

Section 9 TPR and RTFP Compliance

This section contain that assessment of the TSP Updates compliance with the requirements of the Transportation Planning Rule(TPR) , the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) and the Regional Transportation Functional Plan(RTFP). This analysis is covered by the following documents:

- Executive Summary - TSP Regulatory Review 2011
- TSP Regulatory Review 2011
- TPR and RTFP Compliance Review 2013



REGULATORY REVIEW: Executive Summary

December 3, 2011

Overview of Transportation System Planning in Oregon

Transportation System Planning is required by Oregon state law as one of the 19 statewide planning goals. The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), which defines how to implement this goal, requires:

- The state to prepare a transportation system plan -- the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) -- which is implemented, in part, by the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP);
- Metropolitan planning organizations (such as Metro) to prepare a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that meets specific federal requirements and is consistent with the OTP; and
- Counties and cities to prepare their own TSPs consistent with both the state and regional plans.

Clackamas County's Transportation System Plan (TSP) must be in compliance with state transportation plans (which apply to both urban and rural areas) and with the Metro Regional Transportation Plan (which applies only to urban areas).

This Executive Summary briefly mentions topics regulated by the state and region related to TSPs. Details are available in the full document.

Requirements from State Plans and Regulations (apply in urban and rural areas)

1. Statewide Planning Goal 12

- Provide and encourage a "safe, convenient and economic transportation system,"
- The transportation plan must:
 - (1) Consider all modes of transportation including mass transit, air, water, pipeline, rail, highway, bicycle and pedestrian;
 - (2) Be based upon an inventory of local, regional and state transportation needs;
 - (3) Consider the differences in social consequences that would result from using differing combinations of transportation modes;
 - (4) Avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation;
 - (5) Minimize adverse social, economic and environmental impacts and costs;
 - (6) Conserve energy;
 - (7) Meet the needs of the transportation disadvantaged by improving transportation services;
 - (8) Facilitate the flow of goods and services to strengthen the local and regional economy;
 - (9) Conform with local and regional comprehensive land use plans.

2. Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)

- Adopt regulations to:
 - Protect transportation facilities
 - Ensure new development provides on-site streets and access ways that provide routes for pedestrian and bicycle travel where pedestrian and bicycle travel is likely
 - Support transit in urban areas with a population over 25,000 if it has been determined that a public transit system is feasible
- Plans for:
 - Air, rail, water, pipeline, roads and public transportation
 - Transportation system management and demand management

- Parking
- Bicycles and pedestrians that identify improvements to meet travel needs in developed areas
- Transportation finance program
- Freight movement from industrial and commercial development

3. Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP)

The OTP, the state's long-range plan that provides the framework for prioritizing transportation improvements based on future revenue, contains seven goals to guide transportation plans:

- 1) Mobility and Accessibility
- 2) Management of the System
- 3) Economic Vitality
- 4) Sustainability
- 5) Safety and Security
- 6) Funding the Transportation System
- 7) Coordination, Communication and Cooperation

The OTP also includes recommended standards for various forms of transportation, including *Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*; *Oregon Aviation Plan*; *Oregon Rail Plan* and *Oregon Highway Plan*.

4. Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) -- Policies and investment strategies for the state highway system for the next 20 years based on the goals and policies of the OTP. One key goal is to maintain and improve safe and efficient movement of people and goods, while supporting statewide, regional and local economic growth and community livability. OHP policies pertinent to the TSP update are:

- Goal 1: System Definition -- State Highway Classification System, Land Use and Transportation, State Highway Freight System, Scenic Byways, Lifeline Routes, Highway Mobility Standards, Major Improvements
- Goal 2: System Management -- Off-System Improvements, Intelligent Transportation Systems, Traffic Safety
- Goal 3: Access Management -- Classification and Spacing Standards, Interchange Access Management Areas, Deviations
- Goal 4: Travel Alternatives -- Efficiency of Freight Movement, Alternative Passenger Modes

5. Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) -- A four-year transportation capital improvement program with the funding for and scheduling of transportation projects and programs.

6. OAR 734, Division 51: Access Management Rules -- The permitting, management and standards of approaches to state highways to ensure safe and efficient operation of the state highways.

7. Oregon Forest Highway Long-Range Transportation Coordination Plan -- Long-range goals for the Oregon Forest Highway Program and the process for coordinated planning and decision-making among responsible agencies. Clackamas County owns only one Federal Forest Highway, Lolo Pass Road, which would be subject to provisions in this new plan.

Requirements from Regional Regulations (apply only in urban areas)

1. Metro Regional Framework Plan -- Unites all of Metro's adopted land use planning policies and requirements, including transportation and mass transit systems.

2. 2040 Growth Concept -- A long-range plan for managing growth. The County's Comprehensive Plan land use designations are compatible with 2040 Growth Concept designations.

3. Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) -- Regional policies recommended or required for city and county comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances. Includes investment and other incentives to develop strategies and actions to better utilize zoned capacity to enhance each community and help achieve aspirations in 2040 Centers, Corridors, Main Streets, Station Communities.

- 4. Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)** -- The long-range blueprint for transportation in the Portland region, including policies and goals, system concepts for all modes of travel, and strategies for funding and local implementation. The RTP incorporates the goals of the 2040 Growth Concept. The updated 2035 RTP contains several new elements:
- Outcome-based planning focusing on equity, economy and the environment
 - Emphasis on a well-connected arterial and local street network, rather than relying on levels of congestion, to direct how and where to address motor vehicle capacity needs,
 - Regional mobility corridors defining focus areas for investments
 - Incorporating transportation system management and operations into planning
 - Performance targets for safety, congestion, freight reliability, climate change, active transportation, sidewalk/trail/transit infrastructure, clean air, travel, affordability, and access to daily needs
- 5. Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP)** -- Directs how city and county plans will implement the RTP through comprehensive plans, local transportation system plans and land use regulations, and local plans that comply with the RTP. The following directives pertain to local TSPs:
- Include regional and state transportation needs along with local needs
 - Make sure local needs are consistent with the RTP
 - When developing solutions, consider a variety of strategies in the following order:
 - TSMO (Transportation System Management Operations)
 - Transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements
 - Traffic calming
 - Land use strategies
 - Connectivity, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities
 - Motor vehicle capacity improvements
 - Ensure any alternate performance and mobility standards are consistent with regional and statewide planning goals
 - Ensure local parking regulations are consistent with the RTFP
 - Numerous requirements related to:
 - Design (street system, transit system, pedestrian system, bicycle system, freight system)
 - Transportation system management and operations (TSMO)
 - Transportation needs and solutions
 - Performance targets and standards
 - Defining projects in transportation system plan
 - Parking management
 - Amendments of city and county comprehensive and transportation system plans

6. Other Considerations

As the County updates its TSP, particular attention will need to be paid to the following:

1. Identifying pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit and essential destination and on the needs of disadvantaged populations, youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations, i.e., minorities and low-income families.
2. Needs analyses with more emphasis on gaps and deficiencies in the transportation system for:
 - Pedestrian and bicycle plans
 - Freight system plans
 - Transportation system management and operations plans
3. Incorporating regional needs identified in the Mobility Corridor strategies in the RTP.
4. Considering multi-modal strategies to address identified transportation needs.
5. Monitoring changing state laws to ensure compliance with amendments and revisions.



REGULATORY REVIEW:

Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP)

December 14, 2011

This document includes a review of planning documents, policies, and regulations applicable to the 2011-13 Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP) update. The County's current TSP will serve as the foundation for the update process, upon which new information obtained from system analysis and stakeholder input will be applied to address changing transportation needs through the year 2035.

As new strategies for addressing transportation needs are proposed, compliance and coordination with the plans, policies, and regulations described in this document will be required.

This document is divided into three sections.

SECTION I: Overview of the regulatory context within which transportation system planning will be completed. Relevant goals and policies are identified and the principal regulations are described in sufficient detail to provide a working understanding of the requirements that the County's updated TSP will need to meet.

SECTION II: Assessment of how the applicable sections of the existing TSP, the County's Comprehensive Plan and the County's Zoning and Development Ordinance (ZDO) comply with the requirements identified in Section I, with particular attention paid to the recent changes made to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP).

SECTION III: Identification of additional considerations for the TSP update, including emerging issues that may need to be addressed and county plans/documents that may need to be reviewed to ensure consistency.

Overview of Transportation System Planning in Oregon

Transportation System Planning in Oregon is required by state law as one of the 19 statewide planning goals (Goal 12 - Transportation). The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), OAR 660-012-0015, which defines how to implement State Planning Goal 12, requires:

- The state to prepare a TSP, referred to as the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP);
- Metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that is consistent with the OTP (The Portland Metro RTP applies to the Clackamas County region); and
- Counties and Cities to prepare Local TSPs that are consistent with the OTP and RTP.

The OTP, as the guiding document for regional and local TSPs, establishes goals, policies, strategies and initiatives that address the core challenges and opportunities facing transportation in Oregon. These are further implemented with adopted standards in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP). TSPs for Counties and Cities within Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) must also comply with the RTP, which is adopted to meet specific Federal requirements. The Clackamas County TSP must be consistent with the OTP, OHP and the Metro RTP.

The following matrix provides a quick reference to all of the documents reviewed or considered and notes if they have a regulatory context impacting the TSP, which requires compliance.

	Regulatory Context	Regulatory Compliance
State Plans and Regulation		
Statewide Planning Goals	p.3	p.23
Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012)	p.5	p. 23
1992 Oregon Transportation Plan (updated 1999, 2006)	p.6	p.27
1999 Oregon Highway Plan (updated 2006)	p.7	p.27
2010-2013 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	p.13	---
Access Management Rules (OAR 734-051)	P.13	---
2011 Oregon Forest Highway Long-Range Transportation Coordination Plan	p.14	---
Regional Plans and Policies		
Metro Regional Framework Plan	p.15	---
Metro 2040 Growth Concept	p.15	---
Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP)	p.15	---
Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)	p.16	p.28
Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP)	p.19	p.28
Transportation and Land Use Implementation Guidance for the Portland Metropolitan Region (Oct 2011)	P.20	---
High Capacity Transit System Expansion Policy: Implementation Guidance for the Portland Metropolitan Region (May 2011)	p.20	---
TriMet Bike Parking Guidelines	p.21	---

SECTION I: RELEVANT STATE AND REGIONAL GOALS AND POLICIES

The following plans and policies are reviewed in this section.

State Plans and Regulations

1. Statewide Planning Goals 1 (Citizen Involvement), 2 (Land Use Planning), 11 (Public Facilities and Services) and 12 (Transportation)
2. Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012)
3. 1992 Oregon Transportation Plan (updated 1999, 2006)
4. 1999 Oregon Highway Plan (updated 2006)
5. 2010 – 2013 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
6. Access Management Rules (OAR 734-051)
7. 2011 Oregon Forest Highway Long-Range Transportation Coordination Plan

Regional Plans and Policies

1. Metro Regional Framework Plan
2. Metro 2040 Growth Concept
3. Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP)
4. Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
5. Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP)
6. Transportation and Land Use Implementation Guidance for the Portland Metropolitan Region (May 2011)
7. High Capacity Transit System Expansion Policy: Implementation Guidance for the Portland Metropolitan Region (May 2011)
8. TriMet Bike Parking Guidelines

State Plans and Regulations

1. Statewide Planning Goals

Oregon law creates a hierarchy of consistency between local, regional and state land use plans. The foundation of Oregon's land use planning program is a set of 19 Statewide Planning Goals (OAR 660-15-0000 (1-15)) that describe the state's policies on land use and related topics, such as citizen involvement, housing, transportation and natural resources.

Oregon's statewide goals are achieved through local comprehensive plans. State law requires each city and county to adopt a comprehensive plan and the zoning and land-division ordinances needed to put the plan into effect. The local comprehensive plans must be consistent with the

Statewide Planning Goals. Plans are reviewed for such consistency by the state's Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). When LCDC officially approves a local government's plan, the plan is said to be "acknowledged." It then becomes the controlling document for land use in the area covered by that plan.

Clackamas County's Comprehensive Plan has been acknowledged by LCDC; therefore compliance with the policies and implementation measures of the Comprehensive Plan is considered compliance with the statewide goals. However, when the county's Comprehensive Plan is revised, each application for revision is reviewed against the requirements of the statewide goals.

The statewide goals pertinent to the TSP update include: Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement), Goal 2 (Land Use Planning), Goal 11 (Public Facilities and Service), and Goal 12 (Transportation).

Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement) -- Requires development of a citizen involvement program that is widespread, understandable, responsive and funded, and that allows for two-way communications throughout all planning phases.

Goal 2 (Land Use Planning) and OAR 660, Division 4 -- Requires that a land use planning process and policy framework be established as a basis for all decisions and actions relating to the use of land. Goal 2 requires planning coordination between those local governments and state agencies "which have programs, land ownerships, or responsibilities within the area included in the plan." Coordination is particularly important because development within the county or these cities will impact current and future use of the transportation system.

Goal 11 (Public Facilities Planning) and OAR 660, Division 11 -- Requires cities and counties to plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development. The goal also requires that urban and rural development be "guided and supported by types and levels of urban and rural public facilities and services appropriate for, but limited to, the needs and requirements of the urban, urbanizable and rural areas to be served."

