



**Access Management Committee Meeting
ODOT Human Resources Center, Conference Room A
2775 ~ 19th Street SE, Salem, OR 97302
September 13, 2010
8:15 AM – 12:15 PM**

Facilitator: Del Huntington.

Attendees: Brent Ahrend, Doug Bish, Bob Bryant, Victor Dodier, Robin Freeman, Matt Garrett, Erik Havig, Jamie Jeffrey, Harold Lasley, Michael Rock, Bob Russell and Mark Whitlow attended in person. Chris Doty and Jim Hanks attended by telephone.

Meeting Notes: Karen Elliott. Michelle Van Schaick also attended; Michelle will begin taking meeting notes in October.

Introductions and Approval of Minutes

Self introductions were made. The August 16, 2010 Access Management Committee meeting minutes were approved with the following changes:

- On page 7, the last bullet under Sub-Group #2 – Access Management Standards that Conform to Reality. Interchange Management Plans (IMP) need some attention. Interchange Management Plans should be corrected to say Interchange Area Management Plans.
- On page 11, first sentence. ODOT's Traffic Engineer is Ed Fischer, not Jim Fischer.

Sub-Group Updates

Note: For complete minutes of the five sub-group meetings, please go to <http://www.huntingtontrafficsolutions.com/> and follow the link to the Access Management Discussion Forum.

Work Plan

The work plan formed the basis of the meeting, and included discussions on task assignments from each of the sub groups; however, the majority of the meeting time focused on:

- Consideration of draft concepts for revised access management standards for regional- and district-level highways under 5,000 average daily traffic (ADT), item #6 on the following pages.

Draft Concepts

Bob Bryant briefly described the following twenty concepts in the work plan, noting the assigned numbers appear out of order, but have been reorganized to show their priority as listed below. *(Copy of SB 1024 – Draft Concepts, August 2, 2010, is marked Attachment I and included at the end of the minutes.)*

#1 – County Access Management (proposed legislative concept). Clarifies Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) to separate requirements for state highways from county roads which are presently combined under ORS 374 due to an unintended consequence of SB 1024.

Bob Russell stated the draft legislative concept was complete and he would provide Del Huntington with a copy as soon as Senator Betsy Johnson sends the final draft to him. The legislative concept has been endorsed by the Association of Counties (AOC) and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

#5 – Change in Use (proposed permanent administrative rule). Creates a permanent rule to replace the temporary “Change of Use” rule as required by SB 1024.

Bob Bryant advised activities are in motion to advance the permanent rule language to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) for its approval in December 2010. Harold Lasley has taken the lead on the permanent rule and it is on track. Harold advised the rule is currently in the open comment period and each Access Management (AM) committee member has been sent or will receive shortly a copy of the proposed permanent rule. If you do not receive a notice of the rulemaking in the next few days, contact Harold Lasley.

#6 – Less Than 5,000 AADT (proposed administrative rule and Oregon Highway Plan revision). SB 1024 requires new Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) that will result in less stringent access management (AM) rules, spacing standards, mitigation measures, and mobility standards for highways with less than 5,000 Average Daily Traffic (ADT). Spacing standards and mobility standards within the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) will have to be revised to reflect the new standards for highways with less than 5,000 ADT. Bob Bryant indicated the timeline language on the Draft Concepts (Attachment I) is incorrect. Instead of a target date for OHP/OAR changes in June 2010, it should read June 2011.

Michael Rock requested the Planning Section be added to the resource column on Attachment I, Item # 6.

Bob Bryant walked through the proposed language developed by ODOT staff and briefly reviewed by the AM Standards sub-group. *(See Revised Standards and Approval Criteria, marked Attachment II and included at the end of the minutes.)* Bob noted this proposed language is a draft only, and applies to regional- and district-level highways

with less than 5,000 ADT. Work still needs to be done by taking another scan through the volume tables to see what other highways fall under the 5,000 ADT threshold.

Committee member comments on the Revised Standards and Approval Criteria for traffic volumes under 5,000 ADT for regional and district highways (Attachment II) are noted below:

- Bob Russell pointed out the approval criteria for private approaches to the highway do not provide objective criteria for safety, which is part of the problem he thought we were trying to address. The proposed text states “to address safety problems” yet safety is not defined. Bob Bryant agreed work still needs to be done on the safety aspect.
- Mark Whitlow asked how the proposed text would result in a better process than the existing process. He was interested in comparing the new criteria with the old criteria to see if, in fact, the process had become less stringent.
- There was some confusion among committee members about whether or not a developer would be required to meet all four bulleted conditions under “**Approval Criteria**”. The answer was no, just one of the four conditions were required in order for the Region Manager to approve a private approach. Given that understanding, committee members suggested adding the word “or” after each condition.
- Under “**Approval Criteria**”, the first bulleted condition refers to projected left-turn volumes from the approach to the highway are below 75 vehicles per hour (vph) in the peak hour. Chris Doty thought some assumptions had been made on how the number of vehicles per hour were calculated. Jim Hanks volunteered to have his staff look at the left-turn criteria and how that number was derived.

Some committee members felt leaving the number at 75 vph was the way to go, so that deviations would not be needed. However, Jamie Jeffrey pointed out that by doing a little more analysis on the 75 vph and “move in the direction of” as defined in OAR 734-051-0040(39) would be a good option.

- Bob Bryant commented the revised spacing standards shown in the table of Attachment II were less stringent than the old criteria.

Discussion focused on the revised spacing standards table and how to interpret “maximum spacing available to adjacent driveways and road approaches up to. . .” Members wondered if maximum spacing should be changed to minimum spacing or if the reference to maximum or minimum should be left out. It was agreed to leave the word maximum or minimum out.

- In the paragraph preceding the spacing standards table, Harold Lasley recommended replacing the word maximize with optimize, so that a driveway could be appropriately located without having to go through the deviation process. The sentence would read as shown below:

“ . . .Where the above Approval Criteria are met, the application for the first driveway will be approved based on the Revised Spacing Standard table below, or in situations where there is no other available access to the property and the

spacing standards cannot be achieved, the approach shall be located to ~~maximize~~ optimize spacing and safety.”

- Mark Whitlow stated that he wants “alternate access” removed completely from the proposed text as it is not part of ORS 374. Rather, there is a need for objective criteria to determine the number of direct approaches to the state highway. For example, sites of a specific size require X number of approaches to serve the site adequately. Jamie Jeffrey pointed out that a better definition of reasonable access would help this issue.

Del Huntington asked a clarifying question to determine if everyone was on the same page as to what constituted an objective standard. “If a developer could show that an anticipated queue on the site would require an excessively long approach, could this be justification for a second approach?” Mark Whitlow responded that the example was not an objective standard; rather, a site of a certain size will require more than one approach to the highway. Matt Garrett believed that the question Del asked provided specific data that could be applied in the analysis. Matt asked Mark what thresholds he was thinking about and if those conversations have taken place. Mark replied they were trying to get there. Matt would like that clarity – that right now, reasonable access is more of a gut call. Matt continued to say he wanted folks to give us supporting data – we continue to trip up on the word alternative – we want to support economic development – we want the folks at the counter to have the clarity to approve or not approve the application. Matt commented that we have more work to do. Bob Bryant agreed with what Matt said and pointed out that when we talk about reasonable access, Del Huntington’s presentation last week identified that reasonable access is a complex discussion and varies from highway corridor to corridor.

Bob Bryant suggested we flag this item and come back to it. Matt stated he wanted something more; he said let’s move quicker to make this tangible. Matt continued by saying we are talking about important things here and we need to act on them. Don’t put this off for too long – too many people are spending a lot of time on this to not get something accomplished.

