Huntington TRAFFIC SOLUTIONS
1665 A Street NE Salem, OR 97301 503-467-1311 huntingtontrafficsolutions.com

Sub Group 2 Meeting, Access Management Standards

Access Management Committee
Transportation Building
355 Capitol Street NE, Room 119
Salem, OR 97301
10:00 – Noon, July 22, 2010
FINAL

Working Facilitator: Del Huntington.

Participants: Bob Bryant, Jamie Jeffrey, Shawn Stephens, Mark Whitlow, Harold Lasley, Joe Marek, Monte Grove, Jim Hanks, Doug Norval, and Victor Dodier.

Meeting Purpose
Identify legislative concepts, potential revisions to the Oregon Revised Statute (ORS), Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR), and the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) of objective standards for "access management standards that conform to reality" on state highways.

Discussion

Bob provided a summary of the sub-group # 1 meeting on Reasonable Access held earlier in the day.

- The majority of the sub-group participants believe that the existing ORS on reasonable access is sufficient, though it is generally believed that the interpretation in the OAR and how agency staff interprets the statute is inconsistent with the law.
- It is likely that OAR 734, Division 51-0080 will have to be revised to be more specific about what reasonable access means in terms of business and development needs. In addition to rules, guidelines to establish considerations for reasonable access will be beneficial for ODOT staff when considering approach applications.
- Consider Jurisdictional Transfers (JT) of Regional and District level highways within UGBs for permitting of access.
- There was recognition that a JT will take time to achieve and the agency needs something to provide relief to the AM standards more quickly. Therefore, less stringent AM standards will be necessary or ODOT could defer access decisions to local governments on specific segments of Regional and District level highways within UGBs.
- Revise the current appeals process to make the process more unbiased and fair.

Bob also commented on a handout that Brent Ahrend provided to Sub-Group # 1 that identified the number of driveways that might be necessary to provide reasonable access to various uses (See Attachment C). The handout also included possible AM spacing standards. Mark commented that the suggested AM spacing was intended for Statewide and Regional highways and did not include District highways.

Jurisdiction Transfer (JT)

Harold distributed two handouts related to Regional and District highways within UGBs. The first handout identified 262.6 centerline miles of Regional and District level highways with an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volume greater than 5,000, not on a designated freight, and within a UGB (See Attachment A). These are highways that might be considered for a possible jurisdictional transfer in which the local agencies would permit access to the state highway. (SB 1024 requires the agency to develop separate Access Management [AM] rules and standards for Regional and District level highways with less that 5,000 ADT).

The second handout identified that number of approach permits that ODOT has received on these specific 262.62 centerline miles of highway segments since 2000 (See Attachment B). While the 262.62 centerline miles represent approximately 3.5% of the 7500 miles of highways that ODOT manages approximately 15 percent of the approach applications have been on these specific highway segments in the past 10 years.

Joe asked for a clarification of what exactly would be included in a JT.

Bob – Ideally the JT would include everything, but at a minimum, the permitting of approaches.

Jamie provided a summary of the discussion on JT from the earlier meeting of sub-group # 1.

- JT can take a long time to achieve and can become bogged down in specific items when determining exactly what is included. One of the most difficult aspects of finalizing a JT is the financial agreements, due to lack of resources.
- A benefit of a JT is that it reduces the number of jurisdictions that a developer is required to deal with when seeking approvals.

Joe – Recommended that ODOT approaches JT very carefully, consider the various conditions, implementing ordinances and staffing levels with the local agency. Also, elected officials may more quickly be involved in the local decision, resulting in inconsistent application of AM solutions.

Jim Hanks did not see this as a problem as each city is different from another.

Monte – Based on personal experience, JT is very difficult and expensive to achieve. He recommended a two prong approach that considers a JT and a revised set of AM standards.

Mark suggested a possible revision to ORS 374.310 to include a statement that "ODOT shall adopt access spacing standards that are consistent with local adopted street spacing standards within the UGB".