Goal 12 (Transportation) and OAR 660, Division 12 -- Requires cities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations and ODOT to provide and encourage a "safe, convenient and economic transportation system." The goal further requires that a transportation plan:

- (1) consider all modes of transportation including mass transit, air, water, pipeline, rail, highway, bicycle and pedestrian;
- (2) be based upon an inventory of local, regional and state transportation needs;
- (3) consider the differences in social consequences that would result from utilizing differing combinations of transportation modes;
- (4) avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation;
- (5) minimize adverse social, economic and environmental impacts and costs;
- (6) conserve energy;

- (7) meet the needs of the transportation disadvantaged by improving transportation services;
 - (8) facilitate the flow of goods and services so as to strengthen the local and regional economy; and
 - (9) conform with local and regional comprehensive land use plans.
- Goal 12 is implemented through OAR 660, Division 12 (2007), also known as the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR).

2. Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012)

The stated purpose of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) is “to implement Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) and promote the development of safe, convenient and economic transportation systems that are designed to reduce reliance on the automobile so that the air pollution, traffic and other livability problems faced by urban areas in other parts of the country might be avoided.” A major goal of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) is to promote more careful coordination of land use and transportation planning, to assure that planned land uses are supported by and consistent with planned transportation facilities and improvements.

The TPR requires local governments to adopt land use regulations consistent with state and federal requirements "to protect transportation facilities, corridors and sites for their identified functions" (OAR 660-012-0045(2)). This policy is achieved through a variety of measures, including:

- Access control measures consistent with
 - the functional classification of roads, and
 - limiting development on rural lands to rural uses and densities;
- Standards to protect future operations of roads;
- A process for coordinated review of future land use decisions affecting transportation facilities, corridors or sites;
- A process to apply conditions to development proposals in order to minimize impacts and protect transportation facilities, corridors or sites;
- Regulations to provide notice to ODOT of land use applications that require public hearings, involve land divisions or affect private access to roads; and
- Regulations assuring that amendments to land use designations, densities and design standards are consistent with the functions, capacities and performance standards of facilities identified in the TSP.

The primary vehicles for the implementation of the TPR are the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP), Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the local comprehensive plans and their related transportation system plans (TSPs).

Currently, Section 060 of the TPR is being revised. The amendments focus on standards and highway capacity as it relates to Comprehensive Plan amendments. Draft amendments are available for public review on ODOT’s website. A decision from the State regarding adoption of the amendments is expected in early 2012.

3. Oregon Transportation Plan (2006)

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state's long-range multimodal transportation plan that provides the framework for prioritizing transportation improvements based on future revenue conditions. It does not identify specific projects for development.

The OTP is the overarching policy document among a series of plans that together form the state's Transportation System Plan. The plan calls for a transportation system that has a modal balance, is both efficient and accessible, provides connectivity among rural and urban places and between modes, and is environmentally and financially stable.

The OTP contains the following seven goals, each with associated policies, to guide state, regional and local transportation plans:

Goal 1 – Mobility and Accessibility: Provide a balanced, efficient and integrated transportation system that ensures interconnected access to all areas of the state, the nation and the world. Promote transportation choices that are reliable, accessible and cost-effective.

Goal 2 – Management of the System: Improve the efficiency of the transportation system by optimizing operations and management. Manage transportation assets to extend their life and reduce maintenance costs.

Goal 3 – Economic Vitality: Expand and diversify Oregon's economy by transporting people, goods, services and information in safe, energy-efficient and environmentally sound ways. Provide Oregon with a competitive advantage by promoting an integrated freight system.

Goal 4 – Sustainability: Meet present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs from the joint perspective of the environment, economy and communities. Encourage conservation and communities that integrate land use and transportation choices.

Goal 5 – Safety and Security: Build, operate and maintain the transportation system so that it is safe and secure. Take into account the needs of all users: operators, passengers, pedestrians and property owners.

Goal 6 – Funding the Transportation System: Create sources of revenue that will support a viable transportation system today and in the future. The goal recognizes that whether or not funds are increased, it is essential to maximize existing resources, invest strategically, consider return on investment and provide equity among rural and urban areas, equity among income groups and access to transportation options throughout Oregon.

Goal 7 – Coordination, Communication and Cooperation: Foster coordination, communication and cooperation between transportation users and providers so various means of transportation function as an integrated system. Work to help all parties align interests, remove barriers and offer innovative, equitable solutions.

The OTP includes a number of elements which outline recommendations for standards for various forms of transportation. Elements particularly relevant to Clackamas County's transportation system include:

- The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (1995): This is the planning and design manual for pedestrian and bicycle transportation in Oregon to implement the actions recommended by the Oregon Transportation Plan. The standards and designs shown in the plan -- ODOT standards used on state highway projects -- meet or exceed national standards. These standards are recommended but not required for use by local jurisdictions in Oregon.
- The Oregon Aviation Plan (2007): This comprehensive evaluation of Oregon's aviation system serves as a guide for future aviation development. The plan assesses the condition of the existing aviation infrastructure, the economic benefit of the aviation industry, and the national and state significance of each airport.
- The Oregon Rail Plan (2001): This comprehensive assessment of the state's rail planning, freight rail and passenger rail systems summarizes the state's goals and policies for rail systems, measures the state's performance to date and refines the projected costs, revenues and investment needs with regard to rail transportation of people and goods. The passenger rail element of the plan concentrates on intercity passenger service with some mention of commuter rail operations. It does not include light rail or other rail transit-type services. The Oregon Rail Plan is currently being updated.
- The Oregon Highway Plan (1999, amended 2006): (described below)

4. Oregon Highway Plan (1999, amended 2006)

The Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) defines policies and investment strategies for Oregon's state highway system for the next 20 years by further refining the goals and policies of the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP). One of the key goals of the OHP is to maintain and improve safe and efficient movement of people and goods, while supporting statewide, regional, and local economic growth and community livability. This goal is implemented through policies and actions that guide management and investment decisions by:

- defining a classification system for state highways,
- setting standards for mobility,
- employing access management techniques,
- supporting intermodal connections,
- encouraging public and private partnerships,
- addressing the relationship between the highway and land development patterns, and
- recognizing the responsibility to maintain and enhance environmental and scenic resources.

Policies in the OHP pertinent to the TSP update are described below:

OHP Goal 1: System Definition

Policy 1A, State Highway Classification System: Functions and objectives for state highways to serve different types of traffic. Greater mobility is expected on interstate and statewide highways than on regional or district highways. The facility classification is used to guide planning, management and investment decisions regarding state highway facilities. Clackamas County contains state highways of each of the described classifications.

Policy 1B, Land Use and Transportation: The relationship between the highway and patterns of development both on and off the highway. It emphasizes development patterns that maintain state highways for regional and intercity mobility, and supports compact development patterns that are less dependent on state highways than linear development for access and local circulation. This policy is designed to clarify how ODOT will work with local governments and others to link land use and transportation in transportation plans, facility and corridor plans, plan amendments, access permitting and project development.

Policy 1C, State Highway Freight System: The need to balance the movement of goods and services with other uses and the importance of maintaining efficient through movement on major freight routes. I-5, I-205, Hwy 224, Hwy 212/224, and Hwy 26 (south of Hwy 212/224) are all designated freight routes in Clackamas County.

Policy 1D, Scenic Byways: The need to preserve and enhance designated scenic byways, and to consider aesthetic and design elements along with safety and performance considerations on designated byways. Clackamas County contains a portion of one designated Scenic Byway: Hwy 224 (east of I-205).

Policy 1E, Lifeline Routes: The need to provide a secure lifeline network of streets, highways and bridges to facilitate emergency services response, and to support rapid economic recovery after a disaster.

Policy 1F, Highway Mobility Standards: Standards to ensure a reliable and acceptable level of mobility on the highway system to:

- Identify state highway mobility performance expectations for planning and plan implementation;
- Evaluate the impacts on state highways of amendments to transportation plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations; and
- Guide operations decisions such as managing access and traffic control systems to maintain acceptable highway performance.

This policy is currently under review and amendments have been proposed, including revisions to the tables shown on page 10 of this document. If the proposed amendments are adopted, the County's TSP will need to meet the new standards and requirements. A draft of proposed amendments is available for public review on the ODOT website and the Oregon Transportation Commission will consider adoption of the amendments in late December 2011.

The current OHP's mobility standards use the Maximum Volume to Capacity Ratios as the primary metric. If the County's TSP uses a different metric (e.g. Travel Time Reliability), the team will need to coordinate with ODOT on how compliance with OHP Policy 1F can be demonstrated.

Current (1999-2006 OHP) highway volume-to-capacity standards applicable to all state highway sections located outside of the Portland metropolitan area urban growth boundary (PMUGB) are summarized in Table 1 and the standards for all state highway sections located within the PMUGB are summarized in Table 2 below. Standards for freeway ramps and other intersections are further explained in Action 1F.1 of the OHP.

The mobility standards are to be applied over a 20-year planning horizon when developing state, regional or local transportation plans. When evaluating highway mobility for amendments to transportation system plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations, local governments should use the planning horizons in adopted local and regional transportation system plans or a planning horizon of 15 years from the proposed date of amendment adoption, whichever is greater.

Table 1: Maximum Volume to Capacity Ratios (Outside PMUGB)^{A,C,14}

Highway Category/ Location	Inside an Urban Growth Boundary (except PMUGB)					Outside an Urban Growth Boundary	
	STA ^D	MPO	Non-MPO Outside of STAs where non-freeway posted speed <= 35 mph, or a Designated UBA [Urban Business Area]	Non-MPO outside of STAs where non-freeway speed > 35 mph	Non-MPO where non-freeway speed limit >= 45 mph	Unincorporated Communities	Rural Lands
Interstate Highways ^E	N/A	0.80	N/A	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70
Statewide Expressways	N/A	0.80	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70
Freight Route on a Statewide Highway	0.85	0.80	0.80	0.75	0.70	0.70	0.70
Statewide (not a Freight Route)	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.80	0.75	0.75	0.70
Freight Route on a Regional or District Highway	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.80	0.75	0.75	0.70
Expressway on a Regional or District Highway	N/A	0.85	N/A	0.80	0.75	0.75	0.70
Regional Highways	0.95	0.85	0.85	0.80	0.75	0.75	0.70
District / Local Interest Roads	0.95	0.90	0.90	0.85	0.80	0.80	0.75

Source: OHP, Table 6.

^A OHP Amendment 00-04 established alternative mobility standards for Portland Metro and the Rogue Valley MPO (RVMPO). For Portland Metro, see table below. Where there is a conflict between the Table 6 standards and the established alternative mobility standards, the more tolerant standard (higher v/c ratio) applies.

^C 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.

^D Interstates and expressways shall not be identified as STAs.

^E National Highway System (NHS) highway design requirements are addressed in the Highway Design Manual (HDM).

¹⁴ Table 6 was replaced in August 2005, part of OHP Amendment 05-16.

Table 2: Maximum Volume to Capacity Ratios (Inside PMUGB)^A

Highway Category/Location	Standard	
	1 st hour	2 nd hour
Central City Regional Centers Town Centers Main Streets Station Communities	1.10	0.99
Corridors^B Industrial Areas Intermodal Facilities Employment Areas Inner Neighborhoods Outer Neighborhoods	0.99	0.99
I-5 North (<i>from Marquam Bridge to Interstate Bridge</i>) ^C	1.10	0.99
Highway 99E (<i>from Lincoln Street to Highway 224 Interchange</i>) ^C	1.10	0.99
Other Principal Arterial Routes <i>I-205^C</i> <i>I-82 (east of I-205)</i> <i>I-5 (Marquam Bridge to Wilsonville)^C</i> <i>Highway 224^C</i> <i>Highway 213</i>	0.99	0.99

Source: OHP, Table 7 (excerpt)

^A The volume to capacity ratios in the table are for the highest two consecutive hours of weekday traffic volumes. This is calculated by dividing the traffic volume for the average weekly two-hour PM peak by twice the hourly capacity.

^B Corridors that are also state highways are 99W, Sandy Boulevard, Powell Boulevard, 82nd Avenue, North Portland Road, North Denver Street, Lombard Street, Hall Boulevard, Farmington Road, Canyon Road, Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway, Tualatin Valley Highway (from Hall Boulevard to Cedar Hills Boulevard and from Brookwood Street to E Street in Forest Grove), Scholls Ferry Road, 99E (from Milwaukie to Oregon City and Highway 43).

^C Thresholds shown are for interim purposes only; refinement plans for these corridors are required in Metro's Regional Transportation Plan and will include a recommended motor vehicle performance policy for each corridor.

Policy 1G, Major Improvements: Requires maintaining performance and improving safety by improving efficiency and management before adding capacity. ODOT works with regional and local governments to address highway performance and safety.

OHP Goal 2: System Management

Policy 2B, Off-System Improvements: Helps local jurisdictions adopt land use and access management policies.

Policy 2E, Intelligent Transportation Systems: State emphasis on considering a broad range of Intelligent Transportation Systems services to improve system efficiency and safety in a cost-effective manner.

Policy 2F, Traffic Safety: The need to continually improve safety for all highway system users with solutions involving engineering, education, enforcement and emergency medical services.

OHP Goal 3: Access Management

Policy 3A, Classification and Spacing Standards: Access spacing standards for driveways and approaches to the state highway system -- the location, spacing and type of road and street intersections and approach roads on state highways. The adopted spacing standards, which can be found in Appendix C of the OHP, include standards for each highway classification. Generally, the access spacing distance increases as either the highway's importance or posted speed increases.

