

Appendix C: Lane County Bicycle Map

The Lane County Bicycle Map is available in hard copy only at this time. Please contact Lane County Public Works Engineering, Transportation Planning Section, 682-6936.

Appendix D: Detailed Level of Service Methodology

Level of service analysis of the roadway system is necessary for the Lane County Transportation System Plan. This analysis allows assessment of our transportation system's performance. The methodology for the analysis comes from the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual. Certain assumptions were made for Lane County to reflect specific conditions and move away from more general assumptions. Two-lane rural roadways were assumed for the analysis. Therefore, multi-lane or urban roadways will require separate, more specific analysis techniques to determine *level of service*.

The operational function of two-lane, two-way rural roadways differs from multi-lane highways. Passing opportunities allow drivers to maintain their travel speed and therefore reduce travel time. On two-lane roadways, passing is only possible in the face of opposing traffic. As traffic volumes and passing demand increase, the volumes in the opposing direction also increase, reducing the opportunities to pass. When drivers experience delays due to reduced travel speeds and lack of passing opportunities, the *level of service* of the roadway deteriorates. The mixture of heavy vehicles in the traffic stream and steep roadway grades also limit passing opportunities and have the effect of reducing the *level of service*.

Level of service (LOS) is graded on a letter scale from A to F. 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 roadways. Roadway designs attempt to operate at LOS D in only the worst case situations and preferably at higher levels of service.

The Transportation Research Board (TRB) has defined the following definition for level of service:

- LOS A represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience provided to the motorist, passenger, or pedestrian is excellent.
- LOS B is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream from LOS A. The level of comfort and convenience provided is somewhat less than at LOS A, because the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to affect individual behavior.

- LOS C is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is now affected by the presence of others, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.
- LOS D represents high-density, but stable, flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.
- LOS E represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to “give way” to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because even small increases in flow or minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.
- LOS F is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount which can traverse it and queues begin to form. Operations within the queue are characterized by stopping and starting. Over and over, vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, then be required to stop. Level-of-service F is used to describe operating conditions within the queue, as well as the point of the breakdown. It should be noted, however, that in many cases once free of the queue, traffic may resume to normal conditions quite rapidly.

Level of service analysis for two-lane rural highways is found in Chapter 8 of the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual. Rural highways provide both mobility and accessibility for motorists. For major highways, the movement of traffic with a minimum of delay is its principal function. Although mobility is desirable, many highways provide the only means of access to an area. *Percent time delay*, the primary factor affecting highway level of service, reflects both mobility and accessibility. “Percent time delay is the average percent of the total travel time that all motorists are delayed in platoons while traveling a given section of highway”. The *average travel speed* and *capacity utilization* are secondary factors that determine *level of service*. The average travel speed reflects the mobility function and utilization of capacity reflects the accessibility function of the highway. On two-lane highways, the demand for passing increases as traffic volumes increase. Likewise, opportunities for passing decrease as traffic volumes in the opposite direction increase. When highway or traffic characteristics limit the ability to pass, vehicles are delayed and the *level of service* of the highway decreases.

The *terrain type* is one of several variables that must be defined in order to calculate road segment level of service. This analysis is for rural two-lane road segments and follows the methodology set forth on the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual. Our inventories currently provide most of the data necessary to determine roadway level of service, except for the *terrain type*. In order to enrich our inventory and facilitate the calculation of roadway level of service, we must also inventory the *terrain type*.

Terrain type is a factor affecting the roadway conditions and ultimately its operational capacity. The horizontal and vertical alignment of a highway varies due to the topography through which it is constructed. The effects of terrain on traffic flow are most apparent when trucks are included in the traffic stream. In more severe terrain, steeper grades and curves affect the operation of trucks. In particular, significant long grades and sharp curves slow trucks down and limit passing opportunities for cars. The overall effect of the *terrain type* can be a reduction in the capacity of the roadway and its *level of service*.

A general definition of *terrain type* from the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual follows.

- **Level Terrain:** Any combination of grades and horizontal and vertical alignment that allows heavy vehicles to maintain approximately the same speed as passenger cars; this terrain generally includes short grades of no more than 1 to 2 percent.
- **Rolling Terrain:** Any combination of grades and horizontal and vertical alignment that causes drivers of heavy vehicles to reduce speeds to substantially below those of passenger cars, but does not require operation at crawl speeds for any significant length of time.
- **Mountainous Terrain:** Any combination of grades and horizontal and vertical alignment that causes drivers of heavy vehicles to operate at crawl speeds for significant distances or frequent intervals.

Crawl speed is the maximum sustained speed that heavy vehicles can maintain on an extended upgrade of a given percent.

With these definitions in hand, we can classify our two-lane roadway segments into one of then three general terrain types (*level, rolling, or mountainous*). This classification provides the missing link in the calculation of our roadway system's *level of service*.

Other assumptions about the roadway include: *percent of no passing zones* in level, rolling and mountainous terrain; *directional split* of traffic volume; *lane width*; *heavy vehicles* in the traffic stream expressed as a percentage of trucks, recreational vehicles and buses; *design speed*; and the *design hour factor* relating the proportion of the average daily traffic volume expected to occur in the design hour.

- The *percent of no passing zones* are assumed to be 20% in level terrain, 40% in rolling terrain and 60% in mountainous terrain.
- The *directional split* of traffic is assumed to be 60%/40%.
- *Lane widths* are assumed to be 11 feet.
- *Heavy vehicles* in the traffic stream are estimated to be 5% for trucks, 2% for recreational vehicles and 0% for buses.
- The *design speed* of the roadway is assumed to be 60 miles per hour.
- The *design hour factor, K*, is assumed to be 0.10 and represents the proportion of the average daily traffic volume expected to occur in the design hour.

Rural Two-Lane Highway Level of Service Analysis
 1994 Highway Capacity Manual Methodology
 with assumptions for Lane County

The following tables and factors are used to calculate the roadway *level of service*. The final table, titled "*Maximum ADT vs. Level of Service*", contains the maximum daily traffic volumes for each *level of service* for differing *terrain types* and *roadway widths*. The table is used by selecting the *terrain type* and *roadway width*. Then, compare the actual *daily traffic volume* to those in the table. The *level of service* is determined when the daily traffic volume does not exceed the tabulated volume.

(8-1) Service Flow Rate (vph), $SF_i = 2800(vph) \times (v/c)_i \times f_d \times f_w \times f_{nv}$

Volume/Capacity, (v/c) _i (Table 8-1)			
LOS	Percent No Passing		
	Level 20%	Rolling 40%	Mountainous 60%
A	0.12	0.07	0.04
B	0.24	0.19	0.13
C	0.39	0.35	0.23
D	0.62	0.52	0.40
E	1.00	0.92	0.82
F	-	-	-

Directional Split, f_d (Table 8-4) (60/40)= 0.94

Lane and Shoulder Width, f_w (Table 8-5) (11 foot Lanes)				
Usable Shoulder Width	LOS A-D	LOS E	Road Width	
0	0.49	0.66	18	(factors for 9 ft lanes)
0	0.54	0.71	19	(interpolated between 9&10 ft lanes)
0	0.58	0.75	20	(factors for 10 ft lanes)
0	0.62	0.79	21	(interpolated between 10&11 ft lanes)
0	0.65	0.82	22	
1	0.70	0.85	23	(interpolated)
2	0.75	0.88	24	
3	0.80	0.90	25	(interpolated)
4	0.85	0.92	26	
5	0.89	0.93	27	(interpolated)
>= 6	0.93	0.94	>= 28	

Heavy vehicle factor, f_{hv}

$$(8-2) f_{hv} = 1 / [1 + P_T(E_T-1) + P_R(E_R-1) + P_B(E_B-1)]$$

Assume percentage of trucks,

$$P_T (5\%) = 0.05$$

Assume percentage of recreational vehicles,

$$P_R (2\%) = 0.02$$

Assume percentage of buses,

$$P_B (0\%) = 0.00$$

<i>Passenger Car Equivalents, E,</i> for trucks recreational vehicles and buses (Table 8-6)				
	LOS	Level	Rolling	Mountainous
E_T	A	2.00	4.00	7.00
	B and C	2.20	5.00	10.00
	D and E	2.00	5.00	12.00
E_R	A	2.20	3.20	5.00
	B and C	2.50	3.90	5.20
	D and E	1.60	3.30	5.20
E_B	A	1.80	3.00	5.70
	B and C	2.00	3.40	6.00
	D and E	1.60	2.90	6.50

Heavy vehicle factor, f_{hv}			
LOS	Level	Rolling	Mountainous
A	0.93	0.84	0.72
B and C	0.92	0.79	0.65
D and E	0.94	0.80	0.61

Peak Hour Factor, PHF (Table 8-3)					
	Level of Service				
	A	B	C	D	E
PHF	0.91	0.92	0.94	0.95	1.00

Assume design hour factor, $K = 0.10$

Maximum ADT vs. Level of Service					
ADT _i (vpd) = [Service Flow Rate, SF _i (vph)] X PHF _i / K					
Level of Service					
Road Width	A	B	C	D	E
Level Terrain					
18	1311	2612	4338	7153	16357
19	1432	2852	4736	7810	17472
20	1552	3092	5134	8467	18588
21	1646	3279	5444	8977	19455
22	1739	3466	5754	9488	20322
23	1873	3732	6197	10218	21066
24	2007	3999	6639	10948	21809
25	2141	4265	7082	11678	22305
26	2275	4532	7524	12408	22801
27	2382	4745	7878	12992	23049
>=28	2489	4958	8233	13576	23296
Rolling Terrain					
18	688	1792	3373	5113	12826
19	751	1957	3683	5583	13701
20	814	2121	3992	6052	14575
21	864	2249	4233	6418	15255
22	913	2377	4474	6783	15936
23	983	2560	4818	7305	16519
24	1053	2743	5163	7826	17102
25	1123	2926	5507	8348	17490
26	1194	3109	5851	8870	17879
27	1250	3255	6126	9287	18073
>=28	1306	3401	6402	9705	18268
Mountainous Terrain					
18	340	1006	1818	2999	8717
19	371	1098	1985	3275	9312
20	403	1190	2152	3550	9906
21	427	1262	2281	3764	10369
22	451	1334	2411	3979	10831
23	486	1436	2597	4285	11227
24	521	1539	2782	4591	11623
25	555	1642	2968	4897	11887
26	590	1744	3153	5203	12152
27	618	1826	3301	5448	12284
>=28	646	1908	3450	5692	12416

Appendix E.1.
Public Involvement Plan
Approved by Lane County Planning Commission February 5, 2002

Background

Oregon Revised Statutes and the Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR 660-012), regarding transportation (Transportation Planning Rule (TPR),) require the county to develop an essentially new Transportation System Plan that complies with the state rule. Lane County's *Transportation Plan and Master Road Plan* now in effect was adopted in 1980. The 1980 plan is outdated as change has occurred over time and because the current state rule was adopted in 1991 and revised in 1993, 1995, 1998, and 1999. Lane County's new *Transportation System Plan* (TSP) is in the process of development and is nearly ready for public review. The TPR also requires code amendments to implement the new TSP.

Purpose

The purpose of adopting a new Transportation System Plan and associated code amendments is:

- to replace the outdated, 1980 *Transportation Plan and Master Road Plan*;
- to comply with the state Transportation Planning Rule;
- to update Lane Code to implement the TSP and make housekeeping improvements;
- to improve coordination between transportation system improvements and land use requirements;
- to help promote and facilitate the multi-modal transportation needs of county citizens; and
- to be a working document for county agencies, other local and state agencies, and developers.

Components of the Public Involvement Plan (PIP)

1. Staff

Staff from the county Engineering Division, Transportation Planning Section, will be responsible for coordination with other agencies, stakeholders, and the public. This will include coordinating public meetings, scheduling Roads Advisory Committee, Lane County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners work sessions and hearings, disseminating information to the public in general, as well as soliciting input, and communicating how comments are considered and dealt with.

