



MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Dirksen and City Council

FROM: Judith Gray, Sr. Transportation Planner & Darren Wyss, Sr. Planner

RE: Supplemental Staff Report - 2035 Transportation System Plan

DATE: September 29, 2010

This memorandum provides a summary of oral testimony from citizens at the June 21, 2010 Planning Commission Hearing on Comprehensive Plan Amendment CPA2010-00001 and provides supplemental findings that support the Planning Commission action and legislative intent regarding compliance with statewide planning goals.

Public Comment

The Tigard Planning Commission held a public hearing on June 21, 2010 pertaining to Comprehensive Plan Amendment CPA2010-00001 Transportation System Plan (TSP). In advance of the hearing, a staff report and subsequent addenda were provided to the Planning Commission which summarized, among other things, the public involvement process throughout the development of the TSP, up to the day of the public hearing. Public comments received through this process are included in Exhibit C.

Three citizens testified at the June 21 Planning Commission hearing: one in support of the TSP and two opposed. All of the testimony pertained to the proposed Ash Avenue and Walnut Street projects (Projects 18 and 27). The testimony and responses are summarized below:

Citizen Comment: One citizen testified in support of the TSP and specifically supported the Ash Avenue bridge. She stated that the project would be an improvement for circulation and is needed for future density. She suggested it could be maintained as a bicycle/pedestrian/emergency access and converted to a two-way traffic street in the future.

Staff Response: None

Citizen Comments: Two citizens testified in opposition to the plan. One cited the Ash Avenue bridge, and concerns about potential wetland impacts and resulting flooding as well as increased traffic. The second raised concern about the Walnut extension to Ash Avenue. She suggested Frewing Street would be a reasonable alternative.

Staff Response: Potential environmental impacts would be addressed in an engineering analysis before construction of these projects could take place. Potential traffic impacts and phasing options with potential pedestrian/bike/emergency access limitations could be addressed as part of an Ash Avenue Corridor Study, which was recommended in the Tigard Downtown Improvement Plan. The Ash Avenue Corridor Study was not included in the draft TSP that the Planning Commission had reviewed.

PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION

Upon consideration of the public comments and testimony along with staff responses and potential recommendation options, Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the TSP with the following changes:

- An Ash Avenue Corridor Plan was included among the “Future Plans and Studies” identified in Table 5-4.
- The timeframes for the two projects shown in Table 5-6 were changed from “Near-Term” to “Mid-Term” in order to ensure that the corridor plan could be conducted prior to construction.

Supplemental Findings

These findings are in addition to, and not substitutes for, the findings in the June 14, 2010 staff report for CPA2010-00001. They address the basis for the Planning Commission decision on June 21, 2010 and clarify Council’s legislative intent in adopting the 2035 TSP.

Statewide Planning Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement

This goal outlines the citizen involvement requirement for adoption of Comprehensive Plans and changes to the Comprehensive Plan and implementing documents.

Supplemental Findings: This goal was achieved (further to the measures identified in the original staff report) through the public comment opportunities and responses leading up to and including the Planning Commission Public Hearing. Public notice and contact information was provided sufficient to receive comments via email and telephone, and to accommodate oral testimony at the hearing. Comments were used as a basis for additional background research and modification to the TSP.

Statewide Planning Goal 12: Transportation

To provide and encourage a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system.

Supplemental Findings: Based on public testimony, written and oral, and consideration of options presented by staff, Planning Commission recommended adoption with amendments to the implementation elements of the draft TSP. Specifically, an additional item was added to the future plans and studies listed in Table 5-4: -- “Ash Avenue -- Walnut Street Extension Corridor Study” -- to ensure an sufficient opportunity for public involvement in

future planning for Projects 18 and 27. Also, Table 5-6 was modified to identify the time frames for both projects as mid-term rather than near-term.

Goal 12 is further satisfied through regulatory elements included in the TSP, which are described in the Policy/Regulatory Elements section on pages 47 through 59, including Figure 5-2 Roadway Functional Classifications. This section identifies the functional classifications and, where applicable, references specific standards implemented through the Tigard Development Code Title 18. These standards and their regulatory function are not changed as a direct result of the TSP adoption; however, under certain headings (e.g., Street Design Standards, Intersection Performance Standards) further review of the standards is recommended by the TSP.

Background material used in development of the TSP is included in Volumes 2 and 3. The documents do not contain any changes in policies, plans, or standards. Rather, these volumes include reference materials and technical memoranda developed through the TSP process using methods in keeping with accepted industry standards and practices. These materials were available to the public and interested parties as they were developed and throughout the TSP update process through the project web site. They were also presented at public meetings and were the basis of the technical review by the Citizen Advisory Committee. They are not included in the staff report but are included as part of the public record.

Recommendations

1. Planning Commission recommends approval of the 2035 Transportation System Plan CPA 2010-00001.
2. Staff recommends that the record be augmented by the supplemental findings contained herein.

From: jefku@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 12:06 PM
To: Darren Wyss
Subject: TSP

June 20, 2010

City of Tigard
Tigard Planning Commission

Re: Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan Adoption / Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) 2010-00001

Dear Planning Commission members:

TRAILS – Many people use trails, myself included. However, trails do **NOT** belong in every greenway/open space left in Tigard. **We must keep some greenways, etc. FREE of trails in order to minimize human disturbance and protect these Goal 5 Significant habitat resources.** This is important, as the remaining greenways, etc. provide crucial habitat for songbirds, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, waterfowl and many other species. Placing trails in these important areas can displace wildlife and cause serious disruption to migration corridors, breeding habitat, etc. Tigard has a number of State listed Sensitive-critical species that depend on their survival for these remaining habitats; the Red-legged frog and Western pond and painted turtles utilize Summer Creek and the adjacent riparian corridor and remaining uplands for feeding, basking, overwintering and breeding habitats.

Summer Creek trail/new crossing: The proposed Transportation Plan has a new proposed trail going through the riparian corridor/floodplain along Summer Creek (see map) as well as a crossing of the creek from Katherine Street to 116th Street. We adamantly **OPPOSE** this crossing of the stream as well as the proposed trail along Summer Creek. These would seriously compromise the intact riparian corridor along the creek, disrupt and disturb the habitat as well as the migration corridor for a host of species including migratory birds, the State listed painted turtle and waterfowl. This is one of the few, remaining areas in Tigard that still has native turtles and we need to leave it alone!

This proposed trail would not help to get people from point A to B as argued by a certain person in Tigard. Rather, it would be more prudent and cost efficient to install sidewalks on existing streets as well as **safe crossings** across SW 121st and other well used crossings. The cost estimate by the consultant last year was over **\$300,000!!** just for the creek crossing and path to 116th. That is a waste of taxpayer dollars and should be used for building safe street crossings instead!

We HIGHLY RECOMMEND REMOVING THE SUMMER CREEK TRAIL/CREEK CROSSING from the TSP for the above reasons. We do not want it, neighbors don't want it and most important, wildlife does not want it in their habitat.

Fanno Creek Park trails; We OPPOSE any new trails that cross wetlands within Fanno

Creek Park. Tigard is working with CWS to create a new meander of Fanno Creek. We cannot support any new trails in this area since this area is significant wildlife habitat and is one of few remaining crucial habitats for western pond turtles, which are highly sensitive to disturbance and are State listed. Rather, the existing, eroding trail to the south of the creek should be removed, and trails should be kept out of this area.

Metro's Green Trail Guidelines; the proposed TSP and any discussion of where to place any new trails should follow Metro's Green Trail Guidelines, which state that trails should **AVOID** stream crossings and riparian corridors. There is a reason for this, as these areas are considered Significant Habitat, and it is important to avoid and minimize disturbance to these very special areas that harbor a host of listed and declining species.

Safe Crossings: Rather than build new trails, which also are Very costly, we would like to see sidewalks and crossings installed along/across streets to get people to walk more and get out of their cars. One example of this is the need for a crossing at SW 121st and Tigard Place. People already use this crossing to get to Summer Lake Park. Another area that needs safe, marked crossings is at SW North Dakota Street and 115th.

Tigard's Comprehensive Plan (CP) – The city of Tigard recently revised the CP, of which Policy 6 of the Parks, Recreation, Trails and Open Space section states that “The City shall acquire and manage some open spaces **to solely provide protection of natural resources...**”. And Policy 17 of this section of the CP states that “The City shall maintain and manage its parks and open space resources in ways that preserve, protect, and restore Tigard's natural resources, including rare, or state and federal listed species,...”. Both of these policies were written by citizens including myself, who served on the committee for over a year, who are very concerned about natural resources in Tigard, and who wanted to make sure that these policies in the revised CP would protect our fish and wildlife and habitats.

We specifically agreed and then stated in our meetings with city staff during development of the Natural Resources section of the CP that areas such as Summer Creek should NOT have new trails or stream crossings in order to make sure that wildlife and habitats were protected from disturbance, impacts, etc. The proposed TSP should adequately address existing goals and policies as mentioned above, which, in its current form, we believe it **fails to do** regarding the placement of new trails, etc.

Goals and policies in TSP; Upon reviewing the proposed goals and policies, we note that under Goal 1, there is a policy that states “The City shall strive to protect the environment...”. Why is the wording always weakened when it comes to protecting the environment in Tigard?? This wording should be changed to “**The City Shall protect the**

environment....” Just drop the word “strive” which weakens the policy and as we note, no other policy here has the word strive in it.

Again, under Goal 1, The next policy is worded “The city shall mitigate impacts to the natural environment....”. Rather, this should be changed to “**The city shall AVOID impacts to the natural environment associated with proposed transportation...**”. Again, it is a weak policy in its present form and needs to be better. Citizens understand and are quite aware that mitigation often fails, and the best policy in the first place is to always AVOID any impacts to the natural environment, especially in Tigard’s case where we already are in a state of having lost much of our uplands and riparian habitats. We can never replace what is lost.

Under Goal 3, there needs to be a new policy added that addresses natural resources and avoids impacts to fish, wildlife, etc. which currently is lacking under this goal. Our recommendation for a new policy is as follows:

The City shall avoid placing any new trails and stream crossings in riparian habitats, significant habitat, greenways or across any streams in order to avoid impacts to these significant resources.

Streets; In the proposed TSP are several streets which are **NOT needed**, are too costly and most importantly, would cause too much environmental damage by crossing Fanno Creek and removing riparian habitat, etc. These include:

Extension of Wall street across Fanno Creek

Extension of Ash Street across Fanno Creek

Extension of Walnut Street across Fanno Creek

These need to be removed from the TSP permanently. Citizens do not want them, they are too costly, they would disrupt existing neighborhoods, they would cause too much damage and disturbance to Fanno Creek and the surrounding Significant Habitats and they would only cause more traffic problems by increasing traffic in these areas.

