

Although it has rarely been used, petitioning to the County and formation of a local improvement district (LID) is an equitable approach available to property owners seeking improvements to roads adjacent to their land. This is referred to as a “special assessment for public improvements” in Lane Code Chapter 15. Recent use of the special assessment process has been limited to initiation by resolution of the County Board, through the Capital Improvement Program, for improvements on county-maintained urban collector and arterial streets.

Goals And Policies: Transportation And Land Use

Goal 20: Ensure that transportation projects comply with state land use requirements regarding urban and rural land uses, and other federal, state, and local land use requirements.

- Policy 20-a: Transportation projects, facilities, services and improvements as identified in Oregon Administrative Rules 660-012-0065 and as implemented in Lane Code may be permitted on rural lands consistent with statewide land use Goals 3, 4, 11, and 14 without a goal exception.
- Policy 20-b: The following transportation facility improvements do not require an amendment to the TSP unless an exception to state land use laws or a TSP amendment is otherwise required.
- (i) Channelization
 - (ii) Operation, maintenance, and repair
 - (iii) Preservation
 - (iv) Reconstruction
 - (v) Rehabilitation
 - (vi) Intersection improvements
 - (vii) Realignment
 - (viii) Modernization
 - (ix) Transportation facilities, services and improvements serving local travel needs. The travel capacity and level of service of facilities and improvements serving local travel needs shall be limited to that necessary to support rural land uses identified in the acknowledged comprehensive plan or to provide adequate emergency access.
- Policy 20-c: Plan amendments, zone changes, and other land use decisions shall consider impacts on the county transportation system, including federal, state, county, and other local roads; bicycle and pedestrian paths; public transit facilities; and air, rail, port, and pipeline facilities.
- Policy 20-d: Amendments to the comprehensive plan or any of its adopted components and sub-plans, which significantly affect a transportation facility, shall ensure that allowed land uses are consistent with road function, capacity, level of service, and other adopted performance standards. This may be accomplished by:
- (i) limiting land uses to the existing road capacity or level of service;
 - (ii) amending the TSP pursuant to Lane Code 16.400(9), to provide adequate facilities;
 - (iii) altering the land use designation, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for auto travel and meeting travel needs through other modes, or
 - (iv) amend the TSP, pursuant to LC 16.400(9), to modify the planned function, capacity and performance standards, as needed, to accept greater motor vehicle congestion to promote mixed use, pedestrian friendly development where multimodal travel choices are provided. If a TSP amendment is required, it shall not be initiated unless the requirements of LC 16.400(9) have been met.
- A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility, if it:
- (i) Changes the functional class of an existing or planned facility, or will result in the roadway facility no longer meeting the functional class definition;

- (ii) Changes standards that implement the functional class, except that approval of an exception or variance to standards does not in itself significantly affect a transportation facility;
- (iii) Allows types or levels of land uses that would result in levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional class; or
- (iv) Would reduce the performance standards of the facility below the minimum acceptable level identified in the TSP.

Determinations under this policy shall be coordinated with affected transportation facility and service providers and other affected local governments.

- Policy 20-e: The presence of a transportation facility or improvement shall not be a basis for an exception under OAR 660-012, OAR 660-004-0022 or OAR 660-004-0028, to allow residential, commercial, institutional or industrial development on rural lands.
- Policy 20-f: When an exception to statewide land use goals and/or a plan amendment is required for a transportation facility, the approval process should be consolidated with other public hearings and approvals required for the project before the Roads Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission, and the County Board of Commissioners.
- Policy 20-g: Amendments to the county Transportation System Plan shall be processed according to applicable state law requirements, the provisions set forth in Lane Code Chapter 12, and Lane Code 16.400.
- Policy 20-h: Road improvement projects shall comply with federal, state, and local land use regulations.

Goal 21: Provide for coordinated land use review when making decisions about transportation facilities.

- Policy 21-a: It is the county's intent that the Transportation System Plan be consistent with state Transportation System Plans, with *TransPlan* (the Eugene-Springfield Transportation System Plan applicable inside the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan boundary), and with the Transportation System Plans of other cities within the county.
- Policy 21-b: County TSP goals and policies apply to:
- (i) all roads in the county that have been dedicated to and formally accepted by the Board of County Commissioners, unless and until such roads are subsequently accepted or annexed by an incorporated community; and
 - (ii) all other transportation facilities and services, including road, air, rail, pipeline and port facilities, located outside of urban growth boundaries or outside of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan boundary.
- Policy 21-c: Where inconsistencies exist between the county TSP and other TSPs applicable within the county, or between road design standards of the county and other jurisdictions within the county, the following guidelines shall be used in making decisions about road improvements and services. If the inconsistency involves:
- (i) a state highway, state transportation system plans and design standards shall prevail;
 - (ii) a public or private road outside of an urban growth boundary, the county TSP and road design standards shall prevail;
 - (iii) a public or private road functionally classified as a local road within an urban growth boundary, the city TSP and applicable road design standards shall prevail;
 - (iv) a road defined as a county road pursuant to Lane Code 15.010 and functionally classified as a collector or arterial road, the county TSP and road design standards shall prevail;

- (v) a public or private road functionally classified as a local road or primarily used to provide local access to abutting properties within the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan boundary, *TransPlan* and the respective applicable Eugene or Springfield road design standards shall prevail within the urban growth boundary and the applicable County Road design standards shall apply outside the urban growth boundary;
- (vi) an intersection or roads in more than one jurisdiction's ownership or control, the TSP goals and road design standards of the agency having ultimate maintenance responsibility shall prevail.

Decisions about road improvements may follow different guidelines than those above upon agreement of the elected officials of the involved jurisdictions or their designees, or if other recorded inter-jurisdictional agreements exist that supersede the above guidelines.

Goal 22: Encourage adequate road improvements for new development.

- Policy 22-a: The dedication of adequate right-of-way and construction of road improvements may be required to serve traffic that will be generated due to the development.
- Policy 22-b: The County will consider opportunities to purchase land for extensions of right-of-way where connectivity between collector and arterial roads is needed to promote efficient traffic flow.
- Policy 22-c: The County encourages and will facilitate the formation of Local Improvement (special assessment) Districts to address road improvement needs on sub-standard roads.
- Policy 22-d: Road vacations proposed as part of lot or parcel reconfigurations or property line adjustments, that will result in loss of connectivity between dedicated public and/or County Roads shall require approval of a replat of all subdivision lots and partition parcels adjacent to the road to be vacated. As part of the replat process, the County may require dedication of right-of-way or the creation of private easements, and road improvements, to ensure previously existing connectivity between public or County Roads is maintained.
- Policy 22-e: Roads that were dedicated to the County but were never accepted shall be subject to goals, policies, and standards applicable to private roads and easements, unless otherwise specified.

CHAPTER 6: RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

6.1. County Profile And Trends

This section provides an overview of Lane County's population, employment, truck commodity flows, commuting habits, survey information about transportation concerns, and land use with regard to transportation system implications. Data was collected from the U.S. Census Bureau, the Oregon Administrative Services Office of Economic Analysis, the Oregon Employment Department, the state's Population Research Center, the Oregon Blue Book, and other sources as noted.

Lane County was named for General Joseph Lane, who was Oregon's first territorial governor. It began as a farming community in the late 1840s, and was established as a county in 1851. With the building of the railroads, the market for timber opened in the 1880s. Today, wood products and farming are still important sectors of the economy in addition to high-tech manufacturing and tourism. Lane County government operates under a home rule charter approved by voters in 1962.

Population

Lane County's population in the year 2000 was 322,959 (U.S. Census). Between 1990 and 2000, the county's population grew at an annual rate of one to two percent, with an overall increase of 14.2%. This compares with the state's increase over the same period of 20.4% and the national increase of 13.1%. Eugene and Springfield added a total of 33,405 people during the ten year period, making up 83% of the increase in the county as a whole.

Table 9 from Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) on the following page summarizes population data for the county. Long-term projections produced by the State of Oregon Department of Administrative Services Office of Economic Analysis indicate Lane's population should continue to grow between about one and two percent per year. By the year 2020, the county's population is expected to increase 30% to 419,842 (Office of Economic Analysis projections).

Employment

After a history of economic ups and downs related to reliance on lumber and wood products, Lane County's industry mix diversified in the 1990s. Increased industry diversification has contributed to a more stable economy, one less susceptible to downturns in the national business cycle. Lane County has witnessed a substantial increase in employment over the last 10 years. Nonfarm employment since 1990 has increased by approximately 2,600 jobs per year, or about 2.2 percent. Year 2000 Employment within the County was 158,300.

By 2020, the Office of Economic Analysis projects nonfarm employment in the County to grow at a slower rate than it did during the 1990s, to 179,512 jobs, an increase of 13.5% over 2000 employment. It is likely that most of employment growth will occur in the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan area.

Truck Commodity Flows

In 1998, the Oregon Department of Transportation published results of a study of truck commodity flows within Oregon. Trucking accounts for 76% of the weight of all freight shipments, and 64% of the value in Oregon, according to the U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics. For the Willamette Valley/Southwest Oregon, farming and wood products are major truck exports. Orchard crops, vegetables, grains, hay, seeds and berries result in daily export truck trips worth nearly \$7 million. Lumber is also a major commodity.

Table 9

Population for Lane County and Cities											
	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	% Change 1990-2000	Numerical Change 1990-2000	Annual Average Growth Rate 1990-2000	Annual Average Growth Rate 1980-2000	Annual Average Growth Rate 1970-2000	Annual Average Growth Rate 1960-2000
Oregon	1,768,687	2,091,533	2,633,105	2,842,321	3,421,399	20.4%	579,078	1.9%	1.3%	1.7%	1.7%
Lane County	162,890	215,401	275,226	282,912	322,959	14.2%	40,047	1.3%	0.8%	1.4%	1.7%
Cities											
Eugene	50,977	79,028	105,664	112,669	137,893	22.4%	25,224	2.0%	1.3%	1.9%	2.5%
Springfield	19,616	26,874	41,621	44,683	52,864	18.3%	8,181	1.7%	1.2%	2.3%	2.5%
Cottage Grove	3,895	6,004	7,148	7,402	8,445	14.1%	1,043	1.3%	0.8%	1.1%	2.0%
Florence	1,642	2,246	4,411	5,162	7,263	40.7%	2,101	3.5%	2.5%	4.0%	3.8%
Junction City	1,614	2,373	3,320	3,670	4,721	28.6%	1,051	2.6%	1.8%	2.3%	2.7%
Oakridge	1,973	3,422	3,729	3,063	3,148	2.8%	85	0.3%	-0.8%	-0.3%	1.2%
Veneta		1,377	2,449	2,519	2,755	9.4%	236	0.9%	0.6%	2.3%	
Creswell	760	1,199	1,770	2,431	3,579	47.2%	1,148	3.9%	3.6%	3.7%	3.9%
Dunes City		976	1,124	1,081	1,241	14.8%	160	1.4%	0.5%	0.8%	
Lowell	503	567	661	765	857	9.2%	72	0.9%	1.3%	1.4%	1.3%
Coburg	754	713	699	763	969	27.0%	206	2.4%	1.6%	1.0%	0.6%
Westfir			312	278	276	-0.7%	-2	-0.1%	-0.6%		
Incorporated	81,734	124,779	172,908	184,506	224,011	21.4%	39,505	2.0%	1.3%	2.0%	2.6%
Unincorporated	81,156	90,622	102,318	98,406	98,948	0.6%	542	0.1%	-0.2%	0.3%	0.5%

Sources: 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000 Figures from U.S. Census; Lane Council of Governments (2002)

Washington State is the area's most significant out-of-state trade partner, receiving 20 thousand tons worth nearly \$1 million of lumber products daily, according to ODOT's study.

On an average weekday, approximately 19,000 trucks enter Oregon carrying 250 thousand tons of goods worth \$161 million. While the majority of goods go to Portland, the Willamette Valley/Southwest region ranks second in Oregon in shipments from other states. Washington and California account for more than three quarters of all truck imports to Oregon. Of the remaining 25%, approximately 11% of truck imports come from the Mountain Pacific, Midwest, and South regions.

Commute Destinations

Where people live relative to where they work has a significant impact on traffic congestion. According to the 1998 ODOT report on commuting patterns, based upon 1990 data, 116,269 of 118,925 Lane County residents (98%) also work within Lane County, and 72,275 of 73,151 residents (99%) of Eugene-Springfield also work within the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.

Additionally, many people who do not live in Eugene-Springfield commute there from throughout the county and elsewhere. It is not only the dominant employment center for the County, but also offers services not otherwise available in the county, such as health care.

LCOG compiled data about commuting patterns in the county, based upon the 1990 Census. About 25% of workers who resided in Oakridge in 1990 commuted to jobs in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. This compares to about 59% of Junction City workers, about 58% of Creswell workers, and about 76% of Veneta workers.

The 2000 Census includes data on Commuting to Work, shown in the following table.

Table 10: Percent of Commuters to Work Using Various Commuting Modes, and Mean Travel Time (U.S. Census 2000)

	Single Occ. Vehicle	Car/Van Pool	Transit	Walk	Bike/ Other	Work at home	Mean travel time (minutes)
Oregon	73.2	12.2	4.2	3.6	1.9	5.0	22.2
Lane County	71.6	12.2	3.3	4.2	3.7	5.1	19.9
Coburg	79.7	10.1	---	3.9	.6	5.8	19.9
Cottage Grove	77.8	11.7	1.5	4.5	1.1	3.4	22.8
Dunes City	81.1	7.7	---	3.6	.7	6.8	23.0
Eugene	66.8	11.2	4.9	6.1	6.2	4.7	16.9
Florence	71.0	13.5	.6	11.1	1.0	2.8	12.9
Junction City	77.1	11.7	---	5.4	3.2	2.6	19.9
Lowell	74.4	15.7	.3	3.8	---	4.8	26.4
Oakridge	65.0	22.7	---	6.1	.6	5.6	25.2
Springfield	73.5	14.3	4.6	2.0	2.1	3.5	19.8
Veneta	81.1	12.3	---	2.3	.8	3.6	25.9
Westfir	68.0	22.1	.8	2.5	1.6	4.9	36.7

It is noteworthy that Oakridge and Westfir, located about 45 miles from the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area have a significantly lower percentage of single occupant vehicle commutes than all other communities (except that Eugene's single occupant vehicle percentage is slightly lower than Westfir's). 22.7% of Oakridge residents, and 22.1% of Westfir residents, use car/van pools for work commuting, percentages that are significantly higher than those for other communities that are closer to Eugene. LTD runs a van service between Eugene-Springfield and these two cities. The data suggests that distance plays a factor in the decision by residents of Oakridge and Westfir who work in the Eugene-Springfield area to use the van service. Other communities which are closer to Eugene-Springfield, including Cottage Grove, Junction City, Lowell, and Veneta, are all served with transit. However, there is no significant difference in single occupant vehicle or transit use for these communities, suggesting that residents who live there and work in Eugene choose not to use transit, in part based upon a shorter commute compared to that for Westfir/Oakridge residents.

Transportation Issues and Livability Concerns

Transportation relates strongly to livability concerns. Air quality contributes significantly to livability, and motor vehicles are a major source of carbon monoxide and other air pollutants. In addition, the distribution of population compared to economic activities is directly related to traffic congestion.

In 1998, the Willamette Valley Livability Forum⁵ commissioned two surveys totaling 1,156 residents 18 years of age and older throughout the Valley, regarding concerns about growth and future livability. Respondents were asked about various issues that were categorized and ranked within each county. Selected results of the survey provide information about Lane County residents' concerns about transportation-related issues.

Of 16 issues, Lane County respondents ranked traffic congestion and air quality as their fourth highest concerns. Respondents were also asked about desired outcomes for 13 scenarios in 20 years time. As with all five counties, the most desired item for Lane was having good air and water quality 20 years from now.

Land Use Trends

Lane County is one of only two Oregon counties (Douglas County being the other) that extends from the Pacific Ocean to the Cascade mountain range, covering 4,620 square miles, or almost 3 million acres of land. Roughly 4,515 square miles are outside of urban growth boundaries. Of that, 4,395 square miles are in resource use, and approximately 120 square miles (76,800 acres) are developed or committed to development. Unlike any other county in Oregon, all 19 statewide land use goals apply to Lane County.

