



Access Management Stakeholder Report

Responding to Senate Bill 1024

Executive Summary

SB1024 was adopted and is now being implemented by ODOT, in cooperation with stakeholders to create a better balance between access management and economic development. That process will produce draft legislation in 2011 session to develop objective access management standards for state highways. ODOT initiated a facilitated collaborative process with lawmakers, industry stakeholders and city and county staff, forming a 25-member Access Management (AM) Committee. The committee or sub-groups have met 22 times since April, 2010. Progress has been made in each area. The committee objectives were to:

1. Review and recommend adoption of Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) related to “change of use” to meet the intent of SB1024.
2. Establish less stringent access management rules, mitigation measures and spacing and mobility standards for highway segments where annual average daily traffic (AADT) is no more than 5,000 motor vehicles.
3. Develop proposed legislation to create clear and consistent objective standards for ODOT’s access permitting process.
4. Provide a report to the Legislative Assembly prior to January 2011, including a description of proposed legislation.

Related to the permitting tasks identified in SB1024, the AM Committee determined four main areas of additional work:

- a) clarification on how reasonable access is applied
- b) a review of the existing access management standards
- c) costs to mitigate impacts associated with development
- d) when and where raised medians are appropriate

The AM Committee is now preparing draft legislation to codify with objective standards access management issues within the following sections of existing OAR 734 Division 51 rules: Section 0070 (Application Procedure and timelines); Section 0080 (Criteria for Approving an Application for an Approach); Section 0115 (Access Management Spacing Standards for Approaches); Section 0125 (Access Management Spacing Standards for Approaches in an Interchange Area); Section 0135 (Deviations from Access Management Spacing Standards); Section 0145 (Mitigation Measures); Section 0225 (Post-Decision

Review procedure); Section 0345 (Region Review Process and Collaborative Discussion Option); and Section 0510 (Definition). The legislative work will also include an amendment to ORS 374.310 (3), as well as ORS 374.312.

Recommendation

We recommend that an Access Management legislative committee provide oversight to the AM Committee as the process continues in 2011 to revise access management rules, standards, mitigation measures and mobility standards.

Work of the AM Committee specific to the requirements identified in SB1024

1. Change of Use

Status: Work is complete. The AM Committee approved ODOT's emergency OARs to reflect the revised "change of use" threshold stipulated in SB1024. The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) adopted the permanent OAR December 15, 2010.

2. Less stringent access management rules, mitigation measures, spacing and mobility standards

Status: Less stringent access spacing standards have been developed for highway segments with less than 5,000 AADT. Work is underway on less stringent access management rules, mitigation measures and mobility standards, but no formal proposal has been advanced to the AM Committee.

Next Steps: Revised spacing standards for highway segments with less than 5,000 AADT require a revision to the Oregon Highway Plan. A legislative concept has been advanced to place the revised spacing standards in statute.

Work will continue on OAR 734-051-0080 "*Criteria for Approving an Application for an Approach*" to achieve less stringent access management rules. ODOT is hiring a traffic engineering consultant to help the AM Committee develop less stringent mitigation measures and mobility standards on highway segments with less than 5,000 AADT.

3. Proposed legislation based on objective standards

Status: The AM Committee has broken into small working groups on specific items or text of proposed statute. Legislative amendments which are being advanced include:

- Related to non-traversable medians – 1) notice to stakeholders when non-traversable medians are considered on two-lane highways, 2) dividers designated by pavement markings using double double yellow pavement markings, and 3) allow U-turns at signalized intersections unless signed otherwise.
- Standards for approving or denying approach road permits – A significant philosophical shift will occur within ODOT as the presence of reasonable access will not be the sole standard for evaluating an application for an approach. Where the applicant meets the standards, they will receive an approval for an approach.
- Adopt new spacing standards for urban areas that are applicable given the existing local street spacing that will allow the majority of permit applications to be

approved without the need for deviations. This will greatly enhance economic development.

- The Oregon Transportation Commission will review the existing highway classifications and designation of highway segments – As access management decisions are based on highway classification and designation, a review of highways will help to ensure that classifications and designations are consistent and appropriate across the state.
- Facilitate jurisdictional transfer of highways that serve a local interest to local government agencies - This proposal includes a continuing financial commitment.
- Access management dispute resolution process – This concept expands the use of a collaborative discussion to resolve conflicts and replaces the existing region review process with a Dispute Review Board. Members would represent local government, consulting engineers, the business sector and ODOT, to achieve a broad perspective.
- Create an eight-member access management legislative oversight committee to ensure that ODOT, in cooperation with stakeholders, develops OARs to fulfill the requirements of statute. Five legislative members would represent each of the five ODOT regions. Other members would include representatives from the development community, local government and ODOT. The committee will sunset at the end of 2015.

Next Steps: 1) As needed, the AM Committee will accomplish the additional work necessary to complete the objective standards based on roadway classification and designation, lane configuration, posted speed, traffic volume, approach volume and crash history. 2) Revise existing OARs and other internal agency documents to reflect the revised processes.

Introduction

SB1024, Section 2. (1) The Department of Transportation, in cooperation with stakeholders, shall develop proposed legislation to codify, clarify and bring consistency to issuance of access permits based on objective standards.

Background

In the 1980's, ODOT staff developed spacing standards for approaches to statewide, regional and district classification of highways. The concept for the spacing criteria was based on similar models employed in New Jersey, Florida and Colorado. The Oregon spacing standards were made part of the 1991 Oregon Highway Plan (OHP). In the late 1990's, ODOT, in cooperation with Oregon State University developed revised spacing standards, and developed draft policies on medians, Interchange Area Management Plans (IAMP), deviations, and appeals. A public review process was conducted with external stakeholders, developers, consultants, and representatives from cities and counties. This review process resulted in Policies 3A; Classification and Spacing Standards, 3B; Medians, 3C; Interchange Access Management Areas, 3D; Deviations, 3E; Appeals, along with Tables 12 – 19 for approach spacing standards and deviations and were made part of the 1999 OHP. The updated OHP also included highway mobility standards.

ODOT initiated a process with external stakeholders to develop Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) as a basis for implementing the ODOT access management program and policies within the 1999 OHP. This work resulted in approximately 70 pages of rules, plus the spacing standards tables in the 1999 OHP. The rules included a concept that during an approach application process, if it was determined that a property was found to be served by alternate access that was considered "reasonable", direct access to the state highway was often denied. OAR 734 Division 51, rules on access management, were adopted into permanent rules by the Oregon Transportation Commission in April, 2000.

Implementation of the OARs resulted in concern from some of the external stakeholders and in 2003; the Oregon Revised Statute *374.310 Rules and regulations; permits*, was revised to include the following;

(3) The powers granted by this section and ORS 374.315 may not be exercised so as to deny any property adjoining the road or highway reasonable access. In determining what is reasonable, the department or county court or board of county commissioners shall apply the following criteria:

(a) The access must be sufficient to allow the authorized uses for the property identified in the acknowledged local comprehensive plan.

(b) The type, number, size and location of approaches must be adequate to serve the volume and type of traffic reasonably anticipated to enter and exit the property, based on the planned uses for the property.

Concurrent with the revised text in the ORS, ODOT staff undertook a rewrite of OAR 734 Division 51. This effort reduced the rules to 49 pages plus the spacing standards in the 1999 OHP. The rewrite of the rules retained the concept from the previous edition, that when an approach application was processed and it was determined that alternate access was reasonable or could be made reasonable, direct access to the state highway may be denied.

