Oregon Highway Plan Policies

The Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) is a modal element of the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP). The OHP addresses efficient management of the system to increase safety, preserve the system, and extend its capacity; increased partnerships, particularly with local and regional governments; links between land use and transportation; access management; links with other transportation modes; and environmental and scenic resources. The OHP also establishes a variety of policies that are directly related to this Facility Plan. These include: the Mobility Policy, the Major Improvement Policy, and the Access Management Policy.

* A reference link to the Oregon Highway Plan document will be provided with the final version of this plan. *
OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN

SECTION II

POLICY ELEMENT
II. Policy Element

Goal 1: System Definition

To maintain and improve the safe and efficient movement of people and goods and contribute to the health of Oregon’s local, regional, and statewide economies and livability of its communities.

Overview

The state highway classification system divides state highways into five categories based on function: Interstate, Statewide, Regional, District, and Local Interest Roads. Supplementing this base are four special purpose classifications: land use, statewide freight routes, scenic byways, and lifeline routes. These address the special expectations and demands placed on portions of the highway system by land uses, the movement of trucks, the Scenic Byway designation, and significance as a lifeline or emergency response route. Information contained in these special designations supplement the highway classification system and will be used to guide management, needs analysis, and investment decisions on the highway system.

The System Definition section also includes policies on highway mobility standards and major improvements, which further define state highway management goals and objectives.

State Highway Classification System

Background

The 1991 Highway Plan’s Level of Importance Policy classified the state highway system into four levels of importance (Interstate, Statewide, Regional and District) to provide direction for managing the system and a basis for developing funding strategies for improvements. Realizing that limited funding would not allow all the statewide highways to be upgraded, the 1991 Highway Plan also designated some of the statewide highways as the Access Oregon Highway system to focus needed improvements. The goal of the Access Oregon Highway system was to provide an efficient and effective system of highways to link major economic and geographic centers.

Congress adopted the highway routes in the National Highway System (NHS) as part of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. In Oregon, the National Highway System highways include all the Interstate and Statewide Highways and Access Oregon Highways except for Oregon Highway 82. To reduce the redundancy between Level of Importance, Access Oregon Highways and the National Highway System and to define a
highway classification system that is consistent with the National Highway System, this Highway Plan has adopted the National Highway System as the primary classification and retained the Regional and District categories from the Level of Importance system. Oregon Highway 82 in Wallowa and Union Counties will remain a Statewide Highway. This ensures that every county in Oregon has a link to the rest of the state through the Statewide Highway network.

Congress also designated major intermodal connectors as part of the National Highway System. These roads, some owned by the state and some by local jurisdictions, are located in Astoria, Boardman, Coos Bay-North Bend, Eugene, Medford and Portland. (These roads are listed in Appendix D.) They link airports, ports, rail terminals, and other passenger and freight facilities to Interstate and Statewide Highways, and are of particular importance to Oregon’s economy. State-owned intermodal connectors are either Regional or District Highways and are managed according to their state highway classification.

The classification system also recognizes that certain roads which are currently state highways function primarily as local roads. In cooperation with local governments, ODOT will develop a process to identify these roads which may be transferred to local jurisdictions in accordance with Policy 2C of this plan. The process will also consider the transfer of local highways and roads that serve primarily state interests to state jurisdiction.

ODOT will use the state highway classification system to guide management and investment decisions regarding state highway facilities. The system will be used in the development of corridor plans, transportation system plans, major investment studies, review of local plan and zoning amendments, periodic review of local comprehensive plans, highway project selection, design and development, and facility management decisions including road approach permits.

The broad classifications defined in Action 1A.1 will be complemented by specific subcategories and designations defined in other policies within this plan (see Policies 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E, 1F, and 3A). These subcategories and designations are policy-specific; the overall state highway classification defined in Policy 1A forms the basis for the classification system. The classification map in this plan and Appendix D detail the application of the state highway classification system to specific highways.

The categories recognize that different highway types have importance for certain areas and users. The categories are not the same as the federal government’s functional classification system. It is the responsibility of the Oregon Transportation Commission to establish and modify the classification systems and the routes in them.
Policy 1A: State Highway Classification System

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to develop and apply the state highway classification system to guide ODOT priorities for system investment and management.

Action 1A.1

Use the following categories of state highways, and the list in Appendix D, to guide planning, management, and investment decisions regarding state highway facilities:

- **Interstate Highways (NHS)** provide connections to major cities, regions of the state, and other states. A secondary function in urban areas is to provide connections for regional trips within the metropolitan area. The Interstate Highways are major freight routes and their objective is to provide mobility. The management objective is to provide for safe and efficient high-speed continuous-flow operation in urban and rural areas.

- **Statewide Highways (NHS)** typically provide inter-urban and inter-regional mobility and provide connections to larger urban areas, ports, and major recreation areas that are not directly served by Interstate Highways. A secondary function is to provide connections for intra-urban and intra-regional trips. The management objective is to provide safe and efficient, high-speed, continuous-flow operation. In constrained and urban areas, interruptions to flow should be minimal. Inside Special Transportation Areas (STAs), local access may also be a priority.

- **Regional Highways** typically provide connections and links to regional centers, Statewide or Interstate Highways, or economic or activity centers of regional significance. The management objective is to provide safe and efficient, high-speed, continuous-flow operation in rural areas and moderate to high-speed operations in urban and urbanizing areas. A secondary function is to serve land uses in the vicinity of these highways. Inside STAs, local access is also a priority. Inside Urban Business Areas, mobility is balanced with local access.

- **District Highways** are facilities of county-wide significance and function largely as county and city arterials or collectors. They provide connections and links between small urbanized areas, rural centers and urban hubs, and also serve local access and traffic. The management objective is to provide for safe and efficient, moderate to high-speed continuous-flow operation in rural areas reflecting the surrounding environment and moderate to low-speed operation in urban and urbanizing areas for traffic flow and for pedestrian and bicycle movements. Inside STAs, local access is a priority. Inside Urban Business Areas, mobility is balanced with local access.

- **Local Interest Roads** function as local streets or arterials and serve little or no purpose for through traffic mobility. Some are frontage roads; some are not eligible for federal funding. Currently, these roads are District
Highways or unclassified and will be identified through a process delineated according to Policy 2C. The management objective is to provide for safe and efficient, low to moderate speed traffic flow and for pedestrian and bicycle movements. Inside STAs, local access is a priority. ODOT will seek opportunities to transfer these roads to local jurisdictions.

**Action 1A.2**

By action of the Oregon Transportation Commission upon consultation with affected local governments, classify and/or develop Expressways as a subset of Statewide, Regional and District Highways.

a. **Definition.** Expressways are complete routes or segments of existing two-lane and multi-lane highways and planned multi-lane highways that provide for safe and efficient high speed and high volume traffic movements. Their primary function is to provide for interurban travel and connections to ports and major recreation areas with minimal interruptions. A secondary function is to provide for long distance intra-urban travel in metropolitan areas. In urban areas, speeds are moderate to high. In rural areas, speeds are high. Usually there are no pedestrian facilities, and bikeways may be separated from the roadway.

In this classification, “expressway” refers to the kind and number of accesses allowed on a highway segment. It does not refer to the ownership of access rights. Other characteristics include the following:

- Private access is discouraged;
  - There is a long-range plan to eliminate, as possible, existing approach roads as opportunities occur or alternate access becomes available;
  - Access rights will be purchased and a local road network may be developed consistent with the function of the roadway;
- Public road connections are highly controlled;
- Traffic signals are discouraged in rural areas;
- Nontraversable medians are encouraged; and
- Parking is prohibited.

b. **Classification.** Initiation of the process to classify Expressways will occur as a result of a corridor planning process, ODOT special study or action of the Transportation Commission.

Because of the importance of maintaining system mobility, the Transportation Commission will classify new Expressways as a subset of National Highway System (Interstate and Statewide) highways in consultation with local governments.

The Transportation Commission will classify new Expressways as a subset of Regional and District Highways with the agreement of directly affected local governments.
Highways that are already limited access will be automatically classified as Expressways by the Transportation Commission. These are highways where ODOT owns the access rights and direct access is not allowed and where users enter or exit the roadway only at interchanges.

c. Criteria. Highways proposed to be Expressways will be classified on the basis of the following criteria:

- Importance as an NHS route with high volumes of traffic;
- Designation as a part of the State Highway Freight System;
- Designation as a safety corridor; or
- Function as an urban bypass.

The process of classifying segments as Expressways will first focus on highway segments where posted speeds are 50 miles per hour or greater.

Action 1A.3

Conduct a study of highway classifications statewide to determine whether highways function as they are classified. Conduct this study after the adoption of the Highway Plan as a special study of the classification system or as a part of corridor planning. Consider changing the classification of a state highway if the function of the highway has changed significantly since its original classification or the function does not fit the classification description. The classification change will be effective when the Oregon Transportation Commission adopts the change as part of a corridor plan or other planning process.

Land Use and Transportation

Background

The federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 requires the establishment of a National Highway System “to provide an interconnected system of principal arterial routes which will serve...Interstate and inter-regional travel.” ODOT has an obligation to insure that the National Highway System (the routes designated Interstates, and most Statewide Highways and intermodal connectors) adequately performs this function of serving a larger geographic area. Historically, however, communities have grown up along statewide travel routes. This means that in addition to providing mobility for people, goods and services between communities, regions and states, the state highway system often also provides access to homes, businesses, industry and other destinations within communities.

The highway system’s ability to fulfill these functions depends in large part on community land use patterns and the ways that land uses are served by the transportation system. Development with poorly designed accesses along highways and poorly developed street networks often focus local traffic on state highways and reduce the ability of state highways to move through traffic and provide connections between communities. Communities with
compact urban designs that incorporate a transportation network of arterials and collectors reduce traffic impacts on state highways whose primary objectives are to connect cities and move people, goods and services between cities and regions.

The Land Use and Transportation Policy addresses the relationship between the highway and patterns of development both on and off the highway. It emphasizes development patterns that maintain state highways for regional and intercity mobility and compact development patterns that are less dependent on state highways than linear development for access and local circulation.

Policy 1B also recognizes that state highways serve as the main streets of many communities, and it strives to maintain a balance between serving these main streets and the through traveler. It emphasizes management of the transportation system for safety and efficient use of resources. It recognizes the main street function of state highways through designation of these areas as Special Transportation Areas.

The policy encourages compact development patterns for large-scale commercial development through the special designation of Commercial Centers on Statewide, Regional and District Highways, and recognizes existing and future commercial centers of activity called Urban Business Areas on urbanized low-speed Regional and District Highways and on Statewide Highways under certain circumstances.

Focusing growth in more compact development patterns can have the following transportation benefits:

- Reduction of local trips and travel on state highways;
- Shorter vehicle trips;
- More opportunity to walk, bicycle, or use available transit services;
- Increased opportunities to develop transit; and
- Reduction of the number of vehicle trips to shop and do business.

These measures can enhance air quality and conserve energy.

The overall goal and focus of the Land Use and Transportation Policy is to connect land use and transportation in a way that achieves long-term objectives for the state highway and the local community. In applying the policy, ODOT will recognize the regional and topographical differences of communities throughout Oregon.

ODOT acknowledges that the best way to implement the policy is to establish cooperative working relationships with local governments. This includes a commitment on ODOT's part to:

- Participate actively, early, and continuously in the development of transportation system plans and periodic review;
- Look for creative and innovative transportation and land use solutions to transportation problems;
- Work within the context of acknowledged land use plans and zoning; and
- Support planning and implementation of improvements within centers and Special Transportation Areas, including off-system improvements that benefit operation of the state highway system.

The policy recognizes that:
- Local governments are responsible for planning and zoning land uses within their jurisdictions and for developing and managing the local transportation system;
- ODOT is responsible for developing and managing the state highway system;
- ODOT and local and regional governments must work collaboratively to achieve accessibility and mobility goals for a balanced transportation system.

Policy 1B applies to all state highways. It provides guidance to ODOT regarding system management planning and implementation activities. It is not proposed to be an administrative rule. It is designed to clarify how ODOT will work with local governments and others to link land use and transportation in transportation system plans, corridor plans, plan amendments, access permitting, and project development.

ODOT recognizes that the policy will be applied under three different circumstances:
- Existing conditions which do not meet the policy objectives. In these circumstances, the policy will be used to gain closer levels of compliance with the objectives and/or actions.
- A mixture of existing non-compliant conditions and new proposals, projects or developments where higher levels of compliance with the objectives and/or actions would be desirable. In these circumstances, ODOT, the affected local government and/or affected parties need to work out a way to best achieve compliance with the objectives and/or actions.
- New conditions or development where there is an ability to fully comply with the policy objectives and/or actions.

Policy 1B implements the Oregon Transportation Plan’s Urban Accessibility Policy to “assure balanced, multimodal accessibility to existing and new development within urban areas to achieve the state goal of compact, highly livable urban areas.” The Highway Plan’s policies on Major Improvements, Highway Mobility Standards, Partnerships, Off-system Improvements and Travel Alternatives complement the Land Use and Transportation Policy. “Nodal development” in the Eugene-Springfield TransPlan and “2040 concept areas” in Metro’s 2040 Plan are consistent with the policy direction of Policy 1B.

**Policy 1B: Land Use and Transportation**

This policy recognizes the role of both the State and local governments related to the state highway system:

- *State and local government must work together to provide safe and efficient roads for livability and economic viability for all citizens.*
- *State and local government must share responsibility for the road system.*
• State and local government must work collaboratively in planning and decision-making relating to transportation system management.

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to coordinate land use and transportation decisions to efficiently use public infrastructure investments to:

• Maintain the mobility and safety of the highway system;
• Foster compact development patterns in communities;
• Encourage the availability and use of transportation alternatives;
• Enhance livability and economic competitiveness; and
• Support acknowledged regional, city and county transportation system plans that are consistent with this Highway Plan.

Action 1B.1
Work with local governments to develop and implement plans that support compact development, especially within community centers and commercial centers. Support plans, strategies and local ordinances that include:

• Parallel and interconnected local roadway networks to encourage local automobile trips off the state highway;
• Transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, including street amenities that support these modes;
• Design and orientation of buildings and amenities that accommodate pedestrian and bicycle use as well as automobile use;
• Provision of public and shared parking;
• Infill and redevelopment;
• Expansion of intensive urban development guided away from state highways rather than along state highways; and
• Other supporting public investments that encourage compact development and development within centers.

Action 1B.2
Work with local governments to help protect the state highway function by collaborating with local jurisdictions in developing land use and subdivision ordinances, specifically:

• A process for coordinated review of future land use decisions affecting transportation facilities, corridors, or sites;
• A process to apply conditions to development proposals in order to minimize impacts and protect transportation facilities, corridors, or sites;
• Regulations assuring that amendments to land use designations, densities and design standards are consistent with the functions, capacities, and
highway mobility standards of facilities identified in transportation system plans including the Oregon Highway Plan and adopted highway corridor plans;

- Refinement of zoning and permitted and conditional uses to reflect the effects of various uses on traffic generation;

- Standards to protect future operation of state highways and other roads; and

- Access control measures, for example, driveway and public road spacing, median control and signal spacing standards which are consistent with the functional classification of roads and consistent with limiting development on rural lands to rural uses and densities.

**Action 1B.3**

To assist in implementing state access management standards and policies, work with local governments to develop an access management plan or access management component in comprehensive plans, corridor plans and/or transportation system plans involving the state and local system.

After the Oregon Transportation Commission has adopted administrative rules regarding access management and approach road permitting, ODOT and a local government may enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement setting provisions for and allowing the local government to issue approach road permits on state Regional and District Highways in accordance with all applicable standards and criteria contained in the Oregon Highway Plan, Oregon Administrative Rules and Oregon Revised Statutes, and the local adopted and acknowledged transportation system plan. This provision shall not apply to Regional and District Expressways.

**Action 1B.4**

Work with local governments to maintain the highway mobility standards on state highways by limiting the expansion of development along the highway through the following means:

- Developing an adequate local network of arterials, collectors, and local streets to limit the use of the state highway or interchanges for local trips;

- Reducing access to the state highway by use of shared accesses, access from side or back roads, and frontage roads and by development of local street networks as redevelopment along state highways occurs;

- Clustering development off of state highways in compact development patterns; and

- Avoiding the expansion of urban growth boundaries along Interstate and Statewide Highways and around interchanges unless ODOT and the appropriate local governments agree to an interchange management plan.
to protect interchange operation or access management plan for segments along non-freeway highways.

**Action 1B.5**

Work with local governments to develop corridor and transportation system plans that protect existing limited access interchanges according to the following functional priorities:

- At all existing limited access highway interchanges, provide safe egress from freeways and Expressways as the first priority. This priority must be met.

- When an interchange connects a freeway or an Expressway to an Interstate, Statewide or Regional Highway, provide regional access to freeways and Expressways as the second highest priority.

- Establish the priority for travel across freeways and Expressways and the priority for access to property in the vicinity of the interchange consistently in both the local transportation system plan and the corridor plan.

- When an interchange connects a freeway or an Expressway to a District Highway or Local Interest Road, establish the priority for travel across freeways and Expressways and the priority for access to property in the vicinity of the interchange consistently in both the local transportation system plan and the corridor plan.

**Action 1B.6**

Develop design guidelines for highways that describe a range of automobile, pedestrian, bicycle or transit travel alternatives. The guidelines should include appropriate design features such as lighted, safe and accessible bus stops, on-street parking, ample sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, pedestrian scale lighting, street trees and related features.

**Action 1B.7**

To foster compact development patterns in communities, use the following highway segment designations and objectives to guide planning and management decisions for state highways. Use the highway segment designations to guide ODOT’s position on local land use planning and development standards and actions and to define the application of access management standards and broad types of highway facility design. Work with local governments to apply these highway segment designations to segments of the state highway consistent with the local acknowledged comprehensive plan and/or transportation system plan. In plans and projects, work toward achieving specific objectives for each designation as listed in Table 4 (page 52).
• **Special Transportation Area**: The primary objective of managing highway facilities in an existing or future Special Transportation Area is to provide access to community activities, businesses, and residences and to accommodate pedestrian movement along and across the highway in a downtown, business district and/or community center including those in unincorporated communities as defined by OAR 660-22. An STA is a highway segment designation that may be applied to a highway segment, when a downtown, business district or community center straddles the state highway within an urban growth boundary or in an unincorporated community in accordance with Action 1B.9. Direct street connections and shared on-street parking are encouraged in urban areas and may be encouraged in unincorporated communities. Direct property access is limited in an STA. Local auto, pedestrian, bicycle and transit movements to the business district or community center are generally as important as the through movement of traffic. Traffic speeds are slow, generally 25 miles per hour (40 kilometers per hour) or less.

• **Commercial Centers**: The primary objective of the state highway adjacent to a Commercial Center is to maintain through traffic mobility in accordance with its function. A Commercial Center is a highway segment designation which may apply to an existing or future center of commercial activity which may generally have 400,000 square feet (37,000 square meters) or more of gross leasable area or public buildings. The majority of the average daily trips to the center originate in the community in which the center is located. The buildings are clustered with limited direct access to the state highway to reduce the number of vehicle trips and to reduce conflicts with through traffic. They may be located on Statewide, Regional or District Highways within an urban growth boundary. They include a high level of regional accessibility and connections to a local road network. The Commercial Center accommodates pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation and, where appropriate, transit movements.

• **Urban Business Areas**: The Urban Business Area is a highway segment designation which may vary in size and which recognizes existing areas of commercial activity or future nodes or various types of centers of commercial activity within urban growth boundaries on District, Regional or Statewide Highways where vehicular accessibility is important to continued economic viability. The primary objective of the state highway in an Urban Business Area (UBA) is to maintain existing speeds while balancing the access needs of abutting properties with the need to move through traffic. A UBA is a highway segment designation that may apply to an existing area of commercial activity or future center or node of commercial activity in a community located on a District, Regional or Statewide Highway where speeds are 35 miles per hour (55 kilometers per hour) or less. The designation of UBAs on Statewide Highways shall be limited to only those special circumstances where, from a system wide

---

1 Metro concepts for Central City, Town Center and Main Streets are consistent with STAs.
perspective, the need for local access clearly equals or is greater than the need for mobility for an existing designation, and for a new designation, the need for local access must be greater than the need for mobility. Vehicular accessibility is often as important as pedestrian, bicycle and transit accessibility. Safe and regular street connections are encouraged. Transit turnouts, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes are accommodated.

- **Urban**: The objective of an Urban segment designation is to efficiently move through traffic while also meeting the access needs of nearby properties. Access can be provided to and from individual properties abutting an Urban segment, but the strong preference is to limit such access, providing it instead on connecting local roads and streets. Transit turnouts, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes are accommodated.

**Action 1B.8**

Use the classifications and the objectives in Action 1B.7 in planning and decision making involving:

- Access management planning and permitting;
- Development and review of corridor plans;
- Review of metropolitan planning organization and local transportation system plans;
- Periodic review of local comprehensive plans;
- Review of local plan and zoning amendments;
- Review of major development designs within adopted comprehensive plans for commercial/industrial and subdivision development that has a significant impact on a state highway;
- Review of site acquisition and construction of proposed public facilities;
- Review of urban growth boundary amendments;
- Development of major investment studies; and
- Highway facility design and project development.

**Action 1B.9**

Based on a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan, ODOT and a local government may agree in writing to manage a downtown, business district, or community center inside an urban growth boundary or rural unincorporated community as a Special Transportation Area.

**a. Characteristics.** An STA has the following characteristics:

- An STA is a designated compact district located on a state highway within an urban growth boundary in which the need for appropriate local access
outweighs the considerations of highway mobility except on designated Freight Highways where accessibility and mobility needs are balanced.

- While traffic moves through an STA and automobiles may play an important role in accessing an STA, convenience of movement within an STA is focused upon pedestrian, bicycle and transit modes. STAs have a plan for an interconnected local street network to facilitate local automobile and pedestrian circulation except where topography severely constrains the potential for street connections. Speeds typically do not exceed 25 miles per hour (40 kilometers per hour).

- People who arrive by car or transit find it convenient to walk from place to place within the area.

- Larger communities may have more than one STA.

b. Other Attributes. An STA has the majority, if not all, of the following attributes, either as existing or planned uses and infrastructure through an adopted management plan (see Action 1B.11).

- Mixed uses;
- Buildings spaced close together and located adjacent to the street with little or no setback;
- Sidewalks with ample width which are located adjacent to the highway and the buildings;
- Interconnected local street networks to facilitate local automobile and pedestrian circulation except where topography severely constrains the potential for street connections;
- On street parking and shared or general purpose parking lots which are located behind or to the side of buildings; and
- Convenient automobile and pedestrian circulation within the center and off the state highway.

