

# **TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT**

## **TRANSPORTATION**

This element summarizes the findings, recommendations, and policies from the Marion County Rural Transportation System Plan (RTSP), initially adopted in 1998 and updated in 2005. Additional background information, specific details, and recommended projects and priorities can be found in the full version of the RTSP which can be located on the County's web pages, as well as in the offices of Marion County Public Works.

### **History**

In 1991, the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) adopted the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), which requires the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), all metropolitan planning organizations, all counties, and all cities over 2,500 in population to develop and adopt a Transportation System Plan (TSP). For cities under 2,500 in population, ordinances addressing transportation and land use may be needed.

In developing a Transportation System Plan (TSP), the County recognized that the most widely used component of the existing transportation system in the County is the extensive roadway network of arterials, collectors, and local roads. In recognition of this fact, the County Public Works Department has used, and will continue to use, the majority of its resources and funding to maintain and preserve the existing roadway network. The TSP also addresses bicycle, pedestrian, air, rail, water, and public transportation, as well as strategies to reduce demand on the transportation system.

### **Rural and Urban Transportation Planning**

For rural areas outside urban growth boundaries, the Marion County Rural Transportation System Plan (RTSP) serves as the framework for transportation planning. The RTSP is the County's 20-year plan to provide mobility, address safety needs, accommodate planned growth, facilitate economic development, and maintain a high standard of livability for county residents. The findings, recommendations and policies contained in this Transportation element come directly from the RTSP. While every effort has been made to ensure this element matches the RTSP, in the event of any differences, the RTSP would govern.

In urban areas, all cities have developed, or are in the process of developing, transportation plans and/or ordinances. City transportation plans start where the RTSP ends, at the urban growth boundaries. Since many of the main city streets are maintained by Marion County, the County has a vested interest in the transportation planning process for each community. The County also recognizes that the needs, goals and visions vary from city to city. For these reasons, the County works with each city individually to determine the transportation plan most appropriate for that community, rather than developing one countywide urban plan to encompass all urban areas.

In addition, individual planning efforts have begun for some unincorporated communities in the County. Although these communities do not have urban growth boundaries, they function as small urban areas with defined community boundaries. For that reason, the RTSP may not address the issues in these communities as well as for incorporated community plans.

## **TRANSPORTATION GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

During the development of the 1998 Rural Transportation System Plan, a set of goals and objectives was created to provide a starting point for the planning process and to identify concepts that would be used in determining a future transportation system. The goals and objectives have been updated to reflect current issues affecting the transportation system in Marion County.

a. **Goal 1: Improve transportation system safety.**

Objective: Improve system safety for and between all modes of transportation.

Objective: Dedicate adequate resources to ensure that the transportation system is properly maintained and preserved.

b. **Goal 2: Provide an accessible, efficient and practical transportation system appropriate to both urban and rural areas throughout the County.**

Objective: Improve mobility and access options to transportation facilities throughout Marion County for transportation system users.

Objective: Facilitate goods movement into and out of area; increase freight (truck, rail, air and water) mobility and inter-modal transfer.

Objective: Facilitate shipping of goods by most efficient and least-impacting means possible.

Objective: Address changing characteristics of trucking, aviation, agriculture and rail industries.

Objective: Facilitate system connections as needed to improve efficiency and access.

c. **Goal 3: Provide sufficient transportation capacity.**

Objective: Address existing priorities and projected growth.

Objective: Adequately provide for the transportation needs of residents, businesses, customers and visitors.

Objective: Encourage and support actions that reduce demand on the transportation system.

Objective: Encourage and support actions that maximize value and efficiency of the existing system.

d. **Goal 4: Recognize fiscal reality.**

Objective: Facilitate best usage of available financial resources.

Objective: Be ready to use additional resources efficiently if they become available, and be able to show what benefit results from those resources.

Objective: Facilitate procurement of grant funding.

Objective: Recognize that due to financial limitations, **not** all goals and objectives will be met to the ideal extent.

e. **Goal 5: Work in partnership with communities to address community needs and values.**

Objective: Minimize adverse impact of transportation system on quality of life in communities.

Objective: Facilitate regional through movement of goods and services while minimizing conflict between through movement and livability in central city areas.

Objective: Minimize adverse impact of transportation system on quality of life and environment in rural areas.

Objective: Foster cooperation between the County and cities to address a wide variety of transportation issues.

f. **Goal 6: Promote alternative modes of transportation.**

Objective: Facilitate provision of opportunities for a variety of transportation options.

Objective: Reduce dependence on any one mode of transportation.

Objective: Facilitate and support improved connections between different modes.

