

# Appendix E – Citizen Involvement

---

# Memorandum

MID-WILLAMETTE VALLEY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
105 HIGH STREET S. E., SALEM, OREGON 97301-3667  
TELEPHONE: (503) 588-6177 FAX: (503) 588-6094

**To:** Polk County TSP File – Citizen Comments  
**From:** Jim Jacks, Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments  
**Date:** August 19, 2009  
**Subject:** Citizen Comments and Staff Responses

---

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this memo is to list comments by citizens during the process and the responses thereto.

## CITIZEN COMMENTS

Note: When the following responses refer to the “proposed 2009 TSP” it means the version of the 2009 TSP that was submitted to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on July 31, 2009.

### **March 20, 2009, CAC Meeting #1, 11 a.m. Courthouse 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room.**

Introductions were made and COG staff reviewed the materials for each agenda item. This was the first meeting and CAC members did not have comments that led to follow-up. Such comments were at the second CAC meeting on May 20, 2009.

### **May 20, 2009, CAC Meeting #2, 1 p.m. Community Development Conference Room.**

At the CAC Meeting #1 on March 20 staff went through a document showing some initial proposed changes to the 1998 TSP through to the end of the Public Transportation Element. The proposed changes were in *bold italics* for additions and ~~strikeout~~ for deletions. The CAC members had not received the document in time to thoroughly review it so time was set aside at the CAC Meeting #2 on May 20 for comments and questions. At the CAC Meeting #2 members commented and they follow.

#### **A. Comments on Draft Changes to the 1998 TSP.**

The following page numbers refer to the item “Polk County Transportation Systems Plan, Month x, 2009” that was distributed before the March 20 CAC meeting and discussed at the May 20 CAC meeting. The document included proposed changes to the 1998 TSP through to the end of the Public Transportation Element.

**Page 6, paragraph on the Willamette River starting with, “Over the years....” Dredging the Willamette is important to Polk County and something should be added about the efforts to dredge over the years.**

Response: Additional information about the history of dredging is in the proposed 2009 TSP, p. 1-2, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph. The policy in the 1998 TSP that supported spot dredging is retained in the proposed 2009 TSP as Policy 3.4 under Goal 3, p. 23. Note: the 2009 TSP that this response refers to is the version that was submitted to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on July 31, 2009.

**Page 13, Table 2, Covered Employment doesn’t have data for 2008; it’s through 2007.**

Response: The 2008 data was not available from the State. The table included the 2007 data which was the most up to date data available. For a county TSP the historical covered employment data doesn’t have a direct connection to the policies, project list and funding set forth out to the planning horizon in 2030. The covered employment table is at p. 2-4 in the proposed 2009 TSP.

**Page 14, the large paragraph about two-thirds down the page includes the word “calculations.” What calculations?**

Response: The phrase “These calculations” refers to LOS calculations two sentences before wherein it called for the cities and the county to perform level of service calculations. The proposed 2009 TSP (p. 2-5, last paragraph, rewrites the 1998 paragraph and deletes the call for LOS calculations and deletes the phrase “These calculations.” The cities of Dallas, Monmouth, Independence and Salem have completed TSP updates in the past 2-years and any level of service calculations inside the urban growth boundaries were done at that time.

**Page 15, Table 3, Employment Forecast 2006 – 2016. The table includes Polk, Marion and Yamhill Counties. Should use Polk County data if it’s available.**

Response: The Oregon Employment Division forecasts county employment in groups, such as Polk, Marion and Yamhill Counties. Groups are used and the data is aggregated when the total employment for an individual county is not a large number. The proposed 2009 TSP uses the tri-county forecast.

**Page 17, Goals and Policies, refers to Appendix G (citizen involvement). Shouldn’t this be reviewed by the CAC?**

Response: The reference to Appendix G in the March 20 initial proposed changes to the 1998 TSP is a reference to the citizen involvement materials associated with the creation of the 1998 TSP. The citizen involvement materials need not be reviewed by the CAC, although CAC members are welcome to review the 1998 TSP’s Appendix G to determine what the issues were at that time. The process for the update of the 2009 TSP will include its own citizen involvement program.

**Page 18, Policy 1-10 commits the county to evaluate the need for park and ride facilities when realigning roadways and before disposing of surplus right-of-way. It was suggested that if the county has any park and ride areas the county should not be held responsible for thefts of vehicles, thefts from vehicles or thefts of vehicle components such as wheels.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP, page 3-3, Policy 2.11 includes language indicating, if the county establishes a park-and-ride facility, the county will erect a sign on county park and ride areas stating the county is not responsible for thefts or damage.

