Other Community Approaches for Consideration

Common Policy Discussion Pieces amongst All

- Prioritization of Mobility within broader goals
- Street design/functional classification
- Access management
- Connectivity
- Complete streets
- Safety – vision zero
- Mode split targets

Dependencies in Code/Implementation

- Complete street standards/functional class
- Traffic Impact Analysis standards
- Level of Service (LOS) standards & Mobility Targets
- Safety and corridor approach
- Site design/land use
- Access management and street connectivity
- Prioritization of investment decisions
- Management of ROW/curb to curb
- Parking management
- Economic development
- Vision zero
- Local street speed limitations
- Performance monitoring

Policies Highlighted Herein:

- Eugene TSP (pages 2 – 4)
- Bellingham, WA 2016 Multimodal Transportation Plan (page 4)
- Boulder, CO Transportation Master Plan (page 5)
- City of Portland Development Code (page 5)
- Seattle Comprehensive Transportation Plan (page 6)
- Vancouver BC Transportation 2040 Plan (page 6)
- City of Bend Development Code for Assessing Impacts (pages 7 – 8)

Eugene TSP Policies related to Mobility & Access[1]

(Note: Abbreviated for Discussion Purposes – policies tie mobility to complete streets, connectivity, balancing modal needs, safety and intersection treatments)

1. Design, construct, maintain, and operate all streets to provide comprehensive and integrated transportation networks that serve people of all ages and abilities, promote commerce, and support the comprehensive land use plan's vision for growth and development in a responsible and efficient manner. A "complete street" allows safe travel for automobiles and emergency responders, bicycles, walking, transit, and freight. In addition to fulfilling a street's basic transportation functions and providing access to properties, streets and sidewalks should be designed to be attractive, safe, accessible, sustainable, and healthy components of the City's environment.
2. Improve connectivity and address deficiencies in the street network, both inside the Urban Growth Boundary and connecting to neighboring cities, with the understanding that connectivity needs may differ based on an area's planned land uses (*e.g.*, large lot industrial areas may have different needs than residential areas).
3. Improve travel time reliability between key origins and destinations for transit, regional freight movement, and other trips for which on-time arrivals are important.
4. Facilitate prompt emergency responses. Ensure that fire and emergency response routes remain passable by design.
5. Plan for, design and construct or reconstruct streets to achieve consistency between motorists' speeds and target speed limits. Use motor vehicle Level of Service (LOS) standards to evaluate acceptable and reliable vehicular performance on the City's and County's local, collector and arterial streets. Recognize ODOT's mobility targets (based on volume to capacity or V/C) for state facilities. Because mobility targets from the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) are applied on state facilities, the City will seek Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) amendment of the OHP to include alternative mobility targets at the locations identified in the local standards.
6. Continually optimize the efficiency of the transportation system through transportation system management (TSM) improvements, connectivity improvements, multimodal improvements, parking management and supply, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, in combination with the projects identified in this TSP.
7. Facilitate efficient access for goods, employees, and customers to and from employment, commercial, and industrial lands, including freight access to designated freight routes, highways, rail yard, and the Eugene Airport. Increase multimodal access for employees to employment centers.
8. Prior to moving forward with a capital project including Complete Street Upgrades of Existing Streets and in addition to conducting public engagement activities, staff will also consider a neighborhood's character (the built and natural environment) and other elements of community context when designing the project.

Actions for Roadway Policies

A. Amend the City's adopted Traffic Impact Analysis code and administrative rule provisions to expand the measurement of a proposed development's traffic impacts beyond the level of

[1] https://www.eugene-or.gov/3941/Transportation-System-Plan

service measurement and, correspondingly, expand potential mitigation measures beyond measures that address only vehicular delay.

B. Amend the Traffic Impact Analysis provisions to require a review of safety at intersections through a comparison of the actual crash rate experienced during the past 3-5 years versus the expected crash rate for similar facilities to determine whether improvements may be needed.