Sincerely,

Susan Beilke and Jeff Paine

June 20, 2010

City of Tigard
Tigard Planning Commission

Re: Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan Adoption / Comprehensive Plan
Amendment (CPA) 2010-00001

Dear Planning Commission members:

The city of Tigard has developed a preliminary transportation plan (TSP) for the next 25 years. We appreciate the time and effort that have gone into developing this plan. However, I have lived here now for over 20 years and as a biologist and wildlife advocate, have been very concerned over the lack of protection and conservation of our natural resources in many instances as new development continues along with the infrastructure of roads, etc. Our new transportation plan **MUST** consider and incorporate **much stronger** protections for our remaining natural resources in order to adequately conserve the remaining habitats and fish and wildlife.

Our comments are as follows:

- **TRAILS** – Many people use trails, myself included. However, trails do **NOT** belong in every greenway/open space left in Tigard. **We must keep some greenways, etc. FREE of trails in order to minimize human disturbance and protect these Goal 5 Significant habitat resources.** This is important, as the remaining greenways, etc. provide crucial habitat for songbirds, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, waterfowl and many other species. Placing trails in these important areas can displace wildlife and cause serious disruption to migration corridors, breeding habitat, etc. Tigard has a number of State listed Sensitive-critical species that depend on their survival for these remaining habitats; the Red-legged frog and Western pond and painted turtles utilize Summer Creek and the adjacent riparian corridor and remaining uplands for feeding, basking, overwintering and breeding habitats.
- **Summer Creek trail/new crossing:** The proposed Transportation Plan has a new proposed trail going through the riparian corridor/floodplain along Summer Creek (see map) as well as a crossing of the creek from Katherine Street to 116th Street. We adamantly **OPPOSE** this crossing of the stream as well as the proposed trail along Summer Creek. These would seriously compromise the intact riparian corridor along the creek, disrupt and disturb the habitat as well as the migration corridor for a host of species including migratory birds, the State listed painted turtle and waterfowl. This is one of the few, remaining areas in Tigard that still has native turtles and we need to leave it alone!

This proposed trail would not help to get people from point A to B as argued by a certain person in Tigard. Rather, it would be more prudent and cost efficient to install sidewalks on existing streets as well as **safe crossings** across SW 121st and other well used crossings. The cost estimate by the consultant last year was over **\$300,000!!**

just for the creek crossing and path to 116th. That is a waste of taxpayer dollars and should be used for building safe street crossings instead!

We HIGHLY RECOMMEND REMOVING THE SUMMER CREEK TRAIL/CREEK CROSSING from the TSP for the above reasons. We do not want it, neighbors don't want it and most important, wildlife does not want it in their habitat.

- **Fanno Creek Park trails;** We **OPPOSE** any new trails that cross wetlands within Fanno Creek Park. Tigard is working with CWS to create a new meander of Fanno Creek. We cannot support any new trails in this area since this area is significant wildlife habitat and is one of few remaining crucial habitats for western pond turtles, which are highly sensitive to disturbance and are State listed. Rather, the existing, eroding trail to the south of the creek should be removed, and trails should be kept out of this area.
- **Metro's Green Trail Guidelines;** the proposed TSP and any discussion of where to place any new trails should follow Metro's Green Trail Guidelines, which state that trails should **AVOID** stream crossings and riparian corridors. There is a reason for this, as these areas are considered Significant Habitat, and it is important to avoid and minimize disturbance to these very special areas that harbor a host of listed and declining species.
- **Safe Crossings:** Rather than build new trails, which also are Very costly, we would like to see sidewalks and crossings installed along/across streets to get people to walk more and get out of their cars. One example of this is the need for a crossing at SW 121st and Tigard Place. People already use this crossing to get to Summer Lake Park. Another area that needs safe, marked crossings is at SW North Dakota Street and 115th.
- **Tigard's Comprehensive Plan (CP)** – The city of Tigard recently revised the CP, of which Policy 6 of the Parks, Recreation, Trails and Open Space section states that “The City shall acquire and manage some open spaces **to solely provide protection of natural resources...**”. And Policy 17 of this section of the CP states that “The City shall maintain and manage its parks and open space resources in ways that preserve, protect, and restore Tigard's natural resources, including rare, or state and federal listed species,...”. Both of these policies were written by citizens including myself, who served on the committee for over a year, who are very concerned about natural resources in Tigard, and who wanted to make sure that these policies in the revised CP would protect our fish and wildlife and habitats.

We specifically agreed and then stated in our meetings with city staff during development of the Natural Resources section of the CP that areas such as Summer Creek should NOT have new trails or stream crossings in order to make sure that wildlife and habitats were protected from disturbance, impacts, etc. The proposed TSP should adequately address existing goals and policies as mentioned above, which, in its current form, we believe it **fails to do** regarding the placement of new trails, etc.

- **Environmental Resources Map, Figure 4-1;** This map is not accurate and needs to be revised before this TSP can be adopted! For example, it does not show all the water bodies in Tigard, nor does it adequately show all of the significant Goal 5 resources or the floodplain areas.
- **Goals and policies in TSP;** Upon reviewing the proposed goals and policies, we note that under Goal 1, there is a policy that states “The City shall strive to protect the environment...”. Why is the wording always weakened when it comes to protecting the environment in Tigard?? This wording should be changed to “**The City Shall protect the environment...**” Just **drop the word “strive”** which weakens the policy and as we note, no other policy here has the word strive in it.
 - Again, under Goal 1, The next policy is worded “The city shall mitigate impacts to the natural environment...”. Rather, this should be changed to “**The city shall AVOID impacts to the natural environment associated with proposed transportation...**”. Again, it is a weak policy in its present form and needs to be better. Citizens understand and are quite aware that mitigation often fails, and the best policy in the first place is to always AVOID any impacts to the natural environment, especially in Tigard’s case where we already are in a state of having lost much of our uplands and riparian habitats. We can never replace what is lost.
 - Under Goal 3, there needs to be a new policy added that addresses natural resources and avoids impacts to fish, wildlife, etc. which currently is lacking under this goal. Our recommendation for a new policy is as follows:

The City shall avoid placing any new trails and stream crossings in riparian habitats, significant habitat, greenways or across any streams in order to avoid impacts to these significant resources.

- **Streets;** In the proposed TSP are several streets which are **NOT needed**, are too costly and most importantly, would cause too much environmental damage by crossing Fanno Creek and removing riparian habitat, etc. These include:
 - **Extension of Wall street across Fanno Creek**
 - **Extension of Ash Street across Fanno Creek**
 - **Extension of Walnut Street across Fanno Creek**

These need to be removed from the TSP permanently. Citizens do not want them, they are too costly, they would disrupt existing neighborhoods, they would cause too much damage and disturbance to Fanno Creek and the surrounding Significant Habitats and they would only cause more traffic problems by increasing traffic in these areas.

- **Bus transportation;** many of our major streets including Tigard Street west of downtown, do not have bus transportation. This should be a **MAJOR focus** and part of our new TSP. We recommend the city go back and adequately address how bus transportation can meet the needs of the future of Tigard. We would rather have more buses than any new streets, it would be much cheaper and environmentally friendly if we had buses running on biofuels as many cities now do.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed TSP. In conclusion, we believe that to wisely plan for the future transportation needs of Tigard, while at the same time protecting and conserving our remaining natural resources, that Tigard should focus on creating new safe street crossings for pedestrians, focus on new bus routes within the city and drop plans for new trails that negatively impact our remaining natural resources.

Sincerely,

Susan Beilke
Board member, Fans of Fanno Creek
Director, The Turtle Conservancy



City of Tigard Memorandum

To: President Walsh and Members of the Planning Commission
From: Judith Gray, Senior Transportation Planner
Re: Ash Avenue and Walnut Avenue Downtown Projects
Date: June 17, 2010

At the June 21 public hearing, Planning Commission will be asked to make a recommendation to City Council regarding the 2035 Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update. Planning Commission could 1) recommend approval in its current form; 2) recommend approval with changes; or 3) recommend it not be approved, without specific changes identified.

Three related projects in the 2035 TSP involve Ash Avenue and Walnut Street in downtown and have been the subject of concern. The projects are:

- #17: Ash Avenue crossing the railroad tracks. This will be a critical connectivity improvement for downtown. It does not seem to part of the concern.
- #18 – Ash Avenue bridge over Fanno Creek.
- #27 – Walnut Street Extension from 99W to Ash Avenue.

You are aware that there are strong opinions about these projects, both for and against. This memorandum provides some background on these projects and suggests possible direction as you consider your recommendation to Council regarding the TSP.

Potential Recommendation

Based on a review of past plans and concerns raised by citizens currently and in the past, one option for the Planning Commission would be to recommend the following changes to the TSP:

1. Add a new project: An *Ash Avenue Corridor Study*, consistent with the recommendation of the TDIP (more on this below). Such efforts -- including traffic analysis, engineering due diligence, and public involvement -- would be required before the bridge could be constructed. Including the study in the TSP Update would formalize the requirement and help to clarify the potential benefits and impacts of the projects.
2. Move Projects #18 and #27 to mid-term or long-term. This would provide an opportunity to focus on the Ash Avenue railroad crossing while completing the Corridor Study.

Project 17, the Ash Avenue railroad crossing, should remain in the near-term. This project has enough issues that it will take considerable effort complete it within the next several years.

Of course, Planning Commission will also have the option of continuing the hearing if other topics or questions are raised or if additional time for deliberation is needed.

Background on Ash Avenue-Walnut Street Projects

The following background information will provide some historical context for these projects.

Project Purposes

Projects 18 and 27 are the focus of the concern due to potential environmental and neighborhood impacts. The TSP is conducted at such a “high level” of planning that currently these projects are little more than lines on a map. Specific alignments and connections have not been developed. However, their general purposes can be described as follows:

The Walnut Street extension (#27) would provide alternative access to downtown from Pacific Highway and neighborhoods to the northwest. With the planned realignment of the Scoffins-Hunziker connection (Project #11) and a Hwy 217 overcrossing at Hunziker-Hampton, Project #27 would be a link in a continuous east-west route from Scholls to 72nd Avenue. Even if all of these projects do not happen within the 25 year TSP horizon, the Walnut Extension is one of limited options for a long-run circulation improvement.

The Ash Avenue Fanno Creek Bridge (#18) has dual purposes. One is that the bridge provides the essential link to the Walnut extension. Another purpose for the Ash Avenue extension is to connect downtown to the neighborhoods. The opposition I have heard is mostly related to environmental impacts and potential traffic added to the Ash Avenue residential neighborhoods.

Past Plans and Studies

These are not new projects. They were included in the 2002 TSP and in planning documents going back decades. The oldest document found is a 1974 neighborhood plan that includes the connection of Ash Avenue to the neighborhood. The intent was to provide a route for the neighborhood to access downtown without using Pacific Highway. Also, the City has aerial photos from the 1940s (we believe it is 1946) showing a bridge once existed over Fanno Creek and connected Ash Ave to downtown. Further, the City continues to own right of way across Fanno Creek to Ash Avenue.