**Page 19, Goal 3, “To maintain a transportation system....” The language should reference a new third bridge over the Willamette River and the proposed new grade-separated interchange at OR22/OR51 and others that are now in various stages of planning.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP includes policy support for a third bridge over the Willamette River (new Policy 3.7, under Goal 3, p. 3-7). In addition, the proposed 2009 TSP incorporates ODOT’s Expressway Management Plan and its projects into the 2009 TSP per Policy 3.8, under Goal 3, p. 3-7. The Expressway Management Plan includes an overpass at Greenwood Road and grade-separated interchanges at OR22/OR51 and at OR22/Doaks Ferry west of College Drive. The proposed 2009 TSP incorporates ODOT’s ORE-18 Corridor Refinement Plan and its projects into the 2009 TSP per Policy 3.9, under Goal 3, p. 3-7. The ORE-18 Corridor Refinement Plan includes a grade-separated interchange at OR18/OR22 just east of the Spirit Mountain Casino.

**Page 21, Policy 4-3, “To prevent exceeding planned capacity....” The policy is written in a negative way. Prefer it be written in a positive way.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP, Policy 4.3, under Goal 4, page 3-8, includes a rewritten policy in a positive way. It is open for further changes by citizens, the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners.

**Page 25, the second bullet of the second set of bullets about two-thirds down the page. The explanation of bike path width is not clear. It would be clearer if the language was changed something like: from the outside of the white fog line “X” feet to the outside edge of the pavement.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP, page 4-3, “b,” near the bottom of the page, is revised language that references the white (fog) line and the outside edge of the pavement.

**Page 27, includes a narrative about OR22 and the several plans that address the highway. During the discussion a question came up about the 99W/Perrydale Road/Bethel Road intersection and what is the status of that project?**

Response: ODOT cancelled the project due to lack of funding, and Polk County and ODOT didn’t support the configuration of the probable new intersection because it had a 1,300 foot offset. ODOT and Polk County agree a project at that intersection is needed and will continue to design a solution that is acceptable. It will be added to ODOT’s State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

**Pages 33 and 51, Is there a definition of cul-de-sac? A definition should be provided. The point was the listing of road widths on pp. 33 and 51 (or pp. 29 and 47 of the 1998 TSP) requires a 60-foot width for a cul-de-sac, but that actually means the stem road leading to the circular turnaround; it doesn't refer to the width of the turnaround.**

Response: There is no definition of "cul-de-sac" in the 1998 TSP nor in the March 20 draft 2009 TSP. A definition has been added in Appendix A of the proposed 2009 TSP.

**Page 51, What is meant by access management, i.e., access management for access to public highways versus access management to rural and wild lands. There is a process underway by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) regarding managing access onto wild lands. The Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) uses "access management" to private property in forest areas.**

Response: Access management for TSP purposes does not address access onto federal BLM or ODF controlled lands. The TSP address access onto public rights-of-way for state and county roads that are not BLM or ODF lands. ODOT has standards for minimum distances between driveways and public roads that intersect state highways. The 1998 Polk County TSP included standards for minimum distances between driveways and public roads that access onto state highways. In 2007 Ordinance 2007-06 was adopted (Legislative Amendment Case No. 07-02) which added Goal 5 and new policies under Goal 5 to the TSP to augment the county's access standards. The proposed 2009 TSP includes additional language explaining what access management is in the Access Management section (p. 5-11).

**Page 61, first paragraph, third from the bottom line. "In 1996, the airport it was...." Grammer.**

Response: In the proposed 2009 TSP the first paragraph on page 7-1 has been updated and the "it was" has been change to "was."

**Page 63, the water pipeline from the water treatment plant to Dallas along W. Ellendale should be mentioned as a pipeline.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP does not include information about water pipelines for domestic and municipal purposes. The 1998 TSP does not include information about water pipelines. Typically, water supply lines are addressed in public facility plans as part of the water system. The rural domestic systems are local, are administered by their own decisionmakers and are responsible for their own operation and maintenance. A water facility that is a single pipe is the City of Dallas' water line from the City's water treatment plant on the south side of Robb Mill Road running to Dallas in W. Ellendale Road, a county road. The City owns and is responsible for all aspects of the waterline. In total, there is the City of Dallas line and six water districts with water pipes in county public rights-of-way (Rock Cr.; Grand Ronde; Buell/Red Prairie; Perrydale; Orchard Heights; and Luckiamute). The City of Dallas and the water districts are responsible for the repair, replacement, operation, water quality, service and billing. They are required to obtain a permit from the county before doing work in a county road right-of-way.

