

Amendments to the Oregon Highway Plan and Transportation Planning Rule

Presentation by:
Matt Crall, DLCD
Michael Rock, ODOT
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT



March 22, 2012



Welcome & Overview

Jon Makler, OTREC



Agenda

- Background
- TPR amendments
- OHP amendments
- Break
- Questions & Discussion
- Issues specific to Portland Metro Area
- Questions & discussion specific to Portland Metro

Background

- Transportation Planning Rules (TPR)
 - 0060 - Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments
- Oregon Highway Plan (OHP)
 - Policy 1F – Highway Mobility Policy
- Concerns

Background

Transportation Planning Rules (TPR)

- Adopted by Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC)
- Implements Statewide Planning Goal 12
- 0000–0050 Transportation System Plans (TSP)



Background

TPR 0060

- Imbalance
 - Projected traffic > Funded capacity
- 0060 Rezoning
 - “Significant effect”
 - Performance standards
 - Measured at plan horizon
 - “Reasonable worst case”

Background

- Oregon Highway Plan (OHP)
 - Modal Plan
 - Adopted by Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC)
 - Policy 1F – Highway Mobility Policy



Background

Concerns -> Joint Subcommittee

- 3 LCDC Commissioners
- 2 OTC Commissioners
- Clarify concerns
- Recommend scope of actions
- Three meetings in early 2011



Background

Joint Subcommittee Recommendation Report

- Concerns in two themes:
 - “**economic development** objectives should be better balanced with transportation performance”
 - “difficult to increase development intensities, even though the statewide planning goals call for **compact development**”
- Recommend amending TPR & OHP
- Recommend coordinated process



Background

Joint Subcommittee Recommendation

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



Background

Joint Subcommittee Recommendation

- OHP items – ODOT & OTC
 - Exempt proposals with small increase in traffic
 - Average trip generation assumptions
 - Streamline alternate mobility standard development
 - Corridor or area mobility standards
 - Consider measures outside of volume to capacity ratios (v/c)



Background

Senate Bill 795

- Passed in 2011
- Required amendments to TPR and OHP
- 10 items from Joint Subcommittee
- 1 additional item
- Completion by end of 2011



Photo: Gary Halvorson, Oregon State Archives

TPR Amendments

TPR 0060 Amendments

Matt Crall, DLCD



TPR Amendments

- Process
 - Rulemaking Advisory Committee (RAC)
 - 22 members
 - Six meetings, June – September 2011
 - Public Review Draft October 25
 - LCDC Hearing December 8 & 9
 - Effective January 1, 2012

TPR Amendments

- New Sections
 - Rezoning Consistent with Comp Plan Map
 - Compact Urban Development
 - Economic Development
- Changes within Existing Sections
 - TDM
 - Other Modes, Facilities, Locations
 - Failing Facilities

TPR Amendments

- (9) Rezone consistent with comp plan map
 - Consistent with TSP
 - Not “significantly affect”
 - UGB expansion

TPR Amendments

(10) Multimodal Mixed-use Areas (MMA)

- Exempt from congestion standards
- Designate then rezone
- Definition in (b)
- Interchanges (b)(E) and (c)

TPR Amendments

(10) Multimodal Mixed-use Areas (MMA)

- Definition in (b)
 - Allow range of uses: 8(b)(A) - (C)
 - Development Standards: 8(b)(D) - (H)
 - Lower parking requirements

TPR Amendments

(10) Multimodal Mixed-use Areas (MMA)

Interchanges

- (b)(E) Options
 - At least ¼ mile away
 - Within IAMP & consistent
 - ODOT concurrence
- (c) Exit ramps backing onto mainline
- (c)(B) Agreement on traffic management

TPR Amendments

(11) Economic Development

- Definitions
- Partial mitigation
- Concurrence
- Coordination

TPR Amendments

(11) Economic Development

(a) General Definition

- Applicable statewide
- (C)(i) Industrial
- (C)(ii) Traded-sector

TPR Amendments

(11) Economic Development

(a)(D) Broader Definition

- Population < 10,000
- Outside an MPO
- Outside the Willamette Valley
- Allows “other employment uses”

TPR Amendments

(11) Economic Development

(b) Partial Mitigation

- Partial is not defined
- Balancing Test
 - Economic benefits > transportation effects
- Concurrence

TPR Amendments

(11) Economic Development

(c) Coordination

- ORS 197.015
 - “the needs of all levels of governments, semipublic and private agencies and the citizens of Oregon have been considered and accommodated as much as possible”
- NOT concurrence
- Notice

TPR Amendments

(1)(c) definition of “significantly affect”

- Traffic generation reductions
 - Enforceable
 - Ongoing
 - Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
 - Definition in 0005(7)
- Diminish or eliminate the significant effect
- NOT mitigating a significant effect

TPR Amendments

(2)(e) Other Modes, Facilities, Locations

- Corrective action – still a significant effect
- Concurrence required
- System benefits > significant effect
- Not required to meet performance standards

TPR Amendments

(3) Failing facilities

- (b) “Avoid further degradation... by the time of development”
- Previous applicability
 - Failing now
 - Projected to fail
 - No funded fix
- New applicability
 - Failing now NOT required

OHP Amendments

**OHP Policy 1F Amendments:
Highway Mobility Policy**

Michael Rock, ODOT



OHP Amendments

- Process
 - Built on Joint Subcommittee and prior stakeholder input
 - Public review and outreach
 - OTC adoption: December 2011