Most of Lane County's incorporated communities are located within a 30 mile radius of the Eugene-Springfield area. Lane's other population centers outside of the Eugene-Springfield area include the corridor between Florence and Dunes City on the Coast, and the Oakridge/Westfir area in the foothills of the Cascade Mountains.

Eugene and Springfield include approximately 60% of the county's population, based upon Census 2000 data. Approximately 10% of the county population lives in other incorporated communities, and 30% live outside of city limits. Most of the latter population live in the county's 35 unincorporated communities.

Outside of urban growth boundaries, state land use laws primarily determine where new development can occur. While Eugene-Springfield is the third largest Metropolitan Statistical Area in Oregon (with the Portland-Vancouver and Salem-Keizer MSAs being larger), the majority of the county is in resource zoning, including 90% in Forest zones. State land use laws restrict development in resource areas.

Nonresource zones, or "developed and committed" areas of the county are those areas that allow residential development to occur. These areas are generally composed of the county's 35 unincorporated communities. Lane County has an unusually large amount of detailed data regarding these areas. The data was developed by the County in response to a 1988 Oregon Supreme Court decision that overturned the state Land Conservation and Development Commission's (LCDC) acknowledgment of portions of the Rural Comprehensive Plan. Under close scrutiny of Department of Lane Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff and 1000 Friends of Oregon, Lane County re-evaluated its data. The result was a file for each developed and committed area including a report of the number of tax lots, dwellings, and vacant tax lots.

In 1996, the data was updated as part of early efforts associated with the Transportation System Plan update. This work involved re-examining the data for each developed and committed area as to the zoning, the number of built

⁵ The Willamette Valley Livability Forum was created in December 1996 by Governor John Kitzhaber to identify and promote solutions to the growth and development issues that face Willamette Valley communities. It consists of a voluntary consortium of citizen leaders and representatives of businesses, non-profit organizations, and local, state, and federal governments.

upon and vacant parcels, estimating the number of parcels that could be re-divided, and estimating the number of parcels that could be rezoned to a higher density. This data indicated that approximately 2,600 vacant parcels remained in developed and committed areas.

The data was revisited again in 2001, when the County updated its zoning to comply with new and stricter state density requirements adopted by DLCD in October 2000. Given that the density requirements reduced or eliminated the ability to rezone and/or re-divide most residential parcels, the estimate resulted in a decrease of approximately 800 vacant parcels. In addition, based upon building permit activity, it was estimated that approximately 300 additional parcels had been developed since the 1996 analysis, resulting in approximately 1,500 vacant parcels remaining in developed and committed areas that could be developed outside of urban growth boundaries. In these areas, state and local law allow only one primary dwelling per parcel, so this represents 1,500 new residences. These parcels are not located in any particular vicinity, but are scattered throughout the county's developed and committed areas. The relatively low number of remaining, vacant developed and committed parcels is not surprising, given that Lane County was required to comply with strict state criteria when initially designating these lands as "developed and committed".

The analysis does not consider whether new dwellings could be built on any Impacted Forest (F-2) zone or Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) parcels, where dwellings are allowed under special use permits if certain state land use criteria are met. A count of dwelling permits issued for vacant parcels was done for 1999, 2000, and 2001. The count was based upon dwelling permits associated with a new address. (When a new address is needed for a development permit, it typically indicates that the parcel where the residence is being built was vacant). For the F-2 zone, the criteria that are most easily met are generally based upon proving that the surrounding area is already relatively developed. As a result, it is anticipated that the number of remaining F-2 parcels that can qualify will decrease over time, as the remaining, smaller F-2 parcels are developed (larger parcels cannot meet the criteria for a dwelling, and generally cannot be divided to less than 80 acres in size). In 1999, 2000, and 2001, new addresses and dwelling permits issued for F-2 parcels totaled approximately 28, 25, and 26 respectively. In the EFU zone, the state criteria for obtaining a new dwelling are not based upon surrounding development, but rather on farm income. The EFU criteria are extremely difficult to meet, as evidenced by the number of new dwelling permits issued for EFU parcels. New addresses and dwelling permits issued for EFU parcels in 1999, 2000, and 2001 totaled approximately 11, 10, and 8, respectively. Since a small percentage of new addresses are issued for existing dwellings that are relocated on a tract, the number of vacant F-2 and EFU parcels is likely somewhat lower than these numbers indicate.

While a more extensive and time consuming analysis could be done for a small number of areas, it would not be expected to result in significant changes in the estimates for purposes of this analysis, in part because it is anticipated that the number of parcels that could meet F-2 special use permit requirements will decline over time, and because the number of new dwellings in the EFU zones is relatively low overall. Nor does it consider the potential for development resulting from possible successful plan amendments to change plan designations from resource to non-resource use (which would require taking an "exception" to statewide land use laws, a difficult and complex threshold to meet). Furthermore, the analysis does not consider what could happen if state land use laws were changed, a distinct possibility given the efforts to do so over past years.

In summary, given that statewide land use laws discourage development outside of urban growth boundaries, and given the relatively low number of vacant, developable parcels estimated to remain outside of urban growth boundaries (UGBs), potential new dwellings on vacant parcels are likely to be relatively few over the next 20 years.

Of greater influence with regard to transportation facility capacity issues is how much growth will occur in cities and the impact on collectors and arterials. While rural development is expected to be part of the cumulative effect on transportation facilities, capacity issues are more likely related to population growth within UGBs, increasing tourism travel and travel between communities, rather than new development in rural areas. Moreover, as population increases, there will be an increased need for the delivery of commodities, which will result in increased truck traffic between communities as well as through traffic to areas like Portland outside of Lane County.

6.2. FINANCIAL OVERVIEW

Revenue Sources

The primary revenue sources for the County Road Fund are the State Highway Fund (gas tax, weight-mile fees and other highway user fees) and National Forest timber receipts. Secondary sources of revenue are interest earnings on the road fund reserve, state or federal aid grants or contributions to projects by other agencies.

National Forest Receipts

Lane County has enjoyed a substantial reserve in the Road Fund primarily due to National Forest Receipts, mostly from timber harvests from the national forests in Lane County. Federal law requires that 25% of all national forest receipts be paid to the state in which the forest is located. Revenues from the national forests are to be used for the benefit of public schools and public roads. ORS 294.060 requires that 75 percent of these receipts be dedicated to the County Road Fund and 25 percent to the County School Fund.

During the 1980's, timber receipts were the largest Road Fund revenue source by far, peaking at almost \$26 million in fiscal year (FY) 89-90. At that time, state highway trust fund revenue was \$9.3 million.

Changes in timber management policy in the 1990's drastically reduced national timber harvests, including those in Lane County. In 1990, 1993, and 2000, Congress passed legislation that sustained timber receipt payments to Lane County through various "guarantee" formulas, which have stabilized the timber revenue decline.

The most recent federal guarantee legislation, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act was passed in 2000. The Act provides additional funding for road purposes through Federal FY 06. This influx of new revenue created short-term opportunities for the County. In response, the County Board of Commissioners created the Capital Project Partnership Program and, during FY 01-02, allocated over \$9 million to projects on State highways and city streets in Lane County.

Federal Aid/Fund Exchange

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and its predecessors provided federal aid funds for highway capital improvement projects. Lane County has received federal aid allocations historically from both the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area allocation and the allocation to rural systems through an agreement between ODOT and the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC). Although small in the overall Road Fund picture, these allocations have funded important projects in the past, such as construction of the Northwest Expressway and the initial grade separation at the Beltline/Coburg Road interchange.

State Highway Fund

The State Highway Fund consists of state motor fuel taxes (currently 24 cents per gallon), state weight-mile taxes for heavy vehicles, motor vehicle registration fees, fines, licenses and other miscellaneous revenues. Highway fund revenues are distributed to cities based upon the ratio of each city's population to the total statewide population within cities. Revenues are distributed to counties based upon each county's proportion of registered vehicles to the statewide total. Lane County's portion has been declining as the Portland metropolitan area has been growing at a faster rate.

The Oregon Constitution requires that revenue from motor vehicle and gasoline taxes be used exclusively for the construction, reconstruction, improvement, repair, maintenance, operation and use of public highways, roads, streets, and roadside rest areas.

Investment Earnings

These revenues accrue from the interest earned on investments made by the County with the cash on hand from the Road Fund. Investment earnings are subject to the same restrictions of use as the gas tax and national forest revenues. The type of investments available to the County are restricted by ORS and further subject to the policies and conditions recommended by the County Board of Commissioners and approved by the State Treasurer.

Other Revenue Sources

Lane County receives revenues from a variety of other sources, including assessments for road construction projects, reimbursement from the County Surveyor's Corners Fund, and work performed for other County departments and other government agencies.

Issues And Trends

Despite healthy cash reserves, the future of Road Fund revenue sources and levels continues to be uncertain due to dependence on revenues collected by the federal government and the state and the unpredictable nature of legislation regarding these revenue sources. However, through prudent management of the Fund, Lane County has dealt with this uncertainty. The County has performed a balancing act of sorts, to:

- maintain its road and bridge system to a high standard;
- pursue a substantial and vigorous Capital Improvement Program (CIP), funding many projects on the County Road System, city road systems, and, to a lesser extent, on the ODOT system; and
- share timber receipt revenue with the cities in Lane County for general road operation and maintenance.

If the U.S. Congress continues legislation beyond FY 06-07 that maintains payments to Lane County at similar levels as in the past, all of these expenditures will likely continue in a balance, or mix, similar to the last two decades. If revenues decline substantially, all Road Fund programs will likely be affected.

Stagnation at the state level since the early 1990's regarding gas tax increases or substitute revenue sources has increased the pressure on city, county, and ODOT road budgets across the state. If this trend continues, Lane County will be faced with difficult choices in terms of how to share federal timber receipts. If state revenue problems are accompanied by a corresponding drop in federal timber receipt payments to Lane County, these choices will be even more difficult.

The Oregon school finance dilemma could also affect the Federal Timber Receipt distribution formula. School finance packages considered in recent sessions proposed changing the 75/25 split. However, because this change would seriously reduce most counties' road funds and only marginally add to most school funds, such proposals have historically been defeated each time it was introduced.

While the Road Fund currently has an ample cash reserve, current planned expenditures will draw down the Road Fund cash balance over time. Table 11 at the end of this section reflects a revenue and expenditure scenario produced by the Public Works Department in March 2002 that assumed that the timber "guarantee" is not renewed and that timber receipts would be based on current harvest levels. If that occurred and Road Fund spending continued at the rate projected, by FY 07-08 the Fund cash balance would be exhausted. However, it is important to note that this scenario will not occur because prior to that time, adjustments in either projected revenue stream or proposed projects and expenditures would be made.

The projections in Table 11 are based upon the following assumptions, updated to reflect the FY02-03 budget and the adopted FY03-07 CIP:

1. Federal county payments legislation will remain intact through FY06-07, but will not be renewed by Congress.
2. The state Legislature will not increase road user fees; transfers from the State Highway Fund will meet current ODOT forecasts.
3. The Legislature will not change the timber receipt distribution formula.
4. The distribution formula for State Highway Fund transfers will remain intact.
5. Lane County will continue to provide the same level of road maintenance and preservation activities as it presently does.

6. Compliance with environmental regulations such as the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act will not significantly increase operating costs.
7. Projects in the adopted FY03-07 CIP will be constructed as programmed.
8. The County/City Road Partnership program will remain in its current form and at payments of \$2.5 million per year through FY08.
9. There will not be another round of Capital Project Partnership (CaPP) program funding.

FinPlan

Concerned by the sudden Federal Timber Receipts revenue decline, the County developed a Road Fund Financial Plan (FinPlan) in 1991, which was approved by the County Board of Commissioners. In 1995, with continued uncertainty regarding national timber receipts, a set of contingency priorities were incorporated into the FinPlan for Board consideration. The FinPlan document provided the starting point for financial goals and policies included in this chapter of the TSP.

Future Spending And Prioritization

The TSP must attempt to prepare Lane County for a wide range of potential financial circumstances. Revenue uncertainty is dealt with by outlining goals for Road Fund stability and management to be pursued over the next 20 years, and by establishing a set of priorities for Road Fund expenditures. Priorities are important for several reasons. Priorities can guide decisions to reduce expenditures during times of revenue shortfall. They also can be used to describe activities to be funded if the Board decides to seek new revenues. Adopting priorities provides clear direction to the public and staff as to how the Board intends to allocate funds.

The goals and policies place primary emphasis on operation, maintenance, preservation, and safety on the County road system. A second tier of priorities deals with improvement of the County system and basic operation of city road systems. A third set of priorities relates to economic development and off-system project funding.

It is important to clarify the relationship between expenditure priorities and the project list included in the TSP. The Needs Assessment prepared for the TSP is based on a review of roadway conditions and county road standards. The resulting project list is based solely upon the road network's physical assessment and not on a predicted revenue stream nor on priorities established through public involvement. Priority setting occurs as part of the yearly budget and CIP adoption process. As revenues contract, there will be an emphasis on basic county operation, maintenance, and preservation. As revenues expand, priorities will include more county modernization projects and a broader sharing of resources with cities and ODOT

**Table 11: Lane County Road Fund Revenue/Expense Forecast
October, 2002**

	FY01-02	FY02-03	FY03-04	FY04-05	FY05-06	FY06-07	FY07-08
Revenues							
Federal Timber Receipts	19,206,000	19,398,000	19,631,000	19,896,000	20,165,000	20,447,000	5,000,000
State Highway Fund Transfer	14,950,000	12,124,000	12,488,000	13,482,000	13,725,000	13,807,000	13,945,000
Federal Aid/Fund Exchange	533,000	2,210,000	555,000	555,000	555,000	555,000	555,000
Investment Earnings	2,193,000	1,850,000	2,090,000	1,550,000	1,180,000	810,000	520,000
Other	3,620,000	3,000,000	2,500,000	3,380,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Total New Revenue	40,502,000	38,582,000	37,264,000	38,863,000	38,125,000	38,119,000	22,520,000
Cash Balance for Previous FY	43,629,000	48,930,000	38,928,600	26,490,000	23,278,000	11,033,000	11,033,000
Total Resources	84,131,000	87,512,000	76,192,600	65,353,000	61,403,000	49,152,000	33,553,000
Expenses							
Public Works Administration	2,440,000	2,850,000	2,960,000	3,060,000	3,160,000	3,270,000	3,400,000
Engineering Division	18,780,000	22,080,000	22,940,000	23,710,000	24,250,000	25,080,000	26,080,000
Surveyor/Land Mgt. Division	2,040,000	2,240,000	2,330,000	2,420,000	2,510,000	2,600,000	2,710,000
Sheriff's Office	1,550,000	1,570,000	1,630,000	1,690,000	1,750,000	1,810,000	1,880,000
Finance & Management	130,000	190,000	200,000	210,000	220,000	220,000	230,000
Operating Budget Subtotal	24,940,000	28,930,000	30,060,000	31,090,000	31,890,000	32,980,000	34,300,000
Lapse and Unexpended		1,450,000	1,500,000	1,550,000	1,590,000	1,650,000	1,720,000
Operating Expense Subtotal		27,480,000	28,560,000	29,540,000	30,300,000	31,330,000	32,580,000
Capital Projects on County System	6,677,000	12,628,000	13,758,000	10,035,000	16,570,000	11,700,000	8,700,000
County/City Road Partnership	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Capital Project Partnership	40,000	5,368,400	3,653,000	0	0	0	0
Projects/Payments for Agencies	62,000	607,000	1,232,000	0	1,000,000	0	0
Comm'ty Devel. Fd (EDAP bef. FY00)	40,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Expense Subtotal	9,319,000	21,103,400	21,143,000	12,535,000	20,070,000	14,200,000	11,200,000
Total Road Fund Expenses	34,259,000	48,583,400	49,703,000	42,075,000	50,370,000	45,530,000	43,780,000
Cash Balance/Reserves							
Total Resources	84,131,000	87,512,000	76,192,600	65,353,000	61,403,000	49,152,000	33,553,000
Total Road Fund Expenses	34,259,000	48,583,400	49,703,000	42,075,000	50,370,000	45,530,000	43,780,000
Estimated Cash Balance at FYE	49,872,000	38,928,600	26,489,600	23,278,000	11,033,000	3,622,000	-10,227,000
Actual Cash Balance at FYE	48,930,000						
Encumbered/Committed at FYE	4,420,000	10,583,000	6,350,000	12,100,000	8,400,000	8,700,000	0
Reserves at FYE Subject to Rebudget	45,452,000	28,345,600	20,139,600	11,178,000	2,633,000	-5,078,000	-10,227,000

Needs Assessment And Capital Expenditures

Needs Assessment in the TSP

The Needs Assessment in the TSP identified rural and urban road segments that met basic criteria for upgrades to county standards. A subset of 70 projects, mostly on the rural system and totaling about \$101 million, are on a list of projects that are planned for construction over the next twenty years.