- Jim Hanks commented that when you are dealing with roads less than 5,000 ADT, it is most likely going to be a smaller development locating on that type of roadway. It could be an industrial site and the spacing standards don’t take into account the various needs required for industrial properties. Jim indicated an industrial site may have three separate operations going on with totally different operational and safety needs. For example, one approach may serve an asphalt plant, another for a concrete mixing plant and another for customer sales. Jim noted that whatever we do, we need to make accommodations for that.

Bob Russell pointed out that we continue to plow up the same old ground. SB 1024 requires that ODOT adopt objective standards, however, the proposal has too many subjective standards. ODOT needs to come back with a better plan. Bob believes the current approach is to take the cookie cutter issues, define them, and run with it. Bob suggested that just the opposite be done. Instead, go to the other issues that aren’t

cookie cutter issues and attack those, rather than the other way around. Bob Bryant agreed and suggested it may not be too late to take that approach.

Jamie Jeffrey recommended that a better definition be developed for the 75 left-turning vehicles. The 75 vph is a number that is hard to visualize and it might make sense to identify some common uses that would generate this type of traffic volume. Brent Ahrend suggested that 75 projected left-turn volumes from the approach to the highway could be part of a range to apply. Brent felt the bottom line is how many trips are made into the site. Harold Lasley noted that including left-turn criteria in the approval criteria accomplishes two objectives: 1) it provides clear and objective approval criteria, and 2) it represents the point at which ODOT would want to look more closely at potential safety problems with the approach.

Jim Hanks commented he thought the numbers themselves were not bad and it could eliminate many of the issues. He felt that traffic volumes are not the problem, but rather the spacing criteria that creates an issue, especially for industrial sites that often have a need for more than one approach. As proposed in the text, in order for a property owner to achieve more than one approach to the state highway, they would be required to meet the revised spacing standards. Mark Whitlow asked if there was any substitute criteria or, if you can't meet this "quick look", is there a process to show the need for an additional access to the highway? Bob Bryant stated that if the spacing standards are not met, you don't make it. Del Huntington noted there is a need to do more work in this area.

Mark Whitlow asked if the proposed language would solve the concern that arose in Lakeview. Bob Bryant responded that it would not, as the issue was on a statewide highway and statewide highways are not part of the ODOT proposal at this time. However, other work is happening, such as the "change in use" rule which may address Senator Whitsett's concerns.

Jamie Jeffrey offered up a suggestion to get to the basis of this discussion; that is, if you have a certain number of trips, you need a certain number of accesses. If you have a capacity issue, do some capacity number crunching to see if we can do something broader, such as providing a second approach to reduce the number of turning movements at one location (also consider highways with more than 5,000 ADT). Get a combination of some technical data to give us something to hang our hat on. In other words, give us some context to draw a line in the sand.

Bob Bryant agreed more work needs to be done on the "**For Regional and District Level Highways**" paragraph.

- Bob Bryant pointed out the "**Median Exclusion**" paragraph on page two was extremely subjective; Bob Russell said this was difficult for them to deal with and would prefer to delay this discussion until Victor Dodier had a chance to look at the drafted legislative concept language related to medians. Matt Garrett stated that there is a need for flexibility as it relates to medians as there is the potential for tension between the trucking association, which would like higher speeds and limited interruptions through communities, and community values around livability, where people want slower speeds on the highways and more consideration for pedestrians, cyclists and transit. Bob Russell asked why local government can develop policies

and standards in the local Transportation System Plan (TSP) that are different from ODOT's. Bob Bryant responded it gives local government the ability to manage its own roadways and allows them input on how state highways are managed through their community. Matt Garrett thought the issue relates to capacity and we need to figure out how to deal with this, indicating freight mobility needs to be much tighter in this situation. Bob Bryant noted the concern.

- Erik Havig commented on median designs, indicating the wording in the proposed text did not get ODOT out of other requirements. Bob Russell noted that the trucking association is not able to track the development of every TSP across the state and unable to determine if the TSP adopts medians in locations that are unacceptable to the trucking industry. Erik agreed and stated that even in situations where a median is called out in a TSP, the concept must go through a design process before it can be constructed. The designers understand the need and requirements to move truck traffic through a corridor, and therefore, there is a check-and-balance process in place.
- Michael Rock suggested adding “or adopted AM Plan” to the end of the “**Median Exclusion**” paragraph, so the last sentence would read: “The exception is where a non-traversable median is needed to mitigate identifiable safety or traffic operational problems, or is made a condition of approval by the local government or a requirement as set forth in their adopted Transportation Plan or adopted Access Management Plan.”
- Del Huntington clarified the “**Move in the Direction of**” paragraph refers to specific text in the existing OAR 734-051-0040(39). He proposed adding additional criteria that would qualify as “moving in the direction of”. Del commented this is the best opportunity to more quickly identify solutions. Bob Russell agreed with Del's statement; Matt Garrett noted this was at the core of Division 51 – you have technical staff that gives advice. Matt's message was we have to put something in here and Del's recommendation helps us get where we need to be. Jamie Jeffrey suggested that by adding this into the guidelines, it would give Regional Access Management Engineers (RAMEs) the ability to move forward and not have to go to the Region Manager for approval.

Before leaving the committee meeting, ODOT Director Matt Garrett shared some thoughts with committee members: recognizes a lot of work has gone into this effort; need to focus on completing the work; get the organization where it needs to go; there is a sense of urgency; and take the next steps.

- Briefly touching on the “**Exemptions**” and “**How this Helps Applicant**” paragraphs, Bob Bryant noted they could do more work in the “How this Helps Applicant” paragraph.
- With regard to the “**Potential Negative Impacts/Concerns**” paragraph, several comments were made.

Jamie Jeffrey was concerned that statewide highways with less than 5,000 ADT were not included in the ODOT proposal, especially if the traffic isn't different from

district or regional highways. If the traffic and roadway characteristics are the same, treat them the same when dealing with access issues. However, if the statewide highway facility goal is higher, that may be a reason for developing different guidelines.

Bob Russell noted that sight distance was not addressed at all in the criteria. Jamie Jeffrey pointed out that the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) has criteria related to intersection sight distances and that the City of Portland applies those principles to driveway decisions. Bob Russell thought it was important to define and/or incorporate sight distance in some way. Jamie Jeffrey agreed it would be helpful.

Bob Russell commented he does not like accesses too close to intersections. Erik Havig offered that something could be done in the safety criteria to address the issue. Bob Russell thought there needs to be some discussion; Jamie Jeffrey agreed. For example, she noted, if you know something is not going to meet the approval criteria, those kinds of considerations need to be known, that will help the applicant going into the process.

