MEMORANDUM

Date: December 3, 2018
Project #: 22498

To: Kristi Gilbert, City of Sutherlin
Tom Guevara, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

From: Matt Hughart, AICP, Nick Gross, Caitlin Mildner, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
Darcy Rudzinski, Clinton “CJ” Doxsee, and Courtney Simms, Angelo Planning Group

Project: Sutherlin Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update
Subject: Draft Technical Memorandum 1: Goals, Plan and Policy Review, Funding Forecast

This memorandum presents the draft goals and objectives, plan and policy review, and initial funding forecast that will be used to guide development of the Sutherlin Transportation System Plan (TSP) update. The goals and objectives included in the current TSP were used as a basis to develop the revised goals with minor updates that reflect changes in state and local planning requirements since the current TSP was adopted in 2005 as well as changes in demand for active modes of transportation (i.e. walking, biking, and riding transit). Public Facility related goals and objectives identified the City’s Comprehensive Plan were also reviewed for potential inclusion in the updated TSP. Ultimately our team will recommend that one common, consistent set of transportation goals, objectives and policies be used for both documents.

The goals and objectives will be used to guide the review and documentation of existing and future transportation system needs, the development and evaluation of potential solutions to address the needs, and the selection and prioritization of preferred solutions for inclusion in the final plan. The goals and objectives will maximize mobility, safety, efficiency and accessibility to the transportation system and will address the requirements of the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP).

BACKGROUND

The current TSP includes seven goals with corresponding objectives. Several of the current goals and objectives were specific to the development of the current TSP and were accomplished when the current TSP was adopted in 2005. These included the development of a functional classification plan along with street standards, access spacing standards, and mobility standards. The goals and objectives presented below no longer include development of a functional classification plan or standards (as these are now complete); however, the TSP update will include a review and potential update of the functional classification plan and standards. It is assumed that adoption of the TSP update will result in changes to the comprehensive plan, including an update to the goals and policies related to transportation.
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 1 – Safety
Provide a transportation system that enhances the safety and security of all transportation modes.

Objectives
- Promote transportation safety through a comprehensive program of engineering, education, and enforcement.
- Address existing and potential future safety issues by identifying high crash locations and develop strategies to address those issues.
- Designate safe routes from residential areas to schools and identify transportation improvements needed to ensure the safety of Sutherlin’s school children.
- Develop a safe, complete, attractive, efficient, and accessible system of pedestrian ways, bicycle ways and personal electric vehicle ways, including bike lanes, shared roadways, multi-use paths, and sidewalks.

Goal 2 – Mobility and Efficiency
Provide a balanced and efficient transportation system for all members of the community through effective transportation and land use planning.

Objectives
- Reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicles by improving the quality of walking, biking, transit, and electric vehicle facilities. Identify strategies appropriate to the City of Sutherlin to help reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Integrate transportation and land use into development ordinances to increase opportunities for multi-purposes trips.
- Manage projected travel demand consistent with community, land use, environmental, economic and livability goals.
- Manage the transportation system for adequate and efficient operations.
Goal 3 – Health and Livability

Provide a transportation system that enhances the health and livability of local residents by promoting active modes of transportation.

Objectives

- Enhance the livability of the Sutherlin Community through proper location and design of transportation facilities including multi-use paths to balance the needs of human use and enjoyment with resource conservation in areas identified in the Parks Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan.
- Design roadways to enhance livability by ensuring that aesthetics and landscaping are an integral part of Sutherlin’s transportation system.
- Construct multi-use paths where they can be developed with satisfactory design components that address safety, security, maintainability, and acceptable uses.

Goal 4 – Connectivity and Accessibility

Develop a comprehensive, multimodal transportation system that connects all members of the Sutherlin area to community destinations.

Objectives

A. Provide connectivity to each area of the City for convenient multi-modal access. Ensure pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicle access to schools, parks, employment and recreational areas, and the Sutherlin core city area by identifying and developing improvements that address connectivity needs.

B. Make better use of the southern interchange by connecting an east-west route to the southern interchange on both sides of Interstate-5.

C. Identify opportunities to improve east-west travel for all modes of transportation across I-5.

D. Balance the needed street function for all travel modes with adjacent land uses through the use of context-sensitive street and streetscape design techniques.

E. Develop neighborhood and local connections to provide adequate circulation into and out of neighborhoods.

F. Ensure that adequate access for emergency services vehicles is provided throughout the City.
Goal 5 – Coordination and Integration

Ensure the local transportation system is integrated with County and State transportation systems and objectives, and with other related aspects of the community in Sutherlin, including land use planning, natural resource protection, housing, and economic development.

Objectives

A. Meet federal and state safety compliance standards for operation, construction, and maintenance of the rail system.

B. Provide safe routing of hazardous materials consistent with federal guidelines and provide for public involvement in the process.

C. Engage community members and organizations in the development and design of the transportation facilities identified in the TSP.

D. Work with regional and local public transportation providers to identify opportunities to expand public transportation service within the City and to surrounding communities. Encourage intercity public transportation connections for long-range public transportation. Enhance public volunteer transit system.

E. Maintain access management standards for streets consistent with City, County, and State requirements to reduce conflicts between vehicles and trucks, and between vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. Develop access management strategies for Central Avenue.

Goal 6 – Strategic Economic Investment

Facilitate the provision of a multi-modal transport system for the efficient, safe, and competitive movement of goods and services to, from, and within the Sutherlin area.

Objectives

A. Construct all transportation facilities to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

B. Provide satisfactory levels of maintenance to the transportation system in order to preserve user safety, facility aesthetics, and the integrity of the system as a whole.

C. Promote accessibility to transport modes that fulfill the needs of freight shippers.

D. Strive to balance the needs of moving freight with community livability and land use decision making.

E. Promote the appropriate location of freight routes and regional pipeline systems to enhance security, local service, and efficiency.

F. Manage on-street parking by providing an appropriate supply and design of off-street parking facilities to promote economic vitality, neighborhood livability, efficient use of urban space, and reduced reliance on single occupancy motor vehicles.
PLAN AND POLICY REVIEW

Existing plans, regulations, and policies that affect transportation planning in Sutherlin were reviewed to determine their role and potential impact on the development of the Sutherlin TSP update. The intent of the plan and policy review is to guide decisions regarding the selection of preferred transportation solutions and identify potential amendments to related plan documents and regulations. A detailed summary of the plans, regulations, and policies that were reviewed along with an explanation of how each document relates to the TSP planning process and key issues that will factor into the TSP update process is included in Attachment A and will serve as a companion to this memorandum.
CURRENT AND HISTORIC FUNDING SOURCES

A funding forecast was developed based on current and historical funding information for implementation of the Sutherlin TSP update. Financial information provided by the City of Sutherlin provides context for evaluating projects and defining project priorities that will allow Sutherlin to use all available funding opportunities and maximize current resources to preserve and improve the transportation system.

Historical Revenue Sources

Historical revenue sources that have contributed to transportation funding for Sutherlin over the last five years includes Taxes, Inter-Governmental Sources, and Miscellaneous funds such as system development changes. Chart 1 illustrates the historical revenue sources for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 through FY 2017-18.

Chart 1: City of Sutherlin Historical Revenue Sources

As shown in Chart 1, transportation funding has been relatively static over the past 13 years with the exception of Inter-Governmental Sources, most notably in FY 2016-17. Tax revenue has increased steadily from FY 2005-06 to FY 2017-18. Miscellaneous revenue has varied with notable upticks in FY 2012-13 and FY 2016-17. The following summarizes additional information related to historical revenue sources. A detailed summary of historical revenue sources can be found in Attachment A.

State Gas Tax

State gas taxes are comprised of proceeds from excise taxes imposed by the State and Federal government to generate revenue for transportation funding. The proceeds from these taxes are distributed to Oregon counties and cities in accordance with Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 366.764, by county registered vehicle number, and ORS 366.805, by city population. The Oregon Constitution states
that revenue from the state gas tax is to be used for the construction, reconstruction, improvement, maintenance, operation and use of public highways, roads, streets, and roadside rest areas. Based on data provided by the City, total revenue from the State Gas Tax has increased steadily over the last 10 years with an average of $426,320 annual revenue. This is primarily a result of the increase in population. Based on the population forecast prepared by Portland State University (PSU)\(^1\), Sutherlin can expect to continue to grow by approximately 1.87 percent per year forecasted out to horizon year 2040. As a result, a conservative 1.06 percent State Gas Tax increase will be carried forward annually to FY 2039-40.

**Inter-Governmental Sources**

Inter-Governmental Sources in Sutherlin has historically included grant funds and special agreements. During FY 2016-17 the City of Sutherlin received $2,150,000 from ODOT and $651,000 from Douglas County for the transfer of authority of Central Avenue. Based on the unique funding anomaly of FY 2016-17, the average annual Inter-Governmental Source will discount FY 2016-17. Therefore, based on the data, the average annual revenue for Inter-Governmental Sources that will be carried forward to FY 2039-40 will be $384,972.

**Miscellaneous**

Miscellaneous revenue includes various funds received throughout the year from system development charges (SDC) and unanticipated activities including land sales and cost sharing of special projects. As displayed in Chart 1, the City received substantial miscellaneous funding allocations during FY 2012-13 and FY 2016-17. Based on the data provided by the City, total revenue from the miscellaneous funds has averaged approximately $210,583 per year over the last 13 years. As a result, $210,583 will be carried forward as a conservative representation through FY 2039-2040.

**Summary of Historical Revenue**

Overall, transportation funding has increased over the last five years and is projected to continue to increase through FY 2039-40. State Gas Tax has increased over the 13-year period; whereas Inter-Governmental Sources and Miscellaneous have varied substantially.

**Historical Expenditures**

The City organizes historical expenditures into five categories, including Materials & Services, Maintenance, Street Construction & Repair, and Transfers. Chart 2 illustrates the City’s historical expenditures for FY 2005-06 through FY 2017-18.

---

\(^1\) Population Forecast prepared by: Population Research Center, Portland State University, June 30, 2018.
As shown in Chart 2, transportation spending has generally remained consistent over the last 13 years with notable outlying expenditures in FY 2017-18. The following summarizes additional information related to historical expenditures.

Materials & Services

Materials and Services consists of items that need to be purchased and one-time expenses including small equipment, tools and supplies, personnel training, insurance, and more. Based on data provided by the City, total expenditures on Materials & Services over the past 13 years has averaged approximately $91,483 annually.

