



**Access Management Committee
Tele-Conference Call
10:00 AM – 11:00 AM, March 8, 2011
FINAL**

Working Facilitator: Del Huntington.

Participants: Bob Bryant, Paul Mather, Craig Honeyman, Harold Lasley, Mark Whitlow, Bob Russell, Brent Ahrend, Jamie Jeffrey, Matt Garrett, Victor Dodier, Michael Rock, Erik Havig, David Boyd, Marty Jensvold, and Tom Kuhlman.

Meeting Minutes: Michelle Van Schaick

Background

During the March 1, 2011 AM Committee meeting, a request was made to reconvene the technical standards team to reevaluate access spacing standards. The specific request was to propose revised access spacing standards for urban statewide highway with traffic volumes over 5,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), and limited to those highways with posted speeds of 45 mph and less. The technical standards team met on March 7, 2011 to develop proposed access spacing standards on urban statewide highways as requested (*See Attachment I*).

Purpose of the Conference Call

The goal is to reach consensus on revised access spacing standards for urban statewide highways that exceed 5,000 AADT with posted speeds of 45 mph and less.

Proposed Access Spacing Tables

Harold provided an overview of the criteria that the team considered in revised access spacing standards, including mobility, operations, and safety criteria. It was stated that many motorists exceed the posted speed limits at 40 and 45 mph at compared to the lower speeds and therefore the team did not propose reducing the access spacing for highways posted at 40 and 45 mph as dramatically as the proposed spacing standards for highways with lower posted speeds. In addition to the revised access spacing, it is proposed that one half of the spacing standard will be allowed for approaches that are right-in/right-out when restricted with a median barrier, and/or right-in/right-out, left-in/left-out on a one-way roadway. The proposed spacing standards will provide Safe Stopping Distance (SSD) between approaches on statewide highways, including situations where the approach spacing is ½ of the spacing criteria due to a median barrier or a one-way roadway.

The team also proposed reduced spacing standards for regional and district level highways that exceed 5,000 AADT. It was acknowledged that SSD may not be provided between approaches where the spacing is ½ due to a median barrier or on a one-way roadway at slower speeds. Harold explained that the team determined that drivers will be in an urban environment and will be able to evaluate the roadway conditions and two approaches simultaneously. He also stated that the team proposed the same access spacing standards for regional and district highways as there are relatively few regional highways in the state.

Del asked for Jamie to provide the local agency perspective on the proposed spacing standards. She stated that the spacing standards are still greater than many of the local public street block spacing, however, provisions to accommodate access to midblock properties is considered in other portions of the proposed statute. Therefore, the spacing standard will most often be applied to corner lots. In Jamie's opinion, it is not likely that someone would be able to meet these standards very often, and the applicant will probably be required to follow a deviation process to consider an approach to the state highway. She feels that the department will be reasonably protected with the proposed spacing standards and it would be hard to reduce the spacing distances beyond what has been proposed. She thinks this is a very reasonable package.

Bob Russell asked if there was still language in the bill that allows ODOT to use local standards. Mark answered that the concept was taken out of the bill. Jamie believes we may still have some work to do and should look at cities like Portland and Eugene as they are examples of local jurisdictions that may take over the permitting of approaches to state highways. This led to a further discussion of whether or not specific corridor plans would trump the ODOT standards and if the proposed statute would acknowledge the use of plans. Some members recommended that it be included in the proposed statute. Victor stated that some of the footnotes in the spacing tables provides for the local conditions (*See Attachment II*).

Proposed Footnotes for the Access Spacing Tables

Brent stated that he was in agreement with the numbers in proposed access spacing table. Del asked if Brent and the team reached consensus on the footnotes in Attachment II. Brent agrees with the footnotes in general, though is concerned with the footnote related to speeds {*See page 1, footnote (k) and page 3, footnote (10)*}. He felt that ODOT could change the rules on speeds based on a speed study. Bob Russell asked who was responsible for the speed study. The response was that ODOT would conduct the study. Brent was concerned, but felt better about the proposed revision in the footnote that would require an increase or decrease of 10 mph before it would have a bearing on the approach application. (ODOT previously could require a review of the approach application if the speed study identified 85 percent of the motorists driving 5 mph above or below the posted speed).

There was considerable discussion on the grandfathered provision for approaches {*See page 1, footnote (i)*}. David Boyd provided an explanation that legal approaches include 1) permitted approaches, 2) grandfathered approaches, those approaches in existence

prior to 1949 and where the use has remained the same, and 3) approaches constructed by ODOT as part of a project. All other approaches are considered illegal. It was understood that many of the existing approaches are illegal based on the criteria outlined by David. Jamie asked if ODOT considers the legality of the adjacent driveway when establishing the spacing between two adjacent approaches or a proposed approach. If not, could an applicant be denied because they are unable to meet a spacing standard to an adjacent illegal approach? (Jim Hanks was unavailable for the conference call so he talked with Del prior to the meeting to express a concern with “grandfathered” and “legal” approaches. Jim stated that during his time as the City of Eugene Traffic Engineer, he would inform ODOT of a proposed driveway to the state highway. In many cases, ODOT approved the request over the phone though no permit was ever written for the property owner. Jim is concerned that ODOT would now consider the approach “illegal”).

