

TITLE 9

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER 907

TRANSPORTATION PLAN CODE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section Title

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

- 907.010 Title
- 907.020 Amendments to *Comp Plan*
- 907.030 Transportation plan; contents

II. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

- 907.100 Transportation planning; elements
- 907.110 Land use issues
- 907.120 Safety issues
- 907.130 Environmental, economic and social issues
- 907.140 Funding

III. COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

- 907.200 Background
- 907.210 Coordination, continued planning, and notification
- 907.230 Transportation Plan implementation
- 907.240 Exceptions for transportation improvements on rural lands
- 907.250 Mitigation and conditions on project development

IV. ROAD NETWORK POLICIES

- 907.300 General road network
- 907.310 Functional classification and access management
- 907.320 Pavement management
- 907.330 Pavement of gravel roads
- 907.340 Level of service
- 907.350 Capacity
- 907.360 Bridges
- 907.370 Transportation projects; road network
- 907.394 Local road improvement

V. RAIL NETWORK POLICIES

- 907.410 Intermodal connections

- 907.420 Rail abandonment

VI. DEMAND MANAGEMENT POLICIES

- 907.500 General demand management

VII. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

- 907.600 Transportation disadvantaged

VIII. AIR TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

- 907.700 General air transportation
- 907.710 Lebanon Airport
- 907.720 Regional Airport
- 907.730 Policy statements

IX. BICYCLING

- 907.800 Subchapter title
- 907.805 Background viewpoint
- 907.810 Purposes of the Bicycling Plan
- 907.820 Oregon's Transportation Planning Rule
- 907.830 Preparation of the Bicycling Plan
- 907.840 Inventory of facilities
- 907.850 General policies
- 907.860 Bikeway designation guidelines
- 907.865 Bikeway prioritization guidelines
- 907.870 Bicycle parking
- 907.875 Bicycling safety
- 907.880 Prioritization of funding
- 907.890 Plan review

X. OTHER TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

- 907.900 Issues to be addressed

Statutory References and Other Authorities

Legislative History of Chapter 907

Appendix A — Functional Classification of Linn County Roads

Appendix B — Bikeway Project Priority List

- (1) Projects Projected to Be Completed Within 10 Years
 - (2) Projects Projected to Be Completed After Ten Years
-
-

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

907.010 Title

This Chapter, LCC 907.010 to 907.900, shall be known and may be cited as the “Linn County Transportation Plan Code” or simply as the “Transportation Plan Code.”

[Adopted 99-190 eff 5/19/99]

907.020 Amendments to *Comp Plan*

(A) In 1980, Linn County developed a *Comprehensive Plan* for the County which included a transportation planning section.

(1) However, the transportation section of the *Comprehensive Plan* was developed at a time when transportation issues were not as significant as they are today. The population growth that both Linn County and Oregon have been experiencing has given transportation issues and transportation planning a new prominence and importance.

(2) In addition, the State has adopted a new rule, the Transportation Planning Rule, which mandates linking of transportation and land use planning.

(B) In 1993, the Linn County Board of Commissioners directed the Planning and Building Department to begin a comprehensive study of the transportation facilities in Linn County and to prepare a background report and other documents leading to the eventual adoption of a Linn County Transportation Plan as an amendment to the Linn County *Comprehensive Plan*.

(C) The Linn County Planning and Building Department began work on the Transportation Plan in June of 1993. The planning process included:

(1) preparation of the Background Document and preliminary policies;

(2) review of Background Document and preliminary policies by the Board of Commissioners and the Planning Commission;

(3) preparation of a preliminary draft of the Transportation Plan;

(4) public meetings for comment on the draft Plan;

(5) preparation of the draft Plan; and
(6) official adoption of the Transportation Plan.

(D) The Background Document contains a general description of all the transportation facilities in the County and a discussion of the major issues surrounding those facilities. It includes maps and statistical information necessary to make a preliminary evaluation of issues and help in the development of County transportation policy.

(E) The Transportation Plan contains brief background descriptions of facilities and issues followed by the complete list of adopted County transportation policies. In addition, sections of the Plan list and prioritize proposed transportation projects.

(F) Planning is a public process designed to foster the public good. As such, it is important for the citizens of Linn County to be able to express their concerns and ideas on the direction they would like to see transportation facilities take as we move into the 21st century. Therefore, after preliminary staff work on the Background Document and draft policies was completed, the Linn County Planning Commission sought public input through advertised public hearings. Citizens were asked to comment on the document, raise issues of importance, and suggest policies and goals for the County. Armed with this public input, the Board, the Planning Commission, and Planning staff formulated this final set of policies. During this period cities in the County, neighboring counties and cities, and state agencies including the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Department of Land Conservation and Development were given opportunities to comment on the plan. After public hearings held by the Linn County Board of Commissioners were completed, this plan was adopted as part of the Linn County *Comprehensive Plan*.

(G) *Planning Period*. This plan is a 20 year plan and based on economic growth projections, population projections and anticipated transportation needs for that period.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; and 99-190 eff 5/19/99]

907.030 Transportation plan; contents

(A) *What is in the Transportation Plan?* The transportation plan contains:

- (1) transportation facility goals and policies;
- (2) goals, policies and procedures concerning improvement and development of transportation facilities;
- (3) goals, policies and procedures concerning relationships between land use and transportation facilities;
- (4) a list of proposed transportation projects concerning realignment and /or improvement of various curves, intersections and bridges in the County;
- (5) a list of State projects that are part of the State Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and projects that the County would like to see included in future TIPs;
- (6) feasibility studies the County would like to see accomplished during the planning period;
- (7) new programs the County wishes to institute during the planning period; and
- (8) projects, ideas, improvements and innovations that the County supports.

(B) The plan does not include transportation projects other than road and bridge projects as the County is currently not planning on developing any other types of transportation projects. However, the County is interested in pursuing a number of studies to explore the feasibility of expanded transit service (both bus and rail) and a regional airport.

(C) This plan does not include a bicycle and pedestrian facilities plan. The Linn County Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Plan is being developed by the Linn County Bicycle Advisory Committee, the Planning and Building Department, and the Road Department and will be adopted at a later date.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

II. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

907.100 Transportation planning; elements

(A) *Background.* Linn County currently has a multimodal transportation system. In other words it is a transportation system that includes many different means of travel. The elements of the system include a highway and road network, a rail network, public and private airports, a bus system, pipeline transport and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. All of these various elements serve important functions within the County and service important population groups including residents, businesses, industry, agriculture, forestry, mining, recreational users, freight transporters, out-of-county commuters, schools, police, fire, ambulance and emergency services. Continued support for these diverse user communities and modes of transport is an important and ongoing concern of the County as it considers how best to maintain and enhance the transportation system.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) Linn County supports a transportation system that:

- (a) furnishes efficient movement for Linn County residents, businesses and other users;
- (b) facilitates the flow of goods and services so as to strengthen the local and regional economy;
- (c) adequately serves the needs of agricultural and forest enterprises; and
- (d) maintains and supports multi-modal transportation opportunities.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County that an integrated transportation system, which accommodates a variety of travel modes and demand management programs, be maintained and promoted. It is the policy of Linn County to:

- (a) consider all modes of transportation including highways and roads, public transit, air, rail, bicycling, walking and telecommunication, where needed and economically feasible, when making transportation decisions;

(b) consider carpooling, van-pooling, telecommuting and staggered work shifts as alternatives for reducing congestion when making transportation decisions;

(c) avoid total reliance on any one mode of transportation and support other modes of travel besides the automobile;

(d) reduce auto reliance through providing a road network that can accommodate public transit, bicycling and walking facilities;

(e) plan land uses that support alternative modes when appropriate; and

(f) support transportation access for all residents through a combination of walking and bicycling facilities, provision of special transportation for the transportation disadvantaged, identification of opportunities for coordinating special transportation, encouragement of use of alternate modes and coordination of multimodal passenger services.

(3) It is the policy of Linn County that conflicts between transportation modes be minimized, especially:

(a) conflicts between movements of automobiles, pedestrians and bicyclists; and

(b) conflicts between roads, rail lines and airports.

(4) It is the policy of Linn County to cooperate with appropriate agencies, organizations and jurisdictions in locating multimodal transfer points, especially public transit and bicycle facilities.

(5) It is the policy of Linn County that the presence of a transportation facility or improvement shall not be a basis for allowing residential, commercial, or industrial development on rural resource lands.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.110 Land use issues

(A) Background

(1) Land use and transportation have always been linked. Land can be put to many uses — agriculture, forestry, residential, commercial and industrial use. No matter what land use is chosen, however, there must always be a way to

transport both people and goods from the intended use to other locations. We need to be able to travel between our houses, our jobs, shopping areas and schools; we need to be able to move our farm goods and forest products from where they are grown to where they are sold or processed; and we need to be able to circulate the many and varied goods and services that sustain our communities.

(2) Land use and transportation are inseparable. We would not think of building a road to nowhere, or a house or business with no way to get to or from it. In the U.S., we have decided to rely primarily on our road network to move people and goods around. Of course, other options are also used, including rail, sea and air transport.

(3) Land use and transportation decisions often influence each other. In the short run, land use can shape the demand for transportation. Many roads have been built because new population or commercial growth produced traffic congestion or because new development required access to previously inaccessible buildable areas. Conversely, road construction can change land values and alter the intensity and type of land use. With the addition of a road, formerly isolated areas can become an easy commute into a city. Whole new areas can be opened for development. Heavily traveled roads will often encourage commercial development, such as gas stations, motels, restaurants and convenience stores to locate along its length.

(4) Although the inseparable nature of land use and transportation is obvious, land use planning and transportation planning have seldom been well coordinated. The State of Oregon and Linn County have recognized the need for a strong linkage between land use and transportation planning. The State has developed a set of guidelines known as the Transportation Planning Rule in addition to its Statewide Planning Goal 12. Linn County has responded to the transportation/land use planning needs of the County with the development of this Transportation Plan. The purpose of this plan, in concert with other elements of the *Comprehensive Plan*, is to help

guide, plan, and coordinate development over the next twenty years in Linn County.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) Linn County recognizes the rural nature of the county. Anticipated development in the unincorporated areas of the county will be on a rural scale. Therefore, the County does not foresee significant impacts on the County-owned transportation system from upcoming development projects. Furthermore, the County views the main purpose of the County-owned road network as the efficient movement of people and goods between incorporated areas in the County and not as a means of increasing urban scale development in the unincorporated areas. This especially applies to areas outside of urban growth boundaries.

(2) Linn County supports land use policies and transportation policies that enhance one another. Land use planning and transportation planning shall be coordinated.

(3) It is the goal of Linn County that transportation improvements which occur outside of urban growth boundaries do not create urbanizing pressures in those areas.

(4) It is the policy of Linn County to maintain property development standards, as established in the Linn County Zoning Ordinance, that:

- (a) assure proper location and spacing of access;
- (b) provide adequate off-street parking;
- (c) provide adequate room for vehicle maneuvering and turnaround;
- (d) provide adequate visibility; and adequate frontage.

(5) It is the policy of Linn County to review all land divisions that involve creation of new roads or new access onto existing roads for compatibility with the policies of this plan.

(6) It is the policy of Linn County to review the design and layout of transportation facilities (roads, parking areas, bikeways, footpaths, driveways, transit facilities, rail facilities, pipeline facilities and loading areas) in subdivisions or planned unit developments and industrial

parks for compatibility with the policies of this plan.

(7) It is the policy of Linn County to:

- (a) require assessment of direct and cumulative impacts on the County transportation system for significant new development projects;
- (b) require that the level of transportation facility improvement be commensurate with the scale of new development projects;
- (c) require that new development projects be designed and operated in a such a manner that they will not have significant adverse effects on the County transportation system; and
- (d) encourage bicycle, pedestrian and transit friendly design features in new development projects where appropriate.

(8) It is the policy of Linn County that incompatible land uses¹ will not be allowed on the sites of identified transportation system projects.

(9) In order to streamline development procedures, it is the policy of Linn County to permit outright planned transportation improvements identified in this plan, specifically in LCC 907.200 to 907.250 and 907.370.

(10) It is the policy of Linn County to coordinate the development of transportation facilities with other elements of the *Comprehensive Plan* policies.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.120 Safety issues

(A) *Background.* Traffic accident information is useful for identifying intersections and curves that may be in need of upgrading, realignment, or improvement. Accident information for Linn County was used to help identify future transportation projects in this plan. Linn County 911 emergency services collects and stores accident data for the County on a continuous basis. All accident calls are listed by type and location. In addition, the Road Department receives periodic updates from the State on traffic accidents

¹ An “**incompatible land use**” is one that would interfere with the implementation of an identified transportation project.

and fatalities. These ongoing monitoring efforts will assist the County in providing a safe transportation network over the next 20 years.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) Linn County desires a transportation system that provides for the safe transport of people, goods and services through and around the County.

(2) Linn County will plan for and promote the maintenance of roads, bikeways, transit, air and pedestrian facilities in the County so that they operate in a safe manner.

(3) It is the policy of Linn County to periodically review traffic accident information, identify roadway sections, bridges and intersections with traffic problems and then use this information to help in development of projects necessary to eliminate traffic hazards.

(4) To ensure safe conditions and to facilitate traffic flow, it is the policy of Linn County to examine access management issues on new projects through the access permitting process.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.130 Environmental, economic and social issues

(A) *Background.* Environmental, natural resource and economic issues have increased in importance recently in Linn County. Environmental issues include timber harvests, wildlife habitat preservation, and wetlands. In the future, maintaining air quality may also become an important environmental issue in the mid-valley region. Each of these environmental issues have associated economic and social impacts which must be considered when making planning decisions.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) It is the goal of Linn County to reduce air pollution, energy consumption and noise pollution through the land use and transportation planning process.

(2) When a transportation or development project requires review, it is the policy of Linn County to:

(a) evaluate environmental impacts and determine whether mitigation is necessary;

(b) consider the impact new road development will have on resource lands and development patterns;

(c) determine what alternatives to the proposed project are available;

(d) evaluate, when necessary, areas subject to special water quality standards, such as areas needing erosion control or water quality mitigation;

(e) reduce wetland destruction and road runoff, whenever possible;

(f) preserve or restore, whenever possible, farmland and natural vegetation disrupted by transportation projects; and

(g) identify and address conflicts between new transportation projects and protection of inventoried Goal 5 resources.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.140 Funding

(1) *Background*

(a) Linn County has financed road construction, improvement and maintenance funds that have been provided through the sale of federal forest service timber and state gas taxes. A large amount of Federal forest service land is located in the eastern section of Linn County. All receipts from timber sales on this federal forest service land are split with the County. Linn County receives 25% of proceeds from these sales. This 25% is divided, by the County, between schools and roads. Schools receive 25% and roads receive 75% of the revenue.

(b) Historically, the County's share of timber revenues from federal forest service sales peaked at approximately 6.8 million dollars in fiscal 1989-90. By fiscal 1993-94, revenues dedicated to the road fund had declined to around 6.0 million dollars. Timber revenues are expected to continue to fall over the next few years and possibly over the long term. Under the Clinton timber plan for the Northwest, a revenue "safety net" has been put into place. Revenues will be reduced over the next five year period by a specif-

ic formula. A five-year average revenue level will be determined and revenue received in fiscal 1995 (from fiscal 1994 timber sales) will be set at 85% of the previous five-year average. Over the following four years, revenue will continue to be reduced by 3% increments. This arrangement may be renewed for an additional five year period covering 2000-2004, but there is no certainty of that occurring. If the plan is renewed, by 2004 Linn County would receive revenues worth 58% of the current five-year average.

(c) Based on the County's analysis, its road network will not need significant expansion over the next 20 years. Except for the need for a state-funded Lebanon bypass, a state-funded North Corvallis bypass, state-funded lane additions to Highways 20 and 34, and state-funded improvements to Highway 228, the network that is currently in place will serve the County's projected needs. There are only a few road capacity problems expected over the next twenty years that will occur outside of the incorporated city limits of the four largest cities. The County's financing needs over the next twenty years mainly revolve around ensuring a strong maintenance and repair program and a capital improvement program that is sufficiently funded to make necessary road widenings, realignments and minor improvements. Currently, the County's capital improvement program runs around 4 to 5 million dollars per year.

(d) In addition to federal forest service revenue, the County receives a share of state gasoline taxes on an annual basis. Gas tax shares are calculated by the proportion of the state's registered drivers in Linn County compared to the state as a whole. The gas tax is set by the state and shares are calculated from Department of Motor Vehicles records from the previous year. The other major funding source comes from federal funds through the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

(e) Therefore, Road Department funds come from a number of sources — federal forest service revenues, gas tax funds, federal ISTEA monies and interest earnings from Road

Department funds. The total Road Department budget stands at approximately 11 million dollars with the bulk of funds coming from forest service revenues and gas taxes. Unless gas taxes rise this budget will fall as timber revenues decline. The percentage of the budget comprised of gas taxes will rise. While forest revenue funds will diminish over time, the Road Department has built up a balance sufficient to fund maintenance and capital improvements for a four or five year period. Assuming continued availability of gas tax funds, this indicates that the County has sufficient funding for implementing this plan over the next ten years. Long term funding after this period is uncertain.