Maintenance

Maintenance expenditures are primarily used for general street and storm drainage maintenance; striping, filling pot holes, clearing storm drains, fixing storm drains, small paving projects, and dust control. As shown in Chart 2, Maintenance expenses make up a small portion of the City’s overall annual expenditures. Based on the data provided by the City, total expenditures on Maintenance over the past 13 years has averaged approximately $36,495 annually.

---

2 During FY 2017-18 the City of Sutherlin expended approximately $3,057,000 on the reconstruction of Central Avenue.
Street Construction & Repair

Street Construction & Repair funds are typically used for the construction and reconstruction of roadway infrastructure such as traffic signals, turn-lanes, sidewalks, and other public amenities within the City right-of-way. As shown in Chart 2, during FY 2017-18 the City of Sutherlin expended approximately $3,057,000 on the reconstruction of Central Avenue including approximately $115,000 for the construction of a right-turn lane on Dovetail Lane, approximately $200,000 participating funds for the North Comstock Project, and the remainder for various small projects. Based the data provided by the City, total expenditures on Street Construction & Repair over the past 13 years has averaged approximately $571,050 annually.

Transfers

Transfers have consisted primarily for the estimated labor and material costs to the General Fund for administration purposes and to the Public Works fund for street related services i.e., construction crews. As shown in Chart 2, Transfer expenses have remained relatively consistent over the course of the past 13 years. Based on the data provided by the City, total expenditures on Transfers over the past 13 years has averaged approximately $254,327 annually.

Funding Forecast

Revenue estimates from each of the historical revenue sources were combined and projected out over the next 5, 10, and 22-year period to determine the total revenue that is estimated through 2040. Table 1 provides a summary of the potential future funding (in year 2018 dollars) through 2040.

Table 1: Future Transportation Funding Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue/Expenditure Source</th>
<th>5 Year Forecast FY 2018-19 to FY 2022-23</th>
<th>10 Year Forecast FY 2023-24 to FY 2027-28</th>
<th>22-Year Forecast FY 2028-29 to FY 2039-40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Gas Tax</td>
<td>$2,547,420</td>
<td>$5,956,460</td>
<td>$19,609,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Governmental Sources</td>
<td>$1,924,860</td>
<td>$3,849,720</td>
<td>$8,469,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$1,052,920</td>
<td>$2,105,830</td>
<td>$4,632,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,525,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,912,010</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,711,560</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated expenditures were also combined and projected out over the next 5, 10, and 22-year period. Table 2 provides a summary of the potential future expenses (in 2018 dollars) through 2040.
Table 2: Future Transportation Expenditures Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue/Expenditure Source</th>
<th>5-Year Forecast FY 2018-19 to FY 2022-23</th>
<th>10-Year Forecast FY 2023-24 to FY 2027-28</th>
<th>22-Year Forecast FY 2028-29 to FY 2039-40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$457,420</td>
<td>$914,840</td>
<td>$2,012,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$182,480</td>
<td>$364,960</td>
<td>$802,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Construction &amp; Repair</td>
<td>$2,855,250</td>
<td>$5,710,500</td>
<td>$12,563,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>$1,271,640</td>
<td>$2,543,280</td>
<td>$5,595,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,766,790</td>
<td>$9,533,580</td>
<td>$20,973,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the projected funding from now through FY 2039-40 is approximately $32,711,560 and the projected expenditures are approximately $20,973,880. Based on the information provided in Tables 1 and 2, the City is expected to have approximately $11,737,680 over the next 22 years. The City should continue to identify other potential revenue sources to fund transportation projects including projects identified in the TSP update.

CURRENT AND POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

Based on the projected funding analysis, the City of Sutherlin will potentially have $11,737,680 available that can be dedicated to transportation-related capital improvement projects over the next 22 years. The City should continue to pursue additional funding sources such as improvement grants, partnerships with regional and state agencies, and other funding sources to help implement the future transportation-related improvements identified in the TSP update. A list of Federal, State, and Local funding sources is illustrated in Table 3 and described below.

Table 3: Potential Grant Sources and Partnering Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Facility Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act</td>
<td>FAST Act funds surface transportation programs, including, but not limited to, federal-aid highways</td>
<td>Roadway facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)</td>
<td>CMAQ program provides funding for projects that help reduce emissions and meet national air quality standards</td>
<td>Bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)</td>
<td>STBG funds are flexible funding sources for jurisdictions and are eligible to be used for non-motorized transportation projects</td>
<td>Bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>HSIP is a core Federal-aid program with the purpose of achieving a significant reduction in traffic facilities and serious injuries on all public roads</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS)</td>
<td>The ARTS is intended to address safety needs on all public roads in Oregon</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect Oregon</td>
<td>Connect Oregon is an initiative to invest in air, rail, marine, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure to ensure Oregon’s transportation system is strong, diverse, and efficient</td>
<td>Non-motorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
<td>The STIP is ODOT’s four-year transportation capital improvement program</td>
<td>Roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, and trail facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Bill (HB) 2017 Transportation Investments</td>
<td>House Bill (HB) 2017 affects drivers, bicyclists and payroll employees by increasing the gas tax, weight-mile tax, and other transportation-related fees</td>
<td>Roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and trail facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding Source and Potential Facility Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Facility Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Infrastructure Program</td>
<td>ODOT’s Safe Routes to School (SRTS) infrastructure program is focused on providing grants to make it safer for children to walk and bike to school</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Improvement Districts (EIDs)</td>
<td>Economic Improvement Districts collect assessments or fees on businesses in order to fund improvements that benefit businesses and improve customer access within the district</td>
<td>Roadway, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Development Charges (SDC)</td>
<td>SDC are fees assessed on development for impacts created to public infrastructure</td>
<td>Roadway, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Improvement Districts (LIDs)</td>
<td>LIDs are most often used to construct projects such as streets, sidewalks, or bikeways</td>
<td>Roadway, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Fuel Tax</td>
<td>A local tax assessed on fuel purchased within the jurisdiction that has assessed the tax</td>
<td>Roadway facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal Districts/Tax Increment Financing</td>
<td>Urban Renewal Districts are separate taxing districts created to remove blight within a district</td>
<td>Roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and trail facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bond Measures</td>
<td>Local bond measures, or levies, are usually initiated by voter-approved general obligation bonds for specific projects</td>
<td>Roadway facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Utility Fees/Road Maintenance Fee</td>
<td>Flat fee charged to each property, on the number of trips a particular land use generates, or some combination of both</td>
<td>Roadway facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>Fees tied to the annual registration of a vehicle to pay for improvements, expansion, and maintenance to the street system</td>
<td>Roadway facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Federal Sources

**Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act**

Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act funds surface transportation programs, including, but not limited to, federal-aid highways. The FAST Act is the first long-term surface transportation authorization enacted in a decade that provides long-term funding certainty for surface transportation. Non-motorized transportation, as a mode of surface transportation, are eligible for funding through the FAST Act. The FAST Act improves mobility on highways by establishing and funding new programs to support critical transportation projects to ease congestion and facilitate the movement of freight on the interstate system and other major roads. The FAST Act authorizes $226.3 billion in federal funding for FY 2016 through 2020 for road, bridge, bicycling, and walking improvements.

More information is available at: [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/summary.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/summary.cfm)

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)**

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program provides funding for projects that help reduce emissions and meet national air quality standards, such as transportation demand management programs, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, transit projects, diesel retrofits, and vehicle emissions reductions programs. States are required to provide a non-Federal match for program funds (which has not been the case historically for Federal lands highway funding).

More information is available at: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmq](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmq)
**Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)**

In 2015, the FAST Act amended the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and changed the program name to the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG). STBG funds are flexible funding sources for jurisdictions and are eligible to be used for non-motorized transportation projects. STBG funds are contract authority. STBG funds are available for obligation for a period of three years after the last day of the fiscal year for which the funds are authorized. Therefore, funds are available for obligation for up to four years. The federal share is generally 80 percent and 90 percent for projects on the Interstate System unless the project adds lanes that are not high-occupancy-vehicle or auxiliary lanes. For projects that add single occupancy vehicle capacity, that portion of the project will revert to 80 percent. Safety improvements may have a Federal share of 100 percent.

More information is available at: [https://www fhwa dot gov specialfunding stp/160307 cfm c](https://www fhwa dot gov specialfunding stp/160307 cfm c)

**Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)**

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a core Federal-aid program with the purpose of achieving a significant reduction in traffic facilities and serious injuries on all public roads, including non-State-owned public roads and roads on tribal lands. Under the MAP-21, approximately seven percent of total Federal-aid highway funding is provided for HSIP, amounting to $2.2 billion each year. Highway safety improvement projects can be either infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects. All highway safety improvement projects must meet HSIP eligibility criteria. The HSIP program requires a local match for projects where HSIP funding will be used. For Oregon, this local match is 7.78 percent of the project cost.

State Sources

**All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS)**

The All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS) program (formerly known as Jurisdictionally Blind Safety Program) is intended to address safety needs on all public roads in Oregon. By working collaboratively with local jurisdictions (cities, counties, MPO’s and tribes) ODOT expects to increase awareness of safety on all roads, promote best practices for infrastructure safety, compliment behavioral safety efforts and focus limited resources to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes in the state of Oregon. The program is **data driven** to achieve the greatest benefits in crash reduction and should be blind to jurisdiction. The ARTS program primarily uses federal funds from the HSIP with a required local match of 7.78 percent of the project cost.

More information is available at: [http://www oregon gov ODOT HWY/TRAFFIC ROADWAY/Pages ARTS aspx](http://www oregon gov ODOT HWY/TRAFFIC ROADWAY/Pages ARTS aspx)
Connect Oregon

Connect Oregon is an initiative to invest in air, rail, marine, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure to ensure Oregon’s transportation system is strong, diverse, and efficient. As a result of the passage of House Bill (HB) 2017, the following important changes have been made to Connect Oregon. Public transit projects are no longer included in Connect Oregon, Connect Oregon now has a portion of the new vehicle dealer private fee and the new $15 bicycle excise tax in addition to lottery-backed bonds as funding sources³, and the Oregon Transportation Commission is directed to distribute Connect Oregon funds to four specific projects:

- Mid-Willamette Valley Intermodal Facility ($25 million)
- Treasure Valley Intermodal Facility ($26 million)
- Rail expansion in east Beach Industrial Park at the Port of Morrow ($6.55 million)
- Brooks rail siding extension ($2.6 million)

As a result of the allocated funds associated with the projects listed above, the ODOT does not anticipate available funding in the 2017 – 2019 biennium for projects that would have previously been competitive for Connect Oregon program funds. After the four projects listed above have been funded, and if funding is available, ODOT will announce next steps for the competitive grant process which is expected to occur in the 2019 – 2021 or 2021 – 2023 biennia. Project’s eligible for competitive grant funds may receive up to 70 percent of the project cost through Connect Oregon. A minimum of 30 percent cash match is required from the recipient for all grant funded projects (with the exception of Class | Railroads which has a 50 percent cash match). Project eligible for funding from state fuel tax revenues are not eligible for Connect Oregon funding.