Some of the AM Committee members believe that the grandfathered provision should be revisited. Discussion continued with different scenarios when an approach is “grandfathered”. It was agreed that the issue will be revisited.

Regarding footnote (a), Del stated that the determination of the distance between a public road and an approach was revised since the March 1, 2011 meeting and is now proposed to be measured from the centerline of the public road to the centerline of the approach, which is consistent with the process used to measure between two adjacent approaches.

Jamie asked about footnote (c) related to interchanges and expressways, and if they were going to keep access spacing near interchanges and along expressways out of statute. Mark felt these should be in statute. Del explained that the AM committee needed more time to look at approach spacing within interchange management areas and on expressways. Mark specifically asked for clarification on expressways and interchanges and if the department will look at the spacing standards again. The answer was yes, so the spacing standards may change. Interchanges and expressways will remain out of statute for the time being.

It was recommended that footnote (g) related to “a right of access and no other means of access” be removed from the spacing tables and made part of the permitting section in the statute.

Victor will clarify footnote (h) related to signalized spacing standards as they apply to private approaches as well as public street intersections.

It was recommended to remove footnote (j) as provisions for Special Transportation Areas are considered in footnote (f).

Footnote (l) related to expressways access spacing standards should apply to all expressways and not limited to expressways with traffic volumes that exceed 5,000 AADT.

Summary and Future Meetings

There was consensus on the proposed access spacing standards for statewide, regional and district highways with traffic volumes that exceed 5,000 AADT. It was agreed that the committee will continue to work and review spacing standards on expressways and interchange management areas.

Del expressed appreciation to the technical standards team for all their hard work. Many of the AM Committee members also expressed their gratitude to the team for their commitment and resolve to providing the committee with the proposed revised spacing standards.

The Committee agreed to continue to meet as SB 264 goes through the legislative process. Potential meeting times and conference calls will be based on the need to provide information and request guidance as the process moves forward.

The conference call concluded at 11:15 A.M.

Attachment I – Results of AM Technical Standards Team Review, March 7, 2011

Attachment II – Access Management Spacing Standards (with footnotes)

Attachment I
Results of AM Technical Standards Team Review,
March 7, 2011

**Results of AM Technical Standards Team Review
March 7, 2011**

Proposed Access Spacing Standards for Urban State Highways

Statewide Highways with Volumes Greater Than 5,000 Average Daily Traffic		
Posted Speed	Existing Urban Spacing	Proposed Urban Spacing
≥55	1320	1320
50	1100	1100
40 & 45	990	800
30 & 35	720	500
≤25	520	350

Regional Highways with Volumes Greater Than 5,000 Average Daily Traffic		
Posted Speed	Existing Urban Spacing	Proposed Urban Spacing
≥55	990	990
50	830	830
40 & 45	750	500
30 & 35	425	350
≤25	350	250

District Highways with Volumes Greater Than 5,000 Average Daily Traffic		
Posted Speed	Existing Urban Spacing	Proposed Urban Spacing
≥55	700	700
50	550	550
40 & 45	500	500
30 & 35	350	350
≤25	350	250

Attachment II
Access Management Spacing Standards (with footnotes)

**Table 1: Access Management Spacing Standards for
Statewide Highways greater than 5000 AADT (a)(b)(c)(f)(g)(h)(i)**
(Measurement is in Feet)*

Posted Speed^(k)	Rural Expressway^(l)	Rural	Urban Expressway^(l)	Urban	STA
≥55	5280	1320	2640	1320	--
50	5280	1100	2640	1100	--
40 & 45	5280	990	2640	800	--
30 & 35	--	770	--	500	^(j)
≤25	--	550	--	350	^(j)

(a) For spacing between private approaches, the standard applies to the distance measured in both directions along the highway from the center of an existing or proposed private approach to the center of the nearest existing or proposed private approach on the same side of the highway. For spacing between a private and a public approach, the standard applies to the distance measured in both directions along the highway from the center of an existing or proposed private approach to the center of the nearest intersection of the highway with a public approach or another state highway.

(b) The spacing standard for Right-in/Right-out and Left-in/Left-out approaches on one-way highways or highways with a raised or depressed non-traversable median is one-half the spacing shown in the table.

(c) Interchange management areas are excluded from the spacing standards in the table. See OAR 734-051 for spacing standards that apply to expressways and within the influence area of interchanges.

(f) Special Transportation Areas, Access Management Plans, Corridor Plans or Interchange Area Management Plans may have access spacing standards that take precedence over those in the table.