(f) The County is financially responsible for construction, maintenance and improvement of all County-owned roads. In the past, there has been a good working relationship with the Oregon Department of Transportation and the cities in the County to ensure important projects are financed and completed. The maintenance of these good relationships is very important to the County.

(2) *Policy Statements*

(a) It is the goal of Linn County to have an adequately funded transportation network and that there be a reasonable expectation that sufficient funds will be available to carry out the plan.

(b) Transportation projects will be prioritized in accordance with the transportation project list in this plan and as updated and amended in accordance with this plan.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

III. COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

907.200 Background

(A) This Transportation Plan was produced by the Planning and Building Department in cooperation with the Linn County Road Department. The two departments work closely together on transportation issues. The planning department is involved in continuing coordination of regional

transportation planning issues with Cascade West Council of Governments and the Linn-Benton Transportation Committee. The Linn-Benton Transportation Committee includes representatives from Benton County and the cities of Corvallis, Albany and Lebanon. Since transportation facilities do not end at County borders, these meetings provided valuable forums for exchange of ideas and issues on a regional basis. The Linn County Planning and Building Department has, through these efforts, been able to monitor other regional transportation planning efforts. This process, at both the local and regional level, will help insure that planning efforts occurring in the region continue to be coordinated.

(B) The Planning and Building Department also participates in ongoing discussions with staff from the Oregon Department of Transportation, the Department of Land Conservation and Development, and the Oregon Transportation Commission on important issues, such as Highway 34 corridor planning, state highway projects in the County and the future of airport facilities in the County.

(C) Linn County is responsible for coordinating and ensuring the compatibility of all local city plans with State and regional plans. This responsibility is being met by means of regular Linn-Benton Transportation Committee meetings, by the County's ongoing efforts to meet with the cities and resolve and coordinate issues within urban growth boundaries and through distribution of a comprehensive survey that was sent by the Planning and Building Department to all cities in the County. The survey asked cities to respond to any transportation issues, problems, or projects that they felt had either an impact on either their cities or on the County. They were also encouraged to communicate any ideas or visions they had for the future of transportation in Linn County.

(D) The Linn County Board of Commissioners and Linn County Planning Commission are responsible for review of this plan. The Linn County Board of Commissioners is responsible for adoption of this plan. Citizen input was re-

ceived through advertised public hearings held by the Linn County Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.210 Coordination, continued planning, and notification

(A) Policy Statements

(1) It is the goal of Linn County to have a vital, ongoing transportation planning process and a useful, clear and concise transportation plan that meets the real needs of the County and its residents.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County that amendments to land use designations, densities, and design standards, as found in the *Comprehensive Plan* and zoning and subdivision ordinances, be consistent with the functions, capacities and levels of service of facilities identified in this plan.

(3) It is the goal of the Linn County transportation planning process to:

(a) identify local, regional and State transportation needs;

(b) develop a transportation plan that will address these needs;

(c) review and update the plan periodically;

(d) have continuing coordination with relevant agencies and jurisdictions; and

(e) have continuing public input.

(4) It is the policy of Linn County to:

(a) continue public and interagency involvement in the transportation process;

(b) ensure that the transportation plan is consistent with the rest of the Linn County *Comprehensive Plan*;

(c) continue to coordinate transportation planning with local, regional and State plans by reviewing any changes to Linn County city transportation plans, regional county transportation plans, the Oregon Transportation Plan and ODOT's Transportation Improvement Plan; and

(d) continue to coordinate transportation planning with the cities of Linn

County by periodically surveying city transportation projects and needs.

(5) It is the policy of Linn County to notify the State Highway Division of ODOT concerning:

(a) all proposals that would require access to a state or federal highway;

(b) land use applications that affect transportation facilities and require public hearing; and

(c) applications that affect private access to state roads.

(6) It is the policy of Linn County to notify the Linn County Road department of any *Comprehensive Plan* amendments, rezones, planned unit developments, subdivisions, urban growth boundary amendments and conditional use permit applications.

(7) It is the policy of Linn County to notify the Public Utilities Commissioner, the Linn County Engineer, and any affected rail company concerning proposals to create new railroad grade crossings.

(8) It is the policy of Linn County to notify the Aeronautics Division of the Department of Transportation of *Comprehensive Plan* amendments within adopted airport overlay zones and:

(a) all land use applications in adopted airport overlay zones;

(b) all land use applications within identified airport noise corridors;

(c) all proposed new airport sites; and.

(d) all land use applications that involve construction heights which could affect airport operations.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.230 Transportation Plan implementation

(A) *Policies*. It is the policy of Linn County to protect approved or proposed transportation project sites through:

(1) access control measures;²

² See LCC 907.310.

(2) review of transportation projects that significantly effect the County's transportation system or future development and large development projects that significantly affect the transportation system;³

(3) the imposition of conditions on transportation projects and large development projects that significantly affect transportation;⁴ airport protection measures for noise and safety; and

(4) interchange area management plans for new or modified state highway interchanges.⁵

(B) *Lead agency*. The lead agency for transportation project review shall be:

(1) Linn County for facilities outside of UGBs;

(2) Linn County in coordination with the affected city for facilities within UGBs;

(3) Linn County in coordination with the affected city for facilities owned by the County but within city limits;

(4) the affected city for city-owned facilities within city limits; or

(5) the State of Oregon, Linn County and affected cities on projects involving state-owned facilities.

(C) *Transportation projects*

(1) *Transportation projects that are permitted outright*. A transportation project may be allowed without further review if it is permitted outright.⁶ If a transportation project is permitted outright, the Board of Commissioners may summarily adopt the project onto the Transportation Project List. There is no need for a *Comprehensive Plan* text amendment or a conditional use permit. However, access management review⁷ is required for any project where access is an issue including those projects which are approved outright. The following transportation projects are permitted outright:

³ See LCC 907.230 (C).

⁴ See LCC 907.250.

⁵ See LCC Chapter 920 to 938 (Linn County Land Development Code).

⁶ Also see LCC 907.370.

⁷ LCC 907.310.

(a) operation, maintenance, and repair of existing transportation facilities;

(b) dedication of right-of-way;

(c) surfacing, minor widening or realignment of an existing road;

(d) reconstruction or modification of roads and highways where no removal or displacements of buildings occurs and no new land parcels are created;

(e) construction of climbing and passing lanes within right-of-way existing as of July 1, 1987;

(f) improvement of existing road and highway related facilities, such as maintenance yards, weigh stations, stockpile sites and safety rest areas, within right-of-way existing as of July 1, 1987, and/or on contiguous public-owned property already utilized to support the operation and maintenance of roads and highways;

(g) temporary improvements in association with construction projects, such as temporary roads and detours that will be abandoned and restored to the original condition or use at such times as no longer needed;

(h) construction of turn refuges and pullouts at existing intersections;

(i) transportation system management measures, including medians which limit or prevent turning movements, but not including the creation of additional travel lanes or median turn lanes;

(j) roads and bridges on farm or forest lands for the purpose of managing land for forest or farm uses;

(k) replacement of bridges;

(l) construction of railroad spurs under 1/4 mile in length;

(m) construction of bikeways, footpaths, and recreation trails;

(n) changes in the frequency of transit, rail and airport services;

(o) construction of transit stops within existing right-of-way

(p) construction of pipelines.

(2) *Transportation projects that require a conditional use permit.* If a transportation

project requires a conditional use permit and that permit is approved, the Board of Commissioners may then adopt the project as part of the Transportation Project List. There is no need for a *Comprehensive Plan* text amendment. A transportation project needs a conditional use permit if it involves one of the following:

(a) construction of a new road and extensions of an existing road which does not constitute a major new construction or a major realignment and which either enhances local traffic flow, reduces local access to state highways or reduces local traffic on state highways, and has limited intersections and private accesses onto farm and forest lands so as to be consistent with rural uses and densities;

(b) construction of additional travel lanes and median turning lanes, but not resulting in the creation of new land parcels;

(c) construction of additional passing lanes and climbing lanes, requiring the acquisition of new right-of-way (acquired after July 1, 1987), but not resulting in the creation of new land parcels;

(d) reconstruction or modification of roads and highways involving the removal or displacement of buildings, but not resulting in the creation of new land parcels;

(e) construction or improvement of road and highway related facilities, such as maintenance yards, weigh stations, stockpile sites, park and rides and safety rest areas, where new right-of-way (acquired after July 1, 1987) or additional property is required but not resulting in the creation of new land parcels;

(f) construction of railroad spurs over 1/4 mile in length;

(g) construction of transit stops requiring the acquisition of new right-of-way (acquired after July 1, 1987) but not resulting in the creation of new land parcels;

(h) construction of personal-use airports and helicopter pads as defined in the zoning ordinance;

(i) expansion of existing airports;

and

(j) construction of aids to aviation and navigation.

(3) *Transportation projects that require a plan text amendment.* In cases where a transportation project is not listed or identified as allowed outright or allowed through a conditional use permit, a plan text amendment is necessary. A project which requires a plan text amendment, depending on the zoning district, may either require a conditional use permit and/or a plan map amendment. Procedures for both plan text and plan map amendments are outlined in the Linn County *Comprehensive Plan* Amendment Provision. The projects set forth in paragraphs (1) to (12) of this subsection require a plan text amendment and a conditional use permit when they occur in development zones. When projects are proposed in a resource zone then a plan text amendment and an exception are required. A plan map amendment may also be necessary in resource zones depending on the project.⁸

(a) a road or highway that requires major new construction, i.e. construction that requires a new right-of-way (acquired after July 1, 1987) in excess of 120 feet in width and 1,320 feet in length and which is not replacing an existing road or highway;

(b) a road or highway that requires a major realignment, i.e. replacement of an existing road segment where the center line of the roadway shifts outside of the existing right-of-way for a distance of ½ mile or more;

(c) construction of a new rail line, excluding spurs;

(d) construction of a high speed rail line or conversion of an existing line to high speed rail;

(e) construction of a new public use airport (note: public use airports are not allowed in residential or rural center zoning districts);

(f) construction of a new public transit facility; and

(g) improvements that will change the functional classification of a road (note: only a plan text amendment is required; other zoning requirements will be evaluated depending on the nature of the project).

(4) *Other transportation projects.* Any transportation project that is not listed in LCC 907.230 (C) (1) to (C) (3) will be handled at the discretion of the director in a manner determined to be most appropriate.

(D) *Land development projects.* The Linn County *Comprehensive Plan* and Land Development Code have established specific development limitations in the FCM, EFU, A/F, RR, RCT, UGM, and RCM zoning districts. The uses permitted in these zones are not expected to have a significant impact on the transportation system. The scale and density of the permitted uses will allow only a rural level of development. No urban scale development is expected to occur. Based on the capacity analysis of the road network and population and economic projections for the region,⁹ future levels of development in unincorporated areas will not result in adverse impacts to the transportation system. However, to insure adequate site review, access management review is required on a case by case basis for all development in the County. In zones that permit intense development, such as Freeway Interchange Commercial and Urban Development, the combination of already intensely developed parcels, the small amount of available undeveloped parcels, and the size restrictions imposed on all development in these zones will preclude significant transportation impacts from occurring

(E) *Comprehensive Plan or Land Development Code amendments.*

(1) A *Comprehensive Plan* or Land Development Code amendment significantly affects transportation if:

⁸ Note: In resource zones, projects must be consistent with Oregon Revised Statutes, Oregon Administrative Rules, and Statewide Planning Goals 3 and 4.

⁹ See the Linn County Transportation Plan Background Document.

(a) it changes the function of a planned transportation facility;

(b) it changes standards for a functional classification system; or

(c) it would increase or decrease the level of a transportation facility's activity beyond an acceptable level.

(2) Findings shall be made to determine the extent of any impact and suggest ways to mitigate any adverse impacts.

(F) Transportation projects and facilities often create unique development situations and, as a result, it may be appropriate to explore zoning alternatives to transportation project siting. Linn County will evaluate and develop if necessary a special zoning designation for certain types of transportation facilities, such as transit stations, rail lines, and public use airports.

(G) The Transportation Project List shall be reevaluated at least once a year.¹⁰ Amendments to that list shall be made and adopted by the Linn County Board of Commissioners. If a transportation project that would have required a plan text amendment is dropped from the list, findings relating to changed conditions or how the need can be met through alternative projects must be provided.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99; amd 05-138 §1 eff 8/23/05]

907.240 Exceptions for transportation improvements on rural lands

(A) Transportation facilities and improvements which are not allowed outright¹¹ or do not require a conditional use permit¹² may require an exception to statewide planning goals to be sited on resource lands (EFU, A/F, and FCM). Exceptions are not needed for projects located in development zones.

(B) An exception adopted as part of the transportation plan shall at a minimum determine need, mode, function and general location for the proposed facility or improvement. The general

location shall be specified as a corridor within which the proposed project is to be located. Specific sites or areas within the corridor may be excluded from the exception to avoid or lessen adverse impacts.

(C) The size, design and capacity of the proposed facility or improvement shall be described generally, but in sufficient detail to allow a general understanding of the likely impacts of the proposed facility or improvement. Measures limiting the size, design or capacity may be specified in the description of the proposed use in order to simplify the analysis of its effects. If an exception to Statewide Planning Goals 3, 4, 11, or 14 is required, the exception shall be taken pursuant to ORS 197.732 (1) (c).

(D) The adopted exception shall include a process and standards to guide selection of the precise design and location within the corridor consistent with the general description of the proposed facility or improvement. The exception shall be approved and adopted as a plan text amendment through the Linn County *Comprehensive Plan* Amendment Provision. Once adopted the project becomes part of the Transportation Project List.

(E) Land use regulations implementing the exception may include specific mitigation measures to assure compatibility with adjacent uses and/or offset unavoidable environmental, economic, social or energy impacts of the proposed project.¹³

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

907.250 Mitigation and conditions on project development

(A) Transportation or development projects that require a plan text amendment or a conditional use permit may be required to fulfill conditions or implement mitigation measures before approval is granted. Mitigation and conditions may include, but are not restricted to:

- (1) wetland and/or riparian mitigation;
- (2) improvement of surrounding roads;

¹⁰ See LCC 907.370 B) (2).

¹¹ LCC 907.230 (C) (1).

¹² LCC 907.230 (C) (2).

¹³ See LCC 907.250.

- (3) limits on level of development;
- (4) revision of development placement;
- (5) addition or redesign of access;
- (6) addition of traffic management devices such as traffic signals, medians or signage; and/or
- (7) improvements that lessen transportation impacts.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

IV. ROAD NETWORK POLICIES

907.300 General road network

(A) Background

(1) Linn County's road network is the foundation of the County transportation system. No other transportation element approaches the importance of the road network. Over the last 25 years, the County has made a concerted effort to build up and enhance the road network. As a result, the residents of Linn County have a substantial investment in their road infrastructure.

(2) Beginning in the 1960s, a major program was instituted to both stabilize the soil base and then pave many of the dirt roads in the County. For some roads on the valley floor, this was accomplished by adding salt to the road base. While this temporarily stabilized the soil, as the water table rose and fell the stabilizing salt was leached from the soil. As heavy farm equipment used these now unstable roadbeds, deep rutting and cracking quickly appeared.

(3) In the early 1970s, the County developed a commitment to provide a road network that was strong and stable. The County began to implement a full scale program of road construction based on those principles. It became policy that all roads must have a rock base before paving. Nearly all of the old "salt" roads have been replaced. This 25 year program has resulted in Linn County possessing one of the finest road networks in the State. It also represents an incredible investment. This investment needs to be protected. The road network that will serve the County for the next twenty years is basically in

place. However, if both adequate maintenance and a program of sufficient capital improvement is not maintained, Linn County's road network could be placed in jeopardy. Currently, the road department is well-funded. Over the years, forest service timber revenue sharing in Linn County has been dedicated to road construction and maintenance. With the uncertainties surrounding the size of future federal timber harvests, this source of revenue could drop severely. Road maintenance, repair and improvement are activities that must be aggressively pursued, at proper funding levels, for as long as the County depends on the road network for transportation. If an aggressive program of road sealing, maintenance, repair and improvement is not continued, the road system will begin to deteriorate and repair and restoration of the network will be much more expensive than the cost of ongoing maintenance.

(4) Planning for transportation in the unincorporated areas must recognize that all viable alternatives to the automobile also require roads. Often these roads must be better than the roads we currently provide for automobiles. Regular bus service needs a deeper road base that can withstand the greater vehicle weight of busses. Bicycles need smoother road surfaces for safe operation. Pedestrians and bicyclists need wider road shoulders. These types of improvements also benefit automobile and truck traffic by making roads safer and more efficient for vehicle use. Promoting these types of road improvement projects help prepare for the future when multimodal alternatives to the automobile may be more feasible and common.

(B) Policy Statements

(1) Linn County has an excellent road network. It is the goal of Linn County to preserve, protect and enhance this valuable County asset.

(2) Since the Linn County road network is vital for both automobile and truck traffic and for most feasible alternatives such as busses, bicycle and pedestrian uses, it is the policy of Linn County that:

(a) the road network be considered the most important and valuable component of the transportation system;

(b) maintenance and repair of the road network be considered vital to the continued health of the Linn County transportation system; and

(c) maintaining a road network that is in good condition and of sufficient capacity to effectively and efficiently link all major areas of the County is a primary objective of transportation decisions.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.310 Functional classification and access management

(A) Background

(1) *Functional Classification.* Roads often serve different purposes or functions.