More information is available at: http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/ConnectOregon.aspx

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is ODOT’s four-year transportation capital improvement program. It is the document that identifies the funding for, and scheduling of, transportation projects and programs. It includes projects on the federal, state, city, and county transportation systems, multimodal projects (highway, passenger rail, freight, public transit, bicycle and pedestrian), and projects in the National Parks, National Forests, and Indian tribal lands. STIP project lists are developed through the coordinated efforts of ODOT, federal and local governments, Area Commissions on Transportation, tribal governments, and the public.

The STIP is divided into two broad categories: Fix-It and Enhance. The Enhance category funds activities that enhance, expand, or improve the transportation system. The project selection process for the Enhance category has undergone significant changes in the last few years and reflects ODOT’s goal to

³ Bicycle excise tax will only go towards bicycle/pedestrian projects.
become a more multimodal agency and make investment decisions based on the system as a whole, not for each mode or project type separately. The agency has requested assistance from its local partners in developing Enhance projects that assist in moving people and goods through the transportation system. The projects are selected through a competitive application process. The Fix-it category funds activities that fix or preserve the transportation system. These projects are developed mainly from ODOT management systems that help identify needs based on technical information for things like pavement and bridges.

More information is available at: [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/STIP/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/STIP/Pages/default.aspx)

**House Bill (HB) 2017 Transportation Investments**

In August 2017, Governor Kate Brown signed an eight-year transportation tax increase to raise roughly $5 billion for roads, bridges, mass transit, electric vehicles, and other transit options. House Bill (HB) 2017 affects drivers, bicyclists and payroll employees by increasing the gas tax, weight-mile tax, and other transportation-related fees such as excise tax on the sale of bicycles, new vehicles, and instituting a statewide payroll tax equivalent to 1/10th of 1 percent of wages, deducted by employer from payment to employee. Though this funding source is one that can be used to finance multitude of project types, the City has stated that additional funds received from HB 2017 will be primarily allocated to Materials and Services i.e. maintenance of existing transportation facilities and operations.


**Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Program**

ODOT’s Safe Routes to School (SRTS) infrastructure program is focused on providing grants to make is safer for children to walk and bike to school, providing opportunity through investments in infrastructure and non-infrastructure. ODOT’s grant funding for infrastructure programs help create and improve safe walking and biking routes to school, while its grant funding for non-infrastructure programs help raise awareness by focusing on education and outreach. Non-motorized transportation projects related to getting children to school safely, such as closing gaps in the sidewalk and bicycle networks, are eligible for infrastructure program funding. HB 2017 reestablished dedicated funding to SRTS programs. The current funding cycle is focused on projects that address a safety risk factor, include a 20 percent cash match, and are within one mile of a Title I school.

More information is available at: [https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx](https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx)
Local Sources

Economic Improvement Districts (EIDs)
Transportation improvements can often be included as part of larger efforts aimed at business improvement and retail district beautification. Economic Improvement Districts collect assessments or fees on businesses in order to fund improvements that benefit businesses and improve customer access within the district. Adoption of a mutually agreed upon ordinance establishing guidelines and setting necessary assessments or fees to be collected from property owners is essential to ensuring a successful EID.

System Development Charges
System Development Charges (SDC) are fees assessed on development for impacts created to public infrastructure. All revenue is dedicated to transportation capital improvement projects designed to accommodate growth. The County can offer SDC credits to developers that provide public improvements beyond the required street frontage, including those that can be constructed by the private sector at a lower cost. For example, an SDC credit might be given for providing end-of-trip bike facilities within the new development.

Local Improvement Districts (LIDs)
Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) are most often used to construct projects such as streets, sidewalks, or bikeways. Through the LID process, the costs of local improvements are generally spread out among a group of property owners within a specified area. The cost can be allocated based on property frontage or other methods such as trip generation. The costs of an LID project are borne primarily by property owners, moderate administrative costs must be factored in, and the public involvement process must still be followed. If the cost of the local improvement is not 100 percent funded by property owners, the City is required to contribute the remaining unfunded portion of the improvement.

Local Fuel Tax
A local tax assessed on fuel purchased within the jurisdiction that has assessed the tax. The taxes are paid to the city monthly by distributors of fuel. Voters would need to pass the tax, and the process for presenting such a tax to voters will need to be consistent with Oregon State law as well as the laws of the City. Nearby locations with a gas tax includes Milwaukie (two cents per gallon), Canby (three cents per gallon), Tigard (three cents per gallon), Multnomah County (three cents per gallon) and Washington County (one cent per gallon).
Urban Renewal Districts/Tax Increment Financing

Urban Renewal Districts are separate taxing districts created to remove blight within a district. Each Urban Renewal Plan has identified actions that will remove the blight within the District. Those actions are funded by debt financing (e.g., bonds) using the incremental tax revenue generated from improvements on private property that increase the tax assessable value of that property that then create additional property tax revenue. The additional tax revenue (i.e., tax increment) is then directed to the Urban Renewal District to be used for blight removal. This public finance method is referred to as Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and is limited to Urban Renewal in the State.

The City of Grants Pass created an Urban Renewal Agency in 2016 that covers 18 percent of the city. Capital improvement projects include sewer and water plants, transportation improvements in several areas of the city, a convention center, a town center plaza, and improvements to Riverside Park.

More information is available at: https://www.oregon.gov/DOR/forms/FormsPubs/urban-renewal-circular_504-623.pdf

Local Bond Measures

Local bond measures, or levies, are usually initiated by voter-approved general obligation bonds for specific projects. Bond measures are typically limited by time, based on the debt load of the local government or the project under focus. Funding from bond measures can be used for right-of-way acquisition, engineering, design, and construction of transportation facilities. Transportation-specific bond measures have passed in other communities throughout Oregon. Though this funding source is one that can be used to finance a multitude of project types, it must be noted that the accompanying administrative costs are high and voter approval must be gained. In addition, local bonds for transportation improvements will compete with local bonds for other public needs, such as fire and rescue, parks and recreation, schools, libraries, etc.

Street Utility Fees/Road Maintenance Fee

The fee is based on a flat fee charged to each property, on the number of trips a particular land use generates, or some combination of both and is usually collected through a regular utility bill. For the communities in Oregon that have adopted this approach, it provides a stable source of revenue to pay for street maintenance allowing for safe and efficient movement of people, goods, and services. As indicated previously, the city is currently considering implementation of a street utility fee, which could provide the City with an additional funding over the 22-year period.

User Fees

Fees tied to the annual registration of a vehicle to pay for improvements, expansion, and maintenance to the street system. This may be a more equitable assessment given the varying fuel efficiency of vehicles. Regardless of fuel efficiency, passenger vehicles do equal damage to the street system. The cost
of implementing such a system could be prohibitive given the need to track the number of vehicle miles traveled in every vehicle. Additionally, a user fee specific to a single jurisdiction does not account for the street use from vehicles registered in other jurisdictions.
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Technical Memorandum #1: Plans and Policy Review
Sutherlin Transportation System Plan Update

DATE November 16, 2018
TO Project Management Team
FROM Darci Rudzinski, Shayna Rehberg, and Clinton “CJ” Doxsee, Angelo Planning Group
CC Nick Gross and Matt Hughart, Kittelson & Associates

OVERVIEW

This memorandum presents a review of existing plans, regulations, and policies that affect transportation planning in Sutherlin. The review explains the relationship between the documents and this planning process, identifying key issues that will factor into the Transportation System Plan (TSP) update process, particularly given the number of plans and policies that have been adopted or updated since adoption of the City’s 2005 TSP. This memorandum is intended to guide decisions regarding selection of preferred transportation solutions and identifies potential amendments to related plan documents and regulations, steps that will occur later in the TSP update process.

Some documents included in this review establish transportation-related standards, targets, and guidelines with which the TSP update must be coordinated and consistent with; others contain transportation improvements that will need to be factored into the future demand modeling and otherwise reflected in the draft TSP. Local policy and regulatory requirements described in this review – such as the Sutherlin Development Code – may be subject to recommended amendments in order to implement the recommendations of the updated TSP. This memorandum helps set the stage for those potential amendments, which will be prepared as part of project implementation (Task 7).

The following documents were reviewed.
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FEDERAL PLANS


A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 7th Edition (2018), published by American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) contains the current design research and practices for highway and street geometric design. The document provides an updated framework for geometric design that is more flexible, multimodal, and performance-based than in the past. Traditional functional classifications for roadways (local roads and streets, collectors, arterials, and freeways) presented, as well as an expanded set of context classifications (rural, rural town, suburban, urban, and urban core) to guide geometric design.¹

Project Relevance: National Highway System or Federal-aid projects on roadways that are under City or Douglas County jurisdiction will typically use the AASHTO design standards or ODOT 3R (resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation) design standards. See Table 2 in the Highway Design Manual section of this memorandum.

¹ Information from https://store.transportation.org/
STATE PLANS

ODOT TSP Guidelines
The Oregon Department of Transportation’s (ODOT) Transportation System Plan (TSP) Guidelines is an on-line resource that provides technical guidance on how to prepare a TSP. The guidelines provide citizens and planning professionals with information that is relevant during each phase of TSP development, including scoping, plan preparation, adoption, and implementation.

The preparation phase lists seven steps to develop a TSP. The phase starts with the formulation of a public involvement plan and ends with the preparation of the actual TSP document. The steps in between relate to information gathering and analysis needed to develop elements of the TSP. Each step is further broken down into relevant topic areas that further describe elements and processes that are necessary or helpful in developing or updating a TSP. The steps and topics include:

- **Step 1: Agency/Public Engagement Plan**
  - Agency Coordination Plan
  - Public Involvement Plan
- **Step 2: Goals & Objectives**
  - Intent
  - Approach
  - Evaluation and Prioritization Criteria
- **Step 3: Existing Conditions**
  - Plans and Policy Review
  - Existing Conditions Inventory
  - Existing Needs Determination
  - Funding Review
  - Documentation of Existing Conditions and Needs
- **Step 4: Future Conditions**
  - Future Conditions Overview
  - Future Capacity Determination
  - Future Travel Demand Determination
  - Future Deficiencies Determination
  - Future Needs Determination
- **Step 5: Solution Development & Evaluation**
  - Developing and Evaluation Solutions Overview
  - Developing Solutions
  - Evaluating Proposed Solutions
  - Selecting and Prioritizing Preferred Solutions
  - Documentation
- **Step 6: Funding Program**
  - Development of a Financially Constrained List of Transportation Projects/Programs
  - Identifying Potential Funding Sources
  - Documentation

Step 7: TSP Documentation
  - What a TSP Shall, Should, and Could Include

Project Relevance: The ODOT TSP Guidelines provides guidance on how to update a TSP. They can be used as a resource for the Sutherlin TSP update process for advisory committee members, elected and appointed officials, and the consultant team who will consider and apply technical guidance from the TSP Guidelines throughout the planning process.