Needs from City TSPs

In addition to projects identified from the Needs Assessment, projects have been identified in adopted TSPs for the cities within Lane County (Florence's TSP is pending final adoption by the County as of this writing). Total capital needs on County roads identified by the Lane County TSP and City TSPs is an estimated \$194 million. Table 12 shows a listing of these project totals by TSP.

Table 12: Summary of Identified Capital Needs, Lane County Road System in adopted city TSPs and County TSP

System Plan	Number of Projects	Total Projected Cost	Completed	2002 Status	
				Programmed	Unprogrammed
Coburg TSP	3	\$ 1,450,000	\$ 1,450,000		
Cottage Grove TSP	8	\$ 3,240,000	\$ 660,000		\$ 2,580,000
Creswell TSP	1	\$ 200,000			\$ 200,000
Dunes City (1)	n.a.	n.a.		n.a.	n.a.
Florence TSP (2)	3	\$ 2,100,000			\$ 2,100,000
Junction City TSP	11	\$ 9,370,000		\$ 500,000	\$ 8,870,000
Lowell (1)	n.a.	n.a.		n.a.	n.a.
Oakridge TSP	4	\$ 2,450,000			\$ 2,450,000
TransPlan (Eugene /Springfield TSP)	33	\$ 71,020,000	\$ 7,325,000	\$43,400,000	\$ 20,295,000
Veneta TSP	3	\$ 2,420,000			\$ 2,420,000
Westfir (1)	n.a.	n.a.		n.a.	n.a.
Subtotal Urban TSP	66	\$ 92,250,000	\$9,435,000	\$43,900,000	\$ 38,915,000
Lane County TSP	70	\$ 101,315,000		\$21,360,000	\$79,955,000
Total Projects	136	\$193,565,000	\$9,435,000	\$65,260,000	\$ 118,870,000

(1) No TSP. Any capital needs included in Lane County TSP totals.

(2) Projects derived from Draft Florence TSP. Projects subject to change

Notes:

- Cost estimates for unprogrammed City TSP projects are taken from the respective TSPs and have not been adjusted to reflect current dollars.
- Cost estimates for all programmed projects are taken from the 2003-2007 Lane County Capital Improvement Program.
- Unprogrammed Lane County TSP project costs are estimated using a per-mile unit cost of \$625,000 for rural projects and \$2,050,000 for urban projects.
- Cost estimates are subject to change based on, but not limited to, factors such as changes in project scope, unforeseen construction costs, inflation, and the application of more detailed engineering and design analysis during project development.
- Total costs are shown on joint projects. The County's share may be less.

Capital Expenditure History

Table 13 on the following page is a history of capital expenditures on the County Road System, both urban and rural, for FY 1984-2001. This illustrates a long track record of investment around the county on a wide variety of roadways. Expenditures programmed in the CIP over this period totaled over \$250 million. Over \$56 million of this total were payments to cities under the County-City Road partnership program. These are listed under "Payments to other Agencies" in the CIP, but are primarily used by cities for operations, maintenance, and preservation. Subtracting out this total, over \$190 million was invested in capital road projects by the county for the period FY 1984 -2001.

**Table 13: Road Fund Capital Expenditures for FY 84/85-FY 01/02
Category**

<u>Geographic Area</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>General Construction</u>	<u>County/City Partnership</u>	<u>Special Payments</u>	<u>Preservation Projects</u>	<u>Operations</u>	<u>Economic Development</u>	<u>Assisted Housing</u>	<u>Misc</u>
Eugene	\$ 93,312,880	\$ 36,740,009	\$ 30,594,457	\$ 14,649,031	\$ 8,757,946	\$ 5,329	\$ 242,634	\$ 2,323,475	\$ -
Springfield	\$ 33,464,143	\$ 8,321,964	\$ 11,727,495	\$ 7,011,593	\$ 2,056,209	\$ -	\$ 3,868,440	\$ 478,441	\$ -
Subtotal Metro Area	\$ 126,777,023	\$ 45,061,973	\$ 42,321,952	\$ 21,660,624	\$ 10,814,156	\$ 5,329	\$ 4,111,074	\$ 2,801,916	\$ -
Small Cities									
Coburg	\$ 2,934,676	\$ 2,934,676	\$ 802,249	\$ 88,092	\$ 52,836	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Cottage Grove	\$ 1,689,160	\$ 1,689,160	\$ 2,878,000	\$ 886,011	\$ 192,394	\$ -	\$ 157,608	\$ -	\$ -
Creswell	\$ 217,811	\$ 217,811	\$ 956,016	\$ 22,046	\$ 61,612	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Dunes City	\$ 1,449,387	\$ 1,449,387	\$ 1,086,875	\$ 139,005	\$ 747,249	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Florence	\$ 649,740	\$ 649,740	\$ 2,485,243	\$ 338,835	\$ 401,296	\$ -	\$ 950,000	\$ -	\$ -
Junction City	\$ 599,483	\$ 599,483	\$ 1,379,265	\$ 79,034	\$ 801,580	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Lowell	\$ 583,282	\$ 583,282	\$ 566,417	\$ 92,050	\$ 501,729	\$ -	\$ 187,903	\$ -	\$ -
Oakridge	\$ 332	\$ 332	\$ 1,486,268	\$ 245,008	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,039,515	\$ -	\$ -
Veneta	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,702,473	\$ 733,215	\$ 26,414	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Westfir	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 390,156	\$ 153,088	\$ 19,658	\$ 6,056	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Subtotal Small Cities	\$ 29,779,007	\$ 8,123,871	\$ 13,732,962	\$ 2,776,323	\$ 2,804,769	\$ 6,056	\$ 2,335,026	\$ -	\$ -
Subtotal Rural Areas	\$ 86,395,801	\$ 54,345,549	N.A.	N.A.	\$ 27,768,025	\$ 4,179,126	\$ 103,101	\$ -	\$ 7,251,825
Total Countywide	\$ 250,203,657	\$ 107,531,393	\$ 56,054,914	\$ 24,436,947	\$ 41,386,949	\$ 4,190,511	\$ 6,549,201	\$ 2,801,916	\$ 7,251,825
Other Special Payments	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,764,267	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 252,967,924								

6.3. NEEDS ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

Identification of transportation improvement projects is an essential part of transportation system planning. The Needs Assessment is the starting point for identifying road project candidates for modernization, reconstruction, or modification. As the rural major and minor collector system is the most extensive component of the County's transportation infrastructure, it was analyzed on the basis of six criteria and prioritized using a point system. The County's urban collector and arterial system was also analyzed. Local roads were not analyzed in the needs assessment. The six criteria used for the assessment include:

- Pavement Condition Index
- Pavement Structure (Crushed Based Equivalent, or CBE)
- Roadway Width
- Crash Rate
- Average Daily Traffic (ADT)
- Level of Service (LOS)

In addition to the above technical considerations, a land use-based analysis of bicycle and pedestrian facilities serving local destinations in rural developed areas was completed, for both state and county roads. The inventory methodology and results are discussed in this chapter following the Summary of Geometric/Technical Needs. For areas inside urban growth boundaries, bicycle and pedestrian facility needs are identified by the corresponding cities.

The technical needs assessment and evaluation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities near local destinations were used to develop the TSP project list.

Bridges are evaluated biennially based upon federal requirements. A seismic evaluation was also completed in 1995. A description of these evaluations is included in this section.

Finally, planning and assessment summaries for the state highway system, and recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian improvements to serve local travel on state facilities in rural developed areas concludes this section.

Summary Of Geometric/Technical Needs Assessment Findings

The road system was assessed in terms of safety, function, and structural condition. In the process, current and projected future conditions were determined and deficiencies were identified. Overall, the greatest deficiency found in the needs assessment is sub-standard road widths. The analysis shows that a significant number of road segments do not meet the minimum desirable width standards based upon functional class, terrain, and ADT. Structural deficiencies were the next most significant issue, with a number of road segments having less than desirable CBE. Safety concerns were given special consideration by calculating and evaluating crash rates. The analysis demonstrated that safety was not a systemic problem. The Pavement Condition Index shows that road surfaces are, for the most part, in good condition. Finally, Average Daily Traffic and Level of Service analyses show that capacity constraints are an issue isolated to the Eugene metro area, and lack of capacity is not expected to be a concern on the majority of the rural road system over the TSP planning period.

An overall point total was given to "deficient" collector and arterial segments based upon the assessment criteria. Segments with a higher point total were identified for potential projects and incorporated into the TSP Project List after review by county engineering staff. Appendix G shows the needs assessment data, consisting of the points assigned to collector and arterial segments found to be "deficient" in any one of the assessment criteria categories. The point assignment key can also be found in Appendix G.

The following sections detail the criteria and results of the Needs Assessment. Explanations are also provided defining each criterion and the reason it was used.

Pavement Condition

A major goal of the 1991 Road Fund Financial Plan was to maintain and preserve at least 85% of the county’s roads in fair or better pavement condition. In terms of average ratings, the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for county roads is higher compared to the past several years. In 1986 the average county road scored 72 out of 100 possible points. By 1995 the average had increased to 77, with highest ratings on the rural component of the system. Since then, higher ratings have been recorded on the urban component of the system. The current average has increased to 84 for all County roads, including arterials, collectors, and local roads. Table 14 shows PCI in terms of share of miles in fair or better condition.

Table 14: Current Pavement Condition Index

Functional Class	Miles in Fair or Better Condition	Percent in Fair or Better Condition	Miles with No PCI Data
2-Rural Minor Collector	279.3	80.1%	69.1
3-Rural Major Collector	151.3	99.5%	0.7
4-Rural Major Collector (fed)	196.1	93%	10.8
7-Urban Collector	22.8	92.3%	0.9
8-Urban Minor Arterial	17.5	92.3%	0.05
9-Urban Principal Arterial	7.5	100%	0

With some exceptions, the pavement condition rating is generally good for roads in the County system. Those with insufficient PCI are typically addressed by the County’s pavement preservation program.

Pavement Structure

The strength of the pavement structure of a roadway, typically expressed as an equivalent depth of crushed road in inches, or Crushed Based Equivalent (CBE), is an indicator of the underlying structural integrity of the roadway. By converting different pavement types to a CBE, we can compare asphalt, concrete, or bituminous treatment (oil mat) roads. CBE is measured via coring samples taken from the paved road surface. A lower CBE may indicate that there is not a sufficient material base, which may expedite road failure. Factors such as traffic volume, axle weight, and soil types affect the durability of the roadway. In the assessment, arterials and collectors with a CBE less than 16 inches were considered insufficient. The data revealed that many of the roads did not meet this threshold, as shown in Table 15 below.

Table 15: Crushed Based Equivalent Data

Functional Class	Miles <16-inches	Percent <16-inches	Miles with no CBE Data
2-Rural Minor Collector	147.8	42.4%	45.8
3-Rural Major Collector	22.6	14.9%	30.9
4-Rural Major Collector (fed)	12.4	5.9%	16.5
7-Urban Collector	8.2	33.3%	9.5
8-Urban Minor Arterial	2.1	11.1%	6.9
9-Urban Principal Arterial	No Data	--	7.4

While the miles of road not meeting the CBE threshold are significant, this alone does not make a segment a candidate for reconstruction. Rather this serves in combination with other factors as an indicator that further study is required. Of particular note are those roads that are designated as “load limited,” meaning heavy weight truck traffic is restricted to some degree, and also roads that are known to serve a larger number of trucks. Heavy truck traffic places greater stress on the roadbed, thus a larger CBE is required to support the loads. It is also clear that a number of segments have not been cored and have no CBE measurement. As some of these road segments are programmed into the project list for reasons other than CBE deficiency, this will presumably be tested as they are reconstructed or modified.

Road Width

The width assessment for rural County roads is based on Functional Class, ADT and terrain, and includes space for two travel lanes and shoulders on each side. Two-lane urban arterial and collectors use a single minimum standard of 32-feet, which represents travel lanes and bike lanes on each side. The minimum tolerable road widths used to screen the adequacy of the road system are shown in Table 16. The road design standards were in the process of development when the needs assessment was completed, so these widths may vary slightly from the road design standards to be adopted concurrently with the TSP.

Table 16: Minimum Road Widths

Road Type	ADT	Type of Terrain & Minimum Widths		
		Level	Rolling	Mountainous
Rural Collectors	<100	22'	20'	18'
Rural Collectors	100<500	26'	22'	20'
Rural Collectors	500<1500	30'	26'	22'
Rural Collectors	1500 & greater	34'	30'	26'
Urban Arterials/Collectors	NA	32'	32'	32'

Road segments were screened using the minimum width standards from Table 16. The percent of roads not meeting the standard is shown in Table 17.

Table 17: Roadways Failing to Meet Minimum Width Standard

Functional Class	Miles Below Minimum Width	Total Miles	Percent Below Minimum Width
2-Rural Minor Collector	186	348.6	53.4%
3-Rural Major Collector	63.2	152	41.6%
4-Rural Major Collector (fed)	71.8	210.7	34.1%
7-Urban Collector	20.2	24.6	82.1%
8-Urban Minor Arterial	7.4	18.9	39.2%
9-Urban Principal Arterial	1.8	7.4	24.3%

Clearly, it is not practical or desirable to pursue widening projects for all roads that do not meet the minimum width. It has also been taken into consideration that many of these roads are within a few feet or less from the minimum. As such, it is not a priority of the County to modify these roads solely on the basis of the width assessment. Instead, multiple factors from the needs assessment were considered when generating the project list.

Crash Rate

Safety is a chief concern for the road system. Crash data, evaluated by road segment, is compiled and analyzed to identify potential problem areas. This data was used to flag areas with a maximum crash threshold above 2 crashes per million vehicle miles traveled on any particular segment in the road inventory. The results show that 7.8% of the county's road segments had a crash rate above 2. However, the statistical results can be misleading since short road segments with lower ADT will appear to have higher rates than longer road segments and/or higher ADT, although they may have only one recorded crash. In addition, the presence of a crash does not necessarily indicate a safety problem with the road, but perhaps driver error or poor weather conditions instead. Consequently, segments with crash rates above the maximum were analyzed individually to determine any trends or systemic problems with the roadway. In the process, many of the road segments were eliminated from further concern. Remaining segments were incorporated into the project list.

Average Daily Traffic

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) data is kept for most county roads. The ADT values are determined from 48-hour counts that are averaged and adjusted for seasonal variations in traffic flow by month. The counts are totals for both directions of traffic on a two-way street, unless the roadway is a ramp or is one-way. ADT on most county roads is relatively low, while higher ADT values are found on County roads in the Eugene-Springfield metro area. More heavily traveled roads are typically given priority when

considering improvement projects. ADT data also helps identify areas that may have current or projected capacity problems. It is not expected that there will be capacity problems on the majority of the County's rural road system. Table 18 is a summary of ADT levels for each functional class.

Table 18: Average Daily Traffic Summary

Functional Class	Mean ADT	Range
Rural Minor Collector	737	20-4,000
Rural Major Collector	1,439	90-6,150
Rural Major Collector (fed aid)	2,797	120-11,850
Urban Collector	3,212	340-12,950
Urban Minor Arterial	8,008	1,350-26,550
Urban Principal Arterial	11,360	2,800-32,900

The highest volume road is the urban arterial Delta Highway (South of Green Acres Road), at 32,900 ADT. The highest ADT in the rural system is 11,850 on Prairie Road at mileposts 0.2-0.7. The lowest ADTs are recorded on a number of outlying rural minor collectors (less than 100 in some cases). A number of higher-volume County roads in the Eugene/Springfield metro area have been improved in recent years or are programmed to be improved through the CIP process.

