



**Clackamas County TSP  
Public Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #2  
November 15, 2011**

**Technical Memo #3.1 Overview**

The Regulatory review document includes a review of planning documents, policies, and regulations applicable to the 2011 Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP) update. The document is divided into three sections.

- **SECTION I** includes an overview of the regulatory context within which transportation system planning will be completed.
- **SECTION II** includes an 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.
- **SECTION III** includes an identification of additional considerations for the TSP update.

Below is a summary of the assessment of the compliance of the existing TSP with the requirements and areas where there are required changes.

- The Clackamas County TSP **must be** consistent with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) and Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- Current TSP (adopted in 2001) is **largely in compliance** with existing state and regional requirements but analysis and projects are out of date
- **However**, recent or proposed changes to regulations may require additional analysis as part of the TSP update

Current TSP is generally in compliance with existing state requirements with the exception of the following areas of the TPR:

- Policies addressing higher density along transit systems, bicycle and pedestrian connections to transit
- Out-of-date and/or vague policies for bus, passenger rail, transit oriented development , transportation disadvantaged, and transportation system management
- Out-of-date project list
- Funding and investment strategies
- Updated TSP will also need to be in compliance with new regulations in TPR and OHP, if they are adopted

Changes specific to the urban area, inside the Metro boundary, required by the Metro RTP, Regional Transportation Functional Plan and Title 6 of Metros' Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP)

- Outcome-based planning focus
- Performance targets
- Emphasis on a well-connected arterial and local street network & bike/pedestrian connections to transit and essential destinations
- Regional mobility corridors
- Incentives for regional investments and to allow higher volume to capacity ratios and a trip credit reduction

## REGULATORY REVIEW

### Clackamas County Transportation Systems Plan (TSP)

This document includes a review of planning documents, policies, and regulations applicable to the 2011 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** includes an 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** includes an 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** includes an identification of additional considerations for the TSP update, including emerging issues that may need to be addressed and an identification of county plans/documents that may need to be reviewed to ensure consistency.

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

	Regulatory Context	Regulatory Compliance
<b>State Plans and Regulation</b>		
<a href="#">Statewide Planning Goals</a>	p. 4	p.22
<a href="#">Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012)</a>	p.5	p. 22
<a href="#">1992 Oregon Transportation Plan (updated 1999, 2006)</a>	p.6	p.26
<a href="#">1999 Oregon Highway Plan (updated 2006)</a>	p.7	p.26
<a href="#">2010-2013 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</a>	p.13	---
<a href="#">Access Management Rules (OAR 734-051)</a>	P.13	---
<a href="#">2011 Oregon Forest Highway Long-Range Transportation Coordination Plan</a>	p.14	---
<b>Regional Plans and Policies</b>		
<a href="#">Metro Regional Framework Plan</a>	p.15	---
<a href="#">Metro 2040 Growth Concept</a>	p.15	---
<a href="#">Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP)</a>	p.15	---
<a href="#">Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</a>	p.16	p.27
<a href="#">Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP)</a>	p.18	p.27
<a href="#">Transportation and Land Use Implementation Guidance for the Portland Metropolitan Region (Oct 2011)</a>	P.19	---
<a href="#">High Capacity Transit System Expansion Policy: Implementation Guidance for the Portland Metropolitan Region (May 2011)</a>	p.20	---
TriMet Bike Parking Guidelines	p.20	---

## SECTION I: RELEVANT STATE AND REGIONAL GOALS AND POLICIES

The following plans and policies were reviewed:

### 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
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

### **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, defines how to implement State Planning Goal 12. Specifically, the TPR 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 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 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.