Current Process

Oregon has 10 years of experience in managing access to state highways and implementing associated access management policies through OAR 734 Division 51. ODOT's focus in administering these rules over the last decade has been on the state highways, both to ensure the highest level of safety for the traveling public and to protect the function of the highways and the public investment's in them. The current rule places much of the burden on the applicant to identify and mitigate the impacts to the transportation system associated with the proposed development. Some external stakeholders, developers, consultants, and some city and county officials remain concerned that the existing rules and access management standards place an undo burden on businesses and economic development opportunities, and are not considerate of the goals for infill and increased density within the urban growth boundaries that Oregon seeks to establish. This concern became part of the basis of SB1024 that required the agency, together with stakeholders, to develop objective access management standards that create a more equitable balance between economic development and traffic safety.

ODOT hired Mr. Huntington as facilitator to guide a review of the existing state access management standards and develop a process and standards that provide a better balance between the need to manage the transportation system and the goal of facilitating economic development within communities. A collaborative process was established with senators, representatives, external industry stakeholders, and city and county staff. The initial meeting with stakeholders occurred on April 29, 2010 and the attendees agreed on a 25 member Access Management (AM) Committee which met each month throughout the remainder of 2010.. (*See Appendix A for a list of the committee members*). Many issues were identified, though due to the amount of anticipated work and the request for external stakeholders to volunteer their time and energy, the committee agreed on the four main areas to focus their attention, including:

- 1) clarification on how reasonable access is applied,***
- 2) a review of the existing access management standards,***
- 3) costs to mitigate impacts associated with development, and***
- 4) when and where raised, non-traversable medians are appropriate.***

A separate sub group was formed for each of the four main areas of concern. Participants included members of the AM Committee and additional county and ODOT staff to support the process. (*See Appendix B for a list of the sub group participants*). Each group was tasked to identify objective criteria for ODOT to apply when making decisions related to access management. The groups were also asked to determine if the objective criteria would best fit into proposed legislation, administrative rules, policies and/or guidelines. The sub groups met on 14 separate occasions between July and November 2010 to review materials and determine the recommendations that would be advanced to the AM Committee for their consideration. Sub group 2 also reviewed proposed language to achieve less stringent access management rules, mitigation measures, and spacing and mobility standards for state highways where the annual average daily traffic volumes (AADT) are less than 5,000 motor vehicles as required in SB1024.

A fifth sub group was formed and met on June 15, 2010 to ***review the draft Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) to implement the "change of use" criteria as stipulated in SB1024.*** The new "change of use" increases the number of additional trips to the site that may be allowed before engaging ODOT with an approach application for each driveway to the state highway. The revised rule also documents that agencies are not required to go through a public approach application process for a new street or road connection to the highway, and public agencies are not required to go through a

“change of use” process when development occurs on the public road that connects to the state highway when the proposed development is consistent with the intended uses and zoning as identified in the comprehensive plan.

Based on a recommendation from the committee, the revised OAR includes an ability to consider a public road connection opposite an interchange and/or expressway ramp terminal. Subsequent review of the draft and final versions of the OAR were reviewed by the entire AM Committee during their monthly meetings. *(See page 17 for Sub Group 5 Task Assignment “Administrative Rules for Change of Use”)*

Aspects of Stakeholder Discussion

During the stakeholder process, ODOT Director Garrett and his management team have made the commitment that the agency will revise its process to review approach applications with a perspective to; 1) approve the application based on agreed upon set of objective standards, 2) reduce the number of applications requiring deviations for the approval, and 3) scale back the mitigation requirements that are currently the responsibility of the developer or applicant. The AM Committee has developed recommendations on how this might be best achieved. It was recommended by some members of the AM Committee to advance the majority of issues as legislative concepts.

Generally, many of the AM Committee members acknowledge that the Department has taken initiative to make the following changes that move in the direction as set forth in SB1024:

- Develop a legislative concept to facilitate a jurisdictional transfer of state highways to local governments when the roadway serves more of a local interest than a roadway where mobility is the larger priority. It was acknowledged that this may not be a near-term solution as it takes time to work through the details and establish necessary agreements for a jurisdictional transfer.
- Revise the appeal process described in the current rule to replace the existing Region Review with a more independent Dispute Review Board when an application is denied or the mitigation associated with an approval is considered excessive by the applicant.
- A request to encourage the use of collaborative discussion as a method for ODOT and the developer to meet, identify and address concerns early in the ODOT review process.
- The ability to consider a public road or street connection directly opposite an interchange and/or expressway ramp terminal.
- Develop and provide executive direction and training to staff on revisions to the ORS, OAR and Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) pertaining to the states access management rules.

AM Committee discussion focused on the following areas;

- Reasonable Access,
- Access Management Standards (including less stringent standards for highways with less than 5,000 ADT),
- Mitigation Measures,
- Medians, and
- Approval of Administrative Rules to Implement the Revised “Change of Use” Criteria as Identified in SB1024.

The following pages are the assignments and recommendations of the AM Committee. The subcommittee tasks and relative discussion summaries can be found on pages 8 through 17. Concepts and recommendations begin on page 18, and proposed legislative concepts recommended by the AM Committee are summarized on pages 20 to 23. Recommendations for proposed rule changes are summarized on page 24, and other administrative changes resulting from this work are identified on page 25.

Outline of Sub-Group # 1 Task Assignment

(As adopted by the sub-group in July 2010)

Sub-Group # 1 - Reasonable Access

Problem Statement: Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) Division 51 currently limits abutting properties with access to secondary streets to having direct access to the state highway. The rule requires the land owner to prove that the secondary access is not reasonable before direct access to the highway can be considered. While it is most typical to apply operational analysis to determine if access is reasonable, other criteria should be considered such as economic concerns and business needs.

Additionally, one direct access to the highway may not be reasonable to serve the proposed use, and even in cases where a secondary access to the adjacent roadway system is permitted, additional direct access to the state highway may be requested to serve the proposed development.

Background: The definition of what constitutes reasonable access appears to differ between agency staff, legal precedent and the development community. A developer may request one or more accesses that they believe are appropriate to serve the property and intended use. This access is often requested to the state highway, with a second access request to the state highway or the adjacent city street/county road in the case of a property that abuts two major roadways. This may be met with resistance from ODOT, stating that if the developer indeed requires the amount of access requested, the proposed development may need to be scaled back in size. The assumption is that the infrastructure may not be sufficient to support the "highest and best use" of a property from an economic perspective, and counsel from the AG's office is that the state is not required to provide access to the highest and best use of the property. Therefore, ODOT is in a position to require the developer to consider strategies that include but are not limited to; reduction in the scale of development, reduction in traffic impacts, and the provision of additional mitigation measures.

The purpose of the sub-group is to examine what constitutes reasonable access, while mindful of engineering considerations, site circulation, on-site and roadway queuing, turn movements and economic needs.