Bob Bryant asked Victor Dodier if he thought the Revised Standards and Approval Criteria wording meets the legislation's intent for highways with less than 5,000 ADT. Victor responded that if stakeholders say yes to this criteria, then we have done what we needed to do. If they say no, then we have missed the mark. Del Huntington said from his perspective, it is a whole different conversation if ODOT does not put statewide highways into this group. He asked committee members if they would or would not support recommending the Revised Standards and Approval Criteria, recognizing that the proposal does not include statewide highways. The following responses were given:

- Bob Russell preferred to address the issue when statewide highways with less than 5,000 ADT were identified.
- Jamie Jeffrey said if traffic and conditions were not different, is there a purpose for holding statewide highways to different standards?
- Brent Ahrend stated that he would like to gain a better understanding of statewide highways with less than 5,000 ADT in the rural and urban settings.
- Bob Russell believes the proposed text is a good start to meeting one of the requirements of SB 1024, though addressing issues such as sight distance requirements and statewide highways will help get us there.
- Jamie suggested adding another bullet to the "**Approval Criteria**" paragraph on page one to clarify when an additional driveway to the highway may be allowed. Ideas related to additional text were proposed though there was no consensus among the participants.
- Under the seventh bullet on page one, Doug Bish requested adding the word "direct" approach to the highway. The sentence would read "Where a property has more than one existing direct approach to the highway. . ."
- Jamie Jeffrey questioned the benefits of including all of the statements under "Potential Negative Impacts/Concerns" on pages two and three. Bob Bryant noted that the ODOT team that developed the proposal was just trying to capture all the

notes. Jamie recommended that in the event the comments remain in the document, several of the bullets could be combined and could provide better clarity.

The following action items came out of the proposed Revised Standards and Approval Criteria discussion:

- Need to see and identify (preferably using a state map with recognizable highway numbers) which urban and rural statewide highways are under 5,000 ADT. Bob Bryant thought he would have this information in about a week.
- There is a need for the AM Standards sub-group to review the Revised Standards and Approval Criteria – and provide Del with comments, preferably via e-mail or phone conference.

Bob Russell commented on expressways, giving an example of one in Salem, where a portion looks like an expressway and in another place it looks like an arterial. Bob Bryant responded to the concern by noting it is tough to achieve expressway standards on some designations. The work underway with the AM Committee may facilitate changing an expressway designation on a corridor. Bob Bryant stated it would require a case-by-case look at each situation to determine if the expressway designation was correct or should be revised; Erik Havig thought that was definitely a possibility. Bob Russell pointed out it should be easy to say no to all access requests onto expressways and freeways.

Discussion was directed back to the remaining items on the SB 1024 – Draft Concepts list (Attachment I).

#8 – Reasonable Access (proposed administrative rule revision). Revises text for “reasonable access” in OAR 734-051-0080(8) to be consistent with ORS 374.310(3)(a)&(b).

Bob Bryant noted the goal of this concept was to craft language to get to less stringent criteria. Bob stated ODOT Director Matt Garrett had previously requested that we need to start getting this concept pen-to-ink, so to speak. The Director’s expectation is to identify what we can do right now to move the agency in a direction to achieve a different outcome. That is to say, we need to change how we look at reasonable access in the rule. Del Huntington hoped to have a draft proposal for thresholds for infill and redevelopment completed by September 18.

Committee members made the following observations:

- Bob Russell asked if access is always the issue with infill. Mark Whitlow indicated that infill and redevelopment should be a benefit to the local community and was of great concern for Senator Whitsett. Brent Ahrend offered that, if you meet the spacing standards, you are assured a full-movement access, unless there is a safety concern. Jamie Jeffrey spoke of one area in Portland where the situation didn’t meet spacing standards, but alternatives can be achieved with an interconnected street

network. In this particular case, the analysis showed conditions that were significantly over-capacity for a side-street left turn movement and based on the analysis methodology, it would take a motorist 4 ½ hours to make a left turn. The proposed mitigation was a median island to restrict to right turns. However, logic of driver behavior indicates that no driver will wait that long to turn left. Therefore, if you re-evaluated the analysis based on other choices drivers make (i.e. turning right vs. turning left, or going around the block to a signalized intersection), you might find that you can meet mobility standards (in other words, the left turn prohibition may be self enforcing due to lack of gaps in traffic). In which case, you might not need to install a median to address the capacity issue (safety is a different story). These considerations might be applied in an area with a street network that allows good distribution of traffic.

- Bob Russell referred to the Chemult Pilot Truck Stop access and pointed out that reasonable access in rural and urban areas differ. Bob Bryant agreed that Chemult would provide a good case study. Del pointed out another thing to keep in mind, that most of the conversation on reasonable access has been focused on commercial development; however, we need to address industrial, office and residential uses as well.
- Jamie Jeffrey asked for clarification on page one of the Revised Standards and Approval Criteria (Attachment II) under the “**Regional and District Level Highways**” paragraph. She referred to the last sentence . . . “The spacing standard will be the same for both urban and rural highways and for commercial and residential applications.” Jamie asked if commercial was also considered industrial. Bob Bryant answered yes.
- Erik Havig asked if there would be draft language available for the October AM Committee meeting. Bob Bryant confirmed a draft would be provided, with Del Huntington’s help. The intent was to work on the draft offline. Jamie Jeffrey inquired if it would be helpful if she looked at Portland’s city block spacing and identify the size of parcels adjacent to the state highway between the city street intersections. In a majority of cases, ODOT is required to approve an approach to each property unless they have reasonable access via another means. This information from the city would help determine if the proposed spacing standards are realistic and address the concern. Mark Whitlow responded the case study information would be most helpful. Jamie will work with City staff and provide the data to AM Committee members.

#14 – Context Sensitive Access Management Standards (Oregon Highway Plan revision). Develops AM standards that are consistent with the function, context, and surrounding environment of the highway corridor.

Del Huntington commented the AM Standards sub-group focused on reviewing the proposed revised standards for highways with less than 5,000 ADT, which was covered in the prior agenda item. Bob Bryant noted there was much overlap and it all starts to blur as you talk context-sensitive considerations.

Using the City of Sandy as an example, Brent Ahrend inquired about needing different spacing standards for more dense urban vs. suburban areas. Doug Bish stated that spacing standards can vary significantly on a one-way highway as compared to a two-way highway (referring to the one-way couplet through Sandy). Jamie Jeffrey said there may be an opportunity to revise criteria depending on the street spacing. Del Huntington asked if Brent was advocating for more driveways. Erik Havig offered up this wasn't so much a spacing standard issue but more what makes sense for the environment. Del Huntington added that property/frontage values come into the equation as property owners typically do not request approaches in dense downtown areas as the land values are high and store frontage is out against the entire length of the curb/sidewalk. Brent wondered if there was a standard that looks at "it" differently? Jamie Jeffrey noted that the City of Portland does not have a driveway spacing standard and the one thing for ODOT to consider is a process and standards that reduce the high number of deviations. The goal is to make this easier and quicker, but you also need to maintain a certain comfort level. Mark Whitlow noted this would help with reasonable access also.

#15 – Medians (Oregon Highway Plan revision).

6(a.) Non-traversable medians: Agree on a process and criteria to be used in decisions on where and when non-traversable medians are to be used as part of mitigating the impacts associated with access and/or to address safety.

Bob Russell referred committee members to a one-page document containing a proposed legislative concept related to non-traversable medians. *(A copy is marked Attachment III and included at the end of the minutes.)*

Bob Russell stated he wants 28 feet of clear horizontal space; he does not agree with splitting the difference to 14 feet if there is a median in place. He noted that the 28-foot dimension referred to two-lane, rural highways. Erik Havig indicated there may be situations where you don't need the full 28 feet. Bob Russell said the problems are in the very rural communities. Discussion pursued around the wording of 28 feet. Victor Dodier mentioned a "provision" regarding the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) having the authority to make decisions based on safety needs and roadway widths; and therefore, text could be added to the legislative concept that allows the OTC to be part of the process. Bob Russell had no problem making that "provision" part of the language. It was determined that Victor and Bob Russell would work together on the proposed language for the legislative concept.