An STA does not apply to an entire city or the majority of a city or to strip development areas along individual highway corridors. STAs are not located on freeways or Expressways. STAs may be located within established city limits or within an area between a city limit and an urban growth boundary where such a classification would result in redevelopment to eliminate an existing pattern of strip development.

An existing central business/commercial district in an unincorporated community as defined by OAR 660-22 that meets the definition of an STA may also be classified an STA.

**Action 1B.10**

Consider a proposal to establish a Special Transportation Area where compact development did not exist at the adoption of this Highway Plan only if the proposed STA is already planned in the local or regional adopted
comprehensive plan. Through transportation system plans, corridor plans and/or off-system improvements, encourage any new development in an area proposed as an STA to be developed off of the highway or only on one side of the highway.

**Action 1B.11**

Work cooperatively with local governments to designate existing and future Special Transportation Areas.

**a. Designation.** The first step is to identify potential STAs in a corridor plan or regional or local transportation system plan.

The second step is for ODOT and the local jurisdiction to mutually develop and agree to the management plan, within an Intergovernmental Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding. The agreement for an STA in an unincorporated community shall be with the affected county government. The STA management plan may include less restrictive highway mobility standards (see Policy 1F) and may use flexible streetscape designs in order to improve local access and community functions. The agreement will be in effect when the STA is adopted as part of a local transportation system plan and comprehensive plan and in the corresponding corridor plan where a corridor plan exists.

**b. Management Plan.** The management plan for each STA in the local transportation system plan shall include:

- Goals and objectives;
- Clearly defined STA boundaries;
- Design standards that are to be applied to the STA to improve local access and community functions. These may include highway mobility standards, street spacing standards, signal spacing standards and street treatments, and must be reviewed by the Technical Services Manager or his/her designee;
- Strategies for addressing freight and through traffic including traffic speed, possible signalization, parallel or other routes, and actions in other parts of the corridor which address through traffic needs;
- Parking strategies, which address on and off street and shared parking;
- Provisions for a network of local traffic, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation;
- An analysis of the regional and local traffic and safety impacts of the STA to determine the effects of the STA designation. All parties must agree to the analysis methodology, and it must be consistent with regional plans and ODOT analysis methods;
- Identification of needed improvements within the STA or improvements that will support access to the STA and designation of the party
responsible for implementation, likely funding source and anticipated time frame; and

- Identification of maintenance and operational strategies to be employed.

**Action 1B.12**

Whether an area qualifies for STA highway segment designation or not, encourage local governments to cluster commercial development in community centers or Commercial Centers with limited access to the state highway to reduce the number of vehicle trips and to reduce conflicts with through traffic.

**a. Definition.** Encourage a Commercial Center\(^2\) to locate in a community that is the population center for the region, and where the majority of the average daily trips to the center originate in the community in which the Commercial Center is located. Generally these centers have 400,000 square feet (37,000 square meters) or more of gross leasable area or public buildings. These centers are intended for commercial or mixed commercial, retail and office activities. They may include public uses. The buildings are clustered with consolidated access to the state highway rather than developed along the highway with multiple accesses. Multi-family residential uses may be located within or adjacent to a center. Major metropolitan areas may have multiple Commercial Centers.

**b. Attributes.** Commercial Centers must be designated in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan and referenced in a corridor plan, have clearly defined boundaries and include the following, or have a plan adopted by the affected local government(s) to provide the following, before the site is fully developed:

- Convenient circulation within the center, including pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation;
- Provisions for transit access in urban areas planned for fixed-route transit service;
- Shared parking and a reduction in parking to accommodate multimodal elements where alternate modes are available;
- A high level of regional accessibility;
- Accessibility by a variety of routes and modes and a local road network so that most of the traffic circulation may occur off of the state highway; and
- Compact development patterns.

In return for having the above characteristics and adhering strictly to access management spacing standards as provided in Policies 3A and 3C, consider allowing the highway mobility standard to be the same as that for Special Transportation Areas at the point of access to the state highway. The highway

---

\(^2\) Metro’s concept for a Regional Center is consistent with a Commercial Center.
mobility of any affected freeway interchange may not decline below the highway mobility standard for the interchange designated by Policy 1F (Table 6, page 68, and Table 7, page 69).

**Action 1B.13**

Work cooperatively with local governments to designate existing and future Urban Business Areas (UBAs) through a corridor plan and/or local transportation system plan. A UBA is a highway segment designation that may apply to existing areas of commercial activity or future nodes or various types of centers of commercial activity in a community located on a Statewide, Regional or District Highway within an urban growth boundary where speeds are 35 miles per hour (55 kilometers per hour) or less. The designation of UBAs on Statewide Highways shall be limited to only those special circumstances where, from a system wide perspective, the need for local access clearly equals or is greater than the need for mobility for an existing designation, and for a new designation, the need for local access must be greater than the need for mobility.

The highway segment designation must be made through a corridor plan and/or local transportation system plan with the agreement of both ODOT and the affected local government.

The designation provisions in the corridor plan and/or local transportation system plan shall include an interconnected local street and private drive network to facilitate local automobile and pedestrian circulation except where topography severely constrains the potential for street connections. New buildings in a UBA should be clustered in centers or nodes so that the facilities encourage people who arrive by car or transit to find it convenient to walk from place to place within the area.

**Action 1B.14**

Work to accommodate alternate modes on state highways according to the various types of land uses and highways. Work toward development of alternate mode facilities in Special Transportation Areas, Commercial Centers and Urban Business Areas according to the other actions in this policy and to Table 4 on page 52. Use the following objectives to guide project design and development in other areas:

a. **Within Urban Growth Boundaries:**

   **On Expressways:**
   - Accommodate bicycle lanes, if any, on shoulders or separated facilities.
   - Although pedestrians are generally not accommodated on Expressways for safety reasons, analyze accommodation on a case by case basis.

   **On Other Urban Statewide, Regional and District Highways:**
   - Accommodate bicycle lanes and sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities, especially in commercial centers and community use areas.
• Provide convenient pedestrian crossings, especially at transit stops and other high-use generators.

• Design intersections to address the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists.

b. Outside Urban Growth Boundaries:

• In unincorporated communities, address pedestrian crossing safety. This may be addressed through traffic signals and medians designed to serve as pedestrian refuges.
Table 2: Potential Location of Highway Segment Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Highway</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Commercial Center/UBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Within UGBs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>None&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commercial Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Commercial Center/UBA (where there are specific circumstances and where speeds are 35 mph or less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (Outside UGBs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Within UGBs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>None&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commercial Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Commercial Center/UBA (where speeds are 35 mph or less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (Outside UGBs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Highway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Within UGBs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>None&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Commercial Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Commercial Center/UBA (where speeds are 35 mph or less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (Outside UGBs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>3</sup> The location criteria assume there is direct access to the highway facility. An STA or Commercial Center, for example, can be adjacent to an Interstate Highway, but the direct access to highway facilities will be to an urban arterial. An STA can also be located on a highway segment between parts of an Expressway if there are transition zones between the traffic speeds of the Expressway and the STA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Elements of Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Transportation Area</td>
<td>• Adjacent land uses that provide for compact, mixed-use development. “Compact” means that buildings are spaced closely together, parking is shared and sidewalks bind the street to the building. Mixed-use development includes a mixture of community places and uses.                                                                                   • Infill and redevelopment.                                                                                                                                         • Design and orientation of buildings that accommodate pedestrian and bicycle circulation, as well as automobile use.                                                                                           • An adopted management plan as part of the comprehensive plan that shows the area as a compact district with development requirements that address local auto trips, street connectivity, shared parking, design and layout of buildings, parking and sidewalks that encourage a pedestrian-oriented environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Center</td>
<td>• Clustered development with shared parking.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          • Facilities for bicycle and pedestrian access and circulation.                                                                                                       • Provisions for transit movements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Business Areas</td>
<td>• Businesses and buildings clustered in centers or nodes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  • Bicycle lanes and sidewalks and other pedestrian accommodations, especially in commercial centers and community use areas.                                                                                     • Development of a strategy for good traffic progression.                                                                                                        • Joint access to state highways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Alternative Modes</th>
<th>Traffic Management</th>
<th>Access Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Transportation Area</td>
<td>Well-developed transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including street amenities that support these modes.</td>
<td>A well-developed parallel and interconnected local roadway network.</td>
<td>Public road connections that correspond to the existing city block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Business Areas</td>
<td>Development of a strategy for good traffic progression. An efficient parallel local street system where arterials and collectors connect to the state highway.</td>
<td>Local ordinances that support shared driveway approaches and inter-parcel circulation.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Elements of Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Urban Business Areas (continued from previous page) | • Convenient and safe pedestrian crossings, especially at transit stops and other high-use generators.  
• Intersections designed to address the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists.  
• Measures for addressing pedestrian crossing safety. These may include stop signs, traffic signals and medians designed to serve as pedestrian refuges.  
• Improved traffic management strategies such as Advanced Traffic Management Systems. |
Table 3: Highway Segment Designations and Designating Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Segment Designation</th>
<th>Designation Process</th>
<th>Designating Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Center</td>
<td>Corridor plan</td>
<td>ODOT &amp; local government in a plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local transportation system plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Business Area</td>
<td>Corridor plan</td>
<td>ODOT &amp; local government in a plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local transportation system plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Transportation Area</td>
<td>Corridor plan</td>
<td>ODOT &amp; local government in an *IGA/MOU &amp; plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local transportation system plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* IGA = Intergovernmental Agreement
MOU = Memorandum of Understanding
State Highway Freight System

Background

According to the 1993 *Commodity Flow Study*, most freight shipments originating in Oregon are moved by truck (64 percent of the value and 76 percent of the weight of commodities). To ensure that freight is able to move efficiently on the state’s major trucking routes, this plan designates a state highway freight system (Table 5, page 56), using freight volume, tonnage, connectivity, and linkages to National Highway System intermodal facilities as the key criteria. The State Highway Freight System is intended to facilitate interstate, intrastate, and regional movements of trucks. This freight system, made up of the Interstate Highways and certain Statewide Highways on the National Highway System, includes routes that carry significant tonnage of freight by truck and serve as the primary interstate and intrastate highway freight connection to ports, intermodal terminals, and urban areas. It supersedes and replaces the designation of primary freight corridors in the Oregon Transportation Plan.

Freight depends upon timely and dependable movement of goods over the system; some industries structure their facilities and processes on just-in-time deliveries. Highway efficiency for goods movement in an expanding economy will require public and private investments in infrastructure as well as changes in road operations to reduce congestion on freight routes. Designating a network of freight routes of primary importance to the state will help ensure that these investments are coordinated in a way that reinforces the unique needs of the freight system.

Improving and maintaining the efficiency of highway operations requires balancing the needs of freight movement with the needs of other users of the highway system. Some state highways that are important goods movement corridors also serve as communities’ main streets and may be designated as Special Transportation Areas. It may be the objective of local officials to reduce or slow traffic passing through the town, with potentially adverse impacts on long distance freight transportation. In such cases, system investment decisions and local land use planning should recognize the special significance of the designated statewide freight system and balance freight needs with local circulation and access needs. Regional and local jurisdictions may designate their own freight route systems, but these designations should be compatible with or complementary to the designation of routes in the State Highway Freight System.

The State Highway Freight System designation does not guarantee additional state investment in these routes. However, three special management strategies are available:

- Highways included in this designation have higher highway mobility standards than other Statewide Highways (see Policy 1F).

- The highway’s function as a freight route should be balanced with local accessibility in Special Transportation Areas.

- Freight system routes may be treated as Expressways outside of urban growth boundaries and unincorporated communities. (See Action 1C.3 and the definition of Expressways in Action 1A.2.)
Policy 1C: State Highway Freight System

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to balance the need for movement of goods with other uses of the highway system, and to recognize the importance of maintaining efficient through movement on major truck freight routes.*

**Action 1C.1**
Apply performance standards appropriate to the movement of freight on freight routes.

**Action 1C.2**
Prepare a statewide freight study to address the role of trucks and other freight modes in Oregon’s economy, freight mobility and accessibility issues, current, near-term and long-term needs, and other topics.

**Action 1C.3**
In the development of corridor plans, work with local governments to examine options to:

- Treat designated freight routes as Expressways where the routes are outside of urban growth boundaries and unincorporated communities. Continue to treat freight routes as Expressways within urban growth boundaries where existing facilities are limited access or where corridor or transportation system plans indicate limited access; and
- Recognize and balance freight needs with needs for local circulation, safety and access in Special Transportation Areas.

**Action 1C.4**
Consider the importance of timeliness in freight movements in developing and implementing plans and projects on freight routes.
### Table 5: Designated Freight Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description of Highway or Segment Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Washington State Line to California State Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-82</td>
<td>Washington State Line to I-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-84</td>
<td>I-5 (Portland) to Idaho State Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-205</td>
<td>Washington State Line to I-5 (Portland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405</td>
<td>I-5 (Portland) to I-5 (Portland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 20 / OR 34</td>
<td>US 101 (Newport) to I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26</td>
<td>US 101 to I-405 (Portland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 26</td>
<td>OR 212 to US 97 (Madras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 30</td>
<td>US 101 (Astoria) to I-405 (Portland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 97</td>
<td>Washington State Line to California State Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>OR 38 (Reedsport) to OR 42 (Coos Bay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 18 / OR 99W</td>
<td>US 101 (Lincoln City) to I-5 (Tigard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 22 / US 20 / OR 201 / US 30 BUS</td>
<td>I-5 (Salem) to I-84 (Ontario)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 38</td>
<td>US 101 (Reedsport) to I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 42</td>
<td>US 101 (Coos Bay) to I-5 (Roseburg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 58</td>
<td>I-5 (Eugene) to US 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 99E</td>
<td>I-84 (Portland) to OR 224 (Milwaukie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 126 / I-105</td>
<td>Near West Eugene City Limits (Richmond St.) to I-5 (Eugene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 217</td>
<td>US 26 (Beaverton) to I-5 (Tigard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 224 / OR 212</td>
<td>OR 99E (Milwaukie) to US 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenic Byways

#### Background

While every state highway has certain scenic attributes (see Policy 5B), the Oregon Transportation Commission has designated 12 Scenic Byways throughout the state on federal, state, and local roads which have exceptional scenic value (see map in printed document). In 1998, the federal government designated two of these routes as All-American Roads, and four as National Scenic Byways. The Oregon Transportation Commission may designate additional state byways. To protect the scenic assets of its Scenic Byways, ODOT will develop guidelines for aesthetic and design elements within the public right-of-way that are appropriate to Scenic Byways. The Scenic Byways Policy recognizes that safety and performance issues may cause the need for physical improvements to Scenic Byways, and seeks to balance these needs with the preservation of scenic values.
Policy 1D: Scenic Byways

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to preserve and enhance designated Scenic Byways, and to consider aesthetic and design elements along with safety and performance considerations on designated Byways.

Action 1D.1
Develop and apply guidelines for appropriate aesthetic and design elements within the public right-of-way on Scenic Byways. The purpose of these guidelines is to preserve and enhance the scenic value while accommodating critical safety and performance needs. The elements should include guidelines for turnouts, overlooks, signage, and visual treatment of the highway infrastructure.

Action 1D.2
With guidelines in place, develop management priorities for Scenic Byways in management plans and corridor plans.

Action 1D.3
Consider impacts to the scenic qualities of Scenic Byways when designing plans and projects.

Action 1D.4
Develop resource management plans and maps that describe ODOT's maintenance actions for roads which are designated Oregon Scenic Byways, including restricted activity zones, property to be used for disposal of slide debris and other material, and unsold state properties to be considered for ODOT retention. Identify scenic resources and existing vista opportunity locations on the maps. Include guidelines for maintenance activities where scenic resources are a factor. Ensure that ODOT highway maintenance activities are compatible with Scenic Byway management plans.

Lifeline Routes

Background
Earthquakes, flooding, landslides, wild fires, and other natural and man-made disasters may destroy or block key access routes to emergency facilities and create episodic demand for highway routes into and out of a stricken area. ODOT's investment strategy should recognize the critical role that some highway facilities, particularly bridges, play in emergency response and evacuation. In some cases, the most cost-effective solution to maintaining security in these lifeline routes involves investment in roads or bridges owned by local jurisdictions. To the extent feasible, investments should be made without regard to roadway jurisdiction in order to provide the greatest degree of lifeline security for the available
resources. ODOT will work with local governments to further define and map a network of lifeline routes. The lifeline network will focus on serving those communities which are particularly susceptible to isolation by virtue of their limited highway access.

Policy 1E: Lifeline Routes

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to provide a secure lifeline network of streets, highways, and bridges to facilitate emergency services response and to support rapid economic recovery after a disaster.*

**Action 1E.1**

Define the criteria for lifeline routes to respond to short and long-term needs and, working with local jurisdictions, agencies, and emergency service providers, designate the lifeline network for the State of Oregon.

**Action 1E.2**

Provide funds or establish state/local partnerships to make improvements to state and local roads and bridges on the lifeline network where supportive of the Lifeline Routes Policy and cost-effective relative to alternative strategies.

**Action 1E.3**

Consider the presence of designated lifeline routes in system investment and management decisions and in coordination efforts with local land use and transportation planning activities.

**Action 1E.4**

In planning for lifeline routes, focus on susceptibility of the route and improvements on it (bridges and other structures) to disasters such as earthquakes, landslides, and flooding. In corridor plans and transportation system plans, emphasize improvements and other measures which maintain a highway connection between regions or areas of the state in the event of major disasters. Consider a combination of measures to address identified hazards and elements such as appropriate advance maintenance, structural reinforcement, flood-proofing, emergency response planning, and development of emergency alternative routes.
Highway Mobility Standards

Background

Several policies in the Highway Plan establish general mobility objectives and approaches for maintaining mobility.

- **Policy 1A (State Highway Classification System)** describes in general the functions and objectives for several categories of state highways. Greater mobility is expected on Interstate and Statewide Highways than on Regional and District Highways.

- **Policy 1B (Land Use and Transportation)** has an objective of coordinating land use and transportation decisions to maintain the mobility of the highway system. The policy identifies several land use types and describes in general the levels of mobility appropriate for each.

- **Policy 1C (State Highway Freight System)** has an objective of maintaining efficient through movement on major truck freight routes. The policy identifies the highways that are freight routes.

- **Policy 1G (Major Improvements)** has the purpose of maintaining highway performance and improving highway safety by improving system efficiency and management before adding capacity.

Although each of these policies addresses mobility, none specifically identifies what levels of mobility are acceptable.

The Highway Mobility Standards Policy establishes standards for mobility that are reasonable and consistent with the directions of other Highway Plan policies. This policy carries out the directions of Policies 1A and 1C by establishing higher mobility standards for Interstate Highways, freight routes and other Statewide Highways than for Regional or District Highways. It carries out Policy 1B by establishing lower mobility standards for Special Transportation Areas (STAs) and more highly developed urban areas than in less developed areas and rural areas. The lowest standards for mobility are for Regional and District Highways in STAs where traffic congestion will be allowed to reach levels where peak hour traffic flow is highly unstable and traffic queues will form on a regular basis. The levels of mobility established for Statewide Highways in STAs will avoid high levels of traffic instability (except where accidents or other incidents disrupt traffic). A larger cushion of reserve capacity is established for freight routes than for other Statewide Highways to provide steady flow conditions, although traffic will be slowed in STAs to accommodate pedestrians. (Interstate Highways and Expressways will not be incorporated into an STA.)

The mobility standards are contained in Tables 6 and 7 and in Actions 1F.1 and 1F.5. While state highways are often important routes for pedestrians and bicyclists, Tables 6 and 7 refer only to vehicle mobility.

The policy identifies three uses for the highway mobility standards:

- Planning: identifying state highway mobility performance expectations for planning and plan implementation;
• Review of amendments to comprehensive plans and land use regulations: maintaining consistency between desired highway performance and the type of land use development; and

• Making traffic operations decisions such as managing access and traffic control systems to maintain acceptable highway performance.

The Highway Mobility Standards Policy applies primarily to transportation and land use planning decisions. By defining acceptable levels of highway system mobility, the policy provides direction for identifying highway system deficiencies. The policy does not, however, determine what actions should be taken to address the deficiencies. The highway mobility standards in the policy (volume to capacity ratio or v/c) are neutral regarding whether solutions to mobility deficiencies should be addressed by actions that reduce highway volumes or increase highway capacities. The Major Improvements Policy establishes priorities for actions to address deficiencies.

The Highway Mobility Standards Policy will primarily affect land use decisions through the requirements of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The TPR requires that regional and local transportation system plans be consistent with plans adopted by the Transportation Commission. The TPR also requires that comprehensive plan amendments and zone changes which significantly affect a transportation facility be consistent with the adopted function, capacity and performance measures for the affected facility. The Highway Mobility Standards Policy establishes ODOT’s mobility performance measures for state highways.

Policy 1F does not apply to highway design. Separate design standards are contained in ODOT’s Highway Design Manual. Mobility performance standards for highway design are generally equal to or higher than the standards contained in this policy to provide an adequate operating life for highway improvements. In some circumstances, highway improvements may be designed to meet the highway mobility standards in this policy where necessary to avoid adverse environmental, land use or other effects.

ODOT’s intention is that the highway mobility standards not be exceeded over the course of a reasonable planning horizon. The planning horizon shall be:

• 20 years for the development of state, regional and local transportation plans, including ODOT’s corridor plans; and

• The greater of 15 years or the planning horizon of the applicable local and regional transportation system plans for amendments to transportation plans, comprehensive plans or land use regulations.

In the 1991 Highway Plan, levels of service were defined by a letter grade from A-F, with each grade representing a range of volume to capacity ratios. A level of service of A represented virtually free flow traffic with few or no interruptions while level of service F indicated bumper-to-bumper, stop-and-go traffic. However, each letter grade actually represented a range of traffic conditions, which made the policy difficult to implement. This Highway Plan maintains a similar concept for measuring highway performance, but represents levels of service by specific volume to capacity ratios to improve clarity and ease of implementation.
A volume to capacity ratio \((v/c)\) is the peak hour traffic volume \((\text{vehicles/hour})\) on a highway section divided by the maximum volume that the highway section can handle. For example, when \(v/c\) equals 0.85, peak hour traffic uses 85 percent of a highway’s capacity; 15 percent of the capacity is not used. If the traffic volume entering a highway section exceeds the section’s capacity, traffic queues will form and lengthen for as long as there is excessive demand. When \(v/c\) is less than but close to 1.0 (e.g., 0.95), traffic flow becomes very unstable. Small disruptions can cause traffic flow to break down and long traffic queues to form. This is a particular concern for freeways because the capacity of a freeway under stop-and-go traffic conditions is lower than the capacity when traffic is flowing smoothly.