Other plans that include one or both of these projects are:

- A Plan for Downtown – Ash Avenue, 1974
- Tigard Transportation System Plan, 2002
- Tigard Downtown Improvement Plan (TDIP), 2005
- Downtown Tigard Circulation Plan, (still in process)

The TDIP has been the source of some confusion. Apparently, in the course of this project, it was agreed to remove the Ash Avenue extension from the project. This apparently led some residents to believe that the Ash Avenue Fanno Creek bridge was removed from plans altogether because it was removed from the TDIP. However, the TDIP only removed it from the scope of that study so that it was no longer discussed in that plan. The Implementation Plan in the final report states the following:

“Overall, the City’s currently adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP) will accommodate the Preferred Design Alternative without any significant impacts to the regional or local transportation system in the study area. There are no modifications to the TSP recommended at this time as being needed to help carry out this Plan.”

This is followed by a list of action measures, which includes the following:

“Achieve consensus on alternative Downtown Access Improvements. Extending Ash Avenue from Walnut to Downtown Tigard is included in the adopted TSP; however some stakeholders would prefer that the street not be constructed. The City will be undertaking an Ash Avenue corridor study to address the improvements identified in the Ash Avenue Improvements catalyst project discussed above. It is recommended that the City conduct an examination of potential alternatives for improving access to downtown. Detailed travel demand to, from and within Downtown and sub-area travel demand models should be developed to support this process. If the identified access improvements do not include an extension of Ash Avenue across Fanno Creek, it is recommended that the TSP be updated accordingly to remove it”.

I have attached relevant pages from the TDIP for your convenience.



City of Tigard Memorandum

To: President Dave Walsh and Planning Commission Members
From: Darren Wyss, Senior Planner
Re: Response to Citizen Comments
Date: June 16, 2010

On Monday, June 21, 2010, the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan (CPA2010-00001). The Commission has received the packet of materials for the public hearing and included is a Citizen Comment Matrix (Exhibit D to the Staff Report). The deadline for submitting the packet of materials for Commission review did not afford City staff the time to adequately respond to the citizen comments. This memorandum provides staff response and will be submitted as part of the public hearing record.

Four citizens (Mr. Westfall, Ms. Honeyman, Ms. Peterson, and Mr. Frewing) submitted comments either by telephone or email. All comments were regarding the proposed projects to connect Walnut St. to Ash Ave. (projects 18 and 27) and into downtown Tigard. Below is staff response:

Comments from Mr. Westfall, Ms. Honeyman, Ms. Peterson, and Mr. Frewing (items a. - c., and f.)

Response: The technical analysis performed to inform the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan (TSP) shows a benefit in making the Walnut St. /Ash Ave. connection. The Transportation Needs and Deficiencies Report and the Transportation System Solutions Report contain the analysis. Both can be found in Volume 3: 2035 TSP Technical Appendix.

The Transportation Needs and Deficiencies Report (pgs. 8-10) identifies connectivity as an important component of capacity relief and circulation improvements. It also identifies that a limited number of opportunities exist to improve connectivity, particularly east/west across the community. The Transportation System Solutions Report (pgs. 11-12) reiterates that analysis and administers a qualitative evaluation system (Table 5-5, pg. 8) to the projects. Based on the qualitative evaluation, the projects were recommended to remain in the TSP (pg. 35).

As with any capital improvement decision, the pros and cons of the project must be weighed. The analysis shows that the project is still viable and important as conditions, including congestion and circulation, haven't improved since 2002 when the current TSP was adopted with these projects included. Other projects that have been removed have seen significantly changed circumstances or the evaluation of its impact versus value has changed.

The inclusion of the project in the TSP is a line on a map at this point. As with most major roadway projects, a series of studies would need to take place before any construction began. Planning and engineering studies, environmental assessments, and public input would identify the exact alignment, impact, and connections to existing streets. The impacts to the neighborhood, and Fanno Creek Park and its natural resources could be studied in a separate corridor study as recommended in the Tigard Downtown Improvement Plan. Additionally, the Ash Ave. crossing of the railroad tracks (Project 17) needs to occur first for the extension to be a useful project.

Mr. Frewing (item d)

Response: The technical analysis does not provide the level of detail to determine the circulation patterns of downtown traffic or the shopping patterns of individuals. The additional access point into downtown Tigard would provide an alternate access path. As the downtown begins to redevelop and the potential for more commercial businesses along Main St. increases, there is no evidence that this connection would discourage the patronage of these businesses.

Mr. Frewing (item e)

Response: The Tigard 2035 TSP is an update of the existing document. The starting point was to evaluate all projects included in the existing document and make recommendations on the projects that should remain and should be removed or altered. The technical analysis performed shows the projects still provide a benefit to the community.

As always, if you have any questions, please feel free to contact either Judith Gray at Judith@tigard-or.gov or 503-718-2557 or Darren Wyss at darren@tigard-or.gov or 503-718-2442.

Darren Wyss

From: jfrewing [jfrewing@teleport.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2010 5:55 AM
To: Darren Wyss
Subject: Comment on TSP 2010

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Darren,

Please include the following comment in material provided to the Planning Commission for their June 21 consideration of the TSP 2010:

The Tigard TSP 2010 should not include a planned extension of Walnut, crossing Fanno Creek to connect to Ash. I offer the following reasons:

- a. This is a very large, intrusive and expensive project that Tigard does not really 'need'. As I saw some similar plans characterized recently, this is 'a big idea that (needs to) hit reality.' The Planning Commission should consider the distinction between what the city 'wants' versus what the city 'needs' and how to the latter. It is the inclusion of projects like this which make people like me think that our city is not sustainable.
- b. This project would remove park area from Fanno Creek Park. Tigard already is shy of park areas, and the addition of a collector across the park makes that situation more severe.
- c. This project creates another crossing of Fanno Creek, one of the important natural features of Tigard. Despite mitigation efforts, there is likely to be some impact on the stream and its riparian areas, even if only the proximity of more people to the stream.
- d. This project would draw people away from Main Street, for which the city has made extensive renovation plans as the focus of downtown Tigard.
- e. On earlier versions of the TSP 2010, when questioned about this proposed project, staff has told me that this project 'is just on the map because it was on the old map' and that there would be no intent to carry this project to the new TSP simply because of this historic planning.
- f. This project would significantly disrupt an existing high density neighborhood of residences west of Fanno Creek. This neighborhood has in the past opposed the extension of Walnut across Fanno Creek to Ash, and its opposition should be respected.

As soon as practicable, and hopefully in advance of the June 21 hearing, please provide to me and to the Planning Commission the rationale and 'need' for this project to be included on the TSP 2010 street improvement map. I presume there are studies and documentation of outreach in the record of TSP development which support this project.

Sincerely, John Frewing 7110 SW Lola Lane, Tigard 97223 503-245-5760

Darren Wyss

From: Susan Hartnett
Sent: Sunday, June 13, 2010 6:48 PM
To: Judith Gray; Darren Wyss
Cc: Sean Farrelly
Subject: FW: TSP & TDIP comment

Maybe Ron forwarded this to all or some of you in another message but I wanted make sure you saw it. - Susan _____

From: Craig Prosser
Sent: Saturday, June 05, 2010 5:46 PM
To: Ron Bunch; Susan Hartnett
Subject: Fwd: TSP & TDIP comment

Craig Prosser

Begin forwarded message:

From: Craig Dirksen <craigd@tigard-or.gov<mailto:craigd@tigard-or.gov>>
Date: June 5, 2010 4:27:47 PM PDT
To: Liz Newton <LIZ@tigard-or.gov<mailto:LIZ@tigard-or.gov>>, Craig Prosser <CRAIG@tigard-or.gov<mailto:CRAIG@tigard-or.gov>>, Councilmail Councilmail <councilmail@tigard-or.gov<mailto:councilmail@tigard-or.gov>>
Subject: FW: TSP & TDIP comment

From: Ben Westfall[SMTP:BENWESTFALL@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Saturday, June 05, 2010 4:27:44 PM
To: Craig Dirksen
Subject: TSP & TDIP comment
Auto forwarded by a Rule
Craig,

I am a concerned citizen of Tigard and I've seen some alarming information lately in the TSP draft dated April 2010 about the revival of the Ash extension over Fanno Creek (item #17) and the so called "completion" of Walnut St (item #27). Both of these projects provide no value to the people that live in the surrounding neighborhoods and in fact will ruin them by increasing unwanted transitory traffic reducing their safety for children as well as lowering property values of houses that were purchased because they are in quiet neighborhoods with small amounts of traffic.

I was at the meeting where these items were promised to be dropped from the agenda. I recall it being paramount to the passing of the Tigard Downtown Improvement Project. Are you one of those lying sons of bitches politicians that say what ever you want to get elected then piss all over your constituents for god knows what (money and greed I'd assume). What's the slogan again that Tigard has spent ten's of thousands on signage all over the place "Tigard a place to call home" or some drivel like that? Should that be rewritten as "... a place no longer suitable to call home for damn near all the houses around the downtown area". Increasing the "availability" of these neighborhoods to downtown will do nothing more than invite traffic and crime to them. Those are the top 2 items in your friggin surveys that tigard citizens complain about. Why would you, as an elected official by the people for the people, piss on that by increasing these problems for Tigard Neighborhoods?

The WES diesel train will never bring paying customers to Tigard of any fashion. It's a commuter rail, which implies carrying commuters to work, and a poor one at that. It never stands a chance of paying for itself even at maximum capacity. The sheer dollars wasted (and continuing with its current funding) are appalling. It will never serve the citizens of Tigard before, during, or after the TDIP.

I'm confused and unimpressed at the "vision" for the TDIP. It might "revive" a struggling downtown but at the expense of the people that currently live there? That sounds like a resounding failure to me.

-Ben Westfall
Citizen of Tigard

DISCLAIMER: E-mails sent or received by City of Tigard employees are subject to public record laws. If requested, e-mail may be disclosed to another party unless exempt from disclosure under Oregon Public Records Law. E-mails are retained by the City of Tigard in compliance with the Oregon Administrative Rules "City General Records Retention Schedule."

**STAFF REPORT TO THE
PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR THE CITY OF TIGARD, OREGON**



120 DAYS = N/A

SECTION I. APPLICATION SUMMARY

FILE NAME: TIGARD 2035 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN ADOPTION

FILE NO.: Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) CPA2010-00001

PROPOSAL: To amend the current Tigard Comprehensive Plan Goal 12: Transportation and the Tigard Public Facility Plan to incorporate the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan.

APPLICANT: City of Tigard
13125 SW Hall Boulevard
Tigard, OR 97223

OWNER: N/A

LOCATION: Citywide

**ZONING
DESIGNATION:** All City zoning districts

COMP PLAN: All City comprehensive plan designations

APPLICABLE REVIEW CRITERIA:

Community Development Code Chapters 18.380 and 18.390; Comprehensive Plan Goals 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and Special Planning Area: Downtown; the Regional Transportation Plan; the Oregon Highway Plan; Oregon Administrative Rule 66-12; and Statewide Planning Goals 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

SECTION II. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission finds this request to meet the necessary approval criteria. Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning Commission RECOMMENDS to the Tigard City Council that it amends the Tigard Comprehensive Plan and Tigard Public Facility Plan as determined through the public hearing process.