Bob Russell was concerned that we may not have addressed Representative Doherty's issue about the need to provide adequate notice to property owners prior to the installation of a non-traversable median. Victor Dodier said that Representative Doherty's issue is on Highway 99 – and is addressed in specific ways – through specific text in the concept, making the decision part of the local TSP and within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Bob Russell thought all UGBs are not created equal and he voiced a concern with Irrigon's TSP. He pointed out that the trucking industry typically does not get involved in the process in small communities and they learn about decisions

too late in the process. Bob Russell's focus is on rural, two-lane highways, where he does not have alternatives such as closely-spaced city streets.

Bob Bryant indicated more work needs to be done here. He offered that he will soon, hopefully, get to whether or not we have consensus on this concept, as well as all the other concepts outlined on Attachment I.

#4 – Medians (proposed legislative concept).

6(b.) Double-Double Yellow Painted Median: Develop text to allow the use of a "double-double yellow line" as a restricted median that would make it illegal for motorists to cross.

Committee members offered the following comments:

- Doug Bish suggested adding text that double-double yellow solid lines qualify as a restricted area. Doug also thought painting chevrons between the double-double yellow solid lines would be a good idea. Discussion followed around possible wording.
- Bob Russell asked if, conceptually, it is time for Victor Dodier to move forward with the legislative concept. Victor stated his concerns included having a consistent statute across state, city and county highways as it is unclear on the miles of state highways, county roads and city streets that would be impacted. Victor brought up the issue that local governments may have concerns about adding chevrons and creating a major fiscal impact on cities and counties. A suggestion was made to have the Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee (OTCDC) look at the issue.
- Doug Bish stated he did not think highway engineers around the state believe a double-double yellow line prohibits drivers from crossing. Jamie Jeffrey pointed out that if we now make crossing a double-double yellow line illegal, the concept should be forwarded immediately to the OTCDC; however, at this time the OTCDC is grappling with other higher priority assignments. Bob Russell thought we should take the issue to the OTCDC before going to the legislature, though he agrees with Victor's recommendation that this concept would likely fail due to fiscal impacts.

Bob Bryant agreed there was still work to be done on this concept also.

6(c.) U-Turns: Considers change to ORS to allow use of U-Turns.

Victor Dodier explained current Oregon law and that the OTCDC committee recommends flipping the presumption that u-turns are permitted except where signing does not allow it. He indicated they are trying to get to the point where it is the driver's responsibility to determine whether a u-turn is safe or not, rather than putting responsibility on local governments to go out and study whether or not a u-turn would be safe.

The concept is being advanced by ODOT and is a part of the Governor's bill for 2011.

#2 – Jurisdiction Transfers (proposed legislative concept). Creates jurisdictional transfer of certain district and regional non-freight highways within UGBs. Shifts responsibility to local government for balancing function/operations of specific highway segments with goals for urban growth and economic development within the community.

Bob Bryant advised this concept is in the works and local stakeholders will be contacted in the near future to determine if they are interested in a possible jurisdictional transfer.

#10 – Appeal Process (proposed administrative rule revision). Revises ODOT’s current appeal process, OAR 374-051-0345.

Bob Bryant reported ODOT is in the process of developing a proposal to revise the appeals process and committee membership and will soon be made available to the AM Committee. He also advised that Del has developed a preliminary concept of a facilitator/third party at the front end of complex applications to assist in reaching a quicker and less costly decision. There is additional work to do on this concept.

With the exception of #11 – Mitigation Measures (continued below), the remaining following concepts are either overlapping concepts already in the process or require more resource time:

- #3 – Public Road and Street Connections vs. Private Driveways: Revises ORS to distinguish between public road and street connections from private driveways.
- #12 – Access Spacing: Within UGBs, re-evaluates the access spacing in Interchange Management Areas.
- #13 – Access Spacing: Within UGBs, re-evaluates the AM standards on expressways.
- #7 – SB 1024 Section 2(1): ODOT, in cooperation with stakeholders, shall develop proposed legislation to codify, clarify and bring consistency to issuance of permits based on objective standards.
- #9 – SB 1024 Section 2(1): Expands on “move in the direction of” currently included in OAR 734-051-0115(c)(B)and(C) Access Management Standards for Approaches, as the goal within UGBs.
- #16 – OHP Highway Mobility Standards: Revises Highway Mobility Standards and Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Standards.
- #17 – Develops guidelines on criteria for staff to consider in determination of “reasonable access”.
- #18 – Develops guidelines on criteria for staff that is acceptable to achieve the goal of “moving in the direction of”.
- #19 – Develops mitigation measure thresholds for new developments and developments under a change of use.
- #20 – Develops and provide training to staff on revisions to the ORS, OAR and OHP. Pays particular attention to the goal of access management, the desire to attract and retain development within the UGB, and the criteria that constitutes “moving in the direction of” during review of an application.

#11 – Mitigation Measures (proposed administrative rule revision). Revises mitigation measures process, OAR 374-051-0145.

Del Huntington advised the mitigation measures sub-group met last week and provided an update on its work. Harold Lasley had provided a report of the past 10 years, which included approximately 5,000 approach applications that ODOT has processed through to a decision. The summary identified that 96% of the applications were approved, though the report did not include information on the length of time to reach a decision, the number of prospective applicants that chose not to pursue the process, nor the extent and cost of mitigation measures when required. Jamie Jeffrey, who is on the sub-group, suggested a discussion with external stakeholders to gain their perspectives on the current process. As a significant amount of mitigation measures are related to the current volume/capacity (v/c) threshold, Del Huntington asked if there was a way to modify the v/c standard or eliminate the methodology for private approaches. Jim Hanks will run some analysis with various roadway and approach traffic volumes to gain a better sense of conditions that exceed the current v/c threshold. At this point, there is nothing to put out on the table.

Harold Lasley confirmed there were no specifics. The group is trying to get an understanding of what the group is looking at – mobility or safety mitigation. Bob Bryant agreed there is a challenge in trying to separate mobility (congestion) from safety. Jamie Jeffrey suggested picking a range in the middle. There was a situation they looked at in Portland where there becomes a point where you have to consider and look at the analysis. Bob Bryant commented that this concept also overlapped with other concepts with regard to objective standards. Mark Whitlow asked what is safe – when do we get to talk about that when something fails – how much mitigation do you need? When discussing safety issues as part of an existing or proposed development, Mark would like to shift the burden of proof from the developer to ODOT. Rather than requiring the developer to prove that an approach or proposed mitigation measure will be safe, ODOT would have to prove that the approach or proposed mitigation measure would be unsafe.

Related to the left-turn analysis and difficulty in achieving the existing v/c threshold for developers, Jamie Jeffrey recommended that a consideration of the historical experience in a certain location could be helpful. Brent Ahrend commented on looking at other options. At a certain volume/speed level, he suggested that we are not going to worry about left-turns from private developments – at least that's the direction he thought we should be heading toward.

Bob Russell asked if we could ever deal with big box retailers. Jamie Jeffrey and Brent Ahrend agreed that traffic associated with this type of development will require specific analysis for new developments. Brent would like to see a more logical process and provided examples of projects in Newberg where the request to add a gas station resulted in ODOT attempting to remove an existing access, and in Tillamook where a request to expand the building resulted in ODOT requiring public street change-in-use applications and conditions contrary to an existing agreement already in place. Both requests resulted

in lengthy, expensive processes and appeals, as the current rules would not have allowed the approaches as currently constructed. In the end, both sites retained their existing access points as initially requested.