2. Agency and Stakeholder Coordination

As the draft becomes ready, staff will request the involvement, review, and comment of agencies and interest groups whose interests and/or jurisdictions may be affected by the Transportation System Plan and associated code amendments. Agencies and interest groups include:

Airports
Department of Land Conservation and Development
Fire Protection Districts and Emergency Service Providers
Gears, a recreational cycling club that frequently uses county roads
Incorporated Communities
Lane County Land Management Division
Lane County Sheriff's Office
Lane Transit District
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Division of State Lands
Port of Siuslaw

Recognized Neighborhood Associations throughout Lane County
Region 2050 Project
School Districts
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Utility and Service providers (telephone, gas, electric, cable, fiber optic, water, sewer)
Watershed Councils
Williamette Valley Liveability Forum

Notices of meetings and agendas will be sent to all persons who request it. An introductory letter will be sent to each of the above contacts requesting information about desired level of involvement. Parties will be given the option of participating in technical review, only receiving public hearing notices, or not participating. Parties will be involved in the process at the level they request. All agency and interest group comments will be considered in finalizing the TSP.

3. Interested Parties Mailing List

An interest parties mailing list will be developed from the following sources:

- a. agency and stakeholder contacts listed above
- b. Board of County Commissioners agenda mailing list
- c. Lane County Planning Commission agenda mailing list
- d. Roads Advisory Committee agenda mailing list
- e. Capital Improvements Program (CIP) mailing list
- f. any other party requesting to be added to the list.

4. Web Site

Once the draft is ready for public review, it will be published on the county's web site. The web site will encourage review of and written comment on the draft, provide information and updates about the public involvement process and adoption process, and provide staff contact information.

5. Public Meetings

In 1995 Lane County Public Works held a series of ten public meetings, including one each in Eugene and Florence and eight in rural communities around the county. No draft was ready for public review at that time. Instead, staff sought feedback to inform initial preparation of the TSP. A summary of the results of that effort is attached.

When draft materials are ready for public review, staff will schedule a second round of public meetings focusing on the following geographic areas:

- Lane County's coastal areas
- McKenzie River area
- South Lane County
- Lorane area

Meeting notices will be publicized in local newspapers, including information about the web site and how to contact staff for more information.

6. Public Hearings

Lane Code Chapter 12 provides procedural requirements for processing plan amendments. At least one hearing before the Planning Commission and one before the Board of County Commissioners is required

prior to adoption. The Roads Advisory Committee public hearing will be scheduled jointly with the Planning Commission. Hearings will be publicized in the following local county newspapers:

The Register-Guard
Cottage Grove Sentinel
Springfield News
Siuslaw News
River Reflections
West Lane News

After each hearing is concluded, staff will prepare written responses to issues raised. The draft TSP and associated code amendments will be amended as appropriate based upon direction of appointed and elected officials, and adopted by ordinance.

Appendix E.2.: Summary of 1995 Public Comments

SUMMARY OF 1995 PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

Residence	Comment	Staff Response
Bicycle/Pedestrian Comments/Requests		
Dorena	Need more Cottage Grove connections to Row River Trail	A logical route to provide a connection to the Row River Trail is Improving Row River Road to accommodate bicycles. TSP Project #67 identifies an urban standards project from the Urban Growth Boundary to Row River. Beyond that, the road generally meets minimum design standards and does not necessitate a capital improvement project to bring it up to standard.
Eugene	Springfield needs bike/ped facility improvement	TransPlan, the Eugene-Springfield TSP, was adopted October, 2001. Specific requests not addressed by either TransPlan or the project list contained in the Lane County TSP can be forwarded to the City of Springfield for their consideration.
Eugene	Promote Lane County for recreation and livability by creating a network of bicycle routes.	See project list and bicycle/pedestrian section of TSP. Specific comments on gaps in the system are needed to more fully address this comment.
Oakridge	President Of Pathfinders Mountain Recreation Consultants; Tour de Lane concept of using timber-access roads, county and state roads linked into a mapped and signed system is a unique attraction to cyclists and a viable economic diversification tool for rural communities. Pave Thompson Creek Rd. in Mapleton to complete a loop that includes North Fork Siuslaw and Elk Tie Road. Paving gravel roads will attract more bicyclists to tour Lane County.	Thompson Creek Rd has a very low traffic volume. Thompson Creek Rd is partly paved and partly gravel, and it did not make the project list due to its very low ADT (40). Elk Tie Rd does not appear to be a county road. Generally the TSP supports bike facility improvements on roadways that access major destinations—roadway improvements designed only for recreational purposes have a lower priority.
Eugene	Better/secure bike parking	The City of Eugene has bike parking standards. The county TSP does not establish standards for bike parking in the areas under its jurisdiction. This is because the county road system is mostly rural. Bike parking security is more of an urban issue that can/should be addressed by individual city TSP's.
Eugene	Also requests access be created for bikes through construction projects so unanticipated detours are not needed.	In most cases, the nature of road construction projects makes this difficult. Signed detour routes are provided as needed.
Eugene	Improve bike shoulders, in particular: Crow Rd. is okay but could be a foot wider	A number of rural modernization projects on the TSP project list include the addition of or widening of paved shoulders for bicycle use (see project list). Crow Rd. was not identified for improvements—its width is not considered deficient to the point of necessitating a capital improvement project to bring it up to standard.
Eugene	Also supports extension of Fern Ridge bike path and supports having it go under or over Bailey Hill Rd. Bailey Hill is too heavily trafficked at grade for crossing bikes.	The bike path to the Fern Ridge reservoir is identified in TransPlan as Project Number 426 on the Future (beyond 20-years) Project List. Lane County does not have a source of revenue that can be used for "off-right-of-way" improvements. State law restricts the use of the county's Road Fund to only improvements within the public right-of-way. Projects listed in the TSP on Greenhill Road (#10 and 54) and Fir Butte Rd (#118) will improve shoulder bikeways, and in combination with existing shoulder bikeways on Clear Lake Rd provide an on-street bicycle route alternative.
Fall Creek	Most roads need better bike/ped facilities in this area, except for Pengra.	In the Fall Creek area, portions of Jasper-Lowell Rd have been identified for modernization, including paved shoulders for non-motorized use (projects 130 and 132). Projects in the Jasper-Lowell area include modernization of Parkway Rd to past Pengra Rd, to milepost 5.0. See the project list map for location.
Lowell	Add sidewalks along major routes near schools;	In Lowell, sidewalks were added in 2002 to Jasper-Lowell Rd. This provides connectivity with the existing sidewalk that accesses the school. Generally, the County requires sidewalks on its urban arterials and collectors and urban local roads. Improved rural collector roads typically receive paved shoulders for non-motorized travel. Staff considered rural bicycle-pedestrian needs by conducting field surveys of these facilities within 1/4 to 1/2 mile of local destinations, including schools, and made recommendations for improvements. The recommendations were added to the TSP 20-year project list.
Lowell	Lowell needs planning assistance with street design and location	County has developed new design standards that apply to county roads within established urban growth boundaries. City standards apply to county roads classified as local roads within urban growth boundaries. As needed, cities may refer to Lane County design standards and/or publications such as AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets as a resource for developing design standards. Planning the location of roadways inside Lowell falls outside the scope of the Lane County TSP.

SUMMARY OF 1995 PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

Residence	Comment	Staff Response
Lowell	Install stop signs and reduce speed limits; there are auto-ped conflicts on Pengra and Jasper-Lowell	This area was upgraded in 2002 with sidewalks, a school crosswalk, and connections to an existing off-road path to increase pedestrian safety. The intersection was studied and the two existing stop signs were found to be adequate. A speed zoning investigation was conducted and a state Speed Zone Order set new speed limits for this vicinity.
Marcola	Supports multi-modes; does not support widening of Marcola Rd. but supports widening bike lanes	The County recently modernized Marcola Rd., including widening and the addition of adequate paved shoulders for bike use as well as striped bike lanes through the developed portion of Marcola proper. The section below Parsons Creek Rd was completed in 2002. Construction in Marcola is scheduled for 2003.
Junction City	Bicyclists should face traffic	Bicycles are legally classified as vehicles and therefore must follow the regulations that govern vehicular movement in Oregon. Marked bike lanes therefore follow the direction of traffic and bicyclists must go with the traffic flow. According to the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, there are greater safety concerns when bicyclists travel against the flow of traffic on a roadway, whether in a marked bike lane or on a paved shoulder. This is a regulatory policy decision that rests with the Board of County Commissioners.
Eugene	Bicycles should be registered to pay for improvements.	See response above.
Eugene	Bikes are not required to be insured; only motorized vehicles are. Also, registrations would not cover costs of needed improvements. Instead, tax bike purchases like tubes and tires. Finally bicycles benefit everyone by reducing congestion, not using energy resources, and not using parking spaces. These benefits should be rewarded rather than taxed, although taxing at a slight rate would probably be hardly noticeable.	
County Road Improvements		
Cheshire	Improve 6th St. in Cheshire	6th St in Cheshire does not appear on maps, and does not appear to be a county road.
Cheshire	Widen High Pass and Dorsey Ln. as well for bike/ped facilities	Dorsey Lane is identified in the TSP project list for rural modernization, including the addition of paved shoulders to accommodate non-motorized travel (project# 110). High Pass Rd at Cheshire may be considered if additional demand for it is heard from the public.
Cheshire	Replace bridges with culverts	Generally, the environmental impact of replacing bridges with culverts is high and not supported by the county as a general practice. Lane County bridges, in general, are in good condition with very few having sufficiency ratings below 50 (9 out of 402). With this in mind, developing a program to replace bridges that are structurally and functionally sufficient is hard to justify for the public expense.
Dunes City	Clear Lake Rd. needs bike/walking lane	The section from Hwy 101 to Jensen Lane was improved by the County in 2001. The remaining section from Jensen Lane to Canary Rd is programmed in the CIP and scheduled for improvements within the next couple of years.
Eugene	Supports alternative modes; need more shoulders on high speed roads	See project list. A number of county roads are identified for modernization and shoulder improvements. Also see Lane County Road Design Standards, which provide for adequate shoulders on high-volume roadways when designing reconstruction and modernization projects..
Eugene	Promote bike safety; wider shoulders on Lorane Highway	Lorane Hwy was widened from Chambers St. to Spencer Creek in 1998. Variable width shoulders were provided from Chambers to McBeth. Full width shoulders were constructed from McBeth to Spencer Creek Rd. All other sections of Lorane Hwy have full width shoulders that meet standards.
Eugene	From bicyclists standpoint, road surfaces are superb-smooth and well drained. Shoulders need to be wide enough and maintained. Lorane Hwy, Coburg Rd., Jasper Road, Perkins road need safety improvements.	See Lorane Hwy response above. Bike lanes were added on Coburg Road north of Eugene from Kinney Loop to Armitage Park as part of an urban standards project in 2000. Jasper Road is under the jurisdiction of the City of Springfield as well as the State Department of Transportation. The respective agencies must be contacted regarding these facilities. Farther out from the metro area, Jasper-Lowell Rd is a county facility, and there are two projects identified in the Lane County project list (in addition to improvements made in 2002) that will provide paved shoulders for bicycle use (projects# 130, 132). Perkins Rd from the Veneta city limits to Central Rd is identified for the