The assessment chose urban segments greater than 5,000 ADT and rural segments greater than 10,000 ADT for further analysis, as shown in Table 19. The ADT threshold could be breached based on current values or year 2020 projections. ADT projections were roughly approximated assuming 2 percent annual growth in ADT over the 20-year period. Again, using this threshold indicated that capacity constraint issues are not a major concern on the County's rural collector system. The ADT assessment was used mainly to highlight high-volume roads for additional study. The few segments with potential capacity problems have been incorporated into the project list.

Table 19: Higher ADT Roads

Functional Class	Rural Miles at 10,000 ADT and Greater	Urban Miles at 5,000 ADT and Greater	Percent of Total Miles
2 – Rural Minor Collector	0	--	0%
3 – Rural Major Collector	0	--	0%
4 – Rural Major Collector (fed aid)	2.0	--	0.9%
7 – Urban Collector	--	9.1	37%
8 – Urban Minor Arterial	--	15.1	79.9%
9 – Urban Principal Arterial	--	6.8	91.9%

Level of Service

Level of Service (LOS) is a performance measure indicating the quality of the flow of traffic on a roadway. LOS is graded on a letter scale from A to F, with A being the highest level of service and F being the lowest. At LOS A, traffic flows freely, selecting desired travel speeds with ample passing opportunities. At LOS F, traffic flow is forced, the traffic volume has exceeded the capacity of the roadway to handle it and there are no passing opportunities. LOS D is generally considered to be the lowest tolerable level of service. For the purpose of assessing the County's road system, LOS A-D were acceptable, while E and F were not.

Level of service analysis was done for two-lane rural county roads in 1997. The methodology used for the LOS analysis is shown in Appendix D. An expected result of the 1997 analysis indicates that 76 percent of the relatively low-volume rural collector system operates at LOS A. Table 20 shows the complete results of the 1997 analysis for the rural system, by functional class.

Table 20: 1997 LOS Analysis for the Rural System

	Functional Class		
	2 – Rural Minor Collector	3 – Rural Major Collector	4 – Rural Major Collector (fed aid)
LOS A Miles	269.6	123.1	146.1
Percent of Total	77.3%	81%	69.3%
LOS B Miles	11	23.1	41.7
Percent of Total	3.2%	15.2%	19.8%
LOS C Miles	0.7	3.6	21
Percent of Total	0.2%	2.4%	10%
LOS D Miles	0	1.1	1.8
Percent of Total	0	0.7%	0.9%
LOS E Miles	0	0	0
Percent of Total	0%	0%	0%
LOS F Miles	0	0	0
Percent of Total	0%	0%	0%
No LOS Rating	67.6	0.8	0.02
Percent of Total	19.4%	0.5%	0%

Approximately 643 of the 711 rural miles were operating at acceptable levels of LOS A, B, C, or D in 1997. LOS was not calculated for a number of minor collectors due to lack of ADT data or narrow road widths. These are presumably very low-volume roads and are not of concern for level of service problems.

A 20-year level of service projection was also calculated to the year 2017. The 2017 analysis found that six rural collector segments totaling 2.9 miles were projected to be at LOS E in 2017. These segments were analyzed and incorporated into the project list. No segments were projected to be operating at LOS F in 2017.

Bicycle And Pedestrian Facilities In Developed Areas

Inside urban growth boundaries, bicycle and pedestrian facility needs are evaluated by the corresponding cities. Proposed urban bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements on county roads are included in both the county's and cities' TSP Project Lists. For rural Lane County, the road system is the primary bicycle and pedestrian network. As such, the roads inventory with regard to roadway width is the primary resource to identify these facilities in rural areas. The adequacy of paved shoulders can be determined by looking at the total roadway width. The Needs Assessment described in Chapter 6.3 identified county roads with inadequate widths. ADT and terrain are considered in determining whether road widths are adequate. Additional shoulder width for bicycle use would normally be considered if public involvement during the Capital Improvement Program process indicates that this is a priority.

The Needs Assessment analysis only considers geometrics and technical operational characteristics of the road system. Under the Transportation Planning Rule, bicycle and pedestrian facilities serving local destinations within developed areas must also be evaluated. As such, land use characteristics must be integrated into the analysis.

Lane County inventoried bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the 33 (of 35) unincorporated communities where local bicycling and walking destinations exist. Each community was mapped to show zoning and addresses, roads by functional class, and ADT. Using data available from the Regional Land Information Database (RLID), and the County Assessment and Taxation and Land Management Divisions, the locations and types of local destinations were also identified. Included as local bicycling and walking destinations were groceries, eateries, taverns, schools, banks, granges, community centers, offices, churches, parks, and large employment areas near residential areas. Roads within one-quarter to one-half mile were then identified for subsequent field investigations.

During the field investigations in each community, all roads within bicycling and walking distance to local destinations were listed and their widths were recorded. Guidelines in the 1995 *Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan* indicate that roads with traffic volumes of less than 1,000 vehicles a day are generally suitable as shared roadways (page 17). Therefore all roads with ADTs lower than 1,000 were excluded from recommendations.

Eighteen county and eleven state road segments were identified as meriting wider shoulders and/or sidewalks to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel to local destinations in rural developed areas. The recommended state highway improvements are listed in the State Highway System section that concludes this chapter. The county segments were added to the TSP project list. The detailed inventory of bicycle and pedestrian facilities serving local destination needs is kept in the County Public Works Engineering Transportation Planning office.

Bridges

Bridges must be inspected every 24 months to comply with Federal Highway Administration requirements. The county normally retains an independent engineer to complete bridge inspections. The *Bridge Inspection and Load Rating Report* is updated with each round of inspections. This report is maintained in the county Public Works Engineering Division, Transportation Planning office. Bridges are load-rated based upon three levels of use for an estimated number of annual truck trips for up to five axle trucks (trucks with additional axles must be individually load rated):

- The *Inventory* rating represents the maximum loads that can pass over the bridge a large number of times without resulting in significant damage to the bridge.
- The *Operating* rating represents the maximum loads the bridge can sustain on an occasional basis, controlled by permits issued by the county.
- The *Recommended Posting* represents the maximum loads that, in the opinion of the independent engineer, should be allowed to cross the bridge without special approval by the county.

In addition, bridges are rated in two ways to evaluate their condition:

- The *general condition* of each bridge is also evaluated and rated from 0 (lowest) to 9 (new condition).
- A *sufficiency rating* is calculated by the State Bridge Maintenance Section, based upon structural adequacy and safety, functional obsolescence, and use.

Bridges that have a general condition rating of 8-9 are considered to be in good condition. A rating of 5-7 is considered fair and requires monitoring for defects. A rating of 4 or less is considered poor, and deserving attention as soon as possible. Generally speaking, Lane County's bridges are in good condition. As of the latest published data for inspections performed in 1998 and 1999, 91% of Lane County's bridges scored a 7 or higher general condition rating. Ten bridges, all older, one-way covered bridges scored a 4 or lower. Bridges that are rated in poor condition are no longer in operation or are weight-restricted. In addition, these bridges receive immediate temporary repair and are scheduled for more permanent rehabilitation through the Capital Improvement Program.

The geological record indicates that the region is susceptible to large-scale earthquakes. As such, bridges have been given special consideration for their ability to withstand future seismic activity. A CH2M Hill seismic rating report was commissioned by ODOT to look at the earthquake preparedness of the state's bridge system. The report analyzed and rated bridges based on two primary factors—vulnerability and criticality.

The vulnerability rating indicates bridge adequacy based on location and the composition of the bridge structure. The report assigns bridges to vulnerability groups based on particular bridge details that have performed poorly in seismic events (See Table 21). Criticality indicates the importance of the bridge in the transportation network. In other words, bridges located on important lifeline routes identified by ODOT are given a higher rating due to the critical function they serve for emergency services. By

combining the vulnerability and criticality ratings, agencies are able to prioritize and target seismic improvements and/or bridge replacements where it is needed most.

Table 21 shows the vulnerability groups used by CH2M Hill and the breakdown of Lane County bridges in these groups.

Table 21: Lane County Bridges by Vulnerability Group

Vulnerability Group	Total Bridges	Percent of Total
1A	8	3%
1B	87	29%
1C	98	33%
1D	0	0%
2A	3	1%
2B	37	13%
2C	62	21%

- 1A – Unstable bearings
- 1B – Stable bearing with inadequate anchorage and/or seat capacity
- 1C – Single span with inadequate anchorage and/or seat capacity
- 1D – In-span hinges with no other superstructure deficiencies
- 2A – Single column piers
- 2B – Three substructure deficiencies
- 2C – One or two substructure deficiencies

The groups beginning with 1 represent various superstructure deficiencies (bridge deck, beams, girders), and the groups beginning with 2 represent substructure deficiencies (columns, bentwalls). The substructure supports the superstructure above.

The complete report “Seismic Vulnerability of Local Agency Bridges” by CH2M Hill was released in 1995 and is available for viewing from the Road Maintenance section of Lane County Public Works.

State Highway System

Capital improvements on state facilities are managed through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). In many cases, City TSPs identify urban ODOT facility needs in their project list, which may then be promoted to the STIP. The Lane County TSP makes recommendations to the STIP for state facilities where the addition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities is warranted near rural communities (See *Recommendations for State Facilities Serving Rural, Local Bicycle-Pedestrian Needs* in this section). However, project identification in terms of detailed operational and geometric analysis of the state highway system was not part of the initial TSP needs assessment.

ODOT’s development of conditions reports (showing detailed safety, geometric, and operating conditions) for highway corridors in Lane County assists in the assessment of state facilities, but these are not complete. As additional conditions reports are finished and give a more clear understanding of state facilities in Lane County, deficient areas can be better identified and additional projects may be incorporated into the County project list for future STIP development. Until then, the TSP will not include an extensive assessment of rural state facility needs. Lane County continues to support current and future ODOT projects that are otherwise consistent with the TSP and applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

Following is the status of conditions reports and planning activity summaries for major ODOT facilities in Lane County, followed by recommendations resulting from the county’s analysis of bicycle and pedestrian facilities serving rural, local travel needs (discussed earlier in this chapter) for state facilities.

I-5 from Washington to California

The I-5 State of the Interstate Report – 2000 is an assessment of the existing and forecast safety, geometric, and operating conditions on Interstate 5 through Oregon. The conditions report is a CD-ROM

that includes text, maps, and tables. Refinement plans have been developed for several noteworthy interchanges, including the Coburg, Beltline, and Creswell interchanges in Lane County.

US 101 – Oregon Coast Highway

Highway 101, a designated National Scenic Byway and All American Road, is regarded for its natural, historic, and scenic features, and the Pacific Highway Scenic Byway Plan was produced with the following objectives: enhancement, stewardship, awareness, interpretation, and access. Many features in Lane County have been identified for protection along the corridor, including bridges, parks, and other recreational attractions. The Lane County Board of Commissioners endorsed the completed Pacific Coast Scenic Byway Management Plan in November 1997.

OR 58 From Eugene to US Highway 97

No corridor level planning has been completed for OR 58. A conditions report may be produced at some point in the future, but is yet to be programmed into ODOT's budget.

OR 126 from Florence to Eugene

Lane Council of Governments is developing a Highway 126 West conditions report for ODOT. The CD-ROM format will be similar to the I-5 State of the Interstate Report, with safety, geometric, and operating conditions for the Florence-Eugene highway.

Previously, ODOT commissioned Lane Council of Governments to complete a Phase I interim strategy for the Florence-Eugene corridor. The report was released in 1998 and outlines Corridor Strategy development, transportation goals, and management objectives.

OR 126 from Eugene to Santiam Junction

Lane Council of Governments studied the eastern corridor of Highway 126 for ODOT. The resulting Phase I Interim Corridor Strategy was published in May 1998. The Strategy summarizes the results of stakeholders' meetings, a public outreach program, and professional review. Some of the more frequently cited concerns for the corridor include:

- Conflicts between local traffic and the efficient and effective movement of goods and services through the Corridor;
- Increasing traffic and congestion, especially in Springfield and eastward towards Walterville;
- Providing for a safe and efficient highway while protecting the Corridor's scenic attributes and important natural resources;
- Safety and congestion problems associated with the large number of residential driveways that directly access the highway;
- Maintain the Corridor's function as an important link in the state's transportation system while safeguarding the character and communities within the rural portions of the Corridor;
- Ensuring safe transport of hazardous materials through the Corridor;
- Unsafe conditions;
 - Created or exacerbated by driver behavior
 - Associated with highway characteristics and maintenance
 - For bicyclists, pedestrians, and bus riders
- Effects of growth in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area, Deschutes County, and new rural residential development on traffic volumes in the Corridor;
- Inappropriate amount of through truck traffic given the design and character of the highway;
- Widening the highway to accommodate increased traffic will attract more through traffic and increase, not decrease, congestion.

Other Area Plans

ODOT is working on a refinement plan for Highway 99, for the segment within the Junction City UGB, with the technical background work already complete. On ODOT's list for future funded planning analysis are the following:

- West 11th Expressway Plan—Beltline Intersection to Oak Hill;
- OR 126/Main facility refinement plan;
- Beltline capacity study; and
- I-5 Refinement Plan--I-105 to OR 58.

Recommendations for State Facilities Serving Rural, Local Bicycle-Pedestrian Needs

As discussed earlier in the Needs Assessment Chapter, an analysis of facilities serving local destinations in unincorporated communities was completed in Summer 2002. This section provides recommendations that resulted from that evaluation for state facilities. (Needs for county facilities were incorporated into the TSP Project List).

In addition to serving as throughways, state highway facilities provide the main access to many unincorporated communities and the stores, schools, and other local destinations serving their residents. While staff was primarily concerned with county road facilities in completing the analysis, shoulder widths on state roads were also recorded. Roads with inadequate widths were noted. Roads with an ADT lower than 1,000 were then excluded. A list of 11 state road sections within ¼ to ½ mile of local destinations was compiled and is shown in the table below. The list was prioritized in terms of ADT and existing shoulder width. The list, which has also been distributed to ODOT personnel, is provided here as a recommendation for incorporation into the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) - the state equivalent of the county's CIP. The County's priority ranking and recommendations are based upon limited analysis and therefore could change after closer evaluation by ODOT personnel.

Table 22: State Highway Facilities Recommended for Bike-Pedestrian Improvements

State Road	Location	Priority Ranking	ADT	Existing Shoulder	Recommendation*
Hwy 99 South	Goshen	1	7000	1', varies	Widen to include 6'-8' shoulders
Hwy 36	Cheshire	2	3800	0-2'	Widen to include 6'-8' shoulders
Hwy 99 South	Saginaw	3	4100	1'	Widen to include 6'-8' shoulders
McKenzie Hwy	Walterville	4	8000	3'	Widen to include 6'-8' shoulders
McKenzie Hwy	Leaburg	5	5100	3'	Widen to include 6'-8' shoulders
McKenzie Hwy	Nimrod	6	4100	3-4'	Widen to include 6'-8' shoulders
Hwy 126 West	Mapleton	7	6800	4'	Widen to include 6'-8' shoulders
Hwy 101	Glenada	8	12400	4-8'	Widen to include 6'-8' shoulders
McKenzie Hwy	Vida	9	4600	4-6'	Widen to include 6'-8' shoulders
Territorial Hwy	Crow	10	1800	0-1'	Widen to include 4'-6' shoulders
Territorial Hwy	Lorane	11	1500	None	Widen to include 4'-6' shoulders

*Shoulder widening is recommended for both sides of the roadway.

The 2002-2005 STIP already includes four of the sections listed above, for Goshen, Walterville, Leaburg, and Vida. For the Goshen area, Highway 99 South is identified for pavement preservation overlay (STIP key#12379). ODOT personnel indicate that in the initial publication of STIP projects, widening for bicycle/pedestrian facilities is typically not included in pavement preservation unless a legitimate safety issue has been identified. For Walterville, Leaburg, and Vida, the STIP identifies a pavement preservation project for the McKenzie Highway (STIP key #10808), including significant bicycle and pedestrian safety elements.