Objective: Support land use planning strategies that facilitate efficient transportation system use and development.

g. **Goal 7: Consider land use and transportation relationships.**

Objective: Integrate land use planning and transportation planning to manage and plan the transportation system.

Objective: Minimize detrimental effects of transportation improvements on rural land uses.

Objective: Ensure an environmentally responsible/environmentally sound transportation system that minimizes adverse impacts on air and water.

Objective: Ensure transportation-related activities comply with clean air and water requirements and fish and wildlife habitat management regulations.

Objective: Protect established land uses including prime farmland, forestland and other natural resources.

**h. Goal 8: Address transportation policy issues and intergovernmental coordination.**

Objective: Improve coordination with all affected jurisdictions to meet future transportation needs.

Objective: Facilitate development of coordinated transportation design standards.

Objective: Emphasize facilitation, rather than restriction/regulation of business.

Objective: Ensure cost-effective investment in transportation. Improvements should be fiscally responsible, economically efficient and realistic.

Objective: Comply with applicable Transportation Planning Rule requirements for rural transportation system planning.

Objective: Maintain an ongoing public involvement process.

**i. Goal 9: Provide a useful plan document.**

Objective: Accurately reflect the existing and future transportation systems, issues and needs of Marion County.

Objective: Identify methods for funding recommended actions.

Objective: Provide clear planning direction.

Objective: Maintain and update a list of issues for further study.

Objective: Extend usable life of existing facilities; provide a maintenance element.

Objective: Provide for a periodic review and update of the Plan that allows for improvements to be made as circumstances change regarding transportation issues throughout the County.

## **FACILITY INVENTORY AND CONDITIONS**

A detailed inventory of County transportation facilities, including the physical and operational features, was compiled as part of the RTSP. These facilities include: roadways including truck routes and bridges, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, traffic control devices, public transportation providers, rail crossings, airports, ferries, pipelines, and utility and communication lines.

### **Roadways**

The most widely used transportation facility is the County roadway network. The County maintains approximately 1130 miles of roads of which approximately 140 miles lie within various urban growth boundaries, leaving 990 miles of rural county roads, consisting of 793 miles of paved roads and 197 miles of gravel roads. In addition, the County has about 79 miles of local access roads that are public roadways but, under Oregon Revised Statutes, are not maintained by the County, with maintenance generally the responsibility of adjacent property owners. Based on 2002 data, of the 793 miles of paved roads, 107 miles are in “very good” pavement condition, 392 miles are in “good” condition, and 199 miles are in “fair” condition. This leaves 95 miles in “poor” or “very poor” paved surface conditions.

Marion County maintains 141 bridges with 135 in rural areas and 6 in urban areas. All bridges are thoroughly inspected every two years and given a sufficiency rating that represents the overall condition of the structure. Bridges are also assigned an operating rating that is used to determine whether requirements are placed on the use of the bridge, such as vehicle weight and/or height restrictions. Currently 9 bridges have maximum vehicle weight or dimension restrictions.

The RTSP also identifies Interstate 5 and Oregon Highway 22 detour routes that are utilized when emergencies occur that make it necessary to divert traffic onto other State highways and County roads, typically for relatively short periods of time.

### **Public Transportation**

Public transportation providers operating within the County include two inter-city fixed route systems (Chemeketa Area Regional Transportation System or CARTS and South Metro Area Rapid Transit or SMART), two intra-city fixed route systems (Salem/Keizer and Woodburn areas), five para-transit providers, and various other charter/shuttle bus, rail (Amtrak) and taxi service providers. Regional rideshare and park and ride/pool programs also promote public or shared transportation options.

The plan includes recommendations for additional expanded transit service, listing corridors for possible new routes and possible express routes.

## **Rail, Air and Other Facilities**

The County has almost 122 miles of railroad tracks with nearly 200 public rail crossings (66 crossings in rural areas that are maintained by the County) and numerous other private crossings. There are two major railroad mainlines (Union Pacific and Portland & Western) and two short lines (Willamette Valley Railway Company) within the County.

Facilities in Marion County that accommodate air travel include two public airports (Salem and Aurora), 15 private airstrips, one Army National Guard heliport, and seven private heliports.

Two waterway crossings using motorized ferries across the Willamette River north and south of Salem (Wheatland Ferry and Buena Vista Ferry) provide shuttle service to the public.

## **Level-of-Service (LOS)**

The County considers Level-of-Service (LOS) D or better to be acceptable for roadway segments in rural areas, which is the level at which concerns regarding adequate capacity typically arise. The inventory of existing conditions revealed that 4.6 miles of roadway segments in the rural areas operate at LOS D with no segments worse than LOS D. In rural areas, the County considers LOS D or better to be acceptable for signalized and four-way stop intersections and LOS E or better for other unsignalized intersections. Of the 181 major intersections examined, 7 major rural intersections operated at LOS D or worse.

