



TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #10- Draft

DATE: April 21, 2016

TO: Project Management Team

FROM: Scott Mansur, Kevin Chewuk, and Jordin Ketelsen, DKS Associates

SUBJECT: **Transportation Solutions Alternatives Package (Task 7.1)**

P11086-018

The purpose of this memorandum is to document the origins of the draft solution alternatives as well as provide greater detail for each alternative (project). Attached is a solution alternatives package that could reasonably meet the identified transportation needs of the TSP Update. This package used the 2004 Lane County Transportation System Plan (TSP) project list as a base and was further developed through public input and the technical analysis documented in Technical Memorandums 4 and 7; *Existing Transportation Conditions and Future Transportation Conditions and Needs*.^{1,2} Public input was solicited and provided through many opportunities including Technical and Stakeholder Advisory Groups; Interactive Web Comment Map; Public Events in Oakridge, Florence, Creswell, Eugene, and Springfield; Lane County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

A roadway health assessment was completed for most roadways within the county and analyzed safety, pavement conditions, congestion, and road geometry and provided each roadway segment with a “good,” “fair,” or “poor” score for overall roadway health. Any roadway that received a “poor” score based on the assessment was included in the attached package, along with a recommendation for addressing the condition. Roadways with a high number (i.e. greater than statewide averages for similar facilities) of fatal and severe injury collisions were also included, along with specific systemic measures (e.g. delineators, rumble strips, etc.) that have proven collision reduction benefits.

With regard to operational performance and system capacity, only four of the study intersections are projected to fail within the 20-year planning horizon (through the year 2036). Those intersections are also included in the attached list, along with solutions, which do not necessitate an alternative mobility standard. The lack of capacity issues in rural Lane County (the TSP does not include roads within city urban growth boundaries) means that the solution

¹ *Existing Transportation Conditions*, DKS Associates, September 2, 2014.

² *Future Transportation Conditions and Needs*, DKS Associates, April 4, 2016.

set does not necessitate traffic demand management strategies (i.e. to reduce the travel demand of single-occupancy vehicles). The need for additional transportation options to the single-occupancy vehicle (i.e. bicycle and pedestrian amenities and rural transit service) was a common theme expressed throughout the public outreach process.

The predominant need expressed through the public outreach process was for additional transportation options for rural residents (i.e. bicycle and pedestrian amenities and rural transit service). In response to that need, the attached alternative solutions list includes recommendations for widening the shoulders of several rural roadways, especially those of high-volume or designated bicycle routes. All off-road paths are identified as future studies to establish preferred alignments. Additionally, the development of a countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is recommended. As for rural transit service, Lane County facilitated conversations between stakeholders and transit service providers to enable those groups to further explore options for expanding rural transit service beyond the traditional approach that relies on payroll taxes.

The secondary need expressed through the public outreach process was for improved transportation safety. Many of the safety concerns related to people wanting to walk or bicycle, but feeling unsafe to do so. Much of the recommended shoulder widening improves the safety of all modes of travel, by providing the following functions: a recovery area to accommodate for driver error, a pull over area for distressed vehicles or for people needing to respond to an urgent cell phone call, or for enforcement staff needing to radar and issue citations.

Lane County received comments regarding additional needs and concerns on ODOT facilities, such as the need for better bicycle amenities along Hwy 58, Hwy 99, Hwy 101, Hwy 126, and Territorial Highway, etc. Those comments have been forwarded to ODOT staff for further consideration. The ODOT projects are shown on the attached list for reference only. These projects are ones that have already been planned or programmed by ODOT.

With regard to other needs, it is noted that the Goshen area was specifically included in the technical analysis to determine the transportation needs to implement the expanded industrial uses allowed by the GREAT Plan. Four study intersections were analyzed in the Goshen area for both existing and future conditions and the existing infrastructure was found to be adequate for the anticipated growth in the area through the horizon year.

NEXT STEPS

The attached solution set will be used to develop the project list for the updated Lane County TSP. The solution set will be discussed with the community through a second series of public outreach in May. Furthermore, the project management team will identify any fatal flaws to a potential project such as environmental impacts and engineering and financial feasibility. The solutions will then be evaluated against evaluation criteria, which are based on the ten goals

that have been developed for the updated TSP.³ The expectation is that these goals should act as guides for developing projects within the TSP. Policies provide manageable stepping stones for achieving the TSP’s overall vision and goals.

A prioritized list of “County” projects (where the County is assumed to be the primary contributor of funding) that is constrained to a 20-year funding estimate will be provided in Technical Memorandum #11 (Transportation System Recommendations). Technical Memorandum #11 will also provide a prioritized list of “State” projects that the County could use to make decisions for applying for grants or other funding mechanisms. The County can, however, choose to provide funds to help support State projects—thus, expediting the timeline on those projects the County would like prioritized. While there may be “Lane Transit District” projects that the TSP would like prioritized in the next 20 years, these decisions are ultimately up to that agency.

³ For more information regarding the development of the 10 goals and associated policies, see Technical Memorandum #4: *Goals and Policies* and the subsequent restructuring provided in the 7/1/15 PMT memo, which was supported by the TAC on 8/4/15. The Planning Commission recommended the policies be further streamlined on 10/20/15 and the Board of County Commissioners recommended edits on 2/9/16.