Jamie agrees that ORS 374.310 could be revised to include a provision that the entire transportation system should be considered (both state and local facilities), including local spacing standards or transportation goals.

Harold – What about cities that don't want to provide any local street system, but rather rely on state highway for all access?

Mark suggested that we need relief and real solutions as soon as possible.

Temporary Suspension of OAR 734 Division 51

Harold suggested a concept in which ODOT would suspend all of the AM rules within the Regional and District highways within the UGB.

Mark stated that there is an accommodation in the existing OAR to "make it better", though this is seldom applied in the field.

Bob proposed that guidelines be developed if they can trump the OAR's, This would provide staff with information to help achieve good solutions in the field.

Monte does not support a concept that would suspend the OAR, and then revert to the same rules at some point. He believes that the existing rules and process for access management decisions needs revision for both the short and long term.

Joe – If you suspend the AM spacing standards, you also need to suspend the mobility standards.

Monte believes that suspending mobility standards is more complex than suspending the AM spacing standards.

Doug Norval noted that Michael Rock had suggested that simplifying the deviation process could ease the existing burden when applying for an approach that did not meet the current spacing standards.

Del provided some history on the minor and major deviation process that was part of the rule when the OAR 734 was adopted in 2000. Tables 20, 21 and 22 on pages 200 – 202 of the OHP identify AM spacing standards that were considered acceptable and safe under a minor deviation process. A request for a driveway where the access spacing was less than the spacing identified in the tables required a major deviation process. The minor/major deviation process was eliminated when the OAR was revised in 2003 and replaced with a deviation process. A possible strategy for a revised and reduced AM

spacing standard would be the adoption of the spacing standards as identified in the minor deviation tables.

Harold commented that suspending the existing OARs could raise some liability issues that need to be considered.

Jim doesn't believe that the agency will become liable if they permit a driveway that is safe.

Mark discussed governmental immunity and discretionary immunity and recommended that the AG's office could provide advice to ODOT on this issue.

Monte acknowledged that suspending the rules would provide the agency with a lot of flexibility on access issues.

Mark commented that there has to be a balance while not becoming inconsistent when dealing with developers, which could happen if rules are suspended. Mark believes that the solution is agreed upon standards and guidelines that support economic development.

Access Management Spacing Standards

Jamie identified that AM spacing standards can be a double-edged sword. She believes that there is a benefit to evaluating each site individually to determine the appropriate access to the site. She is less concerned with spacing standards.

Joe believes that AM spacing is over-simplified and an additional level of analysis is required. The preferred location of a driveway may be closer or further away from the next driveway based on specific considerations in the field, which is more important than meeting a specific number in the spacing tables.

Victor asked if solving "reasonable access" make spacing standards a moot point.

Mark stated that today, if you cannot meet the AM spacing standard, access is denied. Instead, flip the standard as suggested by Brent Ahrend in the Sub-Group # 1 meeting that "reasonable access" is the driving force and spacing is subservient.

Del provided an overview of the handout that Brent distributed in the sub-group # 1 meeting on reasonable access. The handout identified the number of driveways that are necessary to serve a site based on the estimated number of trips generated by a specific site. (A copy of the handout is attached).

Harold sees the potential of applying the criteria in the handout.

Jim likes the concept that the number of driveways to serve a site is based on the estimated number of trips to a site, with a caveat. Industrial uses may require an additional driveway for truck access, regardless of the total number of trips to the site.

Jamie – Mixing different types of traffic (cars vs. trucks) is a problem and supports separating the traffic through separate driveways when there is an issue with mixing vehicle types related to either the site or the transportation system.

Jim – acknowledged that approving access for elementary and middle schools are one area where ODOT understands the need to separate school bus access from the access used by motorists and pedestrians.

