



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS

This document uses key words and phrases as having the following definitions:

- Access Management:** Measures regulating access to streets, roads and highways from public roads and private driveways. Measures may include but are not limited to restrictions on the siting of interchanges and restrictions on the type and amount of access to roadways to reduce impacts of approach road traffic on the main facility.
- Accessibility:** The ability to move easily from one mode of transportation to another mode or to a destination, for example, from a bicycle to a bus or from a bus to an office. Accessibility places emphasis on being able to get to a desired destination.
- Alternative Modes:** Modes such as rail, transit systems, bicycles and walking that provide transportation alternatives to the use of single occupant automobiles.
- Balanced Transportation System:** A system that provides appropriate transportation options and takes advantage of the inherent efficiencies of each mode.
- Demand Management:** Actions which are designed to change travel behavior in order to improve performance of transportation facilities and to reduce need for additional road capacity. Methods may include but are not limited to the use of alternative modes, ride-sharing and vanpool programs and trip-reduction ordinances.
- Efficient:** An activity is efficient if a desired amount of an output is produced using the least cost combination of resources. A transportation system is efficient when (1) it is fast and economic for the user; (2) users face prices that reflect the full costs of their transportation choices; and (3) transportation investment decisions maximize the net full benefits of the system.
- Full Costs:** Costs that include social and environmental impacts as well as construction, operations and maintenance costs.
- Intermodal:** Connecting individual modes of transportation and/or accommodating transfers between such modes.
- Intermodal Hub:** A facility where two or more modes of transportation interact so that people and/or goods can be transferred from one mode to another, for example, from a bus to an airplane or from a truck to a train. Intermodal hubs include commercial airports and marine ports.
- ISTEA:** The federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 which funds the national highway system and gives state and local

governments more flexibility in determining transportation solutions. It requires states and MPOs to cooperate in long-range transportation planning.

“It is the policy of the State of Oregon to provide...”:

State government provides leadership to achieve the stated quality. The policy may be achieved by both public and private actions at all levels of society to be identified as part of the continuing transportation planning process.

LCDC:

Land Conservation and Development Commission

Metropolitan Planning

An organization located within the state of Oregon and designated

Organization (MPO):

by the governor to coordinate transportation planning in an urbanized area of the state. MPOs exist in the Portland, Salem, Eugene-Springfield, and Medford areas. (The Longview-Kelso-Rainier MPO is not considered an MPO for the purposes of the OTP.)

Mixed Use Development:

A development or center having a mix of uses which may include office space, commercial activity, residential uses, parks and public places, and supporting public facilities and services. The development is designed so that the need to travel from one activity to another is minimized.

Mobility:

Being able to move easily from place to place.

Mode of Transportation:

A means of moving people and/or goods. In this plan transportation modes include motor vehicles, public transit, railroads, airplanes, ships/ barges, water transit, pipelines, bicycles and pedestrian walkways.

Multimodal:

Involving several modes of transportation.

ODOT:

Oregon Department of Transportation.

Public Transit:

Bus, van, light rail and other surface transportation systems open to the general public which operate frequently and on predetermined routes and schedules. Public transit does not include carpools or senior van services, but may include intercity bus and rail services if the service is frequent.

Rural Areas:

Unincorporated areas, unincorporated communities and incorporated cities, characterized by both low levels of population and remoteness from metropolitan areas and other central cities.

Transportation Corridors:

Major or high volume routes for moving people, goods and services from one point to another. They may be multimodal or single modal such as an air corridor.

Transportation Needs:

Means estimates of the movement of people and goods consistent with an acknowledged comprehensive plan and the requirements of the Transportation Rule (OAR 660-12). Needs are typically based on projections of future travel demand resulting from a continuation of current trends as modified by policy objectives, including those expressed in Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) and the

Transportation Rule, especially those for avoiding principal reliance on any one mode of transportation.

Transportation Needs (State): Needs for movement of people and goods between and through regions of the state and between the state and other states and other countries.

Transportation Planning Rule: Administrative rule (OAR 660-12) adopted in April 1991 by the Land Conservation and Development Commission in cooperation with ODOT to implement Statewide Planning Goal 12: Transportation.

Transportation System: A network of facilities and services for moving people, goods and services from one place to another; it includes roads, streets and highways, public transit, demand-response transportation, airports, railroads, waterway and marine transportation facilities, bicycle paths and pedestrian walkways.

Transportation System Management Measures: Techniques for increasing the efficiency, safety, capacity or level of service of a transportation facility without increasing its size. Examples include traffic signal improvements, traffic control devices including installing medians and parking removal, channelization, access management, ramp metering and restriping for high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes.

Transportation System Plan (TSP): A plan for one or more transportation facilities that are planned, developed, operated and maintained in a coordinated manner to supply continuity of movement between modes, and within and between geographic and jurisdictional areas.