SUMMARY OF 1995 PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

Residence	Comment	Staff Response
Eugene	Improve bike shoulders, in particular: Territorial south of Crow Rd., Crow Rd. is okay but could be a foot wider;	addition of bike facilities in the TSP (project# 14). Territorial Hwy is a state facility and out of Lane County's jurisdiction. However, staff has noted insufficient shoulders on Territorial and has included recommendations to the state for shoulder improvements in the TSP. Crow Rd currently has 3-4' shoulders and, as such, does not necessitate a capital improvement project to bring it up to standard.
Eugene	Wants wider shoulders on Sheffler Rd.	Sheffler Rd was noted as having inadequate width as part of the county's road needs assessment. However, the road was within 4 feet of having an adequate minimum width and was sufficient with regard to the other assessment criteria. Since the roadway is otherwise in good condition and its ADT of 950 is not considered high, the road was not recommended to the project list.
Fall Creek	Relieve traffic on Jasper-Lowell Rd., which is too narrow;	See previous staff responses related to Jasper-Lowell Rd. Jasper-Lowell Rd is identified for modernization in the Fall Creek area (projects# 130, 132). In terms of relieving traffic, Lane County supports providing bicycle facilities in these projects and encourages use of alternate modes of transportation along this route.
Fall Creek	Pengra needs realignment; better directional signage at Pengra and Jasper-Lowell	Road improvements were constructed at this intersection in 2002. There are currently no plans or identified need for realignment of Pengra.
Vida	Put in Bear Creek Bridge	From 1988 to 1994, the County undertook an effort to study and build a new bridge crossing over the McKenzie River to serve the Goodpasture Road area. In January 1990, the Board of Commissioners selected Bear Creek as the preferred location for the new bridge. The subsequent land use plan amendment was appealed by the Pacific Rivers Council and the Oregon Guides and Packers to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). LUBA remanded the application back to the Board of County Commissioners who then elected to remove the project from further consideration.
Eugene	From bicyclists standpoint, road surfaces are superb-smooth and well drained. Shoulders need to be wide enough and maintained. Lorane Hwy, Coburg Rd., Perkins road need safety improvements.	Comment addressed above.
Eugene	Add shoulders to Dillard, Lorane, and routes to Veneta/Elmira	Dillard Rd is identified for modernization and shoulder improvements in the project list (project# 86). Lorane Hwy has been improved. Some routes in the Veneta/Elmira area have been included in the project list, namely Perkins, Central, and Suttle Rds (projects# 14, 120, 134).
Eugene	As roads are improved/resurfaced, add 3-4' shoulders for bikes. Coburg Rd. for example needs wider shoulders.	See County Road Design Standards. The standards for the rural collector system provide for a minimum 4' shoulder on higher ADT roads. Only in lower ADT and mountainous terrain settings do the standards require lesser or in some cases no shoulders as the minimum. Coburg Rd from the City of Coburg to Eugene has shoulders and bike lanes that meet standards. See project# 82 in the TSP for the northern most section of Coburg Rd.
County Road Maintenance		
Eugene	Stop roadside spraying.	The County has an Integrated Vegetation Management Program (IVM) that uses a combination of manual, mechanical, chemical, and biological methods to manage vegetation along roadsides. Specific comments can be forwarded to the Vegetation Management Advisory Committee (meets monthly) or the Board of County Commissioners.
Eugene	Promote bike safety clean gravel from shoulders	The County currently sweeps about 4-5 times a year. Increasing this frequency is a matter of allocation of resources. Please comment if you feel a higher frequency of sweepings is necessary.
Lorane	Increase safety for bikes/peds on high speed roads; keep bike lanes swept	The county strives to provide adequate bike facilities (either marked lanes or paved shoulders) in its modernization projects on higher speed collector and arterial roads. Please identify specific roadways with perceived safety problems. The County currently sweeps about 4-5 times a year. Increasing this frequency is a matter of allocation of resources. Please comment if you feel a higher frequency of sweepings is necessary.

SUMMARY OF 1995 PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

Residence	Comment	Staff Response
	Environment and Transportation	
Cheshire	Develop an environmentally sound plan with public/private input to plan for less gas and more people.	The comment is taken to mean "reduce reliance on the automobile". This is a concept embraced in the state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). In developing the Lane County TSP, our goal is to be in compliance with the TPR.
Eugene	Protect wetlands better during road projects.	The TSP includes policy language stating that Lane County shall follow all state and federal environmental regulations, and this has historically been the county's practice. Each project brings its own set of circumstances regarding environmental impact. The goal stated in the TSP is to meet the requirements of Federal and State law through coordination and authorization by the appropriate regulatory agencies. Additional discussion regarding this topic is found in the TSP Transportation and Land Use chapter.
Eugene	Concerned about road encroachment in wetland areas and too many roads.	See response above.
EWEB	Evaluate hazardous materials transportation, especially on McKenzie Hwy. Focus is on shipment of persistent toxic materials that are hard to remove from water.	Movement of hazardous materials on state highways is regulated by the Oregon DOT. Interstate movements of hazardous materials is regulated by the US DOT. McKenzie Hwy is an ODOT facility.
	State Highway Maintenance	
Elmira	Need more signage advertising the coast in Eugene	This comment relates more to economic development than the transportation system, and is beyond the scope of the county's TSP.
Florence	Hwy 126 needs phones and turnouts	Hwy 126 is a state facility and not under the jurisdiction of Lane County. ODOT should be contacted regarding this issue.
South of Florence	Need striping more often (it wears off); favors segregated bike/ped lanes	Separate multi-use paths are typically not provided with county road projects or as a stand-alone project, due to constitutional limits on the use of road funds.
V/da	Hwy 126 needs emergency turnouts	Hwy 126 is a state facility and not under Lane County jurisdiction. ODOT should be contacted regarding this issue.
	State Highway Improvements	
	Highway 36	
Cheshire	Need shoulders on Hwy 36; widen and resurface Territorial; better maintenance of road and ditches on Territorial	While state highways are not under the planning jurisdiction of Lane County, staff has created a partial list of recommendations for state highway improvements based upon a bike-pedestrian needs assessment of facilities near local destinations (such as schools and stores) in rural unincorporated communities. Highway 36 has been recommended for shoulder improvements in Cheshire. Territorial Hwy in Crow and Lorane has been recommended for shoulder improvements. These recommendations were given to ODOT and are discussed in the TSP Needs Assessment chapter.
Cheshire	Safer access for bikes/peds on Hwy 36, Territorial Rd.; put hwy fees back into this area	See above comment.
Junction City	Need more shoulders and improved safety on Hwy 36 near Blachly, Territorial, Laurence. Repair chipped blacktop edges; replace missing crushed rock on shoulders. Territorial too narrow for modern vehicles.	See also above comment. Hwy 36 near Blachly has relatively low traffic volumes, and was therefore not on the list of recommended improvements that was given to ODOT. Territorial in Crow and Lorane has been recommended for shoulder improvements. Safety and operational concerns may also be addressed to ODOT
Dunes City	Highway 101 Need wider shoulders for bikes/peds and emergencies north and south of Florence; need more traffic lights on Hwy 101	As part of an assessment of bike-ped facilities serving local destinations in unincorporated communities, Hwy 101 at Glenada was recommended to ODOT for shoulder improvements. The assessment was limited to a few sections of state roads and mainly focused on county facilities. Safety and operational concerns may also be addressed to ODOT.

SUMMARY OF 1995 PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

Residence	Comment	Staff Response
So. Of Florence	No traffic lights at crosswalks on Hwy 101; increase visibility of crosswalks with vivid colors; need protected turns; more emphasis on pedestrian facilities Hwy 126 Florence-Eugene Highway	See above comment.
Dunes City	keep Hwy 126 2-lane as a scenic highway	Hwy 126 is a state facility and not under Lane County jurisdiction. ODOT should be contacted regarding this issue. Currently, Hwy 126 is not officially designated as a scenic route.
Junction City	Widen W. 11th to 4 lanes to Veneta	W. 11th (Hwy 126W) to Veneta is a state facility and not under Lane County jurisdiction. ODOT should be contacted regarding this issue. West 11th, the urban section of Hwy 126W, is identified for improvements in the TransPlan project list—the TSP for the Eugene-Springfield metro area.
Veneta	Need a bypass between Eugene and Veneta; not Hwy 126 because of riparian areas; proposes different route	A bypass project is not included in the TSP. More support and analysis would be needed to warrant inclusion of this in the TSP.
Veneta	W. 11th is insufficient for large traffic volumes. Hwy 126 should be in CIP. To avoid riparian areas, construct bypass.	Hwy 126 is a state facility and therefore not considered for inclusion in the county CIP. A bypass project is not included in the TSP. West 11th, the urban section of Hwy 126 W, is identified for improvements in the TransPlan project list—the TSP for the Eugene-Springfield metro area.
Eugene	Promote bike safety; wider shoulders on W. 11th, Hwy 99/99W; clean gravel from shoulders	Hwy 99 is recommended to ODOT in the TSP for shoulder improvements in Goshen and Saginaw to allow better bicycle access to local destinations. West 11th is identified for urban standards (including bike facilities) from Greenhill to Danebo in TransPlan. This project has been incorporated into the TSP project list.
Eugene	left turn from W.11th to Bellline is hazardous.	W. 11th at Bellline is a state facility and not under Lane County jurisdiction. ODOT should be contacted regarding this issue.
Eugene	add shoulders to routes to Veneta/Elmira	Some routes in the Veneta/Elmira area have been included in the project list, namely Perkins, Central, and Suttle Rds. See project list for descriptions.
Eugene	Territorial Highway	Comment addressed above.
Eugene	Improve bike shoulders, in particular: Territorial south of Crow Rd., Crow Rd. is okay but could be a foot wider;	Comment addressed above.
Lorane	Territorial needs shoulders; better brush removal	Comment addressed above.
Eugene	From bicyclists standpoint, road surfaces are superb-smooth and well drained. Shoulders need to be wide enough and maintained. Highway 99, Territorial, Jasper Road need safety improvements.	Comment addressed above.
Eugene	Highway 99 Goshen-Creswell	Comment addressed above.
Eugene	add shoulders to Hwy 99 (Goshen-Creswell)	Comment addressed above.
Vida	Hwy 126 McKenzie Highway	Comment addressed above.
Eugene	By-pass Hwy 126 E. with a major highway that avoids riparian areas; Add shoulders to McKenzie Hwy	The TSP recommends to ODOT shoulder improvements along McKenzie Hwy. See ODOT STIP for identified projects along McKenzie Hwy. The county encourages the completion of such projects.
Eugene	Other State	Comment addressed above.
Eugene	Supports alternative modes; need more shoulders on high speed roads	Multi-jurisdictional efforts are underway to promote high speed rail serving the north-south Willamette Valley corridor as an alternative to driving. Public support for high-speed rail improvements assists in addressing this issue. Future I-5 corridor planning will focus on the highway—TransPlan includes improvement projects and studies for I-5 in the Eugene-Springfield area.
Florence	I-5 is getting congested	

SUMMARY OF 1995 PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

Residence	Comment	Staff Response
	Transit (LTD Buses, Vans, Paratransit)	
Dorena	"From a rural person"; need transit to Cottage Grove and Creswell from Eugene	LTD now offers bus service to Cottage Grove with stop in Creswell, terminating at Eugene Station and also servicing UO and LCC.
Eugene	Transit to Cottage Grove and Florence; downtown trolleys; rail to Oakridge	LTD bus service is now offered to Cottage Grove, though not to Florence. Limited funding currently restricts the degree to which bus and new rail service can be provided throughout the county. Current Bus Rapid Transit initiatives will help in providing fluid transit service between major destinations in Eugene-Springfield. See above comment.
Veneta	Need more frequent buses for Veneta, Junction City, and service to Cottage Grove; supports bike paths and more transit	See above comment.
Vida	Transit service needed for Cottage Grove	See above comment.
Junction City	More LTD routes through Junction City and Harrisburg.	See above comment.
Lorane	Commute service between Eugene, Creswell, Cottage Grove, Florence, Albany, Corvallis	See above comment.
Lorane	Vanpool or minivan between Lorane and Eugene via Territorial, Lorane Highway, Bailey Hill Rd; emphasize alternative modes to private auto;	Amount of travel between Lorane and Eugene may not warrant operation of a minivan. Carpool matches may be sought via Commuter Solutions, the regional transportation demand management program at LTD. Commuter Solutions promotes use of alternative modes. Alternative modes are encouraged through the County's CIP with the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on applicable roads. See above comments.
Lorane	Bus service to Lorane that has bike racks	See above comments.
Marcola	Need bus/van service to Marcola	See above comments.
Dunes City	Expand FACT to Mapleton and Dunes City	Refer request to City of Florence.
So. Of Florence	Help Florence form an independent transportation district	This request should be directed to the City of Florence and the county Board of Commissioners. The Commissioners and City will also receive copies of these comments as part of the TSP adoption process.
So. Of Florence	More transit to rural areas; need to expand transit in general, including Deadwood, Canary, Ada, Dunes City; extend dial-a-ride service.	Funding for expanded transit is limited in part by the ability of communities to pay for the service. Lower demand in outlying areas also contributes to decisions not to serve these areas. The Public Transportation section of the TSP discusses this issue in more detail. Also contact LTD for additional information. See above comments.
Florence	West Lane needs bus service to/from Eugene; Transit between Florence, Mapleton, and Eugene is needed; more safe rural bus service	See above comments.
Florence	Need transit between Florence and Eugene; interested in statewide rail system; increasing need for special transportation services for elderly	See above comments.
Eugene	Extend bus to Dillard Rd; bike racks on buses; better transit schedules	See above comments.
Eugene	Promote bike safety and transit; more bike racks and spaces on buses	See above comments.
Eugene	Supports tram downtown	See above comments.
Lorane	Transit to airport	See above comments.
	Make mass transit available to rural areas; offer "maxi-taxi" for a fee to rural areas;	See above comments.