Action items

Del Huntington summarized the following action items coming out of today's meeting:

- ODOT to provide a state map with recognizable highway numbers showing urban and rural highways under 5,000 ADT (including statewide highways).
- Review and provide comments on the proposed text to revise the access management standards, spacing standards, mitigation measures and mobility standards for highways with less than 5,000 ADT. (*See Revised Standards and Approval Criteria, marked Attachment II and included at the end of the minutes.*)
- Jamie Jeffrey will look at Portland's city block spacing and property frontage dimensions for those properties that are adjacent to the state highway to serve as a case study in determining if the proposed revised spacing standards will facilitate the urban context. She will share the results of the case study data with committee members.
- Bob Russell and Victor Dodier will work on the final draft legislative concept for Non-Traversable Median language (Draft Concept #15).
- Defer legislative concept regarding Double-Double Yellow Painted Medians (Draft Concept #4) to the Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee for its review and recommendation.
- Sub-groups to meet, through e-mails or telephone conferencing, to further define its work on the various issues only as materials that propose specific solutions become available.

In closing, Bob Bryant re-emphasized the full committee and sub-groups are getting close to determining the degree of support for each proposal. In the very near future, we will identify if each proposal has full consensus, partial consensus, no consensus, or if there is a need for a majority/minority report – and where to go from there.

Bob Russell pointed out that the Association of Oregon Counties and the League of Oregon Cities need to be present when these items are brought forward.

Next meeting of the Access Management Committee

The next Access Management Committee meeting is Wednesday, October 27, 8:15 to noon, at ODOT's Human Resources Center, Room A, 2775 19th Street SE, Salem. Telephone conferencing will be offered for this meeting. To conference in by phone, dial 1-877-581-9247, and enter participant code: 280787.

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Attachment I – Copy of SB 1024 – Draft Concepts (Work plan)

Attachment II – Copy of Proposed Revised Standards and Approval Criteria

Attachment III – Draft Copy of Non-traversable Median Language

Attachment I
Copy of SB 1024 – Draft Concepts (Work plan)

SB 1024 - Draft Concepts

August 2, 2010

#	Legislative Concept	Administrative Rules	Oregon Highway Plan	Concept	Issue	Champion: Lead: Resource:	Timeline	Potential Impacts	Unknown/Unresolved
1*	X			County Access Management: Create New/Separate ORS to distinguish requirements for State Highways from County Roads (Presently combined under ORS 374)	Existing ORS 374 combines State Highways with County Roads. SB1024 while intended to be directed to ODOT/state highway access management, it resulted in an impact to County's. (Existing commitment from ODOT to AOC to write new ORS that put's County's back to a "pre-SB1020" condition.)	Bob Russell Victor Dodier ??	Proposed ORS Text should be completed and approved by the Director's office and AG's office by 11/31/2010.	Opportunity for ODOT and Counties to revise and improve enabling statute.	It is understood that Senator Johnson is preparing a bill to address this issue. Bob Russell has stated that this bill will allow ODOT and the stakeholders to work on access management issues and develop legislative concepts through February 2011 and added to the senate bill. IF CORRECT, this will have a significant impact on the timeline, extending the working period by several months.
5*		X		Change in Use - Permanent rule to replace temporary "Change of Use" rule as required by SB1024.	SB 1024 imposed a change to permitting requirements associated with a Change in Use. It is understood that the proposed temporary rule advanced to the OTC for adoption on July 20, 2010 will expire after 180 days and requires permanent rule change to memorialize change in OAR 734 Div. 51..	Harold Lasley Ann Zeltman Lauri Kunze	Text for permanent OAR should be adopted by January 9, 2011.		There is a need to make technical corrections as part of the permanent rule making process. Potential concern among some staff that adopted sight distance standards in the temporary rule may expose the agency to liability or the public to unsafe conditions.
6*		X	X	<5000 ADT - SB 1024 requires new OARs that will result in less stringent AM rules, spacing standards, mitigation measures, and mobility standards for highways with <5K ADT. Spacing standards within the OHP will have to be revised to reflect the new standards for highways with <5K ADT.	It is unclear if the drafters of the legislation intended to modify decisions on all public road and street connections and private driveways, or was intended to modify decisions and process for private driveways. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As ODOT collects ADT data based on mile-points across the state highway system, detailed analysis reveals that many highways fluctuate above and below the 5K ADT threshold. Modifying AM standards through a corridor, especially a rural condition, could result in concerns for driver expectancy. Need to preserve and protect a vertical and horizontal dimension to ensure adequate truck access through corridor. 	Harold Lasley ?? ??	SB 1024 is not entirely specific on the date that a new OAR is to be completed and adopted by the OTC. It is critical that an expected date is established for the delivery of the new OAR.	Some of the candidate highways may be access controlled and therefore access locations are pre-determined. Impact of having less stringent AM standards and spacing requirements on highways with <5K ADT within interchange management areas will need to be considered. Impact of having less stringent AM standards and spacing requirements on highways designated as Expressways with <5K ADT with I will need to be considered.	It is recommended that a conversation occur with the drafters of SB 1024 to determine if they would consider an agreement on routes (especially in rural conditions) where a consistent AM standard is established, even if the ADT fluctuates above and below the 5K ADT threshold. It is anticipated that the new rules would be inter-woven within the existing OAR.
8		X		Reasonable Access - Revise test for "reasonable access" in the OAR 734-051-0080(8) to be consistent with in ORS 374.310(3)(a)&(b).	Discussions at AM Committee meetings acknowledge that cities and developers view "reasonable access" from a different perspective than ODOT. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODOT evaluates reasonable access from a primarily from a highway perspective and may determine that access does not need to accommodate the highest and best use of the property. Cities and developers typically view reasonable access that will serve the intended uses allowed under the zoning. 	Mark Whitlow Bob Bryant ??	This impacts many issues within the OAR and therefore should be developed with AM Committee approval by 12/31/2010.	A clarification of how reasonable access is defined within ODOT may result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More equitable solutions for property owners during project development, ORS 374-051-0285(5)(d). Increased r/w costs during project development when existing accesses are altered or removed. More access to state highways affecting mobility, congestion, and safety. 	It is unclear if a revised interpretation of reasonable access will create any additional obligations for ODOT R/W Section during project development due to federal and state regulations and/or guidelines.