Urban: Those areas within urban growth boundaries acknowledged under the Land Conservation and Development Commission's land use planning compliance process.

APPENDIX B

MEMBERS OF STEERING AND POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

STEERING COMMITTEE

CHAIR: Mike Hollern, Chairman
Oregon Transportation Commission

John Whitty, Vice Chairman
Oregon Transportation Commission

Roger Breezley, Member
Oregon Transportation Commission

Cynthia Ford, Member
Oregon Transportation Commission

David Bolender, Member
Oregon Transportation Commission

Martha Pagel
Senior Policy Advisor
Governor's Office

Senator Joan Dukes
Region 1, Astoria

Senator Paul Phillips
District 4, Tigard

Senator Bill McCoy
District 8, Portland

Representative Cedric Hayden
District 38, Fall Creek

Representative Carl Hosticka
District 40, Eugene

Representative Ray Baum
District 58, La Grande

Charles Vars
Mayor, City of Corvallis

Tom Walsh
General Manager
Tri-Met

Kevin Campbell, Judge
Grant County

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

FINANCING SYSTEMS POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHAIR: Mike Hollern, Chairman
Oregon Transportation Commission

Bill Conerly, Vice-President
1st Interstate Bank of Oregon

Randy Franke, Commissioner
Marion County

Bernie Giusto, Lt., City Councilor
City of Gresham

Ken Harrison/Greg Kantor
Portland General Corporation

Dell Isham
AAA Legislative Consultant

Tony Lewis
Assistant Director for Finance
Oregon Dept. of Transportation

Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Lane Transit District

Don McClave, Executive Director
Portland Chamber of Commerce

Mike Meredith, President
Oregon Trucking Association

Greg S. Oldham, Attorney-at-Law

Ray Polani, Chair
Citizens for Better Transit

Felicia Trader, Director
Office of Transportation
City of Portland

Charles Vars, Professor of Economics
Oregon State University

FREIGHT PRODUCTIVITY POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHAIR: Roger Breezley, Member
Oregon Transportation Commission

George Charlan, Traffic Manager
Niedermeyer Martin Corporation

Don Forbes, Director
Oregon Dept. of Transportation

Bill Furman, CEO
Greenbriar Companies

Ray Guimary, Manager
GRATON

Barry Horowitz, Director of International
Transportation
Nike, Inc.

Bill Knox, Public Affairs Manager
Northwest Region
United Parcel Service

Donna Kohler
Director of Transportation
Furnam Lumber Company

Jack Lindquist
Director of Transportation
United Grocers, Inc.

Norm Meyers, Administrator
Economic Regulation Division
Public Utility Commission

Bob Miller, Deputy Director
Port of Astoria

Steve Petersen, Director
Economic Development Dept.

Keith Phildius, Director of Airports
Port of Portland

Brad Skinner, Vice President
Pacific Northwest
Southern Pacific Transportation Company

Fred Swanson, Traffic Manager
Oregon Steel Mills

Dennis Williams, Transportation Director,
Bohemia

RURAL ACCESS POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHAIR: John Whitty, Vice Chairman
Oregon Transportation Commission

Dave Astle/Claudia Howells
Assistant Commissioner
Oregon Public Utility Commission

Steve Bogart, Judge
Baker County Court

Geri Bogart, Volunteer Program Coordinator
Baker City

Evan Boone
Attorney-at-Law
Newport

Zee Carmen, Director
New Day Enterprises
La Grande

Jerry Eiler, President
Oregon Freightways
Medford

Wayne Giesy, Sales Manager
Hull-Oak Lumber Co.
Monroe

Steve Grasty, Owner
A Parts Store
Burns

Robert Mautz,
Attorney-at-Law
Pendleton

Paul Meyerhoff, Manager
Transportation Development Branch
Oregon Dept. of Transportation

Fred Nussbaum, Director and Strategic Planner
Oregon Association of Railway Passengers

Buz Raz, President
RAZ Transportation, Inc.
Portland

Loran C. Wiese, Mayor
City of Coquille

John Williams
City Manager
Cannon Beach

SAFETY IMPROVEMENT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHAIR: Cynthia Ford, Member
Oregon Transportation Commission

Alan Ames
Cargo Superintendent
Port of Portland

Ellie Coleman, State Administrator
MADD

Marcy McInelly, AIA
Fletcher, Farr & Ayotte

Greg Malkasian, Administrator
Transportation Safety Division
Public Utility Commission

Bob Melbo, Superintendent
Southern Pacific Railroad

Dave Moomaw/Jane Cease, Adm.
Driver and Motor Vehicle Services
Oregon Dept. of Transportation