Harold – Access is site specific and therefore the assurance that a developer will be approved "x" number of driveways may be more complex in the field. Also, what happens if the state can't provide "x" number of driveways? Would ODOT be required to pay damages?

Jim is concerned with rural locations as there is often no other means of access, yet the property is limited to only one access.

Jamie – Moving the driveway or denying the driveway request entirely doesn't eliminate the traffic, it merely moves the traffic to a different location therefore the mobility argument can be irrelevant.

Del provided a background on his understanding of how the ODOT AM spacing standards were developed.

- In the late 1980's, Rich McSwain, P.E., former ODOT Corridor Planning and Access Management Manager, in cooperation with Tom Schwab, P.E., former ODOT Region 1 Traffic Engineer, developed recommended access spacing standards for Oregon that were modeled after work that had been developed in Colorado. For access spacing on statewide highways in Oregon, criteria included an assumed 15 percent deceleration of a vehicle on the roadway when another vehicle entered the roadway and accelerated to 85 percent of the posted through speed.
- As leader of the Access Management Program on the late 1990's, Del hired Dr. Bob Layton of OSU to develop analysis methodologies to support the various AM spacing standards for all state highways based on the level of importance.
- This work resulted in the spacing tables 13, 14 and 15 as included in Appendix C of the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan. There was some limited discussion to determine if the spacing standards were appropriate for Oregon, though the main work effort was to justify the adopted spacing standards with various engineering criteria.
- Bob Layton developed several background papers as part of this effort. His research included text that in the event a driveway would be limited to right/in/right/put only, or left-in/left-out only, the desired access spacing could be half of the desired spacing for a driveway where all turning movements were allowed. This text was never included in the 1999 OHP.

- Del will follow up with Rich and Bob to determine if he has accurately portrayed the development of the AM spacing standards and will report back to the sub-group.

Bob – believes that revisiting the AM spacing standards can be a lot of work and raised the concept of suspending the existing OARs to achieve an immediate solution.

This resulted in a discussion of what is considered immediate and how soon ODOT needs to respond with revised AM criteria to meet the intent of SB 1024. The general consensus among participants was that ODOT would have to make improvements this year though there was an understanding that it takes time to develop new standards and OARs. Also, it is acknowledged that there is a specific timeline in adopting new rules. It would be wise for ODOT to provide the 2011 Legislature with clear goals as to what would be achieved in 2011.

Mark believes that the text in the OAR to "move in the direction of" provides the agency with sufficient latitude to make immediate improvements when evaluating requests for access. Mark stressed that the reason for SB 1024 and the subsequent requirement to review the access management statue, related rules and policies is due to the fact that ODOT has not received a good grade when managing access across the state.

Each sub-group participant was asked to provide their recommendation as the process moves forward.

Monte – Provide more guidance to staff in the immediate interim, while revisions are made to the OAR. Monte supports the concept of JT though it can take a long time to achieve.

Jim – *Jim had to leave the meeting early so we unable to include his recommendations on the best way to proceed.*

Shawn – Agreed with Monte's recommendations. He stressed the need for guidelines to assist staff.

Doug – Doug pointed out that guidelines do not trump OAR and expressed concern if the two documents were in conflict. Temporary suspension of the OARs was discussed as one possible solution before the OARs could be amended. Doug did not recommend suspension of the OARs.

Harold – Guidelines may not meet the intent of SB 1024. Rather, the focus should be on legislative concepts.

Jamie – (Agree with providing guidelines), however if guidelines don't address the access spacing standards within a tightly spaced street system, then - would like specific guidance on certain facilities to fit the specific environment. Perhaps a provision that

allows ODOT to establish an access plan or specific spacing standard, similar to the IGA or an Access Management Plan for specific facilities.

Bob – Supports everything that had been put on the table. He doesn't want us to talk ourselves into a corner, rather provide assurance that ODOT is committed to improving the process as quickly as possible. A change to the OHP is a significant work effort.

