



## Metro Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) Compliance

Table 1 is based on a checklist prepared by Metro and is designed to help local jurisdictions comply with the RTFP within their adopted documents. The left column of the table relates to the RTFP requirements and the right column documents where the Sherwood Transportation System Plan (TSP) the requirement is met.

**Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Sherwood TSP Update**

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	TSP Compliance
<p>Include, to the extent practicable, a network of major arterial streets at one-mile spacing and minor arterials or collectors at half-mile spacing, considering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>existing topography;</li> <li>rail lines; freeways; pre-existing development, leases, easements or covenants;</li> <li>requirements of Metro’s Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Title 3 (Water Quality and Flood plains) and Title 13 (Nature in Neighborhoods), such as streams, rivers, flood plains, wetlands, riparian and upland fish and wildlife habitat areas.</li> <li>arterial design concepts in chapter 2 of RTP</li> <li>best practices and designs as set forth in regional state or local plans and best practices for protecting natural resources and natural areas</li> </ul> <p><b>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110C)</b></p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>The TSP update reviewed the system’s connectivity and spacing of arterials and collectors. Volume 2, Section C, pages 31-32.</p>
<p>Include a conceptual map of new streets for all contiguous areas of vacant and re-developable lots and parcels of five or more acres that are zoned to allow residential or mixed-use development. The map shall identify street connections to adjacent areas and should demonstrate opportunities to extend and connect new streets to existing streets, provide direct public right-of-way routes and limit closed-end street designs consistent with Title 1, Sec 3.08.110E</p> <p><b>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110D)</b></p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>The TSP update includes a “functional class” and a “local street connectivity” map showing conceptual locations for future street connections, as shown in TSP. Volume 1, Section 8, page 54 (Figure 17).</p>
<p>To the extent feasible, restrict driveway and street access in the vicinity of interchange ramp terminals, consistent with Oregon Highway Plan Access Management Standards, and accommodate local circulation on the local system. Public street connections, consistent with regional street design and spacing standards, shall be encouraged and shall supersede this access restriction. Multimodal street design features including pedestrian crossings and on-street parking shall be allowed where appropriate.</p> <p><b>(Title 1, Street System Design Sec 3.08.110G)</b></p>	<p>Yes - Not applicable</p> <p>There are no interchanges within the City of Sherwood.</p>
<p>Include investments, policies, standards and criteria to provide pedestrian and bicycle connections to all existing transit stops and major transit stops designated in Figure 2.15 of the RTP.</p> <p><b>(Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120A)</b></p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>Gaps in pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit stops are identified in Volume 2, Section C, pages 6 to 11. Solutions are displayed in Volume 1, Section 7, pages 42 and 43, and listed in</p>



**Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Sherwood TSP Update**

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	TSP Compliance
	Volume 2, Section E.
<p>Include a transit plan consistent with transit functional classifications shown in Figure 2.15 of the RTP that shows the locations of major transit stops, transit centers, high capacity transit stations, regional bike-transit facilities, inter-city bus and rail passenger terminals designated in the RTP, transit-priority treatments such as signals, park-and-ride facilities, and bicycle and pedestrian routes, consistent with sections 3.08.130 and 3.08.140, between essential destinations and transit stops.</p> <p><b>(Title 1, Transit System Design Sec 3.08.120B(1))</b></p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>The TSP update inventoried and evaluated the City’s transit network, including identifying gaps for pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit. Volume 2, Section B, pages 15 to 16 present the existing transit system. Transit projects in the TSP are listed in Volume 2, Section E.</p>
<p>Include a pedestrian plan, for an interconnected network of pedestrian routes within and through the city or county. The plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An inventory of existing facilities that identifies gaps and deficiencies in the pedestrian system;</li> <li>• An evaluation of needs for pedestrian access to transit and essential destinations for all mobility levels, including direct, comfortable and safe pedestrian routes;</li> <li>• A list of improvements to the pedestrian system that will help the city or county achieve the regional Non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 of the RTFP, and other targets established pursuant to section 3.08.230;</li> <li>• Provisions for sidewalks along arterials, collectors and most local streets, except that sidewalks are not required along controlled roadways, such as freeways;</li> <li>• Provision for safe crossings of streets and controlled pedestrian crossings on major arterials</li> </ul> <p><b>(Title 1, Pedestrian System Design Sec 3.08.130A)</b></p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>Existing pedestrian facilities and gaps are presented in Volume 2, Section C, pages 6 to 8. Pedestrian improvements are displayed in Volume 1, Section 7, page 42, and listed in Volume 2, Section E.</p>
<p>Include a bicycle plan for an interconnected network of bicycle routes within and through the city or county. The plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An inventory of existing facilities that identifies gaps and deficiencies in the bicycle system;</li> <li>• An evaluation of needs for bicycle access to transit and essential destinations, including direct, comfortable and safe bicycle routes and secure bicycle parking, considering <i>TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines</i>;</li> <li>• A list of improvements to the bicycle system that will help the city or county achieve the regional Non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 of the RTFP and other targets established pursuant to section 3.08.230;</li> <li>• Provision for bikeways along arterials, collectors and local streets, and bicycling parking in centers, at major transit stops shown in Figure 2.15 in the RTP, park-and-ride lots and associated with institutional uses;</li> <li>• Provision for safe crossing of streets and controlled bicycle crossings on major arterials</li> </ul> <p><b>(Title 1, Bicycle System Design Sec 3.08.140)</b></p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>Existing bicycle facilities and gaps are presented in Volume 2, Section C, pages 9 to 10. Biking improvements are displayed in Volume 1, Section 7, page 43, and listed in Volume 2, Section E.</p>



**Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Sherwood TSP Update**

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	TSP Compliance
<p>Include a freight plan for an interconnected system of freight networks within and through the city or county. The plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An inventory of existing facilities that identifies gaps and deficiencies in the freight system;</li> <li>• An evaluation of freight access to freight intermodal facilities, employment and industrial areas and commercial districts;</li> <li>• A list of improvements to the freight system that will help the city or county increase reliability of freight movement, reduce freight delay and achieve targets established pursuant to section 3.08.230.</li> </ul> <p><b>(Title 1, Freight System Design Sec 3.08.150)</b></p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>Existing freight facilities are presented in Volume 2, Section C, pages 17 to 18. The TSP identifies existing and future truck routes, along with their classifications, in Volume 1, Section 8, pages 56 to 57. Capacity improvements needed along the freight system are discussed in Volume 2, Section C, pages 14 to 16. Improvements to the freight system are displayed in Volume 1, Section 7, page 41 and are listed in Volume 2, Section E.</p>
<p>Include a transportation system management and operations (TSMO) plan to improve the performance of existing transportation infrastructure within or through the city or county. A TSMO plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An inventory and evaluation of existing local and regional TSMO infrastructure, strategies and programs that identifies gaps and opportunities to expand infrastructure, strategies and programs</li> <li>• A list of projects and strategies, consistent with the Regional TSMO Plan, based upon consideration of the following functional areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Multimodal traffic management investments</li> <li>○ Traveler Information investments</li> <li>○ Traffic incident management investments</li> <li>○ Transportation demand management investments</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>(Title 1, Transportation System Management and Operations Sec 3.08.160)</b></p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>TSMO solutions were prioritized to address transportation system needs (see requirements to address <b>(Title 2, Sec 3.08.220 Transportation Solutions)</b>). In addition to these specific projects, general TSMO strategies are contained in Volume 1, Section 8, page 58.</p>
<p>Incorporate regional and state transportation needs identified in the 2035 RTP as well as local transportation needs. The determination of local transportation needs based upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System gaps and deficiencies identified in the inventories and analysis of transportation system pursuant to Title 1;</li> <li>• Identification of facilities that exceed the Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards in Table 3.08-2 or the alternative thresholds and standards established pursuant to section 3.08.230;</li> <li>• Consideration and documentation of the needs of youth, seniors, people with disabilities and environmental justice populations within the city or county, including minorities and low-income families.</li> </ul> <p>A local determination of transportation needs must be consistent with the following elements of the RTP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The population and employment forecast and planning period of the RTP, except that a city or county may use an alternative forecast for the city or</li> </ul>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>System needs and gaps are identified in Volume 2, Section B and Section C.</p>



**Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Sherwood TSP Update**

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	TSP Compliance
<p>county, coordinated with Metro, to account for changes to comprehensive plan or land use regulations adopted after adoption of the RTP;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System maps and functional classifications for street design, motor vehicles, transit, bicycles, pedestrians and freight in Chapter 2 of the RTP;</li> <li>• Regional non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1 and the Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards in Table 3.08-2.</li> </ul> <p>When determining its transportation needs, a city or county shall consider the regional needs identified in the mobility corridor strategies in Chapter 4 of the RTP.</p> <p><b>(Title 2, Transportation Needs Sec 3.08.210)</b></p>	
<p>Consider the following strategies in the order listed, to meet the transportation needs determined pursuant to section 3.08.210 and performance targets and standards pursuant to section 3.08.230. The city or county shall explain its choice of one or more of the strategies and why other strategies were not chosen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TSMO, including localized TDM, safety, operational and access management improvements;</li> <li>• Transit, bicycle and pedestrian system improvements;</li> <li>• Traffic-calming designs and devices;</li> <li>• Land use strategies in OAR 660-012-0035(2)</li> <li>• Connectivity improvements to provide parallel arterials, collectors or local streets that include pedestrian and bicycle facilities, consistent with the connectivity standards in section 3.01.110 and design classifications in Table 2.6 of the RTP,</li> <li>• Motor vehicle capacity improvements, consistent with the RTP Arterial and Throughway Design and Network Concepts in Table 2.6 and Section 2.5.2 of the RTP, only upon a demonstration that other strategies in this subsection are not appropriate or cannot adequately address identified transportation needs</li> </ul> <p>A city or county shall coordinate its consideration of the above strategies with the owner of the transportation facility affected by the strategy. Facility design is subject to the approval of the facility owner.</p> <p>If analysis under subsection 3.08.210A (Local Needs determination) indicates a new regional or state need that has not been identified in the RTP, the city or county may propose one of the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose a project at the time of Metro review of the TSP to be incorporated into the RTP during the next RTP update; or</li> <li>• Propose an amendment to the RTP for needs and projects if the amendment is necessary prior to the next RTP update.</li> </ul> <p><b>(Title 2, Sec 3.08.220 Transportation Solutions)</b></p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>Transportation system needs were addressed with project solutions following the hierarchy of strategies Volume 2, Section D, pages 19 to 20.</p>
<p>Demonstrate that solutions adopted pursuant to section 3.08.220 (Transportation Solutions) will achieve progress toward the targets and standards in Tables 3.08-1, and 3.08-2 and measures in subsection D (local performance measures), or toward alternative targets and standards adopted</p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>Progress towards the targets and standards in the RTFP are discussed in Volume 1, Section</p>



**Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Sherwood TSP Update**

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	TSP Compliance
<p>by the city or county. The city or county shall include the regional targets and standards or its alternatives in its TSP.</p> <p>A city or county may adopt alternative targets or standards in place of the regional targets and standards upon a demonstration that the alternative targets or standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are no lower than the modal targets in Table 3.08-1 and no lower than the ratios in Table 3.08-2;</li> <li>• Will not result in a need for motor vehicle capacity improvements that go beyond the planned arterial and throughway network defined in Figure 2.12 of the RTP and that are not recommended in, or are inconsistent with, the RTP; and</li> <li>• Will not increase SOV travel to a degree inconsistent with the non-SOV modal targets in Table 3.08-1.</li> </ul> <p>If the city or county adopts mobility standards for state highways different from those in Table 3.08-2, it shall demonstrate that the standards have been approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission.</p> <p>Each city and county shall also include performance measures for safety, vehicle miles traveled per capita, freight reliability, congestion, and walking, bicycling and transit mode shares to evaluate and monitor performance of the TSP.</p> <p>To demonstrate progress toward achievement of performance targets in Tables 3.08-1 and 3.08-2 and to improve performance of state highways within its jurisdiction as much as feasible and avoid their further degradation, the city or county shall adopt the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking minimum and maximum ratios in Centers and Station Communities consistent with subsection 3.08.410A;</li> <li>• Designs for street, transit, bicycle, freight and pedestrian systems consistent with Title 1: and</li> <li>• TSMO projects and strategies consistent with section 3.08.160; and</li> <li>• Land use actions pursuant to OAR 660-012-0035(2).</li> </ul> <p><b>(Title 2, Performance Targets and Standards Sec 3.08.230)</b></p>	<p>9, pages 61 to 64.</p> <p>Mobility targets for facilities in Sherwood are discussed in Volume 1, Section 8, pages 55 to 56.</p>
<p>Specify the general locations and facility parameters, such as minimum and maximum ROW dimensions and the number and width of traffic lanes, of planned regional transportation facilities and improvements identified on general location depicted in the appropriate RTP map. Except as otherwise provided in the TSP, the general location is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For new facilities, a corridor within 200 feet of the location depicted on the appropriate RTP map;</li> <li>• For interchanges, the general location of the crossing roadways, without specifying the general location of connecting ramps;</li> <li>• For existing facilities planned for improvements, a corridor within 50 feet of the existing right-of-way and</li> <li>• For realignments of existing facilities, a corridor within 200 feet of the segment to be realigned as measured from the existing right-of-way depicted on the appropriate RTP map.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>Planned regional facilities are shown in Volume 1, Section 7, page 41 (Figure 12). A description of the planned facilities can be found in Volume 2, Section E.</p>



**Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Sherwood TSP Update**

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	TSP Compliance
<p>A City or county may refine or revise the general location of a planned regional facility as it prepares or revises impacts of the facility or to comply with comprehensive plan or statewide planning goals. If, in developing or amending its TSP, a city or county determines the general location of a planned regional facility or improvement is inconsistent with its comprehensive plan or a statewide goal requirement, it shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose a revision to the general location of the planned facility or improvement to achieve consistency and, if the revised location lies outside the general location depicted in the appropriate RTP map, seek an amendment to the RTP; or</li> <li>• Propose a revision to its comprehensive plan to authorize the planned facility or improvement at the revised location.</li> </ul> <p><b>(Title 3, Defining Projects in Transportation System Plan Sec 3.08.310)</b></p>	
<p><u>(Could be adopted in TSP or other adopted policy document)</u></p> <p>Adopt parking policies, management plans and regulations for Centers and Station Communities. Plans may be adopted in TSPs or other adopted policy documents and may focus on sub-areas of Centers. Plans shall include an inventory of parking supply and usage, an evaluation of bicycle parking needs with consideration of <i>TriMet Bicycle Parking Guidelines</i>. Policies shall be adopted in the TSP. Policies, plans and regulations must consider and may include the following range of strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By-right exemptions from minimum parking requirements;</li> <li>• Parking districts;</li> <li>• Shared parking;</li> <li>• Structured parking;</li> <li>• Bicycle parking;</li> <li>• Timed parking;</li> <li>• Differentiation between employee parking and parking for customers, visitors and patients;</li> <li>• Real-time parking information;</li> <li>• Priced parking;</li> <li>• Parking enforcement.</li> </ul> <p><b>(Title 4, Parking Management Sec 3.08.410I)</b></p>	<p>Yes – Other Policy Document</p> <p>Existing parking policy is included in Development Code Chapter 16.94. In addition, the TSP update identifies that a future study will prepare a parking management plan for the Town Center, as discussed in Volume 1, Section 9, page 66.</p>
<p>If a city or county proposes a transportation project that is not included in the RTP and will result in a significant increase in SOV capacity or exceeds the planned function or capacity of a facility designated in the RTP, it shall demonstrate consistency with the following in its project analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategies set forth in subsection 3.08.220A(1-5) (TSMO, Transit/bike/ped system improvements, traffic calming, land use strategies, connectivity improvements)</li> <li>• Complete street designs consistent with regional street design policies</li> <li>• Green street designs consistent with federal regulations for stream protection.</li> </ul> <p>If the city or county decides not to build a project identified in the RTP, it shall</p>	<p>Yes – Included</p> <p>The TSP includes strategies and projects that focus on improving multimodal travel opportunities and improved efficiency of the existing system. The projects included in the TSP would not result in a significant disproportionate increase in SOV capacity. Projects identified in the plan are shown in Volume 1, Figures 12, 13, and 14. Capacity</p>



**Table 1: RTFP Compliance of Sherwood TSP Update**

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Requirement	TSP Compliance
<p>identify alternative projects or strategies to address the identified transportation need and inform Metro so that Metro can amend the RTP. This section does not apply to city or county transportation projects that are financed locally and would be undertaken on local facilities. <b>(Title 5, Amendments of City and County Comprehensive and Transportation System Plans Sec 3.08.510C)</b></p>	<p>projects on regional facilities are consistent with prior plans.</p>