Walt Pendergrass, Chair
Oregon Traffic Safety Commission

Gary Reed, President
Reed Fuel and Trucking Company

Capt. Jim Stevenson
Oregon State Police

Roxanne Sumners
Transportation Program Manager
Corvallis Transit System

Ed Wilson, Spill Response Coordinator
Dept. of Environmental Quality

URBAN MOBILITY POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHAIR: David Bolender, Member
Oregon Transportation Commission

Christine Anderson, Director
Eugene Public Works

Pauline Anderson, Commissioner
Multnomah County

R. G. Anderson-Wyckoff, Mayor
City of Salem

Bill Blosser, Chair
Land Conservation and
Development Commission

Steve Hauck, Polster
Rogue Valley Transportation Board

Jim Howell, Director
Transit Riders Association

David Knowles, Metro Councilor
J-PACT

John Lively, Executive Director
Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Partnership

Denny Moore, Interim Manager
Public Transit
Oregon Dept. of Transportation

Richard Potestio, AIA
Portland

Roy Rogers, Commissioner
Washington County

Greg Teeple
AFL-CIO
Salem

Tom Walsh, General Manager
Tri-Met

Mel Winkelman, City Councilman
Medford

OTHER PARTICIPANTS AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Bicycle Transportation Alliance - Rex Burkholder
City of Gresham - Richard Ross
City of Portland - Grace Crunican, Kate Dean
City of Salem - Dave Siegel
Department of Energy - Katherine Beale
Department of Land Conservation and
Development - Bob Cortright
Department of Transportation -
Don Byard
Erik East
Bob Krebs
Lee LaFontaine
Lidwien Rahman
John Rist
Bob Royer
Ron Schaadt
Economic Development Department -
Gabriella Lang
Tom Notos
Michael Taafee
Metro - Andy Cotugno
Multnomah County - Susie Lahsene
Oregon Environmental Council - John Charles
State Legislature - Janet Adkins
Tri-Met - G. B. Arrington
Washington County - Brent Curtis

STATE AGENCY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Oregon Department of Transportation
Bob Royer (Planning)
Ron Schaadt (Planning)
Dick Unrein (Bikeway Program)
Lee LaFontaine (Public Transit)
Wanda Kennedy (Aeronautics)
Tony DeLorenzo (DMV)
David Dowrie (Information Systems)

Doug Tindall (Information Systems)
Troy Costales (Traffic Safety)
Public Utilities Commission
Dave Astle (Transportation Program)
Department of Land Conservation
and Development
Bob Cortright (Planning)
Economic Development Department
Greg Baker (Business Development)
Duncan Wyse (Progress Board)
Department of Energy
John Savage (Policy & Planning)
Department of Agriculture
John Kratochvil (Marketing/Transportation)

TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES SUBCOMMITTEE

Metro
Andy Cotugno
Mike Hoglund
City of Portland
Steve Dotterer
Greg Jones
ODOT, Region 1
Robin McArthur-Phillips
Dave Williams
Multnomah County
Susie Lahsene
Clackamas County
Rod Sandoz
Ron Weinman
Washington County
Mark Brown
Brent Curtis
Citizens for Better Transit
Ray Polani
Port of Portland
Bebe Rucker
Tri-Met
G. B. Arrington
Washington DOT
Steve Jacobson

APPENDIX C

POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT FORECASTS BY COUNTY (1990-2012)

County projections of population and employment from 1990 to 2012 reflect the wide diversity among counties with regard to the various rates of socioeconomic change. County population projections in 2012 range from a high of 711,385 for Multnomah County to a low of 1,638 for Gilliam County. Employment levels range from a high of 485,842 for Multnomah County to a low of 383 for Wheeler County. Forecasts are revised annually. For the most recent update, contact ODOT Policy and Strategic Planning Section ((503)373-7571).