(a) Linn County has classified its road network into a system of functional types consisting of:

(i) major and minor arterials;

(ii) major and minor collectors; and

(iii) local roads.

(b) The function or purpose of arterial and collector roads is to provide an adequate level of thoroughfare for vehicular users. In contrast, local roads function to provide access to individual sites and usually do not serve as a means to move traffic from one location to another.

(c) In general, the functional classification system can be viewed as a categorization of roads by diminishing levels of road access.

(i) Local roads provide unlimited access to property.

(ii) Collectors provide some access to property, but access is more limited. Generally, collectors should provide access between local roads and arterials rather than providing access to individual property sites.

(iii) Arterials, especially major arterials, should provide little or no access

to individual properties. Access on to and off of arterials should ideally be limited to major collectors.

(2) Factors that deteriorate the ability of arterials and collectors to function properly as thoroughfares should be minimized. High traffic volumes combined with excessive access points can degrade a roads functional ability. Currently, traffic volumes are small and access points are not excessive on most County roads. However, if arterials and collectors are to function properly in the future, access control must be maintained. New access proposals should be carefully considered before approval.

(3) Access Management

(a) Roads accommodate two types of travel — local access traffic and through traffic. Both of these functions are necessary, but they can conflict. Arterials are intended for through movement of traffic while local roads are designed to give access to abutting property. Collectors provide an intermediate function.

(b) Access management includes the control of vehicular access to major roadways. A freeway represents complete access control. Access is limited to interchanges and freeway ramp designs usually allow vehicles to enter the traffic stream without stopping. Partial access control, which is often found on major arterials or state highways, is provided by limiting or prohibiting driveway access, left turn movements and cross traffic at intersections. These limits increase the capacity of an arterial to carry through traffic at desired speeds without requiring additional lane construction.

(c) Unmanaged arterials can become overused for short distance trips and local access to property. Businesses may desire to locate on heavily trafficked arterials. Lack of adequate access management and uncontrolled proliferation of driveways and other roads onto arterials, can contribute to accidents and congestion. Insufficient coordination of land use development, property division and access review can contribute to the deterioration of both an arterial and collector road network. Traffic signals, new

road approaches and driveways can decrease speed and capacity and increase both congestion and hazards. Mitigation often requires costly new roads, widening of roads, new right of way acquisition, expanded maintenance fees and other access control purchases. Coordination, planning and proper policies can help avoid these problems and costly solutions.

(d) As of 1993, Linn County access management policy was limited. The Planning and Building Department issued access permits. The Road Department then evaluated those permits based on three criteria:

(i) the access must be adequate to accommodate the vehicular movement that will be associated with it;

(ii) the access must provide adequate ingress and egress and have sufficient line of sight distance; and

(iii) the drainage associated with the access must be adequate.

(e) This current access management policy is insufficient to adequately protect arterial and collector functionality as population continues to increase in the County and traffic movement between the larger cities continues to grow.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) Linn County supports maintenance of an efficient County road network through the designation of County roads within a functional classification system.

(2) Linn County has established a network of arterials and collector streets.¹⁴ It is the policy of Linn County to designate access and land uses appropriate to the function of a given road. Inappropriate designations will be discouraged.

(3) It is the goal of Linn County to have a system of access management adequate to protect the quality and function of the arterial and collector system.

(4) It is the policy of Linn County that any approved access be adequate for emergency service provision.

(5) It is the policy of Linn County that access points onto collectors and arterials from individual properties, subdivisions, commercial and industrial properties and all other properties shall be kept to one access point where practicable. Wherever possible, onsite traffic movement with limited arterial or collector access is preferred

(6) It is the policy of Linn County that if property access is feasible on a local road, then that local road access will be given preference over access onto a collector or arterial. When access cannot be accommodated on a local road, collector access will be given preference over arterial access.

(7) It is the policy of Linn County that access requests onto county-owned major and minor arterials for new minor or major partitions, subdivisions, and commercial and industrial development be developed with category 4 access control in mind.

| |
|---|
| “ Category 4 access ” offers limited access: public road access spaced at no less than every one mile; driveways spaced at no less than every 1,200 feet; no traffic signals; and no median control. |
|---|

Category 4 is the ideal. If either safety or environmental factors or the unavailability of adequate distance between access points requires placement of access or traffic control at lesser intervals then the best alternative placement will be chosen. On road segments that are already severely impacted by numerous access points or on road segments which abut exception areas, adherence to the above standards may be either unreasonable or counterproductive to exception area infilling. In such cases, these standards may be relaxed to accommodate the aforementioned special conditions.

(8) It is the policy of Linn County that access requests onto county-owned major and minor collectors for new minor or major partitions, subdivisions, and commercial and industrial

¹⁴ See Appendix A following this Chapter.

development be developed with category 5 access control in mind.

“**Category 5 access**” offers partial access: public road access spaced at no more than every ½ mile; driveways spaced at no less than every 500 feet; traffic signals spaced at no less than every ½ mile; and no median control.

Category 5 is the ideal. If either safety or environmental factors or the unavailability of adequate distance between access points requires placement of access or traffic control at lesser intervals than the best alternative placement will be chosen. On road segments that are already severely impacted by numerous access points or on road segments which abut exception areas, adherence to the above standards may be either unreasonable or counterproductive to exception area infilling. In such cases, these standards may be relaxed to accommodate the aforementioned special conditions.

(9) In many counties, high growth rates and insufficient planning have resulted in road capacity problems. One type of road capacity problem is created when structures are located in potential right-of-way, thereby restricting future road widening or lane addition opportunities. The need for removing or relocating structures to widen roads adds to the expense of road improvements. Another type of problem occurs when there are too many driveways located on a collector or arterial. Excessive access points onto higher-speed roadways can create dangerous turning conditions, thereby necessitating the lowering of traveling speeds and resulting in lowered efficiencies. Consolidating access points that are established in poorly considered locations adds to the expense of future road improvements.

(a) (9a) Within or near major urban growth boundaries, Linn County will implement, in coordination with appropriate jurisdictions and the public, policies and procedures that require building construction setbacks for major county roads such that adequate right-of-way are available for future road expansions.

(b) (9b) Within or near major urban growth boundaries, Linn County will require that proposed accesses demonstrate:

(i) how the access will accommodate future neighboring urban-scale development; or

(ii) how the access will integrate with and connect to the future road network planned for the area; or

(iii) how the access coordinates with community transportation plans.

(C) Linn County recognizes that one of the most appropriate forums for creating these policies is through new urban growth boundary growth management agreements such as the one which is currently being developed by Linn County and the City of Lebanon. This agreement will help coordinate development in urban growth areas and will serve as a model for other communities.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

907.320 Pavement management

(A) Background

(1) There are four types of road ownership in Linn County.

(a) A *state road* is a public roadway owned, maintained and improved by the State of Oregon.

(b) A *county road* is a public roadway which has been accepted by the Board of Commissioners as a county road and for which the County will be responsible for improvements and maintenance.

(c) A *local access road* is a road which has been dedicated to the public. Ownership has been formally accepted by the County, but without responsibility, obligation, or agreement for improvement or maintenance.

(d) *Private access road* (also called a private road) is either a driveway, privately owned access road, easement of road access, or a privately maintained road necessitated by land subdivision created for the specific purpose of providing road access from a parcel to a local access road or county road.

(2) There are approximately 1,120 miles of road in the Linn County road system. These roads are maintained and improved under the

direction of the Linn County Road Department. In addition to these roads, there are approximately 45 miles of local access roads in the County. Local and private access roads are not maintained by the Road Department.

(3) Of the total mileage of County roads, approximately 88%, or 985 miles are surfaced with either an oil mat or hot mix asphalt concrete. The remaining 12%, or 135 miles, (except for approximately 1 mile surfaced with portland cement concrete) are gravel surfaced.

(4) Pavement management is the orderly scheduling of pavement repairs and improvements to meet serviceability goals and provide safe, comfortable and economical transportation while striving to achieve the best possible value from available funds. These goals are accomplished by comparing alternative management approaches, which include design and construction options and maintenance activities, while simultaneously making use of proven, existing road department practices and knowledge.

(5) Routine maintenance activities are carried out on an ongoing basis. Road sections requiring more extensive work are prioritized and then selected for improvements based on an annual subjective visual evaluation of pavement condition involving both the maintenance and engineering functions of the Road Department. The visual evaluation of road conditions occurs in late spring. District maintenance supervisors in conjunction with the roadmaster inspect and prioritize the future maintenance projects.

(6) The Association of Counties (AOC) is developing an integrated road information system (IRIS) which will include, when fully developed, a pavement management system suitable for County Road Department use. It is anticipated that this pavement management system will be implemented by the Road Department. This system will provide a more formal, less subjective, pavement management process than is now being used. Subject to member county approval of a specific pavement management process, along with associated computer software, the current AOC development plan projects that the

system will be available through the IRIS framework before the end of 1994.

(7) The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) requires the development, establishment and implementation of a pavement management system for federal-aid highways by fiscal year 1996. Adoption of the AOC recommended pavement management system is anticipated to meet all federal requirements for County-owned, federal-aid routes.

(8) A pavement management system ideally monitors at least three crucial elements. First, it maintains an accurate road inventory listing lane and shoulder widths and surface type. Second, it gives accurate and up-to-date traffic counts that also includes information on traffic split between cars and trucks. Third, it gives information on road conditions either through general visual inspection or actual counts of cracks, wear and ruts.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) Linn County recognizes that pavement management is important to the overall preservation and maintenance of the road network.

(2) It is the goal of Linn County to maintain the County road network pavement in good or fair condition.

(3) It is the policy of Linn County to continue to maintain and preserve the County road network through its program of paving, repairing, reconstruction, drainage clearance and vegetation control.

(4) It is the policy of Linn County to adopt, when fully developed, the Association of Counties' (AOC), integrated road information system (IRIS) which will include a pavement management system suitable for County Road Department use.

(5) It is the policy of Linn County that areas for the storage of materials and equipment for road maintenance and construction shall be allowed where this use is compatible with surrounding land uses.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

907.330 Pavement of gravel roads

(A) Background

(1) *General.* Prior to 1994, Linn County has decided which County gravel roads are eligible for reconstruction and paving based on criteria that change over time because they have never been set forth in a written policy. The County feels that by consistently applying the same rating criteria to these decisions, County gravel roads can be scheduled for reconstruction and paving, as funding allows, in a more reasonable and considered priority than was the case before 1994.

(2) *EFU, F/F, and FCM Zones.* Some paving of roads that are gravel or partially gravel can enhance the overall road network by providing a more useable link between parts of the network. However, keeping roads unpaved in areas that are not zoned for development, such as Exclusive Farm Use (EFU), Farm/Forest (F/F) or Forest Conservation and Management (FCM) zoning, helps strengthen land use goals of resource preservation. The County has kept an area of Forest Conservation and Management (FCM) zoning unpaved for this reason. Mountain Home Rd., Sodaville-Mountain Home Road, Middle Ridge Dr. and Scott Mountain Dr. are all partially paved. Paving of these roads only extends to the beginning of the resource zoning. This provides a valuable disincentive for non-resource related use of these roads and reinforces the resource nature of the area while still adequately serving the resource transportation needs of the area's residents.

(B) Policy Statements

(1) It is the policy of Linn County that County gravel roads will be determined eligible for reconstruction based on three primary criteria and four secondary criteria. Primary criteria will be density, traffic count and road classification. Secondary criteria will be zoning, whether the gravel road is on a school bus route, the estimated cost per mile of reconstruction and paving, and the availability of right-of-way.¹⁵

¹⁵ Reference Policy No. 1 Linn County Board of Commissioners Road Department Policy 11/24/93.

(2) Gravel surface roads often provide an appropriate level of service in resource areas. Therefore, it is the policy of Linn County not to pave gravel road segments in certain areas of EFU, F/F and FCM zoning.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.340 Level of service

(A) Background

(1) The Highway Capacity Manual defines “**level of service**” (LOS) as a qualitative measure of the effect of a number of factors, which include speed and travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, safety, driving comfort and convenience and operating costs. In practical terms, level of service refers to the amount of congestion and other factors that slow down traffic on a road. Level of service is defined by a range of designations — A to F. Level of service A is completely unimpeded traffic flow while level of service F is heavily congested, slowed traffic, as in a traffic jam. There are currently relatively low traffic volumes on County roads and the County has maintained a high level of design and maintenance on almost all roads.

(2) As a result of these factors, the level of service throughout the County in the unincorporated areas is at level of service A through C even at peak traffic hours. These service levels will in all likelihood be sustained throughout the next twenty year planning period on the vast majority of County roads unless population growth exceeds projections. Assigning arterials and collectors levels of service D or better is a very maintainable goal for the next twenty years.

(3) Level of service D represents high-density, but stable, flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver is severely restricted, and the driver experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level. LOS D, on two-lane rural highways, while stable, is approaching unstable traffic flow. Passing becomes extremely difficult with high demand, while passing capacity approaches zero. Platoon sizes of 5 to 10 vehicles are common, although

speeds of 50 mph can still be maintained under ideal conditions. Turning vehicles and/or roadside distractions cause major interruptions in the traffic stream. The percentage of time motorists are delayed approaches 75%. Flow rate is up to 1,800 cars per hour for both directions under ideal conditions.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) Linn County has established a goal of maintaining level of service D or better throughout the County-owned arterial and collector system over the next twenty years.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County to establish a system of traffic volume monitoring on all County-owned arterial and collector roads. The County will periodically examine its traffic volume data and State-collected traffic volume data to determine if there is any deterioration in level of service on the arterial and collector network.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.350 Capacity

(A) *Background*

(1) A capacity analysis was performed on the County's road network using current traffic volumes and projected increases due to population growth. Through this analysis, several areas of concern were discovered. While these road sections are unlikely to exceed their capacity, they may have heavy traffic volumes by 2010. These areas of concern include:

- (a) Airport Rd., Oak St. and Denny School Rd. near Lebanon;
- (b) Grand Prairie, Oakville Rd., Riverside Dr. and Columbus St. near Albany;
- (c) Old Salem Rd. in Millersburg;
- (d) State-owned Hwy. 20 between I-5 and Lebanon; and
- (e) State-owned Hwy. 34 between I-5 and Lebanon.

(2) While these are areas of concern, the conclusion of this analysis is that the County's arterial and collector system will be adequate for the next twenty years and that no major expansion or addition to the network of County roads is necessary.

(3) If any area were considered marginal, however, it is the Highway 34-Airport Rd.-Oak St.-Denny School Rd. network of roads west of Lebanon. This area will experience traffic volumes and general congestion by 2010 that could seriously compromise mobility in the area. Safety and traffic management issues will also increase in importance over the next twenty years in this area.

(4) The movement of east-west traffic is of concern to the County. State-owned highways 20 and 34 are the main routes for this type of movement. Highway 20 and 34 feed directly into and connect within Lebanon. There is a significant need for construction of a bypass to route Highway 34 traffic around the city of Lebanon before it merges with Highway 20. The County has identified the network of Highway 34, Airport Road, Oak St., and Denny School Road as an area with high potential for capacity and safety problems.

(5) The movement of north-south traffic within and through the County is of special concern. The principal through route for traffic is Interstate Highway 5 (I-5), to which State highways US-20 and ORE-34 connect. State sponsored evaluations of the freeway titled "The State of the Interstate, Report 2000;" and two I-5 Corridor Refinement Plans entitled, "Albany I-5 Corridor Refinement Plan, Knox Butte and Santiam Interchanges" and "Millersburg I-5 Corridor Refinement Plan, South Jefferson, Viewcrest, Murder Creek, and the Proposed Tank Farm Interchanges" include information about Interstate highway conditions in Linn County. The reports demonstrate that the freeway is operating below standards established in the Oregon Highway Plan for interstate freeways. Traffic volumes measured ½ mile north of the North Albany/Knox Butte Road Interchange exceed 58,000 vehicles per day and are projected to exceed 85,000 vehicles per day by the year 2020. Even if measures are taken to reduce the future traffic volumes on the highway, additional capacity is necessary to allow the freeway to operate within adopted state highway performance guidelines.

(6) The State of the Interstate Report 2000 and the Albany and Millersburg Corridor Refinement Plans establish that additional travel lanes are needed on the freeway between the Santiam River and the ORE-34 interchange south of Albany. They also state that improvements are needed at interchanges in order for them to function with the new highway configuration and, in some cases, to address interchange capacity and safety concerns. The existing I-5 right-of-way may be generally adequate to accommodate six freeway travel lanes, but additional right-of-way may be necessary to add travel lanes, to modify existing interchanges, and to construct a new interchange between the Viewcrest (Exit 237) and Murder Creek (Exit 235) Interchanges. These alterations also may affect the current alignment of frontage roads in some areas.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) It is the goal of Linn County to maintain and preserve the current arterial and collector system in the County and prevent degradation of that system.

(2) Linn County recognizes that the current arterial and collector network will be adequate for the foreseeable future. Therefore, no new arterial or collector roads are anticipated in the next twenty years in the unincorporated areas outside of the UGBs with the exception of a Lebanon bypass.

(3) It is the policy of Linn County to monitor arterials and collectors, (traffic volumes, accident reports and pavement condition) to help in the determination of when road improvement projects are necessary.