## **State Plans and Regulations**

### **1. Statewide Planning Goals**

Oregon law created a hierarchy of consistency between local, regional and state plans. The foundation of Oregon's land use planning program is a set of 19 Statewide Planning Goals (OAR 660-15-0000 (1-15)). The goals express 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; 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 change is reviewed against the requirements of the 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)**

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

#### **Goal 2 (Land Use Planning) and OAR 660, Division 4**

Goal 2, Land Use Planning, and OAR 660, Division 4, require 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 includes several requirements including requiring 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**

Goal 11, Public Facilities Planning and OAR 660, Division 11, require 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 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**

Goal 12, Transportation, requires cities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and ODOT to provide and encourage a "safe, convenient and economic transportation system." The goal 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 which are consistent with the functional classification of roads and consistent with 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).

Section 060 of the TPR is currently undergoing a revision. 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.

### 3. Oregon Transportation Plan (2006)

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state’s long-range multimodal transportation plan. It provides the framework for prioritizing transportation improvements based on varied future revenue conditions, but 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 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 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. Expand ways to fund the system that are fair and fiscally responsible.

**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 document 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 are ODOT standards used on State Highway projects and these standards 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 Plan is a comprehensive evaluation of Oregon’s aviation system to serve 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 Plan is a comprehensive assessment of the state’s rail planning, freight rail, and passenger rail systems. The Plan 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 rail 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.

An update of the Oregon Rail Plan is currently underway.

- 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. The implementation of this goal occurs through a number of 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:

### **Goal 1: System Definition**

**Policy 1A** (State Highway Classification System) defines the 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) addresses 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) addresses the need to balance the movement of goods and services with other uses and recognizes 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) addresses 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) addresses 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) establishes mobility standards for ensuring a reliable and acceptable level of mobility on the highway system. These standards shall be used for:

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

OHP Policy 1F is currently under review and amendments have been proposed, including revisions to the tables illustrated below. If these 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. The 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.

DRAFT

**Table 1: Maximum Volume to Capacity Ratios (Outside PMUGB)<sup>A,C,14</sup>**

Highway Category/ Location	Inside an Urban Growth Boundary (except PMUGB)					Outside an Urban Growth Boundary	
	STA <sup>D</sup>	MPO	Non-MPO Outside of STAs where non-freeway posted speed <= 35 mph, or a Designated UBA	Non-MPO outside of STAs where non-freeway speed > 35 mph	Non-MPO where nonfreeway speed limit >= 45 mph	Unincorporated Communities	Rural Lands
Interstate Highways <sup>E</sup>	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	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.

<sup>A</sup> 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.

<sup>C</sup> 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.

<sup>D</sup> Interstates and Expressways shall not be identified as Special Transportation Areas.

<sup>E</sup> National Highway System (NHS) highway design requirements are addressed in the Highway Design Manual (HDM).

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

**Table 2: Maximum Volume to Capacity Ratios (Inside PMUGB)<sup>A</sup>**

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

Source: OHP, Table 7 (excerpt)

<sup>A</sup> 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.

<sup>B</sup> 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).

<sup>C</sup> 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.

## **Goal 2: System Management**

**Policy 2B** (Off-System Improvements) helps local jurisdictions adopt land use and access management policies.

**Policy 2E** (Intelligent Transportation Systems) addresses the desire of the State to consider a broad range of Intelligent Transportation Systems services to improve system efficiency and safety in a cost-effective manner.

**Policy 2F** (Traffic Safety) addresses the need to continually improve safety for all users of the highway system using solutions involving engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services.

## **Goal 3: Access Management**

**Policy 3A:** (Classification and Spacing Standards) sets access spacing standards for driveways and approaches to the state highway system. This policy addresses the location, spacing and type of road and street intersections and approach roads on state highways.

The adopted spacing standards can be found in Appendix C of the OHP. It includes 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) sets 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 Expressway interchanges.

**Policy 3D** (Deviations) establishes general policies and procedures for deviations from adopted access management standards and policies.

## **Goal 4: Travel Alternatives**

**Policy 4A** (Efficiency of Freight Movement) addresses the need to maintain and improve the efficiency of freight movement on the state highway system and access to intermodal connections. The State shall seek 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) addresses 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. It is the document 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* is currently under development, and 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 that should be considered during the development of the County's TSP Update for complimentary 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 identified administrative 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 and 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 found to be in compliance with these rules by ODOT.