OAR 734-051-0080 reference: Please refer to page 6 of the OAR for a definition of reasonable access and OAR 734-051-0080 (Pages 13-15) for the criteria for approving an application to the state highway. (This process requires an analysis to determine if a property has reasonable access). The OAR can be reviewed at the following link –

<http://www.huntingtontrafficsolutions.com/>

Sub Group Discussion Summary on Reasonable Access

Reasonable access is a term found in ORS 374.310(3) and the specific text was signed into law in 2003 as follows;

(3) The powers granted by this section and ORS 374.315 may not be exercised so as to deny any property adjoining the road or highway reasonable access. In determining what is

reasonable, the department or county court or board of county commissioners shall apply the following criteria:

(a) The access must be sufficient to allow the authorized uses for the property identified in the acknowledged local comprehensive plan.

(b) The type, number, size and location of approaches must be adequate to serve the volume and type of traffic reasonably anticipated to enter and exit the property, based on the planned uses for the property.

OAR 734 Division 51 contains rules to implement ORS 374 related to access management. The OAR introduces a concept that alternative access may be reasonable or made reasonable to serve the property, and if so, ODOT may deny direct access to the state highway (alternate access does not provide direct access from the state highway to the property, rather access may be via a city street, county road, or easement from an adjoining property). There was considerable discussion on the issue over the intervening months as some committee members stated that ODOT does not consider the amount of access that is necessary to serve the intended and approved uses of the property from a business or economic perspective.

To address the issues related to reasonable access, ODOT in collaboration with the AM Committee has initiated re-writing OAR 734-051-0080 that describes the criteria used when the agency approves or denies an approach application to include a more objective set of criteria or standards. With the exception of large developments, the revised process also reduces the need for the applicant to hire a traffic consultant to produce a traffic analysis as part of the application thus reducing costs for many applicants.

The provision in the current rule that requires ODOT to make a determination on whether existing access to a property is reasonable or can be made reasonable will be removed. The proposed re-write of this portion of the rules will state that where the approach application meets identified standards, the application is approved, regardless if there is alternative access to the site, and regardless if the alternative access is, or can be made reasonable. Within the urban area, an applicant can be approved for additional direct access to the highway in conditions where additional access also meets the standards. In rural areas, an applicant will have the burden to show that one direct access is insufficient to provide reasonable access to serve the intended and approved uses of the property.

There may be limited situations where the applicant meets with new standards but because of unique circumstances at the site, ODOT may need to request or produce additional analysis before a determination can be made as to approve or deny the application. Reasons might include topographical constraints, proximity to intersections or driveways on the opposite side of the highway, or operation issues unique to the location of the proposed driveway that create a safety concern. A proposed list of objective, identifiable conditions have been recommended by ODOT.

While there is general agreement that ODOT needs the ability to consider unique conditions, additional work is necessary to determine if the proposed list of conditions can be considered objectively. Traffic engineers from both perspectives have agreed to work together to develop objective criteria that both parties can agree with. For some applications, a proposal being discussed is a requirement that ODOT produce the analysis and findings rather than making that a requirement of the applicant.

Private sector AM Committee members expressed concern that the definition of “reasonable access” to serve the intended uses of the adjacent property is insufficient from the property owner’s perspective and desire a revision to the existing statute. The AM Committee is working on an amendment to ORS 374.310. A legislative amendment will be proposed.

A legislative concept for a Dispute Review Board is being advanced as a means to allow for a broader perspective on issues that may include reasonable access to serve the property. A more complete description of the legislative concept can be found on page 23.

Outline of Sub-Group # 2 Task Assignment

(As adopted by the sub-group in July 2010)

Sub-Group # 2 - Access management standards that conform to reality/within the context of the environment (This group will also review the work that ODOT is developing to address rural roads with less than 5,000 ADT as part of SB 1024)

Problem Statement: The spacing standards referenced by OAR Division 51 are based on travel speed, traffic operational analysis and human factors. The spacing standards are not necessarily sensitive to the context or character of specific segments along the route. The rule lends itself to a "one size fits all" approach that lacks the flexibility to take into account other factors that could affect the decision on driveway and approach requests.

Background: There was a general acknowledgement that the roadway environment should meet the driver expectation. A motorist on 82nd Avenue in Portland would not typically know if they are driving on a city street or a state highway as the roadway looks and feels like other major city streets. Many of the AM approach spacing standards for urban areas exceed the grid system public street spacing in many cities across the state. Any request for a driveway to the state highway between the two public streets routinely requires a deviation and may result in a protracted process. It is acknowledged that a modification to the driveway spacing standards may result in increased congestion, or extend the hours of congestion in urban areas. It is also acknowledged that the roadway classification system impacts the appropriate driveway spacing standard, and may be especially important along freight routes.

This sub-group will also review the AM strategies/policies/standards that ODOT is currently developing for highways with less than 5,000 Average Daily Trips (ADT) as required by SB 1024.

OAR 734-051-0115 Reference and 1999 Oregon Highway Plan: Please refer to page 18 - 19 of the OAR for the access management standards and Tables 1, 2 and 3 for the access spacing on Statewide, Regional and District level highways. Please refer to OAR 734-051-0125 (Pages 19-20) for the access management standards at interchanges and the corresponding Tables 4, 5 and 6. The OAR and accompanying tables can be reviewed at the following link - <http://www.huntingtontrafficsolutions.com/>

The existing ODOT system definition and highway classification system is identified in the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan, pages 39-44 and can be found at <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/orhwyplan/hwyplan/PolicyElement.pdf>

Sub Group Discussion Summary on the Existing Access Management Standards

It is acknowledged that the existing access management standards are not sensitive to the urban environment as the driveway spacing standard is often higher than the spacing between public street intersections. Approving an approach application in these situations requires ODOT to process a deviation request and occurs frequently as the property may not have any other means of access. Some of the committee members verbalized that this hinders development and redevelopment from occurring.

A series of proposed changes will result in significant relief for potential developers as follows:

- As a result of SB1024, less stringent standards will take effect on all regional and district classification highways in rural and urban areas and urban statewide classification highways posted at 45 mph and lower.
- Expand the concept in the existing OAR that defines “moving in the direction of” which currently requires the closure of an existing driveway. The proposed revision will provide objective criteria of a number of incremental improvements in urban areas that may be a basis for approval, including improvements such as modifications to the existing driveway design, improving internal circulation, and on-site parking that would improve traffic flow to or from the highway.
- For locations where driveways connect to a one-way roadway or where there is a depressed or raised non-traversable median on the highway, the proposal is to reduce the driveway spacing standard to one half of the normal spacing standard. Driveways in these conditions are limited to right-in/right-out only, or may include left-in/left-out only on a one-way highway.
- Where city block spacing is less than the driveway spacing standard, ODOT and the AM Committee have committed to developing standards on a recommended number of driveways between intersections of public roads.
- The AM Committee has approved a draft policy to encourage in-fill and redevelopment in urban corridors, where supported by the local agency. This policy would acknowledge that access spacing standards and mobility thresholds may be exceeded though this would not be a case for denial or extensive mitigation measures.
- A new threshold for a “change of use” to an existing development per SB1024 which allows developers to increase the number of trips to their site up to 20 percent without engaging the ODOT application process except for locations where there is a known and identifiable safety concern. For those re-developments that exceed the 20 percent threshold, the committee has recommended that the analysis and potential mitigation focus on the delta of the additional traffic to the site.
- The committee is developing a clear and objective set of standards based on roadway classification and designation, lane configuration, posted speed, traffic volume, approach volume, and crash history which will result in reaching approvals in a more expedited manner.