(4) It is the policy of Linn County to coordinate road expansion within cities and their urban growth areas in a manner consistent with County policies.

(5) It is the policy of Linn County to support adding travel lanes on I-5 to create a freeway with six general purpose travel lanes between the County's northern border and the ORE-34 interchange in order to promote the safe and efficient movement of vehicles and goods. The County supports addressing safety issues and

other functional needs associated with the expansion of I-5, consistent with the Oregon Highway Plan.

(6) Linn County supports the freeway improvement recommendations contained in the Albany I-5 Corridor Refinement Plan and the Millersburg I-5 Corridor Refinement Plan. These documents are adopted as part of the County Transportation System Plan.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 05-138 §1 eff 8/23/05]

907.360 Bridges

(A) *Background*

(1) Linn County owns 331 bridges. Inspection of these bridges is provided by the Oregon State Highway Division through a consultant inspection program. All Linn County bridges are inspected at two year intervals, or more frequently if special conditions exist. Of these 331 bridges, 79 are on the Federal Aid System with the remaining 252 bridges being off-system. Bridges less than 20 feet in length are inspected by Linn County personnel at two-year intervals. Bridges that are found to be in critical condition during an inspection are prioritized for immediate replacement. The County bridge inspection program addresses all National Bridge Inspection Standards. Routine repairs to Linn County bridges are made by the County maintenance force. Major repair or reconstruction is accomplished through competitive bid. Continued repair, maintenance and widening efforts will be necessary over the next twenty years. Typically, bridges in Linn County consist of reinforced concrete slabs attached to capped posts. Many older bridges have wooden posts and caps. When it is determined that the wood is no longer structurally sound, the cap is replaced with a steel cap. Posts are replaced with treated wood posts.

(2) Linn County is working closely with the Oregon Department of Transportation to inventory and rank all the County's bridges with respect to earthquake response. It is anticipated that the initial survey and priority ranking will be completed during the 1996 calendar year. Identified deficiencies will be addressed on a priority

basis within the constraints of available funding. Typical candidates for upgrading for earthquake protection are steel girder bridges.

(3) There are three bridges in the County on private access (public) roads and therefore not maintained by the County. Two are very low in height and structurally sound. A bridge over Wiley Creek, however, was determined by federal inspection to be unsound. It is also quite high and traverses a creek that carries a substantial volume of water. The County has applied for and received federal funding for replacement of this bridge. Replacement is scheduled for 1995.

(4) Four bridges in the County are very sound structurally, but due to design standards of the time at which they were constructed, they are now considered too narrow. These bridges are the Gates bridge, the Brownsville bridge, the Scio bridge and the Mill City bridge. The Mill City bridge is co-owned by the State. Two of these bridges may need widening in the next ten to fifteen years. They are the Scio bridge and the Mill City bridge. A new Gates bridge is currently under construction.

(5) There are no land connections between Linn and Benton counties. The two counties are completely cut off from one another by the Willamette River. There are six bridge crossing points linking the counties. Two are on Hwy. 20 in Albany, three are on Hwy. 34 at Corvallis and one is on Hwy. 99E in Harrisburg. As the two counties continue to build economic and commuting ties, the current capacity of the crossing points may prove inadequate for commuting and other purposes. The Van Buren St. bridge linking Linn County with Corvallis on Highway 34 is in need of improvement. ODOT, Linn County, Benton County and the City of Corvallis have been participating in discussions to determine whether the bridge should be replaced and, if so, when. At this point in time there has been no conclusion reached.

(B) Policy Statements

(1) It is the goal of Linn County to maintain a safe and efficient network of bridges

through its continuing program of inspection, maintenance, repair and replacement.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County to explore replacement of bridges when necessary. Otherwise, the County will follow standard maintenance and reconstruction procedures.

(3) Linn County supports improvement of bridge capacity and access across the Willamette River between Linn and Benton counties.

(4) Linn County supports the redesign of the Southern Corvallis Bypass. The current interchange does not facilitate turning movement off of Highway 34.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 05-138 §1 eff 8/23/05]

907.370 Transportation projects; road network

(A) *Background.* The Planning and Building Department and the Road Department have compiled a list of expected road projects over the next twenty years. The transportation project list was reviewed by the Linn County Board of Commissioners, the Linn County Planning Commission and the public. The list of projects was determined by:

- (1) performing a capacity analysis on the County road network;
- (2) analyzing accident data provided by the state and 911 Emergency Services;
- (3) expert knowledge of the County Road Department; and
- (4) results of the County and State bridge inspection program.

(B) Policies

(1) Linn County has identified and prioritized needed improvements to the road network in this plan.

(a) The projects are prioritized as Level I, II, or III projects.

- (i) Level I contains high priority projects,
- (ii) level II contains medium priority projects and
- (iii) level III contains low priority projects.

(b) Projects are also prioritized by

time of expected completion. The projects on the Transportation Project List are projects involving minor realignment of roads or replacement of existing bridges. They will not have significant impacts on the transportation system or land use in the County and are approved outright.¹⁶

(2) At least once a year, Linn County will review identified transportation projects and, if necessary, add, delete and/or re-prioritize them to accommodate new conditions. Transportation projects will be prioritized in accordance with the policies of the transportation plan. The Board of Commissioners shall adopt any changes. Adopted changes to the Transportation Project List will become part of the transportation plan. Any projects that are allowed outright may be added to the Transportation Project List by the Board of Commissioners without further review. If a project cannot be approved outright, inclusion of the project on the Transportation Project List will require review and approval before adoption.¹⁷

(3) If population growth, increases in traffic volumes, major development or other unanticipated changes require significant changes to the Transportation Project List, a plan amendment will be necessary. If amendment to the transportation plan is necessary, the procedure for *Comprehensive Plan* amendments outlined in LCC Chapter 902 (*Plan Monitoring and Amendment Code*) shall be followed.

(4) Realignments of curves and intersections are permitted outright by this plan without the need for further review if the realignment is in accordance with provisions of ORS 215 and the Linn County Land Development Code (LCC Chapters 920 to 939).

(5) Linn County recognizes the need for adequate road improvements for the new County Fairgrounds. Construction plans need to address access, capacity and road standards on all roads serving the fairgrounds including Goldfish Farm Road, Knox Butte Road and Highway 20.

(C) *Linn County Transportation Plan Pro-*

¹⁶ See paragraph (5) of this subsection.

¹⁷ See LCC 907.230

ject List. Projects on this list have either:

(a) been permitted outright and adopted by the Linn County Board of Commissioners and not subject to further review; or

(b) been reviewed, approved and adopted and are not subject to further review.

| CURVES | PRIORITY | TIME-FRAME |
|---|----------|------------|
| Courtney Creek Drive (east end) | III | 10 |
| Kingston-Jordan Dr. / Huntley Road (vertical) | III | 10 |
| Kingston-Jordan Dr. / Mount Pleasant (vertical) | III | 10 |
| Miller Cemetery Road / Ridge Drive (vertical) | III | 10 |
| Orleans / Riverside Dr. | III | 10 |
| McCully Mountain | III | 10 |
| Plainview Dr. / Seven Mile Lane (current project) | III | 10 |
| Rogers Mountain Loop | III | 10 |
| Rahn Hill | III | 10 |
| Stoltz Hill / Blueberry Road | III | 10 |
| Brownsville Road / Washburn Heights | III | 10 |

| INTERSECTIONS | PRIORITY | TIME-FRAME |
|---|----------|------------|
| Berlin Road / Bellinger Scale Road | III | 10 |
| Brownsville Road / Harrison Road | III | 10 |
| Brownsville Road / Washburn Heights | III | 10 |
| Berlin Road / Waterloo Road | III | 10 |
| Crowfoot / Cascade Drive | III | 10 |
| Fern Ridge / Highway 228 (State owned) | III | 10 |
| Knox Butte / Scrael Hill Road | III | 10 |
| Kingston-Jordan / Sandner Road | III | 10 |
| McCully Mountain / Substation / Kingston-Lyons / Hwy. 226 (State owned) | III | 10 |
| Marks Ridge Drive / Berlin Road | III | 10 |

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Meridian Road / Fish Hatchery Drive | III | 10 |
| North River Road / Pleasant Valley Road | III | 10 |
| Powerline Drive / Diamond hill | III | 10 |
| Richardson Gap / Fish Hatchery Drive (needs beacon light) | III | 10 |
| Sodaville Road / Buckmaster Road | III | 10 |
| Three Lakes / Grand Prairie | III | 10 |
| Upper Calapooia / Highway 228 (State owned) | III | 10 |
| Spicer Drive / Grand Prairie | III | 10 |
| Tangent Drive / Highway 34 (State owned) | III | 10 |

| BRIDGES — REPLACEMENT | PRIORITY | TIMEFRAME |
|-----------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| Gates Bridge | I | under construction 1994 |
| Scio Bridge | II | 15 |
| Mill City Bridge | II | 15 |

| BRIDGES — RECONSTRUCTION | PRIORITY | TIMEFRAME |
|--------------------------|----------|------------------|
| Three Lakes Road | I | (Summer 94) |
| Plagman Road | II | (within 2 years) |
| Speasl Road | II | (within 3 years) |
| Boston Mill Road | I | (Summer 94) |
| Harrison Road | I | (within 2 years) |
| Peck Road | I | (within 1 year) |

(D) The capacity related projects on the following list may have significant impacts on the transportation system of Linn County. Linn County supports the following capacity related projects subject to review, approval and adoption into the Transportation Project List of specific plans. These projects are placed on the Transportation Project List by being reviewed, approved and adopted through LCC Chapter 902 (*Plan Monitoring and Amendment Code*).

| CAPACITY RELATED PROJECTS | PRIORITY | TIME-FRAME |
|--|----------|------------|
| Lebanon Bypass (State Facility) | I | 10 |
| Hwy. 34 Corridor — Oakville Road, Riverside Dr. and Columbus St. | I | 10 |
| Grand Prairie between Albany and I-5 (possible future City of Albany road) | II | 15 |
| Airport Road* | I | 5 |
| Oak St.* | II | 5 |
| Denny School Road* | II | 5 |
| Old Salem Road | II | 10 |

* In the event of the construction of a Lebanon bypass these projects will be unnecessary as the bypass will route sufficient traffic volumes off of these roads.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

907.380 State highways

(A) Background

(1) *ODOT Corridor Study of Highway 34 between I-5 and the Willamette River*

(a) The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Cascades West Council of Governments (COG) are finalizing discussion on conducting a “corridor study” and system plan for Highway 34 from Lebanon west to Newport and Highway 20 from Lebanon to Sweet Home. The State’s intention is to create a plan to maintain the facility between I-5 and the Willamette River at a level of service B (LOS B) and attainment of access management standard category 2.¹⁸ The planning period extends to 2016.

¹⁸ “Level of service ‘B’” is defined as “reasonably free flow conditions. Design factors allow for average travel speeds of greater than 57 mph. Service flow rate not greater than 1,100 passenger cars per hour per lane.” Category 2 access management is defined as providing for high speed and high volume traffic movements, it should not provide direct land access. It is distinguished by highly controlled connections and medians, traffic signals should be avoided, grade separations should be considered for high volume cross streets. Public access roads should be limited to one every 1 to 5 miles and ideally there should be no private driveway access. Note: Highway 34 between I-5 and the Willamette has numerous public and private access points, far exceeding category 2 status.

The COG will be involved in the management and production of various aspects of the study. The following is a condensation of the preliminary scope of work for the Highway 34 corridor study subject to revision.

(b) *Public Involvement.* General public involvement is to be ongoing throughout the study. At least four advertised public information workshops, as well as other means of disseminating information to the public, will be provided during the study.

(c) *Review Existing Plans, Policies and Standards.* Regulations, plans and policies pertinent to the analysis of alternatives and facility development will be identified and incorporated into the framework of plan development. The impact to transportation facilities from converting land use to commercial and other uses will be evaluated. An existing land use, under-utilized/vacant land analysis will be accomplished.

(d) *Inventory Existing Transportation Systems and Facilities.* This inventory will identify existing public and private facilities, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, bridges, public transit and intercity bus operations and airport facilities. Inventory activities will also identify any existing conflicts between transportation modes and identify environmental, social, economic and energy constraints on future facility development.

(e) *Determine the Transportation Needs.* The needs to be evaluated include state-wide transportation needs; regional and local needs; needs for intermodal connectivity and facility development; special transportation needs; safety needs; and needs created by existing and proposed development.

(f) *Conduct Systems Planning Within the Study Area.* The study will establish what type of transportation facilities will be needed to serve development. The study will identify and evaluate alternative locations for future interchanges and road connections. The study will identify alternative solutions, evaluate associated benefits and costs and select an alternative

that reduces reliance on the automobile.

(g) *Develop Implementation Mechanisms for the Study.* Implementation techniques include a transportation facility management program and progressive development of a land access road system. The study will identify phased facility improvements based upon five-year increments. If determined necessary to maintain LOS, the Plan will establish limitations on land use conversion. The study will develop an access management plan, including access spacing for streets and driveways. Funding for the chosen transportation alternative will be identified and a financing program will be developed.

(h) *Anticipated Products.* The anticipated products include the approximate location for any future interchange(s), the approximate location of a future frontage road/parallel street system and funding and timing for the street system and interchange(s).

(2) *Highway 34 between I-5 and the Willamette River*

(a) The County considers State Highway 34, between the Interstate Freeway (I-5) and the Willamette River, an area of special concern. This area has existing conflicts between through and local traffic. Highway 34 west of I-5 is characterized by a mixture of agricultural, residential, industrial and commercial uses.

(b) One purpose of the Linn County *Comprehensive Plan* is to restrict conversion of farm and forest lands to other uses. The County has recently rewritten its commercial and industrial zoning ordinances to limit urban-scale development and to generally restrict development to a rural-scale. Further development along the Highway 34 corridor is likely to be proposed because of its proximity to Corvallis, Albany, Tangent and I-5, the nature of existing development and high volumes of traffic along the route. The County wishes to see further development in this area proceed in a controlled and reasonable fashion and in such a way that farm and forest land is protected.

(c) *Commercial.* Most commercial development on Highway 34 is clustered at the

freeway interchange of Highway 34 (Corvallis and Lebanon) and I-5. The present amount of commercially zoned land is probably adequate for the near future. There is land currently available for both development or redevelopment at the interchange. The interchange appears to be the most likely site for future transportation-dependent commercial development because of its freeway location.

(d) *Industrial.* Most of the County's light industrial uses are located close to Albany and Corvallis. One of the most intensive areas of industrial development occurs on Highway 34 between Corvallis and Oakville Road. Properties adjacent to Highway 34 are developed with numerous industries. Most of this development is located within two clusters; one near Oakville Road and the other near Peoria Road. The diversity of these two areas is recognized by an Urban Development (UD) zoning designation which has been applied only to these two areas. The purpose of the UD zone is to permit the continuation and expansion of existing uses and their replacement with similar uses. The UD zoning district is restricted to these two intensively developed areas on Highway 34. Other industrially zoned land on Highway 34 is limited to rural types of industrial development (LI - Limited Industrial).

(3) *Highway 34 between I-5 and Lebanon and Highway 20 east of I-5*

(a) Highway 34 between I-5 and Lebanon and Highway 20 east of I-5 are important east-west corridors for Linn County. Preservation and improvement of these highways is important for the economic development of the County. These highways also provide important links in the State Highway system. Currently, Highway 34 has a number of deficiencies which are in need of correction. The highway is too narrow and has insufficient shoulders. There are a number of curves and intersections that require realignment. There are increasing conflicts on the Highway 34 between industrial traffic and commuter traffic. Commuter traffic on this highway is increasing as more people move to Lebanon for inexpensive housing and commute to Albany, Corvallis and

other points for work. There is economic development activity occurring in Lebanon that will further stress this highway segment. This stretch of highway is zoned EFU (Exclusive Farm Use). Therefore no major development conflicts or access management problems due to industrial, commercial or residential development are likely to occur in the planning period. This stretch of highway will function well as a major arterial for the County and as a valuable improvement to the State system.

(b) A significant problem with Highway 34 is that it terminates in downtown Lebanon and intersects there with Highway 20. Two major arterials for the County, both carrying significant traffic volumes, intersect in a busy downtown district. A significant portion of that traffic on Highways 34 and 20 in Lebanon is through traffic. For detailed discussion of the need for the Lebanon bypass, please refer to the *City of Lebanon Transportation Master Plan and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Pacific Highway - Main Street (Lebanon) Reconnaissance Report*.

(c) It is the position of Linn County that Highway 34 traffic needs to be routed around Lebanon to the south of the city. A Lebanon bypass is a high priority for the County along with improvements to Highway 34. The addition of travel lanes east of I-5 and a bypass routing traffic to the south of Lebanon onto the existing five lane stretch of Highway 20 represents an opportunity to enhance the State Highway system, facilitate traffic flow in Lebanon, address possible capacity problems that may arise in the next twenty years and provide a facility that will assist in the economic development of the County.

(d) Highway 20 is also an important east-west link for the County. Many of the problems found on Highway 34 are also found on Highway 20. There is a need for additional travel lanes and turning lanes. Additionally, some intersection realignment is critical on this highway. Of particular note are the intersections of Highway 20 and Highway 226 and the intersection of Highway 20 with Knox Butte Rd. These intersections are

hazardous and should be realigned.