The Department and Transportation Commission are concerned that mobility standards may have the unintended effect of discouraging development in downtowns and encouraging development in urban fringe areas. This may occur where highways in downtowns and central business districts are near capacity. Plan amendments to allow more development in such areas are generally discouraged because there is inadequate highway capacity to support more intense use. By contrast, highway facilities in urbanizable areas may have excess capacity which allow land use plan amendments that increase development. The plan attempts to offset this unintended effect by varying the mobility standards by type of area, as shown by Table 6. Furthermore, the policy in Action 1F.3 allows alternate standards to be adopted in metropolitan areas, Special Transportation Areas (STAs) and constrained areas.

Alternate standards for the Portland metropolitan area have been included in the policy (Table 7). These standards have been adopted with an understanding of the unique context and policy choices that have been made by local governments in that area including:

- A legally enforceable regional plan prescribing minimum densities, mixed use development and multi-modal transportation options;
- Primary reliance on high capacity transit to provide additional capacity in the radial freeway corridors serving the central city;
- Implementation of an Advanced Traffic Management System including freeway ramp meters, real time traffic monitoring and incident response to maintain adequate traffic flow; and
- An air quality attainment/maintenance plan that relies heavily on reducing auto trips through land use changes and increases in transit service.

The alternative standards are granted to the Portland metropolitan area with a mutual understanding that reduced mobility standards will result in congestion that will not be reduced by state highway improvements. Alternative standards may also be approved for other metropolitan areas or portions thereof to support integrated land use and transportation plans for promoting compact development.

Although non-metropolitan areas do not face the same magnitude of traffic and land use pressures as do metropolitan areas, they may include Special Transportation Areas or may face environmental or land use constraints that make it infeasible to provide an adequate road network to serve planned development. For example, in a number of coastal cities, highway and other road improvements are severely limited by the presence of unstable terrain and the coast, sensitive wetlands and endangered plants and animals. In these places
it may not be feasible to improve the transportation system to the degree necessary to accommodate the reasonable use of properties in accordance with acknowledged comprehensive plans. In such circumstances, the standards in Table 6 might also preclude comprehensive plan changes that carry out the Land Use and Transportation Policy (1B) such as compact development in a Special Transportation Area. Therefore, the Transportation Commission may adopt alternate standards to accommodate development where practical difficulties make conformance with the highway mobility standards infeasible.

Local governments may adopt higher operating standards if desired, but the standards in Tables 6 and 7 must be used for deficiency analyses of state highways.

The policy also anticipates that there will be instances where the standards are exceeded and the deficiencies are correctable but the necessary transportation improvements are not planned. This may be due to environmental or land use constraints or to a lack of adequate funding. In these circumstances, the Department of Transportation’s objective is to improve highway performance as much as possible and to avoid further degradation of performance where improvements are not possible. Action 1F.5 gives examples of actions that may be undertaken to improve performance.

Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Standards

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to use highway mobility standards to maintain acceptable and reliable levels of mobility on the state highway system. These standards shall be used for:*

- **Identifying state highway mobility performance expectations for planning and plan implementation;**

- **Evaluating the impacts on state highways of amendments to transportation plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations pursuant to the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12-060);** and

- **Guiding operations decisions such as managing access and traffic control systems to maintain acceptable highway performance.**

**Action 1F.1**

Apply the highway mobility standards below and in Table 6 to all state highway sections located outside of the Portland metropolitan area urban growth boundary and the standards below and in Table 7 to all state highway sections located within the Portland metropolitan area urban growth boundary.

- On portions of highways where there are no intersections, the volume to capacity ratios in Tables 6 and 7 shall not be exceeded for either direction of travel on the highway.

- At unsignalized intersections and road approaches, the volume to capacity ratios in Tables 6 and 7 shall not be exceeded for either of the state highway approaches that are not stopped. Approaches at which
traffic must stop, or otherwise yield the right of way, shall be operated to maintain safe operation of the intersection and all of its approaches and shall not exceed the volume to capacity ratios for District/Local Interest Roads in Table 7 within urban growth boundaries or 0.80 outside of urban growth boundaries.

- At signalized intersections other than crossroads of freeway ramps (see below), the total volume to capacity ratio for the intersection considering all critical movements shall not exceed the volume to capacity ratios in Tables 6 and 7. Where two state highways of different classifications intersect, the lower of the volume to capacity ratios in the tables shall apply. Where a state highway intersects with a local road or street, the volume to capacity ratio for the state highway shall apply.

- Although a freeway interchange serves both the freeway and the crossroad to which it connects, it is important that the interchange be managed to maintain safe and efficient operation of the freeway through the interchange area. The main problem to avoid is the formation of traffic queues on freeway off-ramps which back up into the portions of the ramps needed for safe deceleration from freeway speeds. This is a significant traffic safety concern. The primary cause of traffic queuing at freeway off-ramps is inadequate capacity at the intersections of the freeway ramps with the crossroad. These intersections are referred to as ramp terminals. In many instances where ramp terminals connect with another state highway, the volume to capacity standard for the connecting highway will generally be adequate to avoid traffic backups onto the freeway. However, in some instances where the crossroad is another state highway or a local road, the standards will not be sufficient to avoid this problem. Therefore, the maximum volume to capacity ratio for the ramp terminals of interchange ramps shall be the smaller of the values of the volume to capacity ratio for the crossroad, or 0.85.

At an interchange within a metropolitan area where a majority of the interchange access management area (Policy 3C) of the interchange is developed, the maximum volume to capacity ratio may be increased to as much as 0.90, but no higher than the standard for the crossroad, if:

1. It can be determined, with a probability equal to or greater than 95 percent, that vehicle queues would not extend into the portion of the ramp needed to accommodate deceleration from freeway speed; and

2. The interchange access management area is retrofitted to comply, as much as possible, with the standards contained in Policy 3C of this plan.

For the purposes of this policy, the portion of the freeway ramp needed to accommodate deceleration shall be the distance, along the centerline of the ramp, needed to bring a vehicle to a full stop from the posted freeway speed at a deceleration rate of 6.5 feet/second$^2$ (two meters/second$^2$).
• Because the freeway ramps serve as an area where vehicles accelerate or decelerate to or from freeway speeds, the maximum volume to capacity ratio for the interchange ramps exclusive of the crossroad terminals shall be the standard for the freeway with the following exception. For freeway on-ramps where entering traffic is metered to maintain efficient operation of the freeway through the interchange area, the maximum volume to capacity ratio may be higher.

• The Director of the Department of Transportation or his/her delegate shall have the authority to adopt methods for calculating and applying the volume to capacity ratio standards in this policy or any alternative standards adopted pursuant to this policy.

**Action 1F.2**

Apply the highway mobility standards over a 20-year planning horizon when developing state, regional or local transportation system plans, including ODOT’s corridor plans. When evaluating highway mobility for amendments to transportation system plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations, use the planning horizons in adopted local and regional transportation system plans or a planning horizon of 15 years from the proposed date of amendment adoption, whichever is greater. To determine the effect an amendment to a transportation system plan, acknowledged comprehensive plan or land use regulation has on a state facility, the capacity analysis shall include the forecasted growth of traffic on the state highway due to regional and intercity travel and to full development according to the applicable acknowledged comprehensive plan over the planning period.

**Action 1F.3**

Where it would be infeasible to meet the standards in this policy, consider adopting alternate highway mobility standards for:

• Metropolitan areas or portions thereof to support an integrated land use and transportation plan for promoting compact development, reducing the use of automobiles and increasing the use of other modes of transportation, promoting efficient use of transportation infrastructure, and improving air quality;

• Special Transportation Areas (STAs); and

---

4 Full development, for the purposes of this policy, means the amount of population and employment growth and associated travel anticipated by the community’s acknowledged comprehensive plan over the planning period. The Transportation Commission encourages communities to consider and adopt land use plan amendments that would reallocate expected population and employment growth to designated community centers to reduce reliance on state highways.

5 This policy does not prescribe minimum or maximum sizes for portions of metropolitan areas that would qualify for alternative standards. Nevertheless, the area must be of the size necessary to support compact development, reduce the use of automobiles and increase the use of other modes of transportation, promote efficient use of transportation infrastructure, and improve air quality.
Areas where severe environmental or land use constraints\textsuperscript{6} make infeasible the transportation improvements necessary to accommodate reasonable use of properties in accordance with acknowledged comprehensive plans or to accommodate comprehensive plan changes that carry out the Land Use and Transportation Policy (1B).

The alternative standards shall be clear and objective and shall be related to \( v/c \) (e.g., corridor-average \( v/c \), network-average \( v/c \), and the ratio of average daily traffic and hourly capacity (adt/c)). The standards shall be adopted as part of a regional and/or local transportation system plan. The plan shall demonstrate that it would be infeasible to meet the highway mobility standards in this policy. In addition, the plan shall include all feasible actions for:

- Providing a network of local streets, collectors and arterials to relieve traffic demand on state highways and to provide convenient pedestrian and bicycle ways;
- Managing access and traffic operations to minimize traffic accidents, avoid traffic backups on freeway ramps, and make the most efficient use of highway capacity;
- Managing traffic demand, where feasible, to manage peak hour traffic loads on state highways;
- Providing alternative modes of transportation; and
- Managing land use to limit vehicular demand on state highways consistent with the Land Use and Transportation Policy (1B).

The plan shall include a financially feasible implementation program and shall demonstrate strong public and private commitment to carry out the identified improvements and other actions.

In metropolitan areas, the alternate highway mobility standards will become effective only after the standards have been approved by the metropolitan planning organization and adopted by the Transportation Commission.

Outside of metropolitan areas, the alternate highway mobility standards will become effective only after the Transportation Commission has adopted them in a corridor plan or in a portion of a corridor plan.

\textit{Action 1F.4}

Develop corridor plans for Interstate Highways, other freeways and designated highway freight routes in the Portland metropolitan area that are important for through travel. Develop standards for those routes to provide adequate levels of highway mobility.

\textsuperscript{6} Examples of severe environmental and land use constraints include endangered species, sensitive wetlands, and historic districts.
**Action 1F.5**

For purposes of preparing planning documents such as corridor plans and transportation system plans, in situations where the volume to capacity ratio for a highway segment is [substandard] above the standards in Table 6 or Table 7, or those otherwise approved by the Commission, and transportation improvements are not planned within the planning horizon to bring performance to standard because of severe environmental, land use or financial constraints, the performance standard for the highway segment shall be to improve performance as much as feasible and to avoid further degradation of performance where no performance improvements are feasible. Examples of actions that might improve performance include the following:

- Reconfigure highway and side-street accesses to minimize traffic conflicts at intersections;
- Limit parking near signalized intersections to increase intersection capacity;
- Coordinate and operate traffic signals to improve traffic progression;
- Relocate driveways and improve local road connections to direct traffic away from overburdened intersections and intersections where side-street capacity is limited in order to optimize traffic progression on the state highway;
- Improve turning-radii at intersections that are heavily used by trucks to avoid lane blockages;
- Install raised medians to reduce traffic conflicts;
- Improve accesses so that traffic can enter or exit the highway with minimal disruptions of flow; and
- Manage land uses to favor types of uses that generate less traffic or traffic peaks which do not coincide with traffic peaks on the highway. This could be done by making appropriate plan amendments or changes to zoning ordinances.

Local governments may also request that the Transportation Commission adopt alternate standards in accordance with Action 1F.3.

**Action 1F.6**

For purposes of evaluating amendments to transportation system plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations subject to OAR 660-12-060, in situations where the volume to capacity ratio for a highway segment, intersection or interchange is [substandard] above the standards in Table 6 or Table 7, or those otherwise approved by the Commission, and transportation improvements are not planned within the planning horizon to bring performance to standard, the performance standard is to avoid further degradation. If an amendment to a transportation system plan, acknowledged
comprehensive plan or land use regulation increases the volume to capacity ratio further, it will significantly affect the facility.
### Table 6: Maximum Volume to Capacity Ratios for Peak Hour Operating Conditions Through a Planning Horizon for State Highway Sections Located Outside the Portland Metropolitan Area Urban Growth Boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Category</th>
<th>Inside Urban Growth Boundary</th>
<th>Outside Urban Growth Boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STAs</td>
<td>MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Highways and Statewide (NHS) Expressways</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (NHS) Freight Routes</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (NHS) Non-Freight Routes and Regional or District Expressways</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Highways</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Local Interest Roads</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6 Notes:**

- Interstates and Expressways shall not be identified as Special Transportation Areas (STAs).
- For the purposes of this policy, the peak hour shall be the 30th highest annual hour. This approximates weekday peak hour traffic in larger urban areas.
- For the purposes of Policy 1F and Table 6, the MPO category includes areas within the planning boundaries of the Eugene/Springfield, Medford and Salem/Keizer Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and any other MPO areas that are designated after the adoption of this plan.
Table 7: Maximum Volume to Capacity Ratios for Two Hour Peak Operating Conditions Through a 20-Year Horizon for State Highway Sections within the Portland Metropolitan Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Category</th>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2040 Concept Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Highways and Statewide (NHS) Expressways</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (NHS) Freight Routes</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (NHS) Non-Freight Routes and Regional or District Expressways</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Highways</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Local Interest Roads</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Notes:
- The volume to capacity ratios in the table are for the highest two consecutive hours of weekday traffic volumes. This is calculated by dividing the traffic volume for the average weekly two-hour PM peak by twice the hourly capacity.
- 2040 Concept Areas include the Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Station Communities, and Main Streets identified in Metro’s adopted Region 2040 Growth Concept.
- Alternate standards may be developed in corridor plans for Interstate Highways, other freeways and NHS freight routes to provide adequate levels of highway mobility for through travel.
Major Improvements

Background
Since road construction is very expensive and funding is very limited, it is unlikely that many new highways will be built in the future. Instead, the emphasis will be on maintaining the current system and improving the efficiency of the highways the State already has. The Major Improvements Policy reflects this reality by directing ODOT and local jurisdictions to do everything possible to protect and improve the efficiency of the highway system before adding new highway facilities. This policy carries out the direction of the Oregon Benchmarks. This direction includes improving traffic operations and maintaining the roadway for legal size vehicle travel. These priorities—laid out in Action 1G.1—take precedence over the other actions in this policy.

Policy 1G: Major Improvements

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to maintain highway performance and improve safety by improving system efficiency and management before adding capacity. ODOT will work in partnership with regional and local governments to address highway performance and safety needs.*

**Action 1G.1**

Use the following priorities for developing corridor plans, transportation system plans, the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, and project plans to respond to highway needs. Implement higher priority measures first unless a lower priority measure is clearly more cost-effective or unless it clearly better supports safety, growth management, or other livability and economic viability considerations. Plans must document the findings which support using lower priority measures before higher priority measures.

1. **Protect the existing system.** The highest priority is to preserve the functionality of the existing highway system by means such as access management, local comprehensive plans, transportation demand management, improved traffic operations, and alternative modes of transportation.

2. **Improve efficiency and capacity of existing highway facilities.** The second priority is to make minor improvements to existing highway facilities such as widening highway shoulders or adding auxiliary lanes, providing better access for alternative modes (e.g., bike lanes, sidewalks, bus shelters), extending or connecting local streets, and making other off-system improvements.

3. **Add capacity to the existing system.** The third priority is to make major roadway improvements to existing highway facilities such as adding general purpose lanes and making alignment corrections to accommodate legal size vehicles.

4. **Add new facilities to the system.** The lowest priority is to add new transportation facilities such as a new highway or bypass.
**Action 1G.2**

Support any major improvements to state highway facilities in local comprehensive plans and transportation system plans only if the improvements meet all of the following conditions:

- The improvement is needed to satisfy a state transportation objective or objectives;
- The scope of the project is reasonably identified, considering the long-range projection of need;
- The improvement was identified through a planning process that included:
  - Thorough public involvement;
  - Evaluation of reasonable transportation and land use alternatives including measures for managing the existing transportation system and for reducing demands for highway capacity; and
  - Sufficient environmental analysis at the fatal flaw planning level.
- The plan includes measures to manage the transportation system, but these measures will not satisfy identified highway needs during the planning period or there is a need to preserve a future transportation corridor for future needs beyond the planning period;
- The improvement would be a cost-effective means to achieve the objective(s);
- The proposed timing of the improvement is consistent with priorities established in corridor plans and regional transportation plans and the financing program identifies construction as being dependent on the future availability of funds;
- Funding for the project can reasonably be expected at the time the project is ready for development and construction;
- The local government schedules funding for local street improvements in its local transportation financing program if these are needed to attain the objectives of the major improvement; and
- The plan includes policies and implementing measures that protect the corridor and its intended function.

ODOT recognizes that transportation system plans may identify needs and regional and local governments may defer decisions regarding function, mode, and general location of a long-range project to a refinement plan as described in the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12-025). Before ODOT will agree to any improvements on the state highway system, the improvements must conform to the requirements in this Action.

**Action 1G.3**

Through an intergovernmental agreement, implement a cost-sharing agreement when a project has major benefits to the local system, especially when local sponsors of the
project envision purposes beyond those needed to meet state transportation objectives.

**Action 1G.4**

Design major improvements for limited access to protect through traffic movements. Develop and implement an access management intergovernmental agreement and require the local jurisdiction to adopt supporting actions in the local comprehensive plan.

**Action 1G.5**

As part of project development, negotiate an intergovernmental agreement with the local jurisdiction affected by a major improvement such as a bypass and transfer the ownership of the state routes that are bypassed to the local jurisdiction at the completion of the project.

**Action 1G.6**

Consider purchasing or otherwise protecting right-of-way, consistent with state, regional or local plans, in locations where projects will be necessary in the future.
Goal 2: System Management

To work with local jurisdictions and federal agencies to create an increasingly seamless transportation system with respect to the development, operation, and maintenance of the highway and road system that:

- Safeguards the state highway system by maintaining functionality and integrity;
- Ensures that local mobility and accessibility needs are met; and
- Enhances system efficiency and safety.

Overview

Working towards a seamless highway and road system is a goal based on the need to increase system efficiencies in an environment of limited funding. The term “seamless” implies an integrated system in which a user does not recognize changes in jurisdiction or responsibilities. The state highways and local roads function as a single, integrated system. It is a system where:

- System efficiencies and safety are enhanced through interjurisdictional partnerships;
- Management responsibilities of two or more agencies are consolidated at a single agency to achieve more consistent roadway function and management;
- Duplicative functions such as maintenance responsibilities are eliminated through cooperative agreements between state and local jurisdictions;
- Technologies, such as Intelligent Transportation System technologies, are compatible across jurisdictional boundaries; and
- Federal, state, and local funding sources are flexible for improvements that provide the most benefit, regardless of management responsibilities.

Interjurisdictional Relations

Background

The Oregon Transportation Plan acknowledges that the relationships between federal, regional, and local jurisdictions, and ODOT are crucial for the future of the state’s highway system. It also recognizes that ODOT has direct relationships with citizens, businesses and affected communities that must be fostered and maintained.
As funding for transportation continues to lag behind the rate of inflation and maintenance needs, the ability to form partnerships and find efficiencies to stretch scarce resources farther will become more important for both economic development and quality of life issues throughout the state.

Three overlapping components would further interjurisdictional relationships:

- Creation of cooperative partnerships;
- Funding of off-system improvements; and
- Interjurisdictional transfer of roads.

Improving the relationship between ODOT and local jurisdictions is a starting point for increasing efficiency and eventually creating a seamless transportation system. An integrated system can reduce the confusion created by overlapping jurisdictions, services, and development requirements. Such a seamless system would share decision-making authority through cooperative arrangements to develop, operate, and maintain the state highway and local road systems. Partnership opportunities between ODOT, local jurisdictions, and federal agencies are necessary to help meet both state and local needs.

ODOT should also consider off-system improvements as a means of enhancing the state/regional transportation system. Off-system improvements may provide a cost-effective alternative to increasing the capacity of the state highway system, while helping to meet both state and local needs. ODOT can accomplish off-system improvements to enhance or preserve the state highway system by funding specific local modernization projects that will provide direct benefits to the state highway system or by involving ODOT staff in planning efforts to identify and address future local land use or transportation activities that will have an impact on the state highway system. This policy does not represent a commitment of funds to specific local projects.

Interjurisdictional road transfers (from ODOT to local jurisdictions, or from local jurisdictions to ODOT) currently occur on an ad hoc basis, with basic issues such as condition at time of transfer, funding for maintenance, and ongoing operational responsibilities negotiated on a case-by-case basis. These transfers should occur on a more systematic basis.

ODOT recognizes that, with limited funding, segments of state highways that do not serve state functions will receive less attention than they deserve. These segments are often urban arterials primarily serving local traffic, frontage roads, farm-to-market roads and other roads that function like city and county streets and roads. ODOT sees its role as serving mainly regional and statewide interests. To appropriately align responsibilities for these state-owned Local Interest Roads, ODOT proposes to develop a process with cities and counties to transfer them to local jurisdictions.

At the same time, there are local roads that are serving primarily through traffic or providing connections between state highways. Local governments and ODOT may be interested in transferring these to state jurisdiction.

The Oregon Transportation Plan stresses the importance of public participation, information, and education in the development and implementation of policies, programs, and projects to achieve the State’s transportation goals. In Policy 2D ODOT recognizes that public involvement programs are an important part of building relationships with users and communities to ensure that highway development and maintenance projects meet Oregonians’ needs.
Policy 2A: Partnerships

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to establish cooperative partnerships to make more efficient and effective use of limited resources to develop, operate, and maintain the highway and road system. These partnerships are relationships among ODOT and state and federal agencies, regional governments, cities, counties, tribal governments, and the private sector.*

**Action 2A.1**
Support planning and development of highway and local road projects which enhance the seamless qualities of a transportation system which balances state, regional, and local needs.

**Action 2A.2**
Continue and increase the number of partnerships with federal agencies, tribal governments, and regional and local jurisdictions to share planning, development, operational and maintenance responsibilities, and address aspects of a seamless management system. Seek funding for the partnership process.

**Action 2A.3**
Investigate the legality of combining federal, state, regional, local and/or private funding to achieve the most effective, efficient expenditure of public money for transportation; encourage flexibility in the application of such funds.

**Action 2A.4**
Establish partnerships with the private sector where doing so will provide cost efficiencies to the state and advance state goals.

**Action 2A.5**
With Washington State, support cooperative strategic planning for the bi-state Columbia River bridges and coordinate other transportation projects in corridors approaching the bridges on each side of the river.

Policy 2B: Off-System Improvements

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to provide state financial assistance to local jurisdictions to develop, enhance, and maintain improvements on local transportation systems when they are a cost-effective way to improve the operation of the state highway system if:*

- The off-system costs are less than or equal to on-system costs, and/or the benefits to the state system are equal to or greater than those achieved by investing in on-system improvements;

- Local jurisdictions adopt land use, access management and other policies and ordinances to assure the continued benefit of the off-system improvement to the state highway system;
• **Local jurisdictions agree to provide advance notice to ODOT of any land use decisions that may impact the off-system improvement in such a way as to adversely impact the state highway system; and**

• **Local jurisdictions agree to a minimum maintenance level for the off-system improvement that will assure the continued benefit of the off-system improvement to the state highway system.**

**Action 2B.1**
Establish statewide criteria to identify and prioritize potential off-system improvements.

**Action 2B.2**
Develop a model intergovernmental agreement that addresses access management and land use restrictions, notification requirements, design standards, and maintenance issues.