C. Require all developments and employers of a certain size and type to prepare, implement and monitor Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plans.

Potential Actions for Roadway and Parking Policies

D. Consider roundabouts for new development in any situation where capacity, congestion, delay, crash history, or turning conflicts would otherwise support traffic signal installation. Roundabouts should be actively considered for retrofit at existing signal locations when major reconstruction is planned.

E. Articulate a process for implementing the complete streets policy, including responsibilities for decision making, public review, opportunities for appeals of decisions, the means of documenting and justifying decisions, and the collection and reporting of data that allows monitoring the effects of street design changes over time.

F. Update the Eugene *Design Standards and Guidelines for Eugene Streets, Sidewalks, Bikeways and Accessways* to implement the "complete streets policy" by:

- Recognizing these attributes as integral parts of the planning, design, and programming for public streets and rights-of-way:
  - The safety for those traveling in the public right-of-way, including the most vulnerable people of all ages and abilities.
  - The convenience of all users of the transportation system.
  - The importance of making walking and biking the most efficient, convenient, safe, and comfortable method of travel for trips of up to half a mile and up to 2 miles, respectively.
  - Adopted plans that state a preference for a mode of travel in a specific location, such as transit… emergency services … freight… and bicycles.
  - Balancing traffic flow with the street experience, safety, and needs of other users within the streetscape.
- Articulating circumstances that may require that the complete streets policy be achieved incrementally through a sequential series of smaller improvements rather than by incorporating all elements into a single construction project.
- Articulating a process for determining when conditions inherent to a specific project may make application of the complete streets policy difficult or superfluous, such as when all modes of travel are adequately served in an area by separate, complementary networks, or where a mode of travel is prohibited.

G. Work with developers to complete the major street network as shown in the Arterial and Collector Street Map. The City will fund its share of these improvements through System Development Charges and other funding sources.

H. Review and update as necessary the Eugene Code and policies for access management and street connectivity standards to enhance safety and operational efficiency for all modes of travel on streets and sidewalks.

I. Explore methods of describing multimodal levels of service that address the City's desire for a safe and convenient multimodal transportation system.
J. Work with ODOT to seek alternative mobility targets that align with City policies.
K. Expand the definition of LOS to include volume-to-capacity ratio, queuing, and traffic control changes.

Bellingham Mobility Policy[2]

Policy Statement T-2: Balance land use efficiency with transportation safety and mobility by prioritizing street connectivity within the City limits, mobility for people and goods, and high occupancy vehicles over single-occupancy vehicles (SOVs).

Implementation strategies include:

- Recognize that peak hour vehicle traffic congestion is to be expected in higher density urban and commercial areas, as well as entry/exit points to Bellingham;
- Prioritize safety and connectivity improvements for all modes of transport over improvements focused solely on reducing vehicle traffic congestion;
- Continue to work with WTA to strategically employ transit as a key high occupancy mode of transportation between the City's employment, education, parks and recreation, shopping, and entertainment centers and residential concentrations in Whatcom County; and
- Promote active nonmotorized forms of transportation over motorized forms of transportation to improve public health and minimize environmental impacts.

[2] https://www.cob.org/Documents/planning/comprehensive-plan/2016-multimodal-transportation.pdf

BOULDER TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN[3]

Investment Policies

The city shall generally give priority to transportation investments as follows:

- Highest priority - system operations, maintenance and travel safety;
- Next priority – operational efficiency improvements and enhancement of the transit, pedestrian and bicycle system;
- Next lowest priority - quality of life, such as sound walls and traffic mitigation; and
- Lowest priority - auto capacity additions (new lanes and interchanges).

** Within each priority level, all items are given equal weight. Investment in modal enhancements will be integrated between all modes, focused in the designated multimodal corridors, and prioritized by the ranked multimodal corridor segments.*

As the street network is the primary infrastructure for all modes, it will be managed and expanded to balance its use by all the modes. Roadway capacity will not be added at the expense of the non-auto modes.