(4) *Highway 226 and Highway 228*

(a) The intersection of Highway 226 and Highway 20, as mentioned above, is an issue of concern. Linn County supports reinstatement of planned Highway 228 improvements previously included in the State Transportation Improvement Plan which included reconstruction and replacement of two bridges.

(5) *ODOT Corridor Study of Interstate 5 between the Santiam River and ORE-34*

(a) The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) prepared a “corridor study” for I-5 titled the “State of the Interstate, Report 2000.” For planning purposes, the Report’s planning period extends to the year 2020. In the area between the Santiam River and ORE-34, the study shows that the traffic volume/highway capacity (v/c) condition exceed adopted highway standards in the Oregon Highway Plan. Widening the freeway to six lanes in this section of the I-5 corridor and modifying most interchanges will be necessary to provide a highway that meets the adopted traffic volume to capacity ratio standards adopted in the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan.¹⁹

(b) Two ODOT reports present existing conditions and conceptual solutions to improve freeway access between the South Jefferson Interchange (Exit 238) and the ORE-34 interchange. They are: Millersburg I-5 Corridor Refinement Plan; and Albany I-5 Corridor Refinement Plan. Average daily traffic volumes for the study area in 2002 ranged roughly between 50,000 and 60,000 vehicles. These two reports detail the v/c for I-5 mainline segments in this area, showing that current traffic conditions throughout the study area cause the v/c to drop below ODOT operating standards for an interstate. The Refinement Plans also evaluate alternatives and show proposed modifications needed to ensure that interchanges in this area would meet the Oregon Highway

Plan’s adopted v/c standard.

(c) The Dever-Conner Interchange is not addressed by a refinement plan. ODOT is currently acquiring right-of-way near the Dever-Conner interchange in conjunction with a reconstruction project in order to accommodate future interchange improvements when the highway is widened.

(d) As identified in the Millersburg Refinement Plan, there are current safety and interchange spacing issues between the South Jefferson (Exit 238) and Viewcrest (Exit 237) Interchanges and between the Murder Creek (Exit 235) and Knox Butte (Exit 234) interchanges. The Millersburg Refinement Plan recommends closing both the Viewcrest and Murder Creek interchanges and building a new interchange, called the Tank Farm Road interchange, near milepost 236. The new Tank Farm Interchange will improve access to existing and future industrial uses within the Millersburg urban growth boundary, especially for truck traffic. The new interchange also will remedy operational, spacing and safety problems at the Viewcrest and Murder Creek Interchanges.

(e) The Millersburg Refinement Plan’s public involvement process included letters to property owners and businesses in the Viewcrest area, 10 stakeholder meetings, and briefings before the Linn County Board of Commissioners and the Millersburg City Council to present the preliminary findings and get feedback regarding proposed changes to area interchanges. The summary of all the meetings was presented at a public open house in late May, 2002. In that process, the preferred solution to the traffic concerns associated with the Viewcrest Interchange, and the safety and operational issues at Murder Creek Interchange, was to close both interchanges and construct a new interchange at Tank Farm Road.

(f) An exception to statewide Goals 3, 11, and 14 has been adopted for approximately 23 acres of rural properties east of I-5 affected by development of the proposed interchange near Tank Farm Road and Berry Drive and

¹⁹ “Volume to Capacity Ratio” or “v/c” mean the condition in which the average volume of traffic flowing through the stretch of road in the peak use hour is a percentage of the road capacity limit.

the realignment of Century Drive.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) It is the policy of Linn County to maintain the present supply of RCM (Rural Commercial) zoned land along Highway 34 between the Willamette River and I-5 and to discourage the conversion of agricultural, residential and industrial land to commercial uses. The plan discourages more commercial development because it will create traffic conflicts on the highway and will be inconsistent with planning efforts in Albany, Tangent and Corvallis. Highway 34 has been designed to move a high volume of traffic at fast speeds and additional highway commercial development would create more turning movements on and off the highway which would compromise safety. Since commercial services are available nearby in Corvallis and Albany there is little need to provide additional rural commercial zoning on Highway 34.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County to maintain the present supply of land zoned for LI (Limited Industrial) uses along Highway 34 between the Willamette River and I-5 and to discourage the conversion of agricultural, residential and commercially zoned property to industrial uses. The plan is intended to discourage more industrial development because it will create traffic conflicts on the highway and will be inconsistent with planning efforts in Albany, Tangent and Corvallis. Highway 34 has been designed to move a high volume of traffic at fast speeds and additional industrial development would create more turning movements on and off the highway which would compromise safety. Since industrial land is available nearby in Corvallis, Albany, Tangent and Millersburg, there is little need to provide additional locations for industrial development opportunities on Highway 34.

(3) Future consideration should be given to construction of frontage roads along Highway 34 between the Willamette River and Oakville Road in order to reduce traffic conflicts. A specific plan for this policy is needed appropriate, and should be accomplished through the ODOT Highway 34 Corridor Study.

(4) Linn County opposes closing of important access roads leading onto Highway 34. Specifically the County opposes any proposed closing of Peoria Road, White Oak Road, Riverside Drive, Oakville Road and Columbus Street. All of these roads have been designated either an arterial or collector in the County's functional classification system (except for Looney Lane) and as such represent important sections of the County's road network.

(5) Linn County recognizes the importance of the east-west corridors in the County, especially Highway 34 and Highway 20 for continued economic, tourist, and community development.

(6) Linn County believes there is a need to route traffic from Highway 34 around Lebanon before connecting with Highway 20. A Lebanon bypass is a State road project that the County strongly supports. The County would like to see the bypass project given a high priority, because practical options for placement of the project will decrease and cost will increase over time. The County realizes the size of this project will require cooperation and coordination with both the State and the City of Lebanon. The County encourages all parties to participate in development of a feasible bypass project and the necessary funding mechanisms to accomplish construction within a reasonable timeframe.

(7) It is the policy of Linn County that the improvement and upgrading of Highway 34 and Highway 20 between I-5 and Lebanon are State road projects that the County strongly supports. Improvements needed include better shoulders, additional travel lanes, continuous turn lanes and curve and intersection realignments. Ideally, both facilities need to be five lane facilities that are linked by a bypass around Lebanon. Highway 34 improvements are higher priority than Highway 20 improvements.

(8) Linn County supports renewed inclusion of improvement plans for Highway 228 in the State Transportation Improvement Program.

(9) Linn County recognizes that there may be a need to construct a North Corvallis

Bypass from Highway 34 northwest across the Willamette River in the next twenty years. However, reevaluation of the need for this project should be undertaken before construction. If, after reevaluation, it is determined that the project is needed its eventual alignment also needs to be reevaluated before construction begins.

(10) Linn County supports the following State transportation projects subject to review, approval and adoption into the Transportation Plan Project List.

| STATE-OWNED FACILITIES | |
|--|--|
| Location | Plan Projects |
| Highway 34 between I-5 and Lebanon – | widening, additional lanes, shoulders |
| Highway 20 between I-5 and Lebanon – | widening, intersection realignments |
| Highway 228 between Halsey and Brownsville | reconstruction, replacement of two bridges |
| I-5 between Santiam River and ORE-34: | additional lanes, interchange modifications, new Tank Farm/Berry Drive Interchange, related changes to Century Drive frontage road and county roads |
| I-5 at approximately Mile Post 236: | Tank Farm/Berry Drive interchange, ²⁰ new freeway entrance/exit ramps, bridge across freeway, intersection improvements at Old Salem Road and access road, and realignment of Century Drive |

(11) It is the policy of Linn County to support the proposed coordinated closures of the Viewcrest (Exit 237) and Murder Creek (Exit 235) interchanges with the construction of a proposed Tank Farm /Berry Drive Interchange.

(a) The primary function of the planned Tank Farm/Berry Drive Interchange is to provide access between I-5 and the planned industrial and other urban uses within the Millers-

burg and Albany UGBs. The interchange also functions to provide access to the area east of I-5, to the existing uses in the vicinity of the interchange, and to uses consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations. The interchange is intended to support or provide only for land uses that are consistent with the planning efforts in Albany, Millersburg and Linn County and that will not conflict with the development and function of the interchange.

(b) Linn County and ODOT together will manage the Tank Farm/Berry Drive Interchange area so that the location of the future interchange and the function of the constructed interchange are not compromised.

(i) ODOT shall adopt the necessary regulations to prohibit issuance of additional approach road permits to the existing Century Drive between Crooks Creek and Murder Creek Drive. These regulations will become an ODOT facility plan adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission.

(ii) To protect the function and operation of the Tank Farm/Berry Drive interchange Linn County will administer the county land use regulations in the vicinity of the interchange and will continue to regulate new parcels in the Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zone as required by state law. State law currently requires new EFU zoned parcels in the vicinity of the interchange to be at least 80 acres in size.

(iii) Linn County will review, and as necessary limit, plan amendments and zone changes within one-half mile of the Tank Farm/Berry Drive Interchange ramps to assure that they are consistent with the planned function of the interchange.

(c) Linn County and ODOT will cooperatively prepare and adopt an interchange area management plan (IAMP) for the Tank Farm/Berry Drive Interchange that implements the adopted goal exception and is consistent with the provisions of Oregon Administrative Rule 734-051. The IAMP will be adopted prior to funding the interchange for construction in the State Transportation Improvement Program. The

²⁰ Access road from Old Salem to realigned Century Drive frontage road is approximately 0.5 miles. The west side of the proposed interchange is in the City of Millersburg. A new interchange will require improvements on both sides of the freeway, both in Linn County and the City of Millersburg.

IAMP shall be adopted as an amendment to the county comprehensive plan and as an ODOT facility plan, and shall include policies and implementing measures that:

- (i) Prohibit new access within 1320 feet of the interchange ramp terminals; and
- (ii) Assure that the traffic movement capacity of the interchange, including subsequent improvements to the interchange, is reserved for its primary function — to provide for long-term access under acceptable mobility conditions for planned urban industrial uses within the interchange area and general access to all urban uses within the Millersburg and Albany UGBs.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99; amd 05-138 §1 eff 8/23/05]

907.390 City/County road policy

(A) Background

(1) The County owns roads both within the cities and within the urban growth areas surrounding the cities. Most of these roads outside of city limits but within urban growth areas will eventually be taken over by the cities and become city streets as these areas are annexed into the cities. During the interim, the County will continue to coordinate with the cities to ensure that proper development standards are maintained on these roads and on any new roads developed in urban growth areas.

(2) Proper development standards allow for smooth transitions from county to city ownership. Strengthening relevant portions of the Urban Growth Management agreements with cities is an effective arena from which to pursue tighter coordination on this important issue. The Planning and Building Department has applied for and received a grant from the State to revise and update urban growth management agreements with the City of Lebanon. The revision process will be completed by July of 1995. The revised agreement can be used as a model for similar agreements with other cities in the County.

(B) Policy Statements

(1) Linn County supports further coordination of city and County road networks so that they operate in an efficient fashion.

(2) Linn County supports the transfer of County roads to city jurisdictions when urban development and annexation occurs.

(3) It is the policy of Linn County to better coordinate city and county road standards through the urban growth management agreement process.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.394 Local road improvement

(A) Background

(1) A “**local road**” means a road that functions below the level of minor collector. Local roads serve to provide direct access to and from individual parcels or sites. There are three types of roads that can be considered local roads:

(a) “**County road**” means a public roadway which has been accepted by the Board of Commissioners as a county road and for which the County will be responsible for improvements and maintenance.

(b) “**Local access road**” means a road which has been dedicated to the public. Ownership has been formally accepted by the County, but without responsibility, obligation or agreement for improvement or maintenance.

(c) “**Private access road**” (also called a “**private road**”) means either a driveway, privately owned access road, easement of road access, or a privately maintained road necessitated by land partition created for the specific purpose of providing road access from a parcel to a local access road or county road.

(2) The Linn County Road Department is responsible for improvement and maintenance of County roads. Improvement and maintenance of a local access road or private access road is the responsibility of the parties who own land along that road. Local and private road standards need to evolve over time as a given road services more traffic. A dirt road may be sufficient for access to an individual property. However, as other properties begin to use that road for access, a dirt surface may no longer be adequate. At a certain point, the owners of properties utilizing the road for access may participate in the improvement of the road.

(3) These improvements may include widening and realignment, reinforcement of the road bed, graveling, chip sealing and/or asphaltting. These improvements can be quite costly. Given overall economic conditions in the County, especially in rural areas, road improvement can become an overly-burdensome requirement for property owners. At the same time, it is in the County's interest to maintain a high quality road network including local roads. Historically, the County has not had standards for road improvements outside of subdivisions. Recently, the County has developed a tiered standard in its partitioning ordinance that governs road improvement in these cases.

(B) Policy Statements

(1) It is the policy of Linn County that improvement and maintenance of local access roads and private access roads is the responsibility of the land owners with property along that road.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County that the cost of required local road improvements be equitably and fairly distributed among land owners with property along that road.

(3) It is the policy of Linn County that all local access roads and private access roads have road width, surface improvements, design standards and levels of emergency vehicle access appropriate to the number of properties and level of traffic being serviced by the road. Improvements to local access roads and private access roads are to follow the road improvement standards as outlined in Linn County Land Development Code.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

907.396 Trucking of hazardous materials

(A) Background

(1) In 1987, ODOT and the Oregon Public Utilities Commission conducted two 3-day surveys, one in March 1987 and one in August 1987, of hazardous material movement through Oregon. During the three day period 226 total commodities entered Linn County in 165 shipments. 61% of the commodities were flammable, 75% were corrosive, 2 were flammable gas and 2

were carrying multiple hazards. The most common commodities were gasoline (37), sodium hydroxide (29), corrosive liquid (26), fuel oil (26) and methyl alcohol (21).

(2) All the hazardous materials were recorded on I-5. The movement of these hazardous materials off the freeway needs to be addressed through creation of hazardous trucking routes. Creation of such routes would require a deeper understanding of the movement of these shipments than is currently available.

(B) Policy Statements

(1) It is the goal of Linn County to provide for the safe and efficient movement of hazardous substances through and within the County.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County that hazardous materials are to be transported through the County in the following manner:

(a) agricultural and forest related hazardous materials are restricted to the County arterial and collector network until a reasonable point of delivery requires use of local roads;

(b) non-agricultural and non-forest related hazardous materials are restricted to State highways, Old Salem Road and American Drive; and

(c) large volume fuel deliveries (i.e. tanker trucks) are restricted to State highways and Old Salem Road.

(3) These policies shall be coordinated with relevant Oregon Department of Transportation, Oregon Public Utilities Commission and federal agency policies.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

V. RAIL NETWORK POLICIES

907.400 High speed rail

(A) Background

(1) The states of Oregon and Washington applied for and received high speed rail corridor status in 1992 — one of five high speed rail corridors designated nationwide. A Statewide Transportation Plan and a Rail Passenger Plan

calls for development over the next few years of High Speed Rail services from Eugene to Vancouver, B.C. The longest single section of track for any county in Oregon will pass through Linn County. The probable location for a rail terminal will be somewhere between Albany and Highway 34. Other terminals will be located in Portland, Salem and Eugene. Consensus is that the Eugene-Vancouver Corridor is the leader among the five corridors nationwide as far as having a realistic near term program with state funds committed. In December, the Cascades West Council of Governments (COG) will be conducting a study, funded by the Oregon Department of Transportation, to determine the site of a multimodal station to service the high speed rail, busses and other transportation modes. The study will also determine who should operate the station. The study is slated for completion by March 1995.

(2) A steering committee, the High Speed Rail Task Force, has been organized to lead the project. This group's work will be supported by Oregon Department of Transportation staff and coordinated with the Willamette Valley Transportation Strategy Policy and Technical Committees. Funding, including \$500,000 in State Video Lottery dollars, has been appropriated for master planning, project development and market analysis work. \$5 million in State Video Lottery dollars have been appropriated for construction and match with federal high speed rail funds and/or interim rail and bus services. Another \$5 million will be available if Video Lottery receipts exceed estimates by more than 15 percent in any one quarter. It is likely that all or a substantial amount of the additional funds will be available during the biennium unless video lottery receipts drop considerably. ODOT is currently involved in project development, including a market analysis, rail capacity analysis and rail system engineering work.

(3) Linn County will be a nexus for high speed rail travel. The high speed rail plan calls for aggressive development of transit facilities. In Linn County that would be feeder busses (the Portland area will receive a light rail system

as well as feeder busses). These busses would link Corvallis, Albany, Lebanon and Sweet Home along Hwy. 20.

(4) The route of the high speed rail line has not been determined. Originally, the line was to follow the Southern Pacific rail line through Albany, Tangent, Halsey and Harrisburg. This route would necessitate a number of rail crossing closings, especially in Halsey and Harrisburg where the rail line splits the towns in two. Rail closings would be detrimental to transportation and community development planning in these towns. Noise and dust would be a problem. Fire and police service may be compromised with fewer crossings open. The high speed rail would create a hazardous situation as it travels through the towns at high speeds. The rail line currently goes near elementary schools in Harrisburg, Halsey and Tangent. There is discussion however of bypassing Halsey and Harrisburg. This option would solve a number of problems.

(5) The high speed rail line will certainly impact Linn County. The County is the recipient of the longest section of track in the state and a rail depot will be located in Linn County. Siting analysis of the high speed rail depot needs to consider traffic movement, multimodal connection opportunities and the location of current airports as well as possible future regional airports.