SECTION III. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project History

The 2035 Tigard Transportation System Plan (2035 TSP) is an important long-range planning tool for Tigard as it prepares for future growth in the community and region. The 2035 TSP, an update of the previously adopted plan, was initiated in 2008 and completed in 2010. It was funded by the state's Transportation and Growth Management Program. The completion of the 2035 TSP is timely for two reasons. First, traffic congestion has consistently ranked as the number one issue facing Tigard in community attitude surveys and the City is committed to finding solutions to this issue. Secondly, the community has developed a vision for Tigard's future and a key component of this vision is developing an efficient and balanced multi-modal transportation system. The TSP ensures the vision for the transportation system meets community needs, communicates the City's aspirations, and conforms to state and regional policies. An effective TSP will provide:

- A blueprint for transportation investment;
- A coordination tool with regional agencies and local jurisdictions;
- An important component of prudent and effective land use choices; and
- Answers to existing and future transportation needs related to bicycles, pedestrians, transit, vehicles, freight, and rail.

The document meets the state requirements for a TSP and acts as a resource for staff, decision makers, and the public. It identifies the preferred multi-modal transportation system, consisting of a network of facilities adequate to serve local, regional, and state transportation needs. It is the principal document used for identifying the function, capacity, and location of future facilities, directing resources to transportation projects, and providing the community with the level of investment that will be needed to support anticipated development within the community.

One important task in the development of the 2035 TSP was to consider land use and transportation efforts already completed by the City. This allowed the TSP to analyze and build upon previously adopted plans to ensure consistency and continuity for the transportation system. Plans for Downtown Tigard, the Washington Square Regional Center, Highway 217, and Pacific Highway-99W were incorporated into the TSP.

The 2035 TSP also serves as the transportation element, and as a supporting document, of the Tigard Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) as required by state law. Goals and policies were identified at an early stage of the 2035 TSP update and are adopted as the Goal 12: Transportation element of the Comp Plan. These goals and policies will help to guide future decisions. It was important to ensure the transportation goals and policies were coordinated with the entire Comp Plan because an integrated land use and transportation system is essential to reaching the community's vision. In general, as the Comp Plan is "comprehensive" in nature, all goals and policies are intended to be supportive of one another.

The progress of this plan was guided by the Project Management Team (PMT) made up of City of Tigard staff with input from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). The project was also guided by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), City Council and Planning Commission.

The TAC provided guidance on technical aspects of the 2035 Tigard Transportation System Plan and consisted of staff members from regional partners and local jurisdictions. The CAC ensured

that the needs of people in the community of Tigard are incorporated in the 2035 TSP. The CAC consisted of Tigard residents who provided input throughout the process.

Proposal Description

The primary intent of the amendment is to ensure the City's Transportation System Plan and Comprehensive Plan remain viable tools for decision-makers. By adopting the amendment, the City will ensure it is in compliance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, plans, and programs. As importantly, the update will also ensure that Goal 12 of the Comprehensive Plan reflects current community conditions and values.

SECTION IV. SUMMARY OF REPORT

Applicable criteria, Commission findings and conclusions

- Tigard Community Development Code
 - o Chapter 18.380
 - o Chapter 18.390
- Applicable Comprehensive Plan Policies
 - o Chapter 1: Citizen Involvement
 - o Chapter 2: Land Use Planning
 - o Chapter 5: Natural Resources and Historic Areas
 - o Chapter 6: Environmental Quality
 - o Chapter 7: Hazards
 - o Chapter 8: Parks, Recreation, Trails, and Open Space
 - o Chapter 9: Economic Development
 - o Chapter 10: Housing
 - o Chapter 11: Public Facilities and Services
 - o Chapter 12: Transportation
 - o Chapter 13: Energy Conservation
 - o Chapter 14: Urbanization
 - o Special Planning Area: Downtown
- Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012
- Oregon Highway Plan
- Regional Transportation Plan
- Statewide Planning Goals
 - o Goals 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

City Department and outside agency comments

SECTION V. APPLICABLE CRITERIA AND COMMISSION FINDINGS

CITY OF TIGARD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (TITLE 18)

Chapter 18.380: Zoning Map and Text Amendments

Chapter 18.380.020 Legislative Amendments to the Title and Map

A. Legislative amendments. Legislative zoning map and text amendments shall be undertaken by means of a Type IV procedure, as governed by Section 18.309.060G

Findings: The amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan establishes policies to be applied generally throughout the City of Tigard; and therefore, the application is being processed as a Type IV procedure, Legislative Amendment, as governed by Section 18.390.060G.

Chapter 18.390: Decision-Making Procedures

Chapter 18.390.020. Description of Decision-Making Procedures

B.4. Type IV Procedure. Type IV procedures apply to legislative matters. Legislative matters involve the creation, revision, or large-scale implementation of public policy. Type IV matters are considered initially by the Planning Commission with final decisions made by the City Council.

Findings: The amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan establishes policies to be applied generally throughout the City of Tigard. Therefore was reviewed under the Type IV procedure as detailed in Section 18.390.060.G. In accordance with this section, the amendment was initially considered by the Planning Commission with City Council making the final decision.

Chapter 18.390.060.G. Decision-making considerations. The recommendation by the Commission and the decision by the Council shall be based on consideration of the following factors:

- 1. The Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines adopted under Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 197;**
- 2. Any federal or state statutes or regulations found applicable;**
- 3. Any applicable Metro regulations;**
- 4. Any applicable comprehensive plan policies; and**
- 5. Any applicable provisions of the City's implementing ordinances.**

Findings: The Commission reviewed applicable Statewide Planning Goals, the Regional Transportation Plan, the Oregon Highway Plan, Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012, the Tigard Community Development Code, and the Tigard Comprehensive Plan. As indicated pursuant to the Commission's findings and conclusions found within this staff report the amendment is consistent with this criterion.

CONCLUSION: Based on the analysis above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment satisfies the applicable review criteria within the Tigard Community Development Code.

CITY OF TIGARD COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICIES:

General Findings

Finding: The City's Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the Tigard City Council in 1983, and acknowledged as being in conformance with the Statewide Planning Goals by the Land Conservation and Development Department (LCDC) on October 11, 1984. LCDC re-acknowledged the plan's compliance with the statewide planning goals through the Periodic Review process.

Finding: The Commission finds that the following Comprehensive Plan goals and policies apply to the amendment and the amendment satisfies the applicable goals and policies for the reasons stated below. During the course of public hearings, the Community Development Department and the Planning Commission provided all interested parties opportunities to identify, either orally or in writing, any other Comprehensive Plan goals or policies that might apply to the amendment. No additional provisions were identified.

Chapter 1: Citizen Involvement

Goal 1.1 Provide citizens, affected agencies, and other jurisdictions the opportunity to participate in all phases of the planning process.

Policy 2. The City shall define and publicize an appropriate role for citizens in each phase of the land use planning process.

Findings: The proposal has complied with all notification requirements pursuant to Chapter 18.390.060 of the Tigard Community Development Code. This staff report was also available seven days in advance of the hearing pursuant to Chapter 18.390.070.E.b of the Tigard Community Development Code.

Additionally, a Public Involvement Program for the Tigard Transportation System Plan Update was developed in April 2009. This Program was reviewed and endorsed by the Committee for Citizen Involvement and the Planning Commission. The Program outlined the information, outreach methods, and involvement opportunities available to the citizens during the process.

Information was distributed throughout the process via the project website, an interested parties listserv, Cityscape articles, press releases, articles in the local paper, two public forums, and a project open house. Outreach methods also included presentations to a number of civic organizations in the community, personal emails sent to groups and organizations, updates to City boards and commissions, and staff attendance at community events to pass out information.

Involvement opportunities included two public forums and an open house, submitting written comments via the website, and attending the Planning Commission workshops. Additionally, the interested party listserv was provided notice of all meetings held regarding the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan.

As part of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process, public notice of this Planning Commission public hearing was sent to the interested party list and published in the June 3, 2010 issue of The Times. Notice will be published again prior to the City Council public hearing. The notice invited public input and included the phone number of a contact person to answer questions. The notice also included the address of the City's webpage where the entire draft of the proposed amendment could be viewed.

Policy 3. The City shall establish special citizen advisory boards and committees to provide input to the City Council, Planning Commission, and City staff.

Findings: A citizen advisory committee was established by Tigard City Council Resolution 08-72 on December 9, 2008. The citizen advisory committee helped guide the update of the Tigard Transportation System Plan by reviewing work products and providing advice and feedback to ensure the community's needs and aspirations were being captured in the update. The committee's input was valuable in updating the Plan. The committee met three times during the course of the project (June 18, 2009; October 14, 2009; December 16, 2009) and was invited to participate in the two public forums and open house.

Policy 5. The opportunities for citizen involvement provided by the City shall be appropriate to the scale of the planning effort and shall involve a broad cross-section of the community.

Findings: As outlined above, the community was given multiple venues to get information and get involved. This included a number of articles in the Cityscape newsletter that is delivered to every household in Tigard. Staff also made a good faith effort to ensure a diversity of representation on the citizen advisory committee.

Goal 1.2 Ensure all citizens have access to:

- A. opportunities to communicate directly to the City; and**
- B. information on issues in an understandable form.**

Policy 1. The City shall ensure pertinent information is readily accessible to the community and presented in such a manner that even technical information is easy to understand.

Findings: Information regarding the topics included in this Comprehensive Plan Amendment was available in multiple locations in an understandable format for the duration of the process. This included paper and electronic copies that were available in the permit center and also on the website. Information was regularly sent to the project listserv and to the interested party listserv.

Policy 2. The City shall utilize such communication methods as mailings, posters, newsletters, the internet, and any other available media to promote citizen involvement and continue to evaluate the effectiveness of methods used.

Findings: Information was distributed throughout the process via the project website, an interested party listserv, Cityscape articles, press releases, articles in the local paper, and two public forums and a project open house. Outreach methods also included presentations to a number of civic organizations in the community, personal emails sent to groups and organizations, updates to City boards and commissions, and staff attendance at community events to pass out information.

Policy 5. The City shall seek citizen participation and input through collaboration with community organizations, interest groups, and individuals in addition to City sponsored boards and committees.

Findings: Outreach methods included presentations to a number of civic organizations in the community, personal emails sent to groups and organizations, updates to City boards and commissions, and staff attendance at community events to pass out information.

Involvement opportunities included two public forums and an open house, participation on the citizen advisory committee, submitting written comments via the website, and attending the Planning Commission workshops. Additionally, the interested party listserv was provided notice of all meetings held regarding the Transportation System Plan update.

Chapter 2: Land Use Planning

Goal 2.1 Maintain an up-to-date Comprehensive Plan, implementing regulations and action plans as the legislative basis of Tigard's land use planning program.

Policy 1: The City's land use program shall establish a clear policy direction, comply with state and regional requirements, and serve its citizens' own interests.

Findings: The amendment establishes the general policy direction related to Tigard Comprehensive Plan Goal 12: Transportation for the community. The policy statements are clear and serve the interests of the citizens. The development of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan complies with Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012, which governs the development of transportation system plans in the state and requires coordination with the Metro Regional Transportation Plan.

Policy 2: The City's land use regulations, related plans, and implementing actions shall be consistent with and implement its Comprehensive Plan.