* Denotes mandatory revisions to the ORS or OAR

#	Legislative Concept	Administrative Rules	Oregon Highway Plan	Concept	Issue	Champion: Lead: Resource:	Timeline	Potential Impacts	Unknown/Unresolved
14			X	<p>"Context Sensative" Access Managment Standards: Develop AM standards that are consistent with the function, context, and surrounding environment of the highway corridor.</p> <p>Appendix C: Access Management Standards - Develop separate public street and roads spacing standards on Statewide, Regional and District Highway, Tables 13 - 15.</p> <p>Appendix C: Access Management Standards - Revise access spacing standards for driveways within UGBs on Statewide, Regional and District Highway, Tables 13 - 15.</p>	<p>AM standards for state highways that serve a local/regional use should be the same as similar city streets within the UGB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing access spacing standards are part of the OHP and would have to be revised in the plan, or eliminated entirely and placed in guidelines/standards. 	Mark Whitlow Bob Bryant David Boyd??	The proposed OHP revisions should be developed with AM Committee approval by 12/31/2010.	<p>Proposed relaxation of spacing standards would reduce potential conflicts on ODOT access decisions. This may result in more access to state highways.</p> <p>Provides opportunity to revise AM standards on Expressways to achieve a better balance between economic development, mobility and safety.</p> <p>Opportunity to modify spacing standards within interchange management areas for build/urban areas, consistent with OT Commissioner Russell's concern when AM standards were adopted in 2000.</p>	
15			X	<p>MEDIANS -</p> <p>6 (a.) Non-traversable medians: Agree on a process and criteria to be used in decisions on where and when non traversable medians are to be used as part of mitigating the impacts associated with access and/or to address safety.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has been acknowledged that non traversable median solutions through strip commercial development areas can create significant impacts to accessing businesses and properties abutting the highway. There is clear documentation that raised non traversable medians can be the most effective solution for reducing conflicts, reducing congestion, and improving safety making this a critical balance between providing access to support buisness's and maximizing safety for the traveling public. The current median policy is not flexible and does not provide consideration of economic development or reasonable access for development along the corridor. 	Bob Russell Doug Bish Doug Bish	The proposed OHP revisions should be developed with AM Committee approval by 12/31/2010.	<p>A revised median policy could impact adopted plans that include a non-traversable median.</p>	<p>Where non-traversable medians are identified as the preferred solution, clearer guidelines and standards related to the maximum out-of-direction travel and appropriate accommodation of U-turn possibilities could help to reduce frustration.</p> <p>Creative solutions within the non-traversable area that provide for certain turn movements could help to reduce concern from adjacent property owners.</p> <p>A revised definition of "reasonable access" could impact the agency's ability to require or construct non-traversable medians that would limit or impair access.</p>
4	X			<p>6 (b.) Double-Double Yellow Painted Median: Develop text to allow the use of a "double-double yellow line" as a restricted median that would make it illegal for motorists to cross.</p> <p>6 (c.) U Turns: Consider change to ORS to allow use of 'U' turns.</p>	Limited types of median treatments and supporting legislation often results in the use of raised/non-traversable medians as the method for reducing conflicts by restricting left-turns to and/or from a property adjacent to the highway.	Bob Russell Doug Bish Doug Bish	Proposed ORS text should be completed and approved by the Director's office and AG's office by 11/31/2010.	<p>Proposal would provide ODOT with another method of dealing with turning restrictions rather than the installation of non-traversable medians.</p> <p>Inexpensive to implement, easily modified, does not pose an unsafe barrier for motorcyclists, snow-plows and motorists in dark and/or inclement weather conditions.</p> <p>This solution does not provide the degree of safety for pedestrians as compared to non-traversable medians.</p> <p>Does not require same horizontal shy distance as non-traversable medians, and does not impact adjoining properties.</p>	<p>This concept has been advanced by Jim Hanks of JRH Engineering. Jim is on vacation until August 10th. I have contacted some traffic engineers in CA and learned that the double yellow requires two sets of a 4" yellow stripe, 4" black, 4" yellow strip separated by a minimum of 2". It is illegal to cross the double yellow solid line.</p> <p>Based on conversation with one engineer, he believes that this is a very successful interim strategy though he believes that raised medians are more effective as speeds and volumes increase on multi-lane facilities. He is unaware of any studies that compare painted medians to raised medians.</p>

* Denotes mandatory revisions to the ORS or OAR

#	Legislative Concept	Administrative Rules	Oregon Highway Plan	Concept	Issue	Champion: Lead: Resource:	Timeline	Potential Impacts	Unknown/Unresolved
2	X			<p>Jurisdiction Transfers: Create Jurisdictional Transfer of certain District and Regional non-freight highways within UGBs. Shift responsibility to local government for balancing function/operations of specific highway segments with goals for urban growth and economic development withing the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORS 374.312(4) allows local governments to issue access permits to District and Regional Highways, however the statute requires them to implement the existing administrative rules. 	<p>Currently ODOT imposes Access Management Standards consistent with OAR & OHP on lessor level of important routes within urban growth areas creating a dual decision process that may be in conflict with local jurisdictions goals for urban growth and economic development opportunities. This would disengages ODOT from controversial access decisions on routes within UGBs that serve more of a local function and have a lessor level of importance for a statewide modility perspective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require agreement from local jurisdictions that ODOT will not improve roadway capacity at some later date in the event that increased access degrades transportation operations. • Need to preserve and protect a vertical and horizontal dimension to ensure adequate truck access through corridor. 	<p>Bob Bryant Bob Bryant Matt Malone</p>	<p>Proposed ORS Text should be completed and approved by the Director's office and AG's office by 11/31/2010.</p>	<p>Keeps access decisions at the local level where there is typically a better understanding of the local land use needs and expectations.</p>	<p>It is unknown if local governments have the ability or desire to take on this responsibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the candidate highways may be access controlled and therefore access locations are pre-determined. • Highways within interchange management areas and expressways currently have specific access management and spacing requirements. • It is unclear if ODOT would require or desire cities to update "CHAMPS", the ODOT permitting database, or if a record of the permit decisions is important to the agency. • It is unclear if there are any liability concerns for either agency if the local government assumes permitting authority.

* Denotes mandatory revisions to the ORS or OAR

#	Legislative Concept	Administrative Rules	Oregon Highway Plan	Concept	Issue	Champion: Lead: Resource:	Timeline	Potential Impacts	Unknown/Unresolved
10		X		Appeal Process - Revise ODOT's current appeal process, OAR 374-051-0345.	Discussions at AM Committee and Sub-group meetings suggest that current process is a "unfair" and to heavily weighted to ODOT. The process is expensive for the developer and often/always(?) results is "merely a rubber stamp of the prior decisions".	Bob Bryant Ann Zeltman David Boyd??	The proposed OAR revisions should be developed with AM Committee approval by 12/31/2010.	A modified review committee and process could increase trust level among stakeholders. Potential solutions include: ● A review panel consisting of a city, county and consultant traffic engineer that has no bias as to the decision. ● A process similar to the ODOT Construction Claims process.	
3	X	X		Public Road and Street Connections VS Private Driveways: Revise ORS to distinguish between Public Road and Street Connections from Private Driveways. ● ODOT will have the ability to eliminate "approach" form the current ORS. ● It is recommended that the state use "Public Roads and Streets" for all public road connections. ● It is recommended that "driveways" refer to all private road connections. Revise OAR to Distinguish between Public Road and Street Connections form Private Driveways. ● The term "public approach" and "approach" would be eliminated in the OAR. ● "Public Roads and Streets" would be used for all public road connections. ● It is recommended that "driveways" refer to all private road connections.	Revising the current wording for "approach" will require a complete review and many revisions to OAR 734 Division 51. ● It is difficult to tract all of the specific issues related to public roads and streets in the current OAR as the text is spread through 45 +/- pages. ● The OAR will become increasingly complex when new rules for highways with <5K ADT are incorporated into the existing OAR. Issues related to "Public Approaches" are interlaced through the existing OAR. It can be a complex process for local jurisdictions to determining the issues to be considered for new and/or existing public approach connections. ● The City of Portland has expressed a desire to separate public connections within the OAR. ● The requirement to adopt new rules for highways with <5K ADT will result in more complex OARs. Separating public roads may help to reduce the complex	Del Huntington ?? ??	Proposed ORS text should be completed and approved by the Director's office and by AG's office by 11/31/2010. Time would be required to re-write the OAR, develop a public process for review an ultimate adoption by the OTC.	Will provide a benefit in coordination between ODOT and local jurisdictions by assembling all public road and street connections in one concise rule. Opportunity to improve and simplify text in the existing OAR. This strategy may provide the opportunity to eliminate public roads and streets from "lesser access management standards" as required for highways with less than 5K ADT under SB 1024.	Potential need to resolve specific wording in R/W files related to existing approaches. It is understood that the "throughway" portion of the ORS used the terms streets and roads. It includes access, ingress, and egress as terms to access adjacent private property. "Approach Road" is used and defined in ORS 374.305. ODOT elected not to open the ORS in 1999/2000 to revise the wording from approach to streets and roads, and driveways.
11		X		Mitigation Measures - Revise Mitigation Measures process - OAR 374-051-0145.	Concerns have been raised that mitigation measures as part of a proposed development consistent with the adopted land uses, are too expensive, too extensive, an not proportionate to the impacts resulting from the development. ● Existing system does not require each development to contribute a fair share to roadway improvements; rather the last developer that "breaks the system" is required to provide additional capacity to the entire roadway network.		The proposed OAR revisions should be developed with AM Committee approval by 12/31/2010.	Proposed relaxation of mitigation measures could result in more development activity within the state. A less stringent mobility standard as identified in item #12 could result in less need for extensive mitigation measures. A median treatment as identified in item #4 could significantly reduce mitigation costs, result in fewer impacts to adjacent property owners and provide solutions within constrained rights of way.	The identification of appropriate mitigation measures can often vary from one person to another, therefore training as to appropriate mitigation measures is critical. In the event that mobility standards are less stringent, it is still possible that eventually the traffic associated with a proposed development may "break the system". This can result in an inequitable system where one developer pays more than their fair share.
12			X	Access Spacing - Within UGBs, re-evaluate the access spacing in Interchange Management Areas. Appendix C: Access Management Standards - Revise access spacing standards at interchanges within UGBs, Tables 16 - 19.	Consider former OTC member Russell's concern that the access spacing is not intended to blow away downtown Portland in the event that an interchange along I-5 is modified.	Del Huntington ?? ??		Current spacing standards for access near interchanges may not be consistent with the State desire for infill and redevelopment. ODOT and cities would likely oppose a new interchange that would completely destroy the current compactness of the interchange design.	
13			X	Within UGBs, re-evaluate the AM standards on expressways. Review C: Access Management Standards - Consider revision of access spacing standards for driveways within UGBs on Expressways of Statewide, Regional and District Highway, Tables 13 - 15.	Review AM Standards on Expressways to provide a better balance between mobility, safety and economics (per Monte Grove).	Monte Grove ?? ??			