ODOT manages four separate classifications of highways including freeways, statewide, regional and district level facilities. Each facility provides a unique service to the state with freeways providing the highest degree of mobility and safety with access limited to interchanges. Each classification of highway provides a degree less mobility while providing more access consistent with the descending classification system with district level highways intended to provide for local connectivity and a high level of access to adjacent properties.

“Expressway” is the Oregon Highway Plan designation used to identify where efficient, high speed traffic mobility is the primary function for the state highway ODOT will continue to manage “expressways” to a high standard, with a preference for access to the local roadway network rather than direct, private access to the highway.

ODOT also stated that the agency's focus in the past was to limit access to state highways where possible as national research has shown that increased access along a highway corridor may result in increased congestion on the highway. ODOT has shared with the AM Committee, and it should be acknowledged that the less stringent standards being proposed for driveways and mitigation requirements can result in a potential for increased levels of congestion.

As the highway classification and designation have a significant impact on the access management standards that are applied when requesting an approach application, a legislative concept is being advanced that will require the agency to review the existing classifications and designations across the state. A more complete description of the legislative concept is found on page 22.

Outline of Sub-Group # 3 Task Assignment

(As adopted by the sub-group in July 2010)

Sub-Group # 3 - Mitigation measures

Problem Statement: First, the cost and extensive timeline necessary to produce the Traffic Impact Analysis required by OAR Division 51 is problematic for developers. Second, Division 51 requires developers to pay for improvements that mitigate the impacts associated with the proposed development. The proximity of the impacts and proposed improvements relative to the actual development is a function of the number of trips anticipated by the proposed development. This issue becomes more complex for those situations where there is limited available capacity on the adjacent highway system. The additional trips anticipated to the proposed development may cause the traffic operations to exceed the acceptable mobility standards. The last developer into the system (the straw that breaks the camel's back) may be required to pay for mitigation that brings an entire portion of the roadway to acceptable mobility standards. ODOT lacks the ability to develop System Development Charges (SDC) in which each developer pays a proportionate share to roadway improvements. The existing process can result in cost impacts to the private sectors that seem unreasonable for improvements that should be paid for with public funds.

Background: OAR Division 51 requires the developer to meet adopted mobility standards. The developer is required to have a Professional Engineer (PE) produce a traffic study that identifies the anticipated mobility with the proposed use, the extent of impacts associated with the development and the proposed mitigation necessary to offset those impacts. Division 51 utilizes a "number of trips" threshold to determine to what extent mitigation might be required. This method of establishing a threshold could mean that the developer is required to participate in cost of improvements a significant distance from the actual development.

The cost and time required to produce the required Traffic Impact Analysis can be a deterrent to a business development opportunity, and the actual cost contribution to the actual mitigation may make a project cost prohibitive for moving forward. This creates the potential for significantly impacting economic development opportunity. Mitigation is often times required at locations where improvements would eventually be required even without the proposed development. Developers question if the proposed mitigation measures required by ODOT are "roughly proportional" to the traffic impacts resulting from the development, and if there is a "rational nexus" to the requested roadway improvements. Complexities increase when the proposed mitigation measure impacts adjacent property owners, or property owners on the far side of the roadway.

It is acknowledged that the sub-group will examine if the mobility standards are appropriate and whether the level of mitigation measures required for proposed developments are appropriate. A recommendation is required to help define appropriate mitigation measures that can be required of a developer, and the extent to which the developer is required to participate. (It is assumed that the proposed development is consistent and allowable with the adopted land uses within the existing local comprehensive plan).

Appropriate mitigation measures associated with a proposed change of the approved land use in the comprehensive plan are not included in our discussion as those requests and resulting actions are identified in the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and outside of the focus of this sub-group.

OAR 734-051-0145 Reference: Please refer to pages 23 - 24 of the OAR for mitigation measures. The OAR and accompanying tables can be reviewed at the following link.

<http://www.huntingtontrafficsolutions.com/>

1999 Oregon Highway Plan – Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Standards Please refer to the Highway Plan, pages 73 – 84 for mobility standards at the following link -

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/orhwyplan/hwyplan/PolicyElement.pdf>

Sub Group Discussion Summary on Mitigation Measures

Fewer mitigation measures will be required of developers on regional and district highways and statewide urban highways posted at 45 mph and lower as mobility standards are revised. In addition to this, a proposed infill and redevelopment policy recognizes that access spacing standards and mobility standards may not be achievable through the corridor. Mitigation measures will be significantly reduced as a developer will not be required to mitigate for mobility issues through the corridor. Less expensive mitigation measures and fewer adverse impacts to access for nearby properties along the state highway will be realized with the adoption of proposed median mitigation measures on page 16. A legislative concept is being advanced wherein ODOT would not require that the highway mobility standards be met when measuring traffic queues exiting an applicant's property. A more complete description of the legislative concept is found on page 21.

Many of the committee members acknowledged that as fewer mitigation measures are required on the highway and in the event of increased traffic volumes in the corridor, congestion may increase. ODOT stated that where mitigation requirements have been reduced or eliminated, and development results in increased congestion, it should not be a basis for affecting other existing higher priority improvement needs on the system.

Outline of Sub-Group # 4 Task Assignment

(As adopted by the sub-group in July 2010)

Sub-Group # 4 - Medians

Problem Statement: OAR Division 51 requires mitigation to offset the transportation impacts associated with new development to a minimum "don't make it worse" standard, (Mobility standards are part of the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan and subsequent revisions). On many high volume arterials, this often requires limiting or restricting certain turn movements to meet the mobility standard. The installation of raised medians along the center of the highway ensure that the turn movements are not allowed, though the median may impact the economic potential for not only the developing property, but adjacent properties affected by the median as well.

Background: Conflicts created by left-turning movements and cross traffic are typically the most difficult to mitigate. The level of congestion and number of crashes is thought to have a direct correlation with the density of driveways on high volume roadways. Medians can enhance mobility and traffic safety and include continuous left-turn lanes, painted medians between opposing travel lanes and non-traversable medians (which may be physical barriers, raised or depressed landscaped medians). The current mobility standards lead to the use of non-traversable medians more and more often as a means of achieving compliance with the mobility standards referenced by the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan, particularly on high volume arterials.

The sub-group will evaluate appropriate median types and when various medians should be applied with proposed developments, planning documents and ODOT roadway improvement projects.

1999 Oregon Highway Plan – Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Standards, Policy 3B: Medians

Please refer to the Highway Plan, pages 73 – 84 for mobility standards and pages 128 – 130 for the median policy at the following link -

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/orhwyplan/hwyplan/PolicyElement.pdf>

Sub Group Discussion summary on Medians

The AM Committee is advancing a legislative concept related to median treatments related to proposed development applications, including; 1) a painted double-double solid yellow line in tandem with painted cross hatching to restrict turn movements across a flush median, 2) Permit U-Turns at signalized intersections unless signed otherwise, and 3) An addition is proposed to ORS 366 requiring ODOT to work collaboratively with highway users when a depressed or raised non-traversable median is considered on a two-lane highway. A more complete description of the legislative concept on medians is found on pages 20 and 21.

The AM Committee continues to develop objective standards related to the installation of depressed or raised non-traversable medians through a highway corridor, typically installed to mitigate a safety or operational concern on the state highway.

Outline of Sub-Group 5 Task Assignment

(As adopted by the sub-group in July 2010)

Sub-Group # 5 - Review of temporary rules to meet the intent of SB 1024.