**Page 65, Should the added language about bus service to the casino be called "mass transit?"**

Response: The added language stated: "In January 2009 the Salem Area Mass Transit District and the Grand Ronde Tribal Council entered into an agreement to provide service between the

downtown Salem Transit Mall and Spirit Mountain Casino and the Tribal Governance Center with the service focusing on the work shifts at the Casino.” The question appeared to come from the perspective of inquiring if transit buses from a transit district should be referred to as mass transit when private sector highway busses that transport customers to the casino are not referred to as mass transit. The quoted language makes it clear that the transit busses are scheduled at the times of work shifts and the intent is to provide transportation for workers. While there is the possibility that a customer could travel on the transit bus, it could help to reduce the number of trips on Oregon Routes 22 and 18. The bus riders would pay for their ticket.

## **June 10, 2009, CAC Meeting #3, 8:30 a.m. Public Works Conference Room.**

### **A. Comments on Technical Memo #1, Existing and Future Conditions.**

**Page 18, Pedestrian and Bicycle Element. What does “facilities” refer to in the sentence, “Further, the county has combined planning efforts for both walking and bicycling because of recognized similarities in needs, service provision, and the economies of scale that can be gained through multi-use facilities.”**

Response: “Facilities” means trails and paths for pedestrians and bicycles.

**Page 18, What is a “shoulder bikeway?” (See also pp. 20 and 21.)**

Response: “Shoulder bikeways” are bikeways on the shoulder of a road. The preceding paragraph explains them.

**Page 24, Air, Rail, Water and Transmission Lines. Dredging of the Willamette River should be mentioned due to the county’s history of supporting dredging.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP, pages 1-2 (Introduction) and 7-4 (Water) adds information about dredging in the Willamette River. Only a short reference to dredging is added because the likelihood of significant dredging is low due to the Corps of Engineers not being able to show an acceptable cost/benefit ratio and in the last few years the listing of several salmonids as endangered through the Endangered Species Act. The proposed 2009 TSP, page 3-7, retains Policy 3.4, which supports dredging the river.

**Page 26, Public Transportation Element. Two plans are mentioned at the beginning of the third paragraph, but their names are not listed until the bottom of the page.**

Response: The names of the two public transportation plans were added at their first mention in the proposed 2009 TSP, page 8-1, second paragraph (“Salem-Keizer Transit Specialized Transportation Plan for Polk and Marion Counties” and “Yamhill County Coordinated Human Services Public Transportation Plan”).

**Page 27, Public Transportation Element. What is a “rural node?”**

Response: Technical Memo #1 stated: “There is no fixed route public transportation system to Falls City or the rural nodes and rural areas outside the cities in Polk County.” The term “rural node” has been deleted from the proposed 2009 TSP and the above sentence now states:

“There is no fixed route public transportation system to Falls City or the rural areas outside the cities in Polk County.” (p. 8-2, last paragraph)

**Pages 40, 41, Transportation Forecast and Deficiencies, Impacts From Future Development. There was significant discussion about the planning for roads in the area northwest of Dallas that is served by W. Ellendale Road, Reuben Boise Road, Pioneer Road and James Howe Road. The need for a limited access bypass around Dallas was raised.**

Response: The 1998 TSP discusses this area and includes Figure 9 showing the future road system that was worked-out through a significant citizen involvement process in 1998. Technical Memo #1, pages 40 and 42, discuss the area northwest of Dallas. The possibility of connecting W. Ellendale Road to Webb Road and Webb Road’s connection to Oregon Route 223 (Kings Valley Highway) was discussed. The proposed 2009 TSP (pp. 9-14, 9-15) includes the same discussion as Technical Memo #1 and carries forward from the 1998 TSP a figure (Fig. 7 in the proposed 2009 TSP, p. 9-17) showing the proposed road system in the area northwest of Dallas that was worked-out for the 1998 TSP. The task of doing more planning for new roads and new road connections is not included in the 2009 TSP because the scope of work did not include funding or time for such work. It was not considered to be needed for this update.