The city's transportation system includes all the modes and the resources needed for the sustainable operation of the system.

Any consideration of the share of system funding allocated to future growth will be based on this system.

City of Portland Development Code (on-balancing test)[4]

A. The transportation system must be capable of supporting the proposed development in addition to the existing uses in the area. Evaluation factors include safety, street capacity, level of service, connectivity, transit availability, availability of pedestrian and bicycle networks, on-street parking impacts, access restrictions, neighborhood impacts, impacts on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation. Evaluation factors may be balanced; a finding of failure in one or more factors may be acceptable if the failure is not a result of the proposed development, and any additional impacts on the system from the proposed development are mitigated as required by 33.641.020.B.

B. Measures proportional to the impacts of the proposed use are proposed to mitigate on- and off-site transportation impacts. Measures may include transportation improvements to on-site circulation, public street dedication and improvement, private street improvements, intersection improvements, signal or other traffic management improvements, additional transportation and parking demand management actions, street crossing improvements, improvements to the local pedestrian and bicycle networks, and transit improvements.

[3] https://www-static.bouldercolorado.gov/docs/transportation-master-plan-tmp-2014-1-201408271459.pdf?_ga=2.23893176.30392502.1549481655-504334290.1548782435

[4] https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/53447

Seattle Comprehensive Plan Transportation Plan Policies[5]

T2.7 Prioritize mobility needs in the street right-of-way based on the recommended networks and facilities identified in the respective modal plans. Within the travelway, prioritize space to address safety concerns, network connectivity of modal plans and general purpose travel.

Vancouver BC Transportation 2040 Transportation Policies[6]

Uses "Distance driven" as a measure of performance

Applicable Motor Vehicle Policies include:

- M1 Road Network
    - M1.1 Optimize network operations to manage congestion impacts
    - M1.2 Consider impacts to transit, commercial vehicles, and general traffic flow prior to reallocating road space
    - M1.3 Manage traffic to improve safety and neighborhood livability

[5] http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/OPCD/OngoingInitiatives/SeattlesComprehensivePlan/CouncilAdopted2018_CitywidePlanning.pdf

[6] https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/Transportation_2040_Plan_as_adopted_by_Council.pdf

Current Bend Development Code for Assessing Impacts[7]

4.7.300 Process

Step 4. If no significant impacts are identified, the applicant may submit a development application including the Transportation Impact Analysis and may also have to pay a proportionate share contribution if required under BDC 4.7.700, Proportionate Share Contribution. Development with significant impacts will be required to propose mitigation in compliance with BDC 4.7.600, Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures, as part of the development application and may also have to pay a proportionate share contribution if required under BDC 4.7.700, Proportionate Share Contribution. If mitigation measures have been determined for any significant impacts, then the applicant must include the Transportation Impact Analysis with the mitigation measures identified as part of a development application.

4.7.500 Transportation Impact Analysis.

1. Study Area. The study area must include all site access and adjacent roadways and intersections. The study area must also include all off-site major intersections impacted by 15 or more peak-hour vehicle trips per lane group within one mile of the site. The City Engineer must approve the defined study area prior to commencement of the Transportation Impact Analysis. The City Engineer may choose to waive the study of certain intersections if deemed unnecessary.

d. Projects are considered to have significant impacts on the arterial-collector system for purposes of BDC 4.7.600 as identified below:

i. Two-Way Stop Control. Average delay for the critical lane group for approaches of an arterial or collector to another arterial or collector with greater than 100 peak hour trips is greater than or equal to 50 seconds during the peak hour;

ii. All-Way Stop Control. Average delay for the collector to collector and higher order intersection as a whole is greater than or equal to 80 seconds during the peak hour;

iii. If the ninety-fifth percentile queue exceeds the existing available storage or is projected to block nearby critical system elements such as adjacent traffic signals, roundabouts, or at-grade rail crossings, or such that line of sight safety issues are identifiable; or

iv. For signalized and roundabout collector to collector and higher order intersections under the jurisdiction of the City, the volume-to-capacity ratio for the intersection as a whole is greater than or equal to 1.0 during the peak hour.

e. Intersections under ODOT Jurisdiction. In addition to the City operations standards, intersections on ODOT facilities will also be required to comply with ODOT mobility targets. Coordination with ODOT is required in the study process.