SUMMARY OF 1995 PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

Residence	Comment	Staff Response
	Rail, Passenger and Freight	
Cheshire	Promote multi modes including "super trains".	The Pacific Northwest corridor from Eugene to Vancouver BC has been nationally authorized under the High-Speed Rail Investment Act. High-speed trains may be provided on this route as improvements are made to the tracks. Population growth and continued political support should improve and expand existing rail service in this direction.
Vida	Supports monorail or trolley in Eugene-Springfield.	These particular transportation options are not advocated in the TSP and are not currently included in the Eugene-Springfield TransPlan. Request should be directed at the respective cities.
Eugene	Downtown trolleys; rail to Oakridge	These particular transportation options are not advocated in the TSP and are not currently included in the Eugene-Springfield TransPlan. Requests should be directed at the respective cities.
Eugene	Offer more modes of travel, like rail and transit.	Passenger rail service has improved out of Eugene north to Portland and beyond. Lane County supports the mission of LTD and its provision of local transit service.
Lorane	Commute service between Eugene, Creswell, Cottage Grove, Florence, Albany, Corvallis; light rail between Eugene, Springfield, Junction City, Veneta;	Commuter service may be sought through LTD's Commuter Solutions program. The Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system being developed for Eugene-Springfield mimics a light-rail line at lower cost. No known plans to extend this service to JC or Veneta at this time.
Lorane	Improve and expand freight rail to reduce truck traffic	Freight truck traffic will only increase in the future, and diverting additional freight to rail is a cogent idea. Expanding rail to the dispersed settlements in Oregon would be highly capital intensive, and forces such as market demand would primarily drive these types of decisions.
Lorane	Rapid transit to Portland	The Pacific Northwest corridor from Eugene to Vancouver BC has been nationally authorized under the High-Speed Rail Investment Act. High-speed trains may be provided on this route as improvements are made to the tracks. Population growth and continued political support should improve and expand existing rail service in this direction.
Marcola	Supports train on I-5 corridor.	The Pacific Northwest corridor from Eugene to Vancouver BC has been nationally authorized under the High-Speed Rail Investment Act. High-speed trains may be provided on this route as improvements are made to the tracks. Population growth and continued political support should improve and expand existing rail service in this direction.
Vida	Supports high speed rail to Seattle	The Pacific Northwest corridor from Eugene to Vancouver BC has been nationally authorized under the High-Speed Rail Investment Act. High-speed trains may be provided on this route as improvements are made to the tracks. Population growth and continued political support should improve and expand existing rail service in this direction.
	Land Use and Transportation	
Dunes City	Move commercial uses off of Hwy 101 to move in-town traffic to smaller roads; beautify; require landscaped parking and no parking in front	See Dunes City Comprehensive Plan and development ordinance. Landscaping and parking requirement suggestions may be made to the City for their consideration in future ordinance changes.
Eugene	Better/secure bike parking; land use planning to reduce distance between work/home/shopping	This issue is primarily urban in nature and should be directed to the City.
Eugene	Supports land use planning that reduces VMT.	See TransPlan, which includes strategies to minimize VMT in metro area. The County follows state land use requirements that limit development in rural areas. Concentrating development in well-designed cities should, in effect, reduce VMT per capita.
	Transportation Demand Management	
Eugene	Create incentives for transit use and disincentives for private motor vehicle use, such as through taxes, education, employer incentives. Explore solar powered	The Transportation Planning Rule, which the county's TSP must comply, promotes alternatives to private motor vehicle use. Transit and transportation demand management (TDM) are promoted and supported in the county TSP. For example, TDM is promoted as a mitigation option as part of Traffic Impact Analysis

SUMMARY OF 1995 PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE

Residence	Comment	Staff Response
Lorane	<p>mass transit. Provide employer financial incentives to encourage alternatives to single occupancy vehicles and disincentives to single occupancy vehicle use.</p>	<p>requirements related to proposed development. See Chapter 4.1 in the draft TSP. LTD's commuter solutions program provides opportunities for employers to encourage alternatives to single occupancy vehicle use. See also above comments.</p>
	<p>Miscellaneous Transportation Policy Issues</p>	
Siuslaw RFPD	<p>Concerned about road grades in residential areas.</p>	<p>Maximum grades on county roads are established in the draft road design standards that are being considered for adoption as part of the TSP. This issue is beyond the scope of the County TSP.</p>
Cheshire	<p>Require seatbelts on school buses</p>	
Junction City	<p>Raise age for drivers permits and licenses</p>	
Junction City	<p>Use prisoners for highway maintenance</p>	<p>Currently, the Lane County Sheriff's Office does operate work crews for some highway maintenance tasks. For more information, please contact the Lane County Sheriff's Office. For State facilities, the TSP does not address this comment as it is outside the scope of the document.</p>
Lorane	<p>Be aware of equestrian use of roads</p>	<p>While no longer a prominent use of the roads, equestrian travel is known to exist in part of the county. Shoulder areas can usually accommodate this use. In addition, some state and county parks are developed with equestrian facilities.</p>

Appendix F: Lane County General Plan Chart

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR LANE COUNTY
(includes all adopted general and detailed plans)

EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA PLAN
(includes all land within plan boundaries)

LANE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN
(includes all unincorporated lands beyond Metropolitan Plan Boundary and small city Urban Growth Boundaries)

- Plan Policies
- Coastal Plan Diagram
- Inland Plan Diagram

SMALL AREA PLANS

Examples:

- Willakenzie Plan
- Whiteaker Plan

PLANS FOR SMALL INCORPORATED CITIES
(areas within Urban Growth Boundaries)

- COTTAGE GROVE
- CRESWELL
- OAKRIDGE
- WESTFIR
- LOWELL
- COBURG
- JUNCTION CITY
- VENETA
- FLORENCE
- DUNES CITY

SPECIAL PURPOSE PLANS

Examples:

- 19th & Agate Special Area Study
- Fairmount/U of O Special Area Study

SINGLE PURPOSE PLAN
(may include metro, rural, and small city areas)

Examples:

- Transportation System Plan
- Solid Waste Management Plan
- Parks and Open Space Plan
- Coastal Resources Management Plan

Appendix G: Needs Assessment Data

The needs assessment data that follows consists of a point rating system assigned to collector and arterial segments found to be “deficient” in any one of the assessment criteria categories. Categories left blank indicate no or minimal deficiency. The data shown here will change over time due to normal wear or road improvement projects that may increase width, CBE, PCI, and safety. Operating conditions expressed in ADT and LOS data may change as the population grows and new development occurs.

Each assessment criterion was weighted based upon its importance, and points were also allocated for each criterion not meeting a minimum reasonable threshold. Thus a road segment accumulated points based upon its “deficiencies” and based upon the importance of each deficiency criterion. For instance, Crash Rate, which is an indicator of roadway safety, is weighted as the most important criterion with eight points, while Pavement Condition was weighted the least important with one point. A road would receive the number of points indicated below if the associated deficiency threshold was met.

The Assessment Criteria and associated thresholds and points are shown in the following table. Please see Chapter 6.3, Needs Assessment Methodology and Results, for more detailed explanation.

Criteria	Deficiency Threshold	Points
Pavement Condition Index (PCI)	Less than 50 points (see Chapter 6.3)	1
Crushed Base Equivalent (CBE)	12” to less than 16”	2
Road Width	Between 1’ and 4’ less than the standard	3
CBE	Less than 12”	4
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	Greater than 5,000 for urban roads and 10,000 for rural roads, for 2020 projection	5
Level of Service (LOS)	E or worse in 2017	6
Road Width	Greater than or equal to 4’ less than the standard	7
Crash Rate	Greater than 2.0 crashes per million vehicle miles traveled	8

Acronyms for Needs Assessment Data:

BMP - Beginning Mile Point
 EMP - Ending Mile Point
 Terrain, L - Level
 Terrain, R - Rolling
 Terrain, M - Mountainous
 CIP - Capital Improvement Program
 PCI - Pavement Condition Index
 CBE - Crushed Base Equivalent
 ADT - Average Daily Traffic
 LOS - Level of Service

Lane County Roads Needs Assessment Data

ROAD_NAME	ROAD ID	BMP	EMP	Terrain	CIP	Assessment Criteria					Total Points
						PCI	CBE	Width	ADT	LOS	
06TH AVE WEST	346500	0.520	0.850	L			4				4
16TH AVE EAST & DEAL	347500	0.000	0.300	L				7			7
18TH AVE WEST	347300	0.000	0.854	L				7			7
23RD ST	180900	0.000	0.252	L				7			7
30TH AVE	185000	0.100	1.500	R	Bid List				5		5
31ST ST / 26TH ST	192500	0.542	0.905	L			4				7
ALVADORE RD	361500	0.000	3.587	L				7			7
ALVADORE RD	361500	3.587	6.100	L			2				9
APPLIGATE TRAIL	362200	0.000	2.584	R				7			7
ARROWHEAD ST	320100	0.000	0.230	L				7			7
ASPEN ST	167500	0.000	0.181	L				7			7
ASPEN ST	167500	0.337	0.441	L				7			7
AWBREY LN	344000	0.000	0.170	L			4				11
AWBREY LN	344000	0.170	1.340	L			4				11
BAILEY HILL RD	121500	3.113	4.616	R				3			3
BAILEY HILL RD	121500	2.498	3.010	R					6		6
BAILEY HILL RD	121500	3.010	3.113	R				3			3
BARSTOW AVE	320900	0.000	0.258	L				4			4
BEACON DR EAST	315000	0.740	0.749	L			1				8
BEACON DR WEST	315600	1.000	1.172	L				7			7
BEACON DR WEST	315600	0.000	0.154	L	Bid List			7			7
BEACON DR WEST	315600	0.154	1.000	L				7			7
BEAR CR RD	602800	0.000	2.160	R				7			7
BERNHARDT CR RD	503400	0.000	0.063	M			4				7
BERNHARDT CR RD	503400	0.063	6.985	M							7
BERNHARDT CR RD	503400	6.985	7.058	M			1				8
BIG FALL CR RD	624000	7.550	9.110	M				4			4
BIG FALL CR RD	624000	0.000	7.550	M				7			7
BLACKFOOT AVE	323000	0.300	0.806	L				2			2
BLUE RIVER DR	110500	0.000	1.555	R				7			7
BODENHAMER RD	427200	0.000	1.062	L				7			7
BODENHAMER RD	427200	1.062	1.345	L				7			7
BOLTON HILL RD	406200	0.000	1.171	R				2			9
BOLTON HILL RD	406200	1.171	3.254	R			4				4
BRICE CR RD	247000	0.000	2.150	M				7			7
BRICE CR RD	247000	3.340	8.122	M	Bid List			4			4