## **Crash Experience**

The frequency of crashes on rural County roads and State highways was examined to assist in identifying possible problem areas. It was found that 8 County road intersections had 10 or more accidents over a three-year period (January 2001 through December 2003), while 15 rural State highway intersections had 10 or more accidents in the same three-year period.

## **Functional Classification**

Roadways in Marion County are grouped into categories called *functional classifications*, based on the character of service they are intended to provide for the overall transportation system. The categories used for the Marion County system are based on the definitions found in the U.S. Department of Transportation document titled *Highway Functional Classification: Concepts, Criteria and Procedures, March 1989*. The system is designed to be applied to all levels of transportation facilities including interstate freeways, state highways, county roads and city streets. With permission from the Oregon Department of Transportation, the County has uniformly applied these definitions to both state highways and county roads. With regard to incorporated cities and adjacent counties, Marion County cannot specify what classification system will be used in those planning efforts. However, upon comparison of functional class designations with each of the cities and adjacent counties, it is apparent that all transitions are in accordance with the guidelines suggested in the USDOT document.

The importance of the functional class of a road is it assists the County in determining the level of maintenance or improvements, how traffic is controlled at its intersections, the standards used when the road is reconstructed or improved, the level of access and development activity allowed along its length, and the priority of funding improvements with other competing projects. The functional classification scheme for Marion County roadways is detailed in Chapter 5 of the RTSP.

## **RECOMMENDED 20-YEAR RURAL IMPROVEMENTS**

The recommended rural improvements address various modes of transportation and include specific projects and anticipated needs. The County feels that these improvements are needed within the next 20 years to maintain the safety and efficiency of the transportation system at an acceptable level. A summary of the recommended improvements is provided below. A listing and description of the improvements are detailed in the RTSP.

### **Roadways**

Roadway improvements comprise the majority of transportation facility needs and consist of safety projects (lane widths, shoulder widths, surfacing, right-of-way widths, pavement conditions, safety needs), non-safety and capacity projects (intersection traffic control and modernization, pavement widening for modernization), bridge rehabilitation and replacement projects, railroad bridge restrictions and grade crossing deficiencies, and roadway drainage deficiencies. Safety projects make up the largest category of recommended improvements to address roadway system needs.

Future county roadway needs are based on evaluating possible impacts of projected traffic volumes on the transportation system. Projected traffic volumes are used to identify locations where roadway and intersection capacity deficiencies may develop in the future if no improvements are made. The RTSP identifies locations that are anticipated to have capacity deficiencies and traffic control needs as a result of growth. The County also coordinates with cities on critical links and modernization needs between the rural transportation system and the urban systems.

The County will continue to keep maintenance and preservation of the existing roadway system as its top priority in terms of resource allocation. To ensure that roadways will continue to be properly maintained in the future, the County has developed policies pertaining to roadway maintenance and a matrix for determining maintenance priority, which are provided in the RTSP.

### **Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements**

In conjunction with the 1998 RTSP, a draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan was developed which included various in-house tools for identifying and prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Though a separate plan was never formally adopted, these tools continue to be used to identify and prioritize proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements. These proposed projects were considered in the development of the 2005 RTSP, which recommends various improvements on key rural roadways within the next 20 years.



## **Public Transportation**

The Mid Willamette Valley Council of Governments conducted a public transportation feasibility study in 1996 as part of the initial RTSP. The study recommended the development of a commuter shuttle service, which is currently being provided through the CARTS and SMART intercity bus service programs. The County will continue to encourage and support the provision and expansion of transportation options, such as intra-city transit and other types of public transportation, to serve residents in areas presently being served and not being served, where development of these services is feasible.

Para-transit improvements are also recommended in the RTSP to promote the development of integrated and improved transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged. The County also supports the findings and work program of the Regional Transportation Enhancement Plan, which provides strategies for increasing transportation choices for the region's senior and disabled residents.

## **Air/Rail/Water/Pipeline**

For specifics related to the Aurora State Airport and the Salem Municipal Airport, the respective Master Plans for these airports should be consulted. Both plans are periodically updated and all updates will be reviewed by the County to ensure that the plans are compatible with County land use and zoning requirements.

Freight transport along rail lines is expected to continue. Construction of new rail spurs will be reviewed on an individual basis to ensure that the surrounding communities and environments are not adversely affected. The County will continue to support efforts for developing cost-effective passenger and freight rail service.