(g) Where a property has a right of access and no means of access other than the state highway, an approach meets the spacing standard and is not a deviation if the Region Access Management Engineer and the applicant agree on an approach location that optimizes safety, traffic operations, and site design.

(h) Signal spacing standards supercede access management spacing standards for signalized approaches.

(i) These access management spacing standards do not apply to approaches in existence prior to April 1, 2000 except as provided in OAR 734-051-0115(1)(c) and 734-051-0125(1)(c).

^(j) Minimum access management spacing for public road approaches is the existing city block spacing or the city block spacing as identified in the local comprehensive plan. Public road connections are preferred over private driveways and in STAs driveways are discouraged. However, where driveways are allowed and where land use patterns permit, the minimum access management spacing for driveways is 175 feet (55 meters) or mid-block if the current city block spacing is less than 350 feet (110 meters).

^(k) Adjustments to Posted Speed: If a speed study determines that the 85th percentile speed differs from the current posted speed by more than 10 mph, the Department may raise or lower the access management spacing standard to correspond with the results of the speed study.

(l) Expressway spacing standards apply to highways below 5000 AADT.

#

**Table 2: Access Management Spacing Standards for
Regional Highways greater than 5000 AADT (a)(b)(c)(f)(g)(h)(i)
(Measurement is in Feet)***

Posted Speed^(k)	Rural Expressway^(l)	Rural	Urban Expressway^(l)	Urban	STA
≥55	5280	990	2640	990	--
50	5280	830	2640	830	--
40 & 45	5280	750	2640	500	--
30 & 35	--	600	--	350	^(j)
≤25	--	450	--	250	^(j)

See Table 1 for notes.

**Table 3: Access Management Spacing Standards for
District Highways greater than 5000 AADT (a)(b)(c)(f)(g)(h)(i)
(Measurement is in Feet)***

Posted Speed^(k)	Rural Expressway^(l)	Rural	Urban Expressway^(l)	Urban	STA
≥55	5280	700	2640	700	--
50	5280	550	2640	550	--
40 & 45	5280	500	2640	500	--
30 & 35	--	400	--	350	^(j)
≤25	--	400	--	250	^(j)

See Table 1 for notes.

Table 5: Access Management Spacing Standards Highways with No Greater Than 5000 AADT
 (1)(2)(3)(5)(6)(7)(8)
 (Measurement is in Feet)*

Posted Speed ⁽¹⁰⁾ MPH	Regional/District Rural & Urban	Statewide Rural	Statewide Urban	Statewide Rural Unincorporated Communities ⁽⁴⁾	Special Transportation Area (STA)
≥55	650	1320	1320	1320	--
50	425	1100	1100	1100	--
40 & 45	360	990	360	750	--
30 & 35	250	770	250	425	(9)
≤ 25	150	550	150	350	(9)

¹ For spacing between private approaches, the standard applies to the distance measured along the highway from the center of an existing or proposed private approach to the center of the nearest existing or proposed private approach on the same side of the highway in both directions. For spacing between a private and public approach, the standard applies to the distance measured along the highway from the closest edge of the pavement of the proposed or existing private approach to the closest edge of the pavement of the nearest existing or proposed public approach or state highway.

² The spacing standards for Right-in/Right-out and Left-in/Left-out approaches on one-way highways or highways with a raised or depressed non-traversable median are one-half the spacing standards for highways with greater than 5000 AADT.

³ Expressways and interchange management areas are excluded from the spacing standards in this table. See OAR 734-051 for spacing standards that apply within the influence area of interchanges. For expressway spacing standards, see standards for highways with greater than 5000 AADT.

⁴ Unincorporated Community as defined in OAR 660-022-0010.

⁵ Special Transportation Areas, Access Management Plans, Corridor Plans or Interchange Area Management Plans may have access spacing standards that take precedence over those in this table.

⁶ Where a property has a right of access and no means of access other than state highway, an approach meets the spacing standard and is not a deviation if the Region Access Management Engineer and the applicant agree on an approach location that optimizes safety, traffic operations, and sign design.

⁷ Signal spacing standards supercede access management spacing standards for signalized approaches.

⁸ These access management spacing standards do not apply to approaches in existence prior to April 1, 2000 except as provided in OAR 734-051-0115(1)(c) and 734-051-0125(1)(c).

⁹ Minimum access management spacing for public road approaches is the existing city block spacing or the city block spacing as identified in the local comprehensive plan. Public road connections are preferred over private driveways and in STAs driveways are discouraged. However, where driveways are allowed and where land use patterns permit, the minimum access management spacing for driveways is 175 feet (55 meters) or mid-block if the current city block spacing is less than 350 feet (110 meters).

¹⁰ Adjustments to Posted Speed: If a speed study determines that the 85th percentile speed differs from the current posted speed by more than 10 mph, the Department may raise or lower the access management spacing standard to correspond with the results of the speed study.