Policy 3C, Interchange Access Management Areas: Policy for managing interchange areas by developing an Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) that identifies and addresses current interchange deficiencies and establishes short, medium and long-term solutions. Clackamas County recently completed and the State adopted three IAMPs for the proposed Sunrise Corridor interchanges.

Policy 3D, Deviations: General policies and procedures for deviations from adopted access management standards and policies.

This section of the OHP is also currently undergoing a revision, in response to Senate Bill 264, passed in June 2011. The revisions include changes to the access management standards for spacing and mitigation requirements, use of medians, and deviation and dispute resolution/appeals processes for access applications. These revisions would include changes to the adopted spacing standards, found in Appendix C of the OHP. A draft of proposed amendments is available for public review and comment on the ODOT website. The Oregon Transportation Commission is expected to consider adoption of the amendments in January 2011.

OHP Goal 4: Travel Alternatives

Policy 4A, Efficiency of Freight Movement: The need to maintain and improve the efficiency of freight movement on the state highway system and access to intermodal connections. The State seeks to balance the needs of long distance and through freight movements with local transportation needs on highway facilities in both urban areas and rural communities.

Policy 4B, Alternative Passenger Modes: The need to advance and support alternative passenger transportation systems where travel demand, land use and other factors indicate the potential for successful and effective development of alternative passenger modes.

5. Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (ODOT)

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is Oregon's four-year transportation capital improvement program that identifies the funding for, and scheduling of, transportation projects and programs. It includes projects on the federal, state, city and county transportation systems, multimodal projects (highway, passenger rail, freight, public transit, bicycle and pedestrian) and projects in the National Parks, National Forests and Indian tribal lands. Oregon's STIP covers a four-year construction period, but is updated every two years in accordance with federal requirements. The currently approved program is the *2010-2013 STIP*. The *Draft 2012-2015 STIP*, currently under development, is available for public viewing and comment on ODOT's website.

The *2010-2013 STIP (amended of September 19, 2011)* should be reviewed for projects to consider during the development of the County's TSP Update for complementary or conflicting traffic impacts.

6. OAR 734, Division 51: Access Management Rules

OAR 734-051 governs the permitting, management and standards of approaches to state highways to ensure safe and efficient operation of the state highways. OAR 734-051 policies address the following:

- How to bring existing and future approaches into compliance with access spacing standards, and ensure the safe and efficient operation of the highway;
- The purpose and components of an access management plan; and
- Requirements regarding mitigation, modification and closure of existing approaches as part of project development.

ODOT has adopted the rules to establish procedures and criteria to govern highway approaches, access control, spacing standards, medians and restriction of turning movements in compliance with statewide planning goals, in a manner compatible with acknowledged comprehensive plans and consistent with state law and the OTP. Any new street or driveway connections, as well as any changes to existing street or driveway connections, to state roads within the TSP study boundary must be in compliance with these rules by ODOT.

The access management standards adopted by ODOT and applicable to the County's TSP are summarized in Appendix C of the Oregon Highway Plan. OHP Policies 3A and 3C establish access management objectives for state highways and interchange areas based on facility type and set standards for spacing of approaches. These standards have also been adopted as part of OAR 734-051, which provides the regulatory basis for implementation.

As noted previously, the access management standards in Appendix C of the OHP are currently being revised. A concurrent revision to OAR 734-051 is also underway in response to Senate Bill 264.

7. Oregon Department of Transportation Coordination Rule (OAR 731-015)

This rule establishes procedures used by ODOT to implement the provisions of its State Agency Coordination Program, and ensure programs are carried out in compliance with the statewide planning goals and in a manner compatible with acknowledged comprehensive plans, as required by ORS 197.180 and OAR 660, Divisions 30 and 31.

8. Oregon Forest Highway Long-Range Transportation Coordination Plan

Adopted in August 2011, this plan identifies the long-range goals for the Oregon Forest Highway Program and describes the process for coordinated planning and decision-making among the agencies responsible for the Oregon Forest Highway Program.

Another purpose of this document is to help transportation planners, transportation professionals, forest professionals, community representatives and citizens interested in improving Forest Highways understand the Forest Highway Program, including the types of projects eligible for program funding and how to participate in the planning and decision-making processes.

Clackamas County owns only one Federal Forest Highway, Lolo Pass Road, which would be subject to provisions in this new plan.

Regional Regulations

Metro, the regional government for the Oregon portion of the Portland Metropolitan area, encompasses the urban portions of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas counties. Metro is responsible for:

- Many regional land use planning functions, including all adjustments to the region's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and related activities. Metro's land use planning functions support the assumptions behind the UGB and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
- Regional transportation planning under state law and being the federally-designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Portland metropolitan area. As the federally designated MPO, Metro guides regional transportation system planning and development in the Portland metropolitan area.
- Developing a regional transportation system plan (RTP), consistent with Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements and Federal planning rules.

1. Metro Regional Framework Plan

The Regional Framework Plan unites all of Metro's adopted land use planning policies and requirements. The plan addresses the following subjects:

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

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

2. 2040 Growth Concept

In 1995, the Portland region adopted the 2040 Growth Concept, a long-range plan for managing growth. It is the unifying concept around which the Metro Regional Framework Plan is based. The 2040 Growth Concept contains a series of land-use building blocks for the region, called 2040 Design Types, arranged in a hierarchy that serves as a framework for prioritizing RTP investments and supports the UGB assumptions. From a transportation standpoint, the 2040 Growth Concept provided the best overall performance at the lowest cost of all the alternative concepts that were evaluated. Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) incorporates the goals of the 2040 Growth Concept. The County's existing Comprehensive Plan land use designations are compatible with the 2040 Growth Concept designations.

3. Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP)

Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) contains the regional policies recommended and/or required for city and county comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances. The purpose of this functional plan is to implement regional goals and objectives adopted by the Metro Council as the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO), including the Metro 2040 Growth Concept and the Regional Framework Plan.

Title 6 of the UGMFP offers investment and other incentives to cities and counties to develop their own strategies and actions to better utilize zoned capacity to enhance each community and help them achieve their aspirations in their own 2040 Centers, Corridors, Main Streets and Station Communities.

Title 6 was recently expanded to cover not only Centers and Station Communities, but corridors and main streets because of their potential for redevelopment and infill. It aligns local and regional investment to support local aspirations, and better links land use and transportation to support mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly and transit-supportive development. It moves away from reporting requirements to an incentive-based approach. Available incentives include:

- Eligibility for a regional investment, currently defined as new high capacity transit lines. In the future, the Metro Council, in consultation with the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), could add other major investments to this definition.
- Ability to use a higher volume-to-capacity standard under the Oregon Highway Plan when considering amendments to comprehensive plans or land use regulations, and
- Eligibility for an automatic 30 percent trip reduction credit under the Transportation Planning Rule when analyzing traffic impacts of new development in plan amendments for a Center, Corridor, Station Community or Main Street.

Amendments to the UGMFP, including the changes to Title 6, were adopted by Metro in December 2010-January 2011 and will be reviewed for acknowledgment by the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

4. Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) provides the long-range blueprint for transportation in the Portland region, and presents the overarching policies and goals, system concepts for all modes of travel, and strategies for funding and local implementation. The most current RTP update (adopted June 2010) has been shaped by looking ahead to 2035 to anticipate 21st century needs and the following desired outcomes for the region:

- Promote jobs and create wealth in the economy
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Improve safety throughout the transportation system
- Promote healthy, active living by making walking and bicycling safe and convenient
- Move freight reliably and make transportation accessible, affordable and reliable for commuting and everyday life
- Promote vibrant communities while preserving farm and forest land

Chapter 2 of the RTP establishes mobility standards that apply to specific transportation facilities in the region, primarily based on surrounding 2040 Growth Concept land use designations. Chapter 2 also establishes mode share targets for 2040 Growth Concept designations in order to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule and its requirements to reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles (SOV). The target for Town Centers, Station Communities and Corridors is to achieve 45-55% of trips taken by a non-SOV mode; the target for Employment Land and Neighborhoods is 40-45% non-SOV trips.

Chapter 2 of the RTP gives transportation facilities in the region multiple designations based on the following modes and types of systems:

- regional street design,
- street and throughway system,
- transit system, freight system,
- bicycle system, and
- pedestrian system.

The designations generally correspond to vision and concept statements. However, only the regional street design classifications are associated with facility design guidance and only the street and throughway system, bicycle system and pedestrian system designations are associated with policy statements.

Regional Street and Throughway System Designations

Throughways (50,000-100,000 vehicles per day)

- *provide for high-speed travel on longer motor vehicle trips and*
- *serve as the primary freight routes,*
- *emphasis on mobility.*
- *help serve the need to move both trucks and autos through the region.*
- *connect major activity centers within the region, including the central city, regional centers, industrial areas and intermodal facilities.*

Arterial streets (10,000-40,000 vehicles per day)

- *allow higher speeds than collector and local streets.*
- *major arterial streets accommodate longer-distance through trips and serve more of a regional traffic function.*
- *minor arterial streets serve shorter trips that are localized within a community.*

Regional Bicycle System Designations

Regional Bicycle Parkways form the backbone of the regional bicycle network, providing for direct and efficient travel with minimal delays in different urban environments and to destinations outside the region. (Note: No regional bicycle parkways have been designated yet. These will be developed as part of the upcoming regional Active Transportation Action Plan.)

Regional Bikeways provide for travel to and within the Central City, Regional Centers and Town Centers.

Community Bikeways provide for travel to and within other 2040 Target Areas. These routes also provide access to regional attractions such as schools and parks, and connect neighborhoods to the rest of the regional bicycle network.

Regional Pedestrian System Designations

Transit/mixed-use corridors, priority areas for pedestrian improvements, are located along good quality transit lines and will be redeveloped at densities somewhat higher than today. These corridors will generate substantial pedestrian traffic near neighborhood-oriented retail development, schools, parks and bus stops.

These corridors should be designed to promote pedestrian travel with such features as wide sidewalks with buffering from adjacent motor vehicle traffic, street crossings at a minimum of 530 feet – though an ideal spacing is 200 to 400 feet where possible (unless there are no intersections, bus stops or other pedestrian attractions), special crossing amenities at some locations, special lighting, bus shelters, awnings and street trees.

Pedestrian districts are areas of high, or potentially high, pedestrian activity where the region places priority on creating a walkable environment. These include the central city, regional and town centers and light rail station communities where sidewalks, plazas and other public spaces are integrated with civic, commercial and residential development...They are often characterized by compact mixed-use development served by transit...These areas will be characterized by buildings oriented to the street and boulevard-type street design features such as wide sidewalks with buffering from adjacent motor vehicle traffic, marked street crossings at all intersections with special crossing amenities at some locations, special lighting, benches, bus shelters, awnings and street trees. All streets within pedestrian districts are important pedestrian connections.

Chapters 4 and 6 establish mobility corridors in the region and planning directives for these corridors. Eight of these corridors are located in Clackamas County:

- Four east/west corridors: Milwaukie-Clackamas, Clackamas-Happy Valley, Happy Valley–Damascus, and Tualatin-Oregon City
- Four north/south corridors: Tualatin-Wilsonville, Clackamas–Oregon City, Oregon City-Willamette Valley and Gresham/Troutdale-Damascus.

The mobility corridors are prioritized and placed in the following categories for planning/development:

- Near-term (1-4 years)
 - System demand management along mobility corridor and parallel facilities for all modes of travel.
 - Address arterial connectivity and crossings.
 - Complete alternatives analysis for High Capacity Transit (HCT) corridor.
 - Complete land use planning of HCT corridor as part of HCT System Expansion Policy.
 - Complete gaps and make crossing improvements in the sidewalk and bike network.

- Medium-term (5-10 years)
 - Complete gaps in the arterial network
 - Complete mobility corridor refinement plan
 - Coordinate transportation system management (TSM)/transportation demand management (TDM) strategies.
- Long-term (10-25 years)
 - Make interchange and/or capacity improvements, consistent with refinement plan.

5. Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP)

The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) was adopted as part of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). It directs how city and county plans will implement the RTP through their respective comprehensive plans, local transportation system plans (TSPs) and other land use regulations. The RTFP codifies existing and new requirements that local plans must comply with to be consistent with the RTP. If a TSP is consistent with the RTFP, Metro will find it to be consistent with the RTP.

The RTFP provides guidance on several areas including transportation design for various modal facilities, system plans, regional parking management plans and amendments to comprehensive plans. The following directives specifically pertain to updating local transportation systems plans:

- Include regional and state transportation needs identified in the 2035 RTP along with local needs
- Local needs must be consistent with RTP in terms of land use, system maps and non-SOV modal targets
- When developing solutions, local jurisdictions shall consider a variety of strategies, in the following order:
 - TSMO (Transportation System Management Operations)
 - Transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements
 - Traffic calming
 - Land use strategies in OAR 660-012-0035(2)¹
 - Connectivity, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities
 - Motor vehicle capacity improvements

¹ This section of the Transportation Planning Rule requires Metro area jurisdictions to evaluate land use designations, densities, and design standards to meet local and regional transportation needs. Strategies could include increasing residential densities, setting density minimums near transit lines, employment areas, etc., designating lands for neighborhood shopping centers within convenient walking and cycling distance of residential areas, and designating land uses to provide a better balance between jobs and housing. Section 060 of the TPR is currently undergoing a revision. Draft amendments are available on ODOT's website.