The County intends to continue ferry service across the Willamette River via the Buena Vista Ferry and Wheatland Ferry. Maintenance of the ferry system (including ramps) will continue. Although dredging the Willamette River could bring economic benefits to the region, it could be costly. The County has no plans to pursue dredging at this time.

The County will continue to support the use of underground pipelines that minimize the need for surface shipping. Petroleum and natural gas distribution via pipelines is also expected to continue.

## **Special Studies, Localized Plans and Corridor Studies**

There are several areas in the County where more detailed transportation planning is warranted, such as unincorporated communities and areas where significant development activity is expected. There are also several transportation corridors that merit further study to evaluate the viability, potential demand, and determine whether they should be improved as corridors. The RTSP identifies specific areas in the County where sub-area plans or corridor studies are being recommended to address future travel needs within the county system.

## **State Highway and Regional Transportation Needs**

The State Highway system is a critical part of the overall transportation system and many key corridors in the County are made up of State highways, including Interstate 5 and Oregon 22. State Highway needs include safety, modernization, roadway maintenance, and bridge preservation improvements, as well as corridor and refinement studies. The RTSP identifies these needs, along with connectivity of County roadways to State routes, future widening of State Highways for capacity, regional planning studies, and addressing other restrictions to county roads due to limiting highway structures.

## **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Transportation System Management (TSM)**

The County will monitor implementation of transportation demand management (TDM) strategies such as teleworking, flexible work hours, ride-sharing, carpooling, expanded commuter transit and shuttle services, and bicycle and pedestrian travel as ways to reduce demand for peak hour travel. These strategies are designed to address transportation capacity needs by reducing demand during critical periods to, in turn, maintain optimum function of existing facilities. The County will also pursue transportation system management (TSM) strategies such as access management, land use controls, and traffic control to maximize the efficiency and safety of the existing transportation system.

## **RURAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN POLICIES**

Over 130 policies are included in the RTSP that affect the maintenance, development, and overall efficiency of the rural transportation network. These policies are the outcome of significant public involvement and review by interested groups. Many policies come directly from, or are revisions of, policies in the 1981 Marion County Comprehensive Plan, as amended. The policies are designed to ensure the County transportation system will satisfy the needs of residents and other users well into the future. The policies are grouped into four general categories: 1) Transportation System Management Policies, 2) Roadway Maintenance and Preservation Policies, 3) Transportation Policies, and 4) Future Evaluation of Transportation Issues.

### **Transportation System Management Policies**

The purpose of Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies is to maximize the capacity, safety, and efficiency of the existing transportation system through the application of traffic control improvements, access management, and land use controls. The most notable of these policies relates to access management and are included below.

1. Marion County adopts spacing requirements, (shown in Table 10-1 of the RTSP) for new or modified accesses to County roadways. These spacing standards are measured from centerline to centerline of the respective accesses and/or adjacent roadways (see Policy 4

for variance criteria and Policies 5 and 6 for cases in which longer spacings may be required).

2. Marion County adopts spacing requirements standards, (listed in Table 10-2 of the RTSP) for accesses to: 1) roadways within the boundary of an officially recognized unincorporated community and; 2) County-maintained roadways within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) of a city with no adopted access spacing standards (see Policy 4 for variance criteria and Policies 5 and 6 for cases in which longer spacings may be required).
3. For County Roads within the Urban Growth Boundary of a city that has adopted access spacing requirements (in their Transportation System Plan or other official document) the County will use the City's adopted spacing standards, unless in the County's judgment they would not be appropriate (see Policy 4 for variance criteria and Policies 5 and 6 for cases in which longer spacings may be required).
4. Variance Criteria: Variances may be granted at the authority of the Public Works Director in the following cases:
  - a) The property has no reasonable alternate access and the driveway spacing is the maximum that can be safely and reasonably achieved,
  - b) Adherence to the spacing standard would create safety or traffic operations problems,
  - c) The driveway provides a joint approach that serves two or more properties and results in a net reduction of approaches to the roadway, or
  - d) In the judgment of the Public Works Director, it would be impossible or unsafe to meet these standards and the proposed access configuration provides the best available option in terms of safety, traffic flow, environmental impacts, and access to the property.
5. In some cases, the requirements of another jurisdiction (such as the Oregon Department of Transportation) with roadways adjacent to a county road may be more restrictive than these requirements. When this is the case, the more restrictive requirement will be applied. This situation can occur at locations such as freeway interchanges.
6. In some situations longer distances between accesses may be required due to site-specific traffic concerns. In these cases Public Works will require longer spacing and/or set the appropriate location based on engineering analysis. An example would be if traffic queuing at an intersection would block the driveway during the peak hour of the design life of the project, staff may require the driveway to be located farther away from the intersection.
7. Land use changes that could result in increased development levels and thus higher traffic levels will be assessed for their impact to current and future traffic volume and flow, and

these impacts must be appropriately mitigated (as determined by the Public Works Director in accordance with applicable standards and practices) in order for the development to be allowed.