**Page 41, Transportation Forecast and Deficiencies, Impacts From Future Development. A brief question was about the phrase “road planning” and is it the proper phrase.**

Response: The phrase “road planning” is used in a generic sense, i.e., planning for roads. Technical Memo #1 pages 40 and 42 discuss the area northwest of Dallas. The possibility of connecting W. Ellendale Road to Webb Road and Webb Road’s connection to Oregon Route 223 (Kings Valley Highway) is discussed. The proposed 2009 TSP (pp. 9-14, 9-15) includes the same discussion as Technical Memo #1 and carries forward from the 1998 TSP a figure (Fig. 7 in the proposed 2009 TSP, p. 9-17) showing the proposed road system in the area northwest of Dallas.

**Page 43, Transportation Forecast and Deficiencies, Impacts From Future Development. The phrase “poorly designed” was pointed out.**

Response: The Technical Memo #1 discussion is within the context of areas in the county where the zoning allows rural residential development that might generate additional trips that would affect the county road system. The sentences with the phrase state: “Although the county has other developable lands, they are not expected to generate significant traffic increases. Despite the lack of significant traffic increases there is still accident risk from poorly designed driveway or private road connections to the county road system.”

The proposed 2009 TSP includes the two sentences quoted above. The phrase “poorly designed” was not specifically reviewed before it was included in the proposed 2009 TSP. The phrase could be revised to read “inappropriately designed” or another phrase indicating a driveway or road intersection that is not designed as safely as possible.

## **B. Comments on Technical Memo #2, Develop & Evaluate Draft List of Improvements.**

**Page 4, Section on Revenues, fifth full paragraph on p. 4: There is no recognition that the cost of land for road projects has contributed to the high annual percentage increases in road construction.**

Response: Technical Memo #2, p. 4, states: “Over the past 10-years construction costs have risen significantly. Construction costs rose much faster than the 2.37% average increase per year for revenues and the net effect was that year-by-year the County’s buying power was less and less.” It does not refer to the cost of land. The proposed 2009 TSP includes the cost of land and states: “Over the past 10-years land costs for right-of-way and construction costs have risen significantly. Costs increased much faster than the 2.37 percent average increase per year for revenues with the net effect that year-by-year the county’s buying power was less and less.” (emphasis added)

**Page 4, Section on Gas Tax Revenues, second paragraph: The projected increase per year in gas tax revenues is 2%. Is 2% too high given the changing conditions with fewer miles traveled, higher miles-per-gallon, electric vehicles, etc.? It was suggested that the ODOT economist be contacted.**

Response: The ODOT economist (Jack Svadlenak) was contacted and the proposed 2009 TSP uses 1.5% per year for the increase in gas tax receipts (see p. 11-7).

**Page 5, Section on County-wide Road Bond, second paragraph: Memo #2 did not include an assumption of a county-wide road bond in the 20-year revenue projection. Should a road bond be assumed? CAC discussion ensued. Staff indicated that due to the many factors that must be considered before the Board of Commissioners would propose a bond, staff was hesitant to include a bond in the 20-year revenue projection. However, at a later Technical Advisory Committee meeting it was determined that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO – SKATS) had been advised in the past they could include a bond, especially if bonds had been approved by the voters in the past.**

Response: Staff accepted the TAC discussion and the proposed 2009 TSP includes a \$30 million bond in the year 2029 (see p. 11-11). Polk County voters have approved road bonds in 1986 and in 2006 and the funds were used for the approved purposes. The most recent bond in 2006 was passed by an approximately 70:30 margin.

## **C. Comments on Technical Memo #3, Draft List of Preferred Improvements.**

[[These notes for Technical Memo #3 were added 8/21.]]

**Page 2 (top), Bike Projects: Add bike path on Doaks and Eola and 55<sup>th</sup> that would connect to existing bike path on Oregon Route 22.**

Response: The CAC and TAC agreed a bike facility along the corridor of Doaks-Eola-55<sup>th</sup> would be appropriate because it would connect with the existing path on Oregon Route 22 at the intersection of 55<sup>th</sup> and 22. The proposed 2009 TSP, Figure 3 (Functional Classifications of Roads), designates Eola Drive and 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue as minor collectors. The proposed 2009 TSP, page 10-9, first paragraph, explains that, in addition to the three bicycle projects listed in Table 14, other bicycle facilities will be provided when new roads are constructed or when existing roads are improved, and Eola Drive and 55<sup>th</sup> Avenues are specifically mentioned as examples of roads that will include bicycle facilities when they are improved. Additionally, the minor collector designation on Table 7, page 5-10, shows the paved width



of a rural minor collector to be 30 feet which is sufficient for a shared roadway bicycle facility.