Findings: The amendment establishes the general policy direction related to Tigard Comprehensive Plan Goal 12: Transportation for the community. The Tigard 2035 Transportation Plan carries out the City's policies of integrating land use and transportation planning. The development of the Tigard 2035 Transportation Plan used current Tigard Comprehensive Plan land use designations to develop the analysis of future transportation need as required by state law. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Policy 3. The City shall coordinate the adoption, amendment, and implementation of its land use program with other potentially affected jurisdictions and agencies.

Findings: The City sent out request for comments on the proposed amendment to all potentially affected jurisdictions and agencies. All were given 14 days to respond. Any comments that were received are addressed in Section VII: Outside Agency Comments of this Staff Report. Additionally, a technical advisory committee comprised of potentially affected jurisdictions and agencies provided input throughout the development of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan.

Policy 13. The City shall plan for future public facility expansion for those areas within its Urban Planning Area that can realistically be expected to be within the City limits during the planning period.

Findings: The Tigard Urban Planning Area (TUPA) acted as the study area for the Tigard 2035 Transportation Plan as shown in the document as Figure 5-1. All areas expected to be within the city limits within the planning period are included in the TUPA. The City has operated under the TUPA since 1983 as required by Oregon Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 2. The amendment is consistent with the policy.

Policy 20. The City shall periodically review and if necessary update its Comprehensive Plan and regulatory maps and implementing measures to ensure they are current and

responsive to community needs, provide reliable information, and conform to applicable state law, administrative rules, and regional requirements.

Findings: The amendment is an update to Goal 12 of the Tigard Comprehensive Plan and the Public Facility Plan, which is a component of the Comprehensive Plan. The amendment adopts the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan, which was an update to ensure the most reliable, up-to-date information, was being used to plan for the community's transportation needs into the future. The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan also ensures compliance with Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012, which governs transportation system development in the state and requires conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan. Findings of conformance to applicable state and regional requirements can be found in Section V of this Staff Report.

Chapter 5: Natural Resources and Historic Areas

Goal 5.1 Protect natural resources and the environmental and ecological functions they provide and, to the extent feasible, restore natural resources to create naturally functioning systems and high levels of biodiversity.

Findings: As discussed in the findings made for Statewide Planning Goal 5, the amendment does not alter the City's acknowledged Goal 5 inventories or land use programs. No changes will occur to current Natural Resource protections as the result of adopting the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan. The amendment does not conflict with goals and policies of this chapter of the Tigard Comprehensive Plan. Implementation of the Plan, including the construction of identified improvements, which may affect or amend a Goal 5 resource, will be reviewed against applicable criteria and findings will be made at the time of application.

Chapter 6: Environmental Quality

Goal 6.1 Reduce air pollution and improve air quality in the community and region.

Policy: The City shall support regional and state plans and programs to attain regional, state, and federal standards for air quality.

Findings: The amendment is consistent with this policy as the Tigard 2035 Transportation Plan incorporates regional and state policies, programs, and strategies aimed at meeting the federal standards for air quality. This includes transportation demand management, transportation system management, improving connectivity, reducing congestion, improving access to alternative modes of transportation, and setting mode share targets.

Policy: The City shall cooperate with other public agencies to minimize localized transportation impacts to air quality through intersection improvements, access management, intelligent transportation systems, etc.

Findings: The amendment is consistent with this policy as the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan identifies various intersection improvements, access management strategies, and signal timing improvements that are intended to minimize local impacts to air quality. The amendment also establishes a policy direction of cooperation in achieving the goal of minimizing impacts.

Chapter 7: Hazards

Goal 7.2 Protect people and property from non-natural hazardous occurrences.

Policy: The City shall design, construct, and coordinate the surface transportation system to reduce the potential for mass casualty accidents and to provide the ability to evacuate when necessary.

Findings: The development of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan used vehicle crash data as a component of analyzing need for improvements. The result is intended to reduce the incident of crashes in the planning area and eliminate the likelihood for mass casualty accidents. Improved connectivity, a policy of the amendment, will provide better evacuation routes. The amendment is consistent with the policy.

Chapter 8: Parks, Recreation, Trails, and Open Space

Goal 8.2 Create a Citywide network of interconnected on and off-road pedestrian and bicycle trails.

Policy 1: The City shall create and interconnected regional and local system of on and off-road trails and paths that link together neighborhoods, parks, open spaces, major urban activity centers, and regional recreational opportunities utilizing both public property and easements on private property.

Findings: The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan includes facility improvements, both on-street and off-street, intended to provide improved connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists. The facilities would provide improved access to a variety of destinations within the planning area. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Chapter 9: Economic Development

Goal 9.1 Develop and maintain a strong, diversified, and sustainable local economy.

Policy 4: The City shall address the public facility needs of business and economic development through identifying and programming needed public facilities and services within the Public Facility and Community Investment Plans.

Findings: The amendment updates the Tigard Public Facility Plan to incorporate the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan. The amendment identifies and programs needed transportation facilities within the community. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Policy 9: The City shall strongly represent its interests at the regional, state, and federal levels to acquire transportation funding, including truck and rail freight movement needed

to support existing business activity, attract new business, and improve general transportation mobility throughout the community.

Findings: The amendment outlines the policy of the City regarding transportation. Included is direction to develop inter-agency coordination and seek funding sources for improving the multi-modal transportation system of the community. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Policy 10: The City shall strongly support, as essential to the region’s economic future, the development of efficient regional multi-modal transportation systems throughout the Portland Metropolitan area.

Findings: The amendment outlines the policy of the City regarding transportation. Included is direction to plan, fund, and develop a multi-modal transportation system that meets the needs of the community and region. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Chapter 10: Housing

Goal 10.2 Maintain a high level of residential livability.

Policy 2: The City shall seek to provide multi-modal transportation access from residential neighborhoods to transit stops, commercial services, employment, and other activity centers.

Findings: The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan includes policy direction and facility improvements, both on-street and off-street, intended to provide improved multi-modal access from all areas of the community, including residential. The facilities would provide improved access to a variety of destinations within the planning area. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Chapter 11: Public Facilities and Services

Goal 11.4 Maintain adequate public facilities and services to meet the health, safety, education, and leisure needs of all Tigard residents.

Policy 3: The City shall coordinate the expansion and equitable, long-term funding of public facilities and services with the overall growth of the community.

Findings: The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan uses projected population and employment growth to analyze needed future facilities for the community. The projections are based on current Comprehensive Plan designations and the community’s supply of buildable land. The future facilities are identified as being a near, mid, or long term need and projected available funding is allocated to highest priority projects through the financially constrained status. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Chapter 12: Transportation

Findings: Current Comprehensive Plan Policies 12.1.1, 12.1.2, 12.1.3, 12.1.4, 12.1.5, 12.1.6, 12.1.7, 12.2.1, 12.2.2, 12.2.3, 12.2.4, 12.2.5, 12.2.6, 12.2.7, 12.2.8, 12.3.1, 12.3.2, 12.4.1, 12.5.1, and

12.6.1 will be deleted and replaced in their entirety by amendment Goals 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 12.5, and 12.6 and their associated Policies (see Exhibit A). This update will ensure the City is in compliance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, plans, and programs. This update will also ensure continued compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 12 as the new goals and policies reflect current community conditions and values. The new goals and policies have been developed through a citizen involvement effort, reviewed by City staff, reviewed by affected agencies, and reviewed by the Planning Commission at workshops on April 19, 2010; May 3, 2010; and May 17, 2010.

Chapter 13: Energy Conservation

Goal 13.1 Reduce energy consumption.

Policy 1: The City shall promote the reduction of energy consumption associated with vehicle miles traveled through:

- A. land use patterns that reduce dependency on the automobile;**
- B. public transit that is reliable, connected, and efficient; and**
- C. bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure that is safe and well connected.**

Findings: The amendment outlines the policy of the City regarding transportation. Included is direction to plan, fund, and develop a multi-modal transportation system that meets the needs of the community and region. The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan includes facility improvements, both on-street and off-street, intended to provide improved connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists. The facilities would provide improved access to a variety of destinations within the planning area. The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan also includes policy direction and facility improvements intended to provide improved public transit efficiency and connectivity. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Chapter 14: Urbanization

Goal 14.2 Implement the Tigard Urban Services Agreement through all reasonable and necessary steps, including the appropriate annexation of unincorporated properties.

Policy 6: The City shall periodically update and/or amend its Public Facility Plan to ensure the predictable and logical provision of urban services for areas anticipated to be within the Tigard city limits.

Findings: The amendment updates the transportation section of the Public Facility Plan through incorporating the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan. The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan was an update to the currently adopted plan and ensures the most reliable, up-to-date information, was being used to plan for the community's transportation needs into the future. The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan also ensures compliance with Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012, which governs transportation system development in the state and requires conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Special Planning Area: Downtown

Goal 15.4 Develop comprehensive street and circulation improvements for pedestrians,

automobiles, bicycles, and transit.

Policy 1: The downtown shall be served by a complete array of multi-modal transportation services including auto, transit, bike, and pedestrian facilities.

Findings: The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan includes facility improvements intended to improve the multi-modal system in the City, including the downtown area. Improved connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists, better vehicle access and circulation, and improved transit amenities are included. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Policy 2: The downtown shall be Tigard’s primary transit center for rail and bus transit service and supporting land uses.

Findings: The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan recognizes the importance of the Tigard Transit Center to the downtown. It identifies amenity improvements to the existing Tigard Transit Center to support transit riders and redevelopment opportunities in downtown. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

Policy 4: Recognizing the critical transportation relationships between the downtown and surrounding transportation system, especially bus and Commuter Rail, Highway 99W, Highway 217 and Interstate 5, the City shall address the downtown’s transportation needs in its Transportation System Plan and identify relevant capital projects and transportation management efforts.

Findings: The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan includes facility improvements intended to improve the multi-modal system in the City, including the downtown area. Improved connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists, better vehicle access and circulation, and improved transit amenities are included. The amendment is consistent with this policy.

CONCLUSION: Based on the analysis above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment satisfies the applicable policies contained in the City of Tigard Comprehensive Plan.

OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULE 660-012

Findings: The Land Conservation and Development Commission adopted Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012 (Transportation Planning Rule) to implement Statewide Planning Goal 12 and “to explain how local governments and state agencies responsible for transportation planning demonstrate compliance with other statewide planning goals.” Section 10 defines transportation planning, while Section 15 describes planning role requirements under the statewide planning goals. Section 16 describes coordination with federally required regional transportation plans in metropolitan areas. The development of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan complied with the above sections through collaboration with the Oregon Department of Transportation, the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Metro, and Washington County to ensure consistency with associated transportation plans required by the Transportation Planning Rule.

In addition, the Transportation Planning Rule contains elements listed as required in a transportation system plan. These required elements are found in Sections 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 50, and 60. This staff report provides the findings of compliance with statewide planning goals as

required by Section 25. The development of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan contains all of the other required elements. A determination of transportation needs was undertaken, an evaluation and selection of transportation alternatives was conducted, a transportation financing program is included, and the plan amendment process was followed. The Department of Land Conservation and Development, who administers the Transportation Planning Rule, submitted comments regarding compliance with the rule. These comments and the actions the City took to maintain compliance can be found as Exhibit B to the staff report.