ODOT staff is in the process of developing temporary administrative rules to meet the intent of SB 1024 relating to a "Change of Use". This impacts the existing OAR 734-051-0045 and the criteria that ODOT may consider when reviewing developments under a change of use status. The sub-group will work with ODOT staff in reviewing the proposed administrative rules before the text is advanced to the Oregon Transportation Commission for adoption.

Sub Group Discussion Summary on Revised Rules for "Change of Use" Threshold

The sub-group provided recommended revisions to draft OAR as developed by ODOT staff. The revisions were incorporated in the final temporary rules and advanced to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) with a recommendation for adoption at the July OTC meeting.

The sub group continued to provide review of the proposed permanent OAR that allowed for additional stakeholders to comment during the public review process. The AM Committee approved of the final proposed permanent OAR that was advanced to the OTC and was adopted by the Commission at their December 15, 2010 meeting.

Additional concepts flagged by Stakeholder Committee

While the AM Committee focused the majority of their attention on the four main areas of concern, 1) clarification on how reasonable access is applied, 2) a review of the existing access management standards, 3) costs to mitigate impacts associated with development, and 4) when and where raised, non-traversable medians are appropriate, the committee identified additional concerns. The following is a list of concepts/issues that the committee has flagged for further work:

- The installation of raised medians through a highway corridor unrelated to an approach application.
- The project development process and how ODOT decisions associated with projects may impact adjacent property owners.
- The access spacing and planning involved for Interchange Area Management Plans within Urban Growth Boundaries. There is a concern that the access spacing standards are not sensitive to the urban environment.
- A request to replace “approach” in the OAR with “driveway”.
- A request to separate public roads and streets from driveways within the OAR and make all aspects of a public road and streets a separate part of the OAR.
- A revised process for considering grants of access for public roads and streets.
- In instances where an existing site completes an expansion that results in additional traffic volumes that exceed the “change of use” threshold, evaluate the delta increase and mitigate the specific impacts, rather than considering the site as a completely new development, in which all of the access management standards are applied.
- Within UGBs, re-evaluate the access spacing standards on expressways.
- Extract the spacing standards and access related mobility standards from the OHP and make them part of the revised OAR or standards manual as appropriate.
- An acknowledgement that some industrial uses in the urban and rural areas require more than one driveway for reasonable access, as each driveway may serve a specific type of vehicle and separating the traffic may be necessary for safety.

Recommendations for Certain Exemptions from SB1024

Recommendations:

SB1024 Section 1 (5) The department shall establish access management rules, mitigation measures and spacing and mobility standards that are less stringent for highway segments where the annual average amount of daily traffic is 5,000 motor vehicles or fewer, than highway segments where the annual average amount of daily traffic is greater than 5,000 motor vehicles.

ODOT and the AM Committee are in the process developing standards to meet this requirement for all regional and district highways in the state.

Related to Certain Statewide Classification Highways with less than 5,000 AADT

The AM Committee recommends that the Legislature exempt certain portions of urban and rural statewide classification highways with less than 5,000 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) from the less stringent standards required by SB1024. This proposed exemption would be comprised of rural statewide highways and urban statewide highways with posted speeds greater than 45 MPH. The request is based on the potential crash severity, travel characteristics on the roadway, the long travel distance associated with travel on statewide highways, the varied type of roadway user, the varied type of vehicles on the roadway and the need for certain highways to facilitate efficient movement of goods and services across the state. A more complete description of the legislative concept on the request for an exception is found on pages 21 and 22.

Recommendations for Proposed Legislation

The AM Committee has developed a number of proposed changes to the existing administrative rules on access management as discussed in the preceding pages. The following pages 20 through 23 are a summary of legislative concepts that have been recommended by members of the committee.

Access Management for County Roads (SB 264)

- Issue: ORS 374.310 governs the Department of Transportation's access management program for state highways and County Commissions' access management programs for county roads. The amendment to ORS 374.310 was intended to affect only ODOT's access management, but inadvertently affected county road access management.
- Proposed Solution: Senate Bill 264 creates a new section in ORS 374 for county road access management using the statutory language for county road access management prior to March 4, 2010, the effective date of chapter 31, Oregon Laws 2010 [SB 1024 (2010)].

Notice to Highway Users About Non-traversable Barriers

- Issue: ODOT discusses proposals to reduce the vehicle carrying capacity of a freight route with highway users. There are exceptions to this process when proposed reductions are made for safety and access considerations. Non-traversable median barriers are sometimes used to address safety and access issues that occur at the intersections of public roads and private driveways. The result is that issues related to the ability of large freight vehicles to travel over a two-lane highway are sometimes not identified until after a barrier is installed.
- Proposed Solution: ODOT works collaboratively on mobility issues with members of the Statewide Traffic Mobility Steering Committee in a process that is outlined in the department's Highway Mobility Operations Manual. The proposal is to bring raised or depressed barriers on two lane state highways into that process. Rather than referencing the Committee in statute, the proposal uses generic references. "Highway users" are representatives of the freight industry, automobile users, and local government.

Dividers Designated By Pavement Markings (Double Double Yellow Pavement Markings)

- Issue: Dividers designated by pavement markings could be used as a progressive measure to channel traffic and prevent left turns from the highway without installing curbs or other non-traversable barriers. Currently, pavement markings are used to designate highway dividers across the state. However, some dividers designated by pavement markings can and are being used by drivers as left turn refuges while others were designated to prohibit turns.
- Proposed Solution: This proposal clarifies existing law concerning driving on a highway divider (ORS 811.430). An area enclosed by double yellow lines and marked with crosshatching may be used to designate a highway divider that prohibits a left turn.

U-turns at Traffic Signals (SB 131)

- Issue: U-turns at signalized intersections can facilitate access to properties when left turns are prevented by barriers or boulevard strips. Oregon Law currently prohibits U-turns at signalized intersections unless signs indicate that U-turns are explicitly allowed. Most other states, including Washington, Idaho and California, allow U-turns at signalized intersections unless signs indicate that U-turns are prohibited.
- Proposed Solution: SB 131 changes Oregon law to make it consistent with most states and drivers perception of the law. It would allow U-turns at most signalized intersections; signs would indicate intersections where U-turns are prohibited.

Objective Standards for Approving or Denying Approach Road Permits

- Issue: SB 1024, Section 2 of that bill requires that ODOT "...in cooperation with stakeholders, shall develop proposed legislation to codify, clarify and bring consistency to the issuance of access permits based on objective standards."

The AM Committee has discussed a number of issues related to ODOT's management of access to state highways. Work is underway by ODOT in collaboration with a technical working group and the AM Committee to develop objective standards as required by the bill.

- Proposed Solution: The proposal includes objective standards for the determination of reasonable access and the approval of private approaches within and outside urban growth boundaries and prioritizes the type and location of improvements the department will consider to mitigate traffic impacts associated with an application for a private approach. ODOT will not require that highway mobility standards be met when measuring traffic queues exiting an applicant's property to a public roadway.

Less stringent access spacing standard for state highways with fewer than 5,000 average annual vehicles per day

- Issue: The spacing standards that apply to access management are set out in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) and are incorporated in the AM administrative rule by reference. The OHP is a policy document. While many applications for approaches (driveways) that do not meet these standards are approved, the approval process requires approval of a deviation from the standard.

The Access Management bill requires ODOT to develop less stringent standards for state highways that meet this criterion.