Lane County Roads Needs Assessment Data

ROAD_NAME	ROAD ID	BMP	EMP	Terrain	CIP	Assessment Criteria					Total Points
						PCI	CBE	Width	ADT	LOS	
BRIDGE ST	106000	0.000	0.190	L							7
BRIDGE ST	106000	0.190	0.295	L				7			7
BRIGGS HILL RD	409000	0.000	2.500	R							7
BRIGGS HILL RD	409000	2.500	4.401	R		2					9
CALLA ST	329600	0.000	0.173	L							7
CAMAS SWALE RD	213000	0.743	7.010	R				7			7
CAMAS SWALE RD	213000	0.550	0.743	R							7
CANARY RD	532000	0.000	0.686	R				7			7
CENTRAL RD	428800	0.000	1.920	L		2					7
CENTRAL RD	428800	1.920	4.990	R		2					9
CLEAR LAKE RD	534000	0.142	2.290	R	Bid List						9
CLEAR LAKE RD	534000	2.290	4.233	R	Bid List						7
CLOVERDALE RD	601000	0.000	3.276	L							7
COBURG RD	150000	7.416	8.784	L				7			7
COBURG RD	150000	8.784	12.883	L							7
COBURG RD NO	161000	0.000	0.218	L				7			7
COBURG RD NO	161000	0.218	1.820	L							7
COBURG RD NO	161000	1.820	4.115	L							7
COFFAGE GROVE RES RD	273000	0.000	4.583	R			3				3
CREST DR	125200	0.000	0.360	R				7			7
CREST DR	125200	0.360	0.623	R							7
CREST DR	125200	0.623	0.873	R							7
CROCKER RD	319900	0.000	0.580	L				3			5
CURRIN CONN	252400	0.000	0.071	L							7
DANSTROM RD	602000	0.000	0.135	L							7
DEADWOOD CR RD	514000	8.968	9.989	M		4		3			7
DEADWOOD CR RD	514000	9.989	11.723	M		4					4
DEADWOOD CR RD	514000	5.410	7.180	M							7
DEERHORN RD	105800	0.000	3.680	M		2					2
DEERHORN RD	105800	3.680	7.206	M		4		3			7
DELTA HWY SO	174000	0.000	1.804	L	Bid List				5		5
DELTA HWY SO NE RAMP	174005	0.000	0.195	L					5		5
DELTA HWY SO SW RAMP	174003	0.000	0.245	L					5		12
DELTA RD	861000	0.130	Bridge	L	Bid List						0
DEMMING RD	400800	0.000	1.000	R							7
DEMMING RD	400800	1.000	1.120	R		4					11
DEXTER RD	614000	0.000	1.500	L							7

Lane County Roads Needs Assessment Data

ROAD_NAME	ROAD ID	BMP	EMP	Terrain	CIP	Assessment Criteria					Total Points	
						PCI	CBE	Width	ADT	LOS		Crash Rate
DIBBLEE LN	325900	0.000	0.210	L								11
DILLARD RD	187000	0.000	3.850	R								7
DIVISION AVE	130800	0.000	1.040	L	Bid List							0
DORSEY LN	361200	0.000	1.542	L								7
EAST MAPLETON RD	503000	0.317	1.000	M								2
EAST MAPLETON RD	503000	1.000	3.950	M								4
EDENVALE RD	606800	0.000	1.000	R								11
EDENVALE RD	606800	2.000	3.273	L								11
EDENVALE RD	606800	1.000	2.000	R								11
ELLMAKER RD	429800	0.000	1.114	L								9
ENTERPRISE RD	607500	2.960	4.883	L								11
ENTERPRISE RD	607500	1.050	2.000	R								7
ENTERPRISE RD	607500	0.000	0.500	L								4
ENTERPRISE RD	607500	0.500	1.050	L								4
ENTERPRISE RD	607500	2.000	2.960	R								9
FERGUSON RD	350800	0.000	3.420	L								7
FERGUSON RD	350800	6.320	8.150	L								11
FERGUSON RD	350800	8.150	9.260	L								11
FERGUSON RD	350800	9.260	10.700	R								11
FIR BUTTE RD	427300	0.000	2.706	R								7
FISHER RD	428600	1.120	1.200	R								7
FLECK RD	407400	0.000	2.512	L								9
FRANKLIN BLVD EAST	182500	0.000	1.121	L								12
FRANKLIN RD	383600	0.000	2.522	R								7
GAME FARM RD NO	171000	0.610	1.690	L	Bid List							12
GAME FARM RD SO	152800	0.000	0.910	L								20
GAROUTTE RD	255500	0.000	2.507	R								5
GOLDSON RD	363600	0.000	0.500	R								3
GOLDSON RD	363600	0.500	1.556	R								3
GONYEA RD	185400	0.000	0.595	L								6
GOWDYVILLE RD	264500	0.183	1.890	R								7
GOWDYVILLE RD	264500	0.000	0.183	R								7
GREEN HILL RD	327000	5.072	5.815	L								7
GREEN HILL RD	427000	2.818	3.820	L								7
GREEN HILL RD	427000	3.820	5.072	L								7
GREEN HILL RD	427000	1.869	2.818	L								7
GROVE ST	133100	0.164	0.528	L								2

Lane County Roads Needs Assessment Data

ROAD_NAME	ROAD ID	BMP	EMP	Terrain	CIP	Assessment Criteria					Total Points
						PCI	CBE	Width	ADT	LOS	
HALL RD	362500	0.000	3.500	L							9
HALL RD	362500	1.990	3.820	R		2					2
HALL RD	362500	1.500	1.990	R		2					2
HALL RD	362500	4.560	5.880	R		4	7				11
HALL RD	362500	5.880	6.800	R		4	7				11
HALL RD	362500	6.800	7.158	R		4	3				7
HAMM RD	213200	4.360	5.607	M		2	2				4
HARVEY RD	211400	0.000	0.260	L		4	7				11
HARVEY RD	211400	0.260	0.861	L		4	7				11
HARVEY RD	211400	0.861	1.377	L		4	7				11
HAYDEN BR RD	161000	0.000	1.452	L							7
HAYDEN BR WAY	163500	0.142	0.612	L				5			5
HEGETA BEACH RD	525000	0.000	1.885	R		2	3				5
HENDERSON AVE NO	181500	0.000	0.391	L		4	7				11
HIGH PASS RD	345500	0.000	5.14	L		7					7
HIGH PASS RD	345500	1.514	4.080	L		7					7
HIGH PASS RD	345500	4.080	7.530	R		7					7
HIGH PASS RD	345500	7.530	11.000	M		4	3				7
HIGH PASS RD	345500	11.000	12.840	M		4	7				11
HIGH PASS RD	345500	16.540	17.224	M		4	3				7
HIGH PRAIRIE RD	615400	0.000	0.111	R		4	7		8		15
HIGH PRAIRIE RD	615400	0.111	0.947	R		7					7
HIGH PRAIRIE RD	615400	2.246	6.619	R		7					7
HILL RD	195600	0.000	4.572	R		7					7
HOLDEN CR LN	108000	0.000	0.157	L		2	7				9
HORN LN	136000	0.000	0.928	L		2	7				9
HOWARD AVE	134200	0.000	0.956	L		2	3				5
HOWE LN	217400	0.000	1.230	R		2	3				5
HUNSAKER LN-BEAVER ST	332000	0.000	0.060	L		1	8				9
HUNSAKER LN-BEAVER ST	332000	0.060	1.141	L		7	5				12
HUSTON RD SO	430800	0.524	1.070	L		4	7				11
HUSTON RD SO	430800	0.272	0.524	L		4	7				11
HYACINTH ST	329800	0.530	0.664	L		7					7
INDIAN CR RD	513000	5.500	8.771	M							2
IRVING RD	326800	1.380	1.500	L		2	7	5			12
IRVING RD	326800	1.230	1.360	L		2	7	5			12
IRVINGTON DR	319500	0.000	1.412	L	Bid List	2	7	5			15

Lane County Roads Needs Assessment Data

ROAD_NAME	ROAD ID	BMP	EMP	Terrain	CIP	Assessment Criteria					Total Points
						PCI	CBE	Width	ADT	LOS	
IRVINGTON DR	319500	1.430	1.479	L	Bid List			7	5		12
JASPER RD EXTENSION	199400			L	Bid List						0
JASPER RD EXTENSION	199400			L	Bid List						0
JASPER-LOWELL RD	622000	3.874	5.000	R				7			8
JASPER-LOWELL RD	622000	5.000	6.118	R				7			7
JASPER-LOWELL RD	622000	6.118	8.574	R				7			7
JASPER-LOWELL RD	622000	9.606	10.399	R				3			3
JASPER-LOWELL RD	622000	1.200	1.600	R				4			4
JEANS RD	403600	1.185	3.000	L				7			7
KALMIA ST	329400	0.000	0.070	L							7
KING RD EAST	111800	0.000	1.038	M				2			2
KING RD EAST	111800	3.168	4.012	M				2			2
KNIGHT RD	433000	0.000	1.440	R				3			3
LAKE DR	135200	0.120	0.430	L				3			3
LAKE DR	135200	0.000	0.130	L				7			7
LATHAM RD	269900	0.000	0.965	L				7			7
LAURA ST	193900	0.000	0.273	L				7			7
LINGO LN	348000	0.000	1.896	L	Bid List			3			3
LITTLE FALL CR RD	623000	0.000	1.500	M				2			2
LITTLE FALL CR RD	623000	1.500	3.678	M				2			2
LOST CR RD	612000	0.000	0.669	R				3			3
LOST CR RD	612000	1.876	4.035	R				3			3
LYNX HOLLOW RD	219200	0.000	2.790	R				3			3
MAPLE CR RD	532600	0.000	0.592	M				3			3
MARCOLA RD	190000	5.818	11.550	L	Bid List			7			7
MARCOLA RD	190000	1.550	16.080	R	Bid List			7			7
MARCOLA RD	190000	5.818	11.550	L	Bid List			7			7
MCBETH RD	127300	0.000	3.604	R				2			2
MCFARLAND RD	613000	0.000	1.582	R				2			2
MCKENZIE VIEW DR	159500	0.000	3.190	R				7			7
MCKENZIE VIEW DR	159500	3.190	6.099	R				7			7
MEADOWVIEW RD EAST	344600	0.000	1.162	L				4			4
MEADOWVIEW RD WEST	344300	0.000	1.446	L				7			7
MEADOWVIEW RD WEST	344300	1.446	2.952	L				7			7
MERCER LAKE RD	524000	0.000	1.080	M				4			4
MILL RD	610200	0.000	0.249	L	Bid List			2			2
MILLIRON RD EAST	345000	0.000	0.402	L	Bid List			4	3	8	15

Lane County Roads Needs Assessment Data

ROAD_NAME	ROAD ID	BMP	EMP	Terrain	CIP	Assessment Criteria						Total Points
						PCI	CBE	Width	ADT	LOS	Crash Rate	
MOSBY CR RD	250000	1.204	1.597	L				7				7
MOSBY CR RD	250000	1.610	1.632	L				7				7
MUNSEL LAKE RD	526000	0.000	0.352	L				7				9
MUNSEL LAKE RD	526000	0.382	0.500	L				7				9
MUNSEL LAKE RD	526000	0.774	2.090	R				3				3
NELSON MTN RD	467000	9.890	11.109	M	Bid List			7				0
NELSON MTN RD	367000	0.000	2.860	M				7				7
NELSON MTN RD	467000	4.200	9.890	M				7				11
NO FORK SIUSLAW RD	507000	17.412	17.883	M				3				7
NO FORK SIUSLAW RD	507000	0.000	0.849	L				7				7
NO FORK SIUSLAW RD	507000	5.700	11.450	M				2				2
NO FORK SIUSLAW RD	507000	11.450	12.500	M				4				4
NO FORK SIUSLAW RD	507000	12.500	13.805	M				4				4
NO FORK SIUSLAW RD	507000	13.805	17.412	M				4				4
NO RIVER RD	221000	0.000	0.433	L				7				7
NORATON RD	348500	1.856	2.718	L				2				2
NORTH DELTA HWY	173000	0.000	0.201	L	Bid List			5				6
NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY	121000	0.170	1.738	L				5				5
NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY	121000	0.104	0.170	L				5				5
NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY	121000	2.568	3.220	L				5				5
NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY	321000	3.220	3.350	L				3				5
NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY	321000	3.350	4.749	L				5				5
OAKLEA DR	351200	0.000	1.512	L				7				7
OAKLEA DR	351200	1.512	2.534	L				7				7
PARK AVE	138000	0.000	0.786	L				7				7
PEARL ST	163900	0.561	0.635	L	Bid List			7				12
PEARL ST	163900	0.540	0.561	L				7				7
PERKINS RD	406600	1.110	2.822	L				2				9
PERKINS RD	406600	0.420	0.443	L				7				9
PERKINS RD	406600	0.443	1.110	L				2				9
PINE GROVE RD	425400	0.900	1.000	R				7				7
PIONEER PKWY EAST	194600	1.700	1.781	L	Bid List			3				16
PLACE RD	622500	0.942	2.500	R				7				7
PLACE RD	622500	2.500	4.490	R				7				7
PRAIRIE RD	347000	1.989	2.211	L	Bid List			7				20
PRAIRIE RD	347000	0.690	1.640	L	Bid List			5				11
PRAIRIE RD	147000	0.118	0.690	L				5				6