OHP Amendments

- General/Overarching Changes
 - Significant rewrite of OHP Policy 1F
 - Enhanced policy and background: multi-modal, community and other objectives

OHP Amendments

- General/Overarching Changes
 - Terminology: “standards” to “targets”
 - Convey enhanced flexibility
 - Start of discussion for system/facility planning
 - Considered standards for TPR application, implementation

OHP Amendments

- Key Technical Changes
 - Thresholds for small increase in traffic
 - Consistency with access management TIA thresholds
 - Flexibility in calculating v/c for mitigation
 - Planned development vs. full development assumptions

OHP Amendments

- Alternative Mobility Targets
 - Alternative mobility targets process enhanced and more flexible
 - Change v/c-based target
 - Consider area or corridor targets
 - Measures outside v/c
 - Research and streamlining

OHP Amendments

- Implementing Actions
 - Role of targets
 - Access management (consistent with SB 264)
 - Development review
 - Operations

OHP Amendments

- Implementing Actions
 - Enhance coordination between planning and design
 - Modified v/c tables
 - OHP Table 6
 - OHP Table 7
 - Policy assessment

Portland Metro Region

Perspectives on Implementation in the Portland Metro Region

Lidwien Rahman, ODOT



Portland Metro Region

Implementation

- Metro area mobility standards: Table 7
- Many locations will not meet standards
 - “No further degradation” for plan amendments
- Degradation measured from RTP/TSP future base conditions
- Document assumptions
 - Performance
 - Population
 - Employment

Portland Metro Region

Implementation (continued)

- Before & after “reasonable worst case” analysis required
- Talk to us about:
 - Reasonable worst case
 - TIA methodology

Portland Metro Region

Reasonable worst case

- Not defined in TPR
- OHP amendment says:
 - Not full buildout
 - Plan horizon year development
- Planned 2035 development from:
 - Metroscope
 - Market study
- Background traffic growth from:
 - RTP

Portland Metro Region

Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Title 6

- Allows higher v/c
 - Up to 1.1 and 0.99: Central city
Regional centers
Town centers
Main streets
Station communities
 - Up to 0.99 and 0.99: Corridors
Industrial
Intermodal
Employment
Neighborhoods-inner & outer
- Requirements:
 - Adopt boundary
 - Code allows mix and intensity of uses

Portland Metro Region

Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Title 6

- Assumed trip generation reduced by 30%
- Requirements:
 - Boundary
 - Allow mix and intensity of uses
 - Prohibit new auto dependent uses such as:
 - gas stations
 - car washes
 - auto sales lots

Portland Metro Region

Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Title 6

Requirements (continued):

- Plans to meet non-SOV targets:
 - Street system
 - Street design
 - Transit
 - Bicycle
 - Pedestrian
- TSMO plan
- Parking management plan for a Center, Corridor, Station Community or Main Street

Portland Metro Region

Multi-Modal Mixed Use Areas

- Exempt congestion standards
 - NOT 30% trip reduction
- Similar to 2040 Centers
 - NOT automatic for 2040 Centers
- Must adopt MMA boundary
- Must allow:
 - mix of uses
 - medium-high density residential (12 u/a)
 - multi-story buildings

Portland Metro Region

Multi-Modal Mixed Use Areas – (continued)

- Include plan and development regulations for
 - Street connections,
 - Safe pedestrian crossings
 - Pedestrian-friendly street design
- Lower parking requirements

Portland Metro Region

Multi-Modal Mixed Use Areas – (continued)

- Limit or prohibit low intensity and land extensive uses:
 - industrial,
 - auto sales and service
 - drive-throughs
 - gas stations
 - car washes
 - storage facilities
 - motels
- Safety analysis and ODOT consent within ¼ mile of interchange

Portland Metro Region

Alternative Performance Measures Research

- Goal:
 - Menu of potential alternative performance measures for Metro area
- Enabled by OHP and TPR amendments
- Applicable to corridor plans
 - Southwest Corridor Plan
 - TV Hwy Corridor Plan
- Applicable to TSPs
- Results not yet officially approved by ODOT

Portland Metro Region

Least Cost Planning - “Mosaic”

- ODOT Project
- General and specific indicators
- Applicable to
 - State transportation plans
 - Regional transportation plans
 - Complex corridor plans

Portland Metro Region

Potential Performance Measures

- Mobility:
 - v/c
 - MMLOS
 - Non-SOV mode share
 - Travel time
 - VMT
 - Delay on freight network

Portland Metro Region

Potential Performance Measures (continued)

- Reliability
 - 80th % travel time index
- Accessibility
 - To key destinations
 - To transit
 - To bicycle facilities
 - Equitable accessibility

Portland Metro Region

Potential Performance Measures (continued)

- Safety
 - Critical rate
 - Disproportionate rate of certain crash types
- Infrastructure
 - System completeness
 - Intersection density
- Energy/Environment
 - Tons of pollutants

Portland Metro Region

Possible Measures for Plan Amendments:

- MMLOS
- Access to Destinations
- Access to Transit
- Access to Bicycle Facilities
- Critical Crash Rate
- Excess Proportion of Specific Crash Types
- System Completeness

Further Information

- Recording of this webcast
<http://www.cts.pdx.edu/seminars/>
- Transportation Planning Rule
http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/Rulemaking_TPR_2011.shtml
- Oregon Highway Plan
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/OHP2011.shtml>