8. An access management plan has been developed for a portion of the Wilsonville-Hubbard Hwy near Arndt Road. That plan is hereby incorporated into this plan, and is included as Appendix F of the RTSP. (Note: other access management plans have also been adopted for other specific areas).

### **Roadway Maintenance and Preservation Policies**

The 42 policies in this category encompass a variety of tasks and programs related to preserving the condition and function of the county roadway facilities. They cover such things as pavement management, shoulder and roadside maintenance, hazard abatement, and emergency response. For a complete listing of the policies, please refer to Section 10.2 of the RTSP.

### **Transportation Policies**

This category of policies encompasses the priorities the County has established for the operation of the existing transportation system, the capital improvements needed to enhance the system, the integration of land use and transportation issues, and balancing transportation and community needs. The policy categories include: 1) Transportation System Planning Policies; 2) Resource Allocation Policies; 3) Bicycle, Pedestrian and Public Transportation Policies; 4) Air, Water, Rail, Energy and Pipeline Transportation Policies; 5) Development and Access Policies; and 6) Right-of-Way Policies.

#### **Transportation System Planning Policies**

Transportation system planning policies serve as general guidelines for achieving a safe and efficient transportation system. These policies address transportation priorities for the County and address desired operational characteristics. The policies also provide vision for planning the future transportation system.

1. The general priorities for Marion County with regard to the County Road System are in order of importance:
  - 1) Preservation and maintenance of the existing road system
  - 2) Safety improvements and enhancements
  - 3) Capacity enhancements and growth-related projects
2. The County will evaluate all investments in the transportation system for cost-effectiveness, fiscal responsibility, economic efficiencies, and practicality.

3. The County will re-evaluate, update and adopt design standards and various policies that enhance safety, capacity, and efficient life of the transportation network.
4.
  - a) The County will work with each community to consider the goals and visions of that community in developing and maintaining the transportation system. This will include coordination of the County's transportation plans with their transportation plans. Deviation from a community's desires may occur when addressing issues involving safety, significant added expense, modernization projects, liability, and providing services that are in the best interests of the public.
  - b) Within the urban growth boundary of an incorporated city, Marion County Public Works will apply roadway design standards and criteria in the Transportation System Plan (TSP) adopted by that city, except in cases where in the engineering judgment of the County Public Works Department, it would not be appropriate to do so. In the absence of adopted standards or a TSP by a city, Marion County Public Works will use its own engineering standards and/or judgment to determine the appropriate planning direction or standard to apply.
5. Levels-of-Service considered acceptable in rural areas include:
  - a. LOS D or better with a volume/capacity ratio (v/c) of 0.85 or better for signalized, all-way stop, and roundabout intersections.
  - b. LOS E or better with a volume/capacity ratio (v/c) of 0.90 or better for other unsignalized intersections.
  - c. LOS D or better with a volume/capacity ratio (v/c) of 0.60 or better for road segments.
6. The County will pursue and implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies whenever possible as an alternative to building new transportation facilities (see Sections 8.7 and 10.1 of the RTSP for descriptions of these strategies).
7. To the extent possible, the County envisions a modified grid transportation system in the rural areas (as allowed by geography and demanded by use) that allows all users reasonable access to higher function roads, minimizes out-of-direction travel, delivers reasonable travel times, and in many cases allows circumferential flows around the many incorporated areas within Marion County.
8. The County recognizes the role of State Highways and County Arterials as the backbone of the transportation network. These roads are critical for everyday transportation and serve as critical lifelines in emergency situations. The County will support efforts to enhance and maintain the function of these roads through land use policies, access management strategies, and roadway improvements.
9. The County recognizes that it may be appropriate to consider transfer of jurisdiction between State Highways and County Roads in order to ensure that State Highways

function as regional routes and County Roads function as more localized routes. However, the County will not accept any roads into the County system that do not meet County standards.

10. To encourage tourism, the County supports the concept of Scenic Routes, Tour Routes, and Scenic Byways, and will consider enhancements that preserve or provide scenic or historic values to the transportation system.
11. The County recognizes the importance of facilitating freight movement. With this in mind, the strategic routes designated in Figure 7.1 in the RTSP are also hereby designated freight routes. Effort will be made to facilitate freight movement on freight routes.
12. Effort will be made to reduce conflicts between mobility of freight and livability of communities along these routes.

### **Resource Allocation Policies**

Resource allocation policies provide guidelines for how funds will be spent on transportation related activities. These policies are intended to provide appropriate allocation of resources to address transportation priorities and necessities.