- Local jurisdictions can propose regional projects as part of RTP process
- Local jurisdictions can propose alternate performance and mobility standards, however changes must be consistent with regional and statewide planning goals
- Local parking regulations shall be consistent with the RTFP

6. Transportation and Land Use Implementation Guidance for the Portland Metropolitan Region (October 2011)

The purpose of this document is to help local jurisdictions and consultants understand and implement recent regional policy and regulatory changes. It includes guidance for the RTFP and Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP).

The document provides checklists for local compliance in TSP, development code and comprehensive plan/other adopted documents and outlines requirements to be eligible for the incentives in Title 6 of the UGMFP.

Metro's requirements and guidance for TSPs are available through its website at www.metroregion.org/tsp.

7. High Capacity Transit System Expansion Policy: Implementation Guidance for the Portland Metropolitan Region (May 2011 draft)

The 2035 RTP includes an outline for developing a high capacity transit (HCT) system expansion policy. The policy emphasizes fiscal responsibility by ensuring that limited resources for new HCT are spent where local jurisdictions have committed supportive land uses, high quality pedestrian and bicycle access, management of parking resources, and demonstrated broad-based financial and political support.

The purpose of this document is to:

1. Clearly articulate the decision-making process by which future HCT corridors will be advanced for regional investment.
2. Establish minimum requirements for HCT corridor working groups to inform local jurisdictions as they work to advance their priorities for future HCT.
3. Define quantitative and qualitative performance measures to guide local land use and transportation planning and investment decisions.
4. Outline the process for updating the 2035 RTP, including potential future RTP amendments, for future HCT investment decisions.

8. TriMet's Bike Parking Guidelines

Access to TriMet by bicycle is a key element of the TriMet Total Transit System. Providing convenient, visible and secure bicycle parking is a cost-effective way to increase the catchment area of transit. This document supplements the TriMet Design Criteria. It describes design considerations for bicycle parking at LRT stations, commuter rail stations and transit centers.

These guidelines were developed using survey, inventory and count data as well as research of best practices and recommendations. The following topics are addressed:

- Bike & rides
- Bike parking access
- Urban & neighborhood stations: design & layout
- Community stations: design and layout
- Bike & Ride secure area layout
- Bike rack and locker layout
- Bike rack and locker spacing
- Bus stop considerations

SECTION II: COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATIONS

The following local planning documents contain the TSP and transportation policies and regulations for Clackamas County that will be reviewed for compliance with the above-described regulations. These documents will all be a part of the updated TSP and any changes made to the documents must be consistent with the identified state and regional regulations.

Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan: Transportation (TSP)

The Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP) background documents provide the framework for the transportation system and policies codified in Chapter 5 of the County Comprehensive Plan, which is the official TSP. They summarize the review, analysis and strategies behind the adopted maps and policies, and include the original source of the list of capital transportation projects that will be needed over a 20-year period. The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) implements these adopted transportation goals and policies.

Chapter 5 addresses the following specific modes of transportation: Roadways; Transit; Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities; and Freight, Rail, Air, Pipelines and Water Transportation. This chapter lays out goals and policies, identifies needed roadway and pedestrian/bicycle facility improvements, and Map V-2 identifies road classification. It also contains a table of transportation improvement needs for the next 20 years.

Other chapters of the Comprehensive Plan -- such as Chapter 4, Land Use, and Chapter 10, Community Plans and Design Plans -- provide transportation-related policy direction and help integrate land use and transportation.

Clackamas County Zoning and Development Ordinance (ZDO)

Clackamas County's ZDO contains the regulations to implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The primary ZDO sections that pertain to transportation are described below. Many parts of the ZDO have transportation-related standards and/or help integrate land use and transportation planning. Examples include Section 501, Neighborhood Commercial Zone District (a zone which provides local services that can be accessed easily by biking or walking) and Section 1005, Sustainable Site and Building Design Standards (which supports sustainable and walkable design).

Section 1007 – Roads & Connectivity

This section contains the regulations that apply to the design of new and reconstructed transportation improvements in public rights-of-way, private roads and accessways required through development permit approvals, including regulations for:

- intersection spacing and access control guidelines;
- pedestrian, bicycle, transit and visual amenities in public rights-of-way;
- vehicle access a sight distance; and
- streetscape design elements in centers, corridors and station communities.

Section 1007 also includes requirements to ensure that transportation infrastructure is provided concurrent with, or in a reasonable amount of time, following the approval of a new development it is required to serve.

Section 1015 – Parking & Loading

This section contains the regulations to provide safe, efficient and functional parking areas for automobiles and bicycles, and adequate loading areas for service vehicles. It includes minimum and maximum parking ratios for automobiles, dimensional requirements for parking spaces, parking lot landscaping requirements, bicycle parking standards, and off-street loading standards for multi-family, commercial and industrial developments.

Compliance with Statewide Planning Goals

Clackamas County's Comprehensive Plan and TSP have been acknowledged as complying with the Statewide Planning Goals and related rules. As changes are made to the TSP, they will need to be assessed to ensure they remain in compliance with the statewide planning goals. However, if the TSP is found to comply with the elements of the TRP, as implemented by the OTP and OHP, then it will also be in compliance with the statewide planning goals.

Compliance with Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)

In November 2010, DKS Associates, a consultant on the County TSP project, provided the following review of the TPR requirements (Table 3). This assessment relates to the current TPR; additional assessment may need to be considered if proposed changes, relating to standards and highway capacity with respect to Comprehensive Plan amendments, are adopted.

For each existing TPR requirement, the table notes if the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan is in compliance and where the requirement is addressed within the County's Plan. Additional comments from County staff are included in *italics*.

Table 3: TPR Compliance (as of 10/2011)

TPR	TPR Requirement	Complies with TPR?	Comments
Roadways			
OAR 660-12-0020(2)(b)	A TSP should include a road plan including a functional classification consistent with state and regional TSP's.		Functional classifications and roadway standards included in Comp Plan Roadways Policies 9.0 to 13.0
	Road Standards for the layout of local streets shall include:		
	1) Extensions of existing streets	Yes	
	2) Connections to existing or planned streets	Yes	
	3) Connections to neighborhood destinations	Yes	
OAR 660-12-0045(2)	Local governments should adopt regulations to protect transportation facilities including:		
	1) Access control measures	Yes	Access standards are shown in Table V-5
	2) Standards to protect the future operations of roads	Yes	Operating standards are included in Comp Plan Roadway Policies 27.0, 28.0, and 29.0
OAR 660-12-0045 (7)	Local governments should establish standards for local street and access ways that minimize pavement width and total right-of-way consistent with the operational needs of the facility	Yes	Road standards are addressed in Roadway Policy 9.0
Transit			
OAR 660-12-0020(2)(c)	A TSP should include a public transportation plan that describes:		
	1) Services for the transportation disadvantaged and identifies service inadequacies	Partial	Transit <i>Policies 1.0, 5.0</i> address transportation disadvantaged, but services <i>are not</i> identified
	2) Intercity bus and passenger rail system	Partial	Policies regarding bus and passenger rail are included but may be out of date. <i>Policies do not specifically address all requirements in subsections of OAR 660-12-0020(2)(c)</i>
	3) Existing and planned frequent transit routes and system	Partial	
OAR 660-12-0045 (4)	Local governments should adopt regulations to support transit in urban areas with a population over 25,000 where a determination had been made	Yes	<i>Transit Policies 1.0 – 14.0</i>

	that a public transit system is feasible		
	1) Design transit routes and transit facilities to support transit use through provision of bus stops, pullouts, shelters, and other facilities	Yes	Addressed in Transit Policies
	2) Require that new retail, office and institutional buildings at or near major transit stops provide for convenient pedestrian access to transit	Yes	New developments along transit routes are required to include provisions for transit amenities and pedestrian access to the transit stop. <i>Transit Policy 9.0</i>
	3) Require walkways connecting building entrances and streets adjoining the site	Yes	Pedestrian access to transit reviewed in development review process - <i>Transit Policy 9.0</i>
	4) Connect on-site pedestrian facilities to existing or proposed streets, walkways, and driveways that abut the property	Yes	Transit supportive features and amenities encouraged
	5) At major transit stops require: (i) Buildings be located within 20 feet of the stop or a transit street, (ii) A reasonably direct pedestrian connection between the transit stop and building entrances on the site, (iii) A landing pad for disabled passengers, (iv) Dedication for a passenger shelter if requested by the transit provider, and (v) Lighting at the transit stop	Yes	Standards included for major transit stops. Pedestrian access and transit supportive features and amenities required through the development review process
	6) New roads shall be designed to be adequately served by transit and to incorporate pedestrian access along designated transit routes	Partial	Addressed in roadway standards <i>Pedestrian facilities are addressed in Table V-3 and ZDO Section 1007.06. Access standards are intended to create roads that can be adequately served by transit. This criterion may not need additional work.</i>
	7) Designate types and densities of land uses along transit routes adequate to support transit services	Partial	Land use patterns that support transit encouraged
OAR 660-12-0045(5)(a)	Local governments should adopt regulations to reduce reliance on the automobile by allowing transit oriented development (TOD) along transit routes	Partial	Goal to develop a transit system that supports residential, commercial, and industrial development. <i>Transit oriented development is allowed but not required along most major transit routes.</i>

Pedestrian and Bicycle			
OAR 660-12-0020(2)(d)	A TSP should include a bicycle and pedestrian plan	Partial	Pedestrian and Bicycle master plans referenced but may be out of date and not current with TPR requirements <i>Both plans were adopted in 2003.</i>
OAR 660-12-0045 (3)	Local governments should adopt regulations to ensure new development provides on-site streets and access ways that provide routes for pedestrian and bicycle travel in areas where pedestrian and bicycle travel is likely		
	1) Provide bike parking in multi-family developments of 4 units or more, commercial areas, and transit stops	Yes	ZDO Section 1015 & Table 1015-3 (adopted 5/31/11) shows required minimum bicycle parking spaces by development type (multi-family, commercial, industrial, institutional).
	2) Require pedestrian connections within and to neighborhood activity centers located within ½ mile of residential development	Yes	Call for network of pedestrian and bicycle systems to activity centers
	3) Bikeways shall be required along arterials and major collectors. Sidewalks shall be required along arterials, collectors and most local streets in urban areas.	Yes	Pedestrian and Bicycle facilities considered in all new collector and arterial construction or reconstruction, Table V-3
OAR 660-12-0045(6)	Bicycle and Pedestrian plans should identify improvements to meet local travel needs in developed areas	Yes	Improvements noted in Pedestrian and Bicycle Policy 2.0 and 22.0
Other Modes			
OAR 660-12-0020(2)(e)	A TSP should include an air, rail, water, and pipeline transportation plans	Yes	Policies are included for air, rail, water, and pipeline transportation modes
Transportation Demand Management			
OAR 660-12-0020(2)(f)	A TSP should include a plan for transportation system management and demand management	Partial	Transportation Demand Management Policies 1.0 to 6.0; TSM not addressed
OAR 660-12-0045(5)(b)	Reduce reliance on the automobile by implementing a demand management program	Yes	Non- single occupant vehicle modal split targets are included. <i>Transportation Demand Management Policy 6.0</i>
Parking			
OAR 660-12-0020(2)(g)	A TSP should include a parking plan	Partial	Parking policies included but may not be compliant with TPR requirements towards

			parking reduction. <i>New standards adopted in 5-31/11 to ZDO Section 1015 may adequately address parking reduction requirements but policies may need to be added to Comp Plan.</i>
Finance			
OAR 660-12-0020(2)(i)	A TSP should include a transportation finance program	Yes	Finance plan is included. Also includes references to the Capital Improvement Plan.
Planned Facilities			
OAR 660-12-0020(3)(b)	The TSP should identify a system of planned transportation facilities for the motor vehicle, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle modes and identify their planned capacities and performance standards	Yes	Needed roadway improvements are discussed in Roadway policies 7.0 and 8.0. Pedestrian and Bicycle improvements noted in Pedestrian and Bicycle Policy 2.0.
Freight			
OAR 660-12-0030(1)(c)	The TSP should identify transportation needs for freight movement from industrial and commercial development	Yes	Truck circulation plan is included in Map V-10
Adoption			
OAR 660-012-0015 (4)	The TSP should be adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan	Yes	Implemented as the Transportation section of the Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 5)

Source: DKS (11/2010) and Clackamas County (10/2011)

Based on the DKS assessment and County staff review, the Transportation Element of the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 5) generally addresses most aspects of the TPR. Since most of the TPR requirements are standards-oriented (e.g. functional classifications, street-cross sections, access management), they are often referenced in the Transportation Policies. TPR policy issues identified by DKS Associates that may need to be addressed or strengthened in the County's TSP update include:

- Higher density along transit systems
- More residents living closer to employment areas
- Balancing accessibility with mobility
- Establishing maximum parking area standards
- Funding and investment strategies

Compliance with Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and Oregon Highway Plan (OHP)

The current TSP considers and is generally consistent with the policies found within the OTP, as listed in Section I above. Similarly, the TSP and associated regulations in the ZDO are generally consistent with the requirements of the OHP. To the extent that the current TSP complies with

the TPR, so does it comply with the OTP goals and policies.

The OTP contains implementation requirements for state multimodal, modal and topic plans. Several of these should be contemplated in the County's TSP update:

- Integration with other modal plans/modes;
- Attention to:
 - Supporting economic vitality;
 - Increasing the accessibility and mobility options available for people and freight;
 - Preservation of the existing transportation system;
 - Integration with the transportation system as a whole including enhancement of connections within and between modes and to destinations within and outside the state;
 - Efficient management and operation of the system;
 - Environmental responsibility, sustainability, land use and compact development;
 - Consideration of energy supply assumptions;
 - Safety;
 - Security; and
 - Public/private and state/regional/local partnerships and relationships.
- Description of funding and prioritization of publicly-funded needs.