* Denotes mandatory revisions to the ORS or OAR

#	Legislative Concept	Administrative Rules	Oregon Highway Plan	Concept	Issue	Champion: Lead: Resource:	Timeline	Potential Impacts	Unknown/Unresolved
7*		X	X	SB 1024 Section 2 (1): "The Department of Transportation, in cooperation with stakeholders, shall develop proposed legislation to codify, clarify and bring consistency to issuance of permits based on objective standards. A commitment by ODOT to overhaul and simplify the OAR may provide the legislature and stakeholders assurance that the AM rules will support economic development within the UGB. A potential rewrite of the OAR should focus on specific areas and would include # 8, 9, 10, 11.	Not all of the stakeholders agree on the amount of the text that should be developed and inserted into the existing statute. SB 1024 leaves the door wide open to additional items. A new OAR should focus on achieving access management solutions while being less burdensome to the agency, local jurisdiction and industrial, office, retail and residential developers.		Work to develop draft text for a revised OAR should start as early as possible. It is recommended that the first step in a new rule would focus on extracting all references to public roads and streets and formulate into a new section within the rules.	Doug Tindal was especially concerned and opposed to pulling specific items from the OAR, revising and placing into the ORS, similar to the modification to "Change of Use". Additional ORS will make it increasingly difficult to achieve prudent access management decisions as it is impossible to consider all of the possible scenarios that will occur. It is acknowledged that a new, revised AM rule will likely result in a higher number of driveways and less stringent mitigation measures on state highways within the UGBs. It is acknowledged that the V/C ratio will increase within the UGB on state highways.	Future recommendations by the AM Committee on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable access. AM spacing standards. Mitigation measures. Medians, will impact portions of the OAR. As a result, some text cannot be developed until there is a better understanding of the AM committee recommendations that are approved by ODOT.
9		X		Expand on "move in the direction of" currently included in OAR 734-051-0115(c)(B)and(C) Access Management Standards for Approaches, as the goal within UGBs.	Stakeholders have stated that ODOT staff does not acknowledge this direction within the current rules and makes the decision process too costly, too time consuming and often resulting in a denial.		Add text for "moving in the direction of" in the OAR 734-051-0118 and 0080.	Text would provide additional opportunities to achieve incremental improvements as a justification for an acceptable AM solution within the UGBs.	It is unknown if each Region would apply the concept of incremental improvement acceptably.
16			X	OHP Highway Mobility Standards: Revise Highway Mobility Standards & Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Standards	There is a concern that it is inappropriate to apply the mobility standard, volume to capacity (V/C) analysis to driveway operations. Rather, the V/C analysis should be limited to public street intersection operations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One vehicle exiting via a left-turn from a proposed development onto a multi-lane highway with >6 ADT will exceed the V/C standard during the peak hours. Field observations have identified that there were a sufficient number of available gaps in the travel stream for safe and adequate traffic operations.		The proposed OHP revisions should be developed with AM Committee approval by Spring 2011.	Elimination of the V/C analysis for private driveways would significantly reduce the requirement of mitigation measures on state highways. Traffic associated with large development can result in more traffic via a private driveway than on an adjacent city street/state highway intersection.	There was a concern that some motorists will not wait for a suitable gap in the travel stream and pull out onto the highway in an unsafe condition. Other members commented that many cities allow driveways where the left-turn would exceed the mobility standards. However, they are self-enforcing during the peak hours due to high traffic volumes as there are no suitable gaps to turn left into the roadway, and during non-peak hours, there are many suitable gaps in the travel stream that allow for left-turns in a safe manner.
17		Guidelines		Develop guidelines on criteria for staff to consider in determination of "reasonable access".	Provide criteria that constitutes reasonable access for a variety of land uses in the urban and rural areas		Spring 2011		
18		Guidelines		Develop guidelines on criteria for staff that is acceptable to achieve the goal of "moving in the direction of".	Provide suggested criteria of AM improvements that can be implemented that will provide incremental improvements within the UGB.		Spring 2011		
19		Guidelines		Develop mitigation measure thresholds for new developments and developments under a change of use.	Provide a mitigation matrix to establish when mitigation measures are not required as part of a development.		Spring 2011		
20			Training	Develop and provide training to staff on revisions to the ORS, OAR and OHP. Pay particular attention to the goal of access management, the desire to attract and retain development within the UGB, and the criteria that constitutes "moving in the direction of" during review of an application.	Increase consistency across the state by providing comprehensive training on the goals of AM and the need to balance issues, while being mindful of the goal to support economic development.		Spring 2011		

* Denotes mandatory revisions to the ORS or OAR

Attachment II

Copy of Proposed Revised Standards and Approval Criteria

Revised Standards and Approval Criteria
Traffic Volumes Under 5000 Annual Average Daily Traffic
(AADT)*

Regional and District Highways

(*ADT based on latest publication of Traffic Volume Tables)

Approval Criteria

The Region Manager shall approve a private approach to the highway under the following conditions:

- Projected left-turn volumes from the approach to the highway are below *75 vehicles per hour (vph) in the peak hour.
- The property has a right of access
- The property has no other direct approach to the highway
- The applicant agrees to provide mitigation needed to address safety problems

If more than one approach is requested for a property, approval of additional approaches will be based on meeting one of the following criteria and the applicant's agreement to provide mitigation needed to address safety problems:

- The spacing standard is achievable for both (all) driveways to the property as well as adjacent properties.
- The applicant demonstrates that the approved highway access and any alternate access to the property does not provide reasonable access to the proposed land use that meets the criteria of ORS 374.310
- Where a property has more than one existing approach to the highway, the applicant agrees to changes that would "move in the direction of" (as defined in OAR 734-051-0040(39)) conformance with existing standards.