6.4. TSP PROJECT LIST OVERVIEW

The project list following the Goals and Policies for this section consists of 136 capital improvement projects on County Roads. Seventy of the projects were derived from the Needs Assessment, which analyzed the structural and operational characteristics of the County's roadways, or the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. The remaining projects have been identified in City TSPs. Projects from all of these sources have been incorporated into the County list.

The project list shows a project number, name, and milepost limits of the proposed project. The source of the project is identified (e.g. Coburg TSP) and a general description is given as well as an estimated cost. Three versions of the project list are presented, with one sorted in alphabetical order, the second is sorted by project number, and the third is sorted by the source TSP. The precise cost and scope of each project is subject to change as it is promoted through public involvement and the CIP process. During the CIP process, projects are given a specific design-engineering concept in accordance with applicable design standards and environmental and topographical constraints. The concept is often modified based on public input and/or direction from the County Board of Commissioners before a final design is adopted.

Goals And Policies: Financing And Recommended Improvements

Goal 23: Maintain long-term County Road Fund stability by making annual budget adjustments and following adopted priorities.

- Policy 23-a: Adjust operating and capital expenditures through the annual budget process to maintain long term County Road Fund viability. Maintain a "prudent person" County Road Fund reserve. An appropriate "prudent person" reserve is generally considered to be 10% to 15% of gross receipts.
- Policy 23-b: Identify and consider additional potential funding sources and strategies, such as a local option gas tax or vehicle registration fee, in the event of loss or reduction of existing funding sources.

Goal 24: Use the County Road Fund effectively by following the priorities established in the 1991 Road Fund Financial Plan (updated 1995).

- Policy 24-a: As a first priority (Core Program), maintain and preserve the County Road and bridge system.
- Policy 24-b: As a first priority (Core Program), provide a safe roadside environment for the traveling public on the County Road System.
- Policy 24-c: As a second priority (Enhanced Program) and as funding allows, improve the County Road System to meet modern County design and safety standards.
- Policy 24-d: As a second priority (Enhanced Program) and as funding allows, share timber receipt payments from the County Road Fund with cities for general street purposes and maintenance of City street systems.
- Policy 24-e: As a third priority (Assistance Program) and as funding allows, provide economic development road infrastructure financing to assist in economic development.
- Policy 24-f: As a third priority (Assistance Program) and as funding allows, share timber receipt payments from the County Road Fund, through the CIP process, with cities and ODOT for City or ODOT roadway projects of mutual interest.

Goal 25: Maintain effective partnering relationships with cities and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

- Policy 25-a: Review annually county-city road partnership agreements to maintain road fund viability and to assist cities in providing road services to urban residents in Lane County.
- Policy 25-b: Evaluate existing road project funding agreements with incorporated cities, and make necessary amendments to allocate an appropriate share of system development charges (SDCs) to the County to cover the cost of improvements on county roads generated by new development.
- Policy 25-c: Engage ODOT in continuing discussions regarding jurisdiction of roadways; partnerships in funding programs; response to ODOT policy initiatives; and partnerships for a seamless service delivery system through sharing of resources, collocation of facilities, or consolidation of functions.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted in Alphabetical Order									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
23	6th Avenue West	City Limits to Oaklea Drive	0.000	0.330	0.330	Junction City	Bike-Ped, add sidewalks, restripe to add bike lanes and possibly turn lanes at intersections., #1	\$50,000	
22	10th Avenue West	Rose Street South to Oaklea Dr	0.000	0.346	0.346	Junction City	Bike-Ped, add sidewalks, restripe to add bike lanes and possibly turn lanes at intersections., #2	\$50,000	
18	18th Avenue East & Deal St Modernization	Highway 99E to Dane Lane	0.000	0.509	0.509	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, and possibly turn lanes at intersections., #4	\$700,000	
20	18th Avenue West Modernization	Hwy 99W to Oaklea Drive	0.000	0.854	0.854	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, and possibly turn lanes at intersections such as Oaklea Dr and Rose Street., #3	\$1,200,000	
40	18th Avenue**	Bertelson Rd to Willow Creek Rd			0.710	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #303	\$1,100,000	
35	31st Street	Hayden Bridge to U Street	0.542	0.905	0.850	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane facility, #765	\$1,300,000	
111	Alvadore Rd	Hwy 36 to Snyder Rd	0.000	6.100	6.100	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,800,000	
112	Applegate Trail	Hwy 36 to Territorial Hwy	0.000	2.584	2.584	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$1,600,000	
101	Arrowhead Street***	Invington Drive to Barstow Ave	0.000	0.230	0.230	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$500,000	
47	Aspen St*	Centennial to West D	0.000	0.441	0.441	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 to 3 lane facility, joint project Spfd, #809	\$750,000	
103	Awbrey Lane	Prairie Rd to Hwy 99W	0.000	1.340	1.340	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$850,000	
97	Beacon Drive East	River Rd to Scenic Drive	0.000	0.749	0.749	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$1,500,000	
98	Beacon Drive West	River Rd to Prairie Rd	0.154	1.172	1.018	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$650,000	
46	Beaver Street Arterial	Hunsaker Drive to Wilkes Drive			0.840	TransPlan (Future List)	R.O.W. acquisition, general construction, new arterial #503	\$1,700,000	
71	Bennett Creek Rd	North River Rd to UGB (bridge)	0.000	1.008	1.008	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards - Widen, upgrade guardrail	\$270,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted in Alphabetical Order									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Milepost Begin	Milepost End	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
51	Bloomberg Connector (McVay Hwy Realignment)*	McVay Highway to 30th Ave			0.400	TransPlan	Modification of connection of McVay Hwy to 30th Ave, #297	\$800,000	
78	Blue River Drive	Hwy 126 to Hwy 126	0.000	1.555	1.555	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,000,000	
15	Bolton Hill Rd	Territorial Hwy to UGB	0.000	1.171	1.171	Veneta	Urban Standards. #B5	\$1,900,000	
11	Bolton Hill Rd	At Territorial Hwy	0.000	0.000	0.000	Veneta	Traffic Signal. Possible joint project with Veneta. ODOT. #B15	\$200,000	
13	Bolton Road East	Territorial Hwy to Huston Rd South	0.000	1.300	1.300	Veneta	Bike-Ped Facilities, #D6	\$320,000	
77	Bridge Street	McKenzie River & Overflow Structure	0.006	0.190	0.184	LC TSP	Bridge Improvements	\$120,000	
116	Briggs Hill Rd*	MP 2.5 to Spencer Cr Rd	2.500	4.010	1.510	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,250,000	
91	Camas Swale Rd	Butte Rd to Weiss Rd	0.550	7.010	6.460	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$4,000,000	
124	Canary Rd	Hwy 101 to Woahink Lake	0.000	0.686	0.686	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$450,000	
76	Cedar Flat Rd*	Hwy 126 to East Cedar Flat Rd	0.000	0.500	0.500	LC TSP	Realignment and widening for paved shoulders	\$450,000	
120	Central Rd	Hwy 126 to Fleck Rd	0.000	1.920	1.920	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,200,000	
125	Clear Lake Rd*	Jensen Lane to Canary Rd	1.670	4.233	2.563	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Addition of paved shoulders	\$1,700,000	
126	Cloverdale Rd	Hwy 58 to Hendricks Rd (State Highway begins)	0.000	3.276	3.276	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,000,000	
28	Coburg Industrial Way**	Pearl Street Intersection				Coburg	Traffic Signal Installation and widening of approach to intersection. #B2	\$0 (est. cost included in #28 above)	
82	Coburg Rd	Coburg Rd North to Linn County Line	7.416	12.883	5.467	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,400,000	
84	Coburg Rd North	Coburg Rd to Linn County Line	0.000	4.115	4.115	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,600,000	
43	Coburg Rd**	Kinney Loop to Armitage Park	3.229	4.419	1.190	TransPlan	Urban Standards. Reconstruct to three-lane facility to UGB, turn lane at park entrance, rural. #625	\$2,400,000	
70	Cottage Grove-Lorane Hwy	City Limit to Gowdyville Rd	0.830	1.174	0.344	Cottage Grove	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$90,000	
136	Cottage Grove-Lorane Rd	Hawley Cr Rd to Old Lorane Rd	10.879	12.654	1.775	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$1,110,000	
45	County Farm Loop	North to South Section	0.000	0.550	0.550	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 3-lane facility, joint with Eugene, #631	\$625,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted in Alphabetical Order									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
42	County Farm Loop	West to East Section	0.550	1.080	0.530	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, joint with Eugene, #632	\$800,000	
79	Crest Drive ***	Lorane Hwy to Blanton Rd	0.000	0.873	0.873	LC TSP	Urban Standards/Rural Modernization	\$1,800,000	
63	Dale Kuni Road	Hwy 99 to UGB	0.000	1.430	1.430	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$900,000	
7	Delight Valley School Rd. North	E. Saginaw Rd. to Bachmann Ln.	0.000	0.282	0.282	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$175,000	
58	Delta/Beltline Interchange*					TransPlan	Interim/safety improvements; replace/revise existing ramps; widen Delta Hwy bridge to 5 lanes, #638	\$8,000,000	
129	Dexter Rd	Hwy 58 to Barbre Rd	0.000	1.500	1.500	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$950,000	
86	Dillard Rd*	Hwy 99 to ECM	0.000	4.016	4.016	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,600,000	
32	Division Avenue	Delta Highway to Beaver Street			0.890	TransPlan (Future List)	New frontage road with Willamette River Bridge #512	\$4,000,000	
110	Dorsey Lane	Hwy 36 to High Pass Rd	0.000	1.542	1.542	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$950,000	
121	Eilmaker Rd	Hwy 126 to Jeans Rd	0.000	1.114	1.114	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$700,000	
118	Fir Butte Rd	Royal Ave to Clear Lake Rd	0.000	2.706	2.706	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,700,000	
75	Fish Hatchery Rd	Hwy 58 to 1st Street	0.000	1.650	1.650	Oakridge	Bike-Ped Facilities. Joint with Oakridge, #D2.	\$1,000,000	
72	Fish Hatchery Rd	At Hwy 58	0.000	0.040	0.040	Oakridge	Realignment of Fish Hatchery Rd at Hwy 58 approach. Joint with Oakridge, ODOT, #D7	\$100,000	
119	Fisher Rd	Hwy 126 to Royal Avenue	0.000	1.200	1.200	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$750,000	
115	Fleck Rd	Territorial Hwy to Central Rd	0.000	2.512	2.512	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,600,000	
34	Fox Hollow Rd	Donald Street to UGB	8.829	9.329	0.500	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #245	\$850,000	
85	Franklin Boulevard East***	I-5 Frontage to Twin Buttes Rd	0.000	1.121	1.121	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,300,000	
59	Game Farm Rd North*	I-5 to Coburg Rd	0.419	1.690	1.271	TransPlan	Urban Standards, Upgrade to 2-3 lane facility, joint with Eugene, #654	\$2,200,000	
50	Game Farm Rd South	Game Farm Rd East to Harlow Rd			0.930	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #737	\$2,100,000	
95	Gowdville Rd*	MP 1.89 to Territorial Hwy	1.890	9.034	7.144	LC TSP	Reconstruct and pave gravel road	\$3,100,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted in Alphabetical Order									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
54	Green Hill Rd*	Barger Drive to Airport Rd	3.820	5.820	2.000	TransPlan	Rural widening and intersection modifications.#485	\$2,000,000	
10	Green Hill Rd*	Barger Drive to W 11th	1.540	3.820	2.280	TransPlan	Urban Standards, Upgrade to 2-3 lane facility, joint with Eugene, #454	\$5,000,000	
39	Green Hill Rd**	North Boundary of Airport to Airport Rd			2.060	TransPlan	Closing of existing road and realignment on east boundary of airport property, #486	\$3,000,000	
49	Grove Street	Silver Lane to Howard	0.000	0.528	0.160	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane/Route #515	\$0	
113	Hall Rd*	MP 4.56 to MP 5.88	4.560	5.880	1.320	LC TSP	Pave gravel portion	\$990,000	
62	Harvey Road	At Hwy 99	0.000	0.100	0.100	Creswell	Intersection improvements at Hwy 99, High Priority #9	\$200,000	
30	Hayden Bridge Rd (includes 23rd)	Yolanda to Marcola Rd			1.540	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #747	\$2,300,000	
3	Heceta Beach Rd***	Hwy 101 to Rhododendron Drive	0.000	1.885	1.885	Florence	Bike-Ped Facilities. Listed as project #1-1	\$150,000	
24	High Pass Road Modernization	Hwy 99 to Oaklea Drive	0.000	0.859	0.859	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #5	\$1,200,000	
25	High Pass Road Modernization (Future)	Oaklea Drive to UGB	0.859	1.520	0.661	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #5	\$900,000	
73	High Prairie Rd	1st Street to UGB	0.000	0.947	0.947	Oakridge	Bike-Ped Facilities. Intersection improvements and shoulders. Joint with Oakridge, Part of #D3 and #D6	\$600,000	
90	Hill Rd	Old Mohawk Rd to Marcola Rd	0.000	4.572	4.572	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,900,000	
137	Hillis Cr Rd	Jasper-Lowell Rd to Alden Lane	0.000	0.778	0.778	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen to standard for bike use	\$490,000	
38	Horn Lane	N. Park Ave to River Road	0.000	0.928	0.928***	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #521	\$150,000	
80	Howard Ave	River Road to North Park	0.000	0.956	0.960	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #524	\$0	
106	Huilbert Lake Rd*	Ferguson Rd to Benton County Line	0.000	2.390	2.390	LC TSP	Reconstruction and drainage improvements	\$1,500,000	
48	Hunsaker Lane/Beaver Street*	River Rd to Division Ave	0.000	1.141	1.141	TransPlan	Urban Standards-2 lane facility,#527	\$2,200,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted in Alphabetical Order									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
12	Huston Road South	Hunter Rd to Perkins Rd	0.272	1.070	0.798	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities. See Veneta TSP #D6	\$500,000	
60	Irving Rd at NW Expressway*	Gainsborough Entrance to Prairie Rd			0.300	TransPlan	Construct overpass over NW Expressway and railroad. Signalize access on north side #530	\$4,200,000	
52	Irvington Drive*	River Road to Prairie Rd	0.000	1.479	1.479	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane facility, #533	\$4,000,000	
55	Jasper Road Extension*	Main Street to Jasper Rd			3.200	TransPlan	Construct 4 lane arterial: phasing to be determined; improve RR X-ing at Jasper Rd; at grade interim improvement; grade separation long range improvement, #66	\$10,400,000	
130	Jasper-Lowell Rd	Pengra Rd to MP 5.0	3.874	5.000	1.126	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$700,000	
132	Jasper-Lowell Rd	Parkway Rd to Pengra Rd	0.000	3.874	3.874	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$2,420,000	
16	Jeans Rd	Huston Rd North to Fawver Dr	1.185	3.000	1.815	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities See Veneta TSP #D6	\$1,100,000	
33	Lake Drive/N. Park Ave	Howard to Horn Lane***	0.000	0.430	0.430	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #536	\$170,000	
69	Latham Rd	Hwy 99 to London Rd	0.000	0.965	0.965	Cottage Grove	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$100,000	
56	Laura St*	Scots Glen Drive to Harlow Rd	0.000	0.273	0.273	TransPlan	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility	\$550,000	
138	Lost Creek Rd	Hwy 58 to Parvin Rd	0.000	0.669	0.669	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$420,000	
89	Marcola Rd*	Parsons Cr Rd to Wendling Rd	10.430	11.700	1.270	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen and overlay. Includes curb and sidewalk in Marcola.	\$1,900,000	
88	Marcola Rd*	Wendling Rd to Johnson Rd	11.700	16.080	4.380	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen and overlay	\$3,000,000	
83	McKenzie View Drive	Coburg Rd to Hill Rd	0.000	6.099	6.099	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,800,000	
104	Meadowview Rd West	Hwy 99W to Alvadore Rd	0.000	2.952	2.952	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,850,000	
128	Mill Rd*	Hwy 58 to Wheeler Rd	0.000	0.249	0.249	LC TSP	Realignment at Hwy 58	\$400,000	
105	Milliron Rd East*	Hwy 99W to Prairie Rd	0.000	0.402	0.402	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen and overlay. Modernize two railroad crossings. Access to new corrections facility.	\$950,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted in Alphabetical Order										
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost		
94	Mosby Cr Rd	Currin Connector to Row River Connector #1	1.204	1.632	0.428	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$250,000		
2	Munsel Lake Rd***	Hwy 101 to North Fork Siuslaw Rd	0.000	2.090	2.090	Florence	Bike-Ped Facilities. Listed as project #1-3	\$150,000		
36	N. Park Avenue	Maxwell Rd to Horn Lane	0.268	1.298	1.030	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane/Route #539	\$200,000		
123	North Fork Siuslaw Rd	Hwy 126 to Munsel Lake Rd	0.000	0.849	0.849	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$550,000		
68	North River Rd	Hwy 99 to Bennett Creek Rd	0.000	0.433	0.433	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards	\$430,000		
109	Oaklea Drive	Hwy 99W to 18th Ave West	0.000	1.512	1.512	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$950,000		
21	Oaklea Drive Modernization	18th Ave West to High Pass Rd	1.512	2.534	1.022	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #7	\$1,400,000		
8	Parsons Creek Rd.	Marcola Rd. to Pioch Ln.	0.000	0.899	0.899	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$560,000		
29	Pearl Street**	Coburg Rd to Miller St	0.025	0.244	0.219	Coburg	Urban Standards - Two-lane facility with curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, #B1	\$700,000		
28	Pearl Street**	Miller St to I-5	0.244	0.640	0.396	Coburg	Urban Standards - Four-lane facility with median treatments, curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, #B1	\$750,000		
14	Perkins Rd	City Limits to Central Rd	0.420	2.822	2.402	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities See Veneta TSP #D6	\$1,500,000		
17	Pitney Lane North	UGB to High Pass Road	1.370	1.509	0.139	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes, #11	\$200,000		
107	Prairie Rd	NW Expressway to Hwy 99 (Prairie Rd Connector)	2.221	7.850	5.629	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,500,000		
81	Prairie Rd***	Maxwell Rd to Beltline	0.118	0.690	0.572	LC TSP	Complete urban Standards	\$350,000		
19	Prairie Road Modernization	Highway 99 to High Pass Road	8.030	9.250	1.220	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #8	\$1,700,000		
26	Prairie Road Widening (Future)	UGB to End (near Hwy 99)	7.300	8.030	0.730	Junction City	Rural Modernization. Widen shoulders. Discussion of prison siting, #9	\$1,000,000		