Oregon Transportation Plan (2006)
The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state’s long-range multi-modal transportation plan that addresses the future transportation needs of the State of Oregon through the year 2030. The primary function of the OTP is to establish goals, policies, strategies, and initiatives that are translated into a series of modal plans, such as the Oregon Highway Plan and Oregon Bike and Pedestrian Plan. The OTP considers all modes of Oregon’s transportation system, including Oregon’s airports, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, highways and roadways, pipelines, ports and waterway facilities, public transportation, and railroads. It assesses state, regional, and local public and private transportation facilities. In addition, the OTP provides the framework for prioritizing transportation improvements based on varied future revenue conditions, but it does not identify specific projects for development.

The OTP provides broad policy guidance and sets seven overarching goals for the state. Through these goals and associated policies and strategies, the OTP emphasizes:

- Maintaining and maximizing the assets in place.
- Optimizing the performance of the existing system through technology.
- Integrating transportation, land use, economic development, and the environment.
- Integrating the transportation system across jurisdictions, ownerships, and modes.
- Creating sustainable funding.
- Investing in strategic capacity enhancements.

The Implementation Framework section of the OTP describes the implementation process and how state multimodal, modal/topic plans, regional and local TSPs and master plans will further refine the OTP’s broad policies and investment levels. Local TSPs can further OTP implementation by defining standards, instituting performance measures, and requiring that operational strategies be developed.

The last chapter of the OTP provides implementation and investment frameworks and key initiatives to be consulted in developing TSP projects and implementation measures.

Project Relevance: The OTP’s key initiatives will guide the TSP update, specifically in the areas of system management, maximizing performance of the existing transportation system using technology and creative design solutions, pursuing

---

3 The seven goals are Goal 1 – Mobility and Accessibility; Goal 2 – Management of the System; Goal 3 – Economic Vitality; Goal 4 – Sustainability; Goal 5 – Safety and Security; Goal 6 – Funding the Transportation System; and Goal 7 – Coordination, Communication, and Cooperation.
sustainable funding sources, and investing strategically in capacity projects.
Consistent with a central OTP policy, the TSP update will seek to maximize the
performance of the existing local transportation system by the use of technology
and system management before considering larger and costlier additions to the
system.

Oregon Highway Plan (1999, last amended 2018)
The Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) is a modal plan of the OTP that guides planning, operations, and financing for ODOT’s Highway Division. Policies in the OHP emphasize the efficient management of the highway system to increase safety and to extend highway capacity, partnerships with other agencies and local governments, and the use of new techniques to improve road safety and capacity. These policies also link land use and transportation, set standards for highway performance and access management, and emphasize the relationship between state highways and local road, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, rail, and air systems.

The following policies are relevant to the TSP update process.

Policy 1A: State Highway Classification System
The OHP classifies the state highway system into four levels of importance: Interstate, Statewide, Regional, and District. ODOT uses this classification system to guide management and investment decisions regarding state highway facilities. The system guides the development of the facility plans, as well as ODOT’s review of local plan and zoning amendments, highway project selection, design and development, and facility management decisions including road approach permits.

Interstate 5 (I-5) and Elkton-Sutherlin Highway (OR 138) are classified highways in the state classification system. The purpose and management objectives of these highways are provided in Policy 1A, as summarized below.

• **Interstate highways** (I-5) provide connections between major cities in a state, regions of the state, and other states. A secondary function in urban areas is to serve regional trips within the urban area. Their primary objective is to provide mobility and, therefore, the management objective is to provide for safe and efficient high-speed continuous-flow operation in urban and rural areas.

• **Regional highways** (OR 138) typically provide connections and links to regional centers, Statewide or Interstate Highways, or economic or activity centers of regional significance. The management objective is to provide safe and efficient, high-speed, continuous-flow operation in rural areas and moderate- to high-speed operations in urban and urbanizing areas. A secondary function is to serve land uses in the vicinity of these highways.

The following classifications also apply to the highways in Sutherlin:
• I-5 – National Highway System (NHS), National Network (NN), Federally Designated Truck Routes, Oregon Freight Route (FR), and Reduction Review Route (RRR)

• OR 138 – NN, RRR, and Scenic Byway (west UGB to I-5); Scenic Byway (I-5 to State Street)

• State Street (Old Highway 99) – Scenic Byway

**Policy 1C: State Highway Freight System**

The primary purpose of the State Highway Freight System is to facilitate efficient and reliable interstate, intrastate, and regional truck movement through a designated freight system. This freight system made up of the Interstate Highways and select Statewide, Regional, and District Highways, includes routes that carry significant tonnage of freight by truck and serve as the primary interstate and intrastate highway freight connection to ports, intermodal terminals, and urban areas. Highways included in this designation have higher highway mobility standards than other statewide highways. I-5 and OR 138 (west of I-5) are designated freight routes.

**Policy 1D: Scenic Byways**

This policy emphasizes consideration of aesthetic and design elements on designated Scenic Byways. Such consideration would apply to Central Avenue east of I-5 to State Street (Old Highway 99) and on State Street north to the UGB.

**Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Standards Access Management Policy**

Policy 1F sets mobility standards for ensuring a reliable and acceptable level of mobility on the state highway system. The standards are used to assess system needs as part of long-range, comprehensive planning for transportation projects, during development review, and to demonstrate compliance with the TPR.

Significant amendments to Policy 1F were adopted at the end of 2011. The 2011 revisions were made to address concerns that state transportation policy and requirements have led to unintended consequences and inhibited economic development. Policy 1F now provides a clearer policy framework for considering measures other than v/c ratios for evaluating mobility performance. Also, v/c ratios established in Policy 1F were changed from being standards to “targets.” These targets are to be used to determine significant effect pursuant to TPR Section - 0060.

Table 1 presents mobility targets for the state facilities in the TSP study area. The target of 0.80 applies to I-5 and targets of 0.90 and 0.85 apply to OR 138 depending on posted speed limits.

---

Table 1: V/C Ratio Targets Outside the Portland Metropolitan Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Category</th>
<th>Inside Urban Growth Boundary</th>
<th>Outside Urban Growth Boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STA^1</td>
<td>MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Highways</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Expressways</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Route on a Statewide Highway</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (not a Freight Route)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Route on a regional or District Highway</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway on a Regional or District Highway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Highways</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Local Interest Roads</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^A Unless the Oregon Transportation Commission has adopted an alternative mobility target for the impacted facility, the mobility targets in Tables 6 are considered standards for purposes of determining compliance with OAR 660-012, the Transportation Planning Rule.

^B For the purposes of this policy, the peak hour shall be the 30th highest annual hour. This approximates weekday peak hour traffic in larger urban areas. Alternatives to the 30th highest annual hour may be considered and established through alternative mobility target processes.

^C Highway design requirements are addressed in the Highway Design Manual (HDM).

^D See Action IF.1 for additional technical details.

^E Interstates and Expressways shall not be identified as Special Transportation Areas.

^F For unincorporated communities inside MPO boundaries, MPO mobility targets shall apply.

Policy 1G: Major Improvements
This policy requires maintaining performance and improving safety on the highway system by improving efficiency and management on the existing roadway network before adding capacity. The state’s highest priority is to preserve the functionality of the existing highway system. Tools that could be employed to improve the function of the existing interchanges include access management, transportation demand management, traffic operations modifications, and changes to local land use designations or development regulations.
After existing system preservation, the second priority is to make minor improvements to existing highway facilities, such as adding ramp signals, or making improvements to the local street network to minimize local trips on the state facility.

The third priority is to make major roadway improvements such as adding lanes to increase capacity on existing roadways. As part of this TSP process, ODOT will work with the City and other stakeholders to determine appropriate strategies and tools that can be implemented at the local level that are consistent with this policy.

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

This policy recognizes that the state may provide financial assistance to local jurisdictions to make improvements to local transportation systems if the improvements would provide a cost-effective means of improving the operations of the state highway system. As part of this TSP update process, ODOT will work with the City and project stakeholders to identify improvements to the local road system that support the planned land use designations in the study area and that will help preserve capacity and ensure the long-term efficient and effective operation of high functional class facilities.

**Policy 2F: Traffic Safety**

This policy emphasizes the state’s efforts to improve safety of all users of the highway system. Action 2F.4 addresses the development and implementation of the Safety Management System to target resources to sites with the most significant safety issues. The TSP update process will include citywide crash analysis to identify sites with a history of fatal and serious injury crashes and identify potential countermeasures to reduce crashes.

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

This policy recognizes the need to increase safety and transportation efficiency through the reduction and prevention of conflicts between railroads and highway users. The Central Oregon & Pacific Railroad (CORP) currently provides the only rail service (freight) through Sutherlin.

**Policy 3A: Classification and Spacing Standards**

State policy seeks to manage the location, spacing, and type of road intersections on state highways in a manner that ensures the safe and efficient operation of state highways consistent with their highway classification.

Action 3A.2 calls for spacing standards to be established for state highways based on highway classification, type of area, and posted speed. Tables in OHP Appendix C present access spacing standards which consider urban and rural highway classification, traffic volumes, speed, safety, and operational needs. The access management spacing standards established in the OHP are implemented by OAR 734, Division 51, addressed later in this report. The TSP update process will include an analysis of how existing spacing on ODOT facilities compares to these standards.

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

Policy 4A emphasizes the need to maintain and improve the efficiency of freight movement on the state highway system. It seeks to balance the needs of long distance and through freight movements with local transportation needs on highway facilities in both urban and rural areas. I-5 and OR 138 west of I-5 are designated Freight Routes.
Policy 4B: Alternative Passenger Modes

Policy 4B encourages the development of alternative passenger services and systems as part of broader corridor strategies. The policy promotes the development of alternative passenger transportation services located off the highway system to help preserve the performance and function of the state highway system. Umpqua Regional Transit (UTrans) provides public transportation service in Sutherlin. Improving safety, access, and mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists and enhanced connections to transit are objectives of this update process.