For Regional and District Level Highways with traffic volumes under 5000 AADT, the revised spacing standard are shown in the table below. Where the above Approval Criteria are met, the application for the first driveway will be approved based on the Revised Spacing Standard table below, or in situations where there is no other available access to the property and the spacing standards cannot be achieved, the approach shall be located to maximize spacing and safety. The spacing standard will be the same for both urban and rural highways and for commercial and residential applications.

Revised Spacing Standards:

Maximum spacing available to adjacent driveways and road approaches up to:

- | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| < 25 MPH | - Spacing = 150 feet |
| 30 to 35 MPH | - Spacing = 250 feet |
| 40 to 45 MPH | - Spacing = 360 feet |
| 50 MPH | - Spacing = 425 feet |
| 55 MPH | - Spacing = 650 feet (typically running speed for these areas is 65 MPH) |

Existing Spacing Standards:

Speed:	District Level Highway	Region Level Highway
--------	------------------------	----------------------

	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
≤ 25 MPH	400 ft	350 ft	450 ft	350 ft
30 & 35 MPH	400 ft	350 ft	600 ft	425 ft
40 & 45 MPH	500 ft	500 ft	750 ft	750 ft
50 MPH	550 ft	550 ft	830 ft	830 ft
55 MPH	700 ft	700 ft	990 ft	990 ft

Median Exclusion

For Regional and District Level highways under 5000 AADT and projected peak hour left-turn volumes from the approach to the highway that are determined to be acceptable given the character and function of the surrounding corridor, a non-traversable median will not be required as mitigation for a private approach. The exception is where a non-traversable median is needed to mitigate identifiable safety or traffic operational problems, or is made a condition of approval by the local government or a requirement as set forth in their adopted Transportation Plan.

“Move in the Direction of” (as defined in OAR 734-051-0040(39))

A traffic impact analysis (TIA) may be required to evaluate the impact of the approach to local streets and identify mitigation measures. The Region Access Management Engineer (RAME) may waive the TIA if the RAME and the applicant agree on a solution that will “move in the direction of” conformance with existing standards or improve safety factors.

Exemptions

These approval criteria do not apply to the following:

- approaches in an interchange management area (with 1320’ of ramp terminal), the influence area of a public road intersection, expressways and highways in the statewide classification of the Oregon Highway Plan. These facilities are the highest priority. Less stringent standards present a greater risk of loss to public investment in safety and efficient traffic operations.
- Left turn volume from the approach to the highway equals or exceed 75 vph in the peak hour.
- Access management plan, interchange area management plan, facility plan, refinement plan, or other transportation or project plan approved by the local government or the Oregon Transportation Commission, or applicable local ordinances that establish more stringent standards.

How This Helps Applicant: These changes provide the following benefits for the applicant:

- increased certainty of obtaining direct highway access
- reduces need to request a deviations because of lower spacing standards
- eliminates consideration of alternate access as criteria in approving first highway approach.
- Mitigation to address mobility impacts is eliminated.

Potential Negative Impacts/Concerns

- Increase in R/W cost when over time conditions warrant closing of approaches.
- Cumulative effects on safety and operations of increasing access densities over time. For speed 25 conditions, this would be 4 times higher densities.

- More direct highway access has cumulative impacts. Properties develop around use of approaches so when growth does occur and access conditions deteriorate, solutions are more limited and more expensive to implement.
- Diminishes opportunities to promote joint use of approaches
- Missed opportunities to apply access management techniques that would be more effective protecting highway capacity and function in the long run.
- Having spacing standards that are less stringent will result in more turning conflict points in the highway system and may be determined not acceptable in some circumstances .
- Basing decisions primarily on safety means less mitigation of impacts to traffic operations, unless we can make connection to safety. Operational problems and expectation to solve them in projects will likely increase the cost of projects.
- On high use recreational highways, the AADT will be greatly exceeded. So, the impacts to these routes would be much more significant during the peak seasons and the risk for crashes will be higher.

(*) The 75 left turn exiting vehicles per peak hour is the calculated threshold for when a highway with 5000 AADT would fail its mobility standard. The assumptions connected with this are.

1) The 5000 AADT is equally distributed. i.e. 2500 trips in each direction.

2) The 75 left turns out also has 75 right turns or through movements out, for 150 exiting vehicles

3) As such, there is also a 150 entering vehicles, with equal distribution for arriving.

The 150 exiting vehicles with 150 entering vehicles in the peak hour equates to a development of about 3000 trips per day. Based upon a highway AADT of 5000, one would not expect to see these conditions. However, smaller developments could trigger some of these conditions, if the traffic flow is unbalanced and predominately from one direction.

Attachment III
Draft Copy of Non-traversable Median Language

1 This concept would allow ODOT to install a permanent, non-traversable median barrier on a
2 segment of state highway that reduces the width of the paved surface to less than 28 feet (14 feet
3 in each direction of travel) when the following conditions are met:

- 4 • The highway is a divided, access controlled highway; or,
- 5 • The highway is located within an urban growth boundary and the application and location
6 of a non-traversable median is identified in the local adopted Transportation System Plan;
7 or,
- 8 • The highway is located in an unincorporated area provided that:
 - 9 ○ The highway is not designated by the OTC as a freight route¹; and,
 - 10 ○ The average annual daily traffic volume on the segment is greater than _____
11 (say, 5,000); and,
 - 12 ○ The department has installed traversable medians at the location; and,
 - 13 ○ The department has determined that traversable medians have failed to reduce the
14 number and frequency of traffic crashes; and,
 - 15 ○ The department has provided notice to residents and businesses along the affected
16 highway segment. (The timeframe and form of notice may be more appropriate to
17 set in administrative rule.)
 - 18 ○
 - 19 ○

20
21 A more general alternative:

22
23 This concept would allow ODOT to install a permanent, non-traversable median barrier on a
24 segment of state highway when the following conditions are met:

- 25 • The highway is a divided, access controlled highway; or,
- 26 • The highway is located within an urban growth boundary and the application and location
27 of a non-traversable median is identified in the local adopted Transportation System Plan;
28 or,
- 29 • The highway is located in an unincorporated area provided that:
 - 30 ○ The annual average daily traffic volume is greater than _____ (say, 5,000); and,
 - 31 ○ The width of the paved surface will exceed 28 feet (14 feet in each direction of
32 travel) after installation of the barrier; and,
 - 33 ○ The department has installed traversable medians at the location; and,
 - 34 ○ The department has determined that traversable medians have to reduce the
35 number and frequency of traffic crashes; and,
 - 36 ○ The department has provided notice to residents and businesses along the affected
37 highway segment. (The timeframe and form of notice may be more appropriate to
38 set in administrative rule.)

¹ The freight route carve out that we discussed may be redundant and confusing. ORS 366.215 prohibits the OTC from permanently reducing the vehicle carrying capacity of a freight route when altering a state highway unless safety or access considerations require the reduction.

The criterion stated above would prohibit installation of a non-traversable barrier that reduces the width to less than 28 feet on a freight route. The criterion should be removed if the intent is to allow a non-traversable barrier that reduces the width to less than 28 feet to be used to address safety and access issues.