Victor – Supports the concept of "making it better". He is also concerned that guidelines do not trump OAR. Simplify the rules and provide guidance to staff. Victor is hesitant to recommend a suspension of the OARs due to unintended consequences.

Mark – Agrees with Victor on potential suspension of the OARs. Mark wants to continue the charge to "get it right". He may be persuaded that ODOT is making changes and may not require new and additional statute.

Del – SB 1024 requires ODOT to develop new rules for highway with <5K ADT. This layer of rules will further complicate OAR 734 Division 51, and will increase confusion to -0080. He recommends developing new AM spacing standards for all state highways. Del also recommends extracting all text related to public approaches throughout Division 51 and creating a separate portion of rules explicitly for public roads. This venue also provides an opportunity for ODOT to revisit the spacing standards around interchanges to more correctly consider OTC Russell's issue from 2000, when he expressed his concern that the interchange spacing tables are not intended to wipe out metro areas along the freeways. Additionally, this is an opportunity to re-visit the AM standards on expressways.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 PM.

Total District/Regional Highway Lane Miles

(In UGBs > 5,000 & Highway Sections Not on Freight Routes)

UGB	Hwy #	Highway	Begin MP	End MP	Length	Lane Miles
Albany						
Albany	016	SANTIAM	-0.04	2.62	2.8	8.5
Albany	058	ALBANY-JUNCTION CITY	0.15	6.30	7.6	30.3
Albany	031	ALBANY-CORVALLIS	8.43	11.28	3.8	7.5
		Totals			**14.2**	**46.3**
Ashland						
Ashland	021	GREEN SPRINGS	0.73	2.49	1.7	3.5
Ashland	063	ROGUE VALLEY	17.02	19.46	4.0	15.9
		Totals			**5.7**	**19.4**
Astoria						
Astoria	105	WARRENTON-ASTORIA	6.93	7.24	0.3	0.7
Astoria	102	NEHALEM	2.64	2.86	0.3	0.5
		Totals			**0.6**	**1.2**
Baker City						
Baker City	012	BAKER-COPPERFIELD	0.00	2.76	2.8	10.5
Baker City	071	WHITNEY	49.20	50.95	1.8	3.6
Baker City	066	LA GRANDE-BAKER	49.27	53.89	4.7	9.3
		Totals			**9.1**	**23.4**
Brookings						
Brookings	255	CARPENTERVILLE	361.35	352.36	0.9	1.8
		Totals			**0.9**	**1.8**
Canby						
Canby	081	PACIFIC HIGHWAY EAST	19.28	22.00	2.7	5.5
		Totals			**2.7**	**5.5**
Central Point						
Central Point	063	ROGUE VALLEY	1.42 / 3.60	1.64 / 5.48	2.1	8.4
		Totals			**2.1**	**8.4**
Corvallis						
Corvallis	031	ALBANY-CORVALLIS	0.10	1.54	1.5	2.9
		Totals			**1.5**	**2.9**
Cottage Grove						
Cottage Grove	226	GOSHEN-DIVIDE	13.75	16.17	2.8	5.6
		Totals			**2.8**	**5.6**
Creswell						
Creswell	226	GOSHEN-DIVIDE	4.86	6.60	1.8	3.5
Creswell	222	SPRINGFIELD-CRESWELL	13.63	14.88	1.2	2.3
		Totals			**2.9**	**5.8**
Dallas						
Dallas	191	KINGS VALLEY	2.85	4.90	3.6	7.2
Dallas	189	DALLAS-RICKREALL	0.00	2.05	2.0	4.1
		Totals			**5.7**	**11.3**
Eagle Point						
Eagle Point	022	CRATER LAKE	9.23	10.21	1.7	3.4
		Totals			**1.7**	**3.4**
Eugene/Springfield						
Eugene/Springfield	225	MCVAY	0.02	1.48	1.5	2.9
Eugene/Springfield	228	SPRINGFIELD	0.01	1.40	2.7	5.4
Eugene/Springfield	091	PACIFIC HIGHWAY WEST	125.81	126.37	1.2	2.4
Eugene/Springfield	069	BELTLINE	12.76	13.00	0.5	0.5
		Totals			**5.9**	**11.2**
Grants Pass						
Grants Pass	272	JACKSONVILLE	0.38	2.83	3.1	9.2
Grants Pass	260	ROGUE RIVER LOOP	1.30	2.28	1.0	2.0
Grants Pass	060	ROGUE RIVER	0.01	2.05	2.4	9.6
Grants Pass	025	REDWOOD	-2.83	0.19	5.8	23.3
		Totals			**12.3**	**44.0**
Hermiston						
Hermiston	333	HERMISTON	4.97	10.09	5.5	11.1
		Totals			**5.5**	**11.1**