**Action 2B.3**
Continue to participate in local transportation and land use planning to identify and mitigate potential actions that will adversely impact the state highway system or undermine the benefits to the state system of off-system improvements.

**Action 2B.4**
In preparing corridor plans, transportation system plans and project plans, work with local governments to identify and evaluate off-system improvements that would be cost-effective in improving performance of the state highway.

**Policy 2C: Interjurisdictional Transfers**

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to consider, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, interjurisdictional transfers that:*

• **Rationalize and simplify the management responsibilities along a particular roadway segment or corridor;**

• **Reflect the appropriate functional classification of a particular roadway segment or corridor; and/or**

• **Lead to increased efficiencies in the operation and maintenance of a particular roadway segment or corridor.**

**Action 2C.1**
Working with local governments, define criteria for identifying state roads and highways that serve primarily local interests and local highways, roads, and streets that serve primarily state interests. The criteria should address land use, trip purposes, highway mobility standards, and access management.
Identify potential roads and highways for interjurisdictional transfer. The state roads and highways to be transferred to local jurisdictions may include:

- Urban arterials serving primarily local travel needs;
- Urban streets that have remained state-owned after a parallel major improvement has been constructed;
- Frontage roads;
- Farm-to-market roads;
- Other roads that function like county roads; and
- Connector roadways between highways. (These facilities do not include continuous highway segments that extend through a local jurisdiction.)

Local roads to be transferred to the state may include:

- Urban arterials that serve mainly through traffic; and
- Rural routes that have a statewide economic importance.

**Action 2C.2**

Establish criteria to guide decisions to transfer roads, including appropriate compensation, roadway conditions, maintenance agreements, and management and operational standards to maintain the functionality of the facility. Criteria for consideration of transfers should include but are not limited to:

- The importance of the facility to the functionality of the statewide system and the impacts of the transfer on that functionality. Changes in maintenance, highway mobility, or other standards resulting from the transfer should not negatively impact the function of other nearby state facilities;
- The land use vision of the local community;
- The condition or standard of the facility at the time of transfer and its meeting an agreed upon serviceability standard; and
- Appropriate compensation for the exchange that is determined during negotiation through an analysis which equalizes or balances the relative values of each transaction between the State and the local jurisdiction.

**Action 2C.3**

Develop a decision-making process for interjurisdictional transfers that includes the following:

- The Oregon Transportation Commission finds that the state highway is no longer needed to meet the functional needs of the system, or the local road is needed to meet the functional needs of the state system. The Oregon Transportation Commission solicits comments from the affected jurisdictions and the public;
• The State signs an intergovernmental agreement with the local jurisdiction which addresses compensation, roadway conditions, access management, maintenance, and operational standards;

• The local jurisdiction and ODOT both agree in writing to the transfer; and

• The extent and legal standing of any existing access rights and access management controls is documented and not contested by ODOT or the local jurisdiction.

Policy 2D: Public Involvement

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to ensure that citizens, businesses, regional and local governments, state agencies, and tribal governments have opportunities to have input into decisions regarding proposed policies, plans, programs, and improvement projects that affect the state highway system.*

**Action 2D.1**

Conduct effective public involvement programs that create opportunities for citizens, businesses, regional and local governments, state agencies, and tribal governments to comment on proposed policies, plans, programs, and improvement projects.

**Action 2D.2**

Increase public information and education about construction, operations, and maintenance activities.

**Action 2D.3**

Coordinate with local governments and other agencies to ensure that public involvement programs target affected citizens, businesses, neighborhoods, and communities, as well as the general public.

**Action 2D.4**

Evaluate agency public involvement programs on a regular basis to ensure the programs are effective in involving a broad range of the public in agency planning and decision-making processes.

## Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

**Background**

When integrated into the transportation system, a number of information processing, communication, control, and electronic technologies can save lives, save time, and save money. These technologies are known collectively as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). In Oregon, many public and private transportation providers are using these technologies to assist in the day-to-day problems of moving people and goods.
• In the Portland area, closed circuit television and other traffic surveillance devices and methods allow ODOT to rapidly detect and respond to incidents on the urban freeway system. By clearing incidents quickly, traffic flow can return to normal and minimize inconvenience and delay to travelers and freight haulers. They can also detect congestion occurrences and allow traffic managers to use technologies such as ramp metering, variable message signs, internet, kiosks, and other technologies to alert users of potential delays and advise them of alternative routes.

• At the Farewell Bend port of entry near Ontario, in the Operation Greenlight Project, trucks that are equipped with an inexpensive communication device that mounts on the cab windshield can be uniquely identified, weighed, and checked against a computerized database within seconds while the trucks are traveling at highway speed. If a truck is found to be traveling legally, it is given a signal through the communication device and is allowed to proceed down Interstate 84 without stopping at the weigh station.

• Traveler information involving traffic, construction, road conditions, traveler services, and weather can significantly improve travel in both rural and urban areas.

• Public transit applications of ITS, including traveler information and global positioning dispatching systems, have been shown to improve transit performance.

• Incident detection and response along rural highways is a growing concern in Oregon. ITS technologies such as cellular call-in services and mayday systems are in use or the subjects of experiments in the United States at this time.

ITS can effectively provide additional road capacity without increasing the physical size of the facility. Opposition to adding lanes, as well as the cost of building them, makes ITS an attractive alternative. To keep pace with the growth of vehicle miles traveled, the U.S. Department of Transportation predicts that the United States will need to build 34 percent more highway capacity. For 50 cities, the 10-year cost is estimated to be $150 billion. Implementing an ITS solution could cost much less and provide significant portions of the needed capacity.

Sixty percent of the delay on congested freeways can be attributed to incidents. A highway accident increases the risk of an additional accident by a factor of six, according to a study of accident statistics on several California highways and expressways. National studies assessing incident management programs estimates that by reducing the time it takes to detect and respond to freeway accidents from the current national average of 5.2 minutes to 3 minutes, accident fatalities would be expected to decline by 10 percent. Incident response on rural highways can make similar gains.

Policy 2E: Intelligent Transportation Systems

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to consider a broad range of Intelligent Transportation Systems services to improve system efficiency and safety in a cost-effective manner. Deployment of ITS shall reflect the user service priorities established in the Oregon Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Plan. Specifically:

• Incident Management

• En-route Driver Information
• **Traffic Control (Arterials and Freeways)**
• **Route Guidance**
• **Commercial Vehicle Electronic Clearance**
• **Pre-trip Travel Information**
• **Public Transportation Management**
• **Emergency Notification and Personal Security**
• **Emergency Vehicle Management**
• **Commercial Fleet Management**

**Action 2E.1**

Establish planning, management, budgeting, and project selection processes within ODOT to encourage timely, cost-effective deployment of ITS applications, including:

- Creating and maintaining an ITS office in the Oregon Department of Transportation to evaluate and implement ITS, implement ITS strategies, provide outreach and coordination among agencies, technology integration, education and program development and assessment, and partnership;
- Encouraging the use of ITS in corridor and transportation system plans and ITS proposals in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program process; and
- Creating budgets for ITS operational and maintenance requirements within the ODOT Regions.

**Action 2E.2**

Expand traffic management capabilities in metropolitan areas through the use of ramp meters, variable message signs and closed circuit television to address recurrent congestion and enhance incident management.

**Action 2E.3**

Expand incident management capabilities in metropolitan areas and along key freight and recreational routes around the state where traffic incidents cause severe non-recurrent congestion.

**Action 2E.4**

Continue to advance commercial vehicle applications of ITS such as the Greenlight Project.

**Action 2E.5**

Work with local and regional governments and law enforcement agencies to deploy an effective advanced traffic management system in each metropolitan area.
Action 2E.6
Create a statewide network for real time weather, road condition, traffic, traveler services, and public transportation information.

Action 2E.7
Encourage transit operators and emergency service providers to develop standardized dispatching, vehicle monitoring, and vehicle priority systems.

Action 2E.8
Create a toolbox of standardized ITS applications that can be applied in small cities and rural areas. These products will emphasize enhancements for safety, traveler information, incident response, and congestion relief.

Action 2E.9
Foster public/private partnerships to further ITS development and funding.

Action 2E.10
Develop an advanced high speed telecommunications facility to serve as the communications backbone to statewide ITS deployment in partnership with private communications providers.

Action 2E.11
Develop partnership opportunities with neighboring states for the installation of ITS technologies and for opportunities to share services and information.

Action 2E.12
Support ITS planning, development, and implementation in corridor plans and local transportation system plans.

Traffic Safety

Background
In 1996, 316 people died in the 23,053 motor vehicle crashes occurring on Oregon’s state highway system. Eighty percent of these fatal crashes occurred on rural highways. Speed contributed to over 17 percent of the fatal crashes, and driving under the influence of intoxicants was a factor in 43 percent of the crashes. About half of the fatal crashes occurred during adverse weather conditions and a third on wet or icy pavement. In the cases where restraint usage was known, 42 percent of those killed were not using a safety belt. Thirteen percent of fatalities on the state highway system were non-motorists (11 percent pedestrians, 2 percent bicyclists).

Fatality and injury statistics show that the majority of all crashes are caused by some error on the driver’s part. According to a Michigan study, approximately 80 percent of events causing crashes are due to driver error, 15 percent are due to environmental or roadway conditions, and 5 percent are due to vehicle defects.
ODOT has the responsibility to consider safety in all construction, maintenance, and operating activities on the state highway system. This includes implementation of programs that improve the safety of historically or potentially hazardous sites and routes and programs that address system-wide safety issues. The Oregon Transportation Plan gives safety a high priority in Policy 1G in declaring that “the policy of the State of Oregon is to improve continually the safety of all facets of statewide transportation for system users including operators, passengers, pedestrians, recipients of goods and services, and property owners.”

The Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan further clarifies the 12 actions in the Oregon Transportation Plan. Policy 2F and its actions are based on these adopted policies and priorities.

Three elements are critical to successfully solving any traffic safety issue: engineering, education, and enforcement. Some include another element: emergency medical services. Engineering fixes tend to focus on the driving environment: e.g., improving the road design; improving site distance, illumination, signing and striping; making the shoulder area safer; assessing conditions to establish appropriate speeds; constructing median barriers; and managing access to highways. Solutions to safety problems should also consider the use of non-engineering elements, including coordinating and enhancing state, city, and county law enforcement; involving business, the media, community safety groups, and schools in educational efforts; developing incident management programs; and establishing Corridor Safety Improvement Projects.

Policy 2F: Traffic Safety

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to continually improve safety for all users of the highway system using solutions involving engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services.*

**Action 2F.1**
Establish a process to develop and implement the most cost-effective solutions to high priority safety problems.

**Action 2F.2**
Whenever safety improvement is the stated objective of the project, include goals and a process to evaluate the outcome and further refine the project selection and solution process.

**Action 2F.3**
In identifying solutions to traffic safety problems, consider solutions including, but not limited to:

- Increasing traffic enforcement;
- Involving business and community groups and the media in educational efforts;
- Using educational materials and special signing to change driving practices;
• Making engineering improvements such as geometrics, signing, lighting, striping, signals, improving sight distance, and assessing conditions to establish appropriate speed;

• Constructing appropriate bicycle and pedestrian facilities including safe and convenient crossings;

• Managing access to the highway;

• Developing incident response and motorist assistance programs;

• Ensuring the uniformity of traffic control devices; and

• Developing driver information systems.

**Action 2F.4**
Continue to develop and implement the Safety Management System to target resources to sites and routes with the most significant safety problems. Encourage local governments to adopt a safety management system.

**Action 2F.5**
Seek additional funding for state and local traffic law enforcement.

**Action 2F.6**
Work with citizens and local jurisdictions to address safety concerns on the state highway system.

### Rail and Highway Compatibility

**Background**
In 1997, there were 148 at-grade highway-railroad public grade crossings on Oregon state highways. Each represents the potential for serious injury or death, even if equipped with gates and lights. Despite Oregon’s nationally recognized success in reducing collisions at public grade crossings, the increase in both vehicle and train traffic presents on-going challenges in protecting both the motoring public and train passengers and crews.

Several types of situations can cause conflict between highway and railroad operations at grade crossings:

• Routine maintenance on a roadway, such as an overlay which leaves the track area untouched or a track resurfacing which makes the tracks higher than the adjacent roadway surface.

• Queuing roadway traffic at intersections near rail crossings which results in trapping motorists on the tracks as a train is approaching.

• Roadway design at a rail crossing, including a road expanse wider than two lanes, the angle of intersection of roadway and tracks, the location of the crossing in relation to existing track
devices (switches, multiple tracks, etc.), driveways near the intersection of the track and roadway, and obstructions to motorists’ views of approaching trains.

To increase safety and efficiency, ODOT is directed by statute “to achieve uniform and coordinated regulation of railroad-highway crossings and to eliminate crossings at grade wherever possible [and] to control and regulate the construction, alteration, and protection of railroad-highway crossings.” (ORS 824.202) The 1995 Legislature transferred this authority from the Oregon Public Utility Commission to ODOT.

Statutory authority means that ODOT has the responsibility of meeting the stated objective of uniformity, construction, alteration, and closure over all public crossings. This includes not only crossings of state highways, but also crossings of county roads and city streets. When a road authority wants to construct or alter a crossing, it must file an application with the ODOT Rail Division. The Rail Division works with all the parties to reach an agreed upon course of action. Determination of whether a new crossing or alteration is justified is made on an individual basis. The process includes consideration of such factors as traffic circulation, pedestrian crossings, economic development, safety, congestion and rail traffic. Both Federal Railroad Administration direction and Oregon statutes call for elimination of grade crossings wherever possible.

Policy 2G: Rail and Highway Compatibility

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to increase safety and transportation efficiency through the reduction and prevention of conflicts between railroad and highway users.

Action 2G.1
Eliminate crossings at grade wherever possible. Give priority to closing those crossings with the greatest potential for train-vehicle conflicts. Where rail grade crossings provide an important route for local pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle circulation, the needs of these local movements should be considered.

Action 2G.2
Design highway projects to avoid or reduce rail crossings at grade.

Action 2G.3
In cooperation with railroads and local governments, target resources to increase safety through automated devices and enforcement at specific crossings.

Action 2G.4
Coordinate highway design, construction, resurfacing and traffic signals affecting rail crossings with the Oregon Department of Transportation Rail Division and the railroads.

Action 2G.5
Address pedestrian and bicycle access issues and design concerns when designing grade-separated crossings.
Goal 3: Access Management

To employ access management strategies to ensure safe and efficient highways consistent with their determined function, ensure the statewide movement of goods and services, enhance community livability and support planned development patterns, while recognizing the needs of motor vehicles, transit, pedestrians and bicyclists.

Overview

Access management is balancing access to developed land while ensuring movement of traffic in a safe and efficient manner. To achieve effective transportation it is necessary to have a blend and balance of road facilities. Each performs its unique function, since no single class of highway can provide both high levels of movement and high levels of access to property. The spectrum ranges from freeways that provide for ease of movement through higher speeds, higher capacity and freedom from interruption to local residential streets that serve a diverse group of users from pedestrians to garbage collectors and emergency response vehicles by providing ease of access through slow speeds and numerous driveways.

Because expanding population growth and transportation needs are placing increasing demands on the state highway system, there is intense pressure to allow businesses and individuals extensive access to the roadways. Access can be managed a number of different ways, including freeway interchange placement and design, driveway and road spacing and design, traffic signal location, median design and spacing of openings, connectivity and the use of turn lanes. The challenge is to determine how to best apply these access management techniques on Oregon’s state highway system to safely protect the highway efficiency and investment, contribute to the health of Oregon’s local, regional and statewide economies, and support and maintain livable communities.

Implementation of access management is essential if the safety, efficiency and investment of the existing and planned state highways are to be protected. Roads link together as a chain, and the roadway system is only as effective as its weakest link. The amount of access and how it is allowed to a state highway is a critical factor in determining how long the facility can remain functional, and is the largest contributor to safety. An uncontrolled number of driveways to a highway can cause it to be very unsafe, and some highways will not serve their intended function to carry people, freight, and goods throughout the state. Implementation of access management techniques produces a more constant traffic flow, which helps to reduce congestion, fuel consumption and air pollution.

Access Management

Background on Road Approaches (Driveways and Public Road Connections)

In Oregon, prior to 1949, a property owner could build a road approach (driveway or public road connection) to a highway at any location without obtaining permission. The State Legislature realized that highways would not operate safely or efficiently if this practice continued, and in 1949 a statute was passed that required all parties to receive written permission from ODOT or county governments, as appropriate, before constructing an approach road.
Since that time, property owners adjacent to state highways have been required to obtain an approach road permit from ODOT even though they have a “common law” right of access to the state highway. The common law right allows them to access the highway, and the permit process determines how and where the approach road can be safely constructed. While the statue requires that owners be allowed to access their property, it does not ensure that they can have an approach road wherever they desire. For example, ODOT is not obligated to issue an approach road permit when reasonable access is available, such as to a city street or a county road.

ODOT has the authority to purchase the right of access from property owners where appropriate. In some cases, such as along Interstate Highways, ODOT purchases the right of access in its entirety and the property owner no longer has any common law right to access the highway. In this case, a statement in the property owner’s chain of title will show that the right of access has been conveyed to ODOT.

In other cases, ODOT purchases access rights just along portions of properties. Gaps, called “reservations of access,” may remain along the property’s frontage. The reservation of access gives a property owner the common law right of access to the state highway only at specific locations. The property owner must still apply for a road approach permit at these locations.

Having a reservation of access in the deed does not guarantee that ODOT will permit a driveway at that location. For example, in the time since the reservation of access was established, traffic volumes may have increased significantly, travel speeds on the highway may have risen, the highway design may have changed (for example, by adding a passing lane), other approach roads may be too close, or alternate street connections may have been built. Any of these cases could make a new approach road unsafe or otherwise inappropriate.

In these cases, however, ODOT must still ensure that property owners have reasonable access to their property. If there is no reasonable access to the property leaving the property landlocked, ODOT may be required to purchase the property.

**Scope of the Policies**

The criteria in the Access Management Policies and the standards in Appendix C shall be applied to the development of all ODOT highway construction, reconstruction or modernization projects and approach road permits, as well as all planning processes involving state highways, including corridor plans, refinement plans, state and local transportation system plans and local comprehensive plans.

- All highway plans, including corridor plans and refinement plans, which have not been adopted on or before the effective date of the Access Management Policies, shall be subject to these policies. Local and regional transportation system plans adopted after January 1, 2000 shall be subject to these policies.

- All projects which have not published the draft environmental document at the effective date of the Access Management Policies shall be subject to these policies.

- Projects which have published the draft environmental document prior to the effective date of the Access Management Policies shall be evaluated individually by the Region Manager to determine to what extent these policies should be implemented.

The policy and procedures for Deviations and the standards in Appendix C, and the policy and procedures for Appeals portions of the Access Management Policies apply to local governments, private applicants, and state agencies, including ODOT, where there is a desire to apply standards
and criteria different than those outlined in the Access Management Policies, for the following instances:

- All approach road and private road crossing requests for approaches to state highways.
- New state highway construction projects and new highway plans.
- Any reconstruction or modernization work on state highways.

All proposed traffic control devices on the state highway system must have prior approval of the State Traffic Engineer and may include criteria not set forth in these policies.

Policy 3A: Classification and Spacing Standards

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to manage the location, spacing and type of road and street intersections and approach roads on state highways to assure the safe and efficient operation of state highways consistent with the classification of the highways.*

**Action 3A.1**

Manage access to state highways based on the access management classifications as defined below:

1. **Freeways (NHS) – Interstate and Non-Interstate**
   (Examples: I-5, I-84 (Interstate), and Oregon Route 217, US Route 26 from Interstate 405 west to Oregon Route 6 (Non-Interstate))
   - Freeways are multi-lane highways that provide for the most efficient and safe high speed and high volume traffic movement.
   - Interstate Freeways are subject to federal interstate standards as established by the Federal Highway Administration.
   - Freeways are subject to ODOT’s Interchange Policy.
   - ODOT owns the access rights and direct access is not allowed. Users may enter or exit the roadway only at interchanges.
     - Preference is given to through traffic.
     - Driveways are not allowed.
   - Traffic signals are not allowed.
   - Parking is prohibited.
   - Opposing travel lanes are separated by a wide median or a physical barrier.
   - Grade separated crossings that do not connect to the freeway are encouraged to meet local transportation needs and to enhance bicycle and pedestrian travel.
   - The primary function is to provide connections and links to major cities, regions of the state, and other states.
2. Statewide Highways (NHS)
   (Examples: Oregon Route 58, Oregon Route 42, US Route 30, US Route 97, and US Route 20)

   a. Rural Expressways
      • Expressways are to be designated by action of the Oregon Transportation Commission. (See Action 1A.2.)
      • Expressways are existing two lane and multi-lane highways or planned highways that provide for safe and efficient high speed and high volume traffic movements.
      • Private access is discouraged.
        – There is a long-range plan to eliminate, as possible, existing approach roads as opportunities occur or alternate access becomes available.
        – Access rights will be purchased and a local road network may be developed consistent with the function of the roadway.
      • Public road connections are highly controlled and must be spaced appropriately. Future grade separations (interchanges) may be an option. Compatible land use actions may be necessary and shall be included in local comprehensive plans.
      • Traffic signals are discouraged.
      • Nontraversable medians must be constructed in the modernization of all multi-lane Expressways that have traversible medians.
      • Parking is prohibited.
      • The primary function of Expressways is to provide connections to larger urban areas, ports and major recreation areas with minimal interruptions.

   b. Rural Other
      • Statewide Rural Highways provide for high speed, continuous flow and through traffic movement.
      • Direct access to the abutting property is a minor objective.
      • The function of the highway is consistent with purchasing access rights. As the opportunity arises, access rights should be purchased. Preference is to purchase access rights in full.
      • The primary function of these highways is to provide connections to larger urban areas, ports and major recreation areas of the state not served by Freeways or Expressways.

   c. Urban Expressways (Not inconsistent with, but supplemental to the criteria listed for Statewide Rural Expressways.)
• Traffic signals are discouraged. Where signals are allowed, their impact on through traffic must be minimized by ensuring that efficient progression of traffic is achieved.

• Median treatments are considered in accordance with criteria in Action 3B.3.

d. Urban Other (Not inconsistent with, but supplemental to the criteria listed for Statewide Rural Other.)

• Statewide Urban Highways provide high to moderate speed operations with limited interruptions in traffic flow.

e. Urban Business Areas (UBA) (See Policy 1B.)