The purpose of Oregon's Access Management Rule is to control the issuing of permits for access to state highways, state highway rights of way and other properties under the State's jurisdiction. In addition, the ability to close existing approaches, set spacing standards and establish a formal appeals process in relation to access issues is also identified.

The access management standards adopted by ODOT and applicable to the County's TSP are summarized, as previously mentioned, in Appendix C of the Oregon Highway Plan. Policies 3A and 3C of the OHP 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.

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

This rule establishes procedures used by the Department of Transportation 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 who have an interest in improving Forest Highways understand the Forest Highway Program, thereby helping them to understand the types of projects eligible for program funding as well as 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 is the regional government for the Oregon portion of the Portland Metropolitan area. Metro's jurisdictional boundary encompasses the urban portions of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas counties.

Metro is responsible for a number of 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).

Metro is also responsible for regional transportation planning under state law and is 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. Metro is also responsible for 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. Metro addresses the following subjects in the Plan:

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

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

## 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 this 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. This hierarchy 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, in a way that enhances each

community and helps them achieve their aspirations in their own 2040 Centers, Corridors, Main Streets and Station Communities.

Title 6 of the UGMFP 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 only. 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 RTP

The Regional Transportation Plan provides the long-range blueprint for transportation in the Portland region. The RTP 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 are 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** currently carry between 50,000 to 100,000 vehicles per day, providing for high-speed travel on longer motor vehicle trips and serving as the primary freight routes, with an emphasis on mobility. Throughways help serve the need to move both trucks and autos through the region. Throughways connect major activity centers within the region, including the central city, regional centers, industrial areas and intermodal facilities.

**Arterial streets** usually carry between 10,000 and 40,000 vehicles per day and 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/mix-use corridors** are priority areas for pedestrian improvements. They are located along good-quality transit lines and will be redeveloped at densities that are 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). The RTFP 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 are directives that specifically pertain to updating local transportation systems plans:

- Include regional and state transportation needs identified in the 2035 RTP in local TSPs 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)<sup>1</sup>
  - Connectivity, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities
  - Motor vehicle capacity improvements
- 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

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](http://www.metroregion.org/tsp).

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

The 2035 RTP included 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

DRAFT

## **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 twenty-year period. The "Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)" implements these adopted transportation goals and policies. The essential elements of the TSP, i.e., the project lists and transportation goals and policies, are adopted into Chapter 5 of the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Chapter 5 of Clackamas County's Comprehensive Plan 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. This chapter of the Comprehensive plan also contains a table of transportation improvement needs for the next 20 years.

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

### **Clackamas County Zoning and Development Ordinance (ZDO)**

Clackamas County's Zoning and Development Ordinance (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 concurrency 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. Section 1015 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

Since Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan and the County’s TSP have been acknowledged as complying with the Statewide Planning Goals and related rules. Compliance with the County Comprehensive Plan is considered to be in compliance with the Statewide Planning Goals. 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)<sup>2</sup>

In November 2010, DKS Associates, a consultant on the County TSP project, provided the following summary of a review of the TPR requirements (Table 3). For each TPR requirement, the table displays if the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan is in compliance and provides details where the requirement is addressed within the County’s Plan. Additional comments from County staff’s review of the referenced documents are included in *italics*.

---

<sup>2</sup> NOTE: Amendments to the TPR and to Policy 1F of the OHP (Highway Mobility Standards) are currently being considered by the state. Should these changes be adopted, the County’s TSP will need to be reviewed to ensure continued compliance.