As noted previously, several amendments to the OHP are currently under consideration including:

- Amendments to Policy 1F, mobility standards; and
- Amendments related to the recent passing of Senate Bill 264 - including the access management spacing tables in Appendix B and amendments to Policies 1A, 2A, 2C, and 3A through 3E.

Should these changes be adopted in the coming months, the County's TSP will need to be reviewed to ensure continued compliance with the OHP.

Compliance with 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP)

The updated 2035 RTP contains several new elements that Clackamas County will need to respond to in its TSP update:

- Outcome-based planning focusing on equity, economy and the environment
- Emphasis on a well-connected arterial and local street network, rather than relying on levels of congestion, to direct how and where to address motor vehicle capacity needs,
- Regional mobility corridors defining focus areas for investments
- Incorporating transportation system management and operations (TSMO) into planning

- Performance targets (see Table 4) for safety, congestion, freight reliability, climate change, active transportation, sidewalk/trail/transit infrastructure, clean air, travel, affordability and access to daily needs.

Table 4: 2035 RTP Performance Targets

Objective	Target by 2035
Safety	Reduce serious injuries and fatalities in all modes of travel by 50% (vs. 2005)
Congestion*	Reduce vehicle hours of delay (VHD) by 10% per person (vs. 2005)
Freight reliability	Reduce VHD per truck trip by 10% (vs. 2005)
Climate change	Reduce transportation greenhouse gas emissions by 40% (vs. 1990)
Active transportation	Triple walking, biking and transit mode share (vs. 2005)
Basic infrastructure	Increase by 50% access times to sidewalks, trails and transit (vs. 2005)
Clean air	Ensure 0% population exposure to at-risk levels of pollution
Travel	Reduce vehicle miles traveled per person by 10% (vs. 2005)
Affordability	Reduce average household combined cost of housing and transportation by 25% (vs. 2000)
Access to daily needs	Increase by 50% the number of essential destinations within 30 minutes by bike, transit for low-income, minority, disabled pop. (vs. 2005)

Source: DKS and Clackamas County

In 2010, the regulatory portion of the 2004 RTP was moved out of Chapter 6 (Implementation) of the RTP and adopted as a Regional Transportation Functional Plan within Metro code. The new regional requirements that were added/clarified in 2010 are summarized in Table 5 below, provided by Metro for guidance to local jurisdictions.

Table 5: Summary of Changes to Regional Requirements

Section	Title	Relevant 2004 RTP citation(s)	Summary of change(s) to Requirements in 2004 RTP
TITLE 1: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DESIGN			
3.08.110	Street System Design	Section 6.4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added arterial connectivity to Subsection B Revisions to right-of-way dimensions (Subsection F #1, 3, 4, 7 and 10)
3.08.120	Transit System Design	Section 6.4.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarified Subsection A to specify needed transit access connections within certain proximity to bus stops and HCT stations
3.08.130	Pedestrian System Design	Section 6.4.10 related to pedestrian districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New section to specify pedestrian plan elements and needs analysis Added gaps and deficiencies to inventory (Subsections A1 and B2) and consideration of pedestrian access to transit and other essential destinations as part of needs analysis (Subsection A2)
3.08.140	Bicycle System Design	N/A	New section to specify bicycle plan elements and needs analysis
3.08.150	Freight System Design	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New section to specify freight plan elements and needs analysis
3.08.160	Transportation System Management and Operations	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New section to specify TSMO plan elements and needs analysis
TITLE 2: DEVELOPMENT AND UPDATE OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS			
3.08.210	Transportation Needs	Section 6.4.1 Section 6.4.2 Section 6.4.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defines new needs analysis elements to be consistent with RTP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gaps and deficiencies identified in Title 1 inventories and evaluations (Subsection A1) Consideration of the needs of disadvantaged populations (Subsection A3) Regional needs identified in Mobility Corridor strategies in Chapter 4 of RTP (Subsection B2)
3.08.220	Transportation Solutions	Section 6.4.2 Section 6.4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised title name from “Congestion management” to “Transportation Solutions” Expanded to distinguish between needs and solutions and broaden focus beyond congestion management Establishes order of priority for system-level consideration of multi-modal strategies to address identified needs, consistent with the federally-required Congestion Management Process (CMP) and OHP Major Improvements Policy 1G. This also expands CMP process and OHP Policy 1G to TSP development and update, not just project development, local plan amendments or studies that would amend RTP (Subsection A) Specifies coordination with transportation facility owners when identifying solutions (Subsection B)

Section	Title	Relevant 2004 RTP citation(s)	Summary of change(s) to Requirements in 2004 RTP
3.08.230	Performance Targets and Standards	Section 6.4.6 Section 6.4.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revises title from “Non-SOV Modal Targets” to “Performance Targets and Standards” Removes allowance for local governments to adopt “lower” volume to capacity thresholds than RTP (e.g., Table 3.08.2 establishes the minimum thresholds) (Subsection C1) Clarifies the Oregon Transportation Commission must approve alternative mobility standards for state facilities (Subsection D) Directs inclusion of a broader set of performance targets that local governments are able to analyze at the TSP level; some RTP targets not included (e.g., greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, housing/transportation affordability because they are best analyzed at regional TSP level) (Subsection E) Expands actions to be adopted to demonstrate progress toward TSP performance targets in lieu of modeling progress toward Non-SOV modal targets in local TSPs (Subsection F)
TITLE 3: TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT			
3.08.310	Defining projects in TSPs	Section 6.2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change
TITLE 4: REGIONAL PARKING MANAGEMENT			
3.08.410	Parking Management	Title 2 of UGMFP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Subsections “G,” “H” and “I” to include provisions for freight loading/unloading areas in centers, bicycle parking minimums and parking management plans in centers and HCT corridors
TITLE 5: AMENDMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS			
3.08.510	Amendments of City and County Comprehensive Plans and TSPs	Section 6.4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specifies consideration of range of multimodal strategies as part of the traffic analysis required by OAR 660-012-0060 (Subsections A and B) Allows for an automatic 30 percent trip reduction credit in mixed-use areas if actions in 3.08.230F and TBD Section of Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) are adopted (Subsection C)
TITLE 6: COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES			
3.08.610	Metro review of amendments to TSPs	Section 6.4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change
3.08.620	Extension of compliance deadline	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change (same as Title 8 of the UGMFP)
3.08.630	Exception from compliance	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change (same as Title 8 of the UGMFP)

Source: Metro

In the Implementation and Guidance document (October 2011), Metro provides a checklist to help local jurisdictions comply with the elements in the Regional Transportation Function Plan (RTFP), which was adopted with the 2035 RTP to implement some of the RTP policies. A summary of the checklist and an assessment of the current TSP compared to these regulations follows. Elements not in compliance with the new regulations will need to be considered in the TSP update.

Table 6: RTFP Compliance

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Compliance	Reference/ Comments
Title 1: Street System Design, Sec 3.08.110 Include, to the extent practicable, a network of major arterial streets at one-mile spacing and minor arterials or collectors at half-mile spacing.	Yes	Comp Plan Ch. 5, Functional Classifications and Roadway Policies 9.0 – 16.0, Table V-2,V-3
Include conceptual map of all new streets for all contiguous areas of vacant and re-developable lots and parcels of five or more acres zoned for residential development.	Partial	Map V-4 identifies areas where connections needed, does not provide conceptual streets. Map does not reflect current UGB.
Includes provisions for requirements of new residential or mixed-use development proposing or required to construct new streets, including spacing and crossing distances, bike and pedestrian access and usage of cul-de-sacs.	Yes	Comp Plan Ch. 5, Roadway Policies 19.0 – 22.0, 27.0; ZDO Section 1007.04
Allow implementation of: -narrow streets; -wide sidewalks (at least five feet of through zone); -landscaped pedestrian buffer strips or paved furnishing zones of at least five feet, that include street trees; -Traffic calming to discourage traffic infiltration and excessive speeds; -short and direct right-of-way routes and shared-use paths to connect residences with commercial services, parks, schools, hospitals, institutions, transit corridors, regional trails and other neighborhood activity centers; - opportunities to extend streets in an incremental fashion, including posted notification on streets to be extended.	Yes	Comp Plan Ch. 5, Roadway Policies 26.0, 27.0; ZDO Sections 1007.04, 1007.06, 1007.08,
Allow complete street designs consistent with regional street design policies. Allow green street designs consistent with federal regulations for stream protection	Yes	ZDO Section 1007.04(B)
Establish city/county standards for local street connectivity, consistent with Title 1, Sec 3.08.110E, that applies to new residential or mixed-use development (of less than five acres) that proposes or is required to construct or extend street(s).	Yes	ZDO Section 1007
To the extent possible, restrict driveway and street access in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals, consistent with OHP access management standards.	Yes	Roadway Policies 15.0-16.0
Title 1: Transit System Design, Sec 3.08.120		

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Compliance	Reference/ Comments
Include investments, policies, standards and criteria to provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to all existing transit stops and major transit stops	Yes	Comp Plan Ch. 5, Transit Policies 6.0, 9.0
Include a transit plan that shows the locations of major transit stops, transit centers, high capacity transit stations, regional bike-transit facilities, inter-city bus and rail passenger terminals designated in the RTP, transit-priority treatments such as signals, park-and-ride facilities, and bicycle and pedestrian routes between essential destinations and transit stops.	Yes	<p>Maps V-6, V-6b identifies transit routes, transit centers and park& ride sites. Bike and pedestrian routes are identified in Maps V-7a, V-7b, V-8.</p> <p>In general, probably sufficient but could emphasize connections to transit more.</p>
<p>Include site design standards for new retail, office, multi-family and institutional buildings located near or at major transit. Provide reasonably direct pedestrian connections and safe crossings.</p> <p>At major transit stops, require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Locate buildings within 20 feet of the transit stop, a transit street or an intersection street, or a pedestrian plaza at the stop or a street intersections -Transit passenger landing pads accessible to disabled persons to transit agency standards; - An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter and an underground utility connection to a major transit stop if requested by the public transit provider; -Lighting to transit agency standards at the major transit stop; -Intersection and mid-block traffic management improvements as needed and practicable to enable marked crossings at major transit stops. 	Yes	ZDO Sections 1007.07 and 1005.03(L) address building siting standards and transit amenities.
<p>Title 1: Pedestrian System Design, Sec 3.08.130</p> <p>Include a pedestrian plan, for an interconnected network of pedestrian routes within and through the county. Include and inventory of existing facilities, an identification of gaps and deficiencies in the pedestrian system, an evaluation of needs, a list of needed improvements and other provisions for sidewalks and safe crossings.</p> <p>Includes provisions for creating pedestrian districts as an alternative to implementing site design standards at major transit stops.</p>	Partial	<p>Maps V-8, V-9 identify existing and planned network, Pedestrian Master Plan contains details.</p> <p>New provisions for needs analysis including access to transit and essential destinations will need to be addressed.</p>
Require new development to provide on-site streets and accessways that offer reasonably direct routes for pedestrian travel.	Yes	Table V-3 identifies required sidewalk/pathways by functional classification. ZDO Section 1007.06 contains requirements for bike/ped facilities associated with development.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Compliance	Reference/ Comments
<p>Title 1: Bicycle System Design, Sec 3.08.140</p> <p>Include a bicycle plan for an interconnected network of bicycle routes within and through the county. Include an inventory of existing include, an identification of gaps and deficiencies in the pedestrian system, an evaluation of needs, a list of needed improvements and other provisions for sidewalks and safe crossings.</p>	Partial	<p>Maps V-7a, V-7b identify existing and planned network, Bicycle Master Plan contains details. New provisions for needs analysis including access to transit and essential destinations will need to be addressed.</p>
<p>Title 1: Freight System Design, Sec 3.08.150</p> <p>Include a freight plan for an interconnected system of freight networks within and through the county. Include an inventory of existing facilities, an identification of gaps and deficiencies, an evaluation of freight access to freight intermodal facilities, employment and industrial areas and commercial districts, and a list of needed improvements to the freight system.</p>	Partial	<p>Existing freight routes identified in Map V-10. New provisions for needs analysis will need to be addressed.</p>
<p>Title 1: Transportation System Management and Operations Sec 3.08.160</p> <p>Include a transportation system management and operations (TSMO) plan. Include an inventory and evaluation of existing local and regional TSMO infrastructure, gaps and opportunities, and a list of projects and strategies, consistent with the Regional TSMO Plan, considering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Multimodal traffic management investments o Traveler Information investments o Traffic incident management investments o Transportation demand management investments 	Partial	<p>Comp Plan Ch. 5, Transportation Demand Management policies address strategies. New provisions for needs analysis will need to be addressed.</p>
<p>Title 2: Transportation Needs Sec 3.08.210</p> <p>Incorporate regional and state transportation needs identified in the 2035 RTP as well as local transportation needs. Determination of local transportation needs based upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identified system gaps and deficiencies - Identified facilities that exceed mobility standards - Consideration of the needs of disadvantaged populations - Consideration of regional needs identified in the mobility corridor strategies <p>Determination of transportation needs must be consistent with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population and employment forecast and planning period of the RTP (or alternative forecast coordinated with Metro) - System maps and functional classifications in RTP - Regional non-SOV modal targets and mobility standards 	Partial	<p>County CIP identifies and considers local and regional needs.</p> <p>New elements of needs analysis will need to be considered, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -gaps and deficiencies identified under Title 1 -Mobility corridors - Disadvantaged populations