Lane County Roads Needs Assessment Data

ROAD_NAME	ROAD ID	BMP	EMP	Terrain	CIP	Assessment Criteria					Total Points
						PCI	CBE	Width	ADT	LOS	
PRAIRIE RD	347080	8.050	9.250	L							7
PRAIRIE RD	347000	1.640	1.939	L	Bid List			7			7
PRAIRIE RD	347030	2.221	3.116	L				7			7
PRAIRIE RD	347030	3.116	5.500	L				7			7
PRAIRIE RD	347030	5.500	7.286	L				7			7
PRAIRIE RD	347030	7.286	7.850	L				7			7
RATTLESNAKE RD	610400	2.250	4.474	R			3				3
RHODODENDRON DR	528000	3.440	5.112	R			3				3
RICHARDSON RD	501800	0.000	0.100	M			3				7
RIDGEWAY RD	605800	0.000	1.000	R			7				7
RIDGEWAY RD	605800	1.500	2.540	L			3				5
RIVER LP #1	325800	0.000	0.244	L			7				11
RIVER LP #2	318500	0.000	0.990	L			7		5		12
RIVER RD	310000	7.340	7.366	L	Bid List			5			5
RIVER RD	310000	7.366	7.747	L	Bid List			5			5
RODGERS RD	601800	0.678	1.200	L			7				7
ROW RIVER RD	240000	4.840	6.000	R			2				2
ROW RIVER RD	240000	1.042	1.795	L			3		5		8
ROW RIVER RD	240000	1.795	1.900	L			3		5		3
ROW RIVER RD	240000	6.000	11.000	R			3		3		3
ROW RIVER RD	240000	16.230	16.310	R			7		7		7
ROW RIVER RD	240000	16.310	16.597	R			7		7		7
ROW RIVER RD	240000	16.597	19.778	R			4		7		11
ROYAL AVE	145500	2.267	2.930	L	Bid List			7		5	20
ROYAL AVE	145500	2.930	3.267	L	Bid List			3		5	8
SAGINAW RD EAST	220200	0.000	0.622	L			7				7
SCENIC DR	310800	0.000	0.765	R			2		7		9
SEARS RD	241000	0.000	0.640	L			7				7
SEARS RD	241000	0.640	2.950	L			4		7		11
SEARS RD	241000	3.350	9.610	L			7		7		7
SEAVEY LP RD	188100	0.000	3.791	L			7				7
SEAVEY WAY	189300	0.222	Bridge	L	Bid List						0
SHARPS CR RD	246000	9.650	10.160	M			2		3		5
SHEFFLER RD	401600	0.000	1.870	R			7		7		7
SHOESTRING RD	275500	0.000	3.770	M			4				4
SILTCOOS STA RD	533400	0.000	1.000	M			2				2
SILTCOOS STA RD	533400	1.850	4.841	M			4				4

Lane County Roads Needs Assessment Data

ROAD_NAME	ROAD ID	BMP	EMP	Terrain	CIP	Assessment Criteria					Total Points
						PCI	CBE	Width	ADT	LOS	
SILVER LN	131400	0.458	0.511	L				5			5
SOUTH CANARY RD	533000	0.000	2.613	M					2		2
SPENCER CR RD	413200	0.590	3.285	R							7
SPRING CR DR	317500	0.000	0.527	L					2		9
STAGECOACH RD	502000	9.704	1.488	M	Bid List				2		2
STAGECOACH RD	502000	0.000	2.500	M	Bid List			3			7
STAGECOACH RD	502000	2.500	4.200	M	Bid List				4		11
STAGECOACH RD	502000	4.200	9.704	M	Bid List				2		9
SUNDERMAN RD	194800	0.000	2.728	L				3			3
SUTTLE RD	441000	0.000	3.802	L				7			7
SUTTON LAKE RD	529000	0.000	0.460	R				2			9
SUTTON LAKE RD	523000	0.460	2.688	R				2			9
TEN MILE RD	521000	0.000	2.012	M				4			11
TEN MILE RD	521000	2.143	8.340	M				4			11
THOMPSON CR RD	511000	4.300	4.820	M				4			7
THOMPSON CR RD	511000	0.000	0.050	M				4			4
THOMPSON CR RD	511000	0.050	2.988	M				4			11
THORNTON RD SO	252000	0.150	0.284	L				7			7
THURSTON RD	103500	7.082	1.330	L				9			1
UPPER NO FORK RD	508400	0.000	3.044	M				2			2
VAUGHN RD	433500	6.700	9.906	R				7			7
WARTHEN RD	402400	1.180	4.008	R				7			7
WARTHEN RD	402400	0.000	1.180	L				7			7
WENDLING RD	197500	0.000	1.600	R				3			3
WEST BOUNDARY RD	627000	1.680	15.842	M	Bid List			4			7
WEST SHEFFLER RD	401800	0.000	2.352	R				2			2
WESTFIR-OAKRIDGE RD	612800	2.000	3.050	R				7			7
WESTFIR-OAKRIDGE RD	612800	3.569	5.192	M				3			3
WESTFIR-OAKRIDGE RD	612800	5.192	6.065	M				3			3
WILKES DR	321400	0.000	0.290	L				5			5
WILKES DR	321400	0.790	0.932	L				4			11
WILKES DR	321400	0.290	0.790	L				2			2
WILLAG RD NEE RAMP #1	166001	0.000	0.285	L	Bid List			7			12
WINBERRY CR RD	624500	4.420	5.674	M				4			4

**Appendix H:
Finding of Compliance with State Land Use
Goals and County Comprehensive Plan**

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN SUPPORT OF ADOPTION OF ORDINANCE No. PA 1202

The Lane County Board of Commissioners (“Board”) finds as follows:

1. The Ordinance to which these findings are attached effects an update to the Lane County Transportation System Plan (TSP), which is a component of the Lane County Comprehensive Plan including the Rural Comprehensive Plan (“RCP”). In addition to adopting the updated TSP, the Board is amending RCP General Plan Goal 12, Policy 4 to incorporate the updated TSP into the County’s General Plan Policies. These changes will be referred to as the TSP update throughout these findings.
2. Pursuant to Lane Code (LC) 12.050(1) and LC 16.400(6)(h)(i) amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Rural Comprehensive Plan shall be by ordinance. Adopting Ordinance No. PA 1202 accomplishes these requirements.
3. LC 12.050(2) provides review criteria to adopt the updated TSP and the amendment to General Plan Policy 12 into the County Comprehensive Plan. The criteria are as follows:

LC 12.050

- (2) The Board may amend or supplement the comprehensive plan upon a finding of:*
- (a) an error in the plan; or*
 - (b) changed circumstances affecting or pertaining to the plan; or*
 - (c) a change in public policy; or*
 - (d) a change in public need based on a reevaluation of factors affecting the plan;*
- provided, the amendment or supplement does not impair the purpose of the plan as established by LC 12.005 above.*

LC 16.400(6)(h)(iii)(bb) provides similar review criteria for amendments to the Rural Comprehensive Plan, as follows:

LC 16.400(6)(h)(iii) The Board may amend or supplement the Rural Comprehensive Plan upon making the following findings:

- (bb) For Major and Minor Amendments as defined in LC 16.400(8)(a) below, the Plan amendment or component is:*
- (i-i) necessary to correct an identified error in the application of the Plan; OR*
 - (ii-ii) necessary to fulfill an identified public or community need for the intended result of the component or amendment; OR*
 - (iii-iii) necessary to comply with the mandate of local, state, or federal policy or law; OR*
 - (iv-iv) necessary to provide for the implementation of adopted Plan policy or elements; OR*
 - (v-v) otherwise deemed by the Board, for reasons briefly set forth in its decision, to be desirable, appropriate or proper.*

With regard to these review criteria the Board finds as follows:

The Transportation Element of the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan was last updated in 1980. The TSP update is necessary:

- a. to address changed circumstances related to the use and development of the transportation network in Lane County, including population growth and new development;
- b. to incorporate nationally accepted engineering practices which have evolved and changed since 1980 and which pertain to transportation system planning and development, into local requirements;

- c. to address a change in public need as evidenced in part by the needs assessment which is a part of the TSP document and also as a result of changed circumstances as described in a. above; and
- d. to comply with the mandate of new statewide planning goal requirements, specifically the Transportation Planning Rule.

Based upon all of the above findings, the Board concludes that the proposed update is consistent with the review criteria listed above.

- 4. LC 16.400(6)(h)(ii) requires the amendment be concurrent with an amendment to LC 16.400(4), which lists the adopting ordinance numbers. The adopted changes include an amendment to LC 16.400(4), so this requirement has been met.
- 5. In addition to the requirements in LC 16.400(6)(h)(iii)(bb) listed above, additional findings under LC 16.400(6)(h)(iii)(aa) must be made to adopt the proposed TSP update. Specifically, the Board may amend the Rural Comprehensive Plan upon making certain additional findings, as follows:

LC 16.400(6)(h)(iii) The Board may amend or supplement the Rural Comprehensive Plan upon making the following findings:

(aa) For Major and Minor Amendments as defined in LC 16.400(8)(a) below, the Plan component or amendment meets all applicable requirements of local and state law, including Statewide Planning Goals and Oregon Administrative Rules.

The amendment meets applicable requirements of local and state law in that it is being processed as a Plan Amendment pursuant to LC Chapter 14 requirements, and is subject to the approval criteria of LC Chapter 16, both of which chapters were previously found to be in compliance with state law. Findings of consistency with the approval criteria in LC 16 are contained herein, including findings of consistency with applicable Statewide Planning Goals and applicable Oregon Administrative Rules, as follows:

Goal 1 - Citizen Involvement. *To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.*

Extensive public involvement was afforded pursuant to the Public Involvement Plan that is included in the TSP as Appendix E.1. Specifically:

- Ten public information meetings were held around the County, in May and June, 1995 prior to drafting of the updated TSP.
- In September 2002, peer review was sought of the proposed road design standards, traffic impact analysis requirements, and level of performance requirements. Seventy-eight private and public engineers and land use planners were contacted as part of that process. Follow-up telephone calls were also made to each addressee. Comments received were considered and used to make changes to applicable sections of the TSP document.
- The draft TSP document was placed in each of Lane County's nine libraries, and published on the internet, in January 2003.
- Four public informational meetings were held around the County in February, 2003, after the draft was available for public review.
- The public information meetings and announcements about availability of the draft were publicized on two occasions, one to two weeks prior to the meetings (depending on individual newspaper schedules), via advertisements in all of the following newspapers: The Eugene-Register Guard, Springfield News, Cottage Grove Sentinel, Siuslaw News, River Reflections, and West Lane News. In addition, notice postcards were mailed to over 550 individuals and agencies including schools, emergency response agencies, utility service providers, Port of Siuslaw, other service districts, planning offices and city council members of all Lane County incorporated communities, neighborhood organizations, watershed

councils, public interest groups, state offices with responsibilities for transportation planning and services, private engineering, planning, and legal firms, and other interested individuals.