• UBAs must be designated in a corridor plan and/or local transportation system plan and agreed upon by ODOT and the local government.

• Direct property access is less limited than on Statewide Urban Highways.

• Purchase of access control may be of lesser importance and access to adjacent land use is a higher priority.

• Redevelopment and in-fill development are encouraged.

• The needs of local auto, pedestrian, bicycle and transit movements to the area are balanced with the through movement of traffic.

f. Special Transportation Areas (STA) (See Policy 1B.)

• STAs must be designated in a corridor plan and/or local transportation system plan and agreed upon in writing by ODOT and the local government.

• STAs apply to a highway segment.

• Direct street connections and shared on-street parking are encouraged.

• Direct property access is limited.

• Purchase of access control may be of lesser importance and access to adjacent land use for all modes is a higher priority.

• Redevelopment and in-fill development are encouraged.

• Local auto, pedestrian, bicycle and transit movements to the area are generally given more importance than the through movement of traffic.

3. Regional Highways
(Examples: Oregon Route 99E, Oregon Route 138, Oregon Route 31, and Oregon Route 207)

a. Rural Expressways (Not inconsistent with, but supplemental to the criteria listed for Statewide Rural Expressways.)

• The primary function of these highways is to provide connections and links to regions within the state, and between small urbanized areas and larger population centers.
b. Rural Other

- Regional Rural Highways provide for efficient and safe medium to high speed and medium to high volume traffic movements.
- These highways serve as routes passing through areas which have moderate dependence on the highway to serve land access.
- The function of the highway supports selected acquisition of access rights. Purchase of access rights should be considered where beneficial such as, but not limited to, ensuring safe and efficient operation between connecting highways in interchange areas, protecting resource lands, preserving highway capacity on land adjacent to an urban growth boundary, or ensuring safety on segments with sharp curves, steep grades or restricted sight distance, or those with a history of accidents.
- The primary function of these highways is to provide connections and links to regions within the state, and between small urbanized areas and larger population centers through connections and links to Freeways, Expressways, or Statewide Highways.

c. Urban Expressways (Not inconsistent with, but supplemental to, the criteria listed for Regional Rural Expressways.)

- Where traffic signals are allowed, their impact on through traffic must be minimized by ensuring that efficient progression of traffic is achieved.
- Median treatments are considered in accordance with criteria in Action 3B.3.

d. Urban Other (Not inconsistent with, but supplemental to, the criteria listed for Regional Rural Other.)

- The function of the highway is consistent with selected acquisition of access rights. Purchase of access rights should be considered where beneficial such as, but not limited to, ensuring safe and efficient operation between connecting highways in interchange areas, protecting resource lands, or ensuring safety on segments with sharp curves, steep grades or restricted sight distance, or those with a history of accidents.

e. Urban Business Areas (UBA) (See Policy 1B. Same criteria as Statewide Urban Business Areas.)

f. Special Transportation Areas) (STA) (Same criteria as Statewide Special Transportation Areas.)

4. District Highways and Local Interest Roads

(Examples: Oregon Route 10, Oregon Route 34, Oregon Route 238, Oregon Route 27 and Oregon Route 86)

a. Rural Expressways (Not inconsistent with, but supplemental to, the criteria listed for Statewide Rural Expressways.)

- The primary function of these highways is to provide connections and links to intercity, inter-community and intracity movements.
b. Rural Other

- These highways provide for safe and efficient medium speed and medium to high volume traffic movements.
- Traffic movement demands and access needs are more evenly balanced, with reasonable access to abutting property.
- The function of the highway supports acquisition of access rights in limited circumstances, recognizing the balanced demands of traffic movement and access needs. Purchase of access rights should be considered where beneficial such as, but not limited to, ensuring safe and efficient operation between connecting highways in interchange areas, protecting resource lands, preserving highway capacity on land adjacent to an urban growth boundary, or ensuring safety on segments with sharp curves, steep grades or restricted sight distance, or those with a history of accidents.
- The primary function of these highways is to provide connections and links to intercity, inter-community and intracity movements.

c. Urban Expressways (Not inconsistent with, but supplemental to, the criteria listed for District Rural Expressways.)

- Where traffic signals are allowed, their impact on through traffic must be minimized by ensuring that efficient progression of traffic is achieved.
- Median treatments are considered in accordance with criteria in Action 3B.3.

d. Urban Other (Not inconsistent with, but supplemental to, the criteria listed for District Rural Other.)

- The function of the highway is consistent with acquisition of access rights in limited circumstances, recognizing the balanced demands of traffic movement and access needs. Purchase of access rights should be considered where beneficial such as, but not limited to, ensuring safe and efficient operation between connecting highways in interchange areas, protecting resource lands, or ensuring safety on segments with sharp curves, steep grades or restricted sight distance, or those with a history of accidents.

e. Urban Business Areas (UBA) (See Policy 1B. Same criteria as Statewide Urban Business Areas.)

f. Special Transportation Areas (STA) (Same criteria as Statewide Special Transportation Areas.)

**Action 3A.2**

Establish spacing standards on state highways based on highway classification, type of area and speed. Tables 16, 17, 18, and 19 in Appendix C show the access spacing standards for the access management classifications listed in Action 3A.1.

- These standards shall be applied to the development of all ODOT highway construction, reconstruction or modernization projects, approach road and private road crossing permits, as well as all planning processes involving state
highways, including corridor studies, refinement plans, state and local transportation system plans and local comprehensive plans.

- These standards do not retroactively apply to legal approach roads or private road crossings in effect prior to adoption of this Oregon Highway Plan, except or until any redevelopment, change of use, or highway construction, reconstruction or modernization project affecting these legal approach roads or private road crossings occurs. At that time the goal is to meet the appropriate spacing standards, if possible, but at the very least to improve current conditions by moving in the direction of the spacing standards.

- When in-fill development occurs, the goal is to meet the appropriate spacing standards. In some cases this may not be possible, and at the very least the goal is to improve the current conditions by moving in the direction of the spacing standards. Thus, in-fill development should not worsen current approach road spacing. This may involve such options as joint access.

- In some cases access will be allowed to a property at less than the designated spacing standards, but only where a right of access exists, that property does not have reasonable access, and the designated spacing cannot be accomplished. If possible, other options should be considered such as joint access.

- If a property becomes landlocked (no reasonable access exists) because an approach road cannot be safely constructed and operated, and all other alternatives have been explored and rejected, ODOT might be required to purchase the property. (Note: If a hardship is self-inflicted, such as by partitioning or subdividing a property, ODOT does not have responsibility for purchasing the property.)

**Action 3A.3**

Manage the location and spacing of traffic signals on state highways to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods. Safe and efficient traffic signal timing depends on optimal intersection spacing. It is difficult to predetermine where such locations should exist, although half-mile intersection spacing for Statewide and Regional Highways is desirable. The following are critical elements in planning an interconnected traffic signal system:

- Signalized intersection capacity and operation analysis must take into account lane balance of existing and future (20-year projection) traffic volumes.

- The progression bandwidth must equal or exceed that required to accommodate the through volume on the state highway at the most critical intersection during all peak periods. The most critical intersection is defined as the intersection carrying the highest through volume per lane on the state highway. The State Traffic Engineer or designated representative shall approve signal progression parameters and analysis methodology.

- All signals must provide for adequate vehicle storage that does not encroach on the operation of adjacent lanes and signalized intersections.
• The common cycle length for the interconnected traffic signal system must provide for adequate pedestrian crossing times.

• The speed of the progressed traffic band should be no more than five miles per hour below the existing posted speed for both directions of travel during the off-peak periods, nor more than 10 miles per hour below the existing posted speed during peak periods. Approval of the State Traffic Engineer or designated representative is required where speeds deviate more than the above.

**Action 3A.4**

In general, traffic signals should not be installed on rural high-speed highways because they are inconsistent with the function of these highways to provide for safe and efficient high-speed travel. Although a rural traffic signal may be warranted in a particular instance to control traffic due to existing conditions, ODOT and local governments must avoid creating conditions that would make future traffic signal installations necessary in rural areas. Amendments to local comprehensive plans or land use ordinances that would require a traffic signal on rural highways are inconsistent with the function of the highway.\(^7\)

**Action 3A.5**

Some private approach roads may have characteristics similar to public road approaches. Such similarities may allow a private approach road to operate as a public road approach. For a private approach road to be considered for a signal, it must have the following attributes:

• High traffic volumes, typically 200 vehicles or more during the peak period;

• Design geometry consistent with that of public road intersections including curbs, appropriate lane widths, pavement markings and vertical alignment; and

• An adequate approach throat length to assure that the movement of entering vehicles is not impeded by on-site queuing.

Signalization of a private approach road shall be dependent upon meeting signal spacing criteria considering the likelihood that nearby locations may be signalized in the future as development occurs in the area. Signal spacing concerns may require that a route be established to a nearby public street that can be signalized at its intersection with the state highway, or a shared private driveway may be required to serve the needs of multiple properties. If a private approach road is considered, it should also be required to connect to the existing or planned local street system and allow use by surrounding properties.

---

\(^7\) Typically, based on guidance provided in the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, rural traffic signals are not warranted. Rural traffic signals are unexpected by the motorist who is unfamiliar with the location, requiring longer than normal time for drivers to react. Rural highway speeds are typically very high, requiring longer stopping sight distance.
Policy 3B: Medians

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to plan for and manage the placement of medians and the location of median openings on state highways to enhance the efficiency and safety of the highways, and influence and support land use development patterns that are consistent with approved transportation system plans.*

**Action 3B.1**

Plan for a level of median control for the safe and efficient operation of state highways, consistent with the classification of the highway. Corridor plans and transportation system plans shall identify planned median treatments.

**Action 3B.2**

Design and construct nontraversable medians for:

- All new multi-lane highways constructed on completely new alignment; and
- Modernization of all rural, multi-lane Expressways, including Statewide (NHS), Regional and District.

**Action 3B.3**

Consider construction of nontraversable medians for:

- Modernization of all urban, multi-lane Statewide (NHS) Highways;
- Modernization of all urban, multi-lane Regional Highways where posted speeds are 45 mph (70 km/h) or greater;
- Multi-lane highways undergoing 3-R or 4-R improvements; and
- Highways not undergoing modernization where a median could improve safety.

In the four instances listed above, consideration shall occur when any of the following criteria are present:

- Forecasted average daily traffic is anticipated to be 28,000 vehicles per day during the 20-year planning period;
- The annual accident rate is greater than the statewide annual average accident rate for similar roadways;
- Pedestrians are unable to safely cross the highway, as demonstrated by an accident rate that is greater than the statewide annual average accident rate for similar roadways; and/or
- Topography and horizontal or vertical roadway alignment result in inadequate left-turn intersection sight distance and it is impractical to relocate or reconstruct the connecting approach road or impractical to reconstruct the highway in order to provide adequate sight distance.
Reasons for not using nontraversable medians when any of these criteria are present must be documented and reviewed and approved by the Region Manager.

**Action 3B.4**

Full and directional median openings shall be:

- Restricted to locations that conform to ODOT’s spacing standards as shown in Appendix C; and
- Designed with a left-turn bay and deceleration lane.

Full median openings will be given preference to a public road connection which is part of a continuous and comprehensive public road network.

**Action 3B.5**

Continuous two-way left-turn lanes are primarily used on urban highways. On urban Expressways, continuous two-way left-turn lanes are minimal; they will be approved in the future only as part of staged construction of nontraversable medians, and a strategy/plan to replace existing continuous two-way left-turn lanes with nontraversable medians will be developed.

**Action 3B.6**

Except on freeways, consider using raised median pedestrian refuge islands and mid-block crosswalks in urban areas that are pedestrian and/or transit oriented.

---

**Policy 3C: Interchange Access Management Areas**

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to plan for and manage grade-separated interchange areas to ensure safe and efficient operation between connecting roadways.*

**Action 3C.1**

Develop interchange area management plans to protect the function of interchanges to provide safe and efficient operations between connecting roadways and to minimize the need for major improvements of existing interchanges.

**Action 3C.2**

To improve an existing interchange or construct a new interchange:

- The interchange access management spacing standards are shown in Tables 16-19 in Appendix C;
- These standards do not retroactively apply to interchanges existing prior to adoption of this Oregon Highway Plan, except or until any redevelopment, change of use, or highway construction, reconstruction or modernization project affecting these existing interchanges occurs. It is the goal at that time to meet the appropriate spacing standards, if possible, but, at the very least, to improve the current conditions by moving in the direction of the spacing standards;
• Necessary supporting improvements, such as road networks, channelization, medians and access control in the interchange management area must be identified in the local comprehensive plan and committed with an identified funding source, or must be in place;

• Access to cross streets shall be consistent with established standards for a distance on either side of the ramp connections so as to reduce conflicts and manage ramp operations. The Interchange Access Management Spacing Standards supersede the Access Management Classification and Spacing Standards (Policy 3A), unless the latter distance standards are greater (see Appendix C);

• Where possible, interchanges on Freeways and Expressways shall connect to state highways, major or minor arterials;

• Interchanges on Statewide, Regional or District Highways may connect to state highways, major or minor arterials, other county or city roads, or private roads, as appropriate;

• The design of urban interchanges must consider the need for transit and park-and-ride facilities, along with the interchange’s effect on pedestrian and bicycle traffic; and

• When possible, access control shall be purchased on crossroads for a minimum distance of 1320 feet (400 meters) from a ramp intersection or the end of a free flow ramp terminal merge lane taper.

**Action 3C.3**

Establish criteria for when deviations to the interchange access management spacing standards may be considered. The kinds of considerations likely to be included are:

• Location of existing parallel roadways (e.g., Highways 99W or 99E which parallel Interstate 5);

• Use of traffic controls;

• Potential queuing, increased delays and safety impacts; and

• Possible use of nontraversable medians for right-in/right-out movements.

**Action 3C.4**

When new approach roads or intersections are planned or constructed near existing interchanges, property is redeveloped or there is a change of use, wherever possible, the following access spacing and operation standards should be applied within the Interchange Access Management Area (measurements are from ramp intersection or the end of a free flow ramp terminal merge lane taper).

• Approach roads on the crossroads at no closer than 750 feet (230 meters), and between 750 feet (230 meters) and 1320 feet (400 meters), shall be limited to right-in/right-out. This may require construction of a nontraversable median or a median barrier.
• The first full intersection on a crossroad should be no closer than 1320 feet (400 meters).

**Action 3C.5**

As opportunities arise, rights of access shall be purchased on crossroads around existing interchanges. Whenever possible, this protective buying should be for a distance of 1320 feet (400 meters) on the crossroads.

**Action 3C.6**

Plan for and operate traffic controls within the Interchange Access Management Area with a priority of moving traffic off the main highway, freeway or Expressway and away from the interchange area. Within the Interchange Access Management Area, priority shall be given to operating signals for the safe and efficient operation of the interchange.

**Action 3C.7**

Use grade-separated crossings without connecting ramps to provide crossing corridors that relieve traffic crossing demands through interchanges.

**Policy 3D: Deviations**

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to manage requests for deviations from adopted access management standards and policies through an application process to ensure statewide consistency.*

**Action 3D.1**

Implement a procedure by which an applicant may request consideration of a deviation from access management standards and policies. The Access Management Spacing Standard Minor Deviation Limits are shown in Tables 20, 21 and 22 in Appendix C.

**Action 3D.2**

Establish Region Access Management Engineers to review and act on requests for deviations from access management standards and policies.

**Action 3D.3**

Establish the use of a technical group to assist the Region Access Management Engineer in an advisory capacity in the review of requests for major deviations from access management standards and policies. Members of the technical group shall have expertise in access management policies, roadway design standards and traffic engineering, and may include technical persons who are not ODOT employees.
**Action 3D.4**
Establish the criteria which the Region Access Management Engineers shall consider when reviewing requests for deviations from access management standards and policies.

**Action 3D.5**
Establish criteria for when minor deviations may be allowed. The kinds of considerations likely to be included are:
- Potential queuing, increased delays and safety impacts;
- Pedestrian and bicycle circulation;
- Use of traffic controls;
- Requirements for local road systems;
- Improvement of connectivity to adjacent properties or local road system;
- Plans that address an entire roadway segment (e.g., a transportation system plan);
- Potential need for channelization, such as for turn lanes; and
- Possible use of nontraversable medians for right-in/right-out movements.

Any requests for spacing at less than the minimum deviation limits shall be considered a major deviation from the spacing standards except as stated in Note 1 in the notes on Tables 20, 21 and 22 in Appendix C.

**Policy 3E: Appeals**

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to manage appeals of both denied requests for approach roads and denied requests for deviations from adopted access management standards and policies through an appeals process to ensure statewide consistency.*

**Action 3E.1**
Implement an appeals process by which an applicant may request further consideration of a deviation request denied by a Region Access Management Engineer through ODOT’s Administrative Hearings Procedure.

**Action 3E.2**
Implement an appeals process by which an applicant may request consideration of a denied approach road request (not requiring a deviation).
- Establish Region Review committees to include members with expertise in access management policies, roadway design standards, right-of-way and traffic engineering to make a recommendation to the Region Manager.
- Establish criteria which the Region Review committees shall consider when reviewing denied approach road requests.
• Implement a process where the Region Manager will review and act on the Region Review committee’s recommendation.

**Action 3E.3**

Implement an appeals process by which an applicant may request further consideration of an approach road request denied by the Region Manager through ODOT’s Administrative Hearings Procedure.
Goal 4: Travel Alternatives

To optimize the overall efficiency and utility of the state highway system through the use of alternative modes and travel demand management strategies.

Overview

The state highway system serves different modes of transportation, including auto, bus, truck, bicycle, and pedestrian, as well as different travel purposes including freight movement and person trips. Maintaining and improving the performance of the highway system requires that it function as part of a well-coordinated and integrated multimodal system. Intermodal connections for people and goods must be efficient, and appropriate alternative mode choices must be available to allow users to take advantage of the efficiencies inherent in each mode.

Alternative passenger modes, transportation demand management, and other programs can help reduce the single-occupant vehicle demand on the highway system, thus maintaining performance while increasing the person-carrying capacity of the system. Alternative freight modes and related strategies which strive for more efficient commercial vehicle operation will help maintain the overall reliability and performance of the goods movement networks. All of these strategies can contribute to meeting the objectives of Statewide Planning Goal 12, which requires transportation plans to “avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation” and “conserve energy.”

Freight

Background

An efficient, safe, and environmentally sound system of moving goods through the state is an important economic development goal named in the Oregon Transportation Plan. The Plan also stresses the importance of promoting a balanced freight transportation system that takes advantage of the inherent efficiencies of each mode. For the highway system, this means both improving the efficiency with which motor carriers can operate and promoting alternative (non-highway) modes, where appropriate.

Improving and maintaining the efficiency of highway operations will require balancing the needs of goods movement with the needs of other users of the highway system. For example, some state highways that are important goods movement corridors also serve as communities' main streets.

Improving highway operational efficiency also involves working for more standardization in the areas of commercial vehicle regulations and Intelligent Transportation System technologies. Improving efficiency for goods movement will likely entail public and private investments in infrastructure, especially in an expanding economy. Oregon’s Intermodal Management System is a key part of tracking the need for improvements to intermodal connections.

However, public policies or projects often have limited impact on outcomes such as mode split in freight transportation. Freight transportation patterns are a product of industry trends, the
requirements of shippers, the quality, range of services, and rates provided by freight carriers, and
other factors outside the public sector realm. The State should not attempt to subsidize one mode
over another or otherwise interfere with the market for freight transportation, but should consider
making investments in non-highway freight network improvements where doing so will benefit the
efficiency of the state highway system.

There are sometimes specific infrastructure problems, bottlenecks, or regulations that pose a barrier
to efficiency or exacerbate trends that would be detrimental to the highway system. For example, it
is important to maintain a viable deep draft and shallow draft water freight system on the Columbia
River to prevent increased congestion on major highway freight routes. Shortages of rail equipment
and lack of access to capital may pose a barrier to the increased use of shortline rail for bulk
commodity movements. In these cases, public policies and actions should aim to mitigate physical
and institutional obstacles and promote safety while avoiding undue meddling in the marketplace.
The following policy and actions pertaining to freight transportation and the highway system were
developed to be consistent with this philosophy.

Policy 4A: Efficiency of Freight Movement

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to maintain and improve the efficiency of freight
movement on the state highway system and access to intermodal connections. The State
shall seek to balance the needs of long distance and through freight movements with local
transportation needs on highway facilities in both urban areas and rural communities.*

**Action 4A.1**
Identify roadway obstacles and barriers to efficient truck movements on state
highways. These include bridges with load limits and geometric constraints that
prohibit the travel of legal size vehicles. Set up a process through the Statewide
Transportation Improvement Program to systematically improve the highway
segments that hinder or prevent freight movements.

**Action 4A.2**
Encourage uniform commercial vehicle regulations at the regional and national levels
where the safety and efficiency of Oregon's transportation system will benefit. These
might include regulation regarding vehicle design.

**Action 4A.3**
Support further development, standardization, and/or compatibility of Intelligent
Transportation System Commercial Vehicle Operation technology in the western
United States.

**Action 4A.4**
Maintain and improve roadway facilities serving intermodal freight facilities that are
part of Oregon’s Intermodal Management System, and support development of new
intermodal roadway facilities where they are part of a local or regional transportation
system plan.
**Action 4A.5**
Support the establishment of stable funding or financing sources for transportation systems that will benefit the efficiency of freight movement on the highway system. These transportation systems include non-highway freight modes and intermodal connectors.

**Action 4A.6**
Work with the private sector (e.g., carriers, shippers), local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, port authorities and others to improve planning coordination between public investments in highways and other investments in the freight movement infrastructure.

**Action 4A.7**
Support the maintenance and improvement of non-highway infrastructure that provides alternative freight-moving capacity in critical corridors where doing so will maintain or improve the overall performance of the highway system.

### Alternative Passenger Services

#### Background

Alternative passenger transportation services can help relieve highway traffic congestion and reduce the rate of vehicle miles of travel per capita. They can also delay, reduce, or eliminate the need for highway capacity expansion. For the purpose of this discussion, alternative passenger transportation includes both publicly and privately operated fixed- and demand-responsive bus services, light rail transit, and intercity bus, rail, and air services. Bicycle, pedestrian, and high-occupancy vehicle services are addressed to a limited extent by these alternative passenger service policies, but are addressed more fully in conjunction with the transportation demand management policies described later in this section.

Two goals within the Oregon Transportation Plan emphasize the role of alternative passenger transportation. Goal 1 seeks provision of a balanced or multimodal transportation system as well as one that is efficient, accessible, and connected to several modes. Goal 2 looks to alternative passenger transportation to help achieve state land use goals and to provide mobility to residents of urban and rural areas through a variety of alternative services, both public and private. The State recognizes that alternative passenger transportation systems that are coordinated with land use actions can have positive benefits for the state highway system.