COUNTY	POPULATION CHANGE				EMPLOYMENT CHANGE			
	1990	2000	2012	% Change	1990	2000	2012	% Change
Baker	15,300	17,163	19,051	24.5%	4,802	5,651	6,084	26.7%
Benton	71,200	81,739	95,027	33.5%	31,550	38,031	45,658	44.7%
Clackamas	279,500	345,574	425,854	52.4%	89,267	116,424	156,532	75.4%
Clatsop	33,500	38,261	44,326	32.3%	13,882	16,270	19,338	39.3%
Columbia	37,700	43,771	49,448	31.2%	9,704	11,174	12,994	33.9%
Coos	69,100	63,143	62,718	4.4%	19,661	21,565	21,703	10.4%
Crook	14,100	15,817	17,403	23.4%	5,215	6,149	7,020	34.6%
Curry	19,400	21,897	25,128	29.5%	5,728	6,745	7,949	38.8%
Deschutes	75,600	99,847	112,286	48.5%	32,748	43,425	47,517	45.1%
Douglas (C)	7,070	7,851	8,330	17.8%	2,647	3,001	3,200	20.9%
Douglas (NC)	87,630	99,718	107,256	22.4%	31,319	37,782	41,952	33.9%
Gilliam	1,750	1,741	1,638	-6.4%	513	531	510	-0.6%
Grant	7,900	8,886	9,968	26.2%	2,819	3,317	3,823	35.6%
Harney	7,100	7,969	8,959	26.2%	2,436	2,866	3,304	35.6%
Hood River	16,800	19,331	21,851	30.1%	7,570	9,095	10,582	39.8%
Jackson	146,400	165,563	191,351	30.7%	54,693	66,386	74,438	36.1%
Jefferson	13,700	17,818	19,465	42.1%	4,882	6,629	7,454	52.7%
Josephine	62,800	73,341	82,305	31.1%	18,553	22,352	25,661	38.3%
Klamath	57,800	60,718	63,447	9.8%	20,949	23,655	25,127	19.9%
Lake	7,200	7,683	7,892	9.6%	2,376	2,705	2,798	17.8%
Lane (C)	13,121	15,223	17,822	35.8%	5,850	6,798	7,959	36.0%
Lane (NC)	270,369	310,311	361,236	33.6%	113,442	136,308	162,098	42.9%
Lincoln	38,900	46,197	55,197	41.9%	13,902	16,748	20,564	47.9%
Linn	91,000	99,029	104,703	15.1%	33,482	39,237	44,441	32.7%
Malheur	26,000	29,183	32,806	26.2%	9,694	11,406	13,144	35.6%
Marion	229,500	262,647	302,406	31.8%	97,667	116,577	136,995	40.3%
Morrow	7,650	9,159	10,842	41.7%	2,376	2,844	3,346	40.8%
Multnomah	583,500	651,918	711,385	21.9%	401,142	442,177	485,842	21.1%
Polk	49,700	56,274	64,041	28.9%	11,458	13,527	15,685	36.9%
Sherman	1,950	1,902	1,730	-11.3%	564	574	537	-4.8%
Tillamook	21,500	24,358	28,486	32.5%	6,171	7,278	8,716	41.2%
Umatilla	59,000	66,495	74,444	26.2%	21,080	24,803	28,582	35.6%
Union	23,600	26,548	29,648	25.6%	9,111	10,719	12,352	35.6%
Wallowa	6,950	7,823	8,825	27.0%	2,275	2,677	3,085	35.6%
Wasco	21,700	22,743	22,985	5.9%	7,641	8,474	8,892	16.4%
Washington	313,000	401,982	518,476	65.6%	128,853	180,164	263,326	104.4%
Wheeler	1,400	1,574	1,751	25.1%	282	332	383	35.9%
Yamhill	65,600	75,959	88,824	35.4%	21,796	26,459	31,623	45.1%
State	2,846,990	3,307,156	3,809,309	33.8%	1,248,100	1,490,856	1,771,216	41.9%

C: Coastal

NC: Non-coastal

SOURCE: Oregon Department of Transportation, Policy and Strategic Planning Section, October 9, 1991

APPENDIX D

OPERATING AND TIME COSTS OF ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES
(BILLIONS OF DOLLARS ANNUALLY)

Criteria	1990	2012 Alternatives			
		Funding Decline	Continue	Continue With Modal Shift	Livability Approach
METROPOLITAN AREAS					
Highway Costs					
Out-of-Pocket	\$1.23	\$2.11	\$2.11	\$1.66	\$1.66
Ownership	\$4.77	\$8.19	\$8.19	\$6.80	\$6.80
Travel Time	\$4.31	\$9.66	\$8.97	\$7.03	\$6.39
Fees	\$0.22	\$0.38	\$0.63	\$3.47	\$3.47
Subtotal	\$10.53	\$20.34	\$19.90	\$18.96	\$18.32
Transit Costs					
Operating Costs	\$0.10	\$0.17	\$0.17	\$0.39	\$0.33
Travel Time	\$0.28	\$0.49	\$0.48	\$1.14	\$0.95
Subtotal	\$0.38	\$0.66	\$0.65	\$1.53	\$1.28
Total	\$10.90	\$21.00	\$20.55	\$20.49	\$19.59
RURAL AREAS					
Highway Costs					
Mileage	\$5.035	\$7.900	\$7.900	\$7.900	\$7.900
Time	\$2.729	\$4.282	\$4.282	\$4.282	\$4.282
Benefits	\$0.000	\$0.000	(\$0.385)	\$0.000	(\$0.771)
Fees	\$0.076	\$0.119	\$0.198	\$0.198	\$0.356
Subtotal	\$7.840	\$12.301	\$11.994	\$12.380	\$11.767
Intercity Bus Costs					
Fares	\$0.007	\$0.007	\$0.008	\$0.020	\$0.020
Time	\$0.013	\$0.014	\$0.016	\$0.032	\$0.032
Subsidy	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.006	\$0.006
Subtotal	\$0.020	\$0.021	\$0.024	\$0.058	\$0.058
Intercity Rail Costs					
Fares	\$0.017	\$0.018	\$0.021	\$0.053	\$0.053
Time	\$0.033	\$0.035	\$0.041	\$0.082	\$0.082
Subsidy	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.011	\$0.011
Subtotal	\$0.050	\$0.053	\$0.062	\$0.145	\$0.145
Total	\$7.909	\$12.375	\$12.080	\$12.583	\$11.970
STATE TOTAL COSTS	\$18.812	\$33.372	\$32.632	\$33.073	\$31.563
Savings *	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.740	\$0.299	\$1.809

*Compared to Funding Decline
Numbers may not add up due to rounding.