1. Marion County will not spend Public Works funds on activities outside of public rights-of-way. Work on privately maintained roadways or for private entities may be possible under Private Work Orders.
2. County funds expended on Local Access Roads shall be in accordance with ORS 368.031 and shall be documented and justified in a consistent manner. County resources shall not be dedicated to other activities on these roads unless covered by a Private Work Order.
3. If a County road or other facility is damaged or impacted, the County will work to recover repair costs from those responsible for the damage or impact.
4. The County may use its discretion in selecting projects out of the suggested order of priority, if deemed this is in the best interest of the overall transportation system and general public for reasons including safety, time-sensitive availability of additional funds, improved coordination of work, or improved efficiencies.
5. The County will encourage joint projects with the private sector, affected user groups, or individual citizens, if it improves or allows a project on a County roadway to proceed that might otherwise not be accomplished. This participation may be in the form of material and resource contributions, local improvement districts, right-of-way dedications, or other funding sources such as user fees.
6. The County will comply with ORS 366.514 requiring one percent of the funds it receives from the State Highway Fund to be expended on bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

## **Bicycle, Pedestrian and Public Transportation Policies**

Bicycle, pedestrian, and public transportation are important components of the transportation system plan. These policies are intended to ensure that these modes will be considered in the planning and development of transportation facilities, and to help make these modes more viable options for the traveling public.

1. The County will consider the impact County transportation projects have on bicycling and pedestrian activities.
2. All new Arterials and Major Collectors will be constructed with paved shoulders.
3. The County will consider the needs of those individuals who are transportation disadvantaged or disabled when planning or reviewing transportation improvements.
4. The County will encourage and facilitate the ability of transit providers such as the Salem Area Transit District and Chemeketa Area Regional Transportation System (CARTS) to provide services to areas outside of designated urban growth boundaries.
5. To the extent feasible, the County will facilitate the development of Park-and-Ride/Pool lots at strategic locations throughout the county, in coordination with transit providers where appropriate.
6. The County supports efforts to develop off-street multi-use paths or trails (which typically will be used by bicyclists and pedestrians) where appropriate. These paths or trails will be especially encouraged where they connect trip generators and attractors (such as cities and parks) and where they take advantage of existing scenery (such as along scenic rivers) and available resources (such as power lines, old rail lines, along rivers and in existing right-of-way or easements).
7. In order to promote bicycle and pedestrian travel within the cities of Marion County, and recognizing that fast-moving, high-volume, and heavy vehicular traffic is detrimental to the 'walkability' and 'bikeability' of a city, the County generally supports efforts to divert regional traffic from flowing through the 'downtown' of a city. This may be through simple measures such as signing and traffic control, moderate measures such as improvement of existing roadways, or more complex measures such as the provision of new roadways or bypasses. The County is especially supportive of such efforts when the affected city is a major proponent of these measures.

## **Air, Rail, Water, Energy and Pipeline Transportation Policies**

These policies address air, rail, water, energy, and pipeline transportation in the County. These modes are an important part of the existing and future transportation network in terms of moving freight, passengers, services and information in the County.

1. Airports and airstrips shall be located in areas that are safe for air operations and should be compatible with surrounding uses.
2. The County should review and take appropriate actions to adopt State master plans for public airports in Marion County.
3. The County will adopt appropriate provisions (including plans, ordinances and intergovernmental agreements) to protect the public airports from incompatible structures and uses. These provisions will be consistent with Federal Aviation Administration guidelines.
4. The County will discourage noise sensitive uses from locating in close proximity to public airports.
5. The County will encourage the establishment of cost-effective passenger and commuter rail service in the Willamette Valley.
6. The County generally supports development of new or expanded freight rail service that would improve the efficiency of freight movement, as long as its impacts can be appropriately addressed.
7. The County supports efforts to evaluate, maintain or develop the capability of the Willamette River as a navigable waterway and recreational area.
8. The County will encourage the continued use of underground pipelines and telecommunication lines that minimize the need for surface shipping and that are compatible with established land uses.
9. The County encourages cooperation between energy and utility companies for the more efficient provision of energy and utilities.
10. The County encourages (and often requires) joint use of trenches by different utilities where it would be safe and practical to do so.
11. The County generally supports measures that conserve the amount of energy resources used for transportation in and through the County.

### **Development and Access Policies**

Development and access policies provide guidelines for linking transportation and land use in an attempt to provide suitable transportation facilities while protecting and preserving the agricultural and rural nature of the County. The policies also outline right-of-way and roadway improvement requirements for new developments in the County.