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted in Alphabetical Order									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
31	Prairie Road**	Carol Lane to Irvington Drive	1.589	1.939	0.350	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 3 lane-lane facility, #472	\$825,000	
1	Rhododendron Drive***	City Limits to Heceta Beach Rd	3.440	5.112	1.672	Florence	Urban Standards-Curbs, Sidewalks, bike lanes. Part of project G-4 and bike project I-2...	\$1,800,000	
127	Ridgeway Rd	Hwy 58 to MP 1.0	0.000	1.000	1.000	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$620,000	
102	River Loop #1***	River Rd to Dalewood Street	0.000	0.244	0.244	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$500,000	
100	River Loop #2***	River Rd to Burlwood Street	0.000	0.990	0.990	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$2,000,000	
57	River Rd*	Beacon Dr to Carthage	7.366	7.747	0.381	TransPlan	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility, #545	\$1,100,000	
27	River Road Modernization*	Hwy 99 to vicinity of Strome Ln	0.000	0.694	0.694	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #10	\$970,000	
92	Row River Rd	Sharps Cr Rd to Brice Cr Rd	16.230	19.778	3.548	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,200,000	
67	Row River Rd	UGB to Row River	1.042	2.088	1.046	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility with bike lanes	\$900,000	
53	Royal Avenue*	Terry Street to Greenhill Avenue	2.267	3.267	1.000	TransPlan	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility, joint with Eugene, #481	\$2,200,000	
96	Scenic Drive ***	River Loop #2 to Beacon Drive East	0.000	0.765	0.765	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$1,600,000	
93	Sears Rd	MP 0.62 to Saginaw Rd East	0.620	3.240	2.620	LC TSP	Strengthen pavement structure	\$1,100,000	
87	Seavey Loop ***	Hwy 58 to Franklin Boulevard East	0.000	3.791	3.791	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$2,400,000	
133	South Jetty Rd	Hwy 101 to BLM Rd	0.000	0.620	0.620	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$390,000	
66	South River Rd**	Hwy 99 to Jason Lee (City Limit)	0.000	0.316	0.316	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards & realign at Hwy 99	\$660,000	
117	Spencer Cr Rd	MP 0.5 to Pine Grove Rd	0.500	3.285	2.785	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,700,000	
99	Spring Creek Drive ***	River Rd to Scenic Drive	0.000	0.527	0.527	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$1,100,000	
122	Stagecoach Rd*	Richardson Rd to MP .58	0.000	0.580	0.580	LC TSP	Slope stabilization	\$770,000	
134	Suttle Rd	Hwy 126 to Territorial Hwy	0.000	3.802	3.802	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$2,380,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted in Alphabetical Order									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
65	Sweet Lane	Hwy 99 to Talemena Dr	0.000	0.718	0.718	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards	\$570,000	
64	Thornton Lane***	Row River Rd to ECM (Gate)	0.000	0.518	0.518	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards - Add curb, gutter, sidewalks	\$220,000	
6	Tillicum Ave.	Hwy. 58 to Tenas Ln.	0.000	0.263	0.263	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Sidewalks and/or widen shoulders	\$200,000	
4	Vaughn Rd.	Noti Loop Rd. to Glaze Rd.	0.000	0.953	0.953	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$600,000	
5	Vaughn Rd.	Canaday Rd. to Territorial Hwy.	7.954	9.906	1.952	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$1,220,000	
41	W 11th Avenue	Greenhill Road to Danebo			1.510	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 5 lane facility, joint with Eugene, ODOT, #333	\$4,500,000	
61	W. Hilliard Ln.	River Road to North Park	0.000	0.840	1.090	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #518	\$0	
114	Warthen Rd	Territorial Hwy to Knight Rd	0.000	4.008	4.008	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$2,500,000	
135	Wending Rd	Marcola Rd to Paschelke Rd	0.000	1.599	1.599	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$1,000,000	
131	West Boundary Rd*	End of Pavement to MP 6.4	1.700	6.400	4.700	LC TSP	Pave gravel road	\$2,750,000	
74	Westfir-Oakridge Rd	Norquist Lane to High Prairie Rd	5.707	6.065	0.358	Oakridge	Bike-Ped Facilities. Joint with Oakridge, #D3.	\$750,000	
44	Wilkes Drive	River Road to River Loop #1	0.000	0.932	0.932	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 3-lane facility, #554	\$1,400,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted by Project Number									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
1	Rhododendron Drive***	City Limits to Heceta Beach Rd	3.440	5.112	1.672	Florence	Urban Standards-Curbs, Sidewalks, bike lanes. Part of project G-4 and bike project I-2..	\$1,800,000	
2	Munsel Lake Rd***	Hwy 101 to North Fork Siuslaw Rd	0.000	2.090	2.090	Florence	Bike-Ped Facilities. Listed as project #I-3	\$150,000	
3	Heceta Beach Rd***	Hwy 101 to Rhododendron Drive	0.000	1.885	1.885	Florence	Bike-Ped Facilities. Listed as project #I-1	\$150,000	
4	Vaughn Rd.	Noti Loop Rd. to Glaze Rd.	0.000	0.953	0.953	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$600,000	
5	Vaughn Rd.	Canaday Rd. to Territorial Hwy.	7.954	9.906	1.952	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$1,220,000	
6	Tillicum Ave.	Hwy. 58 to Tenas Ln.	0.000	0.263	0.263	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Sidewalks and/or widen shoulders	\$200,000	
7	Delight Valley School Rd. North	E. Saginaw Rd. to Bachmann Ln.	0.000	0.282	0.282	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$175,000	
8	Parsons Creek Rd.	Marcola Rd. to Pioch Ln.	0.000	0.899	0.899	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$560,000	
10	Green Hill Rd*	Barger Drive to W 11th	1.540	3.820	2.280	TransPlan	Urban Standards, Upgrade to 2-3 lane facility, joint with Eugene, #454	\$5,000,000	
11	Bolton Hill Rd	At Territorial Hwy	0.000	0.000	0.000	Veneta	Traffic Signal. Possible joint project with Veneta, ODOT. #B15	\$200,000	
12	Huston Road South	Hunter Rd to Perkins Rd	0.272	1.070	0.798	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities. See Veneta TSP #D6	\$500,000	
13	Bolton Road East	Territorial Hwy to Huston Rd South	0.000	1.300	1.300	Veneta	Bike-Ped Facilities, #D6	\$320,000	
14	Perkins Rd	City Limits to Central Rd	0.420	2.822	2.402	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities See Veneta TSP #D6	\$1,500,000	
15	Bolton Hill Rd	Territorial Hwy to UGB	0.000	1.171	1.171	Veneta	Urban Standards. #B5	\$1,900,000	
16	Jeans Rd	Huston Rd North to Fawver Dr	1.185	3.000	1.815	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities See Veneta TSP #D6	\$1,100,000	
17	Pitney Lane North	UGB to High Pass Road	1.370	1.509	0.139	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes, #11	\$200,000	
18	18th Avenue East & Deal St Modernization	Highway 99E to Dane Lane	0.000	0.509	0.509	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, and possibly turn lanes at intersections., #4	\$700,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted by Project Number									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
19	Prairie Road Modernization	Highway 99 to High Pass Road	8.030	9.250	1.220	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #8	\$1,700,000	
20	18th Avenue West Modernization	Hwy 99W to Oaklea Drive	0.000	0.854	0.854	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, and possibly turn lanes at intersections such as Oaklea Dr and Rose Street., #3	\$1,200,000	
21	Oaklea Drive Modernization	18th Ave West to High Pass Rd	1.512	2.534	1.022	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #7	\$1,400,000	
22	10th Avenue West	Rose Street South to Oaklea Dr	0.000	0.346	0.346	Junction City	Bike-Ped, add sidewalks, restripe to add bike lanes and possibly turn lanes at intersections., #2	\$50,000	
23	6th Avenue West	City Limits to Oaklea Drive	0.000	0.330	0.330	Junction City	Bike-Ped, add sidewalks, restripe to add bike lanes and possibly turn lanes at intersections., #1	\$50,000	
24	High Pass Road Modernization	Hwy 99 to Oaklea Drive	0.000	0.859	0.859	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #5	\$1,200,000	
25	High Pass Road Modernization (Future)	Oaklea Drive to UGB	0.859	1.520	0.661	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #5	\$900,000	
26	Prairie Road Widening (Future)	UGB to End (near Hwy 99)	7.300	8.030	0.730	Junction City	Rural Modernization. Widen shoulders. Discussion of prison siting, #9	\$1,000,000	
27	River Road Modernization*	Hwy 99 to vicinity of Strome Ln	0.000	0.694	0.694	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #10	\$970,000	
28	Coburg Industrial Way**	Pearl Street Intersection				Coburg	Traffic Signal Installation and widening of approach to intersection, #B2	\$0 (est. cost included in #28 above)	
28	Pearl Street**	Miller St to I-5	0.244	0.640	0.396	Coburg	Urban Standards - Four-lane facility with median treatments, curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, #B1	\$750,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted by Project Number									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
29	Pearl Street**	Coburg Rd to Miller St	0.025	0.244	0.219	Coburg	Urban Standards - Two-lane facility with curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, #B1	\$700,000	
30	Hayden Bridge Rd (includes 23rd)	Yolanda to Marcola Rd			1.540	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #747	\$2,300,000	
31	Prairie Road**	Carol Lane to Irvington Drive	1.589	1.939	0.350	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 3 lane-lane facility, #472	\$825,000	
32	Division Avenue	Delta Highway to Beaver Street			0.890	TransPlan (Future List)	New frontage road with Willamette River Bridge #512	\$4,000,000	
33	Lake Drive/N. Park Ave	Howard to Horn Lane***	0.000	0.430	0.430	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #536	\$170,000	
34	Fox Hollow Rd	Donald Street to UGB	8.829	9.329	0.500	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #245	\$850,000	
35	31st Street	Hayden Bridge to U Street	0.542	0.905	0.850	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane facility, #765	\$1,300,000	
36	N. Park Avenue	Maxwell Rd to Horn Lane	0.268	1.298	1.030	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane/Route #539	\$200,000	
38	Horn Lane	N. Park Ave to River Road	0.000	0.928	0.928***	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #521	\$150,000	
39	Green Hill Rd**	North Boundary of Airport to Airport Rd			2.060	TransPlan	Closing of existing road and realignment on east boundary of airport property, #486	\$3,000,000	
40	18th Avenue**	Bertelson Rd to Willow Creek Rd			0.710	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #303	\$1,100,000	
41	W 11th Avenue	Greenhill Road to Danebo			1.510	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 5 lane facility, joint with Eugene, ODOT, #333	\$4,500,000	
42	County Farm Loop	West to East Section	0.550	1.080	0.530	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, joint with Eugene, #632	\$800,000	
43	Coburg Rd**	Kinney Loop to Armitage Park	3.229	4.419	1.190	TransPlan	Urban Standards. Reconstruct to three-lane facility to UGB, turn lane at park entrance, rural, #625	\$2,400,000	
44	Wilkes Drive	River Road to River Loop #1	0.000	0.932	0.932	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 3-lane facility, #554	\$1,400,000	
45	County Farm Loop	North to South Section	0.000	0.550	0.550	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 3-lane facility, joint with Eugene, #631	\$825,000	
46	Beaver Street Arterial	Hunsaker Drive to Wilkes Drive			0.840	TransPlan (Future List)	R.O.W. acquisition, general construction, new arterial #503	\$1,700,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted by Project Number									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
47	Aspen St*	Centennial to West D	0.000	0.441	0.441	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 to 3 lane facility, joint project Spfd, #809	\$750,000	
48	Hunsaker Lane/Beaver Street*	River Rd to Division Ave	0.000	1.141	1.141	TransPlan	Urban Standards-2 lane facility,#527	\$2,200,000	
49	Grove Street	Silver Lane to Howard	0.000	0.528	0.160	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane/Route #515	\$0	
50	Game Farm Rd South	Game Farm Rd East to Harlow Rd			0.930	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility,#737	\$2,100,000	
51	Bloomberg Connector (McVay Hwy Realignment)*	McVay Highway to 30th Ave			0.400	TransPlan	Modification of connection of McVay Hwy to 30th Ave, #297	\$800,000	
52	Irvington Drive*	River Road to Prairie Rd	0.000	1.479	1.479	TransPlan	Urban Standards,2-3 lane facility, #533	\$4,000,000	
53	Royal Avenue*	Terry Street to Greenhill Avenue	2.267	3.267	1.000	TransPlan	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility, joint with Eugene, #481	\$2,200,000	
54	Green Hill Rd*	Barger Drive to Airport Rd	3.820	5.820	2.000	TransPlan	Rural widening and intersection modifications,#485	\$2,000,000	
55	Jasper Road Extension*	Main Street to Jasper Rd			3.200	TransPlan	Construct 4 lane arterial: phasing to be determined: improve RR X-ing at Jasper Rd; at grade interim improvement; grade separation long range improvement,#66	\$10,400,000	
56	Laura St*	Scots Glen Drive to Harlow Rd	0.000	0.273	0.273	TransPlan	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility	\$550,000	
57	River Rd*	Beacon Dr to Carthage	7.366	7.747	0.381	TransPlan	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility, #545	\$1,100,000	
58	Delta/Beltline Interchange*					TransPlan	Interim/safety improvements; replace/revise existing ramps; widen Delta Hwy bridge to 5 lanes, #638	\$8,000,000	
59	Game Farm Rd North*	I-5 to Coburg Rd	0.419	1.690	1.271	TransPlan	Urban Standards, Upgrade to 2-3 lane facility, Joint with Eugene,#654	\$2,200,000	
60	Irving Rd at NW Expressway*	Gainsborough Entrance to Prairie Rd			0.300	TransPlan	Construct overpass over NW Expressway and railroad. Signalize access on north side,#530	\$4,200,000	
61	W. Hilliard Ln.	River Road to North Park	0.000	0.840	1.090	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #518	\$0	
62	Harvey Road	At Hwy 99	0.000	0.100	0.100	Creswell	Intersection improvements at Hwy 99, High Priority #9	\$200,000	
63	Dale Kuni Road	Hwy 99 to UGB	0.000	1.430	1.430	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$900,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted by Project Number										
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost		
64	Thomson Lane***	Row River Rd to ECM (Gate)	0.000	0.518	0.518	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards - Add curb, gutter, sidewalks	\$220,000		
65	Sweet Lane	Hwy 99 to Talemena Dr	0.000	0.718	0.718	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards	\$570,000		
66	South River Rd**	Hwy 99 to Jason Lee (City Limit)	0.000	0.316	0.316	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards & realign at Hwy 99	\$660,000		
67	Row River Rd	UGB to Row River	1.042	2.088	1.046	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility with bike lanes	\$900,000		
68	North River Rd	Hwy 99 to Bennett Creek Rd	0.000	0.433	0.433	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards	\$430,000		
69	Latham Rd	Hwy 99 to London Rd	0.000	0.965	0.965	Cottage Grove	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$100,000		
70	Cottage Grove-Lorane Hwy	City Limit to Gowdyville Rd	0.830	1.174	0.344	Cottage Grove	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$90,000		
71	Bennett Creek Rd	North River Rd to UGB (bridge)	0.000	1.008	1.008	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards - Widen, upgrade guardrail	\$270,000		
72	Fish Hatchery Rd	At Hwy 58	0.000	0.040	0.040	Oakridge	Realignment of Fish Hatchery Rd at Hwy 58 approach. Joint with Oakridge, ODOT, #D7	\$100,000		
73	High Prairie Rd	1st Street to UGB	0.000	0.947	0.947	Oakridge	Bike-Ped Facilities. Intersection improvements and shoulders. Joint with Oakridge, Part of #D3 and #D6	\$600,000		
74	Westfir-Oakridge Rd	Norquist Lane to High Prairie Rd	5.707	6.065	0.358	Oakridge	Bike-Ped Facilities. Joint with Oakridge, #D3.	\$750,000		
75	Fish Hatchery Rd	Hwy 58 to 1st Street	0.000	1.650	1.650	Oakridge	Bike-Ped Facilities. Joint with Oakridge, #D2.	\$1,000,000		
76	Cedar Flat Rd*	Hwy 126 to East Cedar Flat Rd	0.000	0.500	0.500	LC TSP	Realignment and widening for paved shoulders	\$450,000		
77	Bridge Street	McKenzie River & Overflow Structure	0.006	0.190	0.184	LC TSP	Bridge Improvements	\$120,000		
78	Blue River Drive	Hwy 126 to Hwy 126	0.000	1.555	1.555	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,000,000		
79	Crest Drive ***	Lorane Hwy to Blanton Rd	0.000	0.873	0.873	LC TSP	Urban Standards/Rural Modernization	\$1,800,000		
80	Howard Ave	River Road to North Park	0.000	0.956	0.960	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #524	\$0		
81	Prairie Rd***	Maxwell Rd to Beltline	0.118	0.690	0.572	LC TSP	Complete urban Standards	\$350,000		
82	Coburg Rd	Coburg Rd North to Linn County Line	7.416	12.883	5.467	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,400,000		
83	McKenzie View Dr.	Coburg Rd to Hill Rd	0.000	6.099	6.099	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,800,000		