APPENDIX E

PLAN INVENTORY SOURCES

Bicycle Master Plan, Highway Division, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), March 15, 1988

Commercial Air Service and Facility Needs Study, Oregon Aviation System Plan, Aeronautics Division, ODOT, August 23, 1991

Demographic and Economic Forecasts, 1990-2030, Strategic Planning Section, ODOT, October 1992

Making the Right Turn: Progress Report, Protecting the Public Investment in Oregon's Roads and Bridges, Barney and Worth, February 1991

1988 Oregon Public Transportation Study, Public Transit Division, ODOT, April 1989

1989 Inventory, 1990-2000 Forecasts, Oregon Aviation System Plan, Aeronautics Division, ODOT, 1990

1991 Oregon Highway Plan, Highway Division, ODOT, June 1991

1991 Traffic Volume Tables, Transportation Research Section, ODOT, June 1992

1993-1998 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program, Highway Division, ODOT, January 1992

Oregon Aeronautics Division Strategic Plan, Aeronautics Division, ODOT, January 1992

Oregon Port Assessment, Booz-Allen & Hamilton, October 1986

Oregon Ports Development Study, Economic Development Department, April 1989

Oregon Rail Plan 1986 Update, Policy and Planning, ODOT, 1986

Oregon Rail Plan 1986 Update: 1990 Supplement, "Chapter 4 - Supplement Light Density Branch Line Analysis," Strategic Planning Section, ODOT, 1990

State Agency Coordination Program, Highway Division Planning Section, ODOT, December 1990

Statewide Transportation Plan Volume 2: Intercity Passenger Services Study 1984, ODOT

Statewide Transportation Plan: Overview 1988, ODOT

Transportation Planning Rule, Oregon Department of Conservation and Development, May 9, 1991

Tri-Met Strategic Plan, Pursuing a Shared Vision, Discussion Draft, Tri-Met, April 1992

APPENDIX F

OPERATING LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARD FOR THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

LEVELS FOR DESIGN HOUR OPERATING CONDITIONS THROUGH A 20-YEAR HORIZON (1)

LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE	TYPE OF HIGHWAY IS IN				SPECIAL CONDITIONS	
	Urban (2) Parts of Metropolitan Areas(3)	Urban Parts of Other Cities	Urbanizing (4) Areas and Rural Development Centers (5)	Rural Areas (6)	Special Transportation Areas (7)	Within Exclusive Transit Corr. (8)
Interstate	D	C	C	B	NA	D/E (9)
Statewide	D	C	C	B	E	E
Regional	D	D	C	C	E	E
District	E	D	D	C	E	E

NOTES:

- 1) Operating standards are not design standards. Operating standards are used by the department when making operating decisions, such as access management decisions. Design standards, which are used to guide the design of highway improvements, are often higher to provide acceptable operating conditions in the future.
- 2) Urban areas are those areas within an urban growth boundary that are generally developed at urban intensities as allowed by the comprehensive plan.
- 3) Metropolitan areas include the Portland, Salem, Eugene, Medford and Rainier (part of Longview-Kelso) urban areas.
- 4) Urbanizing areas are those within an urban growth boundary that are undeveloped or are developing. They may include vacant lands and areas developed well below urban intensities as allowed by the local comprehensive plan.
- 5) Rural development centers are concentrations of development outside of urban growth boundaries. Included are rural unincorporated communities.
- 6) Rural areas are areas outside of urban growth boundaries but not including rural development centers.

- 7) Special Transportation Areas (STAs) are compact areas in which growth management considerations outweigh this policy. STAs include central business districts, transit-oriented development areas and other activity or business centers oriented to non-auto (principally pedestrian) travel. They do not apply to whole cities or strip development areas along individual highway corridors.
- 8) Exclusive transit corridors are corridors within which the highway runs generally parallel to an exclusive transitway, such as a light rail line or exclusive busway.
- 9) LOS 'D' applies when the facility is located in an urbanizing area. LOS 'E' applies in an urbanized area.

GENERAL:

Where a highway section is severely constrained by intensive land use or other physical or environmental limitations, and where service levels are substandard, the division's objective will be to maintain the current service levels.