These policies are particularly important because private developers, often through the subdivision process, are constructing most new Local roads, and many of the projects that widen or enhance Arterials and Collectors.

1. Additional interchanges (access points) on Interstate 5 from the northern County line to the Chemawa Interchange, and from the Sunnyside Interchange to the southern County line will be discouraged (except for near Woodburn – see RTSP Chapter 8), unless it can be shown through a comprehensive study and supported by the County that a new interchange is appropriate for regional access to the Interstate system.
2. Transportation facilities should be developed and maintained in such a manner as to minimize negative impact to valuable soil, timber, water, scenic, or cultural resources.
3. The County will consider and strive to minimize the negative impacts to surrounding land uses and communities in the selection and implementation of transportation projects.
4. Development proposals and changes in land use designations shall conform to any sub-area management plans created or adopted by Marion County.
5. The County will discourage sign proliferation in rural areas, including billboard and sign advertising.
6. Rural residential development adjacent to or near major roadways should be designed to minimize adverse effects of traffic noise, traffic volume and other transportation-related impacts.
7. To prevent exceeding the function and capacity of any component of the transportation system, the County will consider roadway functional classification, capacity and current conditions as primary criteria for proposed changes in land use designations and proposed land use developments. In addition, present and anticipated safety issues shall also be significant criteria.
8. The County shall review land use actions, development proposals and large transportation projects in the region for impacts to the transportation system and facilities. If the impacts are deemed significant by the County and cannot be mitigated to the County's satisfaction, the action shall be denied or modified until the impacts are acceptable. The County shall also consider the impact these actions have on affected communities and urban areas.
9. Access to developments must be from roadways with appropriate Functional Classifications and improved to appropriate standards. (Table 10-3 in the RTSP shows the maximum trip generation for new or expanded developments based on the Functional Classification and character of the roadway from which it gains access.)
10. a) The number of access points on arterial and major collector roadways shall be kept to a minimum to reduce the interruption to traffic flow and to promote safety. All new

- or expanded-use accesses must meet the access management standards in the RTSP (see Section 10.1.3).
- b) If a property is partitioned, all platted parcels of that property should use one common access to the road system.
  - c) Loop driveways are discouraged.
11.
    - a.) Direct access to arterials from adjacent parcels should not be allowed if alternative access is available or can be made available.
    - b) If a parcel has access options onto more than one roadway, the access should be derived from the road with the lower functional class, and if of the same functional class, the road with the lower traffic volume and fewer potential conflicts.
    - c) Likewise, where property abuts both a county or public use road and a State highway, the preferred access will be onto the county or public use road (unless the roads' functional classification would indicate otherwise).
  12. All new or modified accesses to an arterial shall be paved to a minimum width of 20 feet for a typical vehicle length (or longer if necessary) from the edge of the roadway to control drainage and prevent rock and other debris from accumulating on the Arterial.
  13.
    - a) To minimize and eliminate hazards along public roadways, the County shall review and approve all proposed driveways and accesses (including all measurable access modifications and significant increases in use of an access) to County roads; and to local access roads as resources allow.
    - b) Accesses shall be located at the safest site possible and shall meet the stopping sight distance requirements specified in Marion County's design standards. Actions required to obtain these stopping sight distances shall be required as a condition of approval of the access permit.
    - c) Accesses should be consolidated, whenever feasible, to minimize the number of access points.
  14. Driveways, internal circulation areas and parking areas shall be designed so that traffic will not back onto arterials or major collectors or any other facility where such conditions would create a hazard.
  15. Where there are several adjacent parcels with narrow frontages or where sight distance is inadequate, a frontage road or combined driveway may be required.
  16. Access to new State and large County parks should be provided by roads of minor collector or higher functional classification.
  17.
    - a) Appropriate notice of comment periods or public hearings shall be mailed to ODOT for any property requesting access to a State highway and any land use change or development within 500 feet of a State highway, or 1320 feet of an interchange.
    - b) The Oregon Department of Aviation shall be notified of any development within 500 feet of a public use airport.