Section 45 of the Transportation Planning Rule requires amendment of land use regulations to implement a transportation system plan. CPA2010-00001 does not include any land use regulation amendments. The adoption of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan is a periodic review work task. The City will submit the adopted Plan for periodic review approval and any required land use regulation amendments will be identified at that time and submitted for legislative approval.

CONCLUSION: Based on the analysis above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment satisfies the requirements of Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012.

THE OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN

Findings: The Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) delineates and expands all of the policies in the Oregon Transportation Plan related to the highway system. The development of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan complied with the OHP through collaboration with the Oregon Department of Transportation, the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Metro, and Washington County to ensure consistency with associated transportation plans required by the Transportation Planning Rule. The City's transportation policy is consistent with the policy direction of the OHP. As a result, the adoption of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan and the amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan is in compliance with the OHP.

CONCLUSION: Based on the analysis above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment is in compliance with the Oregon Highway Plan.

THE METRO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Findings: The development of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan occurred at the same time as the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan was being developed. City staff was closely involved in discussions related to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. Metro, Oregon Department of Transportation, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, and Washington County staff were all members of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan Technical Advisory Committee. They were provided the opportunity to review and comment on all work leading up to the document proposed for adoption. The purpose of the collaboration was to ensure consistency across jurisdictions' plans and compliance with federal, state, and regional requirements.

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and its implementing ordinance, the Regional Transportation Functional Plan, set transportation policy for the region and identify measures that local transportation system plans must implement for consistency. The RTP, as with local

transportation plans, must meet the requirements of Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012 (Transportation Planning Rule).

3.08.010 Purpose of Regional Transportation Functional Plan

- B. The RTFP is intended to be consistent with federal law that applies to Metro in its role as a metropolitan planning organization, the Oregon Transportation Plan, and Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) and its Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). If a TSP is consistent with this RTFP, Metro shall deem it consistent with the RTP.

This amendment (CPA2010-00001) adopts the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan, which was completed following the rules outlined in the Transportation Planning Rule. The Department of Land Conservation and Development, who administers the Transportation Planning Rule, submitted comments regarding compliance with the rule. These comments and the actions the City took to maintain compliance can be found as Exhibit B to the staff report. Metro did not submit comments regarding consistency with the RTP. The amendment is consistent Metro's Regional Transportation Plan.

CONCLUSION: Based on the analysis above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Metro Regional Transportation Plan.

THE STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS AND GUIDELINES ADOPTED UNDER OREGON REVISED STATUTES CHAPTER 197

Statewide Planning Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement:

This goal outlines the citizen involvement requirement for adoption of Comprehensive Plans and changes to the Comprehensive Plan and implementing documents.

Findings: This goal was met through an extensive public involvement process. A Public Involvement Program for the update of the Tigard Transportation System Plan was developed in April 2009. This Program was reviewed and endorsed by the Committee for Citizen Involvement and the Planning Commission. The Program outlined the information, outreach methods, and involvement opportunities available to the citizens during the process.

Information was distributed throughout the process via the project website, an interested party listserv, Cityscape articles, press releases, articles in the local paper, two public forums, and a project open house. Outreach methods also included presentations to a number of civic organizations in the community, personal emails sent to groups and organizations, updates to City boards and commissions, and staff attendance at community events to pass out information.

Involvement opportunities included two public forums and an open house, participation on a citizen advisory committee, and submitting written comments via the website. Additionally, the interested party listserv was provided notice of all meetings held regarding the Comprehensive Plan Update.

As part of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process, public notice of this Planning Commission public hearing was sent to the interested parties list and published in the June 3, 2010 issue of The Times (in accordance with Tigard Development Code Chapter 18.390). Notice will be published again prior to the City Council public hearing. The notice invited public input and

included the phone number of a contact person to answer questions. The notice also included the address of the City's webpage where the entire draft of the text changes could be viewed.

Statewide Planning Goal 2 – Land Use Planning:

This goal outlines the land use planning process and policy framework. The Comprehensive Plan was acknowledged by DLCDC as being consistent with the statewide planning goals.

Findings: The amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan is being undertaken to update the City's acknowledged Comprehensive Plan in a manner consistent with current conditions and citizen values. The amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan is being processed as a Type IV procedure, which requires any applicable statewide planning goals, federal or state statutes or regulations, Metro regulations, comprehensive plan policies, and City's implementing ordinances, be addressed as part of the decision-making process. The amendment is included as a periodic review work program task. The City of Tigard was notified of commencement of periodic review in May 2008 and had its work program approved in April 2010. All noticing requirements have been met. All applicable review criteria have been addressed within this staff report; therefore, the requirements of Goal 2 have been met.

Statewide Planning Goal 5 – Natural Resources

This goal requires the inventory and protection of natural resources, open spaces, historic areas and sites.

Findings: The City is currently in compliance with the State's Goal 5 program and Metro's Title 13: Nature in Neighborhoods program, which implements Goal 5. The amendment does not alter the City's acknowledged Goal 5 inventories or land use programs. No changes will occur to current natural resource protections. As a result, the amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan is in compliance with Goal 5 process requirements.

Statewide Planning Goal 6: Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality

To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water, and land resources of the state.

Findings: The City is currently in compliance with Metro's Title 3: Water Quality and Flood Management program which implements Goal 6. The amendment does not alter the City's acknowledged land use programs regarding water quality and flood management protections. The City is included in the Portland Area Airshed, which is in compliance with Federal Clean Air Act regulations. The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan was developed following the rules and guidance found in Oregon Revised Statute 660-012 and the Metro Regional Transportation Plan. Both outline strategies for decreasing vehicle miles traveled and single-occupancy vehicle trips, which are intended to help improve air quality in the Portland Area Airshed. As a result, the amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan is in compliance with Goal 6.

Statewide Planning Goal 7 – Areas Subject to Natural Hazards

To protect people and property from natural hazards.

Findings: The City is currently in compliance with Metro's Title 3: Water Quality and Flood Management program which implements Goal 7. The amendment does not alter the City's acknowledged land use programs regarding water quality and flood management protections. The

City is currently a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The amendment does not alter the City's participation. As a result, the amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan is in compliance with Goal 7.

Statewide Planning Goal 8 – Recreational Needs

This goal requires the satisfaction of the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

Findings: The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan includes facility improvements, both on-street and off-street, intended to provide improved connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists. These anticipated improvements were taken from the City's adopted Park System Master Plan and would provide improved access to a variety of destinations within the planning area. The amendment is consistent with this goal.

Statewide Planning Goal 9: Economic Development

To provide adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon's citizens.

Findings: The City is currently in compliance with Goal 9 and Metro's Title 1: Requirements for Housing and Employment Accommodation and Title 4: Industrial and Other Employment Areas. The adoption of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System does not alter the City's compliance with Goal 9. The amendment seeks to provide a multi-modal transportation system to meet the needs of the community into the future, including accommodating economic growth. The amendment is consistent with this goal.

Statewide Planning Goal 10: Housing

To provide adequate housing for the needs of the community, region and state.

Findings: The City is currently in compliance with Goal 10 and the Metropolitan Housing Rule (OAR 660-007/Division 7) and Metro's Title 1: Requirements for Housing and Employment Accommodation and Title 7: Affordable Housing. The adoption of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System does not alter the City's compliance with Goal 10. The amendment seeks to provide a multi-modal transportation system to meet the needs of the community into the future, including accommodating its housing needs. The amendment is consistent with this goal.

Statewide Planning Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services

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.

Findings: The City is currently in compliance with Goal 11 through its acknowledged Comprehensive Plan. This includes an adopted Public Facility Plan as required by Oregon Revised Statute 197.712 and Oregon Administrative Rule 660-011. The amendment will update the transportation component of the Public Facility Plan as allowed by Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012-0000(4). As a result, the amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan is in compliance with Goal 11.

Statewide Planning Goal 12: Transportation

To provide and encourage a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system.

Findings: The City is currently in compliance with Goal 12 and Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan through its acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan as required by Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012 (Transportation Planning Rule). The amendment adopts the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan, which was completed following the rules outlined in the Transportation Planning Rule. The Department of Land Conservation and Development, who administers the Transportation Planning Rule, submitted comments regarding compliance with the rule. These comments and the actions the City took to maintain compliance can be found as Exhibit B to the staff report. The amendment will update the transportation component of the Public Facility Plan as allowed by Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012-0000(4). As a result, the adoption of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan and the amendment to the Tigard Comprehensive Plan is in compliance with Goal 12.

Statewide Planning Goal 13: Energy Conservation

Land and uses developed on the land shall be managed and controlled so as to maximize the conservation of all forms of energy, based on sound economic principles.

Findings: The City is currently in compliance with Goal 13 through its acknowledged Comprehensive Plan. The adoption of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan does not alter the City’s compliance with Goal 13. The amendment outlines the policy of the City regarding transportation, including strategies to reduce vehicle miles traveled and single occupancy vehicle trips. Included is direction to plan, fund, and develop a multi-modal transportation system that meets the needs of the community and region. The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan includes facility improvements, both on-street and off-street, intended to provide improved connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists. The facilities would provide improved access to a variety of destinations within the planning area. The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan also includes policy direction and facility improvements intended to provide improved public transit efficiency and connectivity. All of these improvements and strategies are intended to reduce energy consumption associated with the transportation system. The amendment is consistent with this goal.

Statewide Planning Goal 14: Urbanization

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

Findings: The City is currently in compliance with Goal 14 and Metro’s Title 11: Planning for New Urban Areas through its acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and land use regulations. The City also has a signed Urban Planning Area Agreement and Urban Services Agreement as required by ORS 195.065 and ORS 197. The adoption of the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan does not alter the City’s compliance with Goal 14. The amendment updates the transportation section of the Public Facility Plan through incorporating the Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan. The Tigard 2035 Transportation System Plan ensures compliance with Oregon Administrative Rule 660-012, which governs transportation system development in the state and requires conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan. The amendment is consistent with this goal.

CONCLUSION: Based on the analysis above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendment is consistent with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals.

SECTION VI. ADDITIONAL CITY STAFF COMMENTS

The City of Tigard's Current Planning Division, Administrative Department, Public Works Department, and Police Department has had an opportunity to review this proposal and have no objections.

CONCLUSION: Based on no comment from City staff, staff finds the proposed amendment does not interfere with the best interests of the City.

SECTION VII. OUTSIDE AGENCY COMMENTS

The following agencies/jurisdictions had an opportunity to review this proposal and did not respond:

Beaverton School District
City of Durham
City of King City
City of Lake Oswego
City of Portland
Clean Water Services
Metro Land Use and Planning
Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1
Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1, District 2A
Tigard-Tualatin School District
Tualatin Hill Parks and Recreation District
Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue
Tri-Met Transit District

The City of Beaverton had an opportunity to review this proposal and has no objections.

The City of Tualatin had an opportunity to review this proposal and has no objections.

Washington County, Department of Land Use and Transportation had an opportunity to review this proposal and has no objections.