(6) Possible benefits of the high speed rail on Linn County may include:

- (a) a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and increased support of bus service;
- (b) increased commuting between Lebanon, Sweet Home and Albany;
- (c) increased commuting opportunities between Albany, Eugene and Portland;
- (d) increased economic and employment activity; and
- (e) an increased housing market.

(7) Negative impacts may include:

- (a) increased response time for fire, ambulance and police service as well as general interruption of traffic flow due to rail crossing closings;

(b) increased noise and dust and increased safety hazards — especially where rail lines pass near schools.

(8) Positive impacts assume a full multimodal approach, i.e. creating a system of busses and rail to link the system together. What is not clear is the nature of the high speed rail. Is it a long distance travel alternative or a commuting line? This issue has not been resolved yet by State planners. One scenario, under which impacts on Linn County would be minimal, views high speed rail as a competitor for short distance air trips. A second scenario sees the line serving local commuter traffic; County land use could be seriously affected by an influx of new residents who work in Portland or Eugene but could feasibly commute from Albany or Lebanon.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) While Linn County generally supports State plans to locate a high speed rail passenger rail line through Linn County, issues of access need to be resolved before implementation, specifically issues of:

(a) adequate access for public safety, fire, ambulance, and police;

(b) adequate public access to school and work; and

(c) community development impacts.

(2) Linn County supports exploration of alternatives to high speed rail crossing closures that minimize economic and access hardships to Linn County communities. Linn County opposes excessive closings, as such closings will reduce the quality of fire, police and ambulance service delivery and will generally impede efficient traffic flow.

(C) Linn County supports State efforts to implement increased bus service to serve the high speed rail.

(D) Linn County supports, when needed, the further mechanization of railroad crossings by the Oregon Public Utilities Commission.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.410 Intermodal connections

(A) *Background*

(1) Intermodal connections are facilities that allow the transfer of persons and/or goods from one mode of transport, such as an automobile, to another mode of transport, such as a railroad. Two locations in the County will have significant intermodal connections. A siting study for an intermodal connection in Albany which will include the high speed rail depot will begin in December of 1994. The old train station in Lebanon will be refurbished as an intermodal facility in the near future. Intermodal facilities should include park-and-ride facilities, parking lots, bike path connections and bike storage facilities and, when appropriate, linkage to Albany Transit and Linn Benton Loop bus systems. In Lebanon, the old Southern Pacific rail depot is being refurbished, using ISTEA (Intermodal Surface Transportation Enhancement Act) money, into a multimodal hub. This facility, which will be called the Santiam Travel Station, will include facilities for automobiles, trains, bicycles, ridesharing and pedestrian connections.

(2) A transit opportunity that needs to be explored is institution of passenger service on the Burlington Northern and Southern Pacific lines between Sweet Home, Lebanon, Albany and Corvallis. This existing line may have transit possibilities and would provide an obvious alternative link between these cities. Passenger rail could provide an important part of a multimodal solution to Linn County commuter traffic increases.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) It is the goal of Linn County to enhance intermodal connectivity throughout the transportation system.

(2) Linn County supports efforts to develop an intermodal connection with the high speed rail that includes automobile, air, bicycling and pedestrian access.

(3) Linn County supports Lebanon's efforts to develop an intermodal connection, with eventual connection to the high speed rail, that includes automobile, air, bicycling and pedestrian

access.

(4) Linn County supports institution of passenger rail service between Albany, Lebanon and Sweet Home.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.420 Rail abandonment

(A) Background

(1) Rail service is an important component of the Linn County transportation system. Rail is still the most efficient method for transporting large scale natural resources through the County. Rail's importance to forest and timber companies, industrial activities, and the agricultural sector makes it a valuable transportation mode that needs to be preserved within the County. The County does not want to see any further diminishment of rail service and encourages expansion of existing service and establishment of new services. The availability of rail service not only adds flexibility to industrial land, but in most cases, adds value. Access to rail service will often assist in the development of industrially zoned property.

(2) However, when rail lines are abandoned, opportunities for public use are created. When a rail line is abandoned, a stretch of land becomes available which can be used for a number of purposes, such as roads, utility corridors, bike/pedestrian trails and/or reversion to private property use. Often, abandoned rail lines connect two areas of interest or population. They provide a clear unobstructed and graded path that can be linked to other trails, bikepaths, utilities and rights of way to enhance a county's or city's recreational, transportation, and utility facilities.

(3) Recently, creation of pedestrian trails, walkways, bikepaths and equestrian trails within these rights of way has proven popular with citizens. Federal "Rails to Trails" legislation provides a mechanism to achieve this type of conversion. "Rails to Trails" allows cities and counties to obtain those parts of abandoned rail lines that have reversionary clauses associated with them. Sections of the line that are owned outright must be purchased from the rail company.

The Interstate Commerce Commission handles abandonment proceedings and must be notified during abandonment proceedings of any interest in trail conversion.

(B) Policy Statements

(1) Linn County does not support further rail abandonments or diminishment of service. The County supports rail service at present or expanded levels and expansion of rail facilities in the County.

(2) It is the goal of Linn County to protect industrial lands abutting freight lines and the connections between industrial lands and freight lines.

(3) It is the policy of Linn County to actively pursue, whenever feasible, conversion of abandoned rail lines through the federal "Rails to Trails" program and seek to integrate these abandoned lines into the County's trail/bikeway system.

(4) Since Linn County supports institution of passenger rail service between Albany, Lebanon and Sweet Home, the County therefore opposes abandonment of Southern Pacific or Burlington Northern rail lines that currently link these cities.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

VI. DEMAND MANAGEMENT POLICIES

907.500 General demand management

(A) Background

(1) There are two basic ways of dealing with transportation inadequacies.

(a) The first method is to increase the supply of transportation facilities. For example, if roads are congested, a transportation "supply" solution would entail building more roads or adding more lanes to existing roads thereby increasing the "supply" of roads.

(b) An alternative method is to manage the demand for transportation — i.e. demand management. For example, if there is not enough road space due to traffic congestion, rather than adding more roads, an attempt is made to

shift the demand to other options — public transit, bicycling, walking, and carpooling or to reduce the need for trips altogether through means such as telecommuting.

(2) Linn County does not meet many of the favorable conditions for demand management implementation. Rural areas and communities, such as those found in Linn County, are characterized by limited or no traffic congestion, widely spaced commercial and employment centers and widely distributed residential units. What little congestion may exist is experienced for a very short duration, denoting a “peak 5 minutes” as opposed to the “peak hours” in an urban setting. Modes of travel other than personal vehicles are generally not available or economical.

(3) Feasible demand management options in the County include ridesharing, telecommuting, flextime and compressed work week programs. In a county atmosphere, all of these options share some features. They are carried out by individual citizens or individual employers. There are no mandates or penalties. The role of government is to educate, help advertise and possibly help coordinate individual efforts.

(4) Cascades West Council of governments (COG) currently runs a ridesharing program that Linn County participates in. This ridesharing program was established and funded through ODOT and federal funds. There are opportunities for expanded ridesharing in the County. For example, as of June 1993, Hewlett Packard employed 3,921 people. Of those employees, 31% live in Linn County. This represents over 1,200 Linn County residents commuting to this one location in Corvallis. This commute pattern represents a viable opportunity for a significant volume of ridesharing between the counties. Although exact figures are not currently available, similar opportunities may be available with Oregon State University, Linn Benton Community College, Good Samaritan Hospital and some of the large employers in Linn County such as Tele-dyne Wah Chang and Albany General Hospital.

(5) Currently, at the Highway 34/Interstate 5 overpass, an informal area serves as a park

and ride for ridesharing commuters. There is also an informal park and ride on Hwy. 226 and Brewster Road. These areas and possibly some other areas in Linn County may benefit from being identified, designated and built into official ridesharing park and ride locations. Park and rides may also be established at business locations, such as shopping centers, super markets and gas stations, that allow a portion of their parking facilities to be used as a park and ride. The advantage to the owner of the facility is that every workday a number of potential customers are accommodated on their premises. Commercial parking facilities are usually well paved and have adequate access. Informal lots may have poor access, be unpaved and not meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

(6) There is no way of knowing the extent to which telecommuting is being used in Linn County. Facilities, such as phone lines, which are ready and capable of carrying telecommunication traffic, are already in place in the County. As of now, there is no mechanism available to monitor the volume of telecommuting. Assuredly, some segment of the population is using this method of work in some form and the volume is growing and will continue to grow. Current facilities in Linn County are adequate to meet the needs of the telecommuting public. Major infrastructure improvements such as placement of fiber optic cable are not required to accommodate demand in the near term. Only if demand is sufficiently stimulated will major investments prove to be necessary.

(7) Congestion relief and increased employment opportunities are two reasons to promote flextime and compressed work weeks. Although not yet a major problem, continued County growth could eventually lead to road congestion during peak rush hour periods, especially within the cities. An additional benefit of flextime/compressed work week schemes is that they can offer people who cannot work usual “9 to 5” hours additional opportunities to find work. This can allow underemployed workers in depressed industries, such as timber, to have access

to more employment opportunities. Currently, the County Road Department is instituting a compressed work week plan.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) It is the policy of Linn County to encourage implementation of demand management measures to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips. Promotion of carpooling, vanpooling, telecommuting, expanded transit use, provision of park and ride lots and encouragement of staggered work shifts for large employers will be explored where appropriate.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County to:

(a) support Cascade West Council of Governments' efforts to promote ridesharing in Linn County and surrounding counties and to participate in those efforts when feasible;

(b) promote ridesharing through the creation and advertising of Park-and-Ride facilities; and

(c) coordinate efforts with businesses that have excess capacity in their parking facilities to provide Park-and-Ride space to County residents.

(3) Linn County recognizes that telecommuting will play an increasing role in work habits and supports continued provision of telecommunication facilities in the County.

(4) Linn County supports efforts of companies and businesses who institute flextime and compressed work week programs as such efforts aid in the reduction of automobile congestion on the County road network.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

VII. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

907.600 Transportation disadvantaged

(A) *Background*

(1) While public transit is available and useful to the public at large, there is one segment of the population that vitally requires a functioning public transit system — the transportation disadvantaged. A number of different, diverse and sometimes overlapping groups are included

among the transportation disadvantaged. The four main groups are the disabled/handicapped population, the elderly, children under driving age, and the poor. All four groups may be either ineligible to drive a vehicle or physically unable to drive. This leaves the individual dependent on family, friends, or public transit. For the poor, availability of public transit can often determine whether or not they are able to work, take advantage of training and schooling and have access to health care and social services.

(2) Over the next twenty years, three of these transportation disadvantaged groups will increase. The general population is aging and the total percentage of elderly Linn County residents will continue to increase. Unless there is a dramatic reversal, the number of children living in poverty will continue to rise leaving these children with diminished opportunities for family transportation assistance. With the diminishment of institutional care and the increasing trend towards home care, the number of people with disabilities who must meet their own transportation needs will also increase. Poverty will exacerbate the difficulties facing all of the above groups.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) It is the policy of Linn County to identify the needs of the transportation disadvantaged and attempt to fill those needs through a combination of public and paratransit²¹ services.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County to support the expansion and maintenance of the transit and paratransit systems in the County.

(3) Linn County supports expanded coordination and cooperation between service providers to the transportation disadvantaged. Linn County supports the concept of Cascades West Council of Governments taking a lead in the coordination of paratransit providers.

²¹ “Paratransit” refers to public or private transit providers that usually serve elderly or handicapped populations on a more flexible basis. Routes and schedules may not be fixed. Service may be provided on-call. Paratransit is often provided by churches or charitable organizations. Public paratransit in Linn County includes Albany Call-A-Ride and Lebanon Dial-A-Bus.

907.610 Bus service

(A) *Background.* The current transit system in Linn County consists of a number of connecting elements.

(1) Foremost in the network is the Linn Shuttle. The Shuttle began operation in May 1987. By August 1994, it had a ridership of 5,194 passengers, making it the largest provider of public transit in the County. Of the 5,194 riders, 4,721 were disabled with the majority being shuttled to sheltered work programs. The rest of the ridership consisted of the elderly and the general public. The shuttle runs from 7 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and has two busses. It serves a flexible, fixed route between Sweet Home, Lebanon and Albany. It is coordinated with the schedules of the other two major public transit providers, the Albany Transit Service and the Linn-Benton Loop and with the Lebanon Dial-A-Bus. The shuttle also makes two runs to Brownsville daily. The Linn Shuttle is funded by state-provided Special Transportation Funds, approximately \$6,000 from the County's general fund, ridership fees, currently \$2.15 per trip for non-disabled and non-seniors, revenue from advertising and shuttling library books.

(2) The Albany Transit System (ATS) has two double loop routes which serve the City of Albany. Inter-county travel is served by the Linn-Benton Loop System. This route provides service between Albany, LBCC, Corvallis, OSU and Hewlett Packard. There are three park and ride locations servicing the Loop. The Linn Benton Loop makes connections with Corvallis Transit, Albany Transit, the Linn County Shuttle, Greyhound busses and Amtrak.

(3) Another component of the transit system consists of intercity busses running on I-5 and Hwy. 20. The Valley Retriever has one bus daily that runs from Newport to Bend and back on Hwy. 20. Greyhound has four northbound and five southbound busses daily from Albany that run along I-5. They service Salem, Portland, Eugene and points beyond. Greyhound busses also run daily to Corvallis from Albany. Connections can

be made from Portland and Eugene to Greyhound's nationwide network.

(4) One issue concerning the Linn-Benton Loop is increasing the frequency of the bus schedule. The current limited schedule, especially in the heavy commute mornings and evenings, may not be sufficient to fully capture the number of commuters who would use the system if it ran more frequently. Since there is a good operating system in place, efforts should be made to utilize it to its greatest extent.

(5) Another approach to the rural transit problem is to examine some of the transit alternatives that have been used successfully elsewhere. Portland examined what is called the "Smart-Bus system" which has been used in Germany. Adapted for smaller city/rural situation, the smart-bus consists of a number of stops with call-boxes. The busses do not have fixed routes or schedules but respond to calls made from the various stops. Rather than use large, expensive diesel busses, this system utilizes smaller mini-busses. The key to this system is a computerized central controller that sends the busses on the fastest most, efficient route possible. Thus, the bus can "ignore" empty segments of its route and provide faster service to its customers. The increased flexibility and tailored service attracts a larger ridership while keeping costs down via smaller, more fuel efficient vehicles and efficient routing. A system of smart-busses and coordinated paratransit could possibly provide a viable public transit system for a large segment of Linn County's population. The German system was developed in a combined rural/city environment with a city about the size of Albany.

(B) *Policy Statements*

(1) Linn County recognizes the valuable service the Linn Shuttle provides communities in the County and endorses continued support of that service.

(2) Linn County supports expanded transit service in the County but acknowledges that adequate funding mechanisms need to be developed that will equitably distribute the costs of the system.

(3) Linn County supports a feasibility study on creation of a smart-bus system²² to serve the public transportation needs of the unincorporated areas of the County.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

VIII. AIR TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

907.700 General air transportation

(A) Background

(1) There are 25 airports and airfields and 2 helipads in Linn County. Of the 25 airport and airfield facilities, 3 have asphalt runways, 19 have turf runways, one has a graveled runway and one has a combination gravel and turf runway. Two airports stand out as significant air facilities in the county — Albany Municipal and Lebanon State. The other facilities either do not serve the public (19 of the 25 facilities) or are of very limited public use (3 of the 25). These smaller facilities are used for either commercial agricultural spraying operations or private recreational use. There is also a State facility at Santiam Junction which is mainly used for medical emergencies and forest service operations.

(2) The Land Development Code provides for an Airport Overlay (AO). The AO was established to prevent air space obstructions near public use airports and to ensure compatibility between the airport use and surrounding land uses. Currently, the AO applies to areas, outside of city limits, surrounding the Albany, Lebanon, Davis and Daniels Field Airports. This zoning overlay will also apply to all future public use airports.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

907.710 Lebanon Airport

(A) The Lebanon State Airport had a draft Master Plan prepared by the State Aeronautics Division in 1993. The airport is currently owned

and operated by the Aeronautics Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). In 1990, there were forty-two (42) airplanes based at the Lebanon Airport. The Master Plan projects that the number of airplanes based at the facility will increase from 42 to 50 by the year 2010. There is no commercial air carrier activity, because facilities are inadequate for such service. The principal use of the airport is and will be for private use. Projected use for the year 2010 will use only 9.3% of capacity.

(B) Six alternatives were developed by the Master Plan. There are two main problems with the current design. Airport Road is an “obstruction” to the airport. Air space clearance of the road should be at 15 feet, but is now only at 5 feet. The airport also requires a ten degree turn be made by planes for the purpose of noise abatement before making a landing. Ideally, planes should be able to make a straight approach to the runway. Additionally, by leaving the runway at the current length, B-II type planes (over ten seats) cannot be accommodated. Currently, one plane larger than 10 seats uses the facility and is based in Salem.

(C) The Master Plan recommends construction of a new 4,170 foot long runway located to the southwest of the existing runway. The new runway would be rotated by 10 degrees. This alternative would change the airport’s classification to a B-II type air facility. Noise would be reduced for residents north of the airport due to the rotation of the runway. The estimated cost is approximately 1.5 million dollars.