Attachment A

Page 1 of 4

Total District/Regional Highway Lane Miles

(In UGBs > 5,000 & Highway Sections Not on Freight Routes)

UGB	Hwy #	Highway	Begin MP	End MP	Length	Lane Miles
Hood River						
Hood River	281	HOOD RIVER	0.09	1.16	1.6	3.1
Hood River	100	HISTORIC COLUMBIA RIVER	48.90	51.06	2.8	5.5
		Totals			**4.3**	**8.6**
Independence						
Independence	193	INDEPENDENCE	4.88	6.33	1.5	3.0
Independence	043	MONMOUTH-INDEPENDENCE	0.00	2.35	2.4	4.7
		Totals			**3.8**	**7.7**
Junction City						
Junction City	058	ALBANY-JUNCTION CITY	32.12	32.37	0.3	0.8
		Totals			**0.3**	**0.8**
Klamath Falls						
Klamath Falls	020	KLAMATH FALLS-LAKEVIEW	-0.13 / 2.50	0.18 / 5.54	3.5	14.0
Klamath Falls	050	KLAMATH FALLS-MALIN	0.00 / 5.00	-6.86 / 5.10	8.5	33.8
Klamath Falls	420	MIDLAND	1.34	2.40	1.1	2.1
Klamath Falls	021	GREEN SPRINGS	57.69	58.86	1.2	2.3
		Totals			**14.2**	**52.3**
La Grande						
La Grande	066	LA GRANDE-BAKER	0.20	3.63	3.4	6.9
La Grande		WALLOWA LAKE			0.8	3.3
		Totals			**4.3**	**10.2**
Lebanon						
Lebanon	016	SANTIAM	12.24	12.80	0.6	1.1
		Totals			**0.6**	**1.1**
Madras						
Madras	361	CULVER	0.00	1.93	1.9	3.9
		Totals			**1.9**	**3.9**
McMinnville						
McMinnville	091	PACIFIC HIGHWAY WEST	35.01	39.19	5.5	16.6
McMinnville	039	SALMON RIVER	46.12	46.85	0.5	1.1
		Totals			**6.1**	**17.7**
Medford						
Medford	272	JACKSONVILLE	37.34	38.75	2.1	8.3
Medford	063	ROGUE VALLEY	8.13	9.91	1.9	7.5
		Totals			**3.9**	**15.8**
Molalla						
Molalla	161	WOODBURN-ESTACADA	11.00	13.79	2.8	5.6
Molalla	160	CASCADE HWY SOUTH	15.41	16.50	1.0	2.1
		Totals			**3.8**	**7.7**
Monmouth						
Monmouth	194	MONMOUTH	6.23	7.55	1.4	2.7
		Totals			**1.4**	**2.7**
Newberg						
Newberg	140	HILLSBORO-SILVERTON	17.92	22.17	3.8	7.6
Newberg	151	YAMHILL-NEWBERG	10.82	11.50	0.7	1.4
		Totals			**4.5**	**9.0**
North Bend						
North Bend	240	CAPE ARAGO	-0.04	1.92	2.6	10.1
		Totals			**2.6**	**10.1**
Ontario						
Ontario	455	OLDS FERRY-ONTARIO	27.73	28.39	0.7	2.0
		Totals			**0.7**	**2.0**
Pendleton						
Pendleton	038	PENDLETON-COLD SPRINGS	30.01	30.82	0.7	1.5
Pendleton	067	PENDLETON	-0.02	4.96	6.0	12.0
		Totals			**6.7**	**13.5**
Portland Metro						
Metro	141	BEAVERTON-TUALATIN	2.57 / 11.52	8.91 / 13.23	7.9	15.7
Metro	068	CASCADE HWY NORTH	0	10.18	10.7	42.9
Metro	142	FARMINGTON	5.88 / 8.68	7.61 /8.74	1.7	3.5
Metro	029	TUALATIN VALLEY	-0.22 / 13.21 / 17.88	3.22 / 13.29 /19.37	4.8	19.1
Metro	160	CASCADE HWY SOUTH	0 / 2.61	1.24 / 4.22	3.5	14.1
Metro	171	CLACKAMAS	-0.01 / 8.15	0.00 / 10.49	2.4	4.8
Metro	143	SCHOLLS	9.03	9.59	0.6	1.1
Metro	120	SWIFT	0.35	0.41	0.1	0.1
Metro	100	HISTORIC COLUMBIA RIVER	0.00	1.16	1.2	2.3
Metro	140	HILLSBORO-SILVERTON	0.01	0.72	0.7	1.5
Metro	102	NEHALEM	90.18	90.63	0.4	0.9
Metro	026	MT. HOOD	-0.10	9.96	10.5	31.4
Metro	091	PACIFIC HIGHWAY WEST	-5.97 / -0.44	-4.75 / 8.82	10.4	36.5
Metro	040	BEAVERTON-HILLSDALE	0.98	3.41	2.4	9.8
Metro	081	PACIFIC HIGHWAY EAST	-4.01 / 5.46	-3.75 / 15.01	10.5	42.0
Metro	003	OSWEGO	0.00 / 11.29	6.13 / 11.66	7.4	26.1
Metro	123	NORTHEAST PORTLAND	5.33 / 11.25	9.20 / 14.76	7.4	22.1
		Totals			**82.7**	**274.0**
Prineville						