Tualatin Valley Water District had an opportunity to review this proposal and has no objections.

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development had an opportunity to review this proposal and submitted comments that can be found as Exhibit B.

CONCLUSION: Based on responses from outside agencies listed above, the Commission finds the proposed amendment meets all requirements of these agencies and is consistent with the best interests of the City.

SECTION VIII. CONCLUSION

The proposed changes comply with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals, applicable regional, state and federal regulations, the Tigard Comprehensive Plan, and applicable provisions of the City's implementing ordinances.

ATTACHMENT:

EXHIBIT A: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE TIGARD COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

EXHIBIT B: OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMENTS.

EXHIBIT C: PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS/CHANGES MATRIX.

EXHIBIT ~~D~~: CITIZEN COMMENT MATRIX.

D



PREPARED BY: Darren Wyss
Senior Planner

June 14, 2010
DATE



APPROVED BY: Susan Hartnett
Assistant Community Development Director

June 14, 2010
DATE

To: Matt Crall and Anne Debbaut, Department of Land Conservation and Development.

From: Judith Gray, Senior Transportation Planner, City of Tigard

Subject: Tigard TSP Update – Response to Compliance Recommendations

Date: June 3, 2010

CC: Darren Wyss, Senior Planner, City of Tigard

Thank you for taking the time to provide thoughtful comments to the City of Tigard Draft Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update, as provided in your memorandum dated May 24, 2010 and for coming to our office to discuss these issues. We also appreciate the time and effort that you and other agency representatives gave as members of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the TSP.

Throughout the development of the Tigard TSP, Metro has been updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), including the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP). There have been challenges associated with updating the City's TSP concurrent with Metro's update of the RTP. However, through the involvement of the Metro and ODOT TAC representatives and our on-going participation in the RTP Update process, it has been our intent to prepare a TSP Update that meets Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements through compliance with the RTP Update.

The Metro representative on the TAC has expressed confidence that the Tigard TSP Update is in compliance with the RTP Update and, in fact, that he intends to use it as a model for TSP updates in other communities. However, if there are differences of opinion or interpretation regarding the RTP requirements, we hope this will provide an opportunity for a discussion with DLCD and Metro to ensure a common understanding and purpose in future TSP updates.

The remainder of this memorandum identifies/summarizes the Compliance Recommendations in your May 24 memorandum, along with our initial Finding in response. In addition, for each item there is an identified Resolution, which is the outcome of the follow-up meeting held on June 3, 2010 at the City of Tigard office.

Draft response to DLCD Comments on Tigard TSP Update

2. Compliance Recommendation: Transportation Disadvantaged

TPR 0030(1)(b) requires identifying the “needs of the transportation disadvantaged” and TPR 0020(2)(c)(A) requires information that “describes public transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged and identifies service inadequacies”. The term ‘transportation disadvantaged’ is defined in Statewide Planning Goal 12 as, “individuals

who have difficulty in obtaining transportation because of their age, income, physical or mental disability.”

The draft TSP has much of the background information that would help identify transportation disadvantaged populations. The draft does not, however, use the data to draw conclusions about transportation needs or service inadequacies for people who are transportation disadvantaged.

Finding: Page 43 (version 2) includes a description of the Socioeconomic Conditions and identifies the gap in transit service on Hall Boulevard between 99W and Locust. It states that pedestrian and bus stop amenities in this vicinity should be considered priorities to improve transit access to low income neighborhoods. Table 4-2 of the TSP shows the criteria that were used to evaluate potential transportation improvements, including Environmental Justice impacts. The Transportation Solutions Analysis memo (included in Volume 3) includes the evaluation of individual significant projects. See Projects 11, 26, 21, 29, 41-44, 45.

Resolution: A policy statement will be added under Goal 3. This policy will be policy 4, directly following the policy regarding ADA standards.

“The City shall support and prioritize bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements for transportation disadvantaged populations who may be dependent on travel modes other than private automobile.”

4. Compliance Recommendation: Parking Planning

The current Tigard TSP (adopted in 2002) states that Tigard amended the parking requirements in Development Code 18.765 to comply with Title 12 (thus meeting TPR 0020(2)(g)). The draft TSP should include analysis to determine whether Tigard is still in compliance with the parking provisions of Title 12, and if not what steps the city should take.

Finding: The Development Code parking requirements are in compliance with Metro’s ratios. Page 70 of the TSP includes the following statements under the subsection header “Accessory Parking.”

New land uses are required to provide on-site parking to accommodate their own parking demand in order to protect surrounding land uses from over flow parking impacts. The amount of parking required is expressed in the form of parking ratios in the development code (see 18.765 of the Development Code). The Tigard parking ratios incorporate minimum and maximum ratios, consistent with the requirements of the 2040 Growth Management Functional Plan.

The Draft RTFP Update includes a new Title 4 related to Parking. It is moved from the earlier Functional Plan, with some changes. Most of the requirements could be addressed through the general update of the code (e.g., shared parking, variances, etc.).

It allows that parking plans are required for designated Centers and Station Communities can be done separately from the TSP.

- We are just kicking off a parking plan in downtown, funded by Metro.
- The WSRC Master Plan (adopted in 2000) already includes a parking element.
- TGM funding for HCT Land Use Planning will identify potential station communities that *may* then trigger additional parking plans.
- We don't have plans to develop a parking plan for the Pacific Highway 99W Corridor. However, most of it would be addressed through the code updates or the station area planning.

Resolution: No changes needed in the TSP. Periodic Review will require parking management plans for designated centers and corridors; these must meet requirements of the RTP Update.

5. Compliance Recommendation. Mode Targets

Summary: There are several factual observations about the treatment of mode splits in the draft TSP. However, the conclusion that “It does not appear that the draft TSP would achieve much improvement in mode share,” is in direct contrast to one of the overriding goals of the TSP.

Finding: One of the reasons that the TSP differs from the RTP language is a concern that the RTP may not allow for enough progress. For example, the RTP only requires a target for “non-drive alone” travel. On that basis, a 2-person carpool is treated the same as a walk, bike, or transit trip. At the same time, Metro has changed the way that carpools are modeling; they now include vehicles with a parent and a child. I believe Metro intends to update their modeling and possibly the definitions, but it hadn't done so at the time that we were doing our TSP.

As you noted, the Draft TSP (Table 3-1) indicates only limited improvement in mode shares over the planning horizon. These were obtained from the metro travel demand model and are outputs of the assumptions of several factors, including parking pricing, transit availability, and connectivity. As stated on page 31, this reflects minimal changes in those factors. While it is assumed that parking would be priced in designated centers under 2035 conditions, the modeled prices for long-term parking in 2035 is less than \$1 and transit service is assumed to be basically unchanged (the planned high capacity transit service is not included).

Metro targets allow that 45 to 55% of trips could be SOV in designated centers. Our TSP is more ambitious regarding the shift in mode away from SOV. We also felt that distinguishing walk, bike, and transit trips lays the groundwork for targeting specific modal improvements.

As you noted, we identified the need to update/refine the Mode Split Estimates because of the limitations of the model as well as our interest in determining

opportunities to focus on specific modes. Because of these limitations, we have titled our targets as “Aspiration Mode Shares” and the non-auto mode shares are referred to as “illustrative.” We feel it would be appropriate to remove these qualifiers after Metro updates their mode split targets and associated modeling to ensure that the City’s targets reflect the most up-to-date baseline.

The draft 2035 RTFP Update (3.08.230.E) allows that cities can “demonstrate progress toward achievement of the performance targets in Table 3.08-1 by adopting the following:

1. Parking minimum and maximum ratios in centers and station communities.
2. Design for street, transit, bicycle, freight and pedestrian systems consistent with Title 1.
3. TSMO Projects and strategies consistent with Section 3.08.160.
4. Land use actions pursuant to OAR 660-12-0035 (2).

While it is desirable to conduct and monitor mode splits, it is my hope that we will be able to demonstrate compliance based on the above measures from the RTFP.

Resolution: The mode share targets on page 71, currently referred to as “aspiration” targets, will be referred to simply as “targets.” It is recognized that the word “target” implies aspiration, but that using the word “aspiration” may appear to create a lesser commitment or priority.

6. Compliance Recommendation: Performance Standards.

We recommend that the TSP clearly establish performance standards and that these standards include measures of connectivity, pedestrian accessibility, bicycle network completeness and overall safety. If the performance standards also include intersection delay or motor vehicle congestion, we would recommend that different standards be adopted for different areas. In some places (e.g. downtown, the Washington Square regional center and the Tigard triangle) it would be appropriate to tolerate higher levels of congestion (or perhaps waive congestion standards altogether) on city streets, which would facilitate more intense development in the appropriate location.

Finding: As you note, the most common performance measures (other than mode splits) relate to intersection operations and traffic congestion. The TSP identifies the locations where intersection operating standards can be found for State and County roads. The city does not have adopted standards for intersections; we specifically determined not to develop such standards at this time, but left the language in the TSP that points to where such standards will be located if they are adopted.

We are fully supportive of exploring the new MMLoS procedures in the latest Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Staff is familiar with and excited about this methodology. While the methodology has been vetted through the NCHRP process, it is still a new procedure that has not been thoroughly tested anywhere. For this reason, we feel that it should be pursued as a pilot or demonstration project,

preferably conducted multiple locations. I have approached Metro (informally so far) about taking the lead on such an effort. I feel that it should be a federally funded, regional study to examine the implications of the MMLOS rankings.

At the RTP Working Group meetings, there was concern expressed about the specific performance measures, including connectivity, accessibility, and safety. Among the reasons are the absence of standard measures for such standards and the demand on resources for such evaluations. The latest Draft RTP (3.08.230.E) allows that cities can demonstrate compliance through the Parking, Design, TSMO, and Land Use actions listed above.

Resolution: Development and clarification of performance standards, especially for use in evaluating development or land use proposals, will be completed as a part of Periodic Review.

9. Compliance Recommendation: Street Standards

The TPR requirements related to street standards are found in section 0045(7): “Local governments shall establish standards for local streets and accessways that minimize pavement width and total right-of-way consistent with the operational needs of the facility. The intent of this requirement is that local governments consider and reduce excessive standards for local streets and accessways in order to reduce the cost of construction, provide for more efficient use of urban land, provide for emergency vehicle access while discouraging inappropriate traffic volumes and speeds, and which accommodate convenient pedestrian and bicycle circulation.”

Given that the TSP near the end of the process, and that reviewing street standards has not yet started, it may make sense to adopt a TSP while deferring the street standards to a subsequent process within PR. Under that approach, the TSP would need to be clear about the need for review, the general nature of any needed revisions already identified, and the time-frame for completing the revised street standards.

Finding: As you note, the City’s intent is to follow up the TSP Update with a review of the street standards. Some of the specific objectives for street design are identified on page 65 of the TSP Update. The overall review of the street standards is a high priority for staff as a follow on task to the TSP.

Resolution: Development and clarification of street design standards will be completed as a part of Periodic Review.