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Compliance	Reference/ Comments
Title 2: Transportation Solutions, Sec 3.08.220 Identifies a prioritized list of strategies for county to consider for meeting identified transportation needs. County shall explain its choice of one or more of the strategies and why other strategies were not chosen. Requirement for county to coordinate its consideration of strategies with the owner of the transportation facility affected by the strategy.	No	This section contains new provisions that will need to be addressed in the update.
Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards Sec 3.08.230 Includes detailed provisions for the county to adopt alternative targets or standards in place of the regional targets. Includes requirement for 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. County must adopt: - Parking minimum and maximum ratios in Centers and Station Communities - Designs for street, transit, bicycle, freight and pedestrian systems consistent with Title 1: and - TSMO projects and strategies consistent with section 3.08.160; and - Land use actions (to encourage increased density near transit) pursuant to OAR 660-012-0035(2).	Partial	This section also contains substantial changes (see Table 5) that will need to be addressed in update. Items to adopt are largely in compliance: Parking ratios in ZDO 1015 are in compliance and other provisions will be updated through the TSP process.
Title 3: Defining Projects in Transportation System Plan Sec 3.08.310 Includes the specifications for defining projects in the TSP.	Yes	This section did not change. Project lists will be updated accordingly.
Title 4: Parking Management Sec 3.08.410 Adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities. Plans shall include an inventory of parking supply and usage, an evaluation of bicycle parking needs with consideration of <i>TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines</i> . Includes list of strategies to consider in parking management plans.	Partial	Required parking ratios did not change and ZDO 1015 (Parking and Loading) is in compliance. ZDO 1015 was recently amended to include bicycle parking minimums and off-street freight loading areas. Parking management plans and needs assessments will need to be addressed.
Title 5: Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans Sec 3.08.510 Includes provisions for when a city or county proposes a transportation project that is not included in the RTP and will result in a significant increase in SOV capacity or exceeds the planned function or capacity of a facility	N/A	Any proposed amendments meeting these criteria will need to consider the provisions of this section.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Compliance	Reference/ Comments
designated in the RTP. If the city or county decides not to build a project identified in the RTP, it shall identify alternative projects or strategies to address the identified transportation need.		(This section does not apply to city or county transportation projects that are financed locally and would be undertaken on local facilities.)

Metro's RTP contains a number of amendments to the previous RTP (2004). As the County updates its TSP, particular attention will need to be paid to the following:

1. The 2035 RTP and RTP has more emphasis on identifying pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit and essential destination and on the needs of disadvantaged populations youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations, i.e., minorities and low-income families.
2. There are new requirements for needs analyses with more emphasis on gaps and deficiencies in the transportation system for:
 - Pedestrian and bicycle plans;
 - Freight system plans; and
 - Transportation system management and operations plans.
3. The county is required to consider and incorporate regional needs identified in the Mobility Corridor strategies in Chapter 4 of the RTP when completing its transportation needs analysis.
4. Substantial changes were also made to provisions relating to the development of transportation solutions and performance targets, including the need to consider multi-modal strategies to address identified transportation need in order of the prioritized list in the RTP.

SECTION III: OTHER CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE 2011-2013 TSP UPDATE

Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP)

Title 6 of the UGMFP is no longer a compliance requirement and affects only those local governments who want to be eligible for one of the incentives listed in Section I. A new Title 6 map created by Metro will be the official depiction of adopted boundaries for centers, corridor, station communities and main streets, and will be revised as local governments adopt revised boundaries. As the update of the TSP is considered, whether the available investments and other incentives would be desirable to the County will need to be considered and recommendations made as to whether new corridors, main streets or station communities need to be identified and qualified for adoption by Metro.

Emerging Issues

In November 2010, DKS Associates identified several emerging issues that will need to be addressed in the TSP. The issues were identified through a review of emerging Federal policies and from interviews of various Clackamas County stakeholders (Table 7).

Table 7: Emerging Issues

Theme	Issues
Sustainable	Livability
	Greenhouse gas emissions
	Emphasize safety and reliability
Economy	Policies connect to priorities and investments
	Maximize return on investment
	Support basic services and economic growth
Health	Access to public services
	Accessibility to non-motor vehicle modes
	Life safety management
Flexibility	Practical design
	Apply solutions to fit location and function
	Mode neutral – move people and goods

Source: DKS Associates (11/2010)

As part of the current TSP update, a white paper on emerging issues is being prepared. This will identify current thinking regarding issues to be considered in the TSP.

Transportation planning work on a regional and statewide level continues to look into new issues as well. Attention should be paid to any changes in statewide or regional policies as the County goes through the TSP update process. Two notable happenings include:

- Interagency teams are developing strategies for addressing sustainability, global warming, environmental issues and economic revitalization.

- Both Metro and ODOT are exploring funding options including tolling and alternatives to the motor vehicle fuel tax.

Changing Statewide Regulations

Statewide regulations governing transportation planning are changing. The state of Oregon is currently considering several amendments to its transportation planning regulations, including:

- Section 060 of the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012);
- The Oregon Highway Plan, Policies 1A, 1F, 2A, 2C, 3A-E, and the access spacing standards in Appendix C; and
- OAR 734, Division 51, Access Management Rules.

Throughout the County's TSP planning process, attention needs to be paid not only to these potential regulation changes but to any additional changes that may be made before the process is completed.

Consideration of Other County Agency Documents/ Needs

Finally, other county plans and documents that reference transportation systems or mention transportation needs may need to be reviewed for consistency with updates being proposed to the TSP, including, but not limited to:

- Clackamas County Strategic Plan
- Clackamas County Action Plan for a Sustainable Clackamas County
- Clackamas County Roadway Standards
- Housing Authority Strategic Plan(s)
- Development Agency plans
- Regional Center Design Plan/ Bike-Ped Plan



Regulatory Compliance:
Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update
Draft: October 9, 2013

Transportation System Planning in Oregon is required by state law as one of the 19 statewide planning goals (Goal 12 - Transportation). The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), OAR 660-012-0015, which defines how to implement State Planning Goal 12, requires:

- The state to prepare a TSP, referred to as the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP and its related modal plans such as the Oregon Highway Plan);
- Metropolitan planning organizations to prepare a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that is consistent with the OTP (the Metro RTP applies to the Clackamas County within the regional urban growth boundary); and
- Counties and Cities to prepare Local TSPs that are consistent with the OTP and RTP.

The OTP, as the guiding document for regional and local TSPs, establishes goals, policies, strategies and initiatives that address the core challenges and opportunities facing transportation in Oregon. These are further implemented with adopted standards in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP). TSPs for Counties and Cities within Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) must also comply with the RTP, which is adopted to meet both State and Federal requirements. The Clackamas County TSP must be consistent with the OTP, OHP and the Metro RTP.

This document provides findings of compliance of the proposed Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP) update (Planning File #ZDO 246) and the existing and proposed amendments to the Clackamas County Zoning & Development Ordinance (ZDO) with the requirements set out in the Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP). As established in the RTFP, demonstrating compliance with the RTFP constitutes compliance with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Compliance with the Statewide Planning Goals, the Transportation Planning Rule, the Oregon Highway Plan and other applicable regulations will be completed in conjunction with the Staff Report for the scheduled October 28, 2013 public hearing. The County's current TSP served as the foundation for the update process. An assessment of the current TSP and more detailed overview of the regulatory context within which transportation system planning is completed can be found in the TSP Technical Background Document: Section 8 TSP Policy Review.

Compliance with 2035 Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP)

Metro's Implementation and Guidance document (October 2011) provides a checklist table to help local jurisdictions comply with the elements in the Regional Transportation Function Plan (RTFP), which was adopted with the 2035 RTP to implement some of the RTP policies. This table is provided below, along with an assessment of compliance of the proposed updates to the county's TSP. These findings relate to the draft of the TSP dated September 23, 2013, which was distributed with the 35-day notice to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). This document can be found at <http://www.clackamas.us/planning/zdoproposed.html>. The TSP Technical Background Document, referenced in this assessment, can be found at www.clackamascountytsp.com.

Clackamas County's TSP update began with a visioning process. The six overarching goals developed for the county's TSP Update include goals addressing **sustainability; local jobs and economy; livable and local; safety; health and equity; and fiscal responsibility**. Throughout the update process, all existing and proposed policies and projects proposed in the TSP update were evaluated against these goals.

Any analysis of the compliance with the RTFP of the amendments to the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan (Chapters 5 – Transportation and Chapter 10 - Community and Design Plans) and the Clackamas County Zoning & Development Ordinance (ZDO) as part of the Clackamas County TSP Update process must recognize that 80% of the County's land area and a majority of the county transportation facilities are located outside of Metro and the RTFP jurisdiction. This situation works against the use of a singular approach to the analysis of transportation issues in the County and the identification of appropriate solutions to transportation problems based solely on the provision of the RTFP.

Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP)
Findings of Compliance with Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP)
October 2013

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>Title 1: Street System Design, Sec 3.08.110 Include, to the extent practicable, a network of major arterial streets at one-mile spacing and minor arterials or collectors at half-mile spacing considering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing topography; • rail lines; freeways; pre-existing development, leases, easements or covenants; • requirements of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Title 3 (Water Quality and Flood plains) and Title 13 (Nature in Neighborhoods), such as streams, rivers, flood plains, wetlands, riparian and upland fish and wildlife habitat areas. • arterial design concepts in chapter 2 of RTP • best practices and designs as set forth in regional state or local plans and best practices for protecting natural resources and natural areas <p>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110C)</p>	Yes	<p>The County reviewed the arterial and collector system and noted a limited number of gaps in the arterial and collector road network. These gaps were located in area that had existing topographic and environmental constraint. Accordingly no new additions to the arterial and collector system were identified beyond those that are noted in previous plans. Maps 5-4a & 5-4b illustrate the county's' road network by functional class.</p> <p>Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5, Roadway Policies 5.O.1 through 5.O.16 (Functional Classification) and 5.Q.1 through 5.Q.5 (Access Standards) address the County's' road network and designations of functional class.</p> <p>Figures 5-1a through 5-1f illustrate typical cross sections for urban roads by functional classification, which are consistent with the urban design concepts found in the RTP. The guidelines for county road cross sections allow for flexibility, where necessary to accommodate environmental or other physical constraints (<i>note 3 on the cross sections states -- 3. Cross section may vary to accommodate Regional Transportation Functional Plan 3.08.110 Street System Design or to accommodate topographical or environmental constraints</i>).</p>
<p>Include conceptual map of all new streets for all contiguous areas of vacant and re-developable lots and parcels of five or more acres zoned for residential development.</p> <p>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110D)</p>	Yes	<p>The TSP contains Map 5-6 which identifies the location in the urban unincorporated areas that contain parcels of developable residential land with at least 5 acres. Policy 5.R.4 requires implementation of a local street network on these sites, with consideration of the existing road network.</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>Require new residential or mixed-use development (of five or more acres) that proposes or is required to construct or extend street(s) to provide a site plan (consistent with the conceptual new streets map required by Title 1, Sec 3.08.110D) that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides full street connections with spacing of no more than 530 feet between connections except where prevented by barriers • Provides a crossing every 800 to 1,200 feet if streets must cross water features protected pursuant to Title 3 UGMFP (unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a full street connection) • provides bike and pedestrian accessways in lieu of streets with spacing of no more than 330 feet except where prevented by barriers • limits use of cul-de-sacs and other closed-end street systems to situations where barriers prevent full street connections includes no closed-end street longer than 220 feet or having no more than 25 dwelling units <p>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110E)</p>	Yes	<p>Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5, Roadway Policies 5.Q.6 – 5.Q.8; 5.R.3; 5.R.7; ZDO Section 1007.04 all address requirements of new roads to serve development.</p> <p>Policies 5.Q.6-5.Q.8 require that developers proposing new streets provide full street connections at intervals of no more than 530 feet, except when prevented by barriers and require that a bike/pedestrian accessway be provided at no more than 330 feet if the full street connection requirement cannot be met. UGMFP Title 3 requirements are address in Chapter 3 of the Comprehensive Plan and ZDO Section 726. No changes are proposed to those standards.</p> <p>Policy 5.R.7 allows for flexible criteria when roads are less than 200 feet in length and not capable of being extended.</p> <p>ZDO Section 1007.04(C) prohibits cul-de-sacs or other dead-end turnarounds with a list of exceptions, including natural features and existing development patterns.</p>
<p>Establish city/county standards for local street connectivity, consistent with Title 1, Sec 3.08.110E, that applies to new residential or mixed-use development (of less than five acres) that proposes or is required to construct or extend street(s).</p> <p>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110F)</p>		<p>Additional road spacing standards are found in the County's <i>Roadway Standards</i>. No changes are proposed to that document at this time.</p>
<p>Allow implementation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • narrow streets (<28 ft curb to curb); • wide sidewalks (at least five feet of through zone); • landscaped pedestrian buffer strips or paved furnishing zones of at least five feet, that include street trees; • Traffic calming to discourage traffic infiltration and excessive speeds; 	Yes	<p>ZDO Section 1007.04 allows for deviations to standards in 1007.04(B) when the County finds that "safe and efficient alternative designs would better accommodate (a) sustainable development features such as 'green streets.'"</p> <p>Typical urban cross sections found in Figures 5-1a through 5-1f were developed with consideration for existing standards in the County's</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short and direct right-of-way routes and shared-use paths to connect residences with commercial services, parks, schools, hospitals, institutions, transit corridors, regional trails and other neighborhood activity centers; • opportunities to extend streets in an incremental fashion, including posted notification on streets to be extended. <p>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110B)</p> <p>Allow complete street designs consistent with regional street design policies.</p> <p>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110A(2))</p> <p>Allow green street designs consistent with federal regulations for stream protection (Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110A(2))</p>		<p>Comprehensive Plan and the Roadway Standards and Metro's Regional Street Design Classifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow streets: the local road cross section (Figure 5-1d) shows a typical paved width of 36'-42' but allows for flexibility to accommodate standards specifically found in the RTFP (note 3 on the cross sections and Policy 5.O.1). • Sidewalks: ZDO Table 1007-01 requires a minimum sidewalk width of at least 5 feet, depending on functional classification and adjacent land use. • Buffer strips: street trees and pedestrian facilities are required on all new county roads and concurrent with certain land use applications, per ZDO Section 1007.08. • Traffic calming: Policy 5.R.3 requires development and implementation of appropriate traffic calming facilities • Short connections: ZDO Section 1005.03(F) require developments provide on-site walkways • Policy 5.O.6 allows the use of Metro alternative street standards (Green Streets) as "design alternatives" within the County Road Standards. • Incremental extension: ZDO Section 1007.04 (B) requires that the layout of new public and county roads provide for the continuation of roads within and between the development and adjoining developments, when feasible, and that street stubs be provided to allow for future access to adjacent undeveloped property, as deemed necessary.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<u>Applicable to both Development Code and TSP</u> To the extent feasible, restrict driveway and street access in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals, consistent with Oregon Highway Plan Access Management Standards, and accommodate local circulation on the local system. Public street connections, consistent with regional street design and spacing standards, shall be encouraged and shall supersede this access restriction. Multimodal street design features including pedestrian crossings and on-street parking shall be allowed where appropriate. (Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110G)	Yes	Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5, Roadway Policies 5.Q.2 & 5.Q.3 address state access requirements generally and specifically within adopted Interchange Area Management Plans (IAMP) areas. To date, three IAMP areas have been adopted by the County (illustrated in map 5-7) and include provisions for access consistent with the OHP.
Title 1: Transit System Design, Sec 3.08.120 Include investments, policies, standards and criteria to provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to all existing transit stops and major transit stops designated in Figure 2.15 of the RTP. (Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120A)	Yes	Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5, Transit Policies 5.T.7 & 5.T.9 address requirements for transit connections and require transit-supportive amenities to be provided and reviewed through the development review process. ZDO Section 1005 provides more details about requirements at or near transit stops.
Include a transit plan that shows the locations of major transit stops, transit centers, high capacity transit stations, regional bike-transit facilities, inter-city bus and rail passenger terminals designated in the RTP, transit-priority treatments such as signals, park-and-ride facilities, and bicycle and pedestrian routes between essential destinations and transit stops. (Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B(1))	Yes	Maps 5-8a & 5-8b identify transit routes, transit centers and park & ride sites. Clackamas County does not contain any of the other sites designated in the RTP (i.e. regional bike transit facilities). Existing and planned bicycle and pedestrian routes are identified in Maps 5-2a, 5-2b & 5-3.
Include site design standards for new retail, office, multi-family and institutional buildings located near or at major transit stops shown in Figure 2.15 in the RTP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide reasonably direct pedestrian connections between transit stops and building entrances and between building entrances and streets adjoining transit stops; • Provide safe, direct and logical pedestrian crossings at all transit stops where practicable 	Yes	Comp. Plan Ch. 5, Transit Policy 5.T.13 and ZDO Sections 1007.07 and 1005.03(F-L) address pedestrian access, transit-supportive amenities, and/or building siting standards along major transit routes and specifically at major transit stops. Map 5-7a (urban area transit) illustrates major transit routes and major transit stops, consistent with those shown on Figure 2.15 in the RTP. To ensure compliance, ZDO Section 1007.07 requires that all residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial developments on