18. If land to be subdivided, rezoned or partitioned will cause the termination of a roadway or borders a roadway right-of-way of less than standard width, the applicant shall dedicate sufficient land to provide for a cul-de-sac or to increase the half (or halves) of right-of-way bordering this land to one-half of the standard width.
19.
  - a) New private roadways (those on private property and maintained with private funds) shall not be approved as access to more than four parcels except in Planned Unit Developments.
  - b) When private roadways are approved as part of a subdivision or planned development, the roadways shall be constructed and completed to County standards prior to the recording of the plat. The developer shall certify in writing that the roadways were constructed to County standards.
  - c) The maintenance of privately owned roads is neither the responsibility nor liability of the County.
  - d) The property owner shall provide a recorded road maintenance agreement for all new development accessing private roads prior to plat approval.
20. Building permits for new home sites on vacant parcels shall not be approved on previously established private roads serving four or more dwellings unless no other means of providing access to the property is available and appropriate land use approvals are obtained. When these approvals are granted, the applicants shall be required to sign and record an agreement to participate in any future road improvement agreements and/or maintenance agreements.
21. No new local access roads (as defined in ORS 368.001) shall be created in Marion County.
22. New public streets and public street improvements shall be developed to County adopted standards and the development will not be issued occupancy permits or final inspection until these streets have been constructed and the Public Works Department has accepted their design and construction.
23. On a Local Access Road with four or more existing parcels (not counting parcels with frontage on County roadways), no new parcels shall be created that would have access to the road unless the road is improved to County standards.
24. On a Local Access Road with fewer than four legally created parcels (not counting parcels with frontage on County roadways), new parcels may be allowed access to the road as long as the total number of parcels receiving access does not exceed four.
25. All new developments shall be reviewed to ensure that they have an adequate stormwater system. Specific requirements can be found in Marion County's Engineering Standards (or subsequent document).
26. Large developments are discouraged on dead-end or no-outlet roads.

## **Right-Of-Way Policies**

There is a significant amount of public right-of-way in Marion County. Much of it is occupied by roads, while some remain undeveloped. Policies with respect to use of this public right-of-way include:

1. To the extent possible, the County will utilize existing facilities and rights-of-way as the foundation for those intra- and inter-county facilities needed to accommodate anticipated growth and facilitate movement.
2. New transportation facilities of all types should use existing rights-of-way to the extent possible to minimize disruption to existing land use.
3. The development of unopened, dedicated public rights-of-way will be reviewed by the County for consistency with land use and other policies. When opening of the road is appropriate, a permit will be required and adequate roadway development standards shall be met.
4. The County will not abandon or vacate public rights-of-way unless it has been determined beyond reasonable question that it is in the best interest of the general public to not ever have the right-of-way available to the general public for use as a roadway, bicycle/pedestrian path, or any other use.
5. The County will restrict use of public rights-of-way (such as through posted restrictions or gates), roadways and structures to a user or group of users, only if it is deemed appropriate for purposes of safety, roadway preservation, or other engineering reasons.
6. A Special Setback of 30 feet from the existing roadway centerline exists for all County roads unless a larger Special Setback is designated through another policy.

## **Future Evaluation Of Transportation Issues**

This section of the RTSP outlines the guidelines for updating of the RTSP and developing new projects in the future. These guidelines ensure that the plan can easily be updated as new information becomes available and new issues arise.

## **FINANCING PLAN**

The RTSP describes how the County intends to fund the projects recommended in the plan. The cost to fund the rural 20-year recommended improvements identified in the 2005 update is estimated to be \$104 million. However, this represents only part of the total cost for all of the transportation needs identified. The cost to address the remaining rural needs is estimated to be \$25 million, and the total urban needs are anticipated to exceed \$100 million. The total cost to address these needs averages about \$11 million per year whereas we have available funding of only \$1 million per year.

In accordance with the Transportation Planning Rule, the RTSP clearly identifies those projects that reasonably can be funded within 20 years. Projects which are needed but cannot be funded, and the growth and development they will ultimately support, may not be able to occur unless additional funding is obtained or projects are included as conditions of development.

### **SUB-AREA PLANS**

There are a number of locations in the rural County for which the high traffic volumes, accelerated levels of development, and other unique conditions necessitate more detailed transportation planning. For three of these, sub-area plans have been developed which are designed to provide guidance and requirements to property owners and developers who have an interest in how these areas develop. Sub-area plans are included for the Brooks Interchange Area, the Aurora/Donald (Fargo) Interchange Area, and for Cordon Road from State Street to Auburn Road. Details of these plans can be found in Chapter 12 of the RTSP. Additional sub-area plans may be added as the need arises.

### **LONG-TERM ISSUES**

The County has identified possible long-term issues and strategies beyond the 20-year timeframe. Although the long-term vision is still to maintain the concept of facilitating mobility and safety throughout the county, several issues may need to be looked at to meet the long-range transportation needs of the County. These issues are detailed in the RTSP and include:

1. Peripheral Routes and Strategic Corridors
2. Passenger Rail Service with Supporting Access Network
3. Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Strategies
4. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies
5. Additional Connections to Interstate 5 and Highway 22
6. Additional Crossings of the Willamette River
7. Changing Land Use and Transportation Issues.

The purpose of identifying these long-term issues is to initiate discussion about the future of the transportation system beyond the 20-year timeframe.