10. Compliance Recommendation: Implementation Measures

TPR 0045 requires that, “Each local government shall amend its land use regulations to implement the TSP.” This requirement was included in the description of Tigard’s PR work program task #5 as, “conforming Plan / code text amendments.”

The draft TSP includes “Technical Memorandum 6.2 – Draft Implementation Measures”, which identifies several areas in which additional work is needed to address requirements

of the TPR. The memo does not include proposed code language, so we are not able to reach a final conclusion on the issues raised. In general we agree that the items identified in the memo need to be addressed to comply with the TPR.

We anticipate that partial approval of the TSP will list this project to adopt implementing code amendments as one of the items that must be completed under PR.

Finding: As you note, the City's intent is to follow up the TSP Update with a review of the suggested code changes, development of new code language, and adoption of that language as part of an update package to ensure the City is in compliance with the RTP and the TPR.

Resolution: The City will complete this task as part of Periodic Review.

Comments/Changes to the TSP Update, Version 2

Exhibit C

Page/ Location	Change	Source	Status
General	Identify backage roads in connectivity discussion	Council meeting: Consultant presentation	Incorporated in discussion of circulation (p. 67) “The roadway capacity limitations in Tigard are perhaps most pronounced for travel demand from northeast to southwest, especially along Pacific Highway. Opportunities to provide new connections are severely constrained by Highway 217, I-5, the WES commuter/freight rail line, and natural features such as Fanno Creek and Bull Mountain. With only a limited number of east-west through routes, there is considerable demand placed on a few roadways. Adding capacity to Pacific Highway is not desired because of the significant impacts to the community in terms of added through traffic, impacts to adjacent properties, and the greater physical barrier through the City. As such, a higher priority is placed on providing new connections that can work in concert with the principal and major arterial system.”
General	Add bicycle system plan and pedestrian system plan	Council meeting: Consultant presentation	Recommendation for pedestrian system plan text added on p. 78. Recommendation for bicycle system plan text added on p. 82. Both plans added to Table 5-4
General	Add glossary of acronyms	PC Work Session 1	Glossary created, Section 8.
Intro	Clarify plan organization	PC Work session 1	Clarified text description layout, p. 19
Goals & Policies (G&P)	Change “Strategies” to “Action Measures” to be consistent with Comp Plan	PC Work session 1	Incorporated change
G&P, Goal 2	Add policy statement specific to freight	PC Work session 1	Modified Policy 5. 5. The City shall cooperate with the railroads in facilitating <u>and preserving</u> rail freight service to those commercial and industrial <u>existing and future</u> businesses that depend on railroad service. Added Policy

Comments/Changes to the TSP Update, Version 2

Exhibit C

			8. The City recognizes freight movement as being a priority of the transportation system.
G&P Goal 3	Remove the word "corridor"	PC Work session 1	Policy 2 was modified to indicate "High Capacity Transit on the Pacific Highway-99W corridor <u>serving the city of Tigard.</u> "
G&P, Goal 6 (new)	Need to elevate funding policy, especially in balance with capital investments. Possibly a new Goal.	PC Work session 1	Goal 6 was added. Goal 6 – Transportation Funding Fund an equitable, balanced, and sustainable transportation system that promotes the well-being of the community. Policies 1. The City shall make street maintenance a funding priority. 2. The City shall seek to invest in capital projects that leverage other infrastructure investments. 3. The City shall seek opportunities for transportation investments that support transportation goals of efficiency, multi-modal access, and safety.
G&P, Goal 6	Suggestion of new policy in Goal 6 to address connectivity.	PC Work Session 2	Goal 6.3 amended as follows: The City shall seek opportunities for transportation investments <u>that support transportation goals of efficiency, multi-modal access, and safety.</u>
Section 4; Figures 4-3,4-4	Growth forecasts don't reflect local plans for downtown growth.	Council meeting; Consultant presentation; PC Work Session 2	Modified figures to illustrate growth aspirations in Downtown. Added the following text: Growth Assumptions for Downtown – Modeling Implications The City of Tigard plans for increased residential and commercial density in Downtown Tigard, as reflected in Figures 4-3 and 4-4. These planned changes in downtown, along with the City's land use strategy to increase mixed-use development, are intended to mitigate the strain on the east-west roadways by shortening home-to-work trips, supporting transit service, and making walk/bike trips more viable for work, shopping, and other activities. The City's aspirations for growth have not yet been incorporated into the Metro travel demand model. As a result, the 2035 model forecast underestimates the travel demand to and from downtown. While this is a meaningful disparity, it was

			<p>determined that the potential negative impacts of this disparity are lessened by the following considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent of the higher density, mixed use development is to accommodate a higher proportion of travel demand by non-automobile travel modes; • The most critical need for a higher density downtown will be the provision of multiple access points and an efficient overall circulation pattern; and, • The current planning process for downtown includes a grid of two-lane streets to create and preserve a safe, efficient and pedestrian-friendly circulation system. Larger street cross sections would conflict with these objectives, even if travel demand modeling indicated a desire for more automobile capacity. • The arterial streets providing access to Downtown (Pacific Highway, Hall Boulevard, Greenburg Road) are already planned for their maximum roadway width of five lanes. The City does not intend to increase the roadway footprints. If the downtown growth requires specific capacity improvements at critical intersections, those could be developed and are not dependent on inclusion in the TSP. <p>Given these considerations, emphasis was placed on ensuring efficient access and connectivity for downtown, as well as planning for improved pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access.</p>
<p>Section 5, 6</p>	<p>Clarify near-term, mid-term, long-term timelines; remove reference to 1-5 years.</p>	<p>Council meeting; Consultant presentation; PC Work Session 2</p>	<p>Page 86. The planned transportation projects have been divided into three categories: Near-Term; Mid-Term; and Long-Term. These divisions were made primarily to reflect the estimated timing of the actual need as well as availability of project funding.</p> <p>Near-Term Projects These improvements are warranted under existing conditions or are expected to</p>

Comments/Changes to the TSP Update, Version 2

Exhibit C

			<p>be warranted within a relatively short time frame. These improvements should be constructed as opportunities and resources allow and could be considered as potential conditions of approval for new development.</p> <p>Mid-Term Projects These improvements are expected to be warranted within the 20-year planning horizon and should be constructed as opportunities allow; some may be conditions of approval for new development.</p> <p>Long-Term Projects These projects will be needed to accommodate anticipated long-term growth. Other projects that may be warranted sooner than the 25-year planning horizon are included as long-term because the costs are significant and a long-term funding horizon is more realistic. If development occurs along the frontage of these improvements, right-of-way dedications for the ultimate improvement should be obtained; however, physical improvements including travel lanes and pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be constructed if serving a site access or system connectivity function.</p>
Section 4	References to figures 4.1 and 4.2 are still labeled as 3.1 and 3.2	PC Work Session 1	Correction made
Section 5	Nimbus road extension: If it is removed, can there be another connection to Cascade from Nimbus?	Councilor Buehner comment	Not constructible (within reasonable cost); would be redundant with WSRC Crossing. Though alternative auto access from Nimbus is ideal, the Nimbus properties are not landlocked; there is good internal circulation within the business park and in case of emergency, there is pedestrian access to Scholls Ferry Road.
Section 5, 6	Clarify purposes of project lists in Tables 5-6 and 6-4.	PC Work Session 3	<u>Added</u> : The projects summarized in Table 5-6 were identified to address existing or forecast needs and deficiencies. It is not expected that all will be constructed due to limited funding for transportation investments. Major roadway projects will also require additional engineering evaluation for cost, environmental impacts, and other constructability issues. Further, projects identified to address forecast deficiencies will need to be reevaluated to determine whether anticipated growth and associated transportation needs have been realized.

Comments/Changes to the TSP Update, Version 2

Exhibit C

			In order to better reflect anticipated funding resources, a subset of the identified projects has been included in the “financially constrained” project list in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. The financially constrained project list includes those considered “reasonably likely” to be constructed based on all anticipated transportation revenue sources. The projects that are included in the RTP Update are indicated in Table 5-6. Many of these projects are under jurisdiction of other agencies. The local projects on the financially constrained list were selected to achieve the highest return on investment, to achieve City of Tigard goals and priorities, and to address significant congestion and/or safety issues.
Chap 5, 6	Integrate Financially constrained projects (Table 6-4) into Table 5-6. Remove from Section 6.	PC Work Session 3	Changed as noted; added description of financially constrained to Section 5. Removed from Section 6.
Table 5-6	Divide project #48 to two segments: #48a (116th to Tiedeman) and #48b (Tiedeman to Pacific Hwy)	PC Work Session 3	Changed as noted.
Table 6-4	Add project 18 and 52 to Financially Constrained list	PC Work Session 3	Changed as noted in Table 5-6.
Glossary	Add TSMO, WSRC to glossary	PC Work Session 2	Changed as suggested

The following comments to the TSP were provided outside of the formal public involvement activities. Because they were received after the third Planning Commission Workshop, it was not possible for Planning Commission to consider and respond to these comments in the TSP Version being considered at the June 21 Public Hearing.

Date	Source	Contact type	Contact Information	Comment
June 5, 2010	Ben Westfall	Email to Mayor Dirksen	BENWESTFALL@GMAIL.COM	(Partial) Opposed to Ash extension impacts on neighborhoods; Feels it is inconsistent with the Tigard Downtown Improvement Plan
June 7, 2010	Mrs. Honeyman	Phone call (Sean)	--	Opposed to Ash Extension into the neighborhood. Concerned about a "freeway" through the neighborhood; that it will ruin the neighborhood.
June 9, 2010	Bonnie Peterson	Phone call (Judith)	503-639-8246	Opposed to Ash extension impacts on neighborhoods; potential flooding from Fanno Creek impacts
June 10, 2010	John Frewing	Email to staff	jfrewing@teleport.com , 503-245-5760	<p>The Tigard TSP 2010 should not include a planned extension of Walnut, crossing Fanno Creek to connect to Ash. I offer the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. This is a very large, intrusive and expensive project that Tigard does not really 'need'. As I saw some similar plans characterized recently, this is 'a big idea that (needs to) hit reality.' The Planning Commission should consider the distinction between what the city 'wants' versus what the city 'needs' and how to the latter. It is the inclusion of projects like this which make people like me think that our city is not sustainable. b. This project would remove park area from Fanno Creek Park. Tigard already is shy of park areas, and the addition of a collector across the park makes that situation more severe. c. This project creates another crossing of Fanno Creek, one of the important natural features of Tigard. Despite mitigation efforts, there is likely to be some impact on the

				<p>stream and its riparian areas, even if only the proximity of more people to the stream.</p> <p>d. This project would draw people away from Main Street, for which the city has made extensive renovation plans as the focus of downtown Tigard.</p> <p>e. On earlier versions of the TSP 2010, when questioned about this proposed project, staff has told me that this project 'is just on the map because it was on the old map' and that there would be no intent to carry this project to the new TSP simply because of this historic planning.</p> <p>f. This project would significantly disrupt an existing high density neighborhood of residences west of Fanno Creek. This neighborhood has in the past opposed the extension of Walnut across Fanno Creek to Ash, and its opposition should be respected.</p>
--	--	--	--	---