Policy 4D: Transportation Demand Management

This policy supports the efficient use of the state transportation system through investment in transportation demand management (TDM) strategies. Action 4D.1 calls for reducing peak period single-occupancy vehicle travel and to move traffic demand out of the peak period to improve the flow of traffic on state highways. The TSP update process will explore TDM strategies that may be appropriate for Sutherlin, including requirements for new development and incentives for employers that can reduce vehicle trips.

Project Relevance: OHP policies provide guidance related to the accessibility, mobility, and function of state highways. The TSP planning process will consider policies in the OHP to guide proposed improvements, modifications, or policies that could affect any of the state facilities in the city. The TSP is being developed in coordination with ODOT so that projects, policies, and regulations proposed as part of the TSP will be consistent with the standards and targets established in the OHP related to safety, access, and mobility.

Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (2016)

The intent of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (OBPP) is to create a policy foundation that supports decision-making for walking and biking investments, strategies, and programs that help to develop an interconnected, robust, efficient, and safe transportation system. The OBPP establishes the role of walking and biking as essential modes of travel within the context of the entire transportation system and recognizes the benefit of these modes to the people and places in Oregon.

The OBPP provides direction for what needs to be achieved, including 20 policies and associated strategies designed to help develop, sustain, and improve walking and biking networks. It identifies nine goals based upon the broader goals of the OTP that reflect statewide values and desired accomplishments relating to walking and biking:

- Goal 1: Safety
- Goal 2: Accessibility and Connectivity
- Goal 3: Mobility and Efficiency
- Goal 4: Community and Economic Vitality
- Goal 5: Equity
- Goal 6: Health
- Goal 7: Sustainability
- Goal 8: Strategic Investment
- Goal 9: Coordination, Cooperation, and Collaboration
The OBPP also provides background information related to state and federal law, funding opportunities, and implementation strategies proposed by ODOT to improve bicycle and pedestrian transportation. It outlines the role that local jurisdictions play in the implementation of the Plan, including the development of local pedestrian and bicycle plans as stand-alone documents within TSPs.

The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide is the technical element of the plan that guides the design and management of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on state-owned facilities. It is an appendix to the HDM and provides best practices and design guidelines for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

**Project Relevance:** The policies and design guidance in the OBPP apply to state highway facilities in Sutherlin. State policy and design guidance will be considered in evaluating and planning for the TSP’s local street standards and bicycle and pedestrian system elements. Through this TSP update, the City will work with regional and state agencies to help identify gaps in the regional walking and biking network and prioritize projects accordingly.

**Oregon Aviation Plan (2007)**

The Oregon Aviation Plan (OAP) is a modal plan of the OTP that defines policies and investment strategies for Oregon’s public use aviation system for the next 20 years. The plan addresses the existing conditions, economic benefits, and jurisdictional responsibilities for the existing aviation infrastructure. The plan contains policies and recommended actions to be implemented by Oregon Department of Aviation in coordination with other state and local agencies and the Federal Aviation Administration.

The OAP categorizes airports based on functional role and service criteria. A Category II (Business or High Activity General Aviation) airport in Roseburg and a Category I (Commercial Service) airport in Eugene provide the closest and highest levels of air service for Sutherlin.

**Project Relevance:** The TSP update will generally account for airports in the region and how Sutherlin’s residents and businesses access these facilities in developing TSP policies and projects.

**Oregon Rail Plan (2014)**

The Oregon State Rail Plan is a state modal plan under the OTP that addresses long-term freight and passenger rail planning in Oregon. The plan provides a comprehensive assessment of the state’s rail planning, freight rail, and passenger rail systems. It identifies specific policies concerning rail in the state, establishes a system of integration between freight and passenger elements into the land use and transportation planning process, and calls for cooperation between state, regional, and local jurisdictions in planning for rail.

CORP provides rail service through Sutherlin. The railroad is classified as a Type 2 freight facility and provides no passenger service. The 2005 TSP identified at-grade railroad crossings as significant barriers for emergency vehicle access and general mobility in the city.
Project Relevance: The TSP will consider the needs of the freight rail system within the City UGB while developing recommended policies and projects related to improving safety and mobility.

Oregon Freight Plan (2011)
The Oregon Freight Plan (OFP) is a modal plan of the OTP that implements the state’s goals and policies related to the movement of goods and commodities. Its purpose statement identifies the intent to “improve freight connections to local, Native America, state, regional, national and global markets in order to increase trade-related jobs and income for workers and businesses.” The objectives of the plan include prioritizing and facilitating investments in freight facilities (including rail, marine, air, and pipeline infrastructure) and adopting strategies to maintain and improve the freight transportation system.

The plan defines a statewide strategic freight network. I-5, US-199, and parallel railroads are designated as a strategic corridor in the OFP.

The following policy and strategic direction provided in the OFP prioritizes preservation of strategic corridors as well as improvements to the supply chain achieved through coordination of freight and system management planning.

Strategy 1.2: Support freight access to the Strategic Freight System. This includes proactively protecting and preserving corridors designated as strategic.

Action 1.2.1. Preserve freight facilities included as part of the Strategic Freight System from changes that would significantly reduce the ability of these facilities to operate as efficient components of the freight system unless alternate facilities are identified or a safety-related need arises.

Strategy 2.4: Coordinate freight improvements and system management plans on corridors comprising the Strategic Freight System with the intent to improve supply chain performance.

Project Relevance: Maintaining and enhancing efficiency of the truck and rail freight system in the study area will be an objective of the updated TSP. The project advisory committee include representatives from ODOT.

Oregon Public Transportation Plan (2018)
The Oregon Public Transportation Plan (OPTP) is the modal plan of the OTP that provides guidance for ODOT and public transportation agencies regarding the development of public transportation systems. The OPTP is intended to establish common understandings for local, regional, and state agencies by addressing the following:

- Vision and goals for public transportation
- Policy and strategy framework to inform decision making
- Possible priorities under different levels of funding for public transportation
- Opportunities and challenges in investment and implementation
- Positioning public transportation as a key part of Oregon’s transportation system
The vision stated in the OPTP is:

*In 2045, public transportation is an integral, interconnected component of Oregon’s transportation system that makes Oregon’s diverse cities, towns, and communities work. Because public transportation is convenient, affordable, and efficient, it helps further the state’s quality of life and economic vitality and contributes to the health and safety of all residents, while reducing greenhouse gas emissions.*

The OPTP establishes and is organized into the following 10 goal areas:

1. Mobility – Public Transportation User Experience
2. Accessibility and Connectivity – Getting from Here to There
3. Community Livability and Economic Vitality
4. Equity
5. Health
6. Safety and Security
7. Environmental Sustainability
8. Land Use
9. Strategic Investment
10. Communications, Collaboration and Coordination

While the OPTP does not recommend specific projects or investments, new efforts in planning for transit come with the passage of HB 2017 (Keep Oregon Moving Act) and the establishment of a new dedicated source of funding for expanding public transportation service in Oregon. The Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund, or STIF, provides the impetus for coordinating the prioritization of needed infrastructure. STIF funds are continuously appropriated to finance investments and improvements in public transportation services and may be used for public transportation purposes that support the effective planning, deployment, operation, and administration STIF-funded public transportation programs. STIF funds may be also used as the local match for state and federal funds that also provide public transportation service.

**Project Relevance:** The TSP will consider the needs of the transit system in Sutherlin while developing recommended policies and projects related to improving transit service. In addition, project advisory committees include a representative of UTrans who will advise on transit needs and improvements.

**Oregon Transportation Options Plan (2015)**

The Oregon Transportation Options Plan (OTOP) is a topic plan that establishes policies, strategies, and programs that promote efficient use of existing transportation system investments, thereby reducing reliance on the single-occupancy vehicle and facilitating more transportation by walking, biking, taking transit, and ridesharing.

---

5 [https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Pages/HB2017.aspx](https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Pages/HB2017.aspx)
6 [https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action?ruleVrsnRsn=245662](https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action?ruleVrsnRsn=245662)
Adoption of this plan established a statewide vision for transportation options (TO) in Oregon to provide travelers of all ages and abilities with options to access goods, services, and opportunities across the state. TO strategies and programs do not address capital infrastructure investments, but rather provide information and resources to allow people to bike, walk, take transit, drive, share rides, and telecommute.

**Project Relevance:** The goals of the TSP update including improving transportation options in Sutherlin. The updated TSP will draw on program and strategy ideas in the OTOP as appropriate in order to enhance opportunities for non-motorized transportation modes and transit in Sutherlin.

**Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan (2016)**

An element of the OTP, the Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP) provides long-term goals, policies and strategies and near-term actions to eliminate deaths and life-changing injuries. The TSAP addresses all modes on all public roads in Oregon. Over the long term, the goals of the TSAP are:

- **Infrastructure** – Develop and improve infrastructure to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries for users of all modes.
- **Healthy, Livable Communities** – Plan, design, and implement safe systems. Support enforcement and emergency medical services to improve the safety and livability of communities, including improved health outcomes.
- **Technology** – Plan, prepare for, and implement technologies (existing and new) that can affect transportation safety for all users.

The plan identifies actions that jurisdictions can take to increase transportation safety. They include adopting a Safe Communities Program and Safe Routes to School, which is a collaborative partnership with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and ODOT to promote safety. The Safe Routes to School program is a local initiative supported by grant funding that targets safety improvements to encourage walking and biking to school.

In addition, the TSAP also identifies activities and roles for local jurisdictions that can improve safety. They include:

- Evaluate local spot-specific systemic safety needs; develop plans and programs to address needs.
- Collaborate with the state and stakeholder partners to educate the public about transportation safety-related behavioral issues.
- Integrate safety programming, planning, and policy into local planning.

**Project Relevance:** The TSAP will be used as a resource while updating the TSP to develop local goals, policies, and strategies to improve safety in Sutherlin.
Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012) (Last Updated 2012)

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), OAR 660-012, implements Goal 12 (Transportation) of the Statewide Planning Goals. The TPR contains numerous requirements governing transportation planning and project development, including the required elements of a TSP. In addition to plan development, the TPR requires each local government to amend its land use regulations (e.g., development code) to implement its TSP (OAR 660-012-0045). It also requires local government to adopt land use or subdivision ordinance regulations consistent with applicable federal and state requirements “to protect transportation facilities, corridors and sites for their identified functions.”