**Page 2 (bottom), County Road Projects: Delete #1, Greenwood Road overpass over Oregon Route 22, because it will be an ODOT project, not a county road project.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP, Table 12 (Polk County Road and Intersection Improvements) deletes the Greenwood Road overpass as a county project. The proposed 2009 TSP includes the Greenwood Road overpass on page 10-10 in Table 15 (Potential Joint Funded Interchange Projects) to indicate that ODOT may ask the county to participate in the funding of selected projects.

**Page 3 (top), County Road Projects: Delete #3, OR22/OR223 (Kings Valley Hwy.) and Smithfield Road interchange because it will be an ODOT project, not a county road project.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP, Table 12 (Polk County Road and Intersection Improvements) deletes the OR22/OR223 interchange as a county project. The proposed 2009 TSP includes the interchange on page 10-10 in Table 15 (Potential Joint Funded Interchange Projects) to indicate that ODOT may ask the county to participate in the funding of selected projects. This interchange will affect county roads significantly (Smithfield Road, Dike Road) to provide a new connection from the interchange to Perrydale Road.

**Page 4 (middle), County Road Projects: Does project #9 to realign Doaks Ferry Road from Eola Drive to a new grade-separated interchange at OR22 West of College Drive, include the new interchange? Does the estimated \$7,800,000 include the interchange?**

Response: County project #9 does not include the proposed grade-separated interchange and the \$7,800,000 figure does not include the interchange. The proposed 2009 TSP on page 10-10 in Table 15 (Potential Joint Funded Interchange Projects) includes the interchange as an ODOT project and ODOT may ask the county to participate in its funding. In the proposed 2009 TSP, Figure 12, page 10-7, shows two separate projects at that location. Project 20 is the realignment and Project 24 is the interchange.

**D. Comments on Technical Memo #4, Transportation Financing Program.**

[[These notes for Technical Memo #4 were added 8/21.]]

**Page 2 (bottom), Add the federal transportation economic stimulus funds (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 – ARRA). Even though the funds to be received by the county will be spent right away, it would be beneficial to mention the stimulus funds in the 2009 TSP. The county will receive about \$400,000. As of June 10 the projected use of the funds would be to pave Falls City Road from OR 223 (Kings Valley Highway) to the city. About \$50,000 in county funds would be added to the stimulus funds to cover the estimated cost.**

Response: In the proposed 2009 TSP, page 11-9, the stimulus funds are described as funds received in 2009 and expended in 2009 for the Falls City Road paving, and not as funds that will be received in the period 2009 – 2030.

**Page 3, There was discussion whether to add a county voter approved property tax road bond to the estimated sources of revenue for 2009-2030. It was not clear if it was a standard practice for a**

**TSP to assume the passage of a bond measure to pay for projects in the future. The CAC advised that if it was possible to include a bond, then one should be included. Due to the time needed to pay off the 2006 road bond, and allowing for the possibility of a bond for purposes other than roads, it was thought that a road bond near the year 2030 would be appropriate if one could be included. At the follow-up TAC meeting, the TAC members indicated the MPO included an assumption of a bond measure and suggested the Polk County TSP should include one.**

Response: In the proposed 2009 TSP, page 11-4, discusses local property tax levies/road bonds. It indicates road bonds were approved by the county's voters in 1986 and 2006 and another bond in the future is a possibility. Page 11-11, Table 18, includes a \$30 million bond measure in the year 2029. To account for inflation the amount is 50% greater than the \$20 million bond in 2006.

## **June 17, 2009, PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE, 5 - p.m. Courthouse 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room.**

[[These notes for the Open House were added 8/21.]]

**The Open House was attended by about 10 citizens. Most were interested in the Eola area and the ODOT grade-separated interchange at Oregon Route 22/51 and future access for properties in the area from Greenwood Road easterly to Doaks Ferry Road.**

Response: Austin McGuigan, Community Development Director, Ken Husby, County Engineer and Public Works Director, Jim Jacks, Senior Planner, Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments, and other county planning and public works staff attended and provided information and answers to the questions. The ODOT project manager for the TSP, Naomi Zwerdling, also attended. Overall, there were no items changed based on the discussions during the open house.