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

TPR	TPR Requirement	Complies with TPR?	Comments
<b>Roadways</b>			
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
<b>Transit</b>			
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>



<b>Pedestrian and Bicycle</b>			
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
<b>Other Modes</b>			
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
<b>Transportation Demand Management</b>			
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>
<b>Parking</b>			
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</i>

			<i>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>
<b>Finance</b>			
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.
<b>Planned Facilities</b>			
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.
<b>Freight</b>			
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
<b>Adoption</b>			
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)<sup>2</sup>

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requires the state to prepare a TSP. As mentioned, Oregon's TSP is referred to as the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and it contains the goals and

policies to which local TSPs must comply. The Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) further refines some of these policies with adopted standards for mobility and capacity.

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;

**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. In general, the RTP includes the following 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 (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 document 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
<b>TITLE 1: TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DESIGN</b>			
3.08.110	Street System Design	Section 6.4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added arterial connectivity to Subsection B</li> <li>Revisions to right-of-way dimensions (Subsection F #1, 3, 4, 7 and 10)</li> </ul>
3.08.120	Transit System Design	Section 6.4.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarified Subsection A to specify needed transit access connections within certain proximity to bus stops and HCT stations</li> </ul>
3.08.130	Pedestrian System Design	Section 6.4.10 related to pedestrian districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New section to specify pedestrian plan elements and needs analysis</li> <li>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)</li> </ul>
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"> <li>New section to specify freight plan elements and needs analysis</li> </ul>
3.08.160	Transportation System Management and Operations	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New section to specify TSMO plan elements and needs analysis</li> </ul>
<b>TITLE 2: DEVELOPMENT AND UPDATE OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS</b>			
3.08.210	Transportation Needs	Section 6.4.1 Section 6.4.2 Section 6.4.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defines new needs analysis elements to be consistent with RTP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gaps and deficiencies identified in Title 1 inventories and evaluations (Subsection A1)</li> <li>Consideration of the needs of disadvantaged populations (Subsection A3)</li> <li>Regional needs identified in Mobility Corridor strategies in Chapter 4 of RTP (Subsection B2)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3.08.220	Transportation Solutions	Section 6.4.2 Section 6.4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised title name from “Congestion management” to “Transportation Solutions”</li> <li>Expanded to distinguish between needs and solutions and broaden focus beyond congestion management</li> <li>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)</li> <li>Specifies coordination with transportation facility owners when identifying</li> </ul>



Section	Title	Relevant 2004 RTP citation(s)	Summary of change(s) to Requirements in 2004 RTP
			solutions (Subsection B)
3.08.230	Performance Targets and Standards	Section 6.4.6 Section 6.4.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revises title from “Non-SOV Modal Targets” to “Performance Targets and Standards”</li> <li>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)</li> <li>Clarifies the Oregon Transportation Commission must approve alternative mobility standards for state facilities (Subsection D)</li> <li>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)</li> <li>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)</li> </ul>
<b>TITLE 3: TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT</b>			
3.08.310	Defining projects in TSPs	Section 6.2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
<b>TITLE 4: REGIONAL PARKING MANAGEMENT</b>			
3.08.410	Parking Management	Title 2 of UGMFP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>
<b>TITLE 5: AMENDMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANS</b>			
3.08.510	Amendments of City and County Comprehensive Plans and TSPs	Section 6.4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specifies consideration of range of multimodal strategies as part of the traffic analysis required by OAR 660-012-0060 (Subsections A and B)</li> <li>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)</li> </ul>
<b>TITLE 6: COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES</b>			
3.08.610	Metro review of amendments to TSPs	Section 6.4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change</li> </ul>
3.08.620	Extension of compliance deadline	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change (same as Title 8 of the UGMFP)</li> </ul>
3.08.630	Exception from compliance	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change (same as Title 8 of the UGMFP)</li> </ul>

Source: Metro

DRAFT

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 against these regulations follows. Elements not in compliance with the new regulations will need to be considered in the TSP update. If a TSP is consistent with the RTFP, Metro will find it to be consistent with the RTP.