Local compliance with TPR Section -0045 provisions is achieved through a variety of measures, including access control requirements, standards to protect future operations of roads, and notice and coordinated review procedures for land use applications. Local development codes should also include a process to apply conditions of approval to development proposals, and regulations ensuring that amendments to land use designations, densities, and design standards are consistent with the functions, capacities, and performance standards of facilities identified in the TSP.

The TPR does not regulate access management. ODOT adopted OAR 734-051 to address access management and it is expected that ODOT, as part of this project, will coordinate with the City in planning for access management on state roadways consistent with its Access Management Rule. See the review of OAR 734-051 in the next section.

Amendments to the TPR adopted in 2012 include new language in Section -0060 that allows a local government to exempt a zone change from the “significant effect” determination if the proposed zoning is consistent with the comprehensive plan map designation and the TSP. The amendments also allow a local government to amend a functional plan, comprehensive plan, or land use regulation without applying mobility standards (volume-to-capacity (v/c), for example) if the subject area is within a designated multi-modal mixed-use area (MMA).

**Project Relevance:** The TPR directs local TSP development and requires specific transportation elements be implemented in the local development ordinance. Local requirements such as access management, coordinated land use review procedures, and transportation facility standards and requirements – consistent with TPR Sections -0045 and -0060 – are meant to protect road operations, enhance safety, and provide for multi-modal access and mobility.

Access Management Rule (OAR 734-051) (2014)\(^7\)

Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 734-051 defines the State’s role in managing access to highway facilities in order to maintain functional use and safety and to preserve public investment. OHP Policy 3A and OAR 734-051 set access spacing standards for driveways and approaches to the state

---

\(^7\) Amendments to OAR 734-051 were adopted in early 2014 based on passage of Senate Bill 1024 (2010, Senate Bill 264 (2011, and Senate Bill 408 (2014). The amendments were intended to allow more consideration for economic development when developing and implementing access management rules and involved changes to how ODOT deals with approach road spacing, highway improvement requirements with development, and traffic impact analyses requirements for approach road permits.
highway system. The most recent amendments presume that existing driveways with access to state highways have written permission from ODOT as required by ORS 734. The standards are based on state highway classification and differ depending on posted speed and average daily traffic volume.

**Project Relevance:** Analysis for the TSP update and final project recommendations will need to reflect state requirements for state facilities; the updated TSP will comply or move in the direction of meeting access management standards for state facilities. Implementation measures that will be developed for the TSP update may entail amendments to the development code to ensure its requirements are consistent with these access management requirements as well as the draft TSP recommendations related to access management.

**ODOT Analysis Procedures**
The Analysis Procedures Manual (APM) provides the current methodologies, practices, and procedures for conducting long term analysis of Oregon Department of Transportation plans and projects. The APM is generally based on methodologies found in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). However, there are many locations in the APM, either because of limitations in the HCM or because of ODOT policies, where the APM recommends different methodologies to address these issues. Unless otherwise specified in the APM, traffic analyses shall use the current edition of the HCM in effect at the start of the analysis.

A major update of the manual is currently in progress. APM version 1 is being modified to refer to the version 2 procedures; APM version 2 incorporates methodologies from sources such as the 2010 HCM and the Highway Safety Manual. As new chapters or sections of APM version 2 are completed, they are published on ODOT's webpage.

**Project Relevance:** The Sutherlin TSP update will use APM methodology to forecast future transportation growth rates and analyze safety at study intersections and to assess the quality of the pedestrian network and the quality of the bicycle facility inventory (using Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress methodology).

**ODOT Highway Design Manual (2012)**
The 2012 Highway Design Manual (HDM) provides ODOT with uniform standards and procedures for planning studies and project development for the state’s roadways. It is intended to provide guidance for the design of new construction; major reconstruction (4R); resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation (3R); or resurfacing (1R) projects. It has not been updated since the release of AASHTO’s current Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (2018), reviewed earlier in this memorandum. Therefore, sound engineering judgment will continue to be a vital part in the process of applying the design criteria to individual projects. The flexibility contained in the 2012 HDM supports the use of Practical Design concepts and Context Sensitive Design practices.

---


9 [https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/APM.aspx](https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/APM.aspx)
The HDM is used for all projects that are located on state highways. National Highway System or Federal-aid projects on roadways that are under local jurisdiction will typically use the 2011 AASHTO design standards or ODOT 3R design standards. Table 2 shows which design standards are applicable for certain projects based on project type, and if the project involves a state route. State and local planners also use the manual to determine design requirements as they relate to the state highways in TSPs, Corridor Plans, and Refinement Plans. Some projects under ODOT roadway jurisdiction traverse across local agency boundaries; for such facilities, local agencies may have adopted design standards and guidelines that differ from ODOT design standards. Although the appropriate ODOT design standards are to be applied on ODOT roadway jurisdiction facilities, local agency publications and design practices can also provide additional guidance, concepts, and strategies related to roadway design.

Table 2: Design Standards Selections Matrix, ODOT HDM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Roadway Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Roadway Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modernization/ Bridge New/Replacement</td>
<td>ODOT 4R/New Freeway</td>
<td>Interstate (I-5, US-199)</td>
<td>State Highways (OR-99, OR-260, OR-238, and OR-46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ODOT 4R/New Urban</td>
<td>Rural State Highways</td>
<td>Local Agency Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ODOT 4R/New Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation/ Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>ODOT 3R Freeway</td>
<td></td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ODOT 3R Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ODOT 3R Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Maintenance</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety- Operations- Miscellaneous/ Special Programs</td>
<td>ODOT Freeway</td>
<td>ODOT Urban</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ODOT Rural</td>
<td>ODOT 3R Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HDM includes mobility standards related to project development and design that are applicable to all modernization projects, except for development review projects (see Table 3). The v/c ratios in the HDM are different than those shown in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP). The v/c ratio values in the OHP are used to assist in the planning phase to identify future system deficiencies; the HDM v/c ratio values provide a mobility solution that corrects those previously identified deficiencies and provides the best investment for the State over a 20-year design life.

Table 3: 20-Year Design Mobility Standards (Volume/Capacity [V/C]) Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-Year Design/Mobility Standards</th>
<th>Inside Urban Growth Boundary</th>
<th>Non-MPO outside of STAs where non-freeway speed limit &lt;45 mph</th>
<th>Non-MPO where non-freeway speed limit &gt;=45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Highways and Statewide (NHS) Expressways</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (NHS) Non-Freight Routes and Regional or District Expressways</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Highways</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Local Interest Roads</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Relevance:** The ODOT HDM provides design standards on state roadways; analysis for the TSP update and final project recommendations will need to reflect state requirements for state facilities. Standards and guidelines adopted by the City should be considered for additional guidance, concepts, and strategies for design.

**Statewide Transportation Improvement Program**

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is the four-year programming and funding document for transportation projects and programs on state and regional transportation systems, including federal land and Indian reservation road systems, interstate, state, and regional highways, bridges, and public transit. It includes state- and federally-funded system improvements that have approved funding and are expected to be undertaken during the upcoming four-year period. The projects and programs undergo a selection process managed by ODOT Regions or ODOT central offices, a process that is held every two years in order to update the STIP.

The current 2018-2021 STIP includes the following preservation projects in Sutherlin:

- I-5 – Key #20588; re-pave from Mileposts 125.00 to 136.50
- OR 138 – Key # 21063; chip seal from Milepost 0.00 to Milepost 9.00

**Project Relevance:** The TSP update analysis will take into account projects that are programmed in the STIP. An expected outcome of this planning process is proposed recommendations to amend the STIP to include projects from the updated TSP. Projects recommended in the update TSP may be eligible for funding through the ODOT Enhance program, which awards funding through a competitive application process.

**Interchange 136 Interchange Area Management Plan (2009)**

An Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) is a required planning document for new or substantially modified interchanges in order to help protect the State’s long-range investment (OAR 734-051-0155). The 2005 TSP identifies a need to modernize and increase capacity to serve the adopted land use plan for the area; the interchange and roadways in the project area were found to have operational, geometric, and structural deficiencies that were expected to be exacerbated by traffic increases from development. The City and ODOT Region 3 subsequently worked together to develop an IAMP for Interchange 136 (Elkton-Sutherlin Highway).

The principle geometric and structural deficiencies identified in the IAMP are:

a. The southbound ramps use a “gull-wing” configuration that is no longer a standard design.

b. Some ramps do not meet design current standards or achieve minimum standards rather than the higher “desirable” standard.

The objectives of the IAMP are to:

- Develop concepts to improve safety and increase capacity of the interchange and roadways to address existing and future needs.
- Evaluate the need for capacity improvements based on adopted Sutherlin comprehensive land use plans, the Sutherlin TSP, the OHP, and the appropriate level-of-service standards.
- Develop an access management plan that provides for safe and acceptable operations on the transportation network and that move in the direction to meet the access spacing standards prescribed in the OHP.

The preferred interchange configuration, referred to as the TSP Preferred Concept, is shown in IAMP Figure 5. It is similar to a standard diamond but includes a supplemental loop ramp that provides for movements for westbound traffic to southbound I-5. This concept eliminates the need for left turns from OR 138 at the SB ramp terminal. Additional information about the lane configurations and volumes is contained in Appendix C in the IAMP.

The IAMP includes specific local street system projects that amend the adopted TSP to enhance connectivity in the vicinity of the interchange (IAMP Section 10). The existing interchange is a conventional standard diamond configuration for northbound I-5, but a non-standard, unique gull-wing configuration for southbound I-5. Recommendations in the IAMP include modifying improvements associated with Park Hill Lane between OR 138 and W. Duke Road, which is recommended to abandon to allow the construction of a new, modern interchange to replace the current gull wing interchange configuration. The intersection of OR 138 and Dakota Street has been identified as the recommended connection for the new collector that would extend to W. Duke Road. The IAMP further identifies this as a logical route for extending a collector road south to Interchange 135, a project included in the 2005 TSP.