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads -- 20-Year Project List Sorted by Project Number										
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost		
84	Coburg Rd North	Coburg Rd to Linn County Line	0.000	4.115	4.115	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,600,000		
85	Franklin Boulevard East***	I-5 Frontage to Twin Buttes Rd	0.000	1.121	1.121	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,300,000		
86	Dillard Rd*	Hwy 99 to ECM	0.000	4.016	4.016	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,600,000		
87	Seavey Loop ***	Hwy 58 to Franklin Boulevard East	0.000	3.791	3.791	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$2,400,000		
88	Marcola Rd*	Wending Rd to Johnson Rd	11.700	16.080	4.380	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen and overlay	\$3,000,000		
89	Marcola Rd*	Parsons Cr Rd to Wending Rd	10.430	11.700	1.270	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen and overlay. Includes curb and sidewalk in Marcola.	\$1,900,000		
90	Hill Rd	Old Mohawk Rd to Marcola Rd	0.000	4.572	4.572	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,900,000		
91	Camas Swale Rd	Butte Rd to Weiss Rd	0.550	7.010	6.460	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$4,000,000		
92	Row River Rd	Sharps Cr Rd to Brice Cr Rd	16.230	19.778	3.548	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,200,000		
93	Sears Rd	MP 0.62 to Saginaw Rd East	0.620	3.240	2.620	LC TSP	Strengthen pavement structure	\$1,100,000		
94	Mosby Cr Rd	Curin Connector to Row River Connector #1	1.204	1.632	0.428	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$250,000		
95	Gowdville Rd*	MP 1.89 to Territorial Hwy	1.890	9.034	7.144	LC TSP	Reconstruct and pave gravel road	\$3,100,000		
96	Scenic Drive ***	River Loop #2 to Beacon Drive East	0.000	0.765	0.765	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$1,600,000		
97	Beacon Drive East	River Rd to Scenic Drive	0.000	0.749	0.749	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$1,500,000		
98	Beacon Drive West	River Rd to Prairie Rd	0.154	1.172	1.018	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$650,000		
99	Spring Creek Drive ***	River Rd to Scenic Drive	0.000	0.527	0.527	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$1,100,000		
100	River Loop #2***	River Rd to Burlwood Street	0.000	0.990	0.990	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$2,000,000		
101	Arrowhead Street***	Irvington Drive to Barstow Ave	0.000	0.230	0.230	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$500,000		
102	River Loop #1***	River Rd to Dalewood Street	0.000	0.244	0.244	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$500,000		
103	Awbrey Lane	Prairie Rd to Hwy 99W	0.000	1.340	1.340	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$850,000		
104	Meadowview Rd West	Hwy 99W to Alvadore Rd	0.000	2.952	2.952	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,850,000		

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted by Project Number									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
105	Milliron Rd East*	Hwy 99W to Prairie Rd	0.000	0.402	0.402	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen and overlay. Modernize two railroad crossings. Access to new corrections facility.	\$950,000	
106	Hulbert Lake Rd*	Ferguson Rd to Benton County Line	0.000	2.390	2.390	LC TSP	Reconstruction and drainage improvements	\$1,500,000	
107	Prairie Rd	NW Expressway to Hwy 99 (Prairie Rd Connector)	2.221	7.850	5.629	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,500,000	
109	Oaklea Drive	Hwy 99W to 18th Ave West	0.000	1.512	1.512	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$950,000	
110	Dorsey Lane	Hwy 36 to High Pass Rd	0.000	1.542	1.542	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$950,000	
111	Alvadore Rd	Hwy 36 to Snyder Rd	0.000	6.100	6.100	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,800,000	
112	Applegate Trail	Hwy 36 to Territorial Hwy	0.000	2.584	2.584	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$1,600,000	
113	Hall Rd*	MP 4.56 to MP 5.88	4.560	5.880	1.320	LC TSP	Pave gravel portion	\$990,000	
114	Warthen Rd	Territorial Hwy to Knight Rd	0.000	4.008	4.008	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$2,500,000	
115	Fleck Rd	Territorial Hwy to Central Rd	0.000	2.512	2.512	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,600,000	
116	Briggs Hill Rd*	MP 2.5 to Spencer Cr Rd	2.500	4.010	1.510	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,250,000	
117	Spencer Cr Rd	MP 0.5 to Pine Grove Rd	0.500	3.285	2.785	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,700,000	
118	Fir Butte Rd	Royal Ave to Clear Lake Rd	0.000	2.706	2.706	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,700,000	
119	Fisher Rd	Hwy 126 to Royal Avenue	0.000	1.200	1.200	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$750,000	
120	Central Rd	Hwy 126 to Fleck Rd	0.000	1.920	1.920	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,200,000	
121	Eilfmaker Rd	Hwy 126 to Jeans Rd	0.000	1.114	1.114	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$700,000	
122	Stagecoach Rd*	Richardson Rd to MP 0.58	0.000	0.580	0.580	LC TSP	Slope stabilization	\$770,000	
123	North Fork Siuslaw Rd	Hwy 126 to Munsel Lake Rd	0.000	0.849	0.849	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$550,000	
124	Canary Rd	Hwy 101 to Woahink Lake	0.000	0.686	0.686	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$450,000	
125	Clear Lake Rd*	Jensen Lane to Canary Rd	1.670	4.233	2.563	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Addition of paved shoulders	\$1,700,000	
126	Cloverdale Rd	Hwy 58 to Hendricks Rd (State Highway begins)	0.000	3.276	3.276	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,000,000	
127	Ridgeway Rd	Hwy 58 to MP 1.0	0.000	1.000	1.000	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$620,000	
128	Mill Rd*	Hwy 58 to Wheeler Rd	0.000	0.249	0.249	LC TSP	Realignment at Hwy 58	\$400,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Projects on Lane County Roads – 20-Year Project List Sorted by Project Number										
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost		
129	Dexter Rd	Hwy 58 to Barbre Rd	0.000	1.500	1.500	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$950,000		
130	Jasper-Lowell Rd	Pengra Rd to MP 5.0	3.874	5.000	1.126	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$700,000		
131	West Boundary Rd*	End of Pavement to MP 6.4	1.700	6.400	4.700	LC TSP	Pave gravel road	\$2,750,000		
132	Jasper-Lowell Rd	Parkway Rd to Pengra Rd	0.000	3.874	3.874	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$2,420,000		
133	South Jetty Rd	Hwy 101 to BLM Rd	0.000	0.620	0.620	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$390,000		
134	Suttle Rd	Hwy 126 to Territorial Hwy	0.000	3.802	3.802	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$2,380,000		
135	Wendling Rd	Marcola Rd to Paschelke Rd	0.000	1.599	1.599	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$1,000,000		
136	Cottage Grove-Lorane Rd	Hawley Cr Rd to Old Lorane Rd	10.879	12.654	1.775	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$1,110,000		
137	Hills Cr Rd	Jasper-Lowell Rd to Aiden Lane	0.000	0.778	0.778	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen to standard for bike use	\$490,000		
138	Lost Creek Rd	Hwy 58 to Parvin Rd	0.000	0.669	0.669	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$420,000		