Three adopted state modal plans emphasize the role of alternative passenger transportation. The Oregon Public Transportation Plan (1997), the Oregon Rail Passenger Policy and Plan (1992), and the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (1995) further advance state policy supporting the use of alternative modes and services to relieve traffic congestion and provide mobility.

The Oregon Highway Plan emphasizes the use of alternative passenger transportation where the volume of traffic and the type of highway use indicates the potential for successful implementation of alternative passenger modes. Alternative mode passenger services can benefit the highway and community through a reduction in vehicle miles traveled, air quality, increased mobility, relief from congestion and/or delay, as well as reduction in the need for highway capacity expansion. The
Highway Plan further encourages the development of alternative passenger transportation services in concert with other elements of the local transportation network, and supports the development of partnerships with the private sector and local agencies to deliver these services where they will be most effective.

**Policy 4B: Alternative Passenger Modes**

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to advance and support alternative passenger transportation systems where travel demand, land use, and other factors indicate the potential for successful and effective development of alternative passenger modes.*

**Action 4B.1**
Promote alternative passenger transportation services in commute highway corridors to help maintain or meet established performance standards.

**Action 4B.2**
Promote alternative passenger transportation services located off the highway system that help to preserve the performance and function of the state highway system.

**Action 4B.3**
Encourage the development of alternative passenger services and systems as part of broader corridor strategies, and coordinate them with necessary supportive local actions. Such actions include developing applicable land use regulations, appropriate types of passenger services, adequate collector-distributor roadway systems, and other local transportation system elements.

**Action 4B.4**
Encourage the use of alternative passenger modes to reduce local trips on the state highway system where limited highway facilities accommodate large numbers of both intercity and local trips.

**Action 4B.5**
Support the further development of alternative intercity passenger services in congested transportation corridors through additional peak hour service, use of excess freight rail system capacity, and the provision of support facilities and services which help connect passengers to their destinations (e.g., intercity passenger rail, air, and/or shuttle or charter bus operations coordinated with parking areas).

**Action 4B.6**
In recreational corridors, promote shuttles and/or charter passenger transportation services, coordinated with off-site parking areas, to lessen congestion during peak periods for travel to significant tourist/visitor destination areas.
High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Facilities

Background

High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facilities are one response to increasing traffic congestion, declining mobility levels, air quality and environmental concerns and limited resources. While differing in details of design and operation, HOV facilities are generally restricted to use by buses, vanpools and carpools. HOV facilities are intended to help maximize the person–carrying capacity of a roadway or corridor by providing the high–occupancy vehicles such benefits as shorter travel times and improved travel time reliability. Typically, HOV facilities are most appropriate in large metropolitan planning organization areas and their corresponding fringe areas.

The High-Occupancy/Toll (HOT) lane is a variation of the HOV concept which allows vehicles ineligible by their occupancy number to use the HOV lane with payment of a toll. If limited to commercial vehicles, the practice is known as “commercial vehicle buy-in” and has the potential to offer time savings benefits to the small truck carriers of high-value goods. The HOT approach could achieve capacity improvements, provide additional financing tools, and solve the problem of under-use of HOV lanes. However, large scale implementation of HOT lanes will require a practical method of automatic vehicle occupant counting and a way to tell when the required toll has been paid.

A number of factors will affect whether HOV treatment is an appropriate or effective option for a given roadway or corridor. The first factor is the level of demand for the roadway or corridor. Recent research suggests that HOV facilities are appropriate where delays are major and the HOV vehicle/total vehicle ratio is about 5 to 10 percentage points below the HOV lane/total lane ratio. Outside this range, the facility will either be too crowded to offer real benefit to HOV vehicles or will suffer from “empty lane syndrome,” irritating the single occupant vehicle motorists in adjacent congested lanes and resulting in inefficient expenditure of funds.

The extent and completeness of the HOV system will also have an impact on whether any individual HOV facility will function effectively. In addition to the roadway mainline, access ramps, toll plazas, bridges, tunnels and connectors should ultimately be brought into the system to obtain the maximum utility. This system planning approach does not preclude incremental construction of individual HOV facilities, but the individual elements should be part of a well thought-out plan.

Consideration should also be given to the trip ends, or origins and destinations. Park-and-ride facilities on the home end and preferential HOV parking at the work end of a trip complement HOV facilities and increase their effectiveness.

Finally, surrounding land use patterns and transit facilities should also be taken into account. Although HOV and rail in the same corridor are not mutually exclusive, HOV is generally most appropriate in corridors where the existing and planned land uses will not support rail transit. However, HOV may be a suitable forerunner to rail in corridors where long term plans specify a level of development that would support rail.

Policy 4C: High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Facilities

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to utilize HOV facilities to improve the efficiency of the highway system in locations where travel demand, land use, transit, and other factors are
favorable to their effectiveness. A systems planning approach shall be taken in which individual HOV facilities complement one another and the other elements of the multimodal transportation system.

**Action 4C.1**
Promote the development of HOV facilities in corridors where:

- They are supported in local or regional transportation system plans;
- Current or projected demand will allow for efficient operations; and
- HOV facilities will function as part of the overall transportation system.

**Action 4C.2**
Support conversion of existing mixed-flow lanes to HOV lanes where the proposed HOV facility would close specific gaps in the HOV network, such as bridges, toll plazas, tunnels, etc., or where increased number of people in vehicles could offset the need for additional highway capacity.

**Action 4C.3**
Promote the development of support facilities for HOV lanes, such as park-and-ride lots and preferential HOV parking, to provide the complementary elements needed in a comprehensive HOV system.

**Action 4C.4**
Support the development of High-Occupancy/Toll (HOT) lanes when and where doing so supports the objectives of, and is consistent with, state, local and regional plans.

**Action 4C.5**
Support light-duty commercial vehicle buy-in to HOV lanes only with the levy of equitable fees or tolls.

## Transportation Demand Management

### Background
Transportation demand management is a broad family of techniques that help extend the use of the highway system by reducing peak period single occupant vehicle traffic, moving traffic demand to time periods other than the peak period or improving the flow of traffic. Transportation demand management includes but is not limited to:

- Rideshare programs and facilities which foster the use of carpools, vanpools, and express bus or light rail services;
- Incentives that encourage the use of transportation alternatives for the daily commute, such as discounted transit passes and employee transportation allowances;
Market-based mechanisms designed to influence shift of mode or time of travel, such as parking management or pricing strategies to favor high-occupancy vehicles or congestion-based pricing of transportation facilities and services;

Other demand management techniques intended to “flatten” peak period demand such as truck traffic restrictions, compressed work hours, staggered work hours, and flex-time; and

Operational techniques designed to improve the flow of vehicular traffic through modifying demand or optimizing available capacity, such as ramp metering, reversible lanes, traffic signal coordination, traveler information systems, one-way streets, high-occupancy vehicle/bus bypass lanes and telecommuting programs.

The Oregon Transportation Plan and the Oregon Public Transportation Plan support the use of demand management programs as a way to effectively manage existing infrastructure and services and to minimize transportation-related energy consumption. ODOT, in cooperation with local agencies and private employers, has created a toolbox of demand management strategies that can be used in corridor and local transportation system planning. This toolbox is described in ODOT’s Transportation System Planning Guidelines.

Policy 4D focuses on demand management techniques which are appropriate in both rural and urban areas to help decrease congestion, energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled and maintain air quality. These programs are most successful where parking at the destination is costly or where a variety of amenities are available.

Policy 4E highlights one of the most commonly used and cost-effective transportation demand management measures—park-and-ride facilities. Park-and-ride facilities provide a common location for individuals to transfer from a low- to high-occupancy travel mode. Park-and-ride lots may be either exclusive or shared-use facilities. Exclusive lots are planned, designed, constructed and operated to specifically serve as park-and-ride facilities. Shared-use lots serve multiple functions and may be located, for example, at existing shopping centers, schools or churches. In many locations, commuters create informal park-and-ride areas along the side of a road or at an existing parking lot so that they may share rides. Informal and formal park-and-ride facilities exist throughout the state and are common at interchanges along Interstate 5.

The Oregon Constitution strictly limits the use of state highway trust funds to facilities and services that directly benefit the highway system. Therefore, park-and-ride facilities funded through this source must support the motoring public as it travels on the state highway and road system and must be either within the highway right-of-way or adjacent to it. The location of park-and-ride facilities funded from federal and other sources is more flexible.

**Policy 4D: Transportation Demand Management**

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to support the efficient use of the state transportation system through investment in transportation demand management strategies.*

**Action 4D.1**

Establish and support demand management strategies that reduce peak period single occupant vehicle travel, move traffic demand out of the peak period, and/or improve the flow of traffic on the state highway system.
**Action 4D.2**
Investigate further the effectiveness, feasibility, and impacts of tolling and congestion-based pricing on congested highway corridors as a means of reducing peak period congestion and delaying or eliminating the need for highway capacity expansion.

**Action 4D.3**
Support existing transportation demand management/rideshare programs in Portland, Salem, Eugene, Corvallis, Medford, and Bend to reduce peak period congestion. Consider establishing new programs where congestion levels make it appropriate.

**Policy 4E: Park-and-Ride Facilities**

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to encourage the efficient use of the existing transportation system and to seek cost-effective expansion of the highway system’s passenger capacity through development and use of park-and-ride facilities.*

**Action 4E.1**
In coordination with local jurisdictions and based on an analysis of need and potential use, provide park-and-ride facilities at appropriate urban and rural locations adjacent to or within the highway right-of-way.

**Action 4E.2**
Acquire right-of-way for park-and-ride facilities during construction or expansion projects as appropriate. Consider acquisition and use of adjacent right-of-way for park-and-ride facilities at highway interchanges, consistent with ODOT access management policies and standards.

**Action 4E.3**
Establish partnerships with other jurisdictions and the private sector to site park-and-ride facilities.

**Action 4E.4**
Convert informal parking areas within highway rights-of-way to formal park-and-ride facilities where appropriate.

**Action 4E.5**
Use ODOT surplus property for park-and-ride facilities where appropriate.

**Action 4E.6**
Provide park-and-ride facilities located in urban areas that are safely accessible by pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users whenever feasible. Include secure bicycle parking in urban park-and-ride designs.
Goal 5: Environmental and Scenic Resources

To protect and enhance the natural and built environment throughout the process of constructing, operating, and maintaining the state highway system.

Environmental Resources

Background

Protecting and enhancing the natural and built environments is important to the State of Oregon. It is part of protecting Oregon’s livability, preserving its scenic character, and maintaining a healthy environment for plants, wildlife, and people. ODOT constructs, operates, and maintains a state transportation network that traverses a number of habitat types and regional ecosystems. These include the wet forests of the Coastal Range, the mixed forest of the Klamath Mountains Province in southern Oregon, the Willamette Valley grasslands, the temperate and alpine forests of the Western and High Cascades, the High Desert of eastern Oregon, and the Columbia River Gorge. The natural and social diversity of the state contributes to its beauty and resources, but adds complexity to its maintenance.

A variety of federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations direct ODOT’s actions involving the natural and built environment in constructing, operating, and maintaining the highway system. The following are some of the most significant that ODOT must implement:

**General Process Regulations**

- National Environmental Policy Act 1969 as amended (NEPA)
- FHWA Environmental Impact and Related Procedures, 23 CFR 771
- Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966
- Occupational Safety and Health Act

**Biology, Water Resources, Wetlands**

- Federal Endangered Species Act - Oregon Endangered Species Act
- Federal Clean Water Act and the Oregon Water Quality Standards
- Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Corps Regulations and the Oregon Removal/Fill Law
- Location and Hydraulic Design of Encroachments on Floodplains
Executive Memorandum on Landscaping Guidelines

Wild and Scenic Rivers Acts (federal and state)

Cultural, Social, Land Use, Aesthetics

- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966
- Oregon Historic and Scenic Highways Act
- Oregon Land Use Program and Statewide Planning Goals
- Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act
- Civil Rights Act (Title VI)
- Farmland Protection Policy Act
- Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice)

Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Material

- FHWA Noise Standard
- Federal Clean Air Act Amendments – State and Federal Conformity Rules
- Federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

(Note: More specific information about these laws and regulations is included in Appendix F.)

ODOT makes significant efforts to comply with environmental laws and regulations, but wants to broaden responsibility for the effects of its activities. The Environmental Resources Policy was developed to protect more than that required by law.
Policy 5A: Environmental Resources

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon that the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the state highway system should maintain or improve the natural and built environment including air quality, fish passage and habitat, wildlife habitat and migration routes, sensitive habitats (i.e., wetlands, designated critical habitat, etc.), vegetation, and water resources where affected by ODOT facilities.*

**Action 5A.1**
Impliment best management practices to minimize the effects of construction, operations, and maintenance impacts to the human and natural environment.

- Attain and maintain water quality standards through implementation of best management practices, or other actions as needed, to minimize to the maximum extent practicable the effects of construction, operations and maintenance impacts to the human and natural environment.

- Seek and budget money for these purposes as available, especially through federal transportation funding.

**Action 5A.2**

Attain and maintain air quality standards in highway-related plans, programs, projects and maintenance activities, and ensure that transportation commitments in air quality plans are implemented.

- Consult with federal, state and local government agencies to implement air quality transportation conformity regulations of the Clean Air Act, and take the lead role in regional transportation conformity determinations in rural non-attainment areas.

- Take the lead role in the statewide coordination of the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program.

**Action 5A.3**
Partner with state and federal agencies, local governments, tribal governments and resource organizations to identify sensitive habitat areas with a high value that are affected by ODOT facilities. Incorporate design features that will avoid or minimize and, when this is not possible, mitigate impacts to sensitive habitats with a high value on all construction and maintenance activities.

**Action 5A.4**
Design, construct and maintain all stream crossings with anadromous fish in accordance with applicable Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife standards and criteria for stream-road crossings.
**Action 5A.5**
Re-vegetate all cleared areas on construction projects, using plants and species based on expected survival, sustainability and compatibility with the surrounding biological and cultural environment. In areas dominated by a native plant environment, give priority to use of native plants along roadsides.

**Action 5A.6**
Establish a credit/debit banking system for wetland mitigation and wildlife habitat enhancement. Provide advanced mitigation in high-priority areas where construction projects are known to be necessary in the future.

**Action 5A.7**
Establish an inventory system that identifies natural resources on unsold state lands that may be used for mitigation credit when damage to natural resources is unavoidable.

**Action 5A.8**
Establish resource management plans and guidelines that describe ODOT’s maintenance actions for roads in natural resource areas, and map resource locations.

**Action 5A.9**
Support and implement integrated pest and vegetation management planning.

**Action 5A.10**
Identify and implement water- and energy-efficient construction and maintenance practices.

**Action 5A.11**
Participate in watershed and coordinating councils for planning and on-the-ground actions to enhance fish and wildlife habitat and improve migration.

**Action 5A.12**
Prevent hazardous substances encountered as a result of construction and maintenance activities from entering the human and natural environment.

**Action 5A.13**
Design highways with criteria that meet Federal Highway Administration Traffic Noise Standards.

**Action 5A.14**
Increase ODOT employees’ knowledge of the effects of planning, design, development, construction and maintenance activities on environmental and scenic resources and of the legal requirements that govern these resources.
Action 5A.15
Promote and reward the integration of innovative environmental principles in planning, design, development, construction and maintenance activities to encourage ODOT employees to value environmental stewardship.

Action 5A.16
Partner with tribal governments, special districts, local governments, non-profit groups and the private sector to assist in implementing new design standards and environmentally sensitive technologies.

Action 5A.17
Identify environmentally sensitive areas and areas with significant scenic value in corridor plans as appropriate.

Scenic Resources

Background
The introduction to the Oregon Historic and Scenic Highway Program developed in 1985 is still true: “Oregonians have long recognized that preservation of the state’s historic and scenic resources play a vital role in the enhancement of the state’s economic base, and in maintaining its citizens’ pride in and respect for its historic and natural resources. Oregon’s immense wealth of history and diverse scenery provide unlimited recreation potential for residents and visitors alike . . .” Even early efforts to develop a state transportation system foresaw the importance of preserving the state's scenic and historic values. Construction of the Columbia River Highway in the Columbia Gorge in the 1910s “focused on the need to construct a scenic highway that would complement the beauty of the area.”

Since then, a number of state and federal efforts have directed ODOT to preserve or protect historic and scenic features of the state highway system. For example, the 1987 Oregon Legislature declared that it is the state’s policy to “preserve and restore the continuity and historic integrity of the remaining segments of the Historic Columbia River Highway.” This highway is included in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, and the Historic Columbia River Highway Master Plan guides its management. Federal, state and local policies and regulations also recognize the need to balance protection of scenic resources with economic development.

The Scenic Resources Policy is intended to guide project planning, development, construction and maintenance for state highways in a consistent manner with regard to scenic resources and aesthetics. This policy applies to all state highways, not only designated Scenic Byways.

Scenic resources, as addressed in this policy, include the combination of structural, historic, cultural, and natural features within highway rights-of-way. Where appropriate, ODOT may coordinate with other agencies and property owners to address scenic resources that lie beyond the rights-of-way. In addition to views from the highway, views of the highway from other areas should be considered, particularly on designated Scenic Byways.
Policy 5B: Scenic Resources

It is the policy of the State of Oregon that scenic resources management is an integral part of the process of creating and maintaining the state highway system. The State of Oregon will use best management practices to protect and enhance scenic resources in all phases of highway project planning, development, construction, and maintenance.

**Action 5B.1**
Coordinate scenic and cultural resources management with appropriate federal, state and local agencies, tribal governments and special interest groups.

**Action 5B.2**
Coordinate with federal and state agencies, tribal governments, local governments and property owners to encourage aesthetic considerations outside the state highway rights-of-way, such as land use controls for signs, urban design, rural development, utilities and vegetation.

**Action 5B.3**
Design transportation facilities that consider visual quality with functional requirements, including safety and other transportation needs.

**Action 5B.4**
Use best management practices to minimize impacts to scenic resources, and preserve and/or enhance visual quality within the state highway right-of-way when improving and maintaining the state highway system.

**Action 5B.5**
Identify criteria, and measure and evaluate scenic resources management performance on a regular basis.

**Action 5B.6**
Develop an inventory system that identifies scenic resources on unsold state lands that may be used for visual mitigation on designated Oregon Scenic Byways and Wild and Scenic Rivers adjacent to state highways.

**Action 5B.7**
Inventory and map historic resources within the state highway right-of-way including archaeological sites, trails, stone walls, buildings, bridges and other significant antiquities.

**Action 5B.8**
In project designs, include aesthetic elements that enhance the quality of system improvements. Examples of aesthetic elements include plantings and attractive finishes on poured concrete structures.
SYSTEM
ELEMENT
III. System Element

State Highway Needs Analysis

Oregon's ability to implement highway programs in the future is grounded in the current condition of state highways, projected future use of the system and projected transportation revenues. The “Description of the Highway System” section beginning on page 25 discusses future trends. This section summarizes current conditions, the highway needs analysis, and user costs.

Current Infrastructure Condition

ODOT evaluates the condition of the state highway system’s pavements on an annual basis using a visual assessment scale ranging from “very poor” to “very good.” According to ODOT’s 1997 Pavement Condition Report, 77 percent of state highway mileage is in fair or better condition, down 1 percent from 1996.

There are 2,551 bridges on the state highway system, about 38 percent of the bridges in the state. About 95 percent of ODOT bridges are either steel or concrete, and 5 percent are timber. By the year 2000, 76 percent of Oregon's state-owned bridges will be more than 30 years old, and 23 percent will be more than 50 years old.

ODOT’s goal is to maintain highway infrastructure in good condition. Not only does this provide the safest, smoothest ride for the public, but it is also the most cost-effective way to do business in the long run. This is because deterioration and repair costs accelerate rapidly over time. On average, for every dollar spent treating pavement in “fair or better” condition, four dollars are required to repair that same pavement once it has reached “poor” condition.

For this reason, ODOT has established a goal of having 90 percent of state highway pavements in “fair or better” condition. If this goal is to be reached by the year 2010, the average amount of paving completed each year will need to be increased from 550 miles (880 kilometers) to approximately 630 miles (1,010 kilometers). However, recent budgets have not even allowed ODOT to maintain pavement conditions.

Over the 20-year planning period of the Highway Plan, the state would need to perform 1,553 major bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects to keep state-owned bridges at current conditions. This includes work to repair seismic and load deficiencies; strengthen bridge footings; repair decks, railings, mechanical and electrical systems; and perform corrosion and painting projects.

As traffic volumes increase because of population increases, state highways reach capacity during all or part of the day, affecting safety, livability and economic activity. Based on projected traffic volumes, ODOT has identified highway segments that need added lanes, new alignments, bypasses and other major improvements. Some of these are needs and projects identified through corridor plans and/or regional and local transportation system plans. Without these projects, traffic speeds and movements, especially in metropolitan areas, will dramatically decrease over the next 20 years.
ODOT’s goal is also to make the system efficient and safe. Replacing traffic signs and guardrails, interconnecting traffic signals and using intelligent transportation systems are means for achieving this goal. The needs analysis presents more details on these projects and associated costs.

20-Year Needs Summary

Funding needs for the state highway system reflect infrastructure condition and deterioration, traffic volumes and congestion, safety programs, management, operation and maintenance of the system, and related planning, administrative and support services as well as the policies in this plan.

Since the Highway Plan only addresses ODOT’s highway programs, many important ODOT departments and programs are not covered by this needs analysis and revenue projection, including Driver and Motor Vehicle Services, Motor Carrier Transportation, Public Transit, Rail and Aeronautics.

The Highway Plan breaks ODOT’s highway responsibility into eleven major programs and categories: modernization, preservation, bridge, maintenance, operations, safety, special programs, construction support, planning, administration and central services.

Policies in this plan may affect the funding needs of these programs. The Land Use/Transportation Policy and Off-System Improvements Policy suggest that funds are needed to assist local governments in making improvements in Special Transportation Areas and on off-system arterials and collectors that benefit movement on the state highway system. Funding for improvements in Special Transportation Areas need to be identified. The costs of off-system improvements should be offset by reductions in the modernization needs. The freight-related policies call for thicker pavements on designated freight routes and improvements to obstacles to freight movements. The needs analysis for preservation includes funding for thicker pavements. The modernization needs analysis includes geometric improvements to rights-of-way that impede truck movements. The Scenic Byways Policy calls for enhancing designated Scenic Byways. The needs analysis includes some funding for improvements, but relies on federal grants for the majority of the funding. No specific funding for Scenic Byways is included in the maintenance program needs. The Major Improvements Policy should reduce modernization needs since the policy requires examination and implementation of less costly alternatives before a major improvement is constructed.