Figure 1 (IAMP Figure 12) shows needed local road improvements, many of which are identified for the west side of Sutherlin to provide connectivity. The IAMP anticipates that improved connectivity may allow further consolidation of approaches to OR 138, along with some consolidation of driveways overtime, prior to the development of an improved local street network.
The Access Management Plan (IAMP Section 7.3), anticipates that actions to address access management will occur over a long period of time, including before a major interchange improvement (“short-term”), while the interchange is being improved (“medium-term”), and after project completion (“long-term”). (See IAMP Table 10: Access Actions by Individual Approach.) The plan states that traffic evaluations required for development or redevelopment of parcels in the study area should address access points and potential safety issues. Access management actions for both the west and east side of the interchange include reduction and/or consolidation of access points and occasional turning movement restrictions, either in conjunction with the interchange project or as redevelopment occurs. Actions identified for the east side of the interchange include alternative connections between Myrtle Street and Comstock Road as well as Ponderosa Drive and Comstock Road.10

The specific elements adopted by the City and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) as part of the IAMP are identified in Section 10. City actions included amending the TSP policy language to include additional policies (Chapter 2: TSP Goals and Objectives); revisions to the TSP Street Network Plan (Chapter 7); and additional new projects and revisions to the Financial Plan (Capital Improvements List & Potential Funding Partners, Table 13-1). Figure 2 (IAMP Figure 16) shows the revised street network with the addition of the local projects and the Preferred Interchange Concept.

10 See Access Actions - Westside, IAMP Figure 13, and Access Actions - Eastside, IAMP Figure 14.
Figure 2: Recommended Local Street Network Improvements

The Interchange 136 IAMP was adopted by the City as part of the TSP and subsequently adopted by the OTC as an amendment to the Oregon Highway Plan in 2009.

**Project Relevance:** Recommended IAMP policies, projects, and access management measures will be considered during the future conditions and project alternatives evaluation tasks of the TSP. Where appropriate, they will be incorporated into the TSP’s recommended policy amendments and project list to support the preferred transportation system.
LOCAL PLANS

Sutherlin Comprehensive Plan (1990-1991)
The City of Sutherlin Comprehensive Plan is a long-range guide for land use in the Sutherlin urban growth boundary (UGB) consistent with Statewide Planning Goals. Its goals and policies work in concert with goals and objectives in the City’s 2005 TSP to provide direction on transportation system and land use decision-making in the city.

Transportation policies in the adopted Comprehensive Plan are established in the Public Facilities Element of the plan. They address who finances and manages transportation investments, minimum right-of-way and pavement widths, residential access onto higher order streets, alternative transportation modes, and project ideas such as a new east-west limited access arterial and upgrades to OR 99. The following policies in the Land Use Element and Population and Economy Element of the Comprehensive Plan also influence transportation system planning.

Land Use Policies

1. Conversion of urbanizable land to urban uses shall be based on consideration of;
   A. Orderly, economic provision for public facilities and services;

Commercial Land Use Policies

3. Support the improvement of traffic and pedestrian circulation in the CBD along with the development of adequate off-street parking.

4. Require that infilling of vacant land in the areas designated for linear commercial be done in such a fashion so as to encourage the clustering of commercial activities, improve the visual attractiveness of the area, and minimize the points of ingress and egress on Central Avenue. Whenever possible, joint driveways to different commercial establishment would be encouraged.

Industrial Land Use Policies

1. Provide appropriate public facilities in a timely manner to support industrial development in major manufacturing areas and other compatible locations.

Population and Economy Policies

9. The city shall maintain and expand the capacity of its water, drainage, sewerage, and transportation systems to ensure that a proper infrastructure attractive to industry is in place.

Project Relevance: Adopted City transportation goals, objectives, and policies are discussed in detail earlier in this memorandum under Goals and Objectives. The TSP update process will evaluate existing transportation goals, objectives, and policies as to whether they are still applicable and reflect community needs. In addition to updated goals and policies, implementation of the TSP may prompt other policy-level changes in areas related to transportation, including economic development and land use.
Sutherlin Transportation System Plan (2005)
The Sutherlin TSP guides the development and management of transportation facilities in the city, reflecting community goals and objectives and providing consistency with state, regional, and local plans. The current plan was adopted in 2005 and is approaching the end of its 20-year planning horizon.

The 2005 TSP includes goals and objectives, which are used in conjunction with transportation goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan to evaluate land use and transportation actions. This policy direction is discussed in detail in the Goals and Objectives section of this memorandum. The 2005 TSP establishes roadway functional classifications and standards for mobility performance, access management, and street design; provides guidance regarding traffic management/calming, transportation system management, and jurisdictional transfers; recommends multimodal improvements to address the city’s transportation needs, including facilities for personal electric vehicles (PEVs) such as golf carts and scooters; and discusses potential funding sources to implement these projects.

The Southside Parkway Corridor Plan, addressed later in this memorandum, was adopted as an amendment to the TSP in 2007. The Interchange 136 IAMP was adopted as an amendment to the TSP in 2009.

**Project Relevance:** The TSP update process will review the goals, objectives, standards, and recommended projects from the 2005 TSP to determine what needs to be retained or changed in the updated TSP. This planning process will update recommended transportation improvement projects for all modes, based on existing and projected needs. Updated data, stakeholder and community involvement, and evaluation criteria will be used in making these recommendations.

Sutherlin Capital Improvement Plan
Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs) program the funding and construction of significant capital projects, typically for a five-year period. According to City of Sutherlin staff, the City relies on both the current budget and the adopted TSP for its transportation-related CIP. The transportation CIP in the City’s 2018-2019 budget is shown in Table 4.

The 2005 TSP provides a list of approximately 25 projects categorized into high (0-9 years), medium (10-15 years), and low (16-20 years) priorities for implementation. The projects include a new railroad overpass (high priority), a new east-west parkway (high priority), pedestrian plan projects (high priority), PEV multi-use paths (medium priority), and a new connection from the new parkway to Central Avenue (low priority).
Table 4: Transportation CIP in City of Sutherlin 2018-2019 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>$312,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$83,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ave</td>
<td>2,050,000</td>
<td>2,050,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Extension</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slurry Seal</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine Street</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlays</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,898,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,640,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$692,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$279,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$287,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$295,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Amounts are rounded to the nearest thousand.
2. These activities are carried out in the State Gas Tax Fund.

**Project Relevance:** The capital improvement projects that have a committed funding source will be included in the future baseline transportation conditions for the updated TSP. The updated TSP will include capital improvement projects as part of the future conditions analysis and in the development of proposed improvements.

**Sutherlin Southside Parkway Corridor Plan (2007)**

The Southside Parkway Corridor Plan sought to identify a solution to existing and anticipated circulation needs in the southern part of the city, establishing a new connection between the Calapooya Street and Waite Street corridors that would provide an alternative to Central Avenue, particularly for the growing number of homes on the east side of the city.

The project was led by the City of Sutherlin, Douglas County, and ODOT and relied on consultation with a Technical Review Committee and the City’s Transportation Advisory Committee. Primary products of the planning process were a preferred parkway conceptual alignment – meant to provide desired circulation balanced with constructability, cost, and minimized social and environmental impacts – and a set of four road design cross sections that varied with constraints and land use settings. See Figure 3.
As originally envisioned in the City’s 2005 TSP and subsequently refined in this planning process, the parkway concept will be a limited-access facility, with four to five access points along the roughly mile-long alignment.

**Project Relevance:** Concepts for the Southside Parkway alignment and road design (cross sections) should be further refined and incorporated into the standards and project list sections of the updated TSP. Statements should be considered for the update of existing policies regarding the purpose and priority of this parkway.
The City of Sutherlin Development Code (SDC) implements the long-range land use vision embodied in the Coos Bay Comprehensive Plan, regulates uses within the city, and establishes standards for development and land divisions. Key existing development standards are summarized below.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation
Pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation are implemented through required improvements internal to a development site and transportation system (usually roadway design) standards.

Site Development Standards
Standards regarding on-site pedestrian circulation and connection to adjoining sites are established in Section 3.2.120. Connections of on-site pathways to adjacent streets and sidewalks are identified as potentially being required; connections to transit stops are not addressed. On-site pathways must accommodate pedestrians and bicycles and may also be designed for PEVs such as golf carts and scooters.

Transportation System Standards
Street design standards are addressed in Section 3.5.110, which includes dimensional standards in a table and cross section images from the TSP. All roadways include sidewalks but only arterial roadways include bike lanes.

Access Management and Connectivity
Block size and access spacing standards are established as part of vehicle access and circulation requirements (Section 3.2.110). Access spacing standards for collector and arterial streets refer to the TSP. Pedestrian connections through blocks that are longer than standard are required as part of pedestrian access and circulation standards (Section 3.2.120.A.4). Shared driveway provisions are included as a way to manage access and safety (Section 3.2.110.K).

Vehicle and Bicycle Parking
Off-street parking standards include provisions for shared parking and on-street parking credits (Section 3.4.120.B and C). Bicycle parking requirements address the number of spaces required as well as basic design elements (Section 3.4.130).

Traffic Impact Analyses and Performance Standards
Traffic study requirements are addressed within vehicle circulation standards (Section 3.2.110.D) and as part of Type II and Type III application (Section 4.2.130.B and Section 4.2.140.B). Level of service (LOS) is discussed and a standard is set in the 2005 TSP.

Application Review and Coordination
Pre-application conferences are required for Type II and III procedures (Section 4.2.130.A and Section 4.2.140.A, and 4.2.160). Existing pre-application provisions do not require agency participation other than the City Planning Director and/or his designee. Similarly, application and hearing notice requirements for Type II and III procedures do not specify that potentially affected agencies (e.g., transportation agencies such as ODOT, Douglas County, or UTrans) be notified.
TPR Consistency
Pursuant to Section 4.11.110.C.1.a, amendments to the SDC and City land use plans (e.g., Comprehensive Plan) must be consistent with relevant Statewide Planning Goals, which includes Goal 12 (Transportation) and its implementing requirements in the TPR. Amendments to the City Zoning Map must demonstrate that the most intense uses and density that would be allowed by the amendment are consistent with Section -0060 of the TPR. Pursuant to Section 4.8.110.C.2, zone changes for land within the Interchange 136 IAMPS area that do not require a Comprehensive Plan amendment can defer the determination of consistency with Section -0060 to development review.

Project Relevance: Amendments to the SDC will be considered as part of implementation of the updated TSP. Proposed amendments will address consistency with the TPR and will implement recommendations in the updated TSP. Consistency will need to be ensured between requirements in the SDC, updated TSP, and City Standard Construction Specifications and Standard Drawings, for example, regarding transportation facility design standards that may be found in each document.

Sutherlin Zoning Map
The following zoning districts govern land use and development requirements in the City, as shown on the Sutherlin Zoning Map (Figure 4) and established in SDC Sections 2.2 through 2.5:

- Residential – Residential Hillside (RH), Low Density Residential (R-1), Medium Density Residential (R-2), and Multifamily/High Density Residential (R-3)
- Commercial – Downtown Commercial (C-1) and Community Commercial (C-3)
- Industrial – Light Industrial (M-1) and General Industrial (M-2)
- Public/Semi-Public (P or C-S)
- Forestry Resource (FR-20)\(^{11}\)
- Mixed Use (MU)\(^{12}\)

\(^{11}\) The large lots in the southeast corner and on the western border of the city limits that do not have color in the Zoning Map in Figure 4 are zoned FR-20.