(D) The proposed expansion would extend perpendicularly past the current location of Airport Road. The extension of the runway would necessitate putting four 90 degree turns into Airport Road. Existing traffic on Airport Road is quite heavy. To extend the runway in the manner proposed would cause major disruptions to traffic on Airport Road. Given the importance of Airport Road and the nature of the disruption, a major rerouting or new road would need to be constructed.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

²² A smart-bus system utilizes mini-busses that do not run on fixed schedules or routes. Call boxes, in conjunction with a computerized routing system, allows for a flexible and efficient transit system.

907.720 Regional Airport

(A) Two events may occur in the next few years that would alter the future of air transport in Linn County:

- (1) the maintenance of the Lebanon Airport as a B-I facility; and
- (2) the closure of the Albany Airport.

(B) The City of Albany is in the process of studying the economic feasibility of continuing to operate the Albany airport and is also studying the best economic use for the current airport site. Since the Albany Airport has extremely limited expansion potential and the site has a number of potential economic uses if airport operations cease, there is a strong possibility of closure. The above developments, if they come to pass, would leave the County without a major airport. While there are other strong regional airports in the Willamette Valley (specifically Salem, Eugene and Corvallis), there may still be sufficient economic potential for the construction of another airport in Linn County.

(C) While such an airport may not serve commercial carriers, it would accommodate a wide range of recreational, business and resource-related planes. The needs of local business community, recreational users and resource-oriented business users would need to be determined and suitable alternative locations discussed. The location of a regional airport facility near industrially zoned land and/or near major road facilities, such as Highway 34 and I-5, could provide economic benefits to the County and serve as an industrial development hub for the mid-Willamette Valley region.

(D) Currently, the State Aeronautics Department, with Federal Aviation Commission funding, has approved a regional airport study for Linn County. The study has been funded to \$100,000 and includes feasibility and siting components. Albany, Lebanon and Linn County will all participate in the preparation of the study. The study is slated for completion by fall of 1995.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.730 Policy statements

(A) Linn County is committed to air transportation as an ongoing and vital component of the Linn County transportation system.

(B) It is the policy of Linn County that any proposal to develop a public use airport shall include a master plan which describes service levels, support facilities, future uses and noise impact areas.

(C) Linn County is concerned that expansion plans for the Lebanon State Airport currently proposed by the State will seriously disrupt traffic on a County minor arterial, Airport Road. Impacts of airport expansion on the County road network must be addressed in any airport expansion plans.

(D) Linn County supports a study to determine the feasibility for construction and operation of a regional airport. The study would be done in cooperation with the State Aeronautics Division and the Federal Aviation Administration. Any study must evaluate the impact that the airport would have on the County road network.

(E) Linn County opposes expansion of the Lebanon Airport until a regional air facility study has been completed and a determination of airport needs have been made.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

IX. BICYCLING

907.800 Subchapter title

This Subchapter, LCC 907.800 to 907.890, shall be known and may be cited as the "Linn County Bicycling Plan" or simply as the "Bicycling Plan."

[Adopted 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

907.805 Background viewpoint

(A) Bicycling has long been a reasonable and efficient means of transportation and recreation in the United States. Its use and popularity preceded the development of the motorized vehicle. After World War II, bicycle use as transportation declined while automobile use increased. This was due in large measure to a massive increase in road building and subsequent suburbani-

zation that occurred after the war--both of which favored auto use. However, bicycle use has increased dramatically in the last 15 years. This renewed popularity has occurred as many citizens turned to the bicycle to promote a healthier lifestyle, a cleaner environment, cost savings and as an enjoyable form of transport. More and more people are choosing bicycles for recreation, utility or commuting as an alternative to the automobile. Surely, auto use will continue to grow; but as more people become concerned about energy consumption, pollution and increased congestion many will turn to bicycling as an intelligent, healthful and fun alternative.

(B) A basic viewpoint of the Bicycling Plan is that the road network must accommodate all types of traffic--motorized, bicycle and pedestrian; over time the compatibility of the road network with these three modes of transport needs to be increased.

(C) The Bicycling Plan was produced by the Linn County Bicycle Advisory Committee, a citizen committee. All Background Documentation including surveys and project lists that were used to develop this plan are available on request from the Planning and Building Department.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.810 Purposes of the Bicycling Plan

(A) The overall purpose of the Bicycling Plan is to promote bicycling and walking in Linn County.

(B) The first purpose of the Bicycling Plan is to guide development and maintenance of our county road system so that the needs of bicyclists are met. This stems from a recognition of the importance of bicycling as means of transportation. The second purpose is to focus public attention on the importance to our future of planning for bicycling. The Bicycling Plan also discusses parking and other support facilities for bicycling.

(C) The Bicycle Advisory Committee sought to produce a plan that:

- (1) is easy to read and reference;
- (2) addresses current and future needs of bicyclists and pedestrians; and

(3) sets forth guidelines for coordination of the development and maintenance of the bicycle and pedestrian network with the development and maintenance of the county road network.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.815 Assumptions

(A) *Legal vehicles.* The road network generally provides the most efficient and safest routes for transportation. By law, bicycles are recognized as legal means of transportation on the entire roadway system of Oregon (with only a few exclusions on interstate highways in the Portland area). Therefore, the entire public road network in Linn County is also the bikeway network.

(B) *Alternative transportation.* For bicycling and walking to grow as alternatives to the auto, careful planning, coordination and vigilance must be followed. The bicycle must be recognized as an important means of transportation in our future. We must preserve existing facilities and build new ones to facilitate both bicycling and walking.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.820 Oregon's Transportation Planning Rule

This Bicycling Plan fulfills the county's requirements for bicycle planning found in Oregon's Transportation Planning Rule.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

907.830 Preparation of the Bicycling Plan

(A) *Bicycle Advisory Committee.* In 1993 the Board of Commissioners appointed ten volunteers from the various communities in the county to the Linn County Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC). The BAC was charged with the responsibility to prepare a master plan focusing on bicycling to become a part of the county *Comprehensive Plan*. The BAC obtained a small grant from the Oregon Department of Transportation, which along with county support, provided funding for the completion of the Bicycling Plan. The BAC hired a coordinator to facilitate the planning process and conducted a major public survey of bicycling attitudes and usage patterns.

(B) *Public Input.* Public input was solicited

through a county-wide bicycling survey, public hearings held by the Planning Commission and public hearings held by the Board of Commissioners.

(C) *Bicycling Survey.* The Linn County Bicycle Advisory Committee organized and conducted a comprehensive survey of citizen attitudes toward bicycling and patterns of bicycle usage in Linn County. A two-page survey form was created and distributed throughout the county in October and November of 1994. Distribution was two-fold: First, the survey was printed in all newspapers published in Linn County as well as the major paper in adjoining Benton County. Second, surveys were distributed to most of the county city halls and to the Albany Public Library. These locations also served as collection points for the survey. Citizens also had the option of mailing their completed surveys to the Linn County Courthouse. Over 500 people responded to the survey producing results that helped the BAC determine a bicycling network and set priorities for improvements.

(D) *Primary Bikeway Network.* The BAC identified a network of county and state roads that constitute a primary network of roads used by and favorable to bicycling as transportation.

(E) *Bikeway Project Priority List.* The BAC compiled a specific priority list of projects designed to accomplish the most important needed improvements to implement the Primary Bikeway Network. (Appendix B)

(F) *Bikeway Project Priority Map.* A map display of the Bikeway Project Priority List.

(G) *Bicycling Plan.* The committee also developed a series of policies relating to bicycling facilities. The Bicycling Plan is a compilation of the policies, network of roads as bikeways, and priorities for improvements.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

907.840 Inventory of facilities

(A) *Road Ownership.* Linn County contains approximately 3,150 miles of roads of various types and under various ownership. Eighty-four miles are in primitive or unimproved condition;

1,357 miles are graded or graveled; and 1,708 miles are paved. Linn County owns 1,120 miles of the roads in the county. Cities own 341 miles. The State owns 250 miles and various other agencies own 1,438 miles of primarily forest management roads.

(B) *Types of Roads.* There are four types of road ownership in Linn County.

(1) A state highway is a public roadway owned, maintained and improved by the State of Oregon.

(2) A county road is a public roadway which has been accepted by the Board of Commissioners as a county road and for which the county takes responsibility for improvements and maintenance.

(3) A local access road is a road which has been dedicated to the public. Ownership has been formally accepted by the county, but without responsibility, obligation, or agreement for improvement or maintenance.

(4) A private access road is either a driveway, privately-owned access road, easement of road access, or a privately maintained road necessitated by land subdivision created for the specific purpose of providing road access from a parcel to a local access road or county road.

(C) Surface Types

(1) There are a number of road surface types in Linn County. These include:

(a) primitive and unimproved surfaces,

(b) graded surfaces,

(c) gravel surfaces,

(d) oil mat surfaces,

(e) asphalt concrete hot mix (AC) surfaces,

(f) AC with rubberized asphalt surfaces, and

(g) concrete surfaces.

(2) There are approximately 10.5 miles of primitive or unimproved and graded roads in the county that are owned by the cities. The county does not own any roads in these two classes. The county owns 135 miles of gravel roads, 562 miles of oil mat roads, 396 miles of

asphalt concrete roads, and a little over a mile of concrete roads. The Road Department pursues an aggressive program of road surface maintenance. The Road Department estimates that the vast majority of Linn County road surfaces are in good condition.

(D) *Functional Classification Systems.* Roads in Linn County are classified, according to function, as either arterial, collector or local roads.

(1) *Arterials* (major and minor) are roads that carry traffic through and between major urban, suburban, and rural activity centers. Arterials generally provide the shortest routes for through traffic and the greatest mobility at the highest speeds. Arterials are of two types: major and minor.

(2) *Collectors* (major and minor) are roads which function as connectors between local roads and arterials. Collectors provide movement for through traffic and provide direct access to properties. In general, collectors carry residential, commercial, and/or industrial traffic to arterials.

(3) *Local roads* provide direct access to individual properties and are not meant for through traffic. Their purpose is to carry local residential, agricultural, resource-related, and/or business traffic from individual properties to collector roads.

(E) *Lane and Shoulder Width.* Roads in the county's arterial and collector system are two-lane roads with the exception of Interstate 5 and Hwy. 34 (between I-5 and Corvallis and between Lebanon and Sweet Home). Currently, county roads are generally being built to a 22 foot standard. The majority of existing county roads are 20 or 22 feet wide with an additional two to four foot shoulders, however, lane width can (for collectors and arterials) vary from 10 feet to 16 feet. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the road lanes on the collector and arterial system are 10, 11 or 12 feet wide. Shoulders vary from 1 foot to 9 feet. Seventy percent (70%) of shoulders are 2+-foot, 14.7% are 3+-foot, and 10.3% are 4+-foot--representing 95% of the total network.

(F) *Bikeways.* The county considers all roads in the county to be a general bikeway network.

(1) Bikeway roads can be categorized into four different types:

(a) *Shared Roadway*--motorists and cyclists occupy the same traffic lane.

(b) *Shoulder Bikeways*--cyclists are accommodated on paved roadway shoulders.

(c) *Bicycle Lanes*--a section of the road is designated for exclusive use by cyclists.

(d) *Multi-Use Paths*--paths which are completely separated from the roadway.

(2) All county bikeways in the unincorporated areas are either shared roadways or shoulder bikeways.

(G) *Financing*

(1) There are three main funding sources for implementing the policies and goals of the Bicycling Plan:

(a) Linn County General Road Fund;

(b) Linn County Bicycle Fund (1% of Oregon State Gasoline Tax); and

(c) Special grants from ODOT (state) and ISTEA (federal).

(2) The first source for financing improvements and/or maintenance of the bikeway network is the Linn County general road fund which is administered by the Linn County Road Department. The Road Department attempts to include bikeway projects within its own road reconstruction, resurfacing, and expansion program. Bikeway maintenance (i.e. sweeping and vegetation cutting) is also provided through general road funds. The Road Department will endeavor to continue to fund these improvements within the limits of its budget. However, general road funds will be facing declines over the next ten years and maintenance and bikeway improvements may need to be funded from other sources in the future.

(3) The second source for financing improvements and/or maintenance of the bikeway network in Linn County is the Linn County Bicycle Fund which is maintained from with funds from the Oregon State Gasoline Tax. The Oregon legislature has mandated that a minimum of 1% of gasoline tax funds received by the county must be

used for bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The law sets the minimum percentage but allows for a higher percentage, up to any “reasonable amount necessary.”

(4) The county is receiving approximately \$4.75 million dollars a year in State gasoline taxes and is dedicating the minimum 1% (i.e. \$47,500) to bikeway improvements. This funding fluctuates yearly depending on tax collection and the proportion of the state’s registered vehicles located in Linn County. In general, however, gasoline tax funds are a steady source of income and they will provide stable financing base for the improvements proposed in the *Bicycling Plan* over the next twenty years.

(5) The third source of funding comes from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and from the federal government under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) program which is administered by ODOT. These grants are available for special projects. Since these funds are obtained by grants, are competitive, and are generally restrictive in their use — they cannot be considered a long term funding source.

(6) All State highways in Linn County are designated in the *Bicycling Plan* as State Bicycle Routes and the *Bicycling Plan* requires the State to fund improvements to those roads following guidelines as outlined in the *Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.850 General policies

(A) It is the policy of Linn County to provide and/or encourage facilities that serve the diverse needs of citizens traveling by bicycle. Currently those needs include:

- (1) commuting to work and school;
- (2) utilitarian transportation to shopping, public facilities, and for personal business;
- (3) intermodal connections to transit stops and park-n-rides; and
- (4) recreation and touring.

(B) It is the policy of Linn County that bicycles be accorded the same importance as

motor vehicles.

(C) It is the policy of Linn County to consider convenience and efficiency for the bikeway network as equally important as for the motorized network.

(D) It is the policy of Linn County to develop and maintain an integrated system of shoulder bikeways and suitable shared roadways.

(E) It is the policy of Linn County to encourage employer efforts to provide employees with amenities which increase the convenience and attractiveness of commuter bicycling.

(F) It is the policy of Linn County to facilitate bicycling as transportation. The *Bicycling Plan* seeks to increase the modal share of bicycle trips while reducing the modal share of motor vehicle trips within the county transportation system.

(G) It is the policy of Linn County to provide a clear, public, bicycle route map that clearly designates major, minor, and alternate bicycling routes.

(H) It is the policy of Linn County to coordinate bicycle planning and construction projects with the cities.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.860 Bikeway designation guidelines

(A) By law, bicycles are allowed to use all roadways in the State of Oregon. Therefore the road network, including county, state and Federal roads, of Linn County is also the bikeway network.

(B) The *Bicycling Plan* identifies which sections of the roads/bikeway network are primary bicycle routes. A primary bicycle route is a section of a road/bikeway that has been designated as important for bicycling use. Primary bicycle routes are identified for funding decision-making. They do not identify where bicycling is allowed as all roads are open to bicycling (see 8.2.1 and 8.1.2). There are four designations for Bicycle Routes in Linn County:

- (1) *State Bicycle Routes* (All state highways are included in this category. Funding for maintenance and improvements are the re-

sponsibility of the State of Oregon.)

(2) *Major Bicycle Routes* (These roads meet most of the criteria found in the Bicycling Plan. They are to be the primary focus for expenditure of funding.)

(3) *Minor Bicycle Routes* (These roads meet many of the criteria found in the Bicycling Plan. They are to be a secondary focus for expenditure of funding.)

(4) *Undesignated Routes* (These roads meet few of the criteria found in the Bicycling Plan. They are not to be a focus for expenditure of funding.)

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.865 Bikeway prioritization guidelines

(A) The BAC decided on the following list of criteria (listed in descending order of importance) is to be used in the identification of the roads in the county which will constitute Linn County Bicycle Routes:

(1) Safety of the road for bicycling as it is and as it would be if improved.

(2) The utility of the roads for transportation so that the bicycling network provides access to:

- (a) cities & communities
- (b) other transportation modes
- (c) city bicycle paths
- (d) neighboring county bikeway

systems

- (e) bicycle routes
- (f) recreational routes and sites

(3) Existing usage for bicycling (How much and for what reasons is the road being used for bicycling?)

(4) Current levels of motorized use such as traffic volume & type

(5) Existing road conditions such as shoulder width and pavement quality

(6) Road grade

(7) Costs involved in accomplishing improvements

(8) Scenic qualities and features

(B) *Bikeway Construction Standards, Maintenance and Improvements*. When the policies in

the Bicycling Plan apply to the Road Department, they are contingent upon availability of funding. The BAC, Road Department, and Board of Commissioners may allow flexibility in these standards if project costs become prohibitive. In general, it is the policy of Linn County that the best possible bikeway project (i.e., a project which comes closest to meeting the plan's standards) be done. However, if funding is not sufficient, minimal improvements may still be beneficial.

(1) It is the policy of Linn County that when expansion or reconstruction of the arterial and collector road network occurs, roads will be designed to meet the policies, goals and standards set forth in the Bicycling Plan.

(2) It is the policy of Linn County that when new or expanded facilities for bus and rail routes, terminals, passenger stops, and public transit facilities are developed, they will be designed to meet the policies, goals and standards set forth in the Bicycling Plan.