- Proposed Solution. This proposal would adopt in statute access spacing standards that are less stringent spacing standards that the current standards set out in the Oregon Highway Plan for private approaches (driveways) as recommended by the AM Committee for District, Regional, and some Statewide classification highways that are not designated as expressways and that carry fewer than 5,000 annual average daily trips.

The spacing standards as recommended by the AM Committee are not the only requirement

that must be met for approval of a permit application for a driveway on to a state highway that carries fewer than 5,000 annual average daily trips. Other standards adopted by the department, such as sight distance, crash history, and highway lane configuration and design features would continue to apply. In addition, the AM Committee's recommendation would not change the spacing standards for rural statewide highways and urban statewide highways with posted speeds greater than 45 MPH that carry less than 5000 annual average daily trips. The AM Committee's recommendation would not affect the spacing standards for highways that carry more than 5,000 annual average daily trips. The current standards would remain in place.

State Highway Classifications

- Issue: Many decisions about highways, including decisions about access management, depend on the classification of those highways. The Oregon Transportation Commission determined the classifications for state highways as part of the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan. The Commission reviewed the classifications and designated some segments as expressways in 2001. Development has changed travel patterns and highway system use over the decade since.
- Proposed Solution: Require the Oregon Transportation Commission to review the classification of state highways as part of its transportation planning responsibilities.

Concept to Facilitate Jurisdiction Transfers

- Issue: Segments of the state highway system are classified as interstate, statewide, regional, and district according to their primary function. Communities, especially in urban areas, have grown around district level highways so that many function as urban arterials rather than state highways.

ODOT may determine that it is in the best interest of highway users that a highway segment be removed from state highway system and operated by the local jurisdiction. When there is a continuing need for use of the segment as a public roadway and ODOT owns the right of way, ODOT attempts to transfer ownership of the highway segment to a county or a city for operation, maintenance and management. These transfers require the consent of the local government involved and acceptance of jurisdiction and ownership.

Money is distributed from the State Highway Fund to counties and cities by formulas that do not change when a local government accepts ownership of more road miles. In order to facilitate a transfer of jurisdiction, ODOT may bring the segment "up to standard," may exchange the segment for another local road or street, and may make a one-time payment or payments over a short period of time that quantifies the benefit to ODOT for removal from the state highway system and compensates the local government for the additional responsibility that it has accepted. Under current statute, ODOT cannot make a commitment that would supply a continuing revenue stream for the additional incurred costs to the local government because the State no longer has an interest in the segment once it is transferred and is no longer part of the state highway system.

- Proposed Solution: Change statute to allow ODOT to make a continuing financial commitment to a county or city that accepts jurisdiction of a segment of state highway. The

option would provide an additional tool to facilitate management of the state and local road network and to ensure facilities are being managed by the appropriate governmental entity.

Legislative Oversight

- Issue. Stakeholders want legislative oversight of ODOT's continued implementation of the Access Management bill to codify, clarify and bring consistency to the issuance of access permits based on objective standards.
- Proposed Solution. The proposal would create a special eight member legislative oversight committee on Access Management. Two Senate members would be appointed by the Senate President; three House members would be appointed by the Speaker of the House; the ODOT Director or his/her designee, a representative of the development community and a representative of local government would be appointed by the Governor. Legislative members of the special committee would be chosen so that each member would represent a separate ODOT region of the state.

ODOT would staff the oversight committee.

The purpose of the Legislative Oversight Committee is to ensure that ODOT, in cooperation with stakeholders, develop proposed administrative rules to fulfill the requirements of SB1024 and additional administrative rules as required with subsequent statutes related to access management statutes during the 2011 Legislative session.

The Legislative Oversight Committee will sunset at the end of 2015.

Concept to Develop Access Management Dispute Resolution Process

- Issue: Stakeholders have requested a non-biased review board to replace the existing ODOT region review process when applications for approaches or denied, or approved with mitigation requirements that may be considered excessive or not related to the application.
- Proposed Solution: The proposal would prescribe the structure of the dispute resolution in statute.

Recommendations for Proposed Rulemaking

The AM Committee has recommended that significant portions of OAR 734 Division 51 be re-written and/or amended to be consistent with proposed revisions to statute, including but not limited to;

- 734-051-0070 Application Procedure and Timelines.
 - I. The goal is to provide preliminary approval early in the review process, and
 - II. Provide for collaborative discussion at any point during the review process to identify concerns in an effort to expedite the process.
- 734-051-0080 Criteria for Approving an Application for an Approach (*In process*)
 - I. The goal is to work toward an approval of an application,
 - II. When the applicant meets the standard, the application is approved regardless if the property is served by alternative access.
 - III. In the urban areas, the applicant may obtain additional approval for driveways if they meet the standard regardless if the property is served by alternative access..
 - IV. In the rural areas, applicant has the burden to show that one direct access to the highway and other available access do not provide reasonable access to the property to serve the intended and approved uses.
 - V. ODOT will continue to manage “expressways” to a high standard, with a preference for access to the local roadway network rather than direct, private access to the highway.
- 734-051-0115 Access Management Spacing Standards for Approaches (*In process*)
 - I. Less restrictive spacing standards in corridors identified for infill and redevelopment.
- 734-051-0125 Access Management Spacing Standards for Approaches in an Interchange Area
- 734-051-0135 Deviations from Access Management Spacing Standards (*In process*)
 - I. Expand the concept “moving in the direction of” in the urban areas where incremental improvement based on a number of factors may be a justification for approval of an application.
- 734-051-0145 Mitigation Measures (*in process*)

Develop a multi-tiered mitigation strategy. This would direct ODOT to follow a multi-tier approach beginning with pavement markings and signage on an applicant’s property and moving to well designed “pork chops” and similar traffic islands located on the property or at the curb line, to pavement markings or signage on the highway, and to depressed or raised medians as a last resort.
- 734-051-0225 Post-Decision Review Procedure for Construction Permits

Recommendations for Proposed Administrative Actions

It has been acknowledged that in order to create consistency with proposed revisions to the ORS and OAR's, additional actions by the department will be required. The following represents those actions that have been identified.

1999 Oregon Highway Plan (OHP)

It is recommended that Tables 12 – 19 on Interchange Spacing, Access Spacing, Access Spacing for Interchanges be revised as appropriate and potentially be removed from the 1999 OHP and located within the appropriate document.

It is recommended that Policies 3A; Classification and Spacing Standards, 3B; Medians, 3C; Interchange Access Management Areas, 3D; Deviations, 3E; Appeals in the OHP be reviewed and made consistent with the proposed revisions to statute and OAR 734 Division 51.

It is recommended that Policy 1F; Highway Mobility Standards and Tables 6 and 7 in the OHP be reviewed for consistency with proposed revisions to statute, OAR 734 Division 51 and recommendations advanced from the AM Committee.

Guidelines

It is recommended that ODOT develop "Bulletins" or other such documents to provide guidance to permitting staff until such time as a revised OAR 734 Division 51 is completed and adopted.

Training

It is recommended that the state develop and provide executive direction and training to staff on revisions to the ORS, OAR and OHP pertaining to the state's access management rules.