Total District/Regional Highway Lane Miles

(In UGBs > 5,000 & Highway Sections Not on Freight Routes)

UGB	Hwy #	Highway	Begin MP	End MP	Length	Lane Miles
Prineville	370	O'NEIL	16.81	17.66	0.9	1.7
Prineville	380	PAULINA	0.01	1.33	1.3	2.7
		Totals			**2.2**	**4.4**
Redmond						
Redmond	370	O'NEIL	0.00	0.10	0.1	0.2
		Totals			**0.1**	**0.2**
Roseburg						
Roseburg	138	NORTH UMPQUA	-1.13	3.81	5.6	22.4
		Totals			**5.6**	**22.4**
Salem/Keizer						
Salem/Keizer	081	PACIFIC HIGHWAY EAST	44.34	46.49	2.1	8.6
Salem/Keizer	150	SALEM-DAYTON	17.57	20.77	5.2	10.4
		Totals			**7.4**	**19.0**
Sandy						
Sandy	172	EAGLE CREEK-SANDY	4.77	5.93	1.2	2.4
		Totals			**1.2**	**2.4**
Sheridan						
Sheridan	157	WILLAMINA-SHERIDAN	5.28	7.63	2.3	4.7
		Totals			**2.3**	**4.7**
Silverton						
Silverton	140	HILLSBORO-SILVERTON	49.37	50.66	1.7	3.4
Silverton	160	CASCADE HWY SOUTH	28.55	29.77	1.2	2.3
Silverton	163	SILVER CREEK FALLS	39.13	40.83	1.7	3.4
		Totals			**4.6**	**9.2**
Sutherlin						
Sutherlin	231	ELKTON-SUTHERLIN	22.89	25.39	2.5	5.0
		Totals			**2.5**	**5.0**
Sweet Home						
Sweet Home	212	HALSEY-SWEET HOME	20.59	21.40	0.8	1.6
Sweet Home	016	SANTIAM	27.07	31.30	4.2	12.7
		Totals			**5.0**	**14.3**
Talent						
Talent	063	ROGUE VALLEY	13.87	15.72	1.9	7.5
		Totals			**1.9**	**7.5**
The Dalles						
The Dalles	004	THE DALLES-CALIFORNIA	0.40	1.28	0.9	1.8
The Dalles	100	HISTORIC COLUMBIA RIVER	72.11	72.37	0.3	0.6
The Dalles	292	MOSIER-THE DALLES	18.55	20.23	2.1	4.3
		Totals			**3.3**	**6.6**
Umatilla						
Umatilla	002	COLUMBIA RIVER	180.73	184.08	3.4	6.7
		Totals			**3.4**	**6.7**