**Table 6: RTFP Compliance**

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Compliance	Reference/ Comments
<b>Title 1: Street System Design, Sec 3.08.110</b> 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
<b>Title 1: Transit System Design, Sec 3.08.120</b>		



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&amp; 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"> <li>- 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</li> <li>-Transit passenger landing pads accessible to disabled persons to transit agency standards;</li> <li>- 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;</li> <li>-Lighting to transit agency standards at the major transit stop;</li> <li>-Intersection and mid-block traffic management improvements as needed and practicable to enable marked crossings at major transit stops.</li> </ul>	Yes	ZDO Sections 1007.07 and 1005.03(L) address building siting standards and transit amenities.
<p><b>Title 1: Pedestrian System Design, Sec 3.08.130</b></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.
<p><b>Title 1: Bicycle System Design, Sec 3.08.140</b></p> <p>Include a bicycle plan for an interconnected network of</p>	Partial	Maps V-7a, V-7b identify existing and



Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Compliance	Reference/ Comments
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.		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><b>Title 1: Freight System Design, Sec 3.08.150</b></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	Existing freight routes identified in Map V-10. New provisions for needs analysis will need to be addressed.
<p><b>Title 1: Transportation System Management and Operations Sec 3.08.160</b></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"> <li>o Multimodal traffic management investments</li> <li>o Traveler Information investments</li> <li>o Traffic incident management investments</li> <li>o Transportation demand management investments</li> </ul>	Partial	Comp Plan Ch. 5, Transportation Demand Management policies address strategies. New provisions for needs analysis will need to be addressed.
<p><b>Title 2: Transportation Needs Sec 3.08.210</b></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"> <li>- Identified system gaps and deficiencies</li> <li>- Identified facilities that exceed mobility standards</li> <li>- Consideration of the needs of disadvantaged populations</li> <li>- Consideration of regional needs identified in the mobility corridor strategies</li> </ul> <p>Determination of transportation needs must be consistent with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Population and employment forecast and planning period of the RTP (or alternative forecast coordinated with Metro)</li> <li>- System maps and functional classifications in RTP</li> <li>- Regional non-SOV modal targets and mobility standards</li> </ul>	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"> <li>-gaps and deficiencies identified under Title 1</li> <li>-Mobility corridors</li> <li>- Disadvantaged populations</li> </ul>
<p><b>Title 2: Transportation Solutions, Sec 3.08.220</b></p> <p>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</p>	No	This section contains new provisions that will need to be addressed in the update.



Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	Compliance	Reference/ Comments
strategies with the owner of the transportation facility affected by the strategy.		
<p><b>Title 2: Performance Targets and Standards Sec 3.08.230</b> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking minimum and maximum ratios in Centers and Station Communities</li> <li>- Designs for street, transit, bicycle, freight and pedestrian systems consistent with Title 1: and</li> <li>- TSMO projects and strategies consistent with section 3.08.160; and</li> <li>- Land use actions (to encourage increased density near transit) pursuant to OAR 660-012-0035(2).</li> </ul>	Partial	<p>This section also contains substantial changes (see Table 5) that will need to be addressed in update.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Title 3: Defining Projects in Transportation System Plan Sec 3.08.310</b> Includes the specifications for defining projects in the TSP.</p>	Yes	This section did not change. Project lists will be updated accordingly.
<p><b>Title 4: Parking Management Sec 3.08.410</b> 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.</p>	Partial	<p>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.</p> <p>Parking management plans and needs assessments will need to be addressed.</p>
<p><b>Title 5: Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans Sec 3.08.510</b> 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 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.</p>	N/A	<p>Any proposed amendments meeting these criteria will need to consider the provisions of this section.</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>

Metro's RTFP 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 RTFP has more emphasis on identifying pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit and essential destination and on the needs of disadvantaged populations (described as youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations, including 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 RFTP.

### **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 will be created by Metro and 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. The issues can be grouped into four main categories, including planning policies and measures that support sustainability, the economy, health, and provide flexibility (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.

### 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:

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