Appendices

Appendix A – Access Management Committee Members

Appendix B – Access Management Sub Group Participants

Appendix C - Glossary

Appendix D – Senate Bill 1024

Appendix E – Overview of Why Access is Managed

For a review of the AM Committee work, meeting agendas, meeting notes and attachments, and meeting notes and attachments for each of the sub groups, access <http://www.huntingtontrafficsolutions.com/> and follow the link the Access Management Discussion Forum

Appendix A

Access Management Committee Members

Access Management Committee Members

Legislative Members

Representative E. Terry Beyer	rep.terrybeyer@state.or.us
Senator Betsy Johnson	sen.betsyjohnson@state.or.us
Senator Rick Metsger	sen.rickmetsger@state.or.us
Senator Bruce Starr	sen.brucestarr@state.or.us
Senator Joanne Verger	sen.joanneverger@state.or.us
Senator Doug Whitsett	sen.dougwhitsett@state.or.us

Development/Business Interests

Mark Whitlow, RTF & ICSC	MWhitlow@perkinscoie.com
Bob Russell, Oregon Trucking Association	russell@ortrucking.org
Don Forrest, Fred Meyer	don.forrest@fredmeyer.com
Jon Chandler, Home Builder's Association	jchandler@oregonhba.com

Practitioners

Jamie Jeffrey, City of Portland	Jamie.Jeffrey@pdxtrans.org
Brent Ahrend, Group Mackenzie	bahrend@grpmack.com
Jim Hanks, JRH Engineering	jimhanks@jrhweb.com
Mark Becktel, City of Salem	mbecktel@cityofsalem.net

Other Participants

Craig Campbell, Automobile Assoc. of America	craig@victorygrp.com
Craig Honeyman, League of Oregon Cities	choneyman@orcities.org
Mike Eliason, Association of Oregon Counties	meliason@aocweb.org
Art Schlack, Association of Oregon Counties	aschlack@aocweb.org

Oregon Department of Transportation

Matt Garrett, Director	Matthew.L.GARRETT@odot.state.or.us
Bob Bryant, Region 4 Manager	robert.w.bryant@odot.state.or.us
Robin Freeman, Govt. Relations Manager	robin.freeman@odot.state.or.us
Harold Lasley, Access Management Manager	Harold.Lasley@odot.state.or.us
Doug Bish, Traffic Engineering Services Mgr.	douglas.w.bish@odot.state.or.us
Michael Rock, Long-Range Planning	Michael.D.Rock@odot.state.or.us

Working Facilitator

Del Huntington	del@huntingtontrafficsolutions.com
Karen Elliott/Michelle Van Schaick – Scribe	rvmomma@comcast.net, michelleVANSCHAICK@odot.state.or.us

Observers

Representative Margaret Doherty	rep.margaretdoherty@state.or.us
Victor Dodier – ODOT Gov't Relations	Victor.J.DODIER@odot.state.or.us
Pat Cooney – ODOT Gov't Relations	patrick.j.cooney@odot.state.or.us

Appendix B
Access Management Sub Group Participants

Access Management Sub-Group Participants

Sub-Group # 1 - Reasonable Access

Mark Whitlow, RTF & ICSC	MWhitlow@perkinscoie.com
Jamie Jeffrey, City of Portland	Jamie.Jeffrey@pdxtrans.org
Don Forrest, Fred Meyer	don.forrest@fredmeyer.com
Jon Chandler, Home Builder's Association	jchandler@oregonhba.com
Brent Ahrend, Group Mackenzie	bahrend@grpmack.com
Jinde Zhu – Washington County	jinde_zhu@co.washington.or.us
Richard Dunlap, ODOT R/W	Richard.R.DUNLAP@odot.state.or.us
Bob Bryant, ODOT Region 4 Manager	robert.w.bryant@odot.state.or.us
Harold Lasley, Access Management Manager	Harold.Lasley@odot.state.or.us
Del Huntington, Facilitator	del@huntingtontrafficsolutions.com

Sub-Group # 2 – Access Management Standards That Conform to Reality

Mark Whitlow, RTF & ICSC	MWhitlow@perkinscoie.com
Jamie Jeffrey, City of Portland	Jamie.Jeffrey@pdxtrans.org
Jim Hanks, JRH Engineering	jimhanks@jrhweb.com
Jon Chandler, Home Builder's Association	jchandler@oregonhba.com
Michael Rock, Long-Range Planning	Michael.D.Rock@odot.state.or.us
Joe Marek, Clackamas County	joem@co.clackamas.or.us
Gary Farnsworth, ODOT	Gary.C.FARNSWORTH@odot.state.or.us
Monte Grove, ODOT	Monte.GROVE@odot.state.or.us
Shawn Stephens, ODOT	Shawn.A.STEPHENS@odot.state.or.us
Bob Bryant, ODOT Region 4 Manager	robert.w.bryant@odot.state.or.us
Harold Lasley, Access Management Manager	Harold.Lasley@odot.state.or.us
Del Huntington, Facilitator	del@huntingtontrafficsolutions.com

Sub-Group # 3 – Mitigation Measures

Bob Russell, Oregon Trucking Association	russell@ortrucking.org
Don Forrest, Fred Meyer	don.forrest@fredmeyer.com
Brent Ahrend, Group Mackenzie	bahrend@grpmack.com
Jim Hanks, JRH Engineering	jimhanks@jrhweb.com
Mark Becktel, City of Salem	mbecktel@cityofsalem.net
Shashi Bajracharya, Lane County	Shashi.BAJRACHARYA@co.lane.or.us
Doug Bish, Traffic Engineering Services Mgr.	douglas.w.bish@odot.state.or.us
Michael Rock, Long-Range Planning	Michael.D.Rock@odot.state.or.us
Brian Dunn, ODOT	Brian.G.DUNN@odot.state.or.us
David Warren, ODOT	David.WARREN@odot.state.or.us
Bob Bryant, ODOT Region 4 Manager	robert.w.bryant@odot.state.or.us
Harold Lasley, Access Management Manager	Harold.Lasley@odot.state.or.us
Del Huntington, Facilitator	del@huntingtontrafficsolutions.com

Sub-Group # 4 - Medians

Representative Margaret Doherty	rep.margaretdoherty@state.or.us
Craig Campbell, Automobile Assoc. of America	craig@victorygrp.com
Craig Honeyman, League of Oregon Cities	choneyman@orcities.org
Bob Russell, Oregon Trucking Association	russell@ortrucking.org
Jim Hanks, JRH Engineering	jimhanks@jrweb.com
Mark Becktel, City of Salem	mbecktel@cityofsalem.net
Joe Marek, Clackamas County	joem@co.clackamas.or.us
Chris Doty, City of Redmond	chris.doty@ci.redmond.or.us
Doug Bish, Traffic Engineering Services Mgr.	douglas.w.bish@odot.state.or.us
Elaine Smith, ODOT	Elaine.SMITH@odot.state.or.us
Jim Cox, ODOT	Jim.B.COX@odot.state.or.us
Bob Bryant, ODOT Region 4 Manager	robert.w.bryant@odot.state.or.us
Harold Lasley, Access Management Manager	Harold.Lasley@odot.state.or.us
Del Huntington, Facilitator	del@huntingtontrafficsolutions.com

Sub-Group # 5 – Temporary Administrative Rules “Change of Use”