Total District/Regional Highway Lane Miles

(In UGBs > 5,000 & Highway Sections Not on Freight Routes)

UGB	Hwy #	Highway	Begin MP	End MP	Length	Lane Miles
Woodburn						
Woodburn	081	PACIFIC HIGHWAY EAST	30.87	33.62	2.8	8.3
Woodburn	161	WOODBURN-ESTACADA	0.01	0.46	0.5	0.9
Woodburn	140	HILLSBORO-SILVERTON	36.21	39.66	4.6	9.2
		Totals			**7.8**	**18.4**
		Totals			**262.6**	**758.7**

	Within Segment			Entire Highway				
Hwy_No	(a) Inventory	(b) Permits	Total (a+b)	(c) Inventory	(d) Permits	Total (c+d)		% (b/d)
002		53	53		122	122		43.4
003		4	4		17	17		23.5
004		3	3	209	300	509		1.0
012		2	2	4	25	29		8.0
016	14	22	36	18	83	101		26.5
020	2	43	45	95	172	267		25.0
021	1	6	7	1	29	30		20.7
022		1	1		85	85		1.2
025		34	34		165	165		20.6
026	85	148	233	196	230	426		64.3
029		11	11	1	170	171		6.5
031		3	3	7	8	15		37.5
036		1	1		1	1		100.0
039			0	1	31	32		0.0
040		36	36		36	36		100.0
043		8	8		8	8		100.0
050			0		48	48		0.0
058	4	32	36	12	57	69		56.1
060		12	12		52	52		23.1
063		41	41		80	80		51.3
066	394	30	424	771	45	816		66.7
067		3	3		3	3		100.0
068	5	52	57	5	52	57		100.0
069			0	1	1	2		0.0
071	11	19	30	12	30	42		63.3
081	8	134	142	78	196	274		68.4
091	1	29	30	20	234	254		12.4
100		18	18	37	42	79		42.9
102			0		107	107		0.0
105			0		30	30		0.0
120			0		3	3		0.0
123	32	46	78	34	91	125		50.5
138		4	4		13	13		30.8
140		15	15		63	63		23.8
141		28	28		32	32		87.5
142		3	3		5	5		60.0
143		4	4		4	4		100.0
150		9	9	2	18	20		50.0
151		4	4	1	13	14		30.8
157		8	8		14	14		57.1
160		49	49	4	160	164		30.6
161		19	19	20	60	80		31.7