4.7.600 Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures

B. Preparation. Prior to proposing mitigation, the applicant's engineer shall consult with the City Engineer regarding potential mitigation options. The proposed mitigation and a concept-level drawing of the final intersection form must be prepared and submitted prior to a development application being deemed complete, unless approved otherwise by the City Engineer.

C. Intersection Operation Standards. If the Transportation Impact Analysis shows that the operation standards at the intersection will be exceeded or if the intersection already exceeds the standards, the applicant will be required to provide mitigation measures in compliance with subsection (F) of this section impacts.

[7] https://www.codepublishing.com/OR/Bend/html/BendDC04/BendDC0407.html

D. Unique Situations.

1. Development proposals within Master Planned Developments or Special Planned Areas, as described in BDC Chapter 4.5, Master Planning and Development Alternatives, where a Transportation Mitigation Plan has been approved, may exceed the operation standards at affected intersections as long as the proposed development is consistent with the approved Transportation Mitigation Plan.

2. Widening to accommodate additional travel lanes will not be permitted in the following situations:

a. Intersections and streets that are already constructed consistent with the Bend Urban Area Transportation System Plan (TSP) including streets identified by the TSP as "not being authorized for lane expansion";

b. Intersections and streets located within or directly adjoining the City's Central Business District or historic district;

c. Where no physical mitigation is available to improve intersection operations to the performance standard; or

d. Where improvements may result in unacceptable tradeoffs to other modes of travel.

F. Mitigation Measures. Mitigation measures must consider all users and include all or a combination of the following mitigation measures as approved at the discretion of the City Engineer, to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development:

1. Construct Transportation Mitigation.

c. Intersection improvements must improve corridor operations in terms of progression and reduced corridor delay, and must be shown to cause no significant adverse impact to the corridor during integrated corridor operations.

e. Intersection and street improvements must balance operations and safety for all modes of travel. Walking and biking accommodations must be considered as part of any improvement.

5. Payment in Lieu of Construction. If infrastructure construction is required above, the City may elect to accept a payment in an amount equal to the cost estimated by the City for the design, right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation and construction cost of the improvements in lieu of actual construction. The City will use these funds on the impacted corridor to improve multi-modal safety, operations and to relieve congestion. Once the City accepts a payment in lieu of construction, the proposed development may proceed even if the impact of the proposed development causes the operation standards to be exceeded.

6. Alternate Location Mitigation. Mitigation strategies at alternative locations or affecting alternative modes of travel may be proposed by the applicant and may be accepted by the City Engineer. At a minimum, the proposed improvements should meet the following criteria:

a. The overall improvements proposed should be proportional to the impacts created by the application;

b. The proposed improvement strategies must address a critical need or issue within the study area such as safety, connectivity, system capacity, and parallel routes;

c. The locations proposed for improvement must be within the study area;

d. The proposed improvements must not already be, or be in the process of being, a condition of approval of another development; and

e. All applicable analysis requirements for the primary locations(s) shall apply to the analysis of the alternative location(s).

7. Suspend the Mobility Standard. The City Manager may suspend the mobility standard for a particular intersection or series of intersections under the City's jurisdiction when the intersection(s) may be in a condition that interim mitigation is not practical…The City Manager will issue a written statement providing the duration and reason for the suspension of the mobility standard, and will maintain a list of all intersections where the mobility standard has been suspended. Suspending the mobility standard is not a limited land use decision or a land use decision.