On highway sections that are not constrained, but are substandard and not scheduled for improvement, the division objective will be to maintain and, to the extent possible, improve the level of service.

Levels of service are to be determined based on the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual. The cumulative effects of a series of signals should be considered in determining the LOS for a section of roadway.

Source: *1991 Oregon Highway Plan*, Highway Division, ODOT, June 1991

FINDINGS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS

SAC Program Requirements

ODOT's certified State Agency Coordination (SAC) Program and Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 31, Division 15 describe the procedures that ODOT will follow when developing and adopting plans to assure that they comply with the statewide planning goals and are compatible with acknowledged comprehensive plans. The SAC Program recognizes that planning occurs in stages and that compliance and compatibility obligations depend on the stage of planning being undertaken. The SAC Program describes the step-wise process as follows:

ODOT's program for assuring compliance and compatibility recognizes the successive stages of transportation planning and establishes a process that coordinates compliance and compatibility determinations with the geographic scale of the plan and the level of detail of information that is available. At each planning stage, some compliance and compatibility issues come into focus with sufficient clarity to enable them to be addressed. These issues shall be resolved at that time. Other issues may be apparent but not seen clearly enough to determine compliance and compatibility. These issues shall be resolved in subsequent planning stages and any plan decisions that depend on their resolution shall be contingent decisions. The result of this successive refinement process shall be the resolution of all compliance and compatibility issues by the end of the project planning stage of the transportation planning program.

The department's coordination efforts at the transportation policy plan and modal systems plan stages will be directed at involving metropolitan planning organizations, local governments and others in the development of statewide transportation policies and plans. Since these plans have general statewide applicability and since ODOT has the mandate under ORS 184.618 to develop such plans, compatibility with the comprehensive plan provisions of specific cities and counties will not be generally established. However, compatibility determinations shall be made for new facilities identified in modal systems plans that affect identifiable geographic areas. Compliance with any statewide planning goals that specifically apply will be established at these planning stages.

The focus of the department's efforts to establish compatibility with acknowledged comprehensive plans will be at the facility planning and project planning stages of the planning program. At these stages, the effects of the department's plans are more regional and local in nature, although some statewide effects are also present.

The Oregon Transportation Plan is the transportation policy plan as defined in the SAC Program. As such, the department is following the coordination requirements for the policy plan. The department has done the following to comply with those requirements:

- At the beginning of the planning process, the ODOT Strategic Planning Section organized five policy advisory committees to identify key transportation issues and develop draft goals and policies to address the issues. The 70 members on the committees were selected to represent diverse interests including private business and industry transportation users and providers, state agencies, regional and local governments, public interest groups, public transportation agencies and citizen advocates. In monthly meetings held in the spring of 1991 and February-March 1992, the committees drafted the OTP goals, policies and action statements that formed the Policy Element. Each committee was chaired by a transportation commission member and provided with technical support by ODOT staff and private consultants.
- The Strategic Planning Section also organized a state agency technical advisory committee to work in tandem with the policy advisory committees and in each stage of the planning process. The 17-member state agency TAC included representatives of all major divisions of ODOT and other state and federal agencies including the state departments of Land Conservation and Development, Energy, Agriculture, Environmental Quality and Economic Development, and the Public Utility Commission. The TAC identified important transportation issues, suggested ways to coordinate the plan with other agency plans and reviewed and commented on the various drafts of the OTP.
- The Oregon Transportation Plan Steering Committee provided input and direction for the development of the System Element of the plan and reviewed and revised the Policy Element based on public comments. The 15-member committee included the five transportation commissioners, six state legislators and representatives of the governor's office, cities, counties and transit districts.
- Two series of statewide public meetings totaling 48 meetings were held during the development of the OTP. A draft of the Policy Element was distributed in advance of 25 public meetings held in the fall of 1991, and a draft of the System Element was distributed in advance of 23 public meetings held in the spring of 1992. The meetings were publicized through the local media, two OTP newsletters and two brochures that served as executive summaries for each element. The meetings were kept informal to encourage citizen participation. Written and oral comments were summarized by ODOT staff and presented in the form of commentary on the draft plan elements to assist advisory committee deliberations.
- The Strategic Planning Section sought input and support from regional and local governments throughout the planning process. ODOT's Local Officials Advisory Committee provided input periodically. Prior to statewide public meetings, drafts of the Policy Element and the System Element were distributed to all cities,

counties, and metropolitan planning organizations, and input was sought during the 1991 annual conventions of the League of Oregon Cities and Association of Oregon Counties. Plan development has included numerous consultations with MPO boards and staff members.