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At major transit stops, require the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locate buildings within 20 feet of the transit stop, a transit street or an intersection street, or a pedestrian plaza at the stop or a street intersections; Transit passenger landing pads accessible to disabled persons to transit agency standards; An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter and an underground utility connection to a major transit stop if requested by the public transit provider; Lighting to transit agency standards at the major transit stop; Intersection and mid-block traffic management improvements as needed and practicable to enable marked crossings at major transit stops. <p>(Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B(2))</p>		existing and planned transit routes shall be reviewed by Tri-Met or other appropriate transit provider to ensure appropriate design and integration of transit amenities into the development.
<p>Title 1: Pedestrian System Design, Sec 3.08.130</p> <p>Include a pedestrian plan, for an interconnected network of pedestrian routes within and through the city or county. The plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An inventory of existing facilities that identifies gaps and deficiencies in the pedestrian system; An evaluation of needs for pedestrian access to transit and essential destinations for all mobility levels, including direct, comfortable and safe pedestrian routes; A list of improvements to the pedestrian system that will help the city or county achieve the regional Non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 of the RTFP, and other targets established pursuant to section 3.08.230; Provisions for sidewalks along arterials, collectors and most local streets, except that sidewalks are not required along controlled roadways, such as freeways; 	Yes	<p>Map 5-3 identifies the existing and planned pedestrian network; the Pedestrian Master Plan (adopted by reference in the Comprehensive Plan) and the Existing Conditions Report, found in the TSP Background Document contain more details and analysis about the pedestrian network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gaps and deficiencies: The Existing Conditions Report, found in the TSP Technical Background Document: Section 2 TSP Existing Conditions, identifies gaps and deficiencies within the urban pedestrian network (a summary can be found starting on page 19 of the Executive Summary). This information was used to inform the selection of projects for inclusion into the county's 20-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Non-SOV modal targets: Policy 5.E.6 and Table 5-1 identify the county's non-SOV modal targets, which are the same as those identified in the RTFP. This information was also considered in the selection of CIP projects.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision for safe crossings of streets and controlled pedestrian crossings on major arterials (Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130A)		<p>Sidewalks and pedestrian crossings: Sidewalks are required on all urban roads, per ZDO section 1007.06. Typical cross sections for the urban area (Figures 5-1a – 5-1f) illustrate these requirements by functional class and allow for pedestrian refuges on major arterials, as deemed appropriate (<i>note 4 on the cross sections states - 4. Within the range stated, precise dimensions of typical paved width shall be determined by Engineering based upon adjacent land use, vehicle traffic volume, existing travel lane width, design speed and crash history.).</i></p>
<p>(Could be in Comprehensive plan or TSP as well) As an alternative to implementing site design standards at major transit stops (section 3.08.120B(2), a city or county may establish pedestrian districts with the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A connected street and pedestrian network for the district; An inventory of existing facilities, gaps and deficiencies in the network of pedestrian routes; Interconnection of pedestrian, transit and bicycle systems; Parking management strategies; Access management strategies; Sidewalk and accessway location and width; Landscaped or paved pedestrian buffer strip location and width; Street tree location and spacing; Pedestrian street crossing and intersection design; Street lighting and furniture for pedestrians; A mix of types and densities of land uses that will support a high level of pedestrian activity. (Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130B)	Not applicable	<p>The County implements the site design standards at major transit stops through Comp. Plan Ch. 5, Transit Policy 5.T.13 and ZDO Sections 1007.07 and 1005.03(F-L).</p> <p>The County does not plan to establish a pedestrian district at this time; therefore these requirements are not applicable.</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>Require new development to provide on-site streets and accessways that offer reasonably direct routes for pedestrian travel.</p> <p>(Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130C)</p>	Yes	<p>Figures 5-1a through 5-2f illustrate typical cross sections for urban and rural roads by functional classification and identify pedestrian requirements.</p> <p>ZDO Section 1007.06 contains requirements for bicycle and pedestrian facilities associated with development. All new development within the urban area is required to provide these facilities.</p>
<p>Title 1: Bicycle System Design, Sec 3.08.140</p> <p>Include a bicycle plan for an interconnected network of bicycle routes within and through the city or county. The plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inventory of existing facilities that identifies gaps and deficiencies in the bicycle system; • An evaluation of needs for bicycle access to transit and essential destinations, including direct, comfortable and safe bicycle routes and secure bicycle parking, considering <i>TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines</i>; • A list of improvements to the bicycle system that will help the city or county achieve the regional Non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 of the RTFP and other targets established pursuant to section 3.08.230; • Provision for bikeways along arterials, collectors and local streets, and bicycling parking in centers, at major transit stops shown in Figure 2.15 in the RTP, park-and-ride lots and associated with institutional uses; • Provision for safe crossing of streets and controlled bicycle crossings on major arterials <p>(Title 1, Bicycle System Design Sec 3.08.140)</p>	Yes	<p>Maps 5-2a & 5-2b identify the existing and planned bikeway network; the Bicycle Master Plan (adopted by reference in the Comprehensive Plan) and the Existing Conditions Report, found in the TSP Background Document contain more details and analysis about the bicycle network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps and deficiencies: The TSP Technical Background Document: Section 2 TSP Existing Conditions identifies gaps and deficiencies within the urban bikeway network a summary can be found starting on page 22 of the Executive Summary). This information was used to inform the selection of projects for inclusion into the county's 20-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) • Non-SOV modal targets: Policy 5.E.6 and Table 5-1 identify the county's non-SOV modal targets, which are the same as those identified in the RTFP. This information was also considered in the selection of CIP projects. • Bikeways and safe crossings: bikeways (as defined in ZDO Section 202 and Chapter 5) are required on all urban roads, per ZDO section 1007.06. Typical cross sections for the urban area (Figures 5-1a – 5-1f) illustrate these requirements by functional class and allow for pedestrian refuges at crossings on major arterials, as deemed appropriate(note 4 on the cross sections). • Bicycle parking: Bicycle parking is required for all new (non-single-family) development. Bicycle parking standards are found in Section 1015.05.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>Title 1: Freight System Design, Sec 3.08.150 Include a freight plan for an interconnected system of freight networks within and through the city or county. The plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inventory of existing facilities that identifies gaps and deficiencies in the freight system; • An evaluation of freight access to freight intermodal facilities, employment and industrial areas and commercial districts; • A list of improvements to the freight system that will help the city or county increase reliability of freight movement, reduce freight delay and achieve targets established pursuant to section 3.08.230. <p>(Title 1, Freight System Design Sec 3.08.150)</p>		<p>Maps 5-9a through 5-9d identify the existing and planned freight network; the Existing Conditions Report, found in the TSP Background Document contains more details and analysis about the freight network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps and deficiencies and freight access: The Existing Conditions Report, found in the TSP Technical Background Document: Section 2 TSP Existing Conditions, identifies gaps and deficiencies within the county's freight network in conjunction with the overall review of the transportation networks performance. • The County Freight System Maps 5-9a through 5-9d have been updated to reflect the regional and state freight network. • Improved access to employment lands was one of the six goals that was used to rate all of the capital project. • This information was used to inform the selection of projects for inclusion into the county's 20-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) • Freight system improvements: the 20-year CIP includes projects that improve roadways along the county's freight routes. Many of the projects in the top priority are those that are needed for safety reasons, specifically to reduce conflicts between all road users, including freight, thus increasing the reliability of freight movement.
<p>Title 1: Transportation System Management and Operations Sec 3.08.160 Include a transportation system management and operations (TSMO) plan to improve the performance of existing transportation infrastructure within or through the city or county. A TSMO plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inventory and evaluation of existing local and regional TSMO infrastructure, strategies and programs that identifies gaps and opportunities to expand infrastructure, 	Yes	<p>Comp. Plan Ch. 5, Policies 5.D.1 7 5.D.2 and 5.E.1 through 5.E.5 all address Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO), including Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure evaluation: Clackamas County recently updated it's ITS Plan, which contains analysis and evaluations of current ITS and TSM programs and infrastructure. • The County's ITS Plan was used to inform both the policies and projects in the 20-year CIP.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>strategies and programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A list of projects and strategies, consistent with the Regional TSMO Plan, based upon consideration of the following functional areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Multimodal traffic management investments o Traveler Information investments o Traffic incident management investments o Transportation demand management investments <p>(Title 1, Transportation System Management and Operations Sec 3.08.160)</p>		
<p>Title 2: Transportation Needs Sec 3.08.210</p> <p>Incorporate regional and state transportation needs identified in the 2035 RTP as well as local transportation needs.</p> <p>Determination of local transportation needs based upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System gaps and deficiencies identified in the inventories and analysis of transportation system pursuant to Title 1; • 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; • 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. • A local determination of transportation needs must be consistent with the following elements of the RTP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 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 	Yes	<p>The County's proposed 20-year CIP identifies and considers local and regional needs. The initial projects proposed for evaluation inclusion in the County's Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps and deficiencies: All proposed projects were evaluated against the six TSP goals, as well as the identified gap deficiencies and other needs identified in the TSP Background Document. • Deficiency thresholds: There are five intersections and several scattered road segments that exceed the Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards and an analysis has determined that there are no feasible solutions to alter the intersections or road segments resulting in compliance with the mobility standards. These intersections and segments are identified in Technical Memo 12.4 (also found in the TSP Technical Background Document: Section 5 2035 Preferred Alternative) and will be the subject of further analysis under provision in the Oregon Highway Plan (Policy 5.F.1). • Transportation disadvantaged populations: these populations were addressed in the existing conditions analysis - TSP Technical Background Document: Section 2 TSP Existing Conditions. • Additional analysis was conducted by the County's Health, Housing and Human Services Department (H3S). This information