Funding for the Intelligent Transportation System, Traffic Safety, and Rail and Highway Compatibility Policies are included in the needs analysis. Some funding to buy access is included under the safety program, but more is needed to fully implement the access management program. Most of the funding for the Travel Alternatives and Environmental Policies are also included in the analysis although additional funding, largely for maintenance, may be needed to carry out the Scenic Resources Policy. Funding for HOV lanes should come from the modernization and/or operations programs, but needs for HOV lanes have not been identified. The needs created by these policies means that the needs analysis underestimates the total highway needs.

The following list contains a general description of each program or category, some examples of typical projects and costs in that category and a summary of 20-year program needs. More detailed program definitions are presented in Appendix B.

For each highway program, needs estimates are presented for both average yearly and total 20-year investment. The costs were calculated in 1997 dollars. However, the effects of inflation must be considered in order to present a true picture of future buying power. Although inflation is currently quite low—2.3 percent in 1997—the State projects that it will increase gradually over the 20-year
period, reaching 3.9 percent by 2017. The Highway Plan uses the State of Oregon forecast which projects an average annual inflation rate of 3.3 percent for the 20-year period from 1998 to 2017.

Inflation means that buying power decreases over time unless more dollars are spent. For example, an annual inflation of 3.3 percent means that a program that spent $100,000 in 1997 would have to spend $103,300 in 1998 to achieve the same results. Inflation takes on particular importance over the 20-year Highway Plan period: a program that required $100,000 in 1997 would require $190,635 in 2017 with the average 3.3 percent inflation rate used in this plan. That is, if expenditures were not adjusted for inflation, a program would only have 52 percent of its original buying power after 20 years of 3.3 percent inflation.

The annual needs presented are averages. In some cases, programs require higher investments now and lower investments in the future. As discussed above, this is often the most cost-effective way to maintain highway infrastructure: Higher investments in the short term result in savings over the long term.

1. **Modernization.** The primary goal of modernization projects is to add capacity to the highway system in order to facilitate existing traffic and/or accommodate projected traffic growth. Modernization means capacity-adding projects including HOV lanes and off-system improvements. Projects in this category include major widening of lanes or bridges, and the addition of lanes, rest areas or entire facilities.

The cost of modernization projects can vary greatly because there are several different types of projects in this category. However, recent modernization projects and their costs in 1997 dollars provide some examples:

- Widening and reconstruction of 3 miles of Highway 62 north of Medford: $8 million.
- Construction of 4.2 miles of new highway on Route 20 west of Corvallis: $20 million.
- Construction of the Chenoweth interchange on Interstate 84 at The Dalles: $10 million.
- Typical left turn lane: $150,000.
- Typical passing lane (one direction): $650,000.

Modernization needs were calculated by combining current traffic conditions with projections of future highway demand in a computer model. ODOT staff checked the results of the modeling for feasibility and added projects that had been identified in corridor plans and local transportation system plans. The result is an estimate of feasible needs on the state highway system that would allow the state to meet current design standards and minimum tolerable conditions.

2. **Preservation.** The preservation program includes rehabilitative work on roadways and improvements to rebuild or extend the service life of existing facilities. Preservation projects, such as paving, striping and reconstruction, add useful life to a road without increasing its capacity.

Paving costs alone for a two-lane roadway are typically from $100,000 to $200,000 per mile. However, preservation costs can vary greatly depending on the type of treatment required, existing traffic flow and patterns, and the cost of other features (such as safety guardrails) that are included in the total project. The average cost of preservation projects in the 1998-2001
Statewide Transportation Improvement Program was $220,000 per mile. Recent preservation projects provide examples of this variation:

- Five miles on the northbound lanes of Interstate 5 near Albany: $388,000 per mile.
- 21 miles on the Ukiah-Hilgard Highway near the Union County line: $55,000 per mile.
- Three miles on the Oregon Coast Highway in Newport: $900,000 per mile.
- 11 miles on Highway 97 beginning at the California border: $159,000 per mile.

Preservation needs were estimated by determining the cost of getting 90 percent of state highway pavement to be in “fair or better” condition by the year 2010 and keeping it at this level until 2017. In 1997, statewide pavement condition was 77 percent fair or better. The Pavement Management System was used to determine the required investment. Current funding levels will lead to a decline in pavement conditions.

3. Bridge. Bridge projects include improvements or work needed to rebuild or extend the service life of existing bridge structures. These projects include bridge reconstruction or replacement, painting, seismic retrofitting to mitigate the effects of earthquakes, and overpass screening as well as major work on tunnels and large culverts.

Bridge projects vary greatly in expense according to the type of work required, the location and the type of bridge being considered. Projects identified in the bridge needs analysis provide examples of costs:

- Rehabilitation of the Willamette River Bridge on Interstate 205 in West Linn to allow it to perform vital functions after a moderate earthquake: $8 million.
- Cleaning and repainting of the 3,500-foot long northbound Interstate Bridge over the Columbia River in Portland: $23 million. Costs are high due to the bridge’s size and the environmental and lead-abatement requirements of the project.
- Replacement of the Kahler Creek Bridge on the John Day Highway in Wheeler County: $400,000.
- Replacement of rails on the Gales Creek Bridge in rural Washington County: $73,000.

Bridge needs were calculated from existing inventories and inspection databases. Only the most critical third of the identified seismic retrofit needs were included in the needs analysis. At the current level of funding, bridges are declining in condition and value.

4. Maintenance. Maintenance covers many areas relating to the appearance and functionality of the highway system, including surface repairs, drainage work, minor structural work, maintenance of signs, signals, lighting, rest areas, and snow and ice removal.

Maintenance needs were estimated on the basis of current expenditures by assuming that maintenance practices will continue as they are today. Facility conditions under current funding levels are declining. Any additional facilities or infrastructure will require additional funding.

5. Operations. Operations investments increase the efficiency of the highway system, leading to safer traffic operations and greater system reliability. Operations programs include interconnected traffic signal systems, new traffic signals, ramp meters, signs, other control
devices, Intelligent Transportation System features, transportation demand management, and rock fall and slide repairs.

Typical costs for the operations program include the following:

- Replacement of a typical traffic signal: $150,000.
- Replacement of an electronic variable message sign: $200,000.
- Replacement or rehabilitation of a typical sign on an Interstate Highway: $5,000.
- Placement of ramp meters: $100,000.

Operations needs were based on staff estimates of individual program costs.

6. Safety. The safety program focuses on investments which address priority hazardous highway locations and corridors in order to reduce the number of fatal and serious injury crashes. Projects funded through this program meet strict benefit/cost criteria. Safety projects may include access management features, guardrails, illumination, signing, rumble strips and railroad crossing improvements.

Safety needs were based on current and projected costs for each activity.

7. Special programs. Special programs meet special needs or mandates. Included in this category are the Transportation and Growth Management program, ODOT’s share of the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, Scenic Byways, the Immediate Opportunity Fund and the Bicycle/Pedestrian Program.

The salmon recovery program and the Immediate Opportunity Fund make up the bulk of the needs in this category. ODOT will retrofit culverts to improve fish passage as part of the salmon recovery program. While these projects may vary greatly in cost, an average culvert retrofit is expected to cost approximately $150,000.

Special program needs were calculated from individual program estimates.

8. Construction support. This category includes project reconnaissance, staff training and personnel that directly support development of projects. The needs estimate was based on a percentage of construction and preservation related costs.

9. Planning. ODOT planning activities include policy development, modal and corridor planning, review of local comprehensive plans and transportation system plans, transportation analysis and accident data. Planning funds are also given to metropolitan planning organizations and local governments to support their planning activities.

Planning needs were based on current funding and assume a decrease in corridor planning and an increase in state involvement with local plans.

10. Administration. Administration involves costs for management related to highway planning, operations, projects, preservation and maintenance.

11. Central services assessment. Central services include central administration, communications, finance, human resources/organizational development, information services and business services. The needs estimate was based on an assessment of 6 percent of program costs for these services.
Table 8: Summary of Feasible Needs Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>Average annual investment assuming no inflation (millions)</th>
<th>20-year total investment assuming no inflation (millions)</th>
<th>Average annual investment assuming 3.3% inflation (millions)</th>
<th>20-year total investment assuming 3.3% inflation (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>$339</td>
<td>$6,785</td>
<td>$471</td>
<td>$9,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>$3,436</td>
<td>$239</td>
<td>$4,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$159</td>
<td>$3,180</td>
<td>$221</td>
<td>$4,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td>$2,664</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$3,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$694</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>$964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$576</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$581</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Support</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$1,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Services</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>$1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,048</td>
<td>$20,955</td>
<td>$1,456</td>
<td>$29,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

User Costs

In addition to state costs for modernization, preservation and other highway needs, there are significant costs experienced by every user of the system. For example, roads in poor condition put extra wear and tear on private and commercial vehicles, meaning that the public spends more money on vehicle maintenance and replacement. Travel speed decreases as a result of both poorer roadway conditions and increased congestion. Declining travel speed results in increased costs to private and commercial travelers. As congestion reaches very high levels, or roadway condition deteriorates to very low levels, safety is also adversely affected, and the public bears additional costs in the form of accident-related losses. These kinds of costs are called “user costs,” since they are paid “out of pocket” by highway users.

Currently, Oregon highway users incur an estimated $16 billion per year in highway user costs. This is over 30 times as much as the current annual expenditure by ODOT on all highway programs and administration. User costs will go up in the future due to projected increases in vehicle miles of travel and the resulting impact on highway conditions and congestion. ODOT programs can impact only a portion of future user costs. Whatever ODOT can do to minimize future user costs, however, will return dollars into the Oregon economy in the form of reduced user costs which can then be invested elsewhere.

The Oregon Highway Plan evaluates the return on investment or benefit/cost ratio of its programs. Since the State is concerned about all Oregon residents and industries and about Oregon’s livability and economy, ODOT’s concern is with overall benefits of its investments, not with whether state government captures those benefits. User costs and user benefits are of primary concern in this approach to evaluation of investment in the highway system.

Forecasts of vehicle miles of travel (VMT) indicate that VMT will increase by over 40 percent on the state highway system by 2017. This is consistent with forecasts of VMT growth by Metro for the
Portland region and by ODOT for all highway travel in the state. VMT growth has direct implications for highway mobility and user costs. If nothing is done to improve currently high volume highway segments and VMT grows substantially, highway mobility will decrease, travel times will increase, and user costs will increase for each user as well as for users altogether.

**Impact of Various Funding on User Costs**

ODOT has estimated the impacts of various scenarios on user costs for selected categories of investments which are highly correlated with user costs. The Oregon Highway Economic Requirements System (OR HERS) was used to make estimates of user cost impacts of alternative levels of funding for modernization and preservation. ODOT has made parallel estimates of the user cost impacts of operations and safety improvements. ODOT estimated bridge investment impacts not as user costs impacts, but rather as a related “value” of bridges in service by year. No formal estimates of user cost impacts were made for maintenance or special categories.

User cost impacts were estimated as accurately as possible for higher and lower investments in each category. The OR HERS model calculated that the user benefits in the 20th year of the Oregon Highway Plan would be $310 million greater each year for an additional $10 million per year invested in preservation, and about $260 million per year greater in the 20th year for an additional $10 million per year spent on modernization. These marginal benefits in comparison to marginal costs are much higher than could be achieved with any other private or public investment of the $10 million per year increment.

Similar returns on investment accrue from safety and operations improvements. Returns over 20 years from safety investments are estimated at over 20 to 1 in terms of ultimate dollars saved due to fewer fatalities and injuries.

These very high returns from added investments in each category provide assurance that added money over and above today's resources can be wisely spent, but provide little guidance about priorities among categories. The priorities among categories have to be set by first taking care of existing system deficiencies and then by investing in successively higher levels where the dollars have good payoff. Continuing to invest in any one category will result in decreasing returns to scale. Therefore, once critical needs are met in a category, additional resources may go to other categories with a larger backlog of needs. This is the basis for the investment scenarios.

**Investment Policies and Scenarios**

To meet the state highway system needs, ODOT has developed policies and scenarios to use in planning and prioritizing programs at a range of potential funding levels—from no increases in current state fees supporting the highway system, up to a level of funding that can support those highway needs which are feasible to implement.

As funding increases or decreases, various program categories are not increased or decreased proportionately. Difficult choices are necessary under constrained funding. None of the choices yield wholly satisfactory outcomes. However, when the State is not able to fully fund feasible and desirable needs, the goal should be to minimize the short and long term harm to Oregon’s economy and livability which will occur when funding levels are inadequate.

At the lowest funding levels, the emphasis is on doing as much as possible to operate the highway system safely and efficiently and to preserve what already is in place, although conditions are likely
to continue to deteriorate under such a strategy. Trying to build a larger system of highways (or of other modes) would be counterproductive under very low funding levels because new or expanded portions of the system would not be sustainable.

With higher than minimum funding, infrastructure conditions can be stabilized or improved, and attention and resources can begin to be devoted to a wider range of goals. All analyses have shown that conditions and system performance improve rapidly as more resources above the current levels are added for any of the program categories. The plan has not examined levels of investment which are so high that conditions and performance could not be improved further in a cost-effective manner.

To operate the highway system as efficiently as possible with limited abilities to expand the infrastructure, the plan’s investment policies emphasize capacity-adding programs that are not as costly as traditional modernization projects. These include interconnected traffic signal systems and other operational changes, Intelligent Transportation System technologies, access management, off-system improvements, and High-Occupancy Vehicle lanes.

Safety is an element in all the major programs. For example, new extended freeway ramps in the modernization program can ensure that traffic does not extend from an off-ramp of an interchange onto the freeway. The preservation program overlays rutted pavement that may cause drivers to lose control. The operations program installs traffic signals at dangerous intersections. The maintenance program fills potholes and replaces signs and illumination devices. The safety program addresses problems in priority hazardous locations and corridors; the solutions involve better operations or maintenance or traffic enforcement or other changes.

The Highway Plan recognizes that it is critical to maintain alternate modes in order to limit or reduce demand on the highway system in congested areas. At the lowest funding levels if highway conditions can only be maintained at status quo, it is in the State’s interest to maintain at least status quo conditions for alternate modes.

**Investment Policy and Priorities**

*It is the policy of the State of Oregon to place the highest priority for making investments in the state highway system on safety and managing and preserving the physical infrastructure.*

ODOT’s funding priorities will change according to changes in available revenues. The following scenarios establish funding priorities for highway-related plans and programs at four general funding levels; the first applies at the 1998 funding level. With increases in funding ODOT will progress toward the fourth funding scenario.

1. With funding that does not increase with inflation and subject to statutory requirements and regional equity, address critical safety issues, and manage and preserve existing infrastructure at 77 percent fair or better before adding capacity, as explained below:
   - Focus safety expenditures where the greatest number of people are being killed or seriously injured.
   - Fund modernization only to meet statutory requirements.
• Preserve pavement conditions at 77 percent fair or better on all roads except for certain Regional and District Highways.

• Do critical bridge rehabilitation and replace bridges only when rehabilitation is not feasible.

• Fund operations to maintain existing facilities and services and extend the capacity of the system.

2. Invest to improve infrastructure conditions and to add new facilities or capacity to address critical safety problems, critical levels of congestion, and/or desirable economic development.

• Address the highest priority modernization projects.

• Move toward pavement conditions of an average 78 percent fair or better on all state highways.

• Maintain the Bridge Value Index (percentage of total replacement value) at 86 percent.

3. When critical infrastructure preservation, safety and congestion needs are met, pursue a balanced program of additional high priority modernization projects and preservation of infrastructure.

• Move toward modernization funding to meet 55 percent of feasible needs.

• Bring pavement conditions up to an average 84 percent fair or better level on all state highways.

• Maintain bridge conditions at 87 percent of total replacement value and address the critical 1/3 of seismic retrofit needs.

4. With significant funding increases, develop feasible modernization projects, address long-term bridge needs and upgrade pavements to a more cost-effective condition.

• Move toward modernization funding to meet 100 percent of feasible needs.

• Bring pavement conditions up to an average 90 percent fair or better level on all state highways.

• Begin to replace 850 aging bridges and increase the Bridge Value Index (percentage of total replacement value) to 91 percent.

Funding for specific programs will follow these priorities:

**Modernization**

• Give priority to modernization projects that improve livability and/or address critical safety problems and high levels of congestion.

**Preservation**

• Give priority to Interstate pavement condition.

• Maintain Statewide Highways at a higher condition than Regional and District Highways, and invest in thicker pavement on designated freight routes.

• Preserve other highways at lower pavement conditions according to their classification. Preserve District Highways at 60 percent fair or better or higher.

• With no increase in state funding, consider the option of a “maintain only” policy for certain Regional/District Highways.
• With increased funding, increase pavement condition level toward an optimal level.

• With significantly increased funding, maintain pavement conditions at an optimal level of fair or better (90 percent fair or better).

Bridge
• At declining funding due to inflation, do critical bridge rehabilitation and replace critical bridges when rehabilitation is not feasible. Do seismic retrofit projects only to maintain the functionality of major river crossings on Interstate 5 and Interstate 84.

• At increased funding, preserve bridge value at the present state, but ignore most seismic retrofit needs.

• With more funding, maintain the Bridge Value Index (percentage of total replacement value) and address the most critical one-third of the seismic retrofit needs.

• With significant funding increases, address the long-term problems of replacing the 850 bridges built in the 1950s and 1960s.

Safety
• Focus expenditures where the greatest number of people are being killed or seriously injured\(^8\).

• Allow for a reduced number of safety upgrades in preservation projects on highway segments with little or no crash history to increase dollars available for highway preservation.

• Make safety investments based on benefit/cost analysis. The first priority is on preservation projects with a high risk segment. The second priority is stand-alone projects on priority safety segments or spot locations.

Operations
• Maintain the existing facilities and services.

• Increase funding for Intelligent Transportation Systems and other operations to increase safety, increase travel time reliability, and relieve congestion especially in congested metropolitan areas.

• With increased funding, take advantage of technological devices to increase safety, decrease travel time, and relieve congestion throughout the state.

Maintenance
• With existing funding, focus on maintenance of features critical to keeping roads open and safe for travel.

• With increased funding, begin to move toward desired levels of service of features critical to keeping roads open and safe for travel.

---

\(^8\) These priorities are reflected in the Safety Investment Program used to select safety projects for the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. The Program identifies where the most people are being killed and seriously injured on the state highway system and applies the most cost-effective measures to reduce the number of crashes.
• With significantly increased funding, invest in high initial cost solutions that improve service to travelers and minimize long-term spending. Examples range from upgrading substandard guardrail to major culvert and ditch upgrades and include improvements such as durable pavement marking.

Special Programs

• **Scenic Byways**: Position the state and local entities to be able to fund national and state Scenic Byway improvements and facilities mainly through federal funding.

• **Salmon Recovery**: Implement the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds as directed by the Governor’s Executive Order. Fund at appropriate levels.

• **Transportation/Growth Management**: Fund transportation plans and projects in local jurisdictions to support livability and economic opportunity.

• **Bicycle/Pedestrian Program**: Focus the program on identifying simple, low-cost projects on urban highways to improve pedestrian and bicyclist access.

• **Immediate Opportunity Fund**: Fund street, road or other transportation-related improvements needed to respond quickly to economic development opportunities.

Planning

• Maintain basic planning program needs, including region and central work on Transportation Planning Rule implementation, periodic reviews, plan amendments, development review, access management, corridor plans and transportation system plan assistance. Adhere to funding priorities when developing corridor plans, facility plans and local transportation system plans.

• Maintain basic ODOT long-range planning to comply with statutory requirements for the Oregon Transportation Plan and related modal plans.

• Continue to assist in funding local transportation system planning.

• If not able to maintain the basic planning program, decrease or eliminate ODOT funding assistance for local planning.
Investment Scenarios

The investment scenarios fit these policies and priorities together. They begin with the continuation of current (1998) funding rates.

Scenario 1: Current Funding Continued

This scenario is based on the assumption that funding rates will not rise; there will be no fuel tax increase or other state source increase.

Total Investment = $515 million/year

New Funding Requirements = $0

If current funding rates were to continue, ODOT would focus investment on preservation and maintenance. Modernization spending would be limited to the state legislative minimum (currently approximately $54 million in accordance with ORS 366.507) including the high priority projects in TEA 21. Only the most critical capacity improvement projects and TEA 21 projects would be completed. The emphasis of the remaining funds would be on preservation and maintenance.

Since this scenario assumes that current funding rates will continue, the absolute dollars of revenue would rise as population rises, but inflation and increased highway system use would mean that ODOT would not be able to maintain current conditions in terms of physical condition or mobility. This investment level would lead to higher long term costs to repair or replace system facilities.

Under this scenario, the physical condition of highway infrastructure would decline and congestion would increase.

Projected Highway System Conditions in 2017:

- Pavement conditions would decline from 77 percent fair or better, about 2 percent per year.
- Bridge Value Index would decline from 87 percent to 82 percent of total replacement value; funding does not keep up with even the most serious deficiencies. ODOT would place restrictions for truck weight on additional bridges.
- User costs would increase dramatically by over 50 percent per mile of travel, and speeds would decline by 50 percent compared to current levels.

Scenario 2: Protecting Current Infrastructure, But No Preservation of Certain Regional and District Roads

This scenario is designed to maintain the current physical condition of the system as well as possible with limited increases in funding.

Investment = $576 million/year (uninflated) beginning in year 2000.

New Funding Requirements: Approximately 3 cents per gallon gas tax increase to take effect in year 2000, plus adjustments for inflation.*

ODOT would focus the first additional dollars on protecting the physical condition of the current system by investing more in its maintenance and preservation programs. No additional money would be spent on modernization beyond the level in Scenario 1. Certain Regional and District

* Each scenario’s description contains a rough estimate of new funding required to match the scenario. These estimates are discussed in more detail on page 134.
roads would receive maintenance treatments, but not preservation treatments. Long-term needs to replace aging bridges and retrofit high-priority bridges to withstand moderate earthquakes would be ignored.

With this level of investment, physical condition of higher volume roads would stabilize at current levels, but overall pavement conditions would decline, bridge conditions would decline, congestion would increase significantly, and mobility would decline.

Projected Highway System Conditions in 2017:

- 77 percent fair or better pavement for roads with higher volumes. Overall condition of the system would decline over the long term.
- Bridge conditions would decline slightly, but most critical bridge projects are addressed. There is very little seismic retrofit.
- User costs would increase and speeds would decline, but by much less than under current funding.

Scenario 3: Protecting Current Infrastructure

This scenario is designed to maintain the current physical condition of the system as well as possible with limited increases in funding.

Investment = $599 million/year (uninflated) beginning in year 2000.

New Funding Requirements: Approximately 5 cents per gallon gas tax increase to take effect in year 2000, plus adjustments for inflation.