\(^{12}\) The SDC establishes regulations for the MU zoning district. However, no land in the city is currently zoned MU.
The Zoning Map shows the following concentrations of zoning:

- C-3 zoning around Interchange 136 and along OR 138 and Central Avenue;
- C-1 zoning in Downtown north and south of Central Avenue;
- M-2 zoning between I-5 and the railroad and in northeast Sutherlin, between Stearns Lane and Dovetail Lane; and
- M-1 zoning between the railroad and Calapooya Street.

The rest of the city is predominantly zoned residential, with areas of public/semi-public zoning where public facilities, including schools, are located.

The City is currently in the process of completing a UGB exchange involving approximately 302 acres. The areas proposed to be removed from the UGB are the 202-acre Ford’s Pond property located on the west side of Church Road and a 100-acre property located off of State Street. The area proposed to be added is focused in the southwest quadrant of Interchange 136. The UGB exchange is expected to be completed in the winter of 2018. Land added to the UGB within the proposed exchange area will be zoned with a mix of RH and R1. See Figures 4 and 5.

**Project Relevance:** Future conditions analysis performed for the TSP update process will be based on transportation demand projected for planned land uses in the UGB. Transportation improvements developed during the TSP update process will be designed to address needs identified in existing and future conditions reporting.
Figure 5: Proposed UGB Exchange

Figure 6: Proposed City Zoning
Sutherlin Standard Construction Specifications
Division 3 of the Sutherlin Standard Construction Specifications addresses streets. The specifications are materials- and construction-related; the Standard Drawings appended to the Standard Construction Specifications address design. Standard Drawings include: asphalt pavement detail; raised median islands, including those with crosswalks (pedestrian refuges); sidewalks and sidewalk ramps; bike lane and bike route pavement markings; and other pavement markings.

Project Relevance: The Standard Drawings do not include roadway cross section drawings by functional classification. The only drawing with specifications related to roadway cross sections is the sidewalk drawing (# RD720), which specifies a 5-foot minimum width for sidewalks. Therefore, changes in road design standards that may occur as part of the TSP update process should not necessitate amendments of the City’s existing Standard Construction Specifications and Standard Drawings other than to add facility treatments (e.g., protected bike lanes) that may be recommended in the updated TSP.

Urban Growth Management Agreement (1982)
The City of Sutherlin and Douglas County jointly adopted an Urban Growth Management Agreement (UGMA) on July 12, 1982 in order to guide actions within the Urban Growth Area (UGA) – the area between existing city limits and the UGB. The UGMA includes the following elements:

- County ordinances shall be used to implement the City of Sutherlin Comprehensive Plan within the UGA.

- An amendment to the UGB and Comprehensive Plan text and/or map related to the UGA shall be enacted only after agreement by both the City and the County, in accordance with plan and ordinance amendment procedures established by each jurisdiction.

- The City shall seek a recommendation from the County for actions related to the UGA and for which the City has ultimate decision-making authority, including transportation functional plans, or amendments thereto, and capital improvement programs.

- The County and City shall cooperatively develop road design and construction standards in order to assure that an adequate transition may be made between rural and urban environments and from County to City jurisdiction. The County Public Works Departments shall prioritize needed improvements for arterial and collector streets within the UGA.

Project Relevance: Coordination between the City and County will be needed during the TSP update process for any land use regulation and road design standard changes that may affect land and transportation facilities in the UGA.
The Douglas County Comprehensive Plan was completed in 1981 and acknowledged by the Land Conservation and Development Commission in 1983. It has been revised many times, most recently in 2017 to amend the Park and Recreation Element to incorporate data from the Statewide Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) for 2013-2017. The Comprehensive Plan establishes goals and policies for areas of county-wide interest, including preservation of agricultural land and natural and cultural resources, housing, public facilities, parks and recreation, and transportation. The Comprehensive Plan includes land use findings and policies for both rural communities in the County, as well as for the urban unincorporated areas of Dillard, Gardiner, Glide, Green, Shady, Winchester Bay, and Tri City.

The Comprehensive Plan includes information about Sutherlin, the second most populous city in the County after Roseburg, including demographics, natural resources, and land use. Much of this information, however, is more than 20 years old. More recent amendments have updated policies in the Housing Element, including a policy obligating the County to cooperate with its 12 cities to promote coordinated housing policies to ensure that the countywide housing needs of low- and moderate-income households are adequately met (2013); and updates to the Population Element, which incorporated a new 50-year coordinated population forecast (2015).

The Comprehensive Plan document includes a Transportation element, the content of which is identical to the information in the adopted Douglas County TSP.

**Project Relevance:** Transportation forecasting will be based on the population figures that are coordinated between Douglas County and the City. City transportation policy should be consistent with County policy, in particular in areas related to population, urbanization, land use and housing, and transportation. The outcome of this TSP update will be City policies that support the recommendations and implementation of the updated TSP; to the extent these policies intersect with County needs and objectives, an outcome of this project may be recommended County policy amendments.

Douglas County Transportation System Plan (2004, Last Updated 2010)
The Douglas County TSP was adopted in December 2004 and was subsequently updated in 2006, 2009, and 2010 to include elements for three separate IAMPs governing I-5 Interchanges 103, 106, and 108; Interchanges 119 and 120; and Interchange 129 respectively.

The TSP contains a summary of Statewide Planning Goal 12 and a description of Douglas County's transportation facilities, the County roadway network plan, and the Bikeway Master Plan. It includes a description of roadway functional classifications and associated mobility standards (v/c ratio) and provides a list of all of the county roadways and their functional classification. County transportation policy states that, for those roads located within city UGBs, the County shall coordinate road classifications and construction standards with the affected cities. County policies relevant to non-motorized facilities in Sutherlin include:

**OBJECTIVE C:** To provide a system of bikeways which is coordinated with other jurisdictional bikeway plans.
POLICIES:

1. The County shall coordinate with other jurisdictions and agencies to ensure development of routes which are continuous across jurisdictional boundaries and which serve the needs of all Douglas County residents.

2. The County shall coordinate the designation and improvement of bikeways within urban growth boundaries with the affected cities.

The County TSP also describes projects on County roadways within city UGBs. For Sutherlin, this notably included planning for a southern bypass of Central Avenue (amended into the TSP in 1997). The TSP references the Sutherlin Area Transportation Study, which supported a southerly bypass route for Central Avenue using Calapooya Street or Comstock Road, and re-aligning the dogleg corners on the Calapooya Street. This project evolved into the Sutherlin Southside Parkway Corridor Plan, reviewed earlier in this memorandum.

Project Relevance: County transportation improvement projects and roadway standards (for County facilities within the UGB) will be reviewed and considered as part of the Sutherlin TSP Update. Recommendations in the updated TSP will need to be consistent with the County TSP; if necessary, refinements of the County plan will be identified and discussed as part of this update process.

Douglas County Land Use and Development Ordinance and Zoning Map

The TSP update will plan for areas within the City’s UGB, but outside city limits. Locations include the Union Gap area, north of city limits along I-5 (Figure 7), a few properties south of Highway 138 (Waste Water Treatment Plant, Figure 8), and areas south of W. Central Avenue (Figures 9 and 10). Pursuant to the UGMA, the Douglas County Land Use and Development Ordinance (LUDO) governs allowed uses and development in these areas.

These areas are predominantly developed with single-family residences and zoned Suburban Residential (RS). This County classification is applied in areas within adopted UGBs where there are limited urban services. It is intended to provide for a primarily single-family suburban environment where certain limited agricultural activities are permitted (Article 11).

The Wastewater Treatment Plant area includes properties zoned Rural Residential-5 (5R). The 5R Zone classification is intended to provide for low-density rural homesites in an open space environment in order to encourage the continued existence of rural family life (Article 8). Intended to provide a transition from more intense residential development to the agriculture, timber and open space areas of the county, the zone may be applied to areas committed to non-resource use or reserved for rural residential expansion at this density.

Project Relevance: As with land inside Sutherlin city limits, future conditions analysis conducted during the TSP update process will be based on transportation demand projected for planned land uses in the UGB, including land in the UGA, which is subject to Douglas County zoning and LUDO regulations.
Figure 7: Douglas County Zoning Map (North of Sutherlin City Limits)

Figure 8: Douglas County Zoning Map (South and West of Sutherlin City Limits, South of Highway 138)
Figure 9: Douglas County Zoning Map (South of Sutherlin City Limits)

Figure 10: Douglas County Zoning Map (South of Sutherlin City Limits)
Douglas County Transportation Improvement Plan (2016-2021)

The Douglas County Public Works Department operates the County road system. The County Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) documents available funding for road improvements and the projects the County will undertake during a 5-year period. As documented in the TIP, operations, maintenance, and improvements of the County road system are funded by the County Public Works Fund. The TIP includes a description of County funding sources and a summary of the Public Works Fund’s budget for the last five fiscal years (TIP Table 1).

The TIP also lists projects funded in large part by $22.3 million dollars in federal and state grant funding (TIP Table 2) and notes that the County has had much recent success in competing for project grant funds. A summary of all 2016-2021 projects, including yearly cost estimates, is Appendix E of the TIP; maps of project locations by fiscal year are included in Appendix F.

Douglas County operates 10.77 miles of roadway within Sutherlin’s UGB, 8.25 miles of which are within city limits. Urban roadway improvement projects identified for 2016-2021 includes Phase 2 of the Comstock Road project referred to as “Comstock Rd: N of 6th Street to Page Ave – Phase 2 (N Comstock Road).” Phase 1 of the project, completed in 2015, included improvements to a section of S. Comstock Road that is now under the City’s jurisdiction. Phase 2 includes the construction of 6-foot sidewalks, 6-foot bike lanes, storm sewer facilities, and surfacing on N. Comstock Road between W. Central Avenue and Laurel Avenue. Identified funding includes $1,000,000 in STP Flex funds, $200,000 in City funds, and $403,495 in County funds. Upon project completion, jurisdiction of N. Comstock Road will be transferred to the City of Sutherlin.

**Project Relevance:** Funded County transportation improvement projects for County facilities within the UGB will be reviewed and considered as part of the Sutherlin TSP Update. Recommended improvements on County roadways in the updated City TSP will include anticipated funding and may be recommended for inclusion in the County TIP.