The majority of the attendees were property owners in the Oregon Route 22 corridor from Greenwood Road to Doaks Ferry Road. They had participated in ODOT's Expressway Management Plan (EMP) process over the last few years and had attended many public meetings regarding the Oregon Route 22/51 interchange and associated frontage and backage roads. They had had one-on-one discussions with county and ODOT staff during the EMP process. Due to their prior participation they were not surprised by the provisions in the draft 2009 TSP. Those provisions, essentially, are that the EMP with its Oregon Route 22/51 and Oregon Route 22/Doaks Ferry grade separated interchanges is proposed to be adopted into the 2009 TSP.

Staff indicated the details of the new Oregon Route 22/51 interchange and access roads will be the subject of an Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) that ODOT could start as early as 2010. The EMP is proposed to be adopted by reference in the 2009 TSP. The details of the interchange and access roads will be determined in the IAMP. The county will adopt the IAMP into the 2009 TSP when the IAMP is ready for adoption sometime in 2011 or later – possibly much later.

Much of the discussion at the open house was about the IAMP process and the possible access road locations. The property owners' primary interest was how the proposed 2009

TSP would affect access to their properties. The answer was the EMP with its process already completed and the IAMP with its process yet to be started would be the plans that would most affect their properties. Mr. McGuigan reiterated the county's position from the EMP process that the county is very concerned about access to properties and intends to have frontage and backage roads available before ODOT starts construction of the Oregon Route 22/51 interchange. Such access roads would be determined in the IAMP process. Maps and aerial photos with possible roads superimposed on them were available showing some of the many alternatives and sub-alternatives that were discussed in the EMP process.

There was less discussion about the proposed grade-separated interchange of the realigned Doaks Ferry Road and Oregon Route 22 west of College Drive and east of the BPA facility. The property owner where the realigned Doaks Ferry may be constructed did not attend the open house, thus there was less interest in that interchange. The property owner had attended several of the 2009 TSP Citizen Advisory Committee meetings and had discussed the issues with county and ODOT staff during the EMP process. The Doaks Ferry Road and Oregon Route 22 interchange is anticipated to be built after the Oregon Route 22/51 interchange is completed, thus it is many years away.

## **June 24, 2009, CAC Meeting #4, 8:30 a.m. Public Works Conference Room.**

[[These notes for the draft 2009 TSP were added 8/21.]]

**The final CAC meeting was to review the June draft of the 2009 TSP.**

**Page 16, is "iterative" the best word to use.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP, page 2-2, second paragraph from the bottom, first sentence, deletes "iterative" so the sentence now reads, "Polk County recognizes that planning is a dynamic process."

**Page 25, Policy 4-3 has been changed per prior comments, but could use rewording to be positive.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP, page 3-8, includes a rewritten Policy 4.3 that makes it a positive policy without changing the meaning. It now reads, "To allow comprehensive plan map and zone map amendments that may generate trips up to the planned capacity of the transportation system, Polk County will consider road function, classification, road capacity and existing and projected traffic volumes, as criteria for comprehensive plan map and zone map amendments." In the 1998 TSP it read, "To prevent exceeding planned capacity of the transportation system, Polk County will consider road function, classification, and capacity as criteria for comprehensive plan map and zoning amendments/changes."

**Page 31, top, where historical information has been carried forward from the 1998 TSP, the June draft 2009 TSP should be updated with more current information.**

Response: The proposed 2009 TSP includes updated information on pages 4-4 and 4-5 regarding improvements by ODOT in the Grand Ronde/Fort Hill area that have addressed the traffic counts and accidents since the 1998 TSP was adopted. It indicates the Fort Hill grade-separated interchange is complete. To the east and west of the new Fort Hill interchange,

Oregon Route 18 is 4-lanes with a concrete median barrier, and the intersection of Yamhill River Road/Fort Hill Road with Oregon Route 22 is closed. The next phase will address the current “T” intersection of Oregon Routes 18 and 22 move that intersection slightly west and reconfigure it into a grade-separated interchange that will also serve the Spirit Mountain Casino and Hotel.

**At prior CAC meetings a few comments had been made that were not yet addressed in the June draft 2009 TSP. Staff was aware of them, but due to the compressed timing of the process had not yet addressed them in the June draft 2009 TSP. They are noted above in the comments for the prior CAC meetings and their disposition is noted. The comments have now been addressed in the proposed 2009 TSP.**

END.