- A joint public hearing before the Lane County Roads Advisory Committee and Planning Commission was held on September 9, 2003. Legal notices for the hearing were published in the Eugene-Register-Guard and Springfield News, on August 19 and 20, respectively. Public hearing notice postcards were also mailed to the same 550+ parties described in the previous paragraph, and display advertisements were placed in the same six newspapers.
- A “Ballot Measure 56” notice pursuant to ORS 215.503 was mailed to more than 37,000 owners of property located within Lane County and outside the Eugene-Springfield urban growth boundary and outside the city limits of other incorporated communities.
- A second hearing before the Board of County Commissioners was held in early 2004. Prior to the hearing, legal notices were published in the Eugene Register-Guard and the Springfield News. In addition, notification postcards were mailed to the same 550+ parties described above, as well as to the parties who testified in writing or verbally at the Roads Advisory Committee/Planning Commission joint hearing.

The TSP is a plan amendment that is subject to the public notification and hearing processes and provisions of LC Chapter 14 and 16. As described above, the public involvement requirements of these chapters have been met, and exceeded, and opportunity for public involvement was afforded at all phases of the process. The amendment is therefore consistent with statewide planning Goal 1.

Goal 2 - Land Use Planning: *To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.*

The Rural Comprehensive Plan (RCP) was acknowledged by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) as complying with state planning goals. LC 16.400, adopted and also acknowledged by LCDC specifies the means by which the RCP may be amended. The TSP update follows the procedures outlined in Lane Code and these findings provide an adequate factual basis for action. The amendment therefore conforms to the established land use planning process and framework consistent with Goal 2.

Goal 3 - Agricultural Land: *To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.*

As addressed under Goal 12 below and incorporated here by reference, certain transportation facilities and uses are allowed on agricultural land either outright or with a special use permit. TSP policy 20-a is being adopted and related land use regulations are being amended to provide for these uses, consistent with statewide planning Goal 3. Adoption of the TSP update will not change any agricultural land use designations. Based upon these findings the amendment is consistent with Goal 3.

Goal 4 - Forest Lands: *To conserve forest lands by maintaining the forest land base and to protect the state’s forest economy by making possible economically efficient forest practices that assure the continuous growing and harvesting of forest tree species as the leading use on forest land consistent with sound management of soil, air, water, and fish and wildlife resources and to provide for recreational opportunities and agriculture.*

As addressed under Goal 12 below and incorporated here by reference, certain transportation facilities and uses are allowed on forest lands either outright or with a special use permit. TSP policy 20-a is being adopted and related land use regulations are being amended to provide for these uses, consistent with statewide planning Goal 4. Adoption of the TSP update will not change any forest land designations. Based upon these findings the amendment is consistent with Goal 4.

Goal 5 - Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources: *To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources.*

Changes to Lane Code associated with the TSP update include an exemption for public road projects within County-regulated riparian areas from Riparian Modification Permit requirements if they comply with Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements for aquatic species. Public road projects are required to comply with provisions under the ESA for aquatic species that exceed the Goal 5 and associated Lane Code requirements for riparian protection. As such, by complying with the ESA, such public road projects also will adequately address riparian protections otherwise required by regulations applicable to riparian area development.

The treatment of other resources regulated under Goal 5 will not change as a result of the TSP update, and therefore the goal is otherwise not relevant to this amendment. Based upon these findings, the TSP update is consistent with Goal 5.

Goal 6 - Air, Water and Land Resources Quality: *To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.*

The TSP update does not include any changes to the treatment of the resources protected under this goal, so the goal is not relevant to this amendment.

Goal 7 - Areas Subject To Natural Disasters And Hazards: *To protect life and property from natural disasters and hazards.*

The TSP update does not include any changes relevant to management of areas subject to natural disasters and hazards so the goal is not relevant to this amendment.

Goal 8 - Recreational Needs: *To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.*

The TSP update does not include any changes related to management of recreational resources, so this goal is not relevant to the amendment.

Goal 9 - Economic Development: *To provide adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon's citizens.*

While the TSP update will provide for the continued orderly development of the County road network which is vital to economic development activity, the above statewide planning goal requirement is not directly relevant to the amendment.

Goal 10 - Housing: *To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state.*

The TSP update will not change any County requirements related to housing, so this goal is not relevant to the amendment.

Goal 11 - Public Facilities and Services: *to plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.*

Transportation facilities are identified as public facilities under this goal. OAR 660-011-0035(1) requires,

The public facility plan shall include rough cost estimates for those sewer, water, and transportation public facility projects identified in the facility plan . . .

The TSP update includes a project list and cost estimates for each anticipated County Road improvement project. Other public facility projects, for example water, sewer and public transit improvements, are identified in other long range planning documents adopted separately from the TSP.

Goal 12 - Transportation: *To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.*

OAR 660-012 is the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) that implements statewide planning Goal 12. Subsection numbers below are those found within OAR 660-012 (i.e., “-0005” refers to OAR 660-012-0005). The Board finds the TSP update complies with the TPR requirements based upon the following findings:

-0005 provides certain definitions that were adopted, as applicable to Lane County, as part of the TSP update.

-0010 provides for a distinction between transportation system planning and project development, noting that the latter implements the former by determining the precise location, alignment, and preliminary design of improvements included in the TSP. This section does not direct local governments to adopt any provisions to comply with the TPR but it is noted that the County’s TSP provides for transportation system planning while Lane Code and Lane Manual provide for project development.

-0015 requires County TSPs to be consistent with the state TSP. The County has consulted and coordinated with Oregon Department of Transportation to provide for coordination and mutual TSP consistency. This section of the TPR also requires that the County TSP be coordinated with federal agencies, local governments, special districts, and private providers of transportation services. The County TSP effort involved coordination with all service districts and providers of transportation services throughout Lane County, and with local governments.

-0020 requires TSPs for local jurisdictions such as Lane County to have certain elements, including:

- a determination of needs;
- road system plan including functional classes consistent with state and regional TSPs;
- road standards;
- public transit; bicycle and pedestrian; air, rail, water, and pipeline elements; and
- an inventory of the road system and other transportation system elements.

The TSP update includes all the required elements listed above. While a financing element is not required for areas outside urban growth boundaries, the TSP update also includes a financing element.

-0025 requires findings of compliance with statewide planning goals and acknowledged comprehensive plan policies and land use regulations. These findings demonstrate consistency with this requirement.

-0045 requires certain regulations and ordinances to be adopted. This includes land use regulations specifying transportation uses and services allowed in each land use zone; other regulations specifying access control measures and acceptable road performance levels; other transportation system protection measures consistent with road functional classes and rural land density limitations; measures to protect public use airports; a process for coordinated review of land use decisions; a process to apply development proposal conditions to minimize impacts and protect transportation facilities; regulations to require notice to public agencies; and regulations to assure that land use designations, densities, and design standards are consistent with functions, capacities and levels of service of facilities. Regulations to provide for safe,

convenient, and reasonably direct access for bicycles and pedestrians are also required. Finally, this section of the TPR requires that standards for local streets be adopted that minimize pavement width and total right-of-way consistent with the operational needs of the facility.

Certain of the above requirements have already been in place in Lane County's land use regulations, including provisions to protect airports, and land use review processes providing for coordination, notice to agencies, and for assigning conditions to development proposals. Under separate ordinance, changes to the regulations in Lane Code Chapters 10, 13, 15, and 16 are being adopted to implement the TSP in compliance with all the other above noted requirements, including new access control measures, updated regulations to provide for safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian access, road performance and traffic impact analysis requirements to protect transportation facilities, and new road design standards that minimize pavement width consistent with operation needs of road facilities. The TSP also includes related, overarching goals and policies. Therefore, the amendment is consistent with the requirements of -0045.

-0050 includes provisions for transportation project development, and specifies requirements for public involvement and compliance with the comprehensive plan and land use regulations when a land use decision is involved in project development. The updated TSP, and Lane Code land use regulations being adopted as part of this amendment, provide for transportation uses that may be allowed in rural areas without a goal exception. Also, pre-existing requirements provide for the necessary public process if a transportation facility or use requires a land use decision or an amendment to the TSP.

-0060(1) and (2) provide that plan and land use regulation amendments which significantly affect a transportation facility shall ensure that land uses allowed by the amendment are consistent with road function, capacity, level of service, and other performance standards. The TPR also specifies under what conditions a plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility. TSP Policy 20-d and related land use regulations implement this requirement with regard to plan amendments.

-0060(3) requires coordination with other agencies regarding determinations under -0060(1) and (2). Lane County has long had such a coordination process in place, routinely sending proposed plan and land use regulation amendment referrals to all affected agencies. The updated TSP also includes Goal 21, and policies 21-a through 21-c, which provide for coordinated land use review when making decisions about transportation facilities.

-0060(4) provides that the presence of a transportation facility or improvement shall not be the basis for an exception to allow certain development on rural lands. This requirement was incorporated into the TSP as policy 20-e.

-0065 provides for transportation facilities, services, and improvements which may be permitted either outright or as special uses on rural lands consistent with Goals 3, 4, 11, and 14 without a goal exception. In addition, this section of the TPR references provisions in ORS 215.213 applicable to agricultural lands in Lane County, and references Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 660, Division 6 applicable to forest lands in Lane County. These ORS and OAR sections referenced by the TPR provide for transportation facilities and uses that may be permitted outright or as special uses in agricultural zones and forest zones. All of these provisions were addressed by TSP policy 20-a and by the adoption of corresponding land use regulation amendments that specify the facilities, services and improvements that may be permitted on rural lands, including agricultural and forest zones.

As described above, and in combination with amendments being made to Lane County land use regulations, the proposed amendment is consistent with the applicable requirements of the TPR.

Goal 13 - Energy: To conserve energy.

The TSP update will not change any County requirements related to energy, so this goal is not relevant to the amendment.

Goal 14 - Urbanization: *To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use.*

Goal 12, the Transportation Planning Rule, includes provisions related to transportation uses allowed on rural lands to help maintain the orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. As noted above under findings related to Goal 12, incorporated here by reference, this proposal complies with those provisions. Besides complying with these related sections in the TPR, the TSP update will not change any County requirements related to urbanization, so the amendment is consistent with Goal 14.

Goal 15 - Willamette River Greenway: *To protect, conserve, enhance and maintain the natural, scenic, historical, agricultural, economic and recreational qualities of lands along the Willamette River as the Willamette River Greenway.*

The TSP update will not change any County requirements related to the Willamette River Greenway, so this goal is not relevant to the amendment.

Goal 16 - Estuarine Resources: *To recognize and protect the unique environmental, economic, and social values of each estuary and associated wetlands; and to protect, maintain, where appropriate develop, and where appropriate restore the long-term environmental, economic, and social values, diversity and benefits of Oregon's estuaries.*

The land use regulation amendments associated with the TSP update provide for consistency with this goal by restricting allowed transportation facilities, services, and improvements within estuarine zones to operations, maintenance, repair, preservation, and rehabilitation. Furthermore, such uses are only allowed provided there is no associated dredging or excavation. As such this proposal is consistent with Goal 16.

Goal 17 - Coastal Shorelands: *To conserve, protect, where appropriate, develop and where appropriate restore the resources and benefits of all coastal shorelands, recognizing their value for protection and maintenance of water quality, fish and wildlife habitat, water-depending uses, economic resources and recreation and aesthetics. The management of these shoreland areas shall be compatible with the characteristics of the adjacent coastal waters; and to reduce the hazard to human life and property, and the adverse effects upon water quality and fish and wildlife habitat, resulting from the use and enjoyment of Oregon's coastal shorelands.*

Goal 17 is implemented under Lane County's coastal shorelands combining zone regulations. The TSP update will not change any County requirements related to these requirements, so this goal is not relevant to the amendment.

Goal 18 - Beaches and Dunes: *To conserve, protect, where appropriate develop and where appropriate restore the resources and benefits of coastal beach and dune areas; and to reduce the hazard to human life and property from natural or man-induced actions associated with these areas.*

Goal 18 is implemented under Lane County's land use combining zone regulations. The TSP update will not change any County requirements related to these requirements, so this goal is not relevant to the amendment.