- The draft findings of compliance with statewide planning goals were distributed with the draft OTP for public hearing review.
- The Transportation Commission in coordination with the department conducted a public hearing on the OTP on Tuesday, August 25, 1992. The hearing record remained open for additional written public comment until Friday, August 28, 1992, 5:00 p.m. The commission considered changes to the OTP based on the public hearing record and adopted the OTP on Tuesday, September 15, 1992.
- The findings of compliance with statewide planning goals were adopted as part of the final OTP.
- Copies of the adopted OTP were distributed to DLCD, cities, counties, MPOs and participating state agencies, as well as to all interested persons and agencies who requested copies.

Transportation Planning Rule

The Land Conservation and Development Commission adopted the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12) to implement Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) and “to explain how local governments and state agencies responsible for transportation planning demonstrate compliance with other statewide planning goals.”

The Transportation Planning Rule describes transportation planning as follows (Section 010):

- (1) As described in this division, transportation planning shall be divided into two phases: transportation system planning and transportation project development. Transportation system planning establishes land use controls and a network of facilities and services to meet overall transportation needs. Transportation project development implements the TSP by determining the precise location, alignment, and preliminary design of improvements included in the TSP.

Section 15 of the Transportation Planning Rule recognizes that ODOT’s transportation system plan (TSP) is composed of a number of elements as described in the department’s State Agency Coordination (SAC) Program.

- (1) (a) The state TSP shall include the state transportation policy plan, modal systems and transportation facility plans as set forth in OAR 731, Division 15.

The OTP is ODOT's policy plan. The policy plan is described in the SAC Program as follows:

This is the policy plan for the state transportation system, encompassing all modes of transportation. It addresses matters such as overall direction in the allocation of resources, coordination of the different modes of transportation, the relationship of transportation to land use, economic development, the environment and energy usage, public involvement in transportation planning, coordination with local governments and other agencies, transportation financing, and management of the department.

As can be seen from this description, the OTP is intended to be broad in scope and general in nature. The contents of the plan are described in the introduction. More detailed transportation system planning is done in modal system plans (e.g. Highway Plan) and in facility plans (e.g. corridor plans).

Section 15 of the TPR describes ODOT planning responsibilities under the statewide planning goals.

- (1) ODOT shall prepare, adopt and amend a state TSP in accordance with ORS 184.618, its program for state agency coordination certified under ORS 197.180, and OAR 660-12-030, 035, 050, 065 and 070. The state TSP shall identify a system of transportation facilities and services adequate to meet identified state transportation needs.

Following are findings relating to each of the sections of the TPR that apply to ODOT.

SECTION 030 - DETERMINATION OF TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

Section 030 identifies the basic requirements for determining transportation needs as follows:

- (1) The TSP shall identify transportation needs relevant to the planning area and the scale of the transportation network being planned including:
 - (a) State, regional and local transportation needs.
 - (b) Needs of the transportation disadvantaged.
 - (c) Needs for movement of goods and services to support industrial and commercial development planned for pursuant to OAR 660-09 and Goal 9 (Economic Development).

Since this plan is at a statewide scale, it addresses needs for transportation between regions of the state and between the state and other states and countries. Forecasts are projected at the county and metropolitan area levels. Identified corridors and facilities are those that serve a

statewide function. Local and regional systems are addressed only where they serve a statewide function as a whole. In such cases, needs are addressed in the aggregate. Other elements of ODOT's TSP (modal and facility plans) will address transportation needs in more detail.

The plan addresses the needs of the transportation disadvantaged including the new requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. (See policy 1C and the corresponding actions.)

The plan also addresses the needs for the movement of goods and services. (Also see policies 1E, 1F, 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 3E and the corresponding actions. Also see base case forecasts for employment growth and identification of major ports, mainline rail lines and commercial air carrier service airports of statewide function.)

This section also contains the following additional requirements for identifying transportation needs in urban and MPO areas:

- (3) Within urban growth boundaries, the determination of local and regional transportation needs shall be based upon:
 - (a) Population and employment forecasts and distributions which are consistent with the acknowledged comprehensive plan, including those policies which implement Goal 14, including Goal 14's requirement to encourage urban development on urban lands prior to conversion of urbanizable lands. Forecasts and distributions shall be for 20 years and, if desirable, for longer periods.
 - (b) Measures adopted pursuant to 660-12-045 to encourage reduced reliance on the automobile.
- (4) In MPO areas, calculation of local and regional transportation needs also shall be based upon accomplishment of the requirement in 660-12-035(4) to reduce reliance on the automobile.

The OTP addresses these needs on an aggregate basis. The assumptions on which the need forecasts are based are consistent with the requirements above. The following are assumptions included in the OTP.

- Regional and local governments will continue to contain development within established urban growth boundaries.
- Urban areas will use compact and mixed use development patterns to enhance livability and preserve open space. These patterns will support transit and other alternatives to the automobile.
- State, regional and local governments will cooperate to achieve the vehicle miles traveled reduction standard in the LCDC Transportation Rule.