Brent Ahrend, Group Mackenzie	bahrend@grpmack.com
Jim Hanks, JRH Engineering	jimhanks@jrweb.com
Mark Whitlow, RTF & ICSC	MWhitlow@perkinscoie.com
Don Forrest, Fred Meyer	don.forrest@fredmeyer.com
Doug Bish, Traffic Engineering Services Mgr.	douglas.w.bish@odot.state.or.us
Doug Norval, ODOT	douglas.d.norval@state.or.us
Bob Bryant, ODOT Region 4 Manager	robert.w.bryant@odot.state.or.us
Harold Lasley, Access Management Manager	Harold.Lasley@odot.state.or.us
Del Huntington, Facilitator	del@huntingtontrafficsolutions.com

Appendix C
Glossary

Glossary

AADT – Average Annual Daily Traffic

ADT – Average Daily Traffic

AG – Attorney General

AM – Access Management

AM Committee – Access Management Committee

Division 51 – Portion of the Oregon Administrative Rules 734 that pertain to access management procedures

DRB – Dispute Review Board

IMP – Interchange Management Plan

ICSC – International Council of Shopping Centers

MPH – Miles per Hour

N/A – Not Applicable

OAR – Oregon Administrative Rule

OHP – Oregon Highway Plan

ORS – Oregon Revised Statute

OTC – Oregon Transportation Commission

PE – Professional Engineer

RTF – Retail Task Force

R/W – Right of Way

SB1024 – Senate Bill 1024 – a bill that was part of the 2010 special legislative session, requiring ODOT to review the current access management standards and policies

SDC – System Development Charge

STA – Special Transportation Area

TBD – To Be Determined

TPR - Transportation Planning Rule

UBA - Urban Business Area

UGB - Urban Growth Boundary

Appendix D
Senate Bill 1024

Enrolled

Senate Bill 1024

Sponsored by Senator JOHNSON (Pre-session filed.)

CHAPTER

AN ACT

Relating to highway access; creating new provisions; amending ORS 374.310; and declaring an emergency.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. ORS 374.310 is amended to read:

374.310. (1) The Department of Transportation with respect to state highways and the county court or board of county commissioners with respect to county roads shall adopt reasonable rules and regulations and may issue permits, not inconsistent with law, for the use of the rights of way of such highways and roads for the purposes described in ORS 374.305. However, the department may not issue a permit for the construction of any approach road at a location where no rights of access exist between the highway and abutting real property.

(2) Such rules and regulations and such permits shall include such provisions, terms and conditions as in the judgment of the granting authority may be in the best interest of the public for the protection of the highway or road and the traveling public and may include, but need not be limited to:

(a) Provisions for construction of culverts under approaches, requirements as to depth of fills over culverts and requirements for drainage facilities, curbs, islands and other facilities for traffic channelization as may be deemed necessary.

(b) With respect to private road crossings, additional provisions for the angle of intersection, crossing at grade or other than grade, sight distances, safety measures including flaggers, crossing signs and signals, reinforcement for protection of the highway, maintenance of the crossing and for payment by the applicant of the costs of any of the foregoing.

(c) With respect to private road crossings, the granting authority may also require the applicant to furnish public liability and property damage insurance in a sum fixed by the granting authority, which insurance shall also indemnify the members, officers, employees and agents of such authority from any claim that might arise on account of the granting of the permit and the crossing of the highway or road by vehicles operating under the permit; and the granting authority may also require the applicant to furnish indemnity insurance, an indemnity bond or an irrevocable letter of credit issued by an insured institution as defined in ORS 706.008 in a sum fixed by the granting authority, indemnifying such authority for any damage to the highways or roads that may be caused by the use of the crossing.

(3) The powers granted by this section and ORS 374.315 may not be exercised so as to deny any property adjoining the road or highway reasonable access. In determining what is reasonable, the department or county court or board of county commissioners shall apply the following criteria:

- (a) The access must be sufficient to allow the authorized uses for the property identified in the acknowledged local comprehensive plan.
- (b) The type, number, size and location of approaches must be adequate to serve the volume and type of traffic reasonably anticipated to enter and exit the property, based on the planned uses for the property.

(4)(a) As used in this subsection:

- (A) “Peak hour” means the hour during which the highest volume of traffic enters and exits the property during a typical week.**
 - (B) “Private approach” means an approach that serves one or more properties and that is not a public approach as defined in this subsection.**
 - (C) “Public approach” means an existing or planned city street or county road connection that provides vehicular access to and from a highway.**
 - (D) “Trip” means a one-way vehicular movement that consists of a motor vehicle entering or exiting a property.**
- (b) An approach permit is not required for a public approach.**
 - (c) A new approach permit for a change of use of an approach is required for a private approach if:**
 - (A)(i) The number of peak hour trips increases by 50 trips or more from that of the property’s prior use; or**
 - (ii) The number of trips on a typical day increases by 500 trips or more from that of the property’s prior use; and**
 - (B) The increase in subparagraph (A)(i) or (ii) of this paragraph represents a 20 percent or greater increase in the number of trips on a typical day and the number of peak hour trips from that of the property’s prior use.**
 - (d) A new approach permit for a change of use of an approach is required for a private approach if the daily use of a private approach increases by 10 or more vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating of 26,000 pounds or greater.**
- (5) The department shall establish access management rules, mitigation measures and spacing and mobility standards that are less stringent for highway segments where the annual average amount of daily traffic is 5,000 motor vehicles or fewer, than for highway segments where the annual average amount of daily traffic is greater than 5,000 motor vehicles.**
- [(4)] (6) The department may not charge any fee for issuance of a permit under this section for construction of an approach road.**

SECTION 2. (1) The Department of Transportation, in cooperation with stakeholders, shall develop proposed legislation to codify, clarify and bring consistency to issuance of access permits based on objective standards.

(2) The department shall provide a report to the Legislative Assembly prior to January 2011. The report must include a description of the proposed legislation developed under subsection (1) of this section.

SECTION 3. The amendments to ORS 374.310 by section 1 of this 2010 Act apply to existing approaches and to approaches permitted on or after the effective date of this 2010 Act.

SECTION 4. This 2010 Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this 2010 Act takes effect on its passage.

Passed by Senate February 15, 2010

.....
Secretary of Senate

.....
President of Senate

Passed by House February 22, 2010

.....
Speaker of House

Received by Governor:

.....M,....., 2010

Approved:

.....M,....., 2010

.....
Governor

Filed in Office of Secretary of State:

.....M,....., 2010

.....
Secretary of State

Enrolled

Appendix E

Overview of Why Access is Managed

Overview of Why Access is Managed

The January 2010 Institute of Transportation Engineers “ITE Journal” (a national publication) devoted the entire publication to the subject of access management. The following are selected excerpts from the journal.

“Access management is much more than the control of driveways. It is a means of enhancing roadway safety and preserving mobility through the systematic control of the location, spacing, design and operation of driveways, median openings, interchanges, and street connections to the roadway. Roadway design elements, such as median treatments, auxiliary lanes, and the spacing of traffic signals, are also involved. Over the years, arterial roadways have been constructed to improve mobility and relieve congestion. Yet mobility has too often been eroded by a proliferation of driveways, street connections and traffic signals. Roadway safety has also been compromised, and the corresponding roadside strips have had a decidedly adverse effect on community character and walkability.”

“The practice of access management continues to evolve to meet contemporary needs. The ultimate goal is a coordinated approach to transportation, land use, and community design – one that preserves the safety and mobility of the major transportation corridors, provides dense and connected networks in developed areas and reinforces desired urban form. The result will be a more sustainable, energy-efficient transportation system; enhanced safety and mobility; and improved livability and environmental quality.”