ODOT would focus additional dollars on protecting the physical condition of the current system by investing more in its maintenance and preservation programs. This scenario is like Scenario 2 in that no additional money would be spent on modernization beyond the level in Scenario 1. Preservation projects would occur on all state highways; safety costs would go up because of the additional preservation projects, but maintenance costs would go down slightly from Scenario 2. Long-term needs to replace aging bridges and retrofit high-priority bridges to withstand moderate earthquakes would be ignored.

With this level of investment, the physical condition of pavement would stabilize at current levels, but congestion would increase and mobility would decline.

Projected Highway System Conditions in 2017:

- 77 percent fair or better pavement condition for roads overall.
- All critical bridge projects are addressed, but very little seismic retrofit.
- User costs would increase and speeds would decline but by less than under current funding.

Scenario 4: Protecting the Current Infrastructure with Some Modernization

This scenario focuses investment on preserving and maintaining pavement and bridge conditions as well as possible with limited funding. It would fund about 30 percent of feasible modernization needs.

Investment = $659 million/year (uninflated) beginning in year 2000.

New Funding Requirements: Approximately 10 cents per gallon gas tax increase to take effect in year 2000, plus adjustments for inflation.
Although most of the funding would be directed to preserving pavement conditions, improving bridge conditions, and improving operations, safety and maintenance, funding would support additional modernization projects. Operational and safety increases could help mitigate increased congestion.

Projected Highway System Conditions in 2017:

- 77 percent fair or better pavement condition for roads overall.
- Bridges maintained in their current state, but very little seismic retrofit.
- User costs would increase and speeds would decline.

**Scenario 5: Protecting the Current Infrastructure with Additional Modernization**

Like Scenario 4, this level of investment is designed to marginally improve current pavement, bridge and maintenance conditions. Additionally, this scenario addresses high priority capacity-improvement needs (modernization), thus providing greater management of mobility and congestion than the other scenarios.

Investment = $735 million/year (uninflated) beginning in year 2000.

New Funding Requirements: Approximately 17 cents per gallon gas tax increase to take effect in year 2000, plus adjustments for inflation.

This next level of funding would improve the condition of current infrastructure and allow additional high priority modernization projects. Modernization needs would be funded to about $145 million/year. About 43 percent of the feasible projects identified through the review of current state and local transportation system plans and projected needs would be constructed.

Under this scenario, congestion continues to increase over current levels, but less than in the first four scenarios.

Projected Highway System Conditions in 2017:

- Pavement conditions would be improved to 80 percent fair or better.
- All critical bridge projects would be addressed; seismic retrofit work would be focused on critical routes. Bridges would be maintained at 86 percent of full replacement value.
- Speeds would be higher and user costs would be lower than under protecting current infrastructure, but still very unfavorable compared to meeting feasible needs in Scenario 7.

**Scenario 6: Coping with Congestion**

This level of investment is designed to further improve current pavement, bridge and maintenance conditions on all roads. Bridge values are maintained at current levels, and the most critical seismic retrofit needs are addressed. Additionally, this scenario addresses about 55 percent of high priority capacity-improvement needs (modernization), thus providing greater management of mobility and congestion than the previous scenarios.

Investment = $823 million/year (uninflated) beginning in year 2000.

New Funding Requirements: Approximately 25 cents per gallon gas tax increase to take effect in year 2000, plus adjustments for inflation.
This next level of funding would improve the condition of current infrastructure and fund 55 percent of feasible modernization projects. The most critical one-third of the seismic retrofitting of bridges would be done.

Under this scenario, congestion continues to increase over current levels, but less than in the previous scenarios.

Projected Highway System Conditions in 2017:

- Pavement conditions would be improved to 84 percent fair or better overall.
- All critical bridge projects and the most critical one-third of the seismic retrofit needs would be addressed. The Bridge Value Index would be maintained at 87 percent of full replacement value.
- Speeds would be higher and user costs would be lower than Scenarios 1 through 5, but still very unfavorable compared to meeting Scenario 7 Feasible Needs.

Scenario 7: Feasible Needs

This scenario is designed to improve pavement conditions to 90 percent fair or better, improve bridge conditions to increase the current value of the system, and complete the list of feasible capacity-enhancing projects that has emerged from the Oregon Highway Plan Needs Analysis. These are projects identified through state and local transportation planning processes and analyses.

Investment = $1,048 million/year (uninflated) beginning in year 2000.

New Funding Requirements = Approximately 46 cents per gallon gas tax increase to take effect in year 2000, plus adjustments for inflation.

This scenario improves the physical condition of highways so that pavements and bridges can be maintained most cost-effectively, operates the system efficiently and completes feasible capacity projects to relieve congestion problems except in places where physical constraints, environmental impacts, high costs and/or political decisions would limit congestion relief. The places with these constraints are mainly in the metropolitan areas. A program to replace the 850 aging bridges built during the 1950s and 1960s would be underway. Seismic retrofitting would be incorporated into the replacement.

Highway physical condition would improve but congestion would increase, although less than above.

Projected Highway System Conditions in 2017:

- Pavement conditions would be 90 percent fair or better overall.
- Bridge value would be increased to 91 percent of full replacement value, and problems with aging of “baby boomer” bridges would begin to be addressed.
- Speeds would decline and user costs would increase compared to current levels, but user costs per mile would increase by less than half the increase under current funding.

These policies, priorities, and scenarios will be the basis for ODOT’s Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the document that programs and schedules specific construction projects for the next four years. Actual dollar figures will vary between the Highway Plan and the STIP because the Highway Plan figures are 20-year averages and include preliminary engineering,
right-of-way and other costs that the STIP does not. The Highway Plan figures are based on needs, and the STIP project costs have to balance to revenues.

**Impacts of Scenarios on User Costs**

User costs vary considerably across the scenarios. User costs always decrease much faster than ODOT investment levels increase, for all categories of expenditure and for all investment levels that have been analyzed. In terms of overall benefits that can accrue to Oregon's economy, the highest level of expenditure that was formally evaluated is the most desirable level of expenditure.

None of the alternatives examined, up to and including the alternative with the highest funding level, achieve speeds, user costs and mobility standards as good as current figures.

Table 9 shows the results of using the OR HERS model to estimate the speeds and user costs for the scenarios. The first row of numbers shows initial year conditions. Speeds average around 43 miles per hour for travel on state highways. The average cost per mile, considering ownership and operating costs, safety costs, and travel time costs, is about 82 cents per mile. Total user costs for travel on the state system are estimated at nearly $16 billion per year. Thus, users spend much more on travel costs on the state system than ODOT spends.

**Table 9: Implications of Scenarios for Transportation System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Scenario</th>
<th>Average Speed</th>
<th>Total User Costs Per Mile</th>
<th>Total User Costs Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Year</td>
<td>43.1 mph</td>
<td>82.4¢</td>
<td>$15.9 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Current Infrastructure</td>
<td>21.6 mph</td>
<td>132.1¢</td>
<td>$34.4 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with Congestion</td>
<td>22.6 mph</td>
<td>123.6¢</td>
<td>$32.5 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible Needs</td>
<td>29.0 mph</td>
<td>102.3¢</td>
<td>$28.4 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible Needs with Reduced VMT Growth</td>
<td>31.2 mph</td>
<td>96.6¢</td>
<td>$25.7 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The investment scenarios are shown in terms of the conditions in the 20th year (2017). The intermediate scenarios defined for the Highway Plan, Protecting Current Infrastructure and Coping with Congestion, are shown in the second and third rows of the table. These scenarios result in user speeds and costs which are significantly worse than the initial year. These scenarios also show significantly worse performance than the Feasible Needs scenario (row four). In fact, because user costs go up much faster than ODOT budget reductions, all reductions below the Feasible Needs scenario have significant negative impacts which far outweigh the budget savings. For example, by the 20th year, any reduction in expenditure levels below Feasible Needs is costing users 40 times the

---

9 All values, other than for the Initial Year, represent conditions at the end of the 20-year planning period.

10 Approximately 40 percent below feasible needs.

11 Approximately 27 percent below feasible needs.

12 The maximum likely level of VMT reduction, relative to 20-year forecast, achieved through aggressive transportation demand management programs primarily at the metropolitan planning organization level.
savings in ODOT highway budget for that year, due to the cumulative negative impact of foregone investments.

For the Feasible Needs scenario with the VMT growth as forecast, speeds will decrease compared to today and user costs will go up, both in total and on a cost per mile basis.

The fifth row shows what speeds and user costs would be by 2017 if Feasible Needs were funded and if the VMT reductions that the metropolitan planning organizations consider to be the maximum feasible were achieved. Speeds increase substantially compared to a higher VMT, and user costs go down. User costs per mile still increase compared to today, but by a lower amount than if Feasible Needs were implemented but VMT was not reduced.

Revenue Projections

It is difficult to accurately predict future revenues since they are dependent on a large number of political and economic variables. The Highway Plan makes general estimates so that investment priorities can be discussed. State highway funding in Oregon comes from both state and federal taxes and fees. Each of these revenue sources is discussed briefly below. This discussion and the numbers cited only cover those revenues that go to the highway programs described above. There are a number of state transportation programs that are not covered by the Highway Plan.

State road user revenues provide approximately 65 percent of state transportation revenues. Oregon's State Highway Fund, which is constitutionally dedicated to highways, derives most of its revenue from three major highway user taxes: vehicle registration fees, motor vehicle fuel taxes and motor carrier fees (the weight-mile tax). These taxes are governed by the concept of cost responsibility—collecting revenues from users based on their fair share of highway costs. Cost responsibility studies are published periodically to ensure that users' shares reflect current conditions. The latest cost responsibility study update was completed in 1995 and assigns 62.3 percent of highway costs to vehicles weighing less than 8,000 pounds and 37.7 percent to heavy vehicles. The 1995 State Legislature reduced heavy vehicle registration fees and weight mile taxes to match this cost responsibility.

In 1998 automobiles paid an annual registration fee of $15 and a state gas tax of 24.6 cents per gallon. Heavy vehicles (those over 8,000 pounds) paid an annual registration fee of between $110 and $415 depending on their weight. In addition, all commercial vehicles with a registered weight of over 26,000 pounds paid a weight-mile tax of between 4.45 cents and 20.4 cents per mile depending on their weight and the number of axles. Vehicles that paid the weight-mile tax did not pay state fuel taxes.

If there are no rate increases, state highway revenues from these sources are expected to average approximately $424 million over the next 20 years, for a total of $8.1 billion. This estimate assumes growth in revenues from additional users of the system, but does not assume any increase in the tax rate. Since motor vehicle taxes in Oregon are fixed amounts (i.e., rather than a percentage of fuel prices), these revenues will not grow with inflation over time.

Oregon also receives highway revenues from the federal government. The federal highway program is financed with proceeds from federal fuel and other transportation-related user taxes and fees. These funds are discretionary and subject to Congressional authorization. The federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, signed in June 1998, will provide over $246 million annually for Oregon state highways for fiscal years 1998-2003. After this point, it is difficult to accurately forecast revenues. This analysis assumes a gradual rise in federal highway funds which
reflects an upper limit of what may be achievable under fixed tax rates. Using this assumption, federal highway funds for the State of Oregon are estimated at a total of $5.8 billion over the next 20 years.

Thus, Oregon's total highway revenues for the period 1998-2017 are projected to be approximately $13.9 billion (see Table 10) if state funding rates do not change.

Table 10: Projected State and Federal Highway Revenues, 1998-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$346,983,057</td>
<td>$184,257,079</td>
<td>$531,240,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$364,822,730</td>
<td>$211,757,470</td>
<td>$576,580,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$369,977,182</td>
<td>$217,371,205</td>
<td>$587,348,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$375,263,272</td>
<td>$222,597,185</td>
<td>$597,860,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$381,364,362</td>
<td>$227,419,252</td>
<td>$608,783,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$386,202,160</td>
<td>$229,322,523</td>
<td>$615,524,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$392,805,296</td>
<td>$279,526,785</td>
<td>$672,332,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$398,948,938</td>
<td>$279,526,785</td>
<td>$678,475,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$405,115,216</td>
<td>$279,526,785</td>
<td>$684,642,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$410,579,143</td>
<td>$279,526,785</td>
<td>$690,105,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$415,577,315</td>
<td>$279,526,785</td>
<td>$695,104,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$420,216,752</td>
<td>$279,526,785</td>
<td>$699,743,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$424,528,797</td>
<td>$334,432,142</td>
<td>$758,960,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$427,621,303</td>
<td>$334,432,142</td>
<td>$762,053,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$431,120,636</td>
<td>$334,432,142</td>
<td>$765,552,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$434,492,387</td>
<td>$334,432,142</td>
<td>$768,924,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$437,387,939</td>
<td>$334,432,142</td>
<td>$771,820,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$440,453,086</td>
<td>$334,432,142</td>
<td>$774,885,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$442,803,615</td>
<td>$400,318,571</td>
<td>$843,122,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$445,689,041</td>
<td>$400,318,571</td>
<td>$846,007,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$8,151,952,226</td>
<td>$5,777,115,420</td>
<td>$13,929,067,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Needs and Revenues
If revenues remain at current rates, there will be a shortfall of at least $15.2 billion over the 20-year planning period of the 1999 Highway Plan. This means that all state highway needs will not be met unless highway funding rises.

Tax Increases Required to Meet Scenarios
In order to meet the needs of any of the scenarios above current funding, state highway revenues would have to rise. Table 11 lists estimates of the gas and weight-mile tax increases that would be necessary to meet the needs of each scenario. These are general estimates, presented to give a context for long-term state highway needs. The estimates are shown in two ways—a steady increase each year which covers the effects of inflation, and a “one-time” increase with future adjustments tied to inflation.

Table 11: Examples of Tax Increases Needed to Match Projected Revenues with Needs
## Table 11: New Gas Tax Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steady Increase</th>
<th>Scenario 2</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
<th>Scenario 4</th>
<th>Scenario 5</th>
<th>Scenario 6</th>
<th>Scenario 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 cent increase per year</td>
<td>18 cents</td>
<td>18.5 cents</td>
<td>36 cents</td>
<td>54 cents</td>
<td>72 cents</td>
<td>126 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1+1+1...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 cent increase per year</td>
<td>18 cents</td>
<td>18.5 cents</td>
<td>36 cents</td>
<td>54 cents</td>
<td>72 cents</td>
<td>126 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1+1+1...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 cent increase per year</td>
<td>36 cents</td>
<td>54 cents</td>
<td>72 cents</td>
<td>90 cents</td>
<td>108 cents</td>
<td>126 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2+2+2...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 cent increase per year</td>
<td>54 cents</td>
<td>72 cents</td>
<td>90 cents</td>
<td>108 cents</td>
<td>126 cents</td>
<td>144 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3+3+3...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 cent increase per year</td>
<td>72 cents</td>
<td>90 cents</td>
<td>108 cents</td>
<td>126 cents</td>
<td>144 cents</td>
<td>162 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4+4+4...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 cent increase per year</td>
<td>126 cents</td>
<td>144 cents</td>
<td>162 cents</td>
<td>180 cents</td>
<td>208 cents</td>
<td>226 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7+7+7...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes for Table 11:

A. The steady increase only meets highway needs (including the effect of inflation) over the full 20-year period. In the next 5-10 years, relatively low levels of new revenues are generated, but this would be compensated for by increased revenues in later years.

B. The “one-time” increase would match needs and revenues in the year 2000. After this increase, there would still need to be yearly increases pegged to inflation in order to meet the needs.

C. Revenue produced by each penny assumes:
1. There will be an equivalent increase in the weight-mile tax that will maintain the cost responsibility split at current levels (62.3 percent light vehicles/37.7 percent heavy vehicles).
2. The State will receive 50 percent of any new revenues (the State would receive half of the increase shown in Table 11).
3. There will be growth in the revenue produced by each penny due to increased highway use.

D. The numbers assume that federal revenues will increase as shown in Table 10.

E. Needs were calculated assuming an average inflation rate of 3.3 percent for the period 1998-2017. This consists of inflation rates under 3 percent until 2003, and rising to 3.9 percent by 2018.

F. The numbers do not include needs for city- or county-owned roads.
Implementation Strategies

The Highway Plan will be implemented through planning, project selection, design and development, operations and maintenance related to the state highway system. Within one year of the Plan’s adoption, ODOT will develop an Action Plan that identifies implementation actions and agency responsibilities. More specifically ODOT will:
1. Identify responsibilities and impacts of the plan related to planning, project selection and development, maintenance and investments.

2. Monitor the implementation of the plan’s policies through performance measures.

3. Conduct a process for examining highway classifications, classifying Expressways and designating Special Transportation Areas.

4. Work with local governments to:
   - Develop a process for identifying and transferring Local Interest Roads.
   - Conduct a demonstration project in each ODOT region to apply the Special Transportation Area highway segment designation.
   - Complete corridor plans and transportation system plans to address Highway Plan policies.
   - Achieve consistency between the Highway Plan and local plans and ordinances.
   - Establish criteria and designate lifeline routes.
   - Develop a policy or strategy for interchange management through the Interstate 5 corridor study or other planning efforts.
   - Establish criteria for considering, evaluating, and prioritizing off-system improvements.

5. Develop a funding plan that includes looking at various funding options. These options might include:
   - Increased vehicle fuel taxes
   - Higher vehicle registration fees
   - Increased weight/mile tax compenserate with increased fuel taxes
   - Increased heavy vehicle fees
   - New vehicle sales taxes
   - Fees on vehicle miles traveled
   - Congestion pricing
   - Tolls
   - State systems development charges

6. Develop an administrative rule for access management procedures.

7. Work with freight interests to identify concerns about freight movements on state highways.

8. Develop best management practices to protect environmental and scenic resources.
Performance Measures

The following performance measures have been developed as a means of monitoring the overall implementation of the Highway Plan. ODOT will use these measures to track progress in meeting the goals of the plan. In some cases, current and historical trend data already exist. In others, the current or baseline conditions need to be established. Once the baseline data is in place, future trends will be monitored to evaluate how well the Highway Plan is helping ODOT and its partners meet their stated goals in four policy areas. These measures are intended for overall system-wide use rather than for project-specific application. They are intended to guide the implementation and periodic refinement of programs and strategies rather than be used for budgeting purposes.

Goal 1: System Definition

Policy 1B: Land Use and Transportation

1. Percent of Special Transportation Areas where the highway mobility, as measured by volume-to-capacity ratios (v/c), meets the designated standard.

2. Highway v/c ratio within a Special Transportation Area (for corridor planning applications).

Policy 1C: State Highway Freight System

1. Percent of freight system lane miles that meet highway mobility standards during peak hour or two hour peak period.

2. Number and percent of accidents on the designated state highway freight system involving trucks.

Policy 1D: Scenic Byways

1. Percent of customers reporting favorable perception of Scenic Byway aesthetics, safety and performance.

2. Oregon Scenic Byway Committee rating (every three years) of improvement/degradation overall and for certain routes.

Policy 1E: Lifeline Routes

1. Percent of bridges on lifeline routes with satisfactory seismic rating (potentially bridge health index, sufficiency rating, and/or National Bridge Inventory rating).

2. Number of bridges on lifeline routes brought to satisfactory rating in reporting period.

Additional desirable measures which would be feasible as Geographic Information Systems capabilities are expanded within ODOT include:

3. Percentage of Oregon residents whose lifeline system access has been defined and evaluated.
4. Percentage of Oregon residents whose lifeline system access meets bridge rating standards.

**Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Standards**

1. Percent of highway lane miles that meet highway mobility standard, by statewide highway classification.

2. Percent of miles on limited-access highways in Oregon urban areas that do not meet highway mobility standard (Oregon Benchmark #70).

**Goal 2: System Management**

**Policy 2A: Partnerships**

1. Percent of state expenditures saved through cost-sharing and other partnership arrangements.

**Policy 2B: Off-System Improvements**

1. Net benefit (savings and/or benefits less costs) of off-system improvements.

**Policy 2C: Interjurisdictional Transfers**

1. Number of route miles designated by ODOT as having potential for interjurisdictional transfer.

2. Number (and percent of potential total) of route miles transferred.

**Policy 2F: Traffic Safety**

The Oregon Transportation Commission established safety priorities to carry out the Traffic Safety policy when it approved the *Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan* (OTSAP). Three of the performance measures included in the OTSAP are directly related to state highway travel:

1. Reduce deaths due to motor vehicle crashes from 1.73 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in 1996 to 1.30 by the year 2010.

2. Increase the percentage of occupants using vehicle safety restraints from 83 percent in 1996 to 90 percent by the year 2010.

3. Reduce the number of deaths due to alcohol and drug-related motor vehicle crashes from 0.72 per 100 million VMT in 1996 to 0.58 per 100 million VMT by the year 2010.

Two additional measures are:

4. Number of accidents with fatalities or serious injury (F/SI) per million vehicle miles traveled.
5. Annual percent reduction in fatal and injury crashes on Category 3, 4, and 5 safety segments, based on 1998 baseline.\textsuperscript{13}

**Policy 2G: Rail and Highway Compatibility**

1. Number of newly constructed at-grade crossings on the state system (target is zero).

2. Number of at-grade crossings eliminated or replaced with grade-separated crossings.

3. Number of at-grade crossings improved through installation of new control devices or improved geometric design.

**Goal 3: Access Management**

\textit{There are no performance measures proposed for the Access Management policy.}

**Goal 4: Travel Alternatives**

**Policy 4A: Efficiency of Freight Movement**

1. Percentage of identified obstacles to freight movement that are eliminated through action of the State, or the State in partnership with others.

2. Percentage (or number) of intermodal connectors improved.

**Policy 4B: Alternative Passenger Modes**

1. Percent of Oregonians who commute to and from work during peak hours by means other than a single occupancy vehicle (Oregon Benchmark #73).

2. Vehicle miles traveled per capita in metropolitan areas (Oregon Benchmark #74).

**Policy 4C: High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Facilities**

1. Percent of total person miles of travel that are made in High-Occupancy Vehicle lanes.

2. Percent VMT reduction attributable to High-Occupancy Vehicle lanes.

**Policy 4D: Transportation Demand Management**

1. Percent of Oregonians who commute to and from work in peak hours in a single-occupancy vehicle.

\textsuperscript{13} The state highway system is divided into five-mile segments, and a tally is made of the number of fatal and serious injury crashes over a three-year period. Category 3, 4, and 5 have had three or more fatal and serious injury crashes during this time period.
Policy 4E: Park-and-Ride Facilities

1. Inventory (number) of park-and-ride spaces within and immediately adjacent to the state highway right-of-way, by corridor.

Goal 5: Environmental and Scenic Resources

Policy 5A: Environmental Resources

1. Number of state highway miles with up-to-date natural resource maps relative to the total number of miles needing mapping.

2. Number of culverts retrofitted for salmon relative to the total number of culverts needing retrofitting.

Policy 5B: Scenic Resources

1. Percent of customers by region reporting “favorable or better” perception of the state highway system for aesthetics, safety and performance.