The forecasts for regional and local travel in the MPO areas are consistent with a 10 percent reduction in per capita vehicle miles traveled by automobile during the period from 1995 (when MPO plans must be adopted) to 2015.

SECTION 035 - EVALUATION AND SELECTION OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES

Section 035 contains requirements for evaluating and selecting transportation system alternatives:

- (1) The TSP shall be based upon evaluation of potential impacts of system alternatives that can reasonably be expected to meet the identified transportation needs in a safe manner and at a reasonable cost with available technology. The following shall be evaluated as components of system alternatives:
 - (a) Improvements to existing facilities and services;
 - (b) New facilities and services, including different modes or combinations of modes that could reasonably meet identified transportation needs;
 - (c) Transportation system management measures;
 - (d) Demand management measures; and
 - (e) A no-build system alternative required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 or other laws.

The system alternatives identified in the System Element of the OTP include all of the components listed above. They address new technology that is expected to be feasible and reasonable as well as existing technology. (Please see description of alternatives and Table 4).

This section of the TPR also contains the following standards for evaluating transportation system alternatives:

- (3) The following standards shall be used to evaluate and select alternatives:
 - (a) The transportation system shall support urban and rural development by providing types and levels of transportation facilities and services appropriate to serve the land uses in the acknowledged comprehensive plan.
 - (b) The transportation system shall be consistent with state and federal standards for protection of air, land and water quality including the State Implementation Plan under the Federal Clean Air Act and State Water Quality Management Plan.
 - (c) The transportation system shall minimize adverse economic, social, environmental and energy consequences.
 - (d) The transportation system shall minimize conflicts and facilitate connections between modes of transportation.
 - (e) The transportation system shall avoid principal reliance on any one mode of transportation and shall reduce principal

reliance on the automobile. In MPO areas this shall be accomplished by selecting transportation alternatives which meet the requirements in 660-12-035(4).

Table 4 shows the evaluation of alternatives. The evaluation criteria address the TPR standards. In addition:

- The preferred alternative is based on supporting urban and rural land uses with appropriate types and levels of service. (See policies 2A and 2B, discussion of assumptions above, and minimum levels of service.)
- The OTP addresses consistency with state and federal air and water quality standards. (See actions 1D.4 and 1D.5)
- The OTP address minimization of conflicts and facilitation of connections between modes. (See policies 1F, 3A and 3D and their actions.)
- The preferred plan is based on the principle of avoiding principal reliance on any one mode of transportation and reducing principal reliance on the automobile as described above. It is also based on the achievement of the VMT reduction goal in the rule. (See assumptions, minimum levels of service, and system management and pricing.)

SECTION 050 - TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

This section contains requirements for transportation project development and references ODOT's administrative rule for state agency coordination OAR 731 Division 15. It does not apply to the OTP.

SECTION 065 - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS ON RURAL LANDS

This section includes requirements for making transportation improvements on rural lands. The OTP does not identify specific improvements in rural areas. It does, however address such improvements in policies. (See policies 2A, action 2A.6 and policy 2F and its actions.)

This section of the TPR will be addressed in corridor plans.

SECTION 070 - EXCEPTIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS ON RURAL LANDS

Section 070 applies to exceptions to goals 3, 4, 11 and 14 for transportation facilities on rural lands. It does not apply to the OTP for the reasons mentioned above.

Statewide Planning Goals

Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement) and Goal 2 (Land Use Planning) are addressed by ODOT's SAC Program. ODOT has complied with these goals by following its SAC Program procedures as described above.

The SAC Program describes a process of going from the general to the specific. The OTP is a general plan which addresses systemwide management strategies and policies. It does not identify specific areas that would be affected by highway improvements. Accordingly, several land specific goals do not apply. These include:

- Goal 3 (Agricultural Land)
- Goal 4 (Forest Lands)
- Goal 5 (Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources)
- Goal 7 (Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards)
- Goal 15 (Willamette River Greenway)
- Goal 16 (Estuarine Resources)
- Goal 17 (Coastal Shorelands)
- Goal 18 (Beaches and Dunes)

According to the SAC Program, these goals will be addressed during the development of facility plans such as corridor plans and project plans when specific future improvements and geographic impacts are identified.

Several goals relate only indirectly to the OTP. These are:

- Goal 8 (Recreational Needs)
- Goal 10 (Housing)

In general, the OTP supports Goal 8 by laying out a plan which improves accessibility to recreational areas of the state. Policy 3E states the policy to improve access to recreational areas of the state. Similarly, the plan supports Goal 10 by establishing policies for improving mobility within urban areas.

A number of the goals do affect systemwide planning. These include:

- Goal 6 (Air, Water and Land Resources Quality)
- Goal 9 (Economic Development)
- Goal 11 (Public Facilities and Services)
- Goal 12 (Transportation)
- Goal 13 (Energy Conservation)
- Goal 14 (Urbanization)

These goals are all addressed by TPR requirements.