(3) It is the policy of Linn County that all new, reconstructed, or widened shoulder bikeways, will conform to AASHTO standards whenever possible.

(4) It is the policy of Linn County that on roads designated as major or minor bicycle routes, shoulder bikeways shall, ideally, be at least four-feet wide and shall be provided for in each direction of travel allowed on the road.

(a) Two- and three-foot shoulders are acceptable when terrain, right-of-way, or environmental conditions do not permit four-foot shoulders.

(b) Local roads, with low traffic volumes, do not need shoulders and should be considered shared bikeway facilities.

(5) It is the policy of Linn County that when a road designated as a major or minor bicycle route is resurfaced, bikeways shall be resurfaced, as a minimum, to the same width as the existing pavement and, where possible shall be widened to a four-foot standard.

(a) Where practical, driveway approaches shall be paved back to the edge of the road rights-of-way or a minimum of ten feet from

the pavement to prevent gravel from being carried onto the bikeway.

(b) To improve safety, “feathering” of new asphalt onto existing pavement is preferred.

(6) It is the policy of Linn County that shoulder bikeways shall be paint striped conforming to State of Oregon standards with a 4 in. stripe per the county maintenance schedule.

(7) It is the policy of Linn County that when new drainage grates are installed, those grates will be designed, oriented, and installed so as to pose no (or minimal) additional hazard to bicyclists.

(8) It is the policy of Linn County that unless required in the specific situation, curbs will not be installed along the edge of shoulder bikeways.

(9) It is the policy of Linn County that when resurfacing a road, paving and gutters will be the same height with no hazardous crevice between.

(10) It is the policy of Linn County that bikeway pavement surfaces shall be swept clean per the county maintenance schedule, on at least an annual basis.

(11) It is the policy of Linn County that trees and shrubs shall be cut back so that no vegetation protrudes into the bicycle lane below a height of ten feet. Vegetation and other obstructions will be kept back at least two feet from the edge of the bikeway. Consideration shall be given to maintaining and improving sight distance on horizontal and vertical curves to keep bicycles visible to motorists.

(12) It is the policy of Linn County that when a shoulder bikeway must be reduced or eliminated (e.g. on older bridges or at intersections), bicyclists and motorists will be warned with signage in adequate time to traverse the distance involved.

(13) It is the policy of Linn County that there be clear and consistent educational signage, consistent with state and national standards, on all major and minor bikeway routes. The purpose of the signage is to alert motorists that bicycles have

the same rights on the road as motorized vehicles.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.870 Bicycle parking

(A) It is the policy of Linn County to encourage the provision of bicycle parking for all retail, school and industrial development. Ideally, the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces should equal or exceed 10% of the number of motor vehicle parking spaces.

(B) It is the policy of Linn County that any bicycle parking facilities that are provided should be surfaced in the same manner as motor vehicle parking as addressed in the Linn County Building Code.

(1) Bicycle parking spaces should be at least six feet long and two feet wide, and overhead clearance in covered spaces should be at least seven feet.

(2) A five foot aisle for bicycle maneuvering should be provided between each row of bicycle parking.

(3) Ideally, at least 50% of bicycle parking should be covered.

(4) Bicycle parking should provide secure stationary racks (anchored to the surface), which accommodate bicycle locks, securing the frame and both wheels.

907.875 Bicycling safety

Linn County seeks to provide a safe environment for both the bicyclist and the motorist.

(A) It is the policy of Linn County that shoulder bikeways be provided wherever feasible and suitable to provide for greater safety for both bicyclists and motorists.

(B) It is the policy of Linn County to promote adequate bicyclist and motorist education so that both shared roadways and roadways with bikeway shoulders are used in a safe manner.

(C) It is the policy of Linn County to encourage and support education and safety programs for all ages, that improve riding skills, encourage observance of traffic laws, and increase awareness of bicyclist and pedestrian rights.

(D) It is the policy of Linn County to include

the Oregon Motor Vehicle Code as a necessary component of bicycle safety and education (since bicycles are considered vehicles under the Oregon Motor Vehicle Code; are subject to the same penalties; and bicyclists must obey the same rules of the road).

(E) It is the policy of Linn County that the rights and responsibilities of pedestrians need to be included in educational and safety efforts.

(F) It is the policy of Linn County that the BAC will help coordinate and promote educational programs and activities within the county, especially at schools. Any funding will be provided through state and federal grants.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.880 Prioritization of funding

(A) If the general road fund is unable to finance maintenance of existing bikeways, the 1% gas tax funds shall be expended first on the maintenance and repair of existing major and minor bicycle routes. Other projects, if they cannot be financed through the general road fund, shall be prioritized as in 8.7.3 and paid for with remaining funds.

(B) The Bikeway Project Priority List, the Bikeway Project Priority Map and the Primary Bikeway Network Map are used to prioritize improvements for funding. They guide decision-making by listing and displaying the roads which have been identified as facilitating bicycling as transportation in the County. A copy of the Bikeway Project Priority List is included in Appendix 4. A copy of the Bikeway Project Priority Map and a copy of the Primary Bikeway Network Map is included with this plan.

(C) It is the policy of Linn County to implement the improvements on the Bikeway Project Priority List and to fund, when possible, general improvements to the major and minor bike routes found on the Primary Bikeway Network Map.

(1) Once a year, proposed county road projects involving bikeways and the Bikeway Project Priority List will be reviewed by the BAC and the Road Department.

(2) A bikeway projects recommenda-

tion, which will include funding sources, will be given to the Board of Commissioners. Also, any recommended amendments to the Bicycle Project Priority List will be made at that time.

(3) In-so-far-as it's practical, the bike-way projects recommendation will follow the relative priorities reflected in the Bikeway Project Priority List and the Primary Bikeway Network map. However, implementation is not restricted absolutely to any hierarchy. Exceptions might include: projects that fulfill an unanticipated need, projects that would result in substantial savings if timed properly, or projects that would allow for more extensive improvements than would normally be the case if coordinated with other road department projects.

(4) The purpose of this strategy is to yield, in the long run, the most value from the limited funds available for bicycling improvements.

(5) In the event that the BAC is not available, the Linn County Roadmaster will be responsible for making the bikeway projects recommendation.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

907.890 Plan review

It is the policy of Linn County that the Bicycling Plan be evaluated every three years by the Bicycle Advisory Committee to determine how well the goals are being fulfilled.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

X. OTHER TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

907.900 Issues to be addressed

(A) Three transportation issues are addressed in this section. They are:

- (1) pipeline facilities,
- (2) waterways, and
- (3) pedestrian facilities.

(B) There are no new pipelines planned for Linn County and no planned expansion of present facilities. There are no current or future capacity problems anticipated that would require coordinated planning efforts with petroleum companies.

(C) There are extensive waterways in Linn County. They provide numerous recreational opportunities for residents and tourists but they do not serve any transportation functions.

(D) The volume of pedestrian traffic in the unincorporated parts of the County is very low. The County considers its bikeway network, which consists of shoulder bikeways, to be sufficient to serve the needs of the walking public in the unincorporated areas. Therefore, any improvements outlined in the Bicycling Plan are considered to be improvements for pedestrians. No special facilities are needed.

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

Statutory References and Other Authorities:
ORS 203

Legislative History of Chapter 907:

Adopted 80-335 9/2/80

Amendments to 80-335:

- #1 95-026 §? eff 2/1/95²³
 - #2 95-398 §? eff 8/16/95²⁴
 - #3 95-449 §? eff 12/13/95²⁵
 - #4 95-456 §? eff 12/13/95²⁶
 - #5 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99
 - #6 05-138 §1 eff 8/23/05
-
-

²³ Articles rewritten and replaced: “Transportation” section of the “Community Facilities and Development Element.”

²⁴ Articles rewritten and replaced: “Introduction” and “Background and Summary Issues” in “Citizen Involvement” section.

²⁵ Articles rewritten and replaced: “Transportation” section of the “Community Facilities and Development Element.”

²⁶ Articles rewritten and replaced: “Urbanization.”

APPENDIX A — FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF LINN COUNTY ROADS

[Table goes here]

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

APPENDIX B — BIKEWAY PROJECT PRIORITY LIST

The purpose of this list is to identify and prioritize projects for bikeway improvements. This list was developed through information gathered from a citizen survey, the BAC, the Road Department, and the Planning and Building Department. While the list is arranged in a hierarchy, its implementation will not necessarily follow that hierarchy. As stated in the Bicycling Plan policy section other factors may determine the order in which projects are done. Bicycle traffic volumes are very low in the unincorporated areas of the County, therefore there are no pressing needs or serious problem areas (i.e. insufficient infrastructure coupled with high bicycle traffic volumes). Projects can therefore be done in a flexible manner without jeopardizing the integrity of the network. The goal is to improve as much of the bikeway network as possible over time. Therefore linking with Road Department projects as a way to stretch dollars and enhance projects is more important than the hierarchy of the list.

The list is broken into two further sections — projects projected for completion within ten years Appendix B (1) and those projected to be completed beyond a ten year timeframe Appendix B (2). Those projects anticipated to be completed within ten years contain road information, improvements needed and estimated costs. The other projects just list needed improvements.

| PRIORITY # | BIKEWAY PROJECT |
|------------|---|
| 1 | Riverside Drive |
| 2 | Peoria Road |
| 3 | Jefferson-Scio Drive |
| 4a | Old Salem |
| 4b | Gore/Red Bridge/Goltra/Midway/Swank/Three Lakes |
| 4c | Grand Prairie |
| 4d | Spicer |
| 5a | Ellingson |
| 5b | South Main |
| 5c | Seven Mile Lane |
| 6 | Tangent |
| 7 | Richardson Gap |
| 8 | Brownsville |
| 9 | Rockhill |
| 10 | Bryant |
| 11a | Stayton-Scio |
| 11b | Lacomb |
| 11c | Crawfordsville |
| 11d | North River |
| 12 | Coberg |
| 13a | Fish Hatchery |
| 13b | Liberty/Fairview/Waterloo/River |
| 14 | Diamond Hill |
| 15 | Brewster |
| 16 | Tennessee School/Honey Sign |

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80; amd 99-190 §? eff 5/19/99]

(1) PROJECTS PROJECTED TO BE COMPLETED WITHIN 10 YEARS

(Signage costs --approximately \$75/sign. Signs will be placed as needed on a project specific basis.)

PRIORITY 1

RIVERSIDE DRIVE

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | entire length |
| Length | 5.5 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 2-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 58,080 linear feet @ \$5.00/linear foot \$290,250 |
| Comments | Suggest blocking Riverside to car traffic just west of Orleans Rd.--allow bicycles continued passage. Some road segments may need repaving. Needs sweeping. |

PRIORITY 2

PEORIA ROAD

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | entire length |
| Length | 43.18 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 4-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | restripe, blackout, widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | \$168,805 |
| Comments | Some road segments may need repaving |

PRIORITY 3

JEFFERSON-SCIO DRIVE

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | Robinson Drive to Marion County line |
| Length | 2.54 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 4-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 26,822 linear feet @ \$5/linear foot \$134,112 |
| Comments | Needs sweeping. Need to coordinate with Marion County. |

ROBINSON DRIVE

| | |
|---------------|------------------------------|
| Location | Jefferson-Scio Drive to Scio |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 4A

OLD SALEM

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | I-5 to Murder Creek Road |
| Length | 2.64 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 4-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 27,878 linear feet @ \$15/linear foot \$418,176 |
| Comments | Needs sweeping. Some road segments may need repaving. |

PRIORITY 4B

GORE ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Location | Highway 20 to Red Bridge |
| Length | 3.71 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 3-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

RED BRIDGE ROAD

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | Gore to Swank |
| Length | 0.13 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Improvements | |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

GOLTRA ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Location | Midway to Swank |
| Length | 1.09 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 2-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

MIDWAY ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Location | Goltra to Three Lakes |
| Length | 2.74 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 20 feet with 3-foot gravel shoulders |

| | |
|--------------|---------|
| Improvements | signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

SWANK ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Location | Red Bridge to Goltra |
| Length | 1 mile |
| Condition | poor |
| Current width | 18 feet gravel |
| Improvements | pave and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 10,560 linear feet @ \$6/linear foot \$63,360 |
| Comments | |

THREE LAKES ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Location | Grand Prairie to Spicer Road |
| Length | 2.23 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 4-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 4C

GRAND PRAIRIE ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Location | Spicer Road to Albany city limits |
| Length | 2.23 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 4-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 23,547 linear feet @ \$6.50/linear foot \$153,069 |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 4D

SPICER ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Location | Highway 20 (Albany) to Highway 20 (Lebanon) |
| Length | 7.9 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 4-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 83,424 linear feet @ \$6.50/linear foot \$542,259 |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 5A

ELLINGSON ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Location | Columbus Street to Albany city limits |
| Length | 1.05 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 4-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 47,481 linear feet @ \$6.50/linear foot \$308,627 |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 5B

SOUTH MAIN

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | Vaughn Lane to Rock Hill |
| Length | 1.18 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 24 feet with 2-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 12,461 linear feet @ \$9/linear foot \$112,149 Bridge widening \$30,000 |
| Comments | Needs sweeping. |

PRIORITY 5C

SEVEN MILE LANE

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | Columbus Street to Brownsville |
| Length | 19.44 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 3-foot gravel shoulders (Columbus to Highway 34) 24 feet with 3-foot gravel shoulders (Highway 34 to Brownsville city limits) |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 171,178 linear feet @ \$6.50/linear foot \$1,112,657 |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 6

TANGENT DRIVE

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | Peoria to Hwy 34 |
| Length | 10.34 miles |
| Condition | poor |
| Current width | 20 to 22 feet with 2 to 4-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| Costs | Paving (Peoria to Oakville)-- 10,560 linear feet @ \$7.50/linear foot | \$ 79,200 |
| | Paving (Oakville to McClagen)-- 14,362 linear feet @ \$7.50/linear foot | \$107,715 |
| | Paving (McClagen to Hinck)-- 5,280 linear feet @ \$7.50/linear foot | \$ 39,600 |
| | Paving (Hinck to McFarland)-- 12,672 linear feet @ \$9.00/linear foot | \$114,048 |
| | Paving (McFarland to 99E)-- 3,591 linear feet @ \$12.50/linear foot | \$ 44,888 |
| | Paving (99E to city limits)-- 8,554 linear feet @ \$9.00/linear foot | \$ 76,986 |
| | Paving (city limits to Tangent Loop)-- 11,088 linear feet @ \$6.50/linear ft | \$ 72,072 |
| | Paving (Tangent Loop to I-5)-- 6,336 linear feet @ \$5.00/linear foot | \$ 31,680 |
| | Paving (I-5 to Seven Mile Lane)-- 6,864 linear feet @ \$5.00/linear foot | \$ 34,320 |
| | Paving (Seven Mile to Milepost 1.84)--10,560 linear feet @ \$9.00/linear ft | \$ 95,040 |
| | Paving (Milepost 1.84 to bridge)-- 16,685 linear feet @ \$5.00/linear foot | \$ 85,425 |
| | Paving (bridge to Hwy 34)-- 2,746 linear feet @ \$6.50/linear foot | \$ 17,849 |
| | Bridge widening | \$100,000 |
| | Total | \$898,823 |
| Comments | | |

PRIORITY 7

RICHARDSON GAP ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Location | Highway 226 to Fish Hatchery |
| Length | 4.67 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 4-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | Paving — 49,315 linear feet @ \$6.50/linear foot \$320,548 |
| Comments | |

RICHARDSON GAP ROAD

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Location | Fish Hatchery to Kowitz |
| Length | 3.28 miles |
| Condition | fair to good |
| Current width | 22 feet with 3-foot gravel shoulders |
| Improvements | signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

(2) PROJECTS PROJECTED TO BE COMPLETED AFTER TEN YEARS

PRIORITY 8

BROWNSVILLE ROAD

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 9

ROCKHILL ROAD (SOUTH MAIN TO SAND RIDGE)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 10

BRYANT DRIVE (TO RIVERSIDE)

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | restripe with no widening (to keep traffic speeds low) |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 11A

STAYTON-SCIO ROAD

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 11B

LACOMB DRIVE

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 11C

CRAWFORDSVILLE DRIVE (HOLLY SCHOOL TO HIGHWAY 228)

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | repair pavement and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 11D

NORTH RIVER DRIVE AT FOSTER LAKE

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | Try to link with Foster Lake bike projects |

PRIORITY 12

COBERG ROAD (HARRISBURG TO LANE COUNTY LINE)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 13A

FISH HATCHERY ROAD (HIGHWAY 226 TO RICHARDSONS GAP)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | mailboxes impede bicycle traffic |

PRIORITY 13B

LIBERTY, FAIRVIEW, WATERLOO AND RIVER ROADS

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 14

DIAMOND HILL ROAD (HARRISBURG TO HARRIS DRIVE)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | widen, pave and stripe shoulder as needed to 4 feet and signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 15

BREWSTER ROAD

| | |
|---------------|---------|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

PRIORITY 16

TENNESSEE SCHOOL AND HONEY SIGN ROADS

| | |
|---------------|---------|
| Location | |
| Length | |
| Condition | |
| Current width | |
| Improvements | signage |
| Costs | |
| Comments | |

[Adopted 80-335 eff 9/2/80]

[This page is intentionally blank]