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>the RTP;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ System maps and functional classifications for street design, motor vehicles, transit, bicycles, pedestrians and freight in Chapter 2 of the RTP; ○ Regional non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 and the Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards in Table 3.08-2. <p>When determining its transportation needs, a city or county shall consider the regional needs identified in the mobility corridor strategies in Chapter 4 of the RTP. (Title 2, Transportation Needs Sec 3.08.210)</p>		<p>regarding transportation needs of underserved members of the community (youth, elderly, disables and low-income families) were considered in the evaluation. The H3S report can be found in TSP Technical Background Document: Section 11 TSP Other County Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Plan Equity, Health & Sustainability Policies 5.C.1 – 5.C.6 address equity and the transportation disadvantaged. • Transportation needs: The determinations of need found in the County's TSP are consistent with the listed elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The existing conditions analysis was based on Metro's 2035 Beta Household and Employment forecast. ○ The future conditions preferred alternatives analyses was based on Metro's 2035 Gamma Household and Employment forecast ○ Maps 5-2 through 5-9d and Figures 5-1a through 5-1f (typical cross sections) all identify and are consistent with road designations and other roadway design elements found in the RTP. ○ Regional non-SOV targets are included in Table 5-1 and Policy 5.E.6. Operating standards are addressed in Policies 5.S.1 through 5.S.7 and Tables 5-2a and 5-2b. These standards are the same as those identified in Table 3.08-2. • Mobility corridors: Issues for Corridors 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 , and 15 were considered during the creation of the Existing Conditions Report - TSP Technical Background Document: Section 2 TSP Existing Conditions.
<p>Title 2: Transportation Solutions, Sec 3.08.220</p> <p>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</p>	Yes	<p>Through the extensive process of alternatives analysis and project selection and prioritization, each of the strategies below was contemplated (See TSP Technical Background Document: Section 6 TSP Capital Projects.)</p> <p>County Capital Projects Lists were developed using a different project</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>one or more of the strategies and why other strategies were not chosen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TSMO, including localized TDM, safety, operational and access management improvements; • Transit, bicycle and pedestrian system improvements; • Traffic-calming designs and devices; • Land use strategies in OAR 660-012-0035(2) • Connectivity improvements to provide parallel arterials, collectors or local streets that include pedestrian and bicycle facilities, consistent with the connectivity standards in section 3.01.110 and design classifications in Table 2.6 of the RTP, • 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 <p>A city or county shall coordinate its consideration of the above strategies with the owner of the transportation facility affected by the strategy.</p> <p>Facility design is subject to the approval of the facility owner. If analysis under subsection 3.08.210A (Local Needs determination) 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose a project at the time of Metro review of the TSP to be incorporated into the RTP during the next RTP update; or • Propose an amendment to the RTP for needs and projects if the amendment is necessary prior to the next RTP update. 		<p>classification system. The 20 Year Capital Improvement Projects List is a financially constrained project list and contains approximately 15% of the total projects analyzed based on estimated project cost. The project types show below also show the percentage of the total projects on this list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrades – Projects that add sidewalk, bicycle lanes and vehicle capacity. (47% of total number of projects) • Upgrade, Active Transportation Only - Projects that add sidewalk and/or bicycle lanes to an existing roadway. (24% of total number of projects) • Upgrade: Vehicle Capacity Only - Projects within the UGB that add vehicle capacity to an existing roadway or intersection. This may require the reconstruction of any existing sidewalks and/or bicycle lanes. (5% of total number of projects) • Safety – Projects or studies specifically focused on reducing crashes and/or the risk for crashes, including railroad crossing projects. (3% of total number of projects) • Study – Future Transportation Studies to be undertaken as part of the implementation of the TSP (Less than 1% of total number of projects) • New Roadway – Projects that identify the need for a new roadway or roadway extension. (6% of total number of projects) • Multiuse Paths – Projects that identify the need for a new multiuse path or multiuse path extension. (4% of total number of projects) • Bridges – Projects that identify a need for constructing, replacing or upgrading an existing bridge. (8% of total number of projects) • Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Projects (Less than 1% of total number of projects)

RTPF Compliance (October 9, 2013)
Clackamas County TSP Update 2013

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
(Title 2, Sec 3.08.220 Transportation Solutions)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Miscellaneous Project Categories including: Other Projects, Programs And Multimodal Improvements (3% of total number of projects) Land use strategies: Changes to land use designations were not considered as a part of this TSP update. The County's Planning & Zoning Division is currently in a multi-year process of evaluating and updating its Comprehensive Plan and ZDO and may consider land use changes related to increasing density at or near transit stations and/or strategies to encourage development in centers and corridors to occur at densities that are currently allowed but not occurring. <p>The process to identify and evaluate projects for inclusion into the County's CIP was extensively coordinated with ODOT, DLCD, Metro, Tri-Met, neighboring cities and other affected agencies and facility owners. These agencies were represented on the County's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) which met 10 times to discuss both projects and policies for inclusion into the TSP. Individual meetings with several of the agencies also occurred.</p> <p>The County is proposing to both remove and add projects to Metro's RTP. This request will be made in conjunction with the next update of the RTP, expected to be completed in mid-2014. Clackamas County will coordinate closely with Metro to ensure the County's TSP and Metro's RTP remain consistent.</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards Sec 3.08.230</p> <p>Demonstrate that solutions adopted pursuant to section 3.08.220 (Transportation Solutions) will achieve progress toward the targets and standards in Tables 3.08-1, and 3.08-2 and measures in subsection D (local performance measures), or toward alternative targets and standards adopted by the city or county. The city or county shall include the regional targets and standards or its alternatives in its TSP.</p> <p>A city or county may adopt alternative targets or standards in place of the regional targets and standards upon a demonstration that the alternative targets or standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are no lower than the modal targets in Table 3.08-1 and no lower than the ratios in Table 3.08-2; • 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 • Will not increase SOV travel to a degree inconsistent with the non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1. <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To demonstrate progress toward achievement of performance targets in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 and to improve performance</p>	Yes	<p>The County is proposing to adopt the targets and standards in Tables 3.08-1, and 3.08-2, as demonstrated in Policies 5.E.5, 5.E.6, and 5.S.1 through 5.S.7 and Tables 5-1 and 5-2a.</p> <p>Projects proposed for inclusion into the 20-year CIP were evaluated against these standards, as well as the six overarching TSP goals. Both the standards and goals are intended to help direct the prioritization of the projects to ensure they do achieve progress toward the standards and goals. The analysis of the 2035 transportation system performance was undertaken using the regional performance standards and the capital projects included in the 20 Year Capital Improvement Plan. Five intersections and several road segment exceeded the regional performance standards even with the assumed improvements.</p> <p>The County is proposing to develop-alternative performance targets for these intersection and road segments over the next 5 years in cooperation with ODOT and Metro.</p> <p>The County has or is proposing to adopt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum and maximum parking ratios consistent with subsection 3.08.410A (ZDO Section 1015.04 and Table 1015-2); • Designs for street, transit, bicycle, freight and pedestrian systems consistent with Title 1 (Figures 5-1a through 5-1f and associated Active Transportation, Roadway, Transit and Freight Policies); and • TSMO projects and strategies consistent with section 3.08.160 (Policies 5.D.1, 5.D.2 and 5.E.1 through 5.E.7). <p>The County is not proposing and land use changes at this time.</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>of state highways within its jurisdiction as much as feasible and avoid their further degradation, the city or county shall adopt the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking minimum and maximum ratios in Centers and Station Communities consistent with subsection 3.08.410A; • Designs for street, transit, bicycle, freight and pedestrian systems consistent with Title 1: and • TSMO projects and strategies consistent with section 3.08.160; and • Land use actions pursuant to OAR 660-012-0035(2). <p>(Title 2, Performance Targets and Standards Sec 3.08.230)</p>		
<p>Title 3: Defining Projects in Transportation System Plan Sec 3.08.310</p> <p>Specify the general locations and facility parameters, such as minimum and maximum ROW dimensions and the number and width of traffic lanes, of planned regional transportation facilities and improvements identified on general location depicted in the appropriate RTP map. Except as otherwise provided in the TSP, the general location is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For new facilities, a corridor within 200 feet of the location depicted on the appropriate RTP map; • For interchanges, the general location of the crossing roadways, without specifying the general location of connecting ramps; • For existing facilities planned for improvements, a corridor within 50 feet of the existing right-of-way and • For realignments of existing facilities, a corridor within 200 feet of the segment to be realigned as measured from the existing right-of-way depicted on the appropriate RTP map. 	Yes	<p>After nearly two years of work with the public, consultants, and several advisory committees, the County has found a need for and is proposing to include more than 320 projects for roads, bridges, sidewalks and bikeways in its TSP. These include projects that are consistent with the locations of projects on the RTP, as well as a few that are not.</p> <p>Each proposed project can be found on one of seven project maps (Maps 5-11a through 5-11g), each map representing a subarea of unincorporated Clackamas County.</p> <p>Project lists, including a brief description of the project and number of lanes (if applicable) are found in Tables 5-3a through 5-3d, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 5-3a: <i>20-Year Capital Projects</i>, the highest priority major and minor transportation projects that can reasonably be undertake given the current estimates of available funding • Table 5-3b: <i>Preferred Capital Projects</i>, second priority projects that the County hopes to undertake if additional funding becomes available during the next 20 years.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>A City or county may refine or revise the general location of a planned regional facility as it prepares or revises impacts of the facility or to comply with comprehensive plan or statewide planning goals. If, in developing or amending its TSP, a city or county determines the general location of a planned regional facility or improvement is inconsistent with its comprehensive plan or a statewide goal requirement, it shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose a revision to the general location of the planned facility or improvement to achieve consistency and, if the revised location lies outside the general location depicted in the appropriate RTP map, seek an amendment to the RTP; or Propose a revision to its comprehensive plan to authorize the planned facility or improvement at the revised location. <p>(Title 3, Defining Projects in Transportation System Plan Sec 3.08.310)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5-3c: <i>Long-Term Capital Projects</i>, third priority projects that will be needed to meet the transportation needs of the County in the next 20 years, but are not expected to be funded or constructed during that time. Table 5-3d: <i>Project to be Completed by Others</i>, projects needed by not likely to be completed or funded by Clackamas County (i.e. ODOT facilities) <p>As part of the RTP Update process, the County is expected to propose to do the following :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the project description for several planned regional facilities, To request the removal of a limited number of planned facilities that have been determined to no longer be a county priority and are recommended for removal from the County Project lists. (These RTP Project may include # 10003, 10007, 10019, and 10114.) To request the removal of recently completed projects, and Add some new facilities to the RTP. <p>This request will be made in conjunction with the next update of the RTP, expected to be completed in mid-2014. Clackamas County will coordinate closely with Metro to ensure the County's' TSP and Metro's RTP remain consistent.</p>
<p>Title 4: Parking Management Sec 3.08.410 (Could be adopted in TSP or other adopted policy document) Adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities. 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</p>	Yes	<p>Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5, Parking Policies 5.G.1 through 5.G.7 address parking in the unincorporated area, including both automobile and bicycle parking requirements and an allowance for using shared parking to comply with parking standards.</p> <p>Required parking ratios by land use and area (related to major transit routes) are found in ZDO Section 1015, Table 1015-2. Section 1015</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>consideration of <i>TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines</i>. Policies shall be adopted in the TSP. Policies, plans and regulations must consider and may include the following range of strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By-right exemptions from minimum parking requirements; • Parking districts; • Shared parking; • Structured parking; • Bicycle parking; • Timed parking; • Differentiation between employee parking and parking for customers, visitors and patients; • Real-time parking information; • Priced parking; • Parking enforcement. <p>(Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410)</p>		<p>was recently amended to include bicycle parking minimums (Table 1015-3) and off-street freight loading areas (Table 1015-4).</p> <p>ZDO Section 1015 also includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dimensional requirements for automobile parking spaces • Details about allowances for shared parking and the use on on-street parking to count toward parking minimums in certain location, including the Clackamas Regional Center. • Exceptions to parking requirements
<p>Title 5: Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans Sec 3.08.510</p> <p>If a city or county proposes a transportation project that is not included in the RTP and will result in a significant increase in SOV capacity or exceeds the planned function or capacity of a facility designated in the RTP, it shall demonstrate consistency with the following in its project analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategies set forth in subsection 3.08.220A(1-5) (TSMO, Transit/bike/ped system improvements, traffic calming, land use strategies, connectivity improvements) • Complete street designs consistent with regional street design policies • Green street designs consistent with federal regulations for stream protection. <p>If the city or county decides not to build a project identified in the RTP, it shall identify alternative projects or strategies to</p>	Not Applicable	<p>The County is not proposing any projects that would fall into this category. This provision is not applicable.</p>

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Proposed TSP Update (draft September 23, 2013)	
	Compliant?	Reference/ Comments
<p>address the identified transportation need and inform Metro so that Metro can amend the RTP.</p> <p>This section does not apply to city or county transportation projects that are financed locally and would be undertaken on local facilities.</p> <p>(Title 5, Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans Sec 3.08.510C)</p>		