the interchange and extending the northbound off-ramp) were developed through the monitoring and implementation plan and will be evaluated based on conditions at the time the threshold is reached.

Conclusion: Due to the city’s adoption of the interchange monitoring & implementation plan, the city has obtained written concurrence with the MMA designation from the ODOT Region 6 Manager. This requirement is met.

Comparison of Regional UGMFP Title 6 with State Multimodal Mixed-use Area (MMA)

Urban Growth Mgmt Functional Plan (UGMFP) Title 6 — 30% trip reduction credit	Multimodal Mixed Use Area (MMA) TPR: 660-0012 (10) and (8) – exemption from congestion (e.g. V/C) standard
<u>Applicability:</u> Metro 2040 center, station community, main street, corridor	<u>Applicability:</u> Multimodal Mixed Use Center (MMA) anywhere in the state
<u>Adoption Requirements:</u> by ordinance or resolution, with notice to Metro and ODOT. Jurisdictions may seek recognition of previous planning work from Metro COO; process for stakeholder participation or notice not clear.	<u>Adoption Requirements:</u> land use action adopted by ordinance, with notice and findings as required by statewide land use program, including PAPA notice to DLCD.
<u>Adopted Boundary</u>	<u>Adopted Boundary</u>
<u>Mix of Uses:</u> Allow mix of uses: Urban Living Infrastructure uses such as grocery stores, restaurants; institutional uses (schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, medical offices), and civic uses (government offices, libraries, city halls, and public spaces)	<u>Mix of Uses:</u> Allow concentration of a variety of uses in well-defined area, incl. medium-high density residential, offices, retail, restaurants, open space, civic or cultural uses.
<u>Intensity:</u> Allow intensity specified by 2040 design type: 39 persons per acre (ppa) for Main Street, 40 ppa for Town Centers, 45 ppa for Station Communities and Corridors, 60 ppa for Regional centers, and 250 ppa for Central City	<u>Density:</u> Allow medium to high density residential development (12 or more units/acre)
<u>Transportation:</u> Adopted plan to achieve non-SOV mode share target, including street, transit, bike, and pedestrian system design; street connectivity; street facility design; TSMO/TDM; parking management program	<u>Transportation:</u> street connections and safe crossings from adjacent areas; network of streets with good pedestrian characteristics (wide sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, street trees, pedestrian-scale lighting, on-street parking); one or more transit stops; lower or no off-street parking requirements that allow flexibility
NA	Core commercial area where multi-story buildings are permitted
<u>Building entrances</u> oriented to transit stops	<u>Building entrances</u> oriented to streets
Prohibit new auto-dependent uses (e.g., gas stations, car washes, auto sales lots)	Limit or do not allow low-intensity or land extensive uses, such as most industrial uses, auto sales and services, drive through services (subsection 8), and prohibition of uses which rely solely on auto trips, such as gas stations, car washes, storage facilities, and motels (subsection 6a)
NA	<u>Safety :</u> consideration within 1/4 mile from interchanges