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Lane County Transportation System Plan 20-Year Project List									
Projects on Lane County Roads - Sorted by TSP									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
County Projects Identified in Lane County TSP									
111	Alvadore Rd	Hwy 36 to Snyder Rd	0.000	6.100	6.100	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,800,000	
112	Applegate Trail	Hwy 36 to Territorial Hwy	0.000	2.584	2.584	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$1,600,000	
101	Arrowhead Street***	Irvington Drive to Barstow Ave	0.000	0.230	0.230	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$500,000	
103	Awbrey Lane	Prairie Rd to Hwy 99W	0.000	1.340	1.340	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$850,000	
97	Beacon Drive East	River Rd to Scenic Drive	0.000	0.749	0.749	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$1,500,000	
98	Beacon Drive West	River Rd to Prairie Rd	0.154	1.172	1.018	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$650,000	
78	Blue River Drive	Hwy 126 to Hwy 126	0.000	1.555	1.555	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,000,000	
77	Bridge Street	McKenzie River & Overflow Structure	0.006	0.190	0.184	LC TSP	Bridge Improvements	\$120,000	
116	Briggs Hill Rd*	MP 2.5 to Spencer Cr Rd	2.500	4.010	1.510	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,250,000	
91	Camas Swale Rd	Butte Rd to Weiss Rd	0.550	7.010	6.460	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$4,000,000	
124	Canary Rd	Hwy 101 to Woathink Lake	0.000	0.686	0.686	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$450,000	
76	Cedar Flat Rd*	Hwy 126 to East Cedar Flat Rd	0.000	0.500	0.500	LC TSP	Realignment and widening for paved shoulders	\$450,000	
120	Central Rd	Hwy 126 to Fleck Rd	0.000	1.920	1.920	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,200,000	
125	Clear Lake Rd*	Jensen Lane to Canary Rd	1.670	4.233	2.563	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Addition of paved shoulders	\$1,700,000	
126	Cloverdale Rd	Hwy 58 to Hendricks Rd (State Highway begins)	0.000	3.276	3.276	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,000,000	
82	Coburg Rd	Coburg Rd North to Linn County Line	7.416	12.883	5.467	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,400,000	
84	Coburg Rd North	Coburg Rd to Linn County Line	0.000	4.115	4.115	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,600,000	
136	Cottage Grove-Lorane Rd	Hawley Cr Rd to Old Lorane Rd	10.879	12.654	1.775	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$1,110,000	
79	Crest Drive ***	Lorane Hwy to Blanton Rd	0.000	0.873	0.873	LC TSP	Urban Standards/Rural Modernization	\$1,800,000	
63	Dale Kuni Road	Hwy 99 to UGB	0.000	1.430	1.430	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$900,000	
7	Delight Valley School Rd. North	E. Saginaw Rd. to Bachmann Ln.	0.000	0.282	0.282	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$175,000	
129	Dexter Rd	Hwy 58 to Barbre Rd	0.000	1.500	1.500	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$950,000	
86	Dillard Rd*	Hwy 99 to ECM	0.000	4.016	4.016	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,600,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Lane County Transportation System Plan 20-Year Project List									
Projects on Lane County Roads - Sorted by TSP									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
110	Dorsey Lane	Hwy 36 to High Pass Rd	0.000	1.542	1.542	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$950,000	
121	Elmaker Rd	Hwy 126 to Jeans Rd	0.000	1.114	1.114	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$700,000	
118	Fir Butte Rd	Royal Ave to Clear Lake Rd	0.000	2.706	2.706	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,700,000	
119	Fisher Rd	Hwy 126 to Royal Avenue	0.000	1.200	1.200	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$750,000	
115	Fleck Rd	Territorial Hwy to Central Rd	0.000	2.512	2.512	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,600,000	
85	Franklin Boulevard East***	I-5 Frontage to Twin Buttes Rd	0.000	1.121	1.121	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,300,000	
95	Gowdyville Rd*	MP 1.89 to Territorial Hwy	1.890	9.034	7.144	LC TSP	Reconstruct and pave gravel road	\$3,100,000	
113	Hall Rd*	MP 4.56 to MP 5.88	4.560	5.880	1.320	LC TSP	Pave gravel portion	\$990,000	
90	Hill Rd	Old Mohawk Rd to Marcola Rd	0.000	4.572	4.572	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,900,000	
137	Hills Cr Rd	Jasper-Lowell Rd to Alden Lane	0.000	0.778	0.778	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen to standard for bike use	\$490,000	
106	Hulbert Lake Rd*	Ferguson Rd to Benton County Line	0.000	2.390	2.390	LC TSP	Reconstruction and drainage improvements	\$1,500,000	
12	Huston Road South	Hunter Rd to Perkins Rd	0.272	1.070	0.798	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities. See Veneta TSP #D6	\$500,000	
130	Jasper-Lowell Rd	Pengra Rd to MP 5.0	3.874	5.000	1.126	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$700,000	
132	Jasper-Lowell Rd	Parkway Rd to Pengra Rd	0.000	3.874	3.874	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$2,420,000	
16	Jeans Rd	Huston Rd North to Fawver Dr	1.185	3.000	1.815	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities See Veneta TSP #D6	\$1,100,000	
138	Lost Creek Rd	Hwy 58 to Parvin Rd	0.000	0.669	0.669	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$420,000	
89	Marcola Rd*	Parsons Cr Rd to Wendling Rd	10.430	11.700	1.270	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen and overlay. Includes curb and sidewalk in Marcola.	\$1,900,000	
88	Marcola Rd*	Wendling Rd to Johnson Rd	11.700	16.080	4.380	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen and overlay	\$3,000,000	
83	McKenzie View Drive	Coburg Rd to Hill Rd	0.000	6.099	6.099	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,800,000	
104	Meadowview Rd W	Hwy 99W to Alvadore Rd	0.000	2.952	2.952	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,850,000	
128	Mill Rd*	Hwy 58 to Wheeler Rd	0.000	0.249	0.249	LC TSP	Realignment at Hwy 58	\$400,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Lane County Transportation System Plan 20-Year Project List									
Projects on Lane County Roads - Sorted by TSP									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
105	Milliron Rd East*	Hwy 99W to Prairie Rd	0.000	0.402	0.402	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen and overlay. Modernize two railroad crossings. Access to new corrections facility.	\$950,000	
94	Mosby Cr Rd	Currin Connector to Row River Connector #1	1.204	1.632	0.428	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$250,000	
123	North Fork Siuslaw Rd	Hwy 126 to Munsel Lake Rd	0.000	0.849	0.849	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$550,000	
109	Oaklea Drive	Hwy 99W to 18th Ave West	0.000	1.512	1.512	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$950,000	
8	Parsons Creek Rd.	Marcola Rd. to Ploch Ln.	0.000	0.899	0.899	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders	\$560,000	
14	Perkins Rd	City Limits to Central Rd	0.420	2.822	2.402	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities See Veneta TSP #D6	\$1,500,000	
81	Prairie Rd***	Maxwell Rd to Beltline	0.118	0.690	0.572	LC TSP	Complete urban Standards	\$350,000	
107	Prairie Rd	NW Expressway to Hwy 99 (Prairie Rd Connector)	2.221	7.850	5.629	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$3,500,000	
127	Ridgeway Rd	Hwy 58 to MP 1.0	0.000	1.000	1.000	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$620,000	
102	River Loop #1***	River Rd to Dalewood Street	0.000	0.244	0.244	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$500,000	
100	River Loop #2***	River Rd to Burlwood Street	0.000	0.990	0.990	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$2,000,000	
92	Row River Rd	Sharps Cr Rd to Brice Cr Rd	16.230	19.778	3.548	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$2,200,000	
96	Scenic Drive ***	River Loop #2 to Beacon Drive East	0.000	0.765	0.765	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$1,600,000	
93	Sears Rd	MP 0.62 to Saginaw Rd East	0.620	3.240	2.620	LC TSP	Strengthen pavement structure	\$1,100,000	
87	Seavey Loop ***	Hwy 58 to Franklin Boulevard East	0.000	3.791	3.791	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$2,400,000	
133	South Jetty Rd	Hwy 101 to BLM Rd	0.000	0.620	0.620	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$390,000	
117	Spencer Cr Rd	MP 0.5 to Pine Grove Rd	0.500	3.285	2.785	LC TSP	Rural Modernization	\$1,700,000	
99	Spring Creek Drive ***	River Rd to Scenic Drive	0.000	0.527	0.527	LC TSP	Urban Standards	\$1,100,000	
122	Stagecoach Rd*	Richardson Rd to MP 0.58	0.000	0.580	0.580	LC TSP	Slope stabilization	\$770,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Lane County Transportation System Plan 20-Year Project List									
Projects on Lane County Roads - Sorted by TSP									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
134	Suttle Rd	Hwy 126 to Territorial Hwy	0.000	3.802	3.802	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$2,380,000	
6	Tillicum Ave.	Hwy. 58 to Tenas Ln.	0.000	0.263	0.263	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Sidewalks and/or widen shoulders	\$200,000	
4	Vaughn Rd.	Noti Loop Rd. to Glaze Rd.	0.000	0.953	0.953	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$600,000	
5	Vaughn Rd.	Canaday Rd. to Territorial Hwy.	7.954	9.906	1.952	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities – Widen shoulders	\$1,220,000	
114	Warthen Rd	Territorial Hwy to Knight Rd	0.000	4.008	4.008	LC TSP	Rural Modernization - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$2,500,000	
135	Wendling Rd	Marcola Rd to Pascheike Rd	0.000	1.599	1.599	LC TSP	Bike-Ped Facilities - Widen shoulders for bike use	\$1,000,000	
131	West Boundary Rd*	End of Pavement to MP 6.4	1.700	6.400	4.700	LC TSP	Pave gravel road	\$2,750,000	
County Projects Identified in Urban Area TSPs									
29	Pearl Street**	Coburg Rd to Miller St	0.025	0.244	0.219	Coburg	Urban Standards - Two-lane facility with curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, #B1	\$700,000	
28	Pearl Street**	Miller St to I-5	0.244	0.640	0.396	Coburg	Urban Standards - Four-lane facility with median treatments, curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, #B1	\$750,000	
28	Coburg Industrial Way**	Pearl Street Intersection				Coburg	Traffic Signal Installation and widening of approach to intersection, #B2	\$0 (est. cost included in #28 above)	
71	Bennett Creek Rd	North River Rd to UGB (bridge)	0.000	1.008	1.008	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards - Widen, upgrade guardrail	\$270,000	
70	Cottage Grove-Lorane Hwy	City Limit to Gowdlyville Rd	0.830	1.174	0.344	Cottage Grove	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$90,000	
69	Latham Rd	Hwy 99 to London Rd	0.000	0.965	0.965	Cottage Grove	Bike-Ped Facilities	\$100,000	
68	North River Rd	Hwy 99 to Bennett Creek Rd	0.000	0.433	0.433	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards	\$430,000	
67	Row River Rd	UGB to Row River	1.042	2.088	1.046	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility with bike lanes	\$900,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Lane County Transportation System Plan 20-Year Project List									
Projects on Lane County Roads - Sorted by TSP									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
66	South River Rd**	Hwy 99 to Jason Lee (City Limit)	0.000	0.316	0.316	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards & realign at Hwy 99	\$660,000	
65	Sweet Lane	Hwy 99 to Talemna Dr	0.000	0.718	0.718	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards	\$570,000	
64	Thomton Lane***	Row River Rd to ECM (Gate)	0.000	0.518	0.518	Cottage Grove	Urban Standards - Add curb, gutter, sidewalks	\$220,000	
62	Harvey Road	At Hwy 99	0.000	0.100	0.100	Creswell	Intersection improvements at Hwy 99, High Priority #9	\$200,000	
3	Heceta Beach Rd***	Hwy 101 to Rhododendron Drive	0.000	1.885	1.885	Florence	Bike-Ped Facilities. Listed as project #1-1	\$150,000	
2	Munsel Lake Rd***	Hwy 101 to North Fork Siuslaw Rd	0.000	2.090	2.090	Florence	Bike-Ped Facilities. Listed as project #1-3	\$150,000	
1	Rhododendron Drive***	City Limits to Heceta Beach Rd	3.440	5.112	1.672	Florence	Urban Standards-Curbs, Sidewalks, bike lanes. Part of project G-4 and bike project I-2..	\$1,800,000	
23	6th Avenue West	City Limits to Oaklea Drive	0.000	0.330	0.330	Junction City	Bike-Ped, add sidewalks, restripe to add bike lanes and possibly turn lanes at intersections., #1	\$50,000	
22	10th Avenue West	Rose Street South to Oaklea Dr	0.000	0.346	0.346	Junction City	Bike-Ped, add sidewalks, restripe to add bike lanes and possibly turn lanes at intersections., #2	\$50,000	
18	18th Avenue East & Deal St Modernization	Highway 99E to Dane Lane	0.000	0.509	0.509	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, and possibly turn lanes at intersections., #4	\$700,000	
20	18th Avenue West Modernization	Hwy 99W to Oaklea Drive	0.000	0.854	0.854	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, and possibly turn lanes at intersections such as Oaklea Dr and Rose Street., #3	\$1,200,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Lane County Transportation System Plan 20-Year Project List									
Projects on Lane County Roads - Sorted by TSP									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
24	High Pass Road Modernization	Hwy 99 to Oaklea Drive	0.000	0.859	0.859	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #5	\$1,200,000	
25	High Pass Road Modernization (Future)	Oaklea Drive to UGB	0.859	1.520	0.661	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #5	\$900,000	
21	Oaklea Drive Modernization	18th Ave West to High Pass Rd	1.512	2.534	1.022	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #7	\$1,400,000	
17	Pitney Lane North	UGB to High Pass Road	1.370	1.509	0.139	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes, #11	\$200,000	
19	Prairie Road Modernization	Highway 99 to High Pass Road	8.030	9.250	1.220	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #8	\$1,700,000	
26	Prairie Road Widening (Future)	UGB to End (near Hwy 99)	7.300	8.030	0.730	Junction City	Rural Modernization. Widen shoulders. Discussion of prison siting, #9	\$1,000,000	
27	River Road Modernization*	Hwy 99 to vicinity of Strome Ln	0.000	0.694	0.694	Junction City	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane with curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes. Need and location of turn lanes to be determined., #10	\$970,000	
75	Fish Hatchery Rd	Hwy 58 to 1st Street	0.000	1.650	1.650	Oakridge	Bike-Ped Facilities. Joint with Oakridge, #D2.	\$1,000,000	
72	Fish Hatchery Rd	At Hwy 58	0.000	0.040	0.040	Oakridge	Realignment of Fish Hatchery Rd at Hwy 58 approach. Joint with Oakridge, ODOT, #D7	\$100,000	
73	High Prairie Rd	1st Street to UGB	0.000	0.947	0.947	Oakridge	Bike-Ped Facilities. Intersection improvements and shoulders. Joint with Oakridge, Part of #D3 and #D6	\$600,000	
74	Westfir-Oakridge Rd	Norquist Lane to High Prairie Rd	5.707	6.065	0.358	Oakridge	Bike-Ped Facilities. Joint with Oakridge, #D3.	\$750,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Lane County Transportation System Plan 20-Year Project List									
Projects on Lane County Roads - Sorted by TSP									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
40	18th Avenue**	Bertelson Rd to Willow Creek Rd			0.710	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #303	\$1,100,000	
35	31st Street	Hayden Bridge to U Street	0.542	0.905	0.850	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2-3 lane facility, #765	\$1,300,000	
47	Aspen St*	Centennial to West D	0.000	0.441	0.441	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 to 3 lane facility, joint project Spfd, #809	\$750,000	
46	Beaver Street Arterial	Hunsaker Drive to Wilkes Drive			0.840	TransPlan (Future List)	R.O.W. acquisition, general construction, new arterial #503	\$1,700,000	
51	Bloomberg Connector (McVay Highway Realignment)*	McVay Highway to 30th Ave			0.400	TransPlan	Modification of connection of McVay Hwy to 30th Ave, #297	\$800,000	
43	Coburg Rd**	Kinney Loop to Armitage Park	3.229	4.419	1.190	TransPlan	Urban Standards. Reconstruct to three-lane facility to UGB, turn lane at park entrance, rural, #625	\$2,400,000	
45	County Farm Loop	North to South Section	0.000	0.550	0.550	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 3-lane facility, joint with Eugene, #631	\$825,000	
42	County Farm Loop	West to East Section	0.550	1.080	0.530	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, joint with Eugene, #632	\$800,000	
58	Delta/Beltline Interchange*					TransPlan	Interim/safety improvements; replace/revise existing ramps; widen Delta Hwy bridge to 5 lanes, #638	\$8,000,000	
32	Division Avenue	Delta Highway to Beaver Street			0.890	TransPlan (Future List)	New frontage road with Willamette River Bridge #512	\$4,000,000	
34	Fox Hollow Rd	Donald Street to UGB	8.829	9.329	0.500	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #245	\$850,000	
59	Game Farm Rd North*	I-5 to Coburg Rd	0.419	1.690	1.271	TransPlan	Urban Standards, Upgrade to 2-3 lane facility, joint with Eugene, #654	\$2,200,000	
50	Game Farm Rd South	Game Farm Rd East to Harlow Rd			0.930	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #737	\$2,100,000	
54	Green Hill Rd*	Barger Drive to Airport Rd	3.820	5.820	2.000	TransPlan	Rural widening and intersection modifications, #485	\$2,000,000	
10	Green Hill Rd*	Barger Drive to W 11th	1.540	3.820	2.280	TransPlan	Urban Standards, Upgrade to 2-3 lane facility, joint with Eugene, #454	\$5,000,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Lane County Transportation System Plan 20-Year Project List										
Projects on Lane County Roads - Sorted by TSP										
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost		
39	Green Hill Rd**	North Boundary of Airport to Airport Rd			2.060	TransPlan	Closing of existing road and realignment on east boundary of airport property, #486	\$3,000,000		
49	Grove Street	Silver Lane to Howard	0.000	0.528	0.160	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane/Route #515	\$0		
30	Hayden Bridge Rd (includes 23rd)	Yolanda to Marcola Rd			1.540	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 2 lane facility, #747	\$2,300,000		
61	W. Hilliard Ln.	River Road to North Park	0.000	0.840	1.090	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #518	\$0		
38	Horn Lane	N. Park Ave to River Road	0.000	0.928	0.928***	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #521	\$150,000		
80	Howard Ave	River Road to North Park	0.000	0.956	0.960	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #524	\$0		
48	Hunsaker Lane/Beaver Street*	River Rd to Division Ave	0.000	1.141	1.141	TransPlan	Urban Standards-2 lane facility,#527	\$2,200,000		
60	Irving Rd at NW Expressway*	Gainsborough Entrance to Prairie Rd			0.300	TransPlan	Construct overpass over NW Expressway and railroad. Signalize access on north side,#530	\$4,200,000		
52	Irvington Drive*	River Road to Prairie Rd	0.000	1.479	1.479	TransPlan	Urban Standards,2-3 lane facility, #533	\$4,000,000		
55	Jasper Road Extension*	Main Street to Jasper Rd			3.200	TransPlan	Construct 4 lane arterial: phasing to be determined: improve RR X-ing at Jasper Rd; at grade interim improvement; grade separation long range improvement,#66	\$10,400,000		
33	Lake Drive/N. Park Ave	Howard to Horn Lane***	0.000	0.430	0.430	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane or Route, #536	\$170,000		
56	Laura St*	Scots Glen Drive to Harlow Rd	0.000	0.273	0.273	TransPlan	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility	\$550,000		
36	N. Park Avenue	Maxwell Rd to Horn Lane	0.268	1.298	1.030	TransPlan	Bike-Ped, Striped Lane/Route #539	\$200,000		
31	Prairie Road**	Carol Lane to Irvington Drive	1.589	1.939	0.350	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 3 lane-lane facility, #472	\$825,000		
57	River Rd*	Beacon Dr to Carthage	7.366	7.747	0.381	TransPlan	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility, #545	\$1,100,000		
53	Royal Avenue*	Terry Street to Greenhill Avenue	2.267	3.267	1.000	TransPlan	Urban Standards - Three-lane facility, joint with Eugene, #481	\$2,200,000		
41	W 11th Avenue	Greenhill Road to Danebo			1.510	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 5 lane facility, joint with Eugene, ODOT, #333	\$4,500,000		

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.

Lane County Transportation System Plan 20-Year Project List									
Projects on Lane County Roads - Sorted by TSP									
Project Number	Road Name	Limits	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Length	Source	Description	Estimated Cost	
44	Wilkes Drive	River Road to River Loop #1	0.000	0.932	0.932	TransPlan	Urban Standards, 3-lane facility, #554	\$1,400,000	
15	Bolton Hill Rd	Territorial Hwy to UGB	0.000	1.171	1.171	Veneta	Urban Standards. #B5	\$1,900,000	
11	Bolton Hill Rd	At Territorial Hwy	0.000	0.000	0.000	Veneta	Traffic Signal. Possible joint project with Veneta, ODOT. #B15	\$200,000	
13	Bolton Road East	Territorial Hwy to Huston Rd South	0.000	1.300	1.300	Veneta	Bike-Ped Facilities, #D6	\$320,000	

* Programmed (all or partially) in the adopted 2003-2007 Lane County CIP. CIP cost used.

** Project completed or under contract

*** Project added, description modified, or for other reasons may require action on City TSP.