Attachment B

	Within Segment			Entire Highway				
Hwy_No	(a) Inventory	(b) Permits	Total (a+b)	(c) Inventory	(d) Permits	Total (c+d)		% (b/d)
163		9	9		33	33		27.3
171		14	14	3	74	77		18.9
172		3	3		11	11		27.3
189		10	10		11	11		90.9
191	2	7	9	3	36	39		19.4
193		4	4		7	7		57.1
194			0	1	4	5		0.0
212	2	2	4	2	22	24		9.1
222		1	1		9	9		11.1
225		4	4		6	6		66.7
226		19	19		30	30		63.3
228		3	3		3	3		100.0
231		13	13	75	21	96		61.9
240		4	4	3	8	11		50.0
255			0		7	7		0.0
260		5	5		65	65		7.7
272		27	27		103	103		26.2
281		8	8		37	37		21.6
292			0		1	1		0.0
333	271	224	495	441	261	702		85.8
361		4	4		16	16		25.0
370			0	1	25	26		0.0
380		5	5	1	12	13		41.7
420		5	5		5	5		100.0
455		3	3	4	216	220		1.4
SUM=	832	1308	2140	2063	3958	6021		33.0

Total CHAMPS Records= 11643

Approx. 18% (2140/11643) of approach records (inventory + permit) in CHAMPS are on hwys segments on "jurisdictional transfer " list.

Total Inventory Records= 3265

Total Permitting Records= 8378

Approx. 15% (1308/8378) of permit records in CHAMPS are on hwy segments on "jurisdictional transfer " list.

ACCESS MANAGEMENT
CRITERIA FOR APPROVING A DRIVEWAY APPLICATION

OAR 074-051-0080

Driveway Spacing. Driveways shall be spaced in accordance with Table 1.

Number of Driveways. The number of driveways and driveway shall be based upon an estimate of site traffic generation in accordance with Table 2. Multiple driveways are permitted when the estimated ADT exceeds the number shown in the second column for the different type of land use. Then, an additional driveway is allowed each time the estimated ADT increases above the previous maximum ADT for each driveway as shown in the columns for regional and statewide facilities; provided, the additional driveways meet the spacing requirements specified in Table 2. As an example, a commercial land use has one (1) driveway up to two thousand (2,000) ADT, then two (2) driveways for two thousand one (2,001) to five thousand five hundred (5,500) ADT, three (3) driveways for five thousand five hundred one (5,501) to nine thousand (9,000) ADT and so on.

Table 1. Driveway Spacing

Posted Speed (MPH)	Minimum Separation (Feet)
20	85
25	105
30	125
35	150
40	185
45 and over	230

Table 2. ADT Carried by Each Driveway

		Maximum ADT for Each Additional Driveway	
Access from:	ADT for First Driveway	Regional Facility	Statewide Facility
Commercial use	0 to 2,000	3,500	5,000
Office campus	0 to 2,000	3,000	5,000
Multifamily use	0 to 1,500	3,000	5,000
Industrial use	0 to 1,500	3,000	4,000

Attachment C

Number of Driveways.
a) One driveway is permitted for a frontage of one hundred twenty-five feet or less.
b) One additional driveway is permitted for frontage over one hundred twenty-five feet.
c) Requests for additional driveways over the two of this section above, shall be justified by a traffic engineering study.

Spacing.
a) Driveways shall be spaced in accordance with the standard plans.
b) Distances between adjacent one-way driveways with the inbound drive upstream from the outbound drive may be one-half the distance shown.
c) Shared driveways are encouraged in order to meet the required separation.
d) Driveways should align with existing driveways on the opposite side of the street.

Width.
a) A residential driveway shall be fifteen to twenty-five feet in width; provided, that a clustered driveway serving two residential lots shall not exceed thirty-six feet in width.
b) A commercial two-way driveway shall be twenty-five to forty feet in width.

Corner Clearance.
a) To provide adequate corner clearance, the tangent curb length between the nearest edge of a driveway on an intersecting side street and an arterial street, or a driveway on an arterial street and an intersection with a cross street shall be fifty feet.
b) Where the intersection is signalized or is planned for signalization, driveways shall be limited to right turn movements only if located within two hundred fifty feet.