Goal 19 - Ocean Resources: *To conserve the long-term values, benefits, and natural resources of the nearshore ocean and the continental shelf. All local, state, and federal plans, policies,*

projects, and activities which affect the territorial sea shall be developed, managed and conducted to maintain, and where appropriate, enhance and restore, the long-term benefits derived from the nearshore oceanic resources of Oregon. Since renewable ocean resources and uses, such as food production, water quality, navigation, recreation, and aesthetic enjoyment, will provide greater long-term benefits than will nonrenewable resources, such plans and activities shall give clear priority to the proper management and protection of renewable resources.

The TSP update will not change any County requirements related to ocean resources, so this goal is not relevant to the amendment.

6. Pursuant to LC 16.400(6)(h)(iii)(aa) and OAR 660-012-0025(2) above, findings of consistency with applicable local policies, including the applicable Rural Comprehensive Plan policies are required to adopt this amendment. Findings of consistency with applicable policies of the Rural Comprehensive Plan follow.

Goal 1: Citizen Involvement

1. . . . assure availability of planning information . . .
2. . . . plan implementation shall include participation by the general public . . .
4. . . .The Citizen Involvement Program is recognized as the primary body advising the Board as to . . . Because of their regular meeting schedule and expertise, the Planning Commissions have been designated as Lane County's Citizen Involvement Program Committees.
5. The program of communicating with chartered community organizations shall be continued.
6. Identification of priorities for and adoption of capital improvement programs shall be done through the citizen involvement program.

Findings addressing statewide planning goal 1 above demonstrate that the plan amendment is consistent with the above policies, and are incorporated here by reference. Additional findings with regard to policy 6 above are as follows. The TSP, page 64 addresses future spending and prioritization, noting that priority setting shall occur through the Capital Improvement Program process. TSP Goal 1, 23, and 24 address priority setting, and the Planning Commission has reviewed and endorsed these policies as adopted. Therefore the amendment is consistent with the above goal and applicable policies 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 above.

Goal 2: Land Use Planning

3. All products of the County Planning process shall be made available for public review and comment and shall be adopted through the hearings process.
5. The Lane County Planning Commission shall have primary advisory authority to the Board of County Commissioners for and Countywide land use policy issues.

All products proposed for adoption herein have been made available for public review as discussed in findings for statewide planning Goal 1, above, incorporated here by reference. The Lane County Planning Commission's advice was sought and used prior to adoption of these products by the Board. Therefore the amendment is consistent with the above goal and applicable policies 3 and 5.

Goal 3: Agricultural Lands

3. Reserve the use of the best agricultural soils exclusively for agricultural purposes.
5. Use planning and implementation techniques that reflect appropriate uses and treatment for each type of land.
8. Provide maximum protection to agricultural activities . .
13. No County policy shall be construed to exclude permitted and specially permitted nonfarm uses, as defined in ORS Chapter 215.213 and OAR 660 Division 33, from the EFU zones . . .

TSP Policy 20-a and associated Code changes specify transportation facilities and uses allowed on agricultural lands, consistent with ORS Chapter 215.213 and OAR 660 Division 33. By doing so, the amendments are consistent with the above Goal and applicable policy statements.

Goal 4: Forest Lands

Goal 5: Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas and Natural Resources

Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resources

Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards

Goal 8: Recreational Needs

Goal 9: Economy of the State

Goal 10: Housing

The TSP update does not include any changes relevant to management of areas subject to the above goals 4 through 10, or associated policies, so those goals are not relevant to this amendment.

Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services

4. Lane County shall maintain an active role to provide the facilities and services needed to make quality health, social and cultural services available and accessible to all Lane County residents . . .

Transportation facilities are defined as public facilities under statewide land use Goal 11. By adopting this updated TSP, Lane County is maintaining an active role in providing transportation facilities needed to make the referenced services available and accessible to all County residents.

5. Lane County shall participate in the coordination of planning and development for various public facilities and utility services. The primary means of effecting this policy shall be through a system whereby land use application shall be referred to the various providers of services . . .

Lane County has primary responsibility for the coordination of planning and development for County-maintained transportation facilities. Coordination with other service providers, including cities, Lane Transit District, utilities, special districts, and other public agencies, has been a high priority of this amendment effort. All known entities listed above were included on mailing lists for informational meetings and public hearings. Applicable agencies and service providers were directly consulted regarding the accuracy of information and policies affecting their operations.

Based upon the above findings, the amendment is consistent with Goal 11 and applicable policies.

Goal 12: Transportation

- 1. Lane County shall strive for a coordinated and balanced transportation system which complies with LCDC Goal 12 and is responsive to the economic, social and environmental considerations, and which will work toward the following objectives:*
 - a. Safe, convenient and economical transportation for all people, materials and services*

The TSP update (TSP) complies with LCDC Goal 12 as demonstrated in the findings for that goal contained above in this document. The TSP is responsive to economic, social and environmental considerations, and works toward the objectives of safety, convenience, and economical transportation for all people, materials and services as demonstrated by all the goals and associated policies in the document.

- b. An effective distribution of transportation options.*

Transportation options are effectively distributed to the extent possible given Lane County's primarily rural character and lack of development in rural areas. The TSP demonstrates consideration for all transportation options available, as required under statewide land use Goal 12.

c. A transportation system responsive to changing needs and conditions.

Adoption of the updated TSP is meant to comply with state regulations and to address changing needs and conditions, demonstrating consistency with this policy statement.

d. Consideration of direct and indirect impacts of proposed transportation projects on the environment, energy resources, economy and general livability.

The TSP is primarily concerned with rural Lane County which is generally in resource land zoning and use. The findings in this document demonstrate compliance with all statewide planning goals regulating these resource lands and the related environment, energy resources, economy and general livability of these areas. The needs assessment contained in the TSP also demonstrates consideration of unincorporated communities as to access for bicycle and pedestrian travel from residential areas to nearby commercial areas and employment centers. The project list included in the TSP includes projects specifically designed to improve pedestrian access, and policies require provision of bus turnouts. Consideration for freight movement and multiple transportation modes including air, transit, and other modes demonstrates consideration of impacts on the environment, energy resources, economy and general livability.

e. Public participation in the transportation planning process.

Findings for statewide Goal 1 and for Lane County Goal 1 demonstrate consistency with this objective. In addition, adopted changes to Lane Manual concerning citizen involvement in the Capital Improvement Program promotes the above objective by allowing for a stakeholder process to enhance public participation in project design.

f. Coordination with the development of statewide comprehensive transportation plans.

Coordination was of primary concern in developing the TSP. ODOT was consulted and has testified to being generally satisfied with the updated TSP.

g. Encouragement of energy-efficient modes of transportation.

Updated TSP policies associated with, and Goals 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13 promote alternative, energy efficient transportation modes.

h. Safe and convenient opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian travel throughout population areas of Lane County.

Updated TSP Goals 6, 7, and 8 and associated policies promote safe and convenient opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian travel. Policy 1-e also accomplishes this by promoting alternative transportation modes when roads are improved, through the provision of sidewalks, bike lanes, and bus stop turnouts. Additionally, the project list includes bicycle- and pedestrian-oriented projects, based upon a needs assessment that specifically considered safe and convenient opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian travel.

i. An efficient public transportation service, which meets demonstrated needs for alternative transportation.

As a regional, independent service, Lane County has limited control over the management of public transportation but does participate in associated committee, task force, and lobbying activities. As reflected in the TSP, public transportation services are provided to rural Lane County to the extent possible given limited populations in these areas, and given legal and economic constraints. Goals 10, 11, and 12 of the updated TSP and associated policies demonstrate consistency with the above objective to the extent possible.

j. An appropriate level of general and commercial aviation development.

The updated TSP supports general and commercial aviation development through supportive goals and associated policies 14, 15, and 16.

k. The development of the Port of Siuslaw consistent with adopted policies and plans.

The updated TSP supports development of the Port of Siuslaw through supportive goals and associated policies 17 and 18.

2. *In managing the transportation system toward the fulfillment of adopted County land use goals and plans, Lane County shall:*
 - a. *Provide transportation services as necessary to accommodate growth concentrated within existing communities.*

While city TSPs are the primary policy documents for existing incorporated communities, the updated County TSP is consistent with these TSPs. For example, the TSP project list includes all projects listed in city TSPs. These city projects are designed to accommodate growth in the corresponding communities. The project list also includes road improvements associated with unincorporated communities where need was demonstrated through the needs assessment in the TSP document. Other transportation modes serving growth within existing communities are addressed primarily in city TSPs.

b. Discourage the spread of residential development in agricultural and forest areas.

By complying with statewide land use goals as demonstrated in the findings above, the TSP discourages the spread of residential development in agricultural and forest areas.

c. Guide the transportation pattern of newly developing areas and rural communities.

To the extent allowed under statewide planning goals, TSP Goals and associated policies 20, 21, and 22, and associated regulations that are being adopted provide for road improvements to serve new development in a manner that contemplates the future transportation pattern by considering factors such as the logical extension of County Roads, road functional classifications, access management, and provision of improvements to serve new development consistent with statewide land use goals.

d. Ensure that transportation improvements are consistent with adopted public policies and plans.

e. Ensure that road development or improvement is consistent with adopted plan and policies.

Transportation improvements must show compliance with the adopted County Comprehensive Plan including the updated TSP and with adopted land use regulations, demonstrating consistency with the above two objectives.

3. *Lane County shall seek an efficient, safe and attractive highway network to serve the existing and future arrangement of land uses by striving toward the following objectives:*
 - a. *Make improved safety for the traveling public a primary consideration in the expenditure of resources.*

Improved safety is the first goal of the updated TSP and policy 1-c specifies that safety is the first priority in making decisions about roadway operations, maintenance, and repair.

- b. *Ensure that all road construction meets adopted uniform standards unless excepted for substantial reason.*

New road design standards and corresponding policies being adopted in the updated TSP apply to publicly and privately initiated road improvement projects. In particular, Goal 1 in the updated TSP and associated policies will uniformly guide road construction.

- c. *Provide for timely development of streets and roads in community development centers.*

Development of streets and roads in community development centers are programmed primarily in city TSPs. The County TSP needs assessment and project list, and requirements for traffic impact analysis and maintaining acceptable performance levels, provide for timely development of necessary street and road improvements for County roads within community development centers.

- d. *Include aesthetic considerations in maintenance, construction or improvement within County road right-of-way.*

Aesthetics are incorporated into road design standards being adopted with the updated TSP. Aesthetics are also considered in policies that encourage setback sidewalks and the involvement of adjacent neighborhoods in project design.

- e. *Minimize frontage access onto the County's collector and arterial roads.*

Access onto County collector and arterial roads will be minimized under new TSP Goal 3 and associated policies, and associated regulations providing spacing standards and other access management provisions.

- f. *Ensure that future route selection considers the indirect costs as well as the direct costs of construction.*

Direct and indirect costs are considered at several levels as part of the TSP update. Individual project designs are subject to citizen involvement processes. All projects must be consistent with land use policies and regulations. Alternative transportation modes to promote reduced energy use and pollution are encouraged. Projects must comply with environmental regulations and best management practices administered by state, federal, and local agencies.

- g. *Discourage strip development between the County's urban service areas and their satellite communities.*

The TSP update discourages strip development by complying with statewide land use goals as shown in the findings above.

- h. *To the extent possible, coordinate implementation of new highway facilities with land development needs to minimize stimulation of untimely land development.*

The TSP minimizes stimulation of untimely land development and coordinates implementation of new highway facilities with land development to the extent possible by complying with statewide land use laws and coordinating with the state in development of the TSP.

i. Ensure that street and highway development or improvement is integrated with and complementary to other transportation modes.

TSP policies provide for coordination with other transportation modes.

j. Maintain County roads and bridges adequately to meet the needs of the trucking industry consistent with adopted land use plans for the area.

Maintaining the County road system and bridges is specified as a priority under Goal 1 of the updated TSP. Policy 1-f states, "Maintain county arterial and collector roads sufficiently for the safe and efficient movement of freight, consistent with applicable traffic impact analysis, design policies and standards and land use regulations."

k. Establish priority trucking routes, which minimize conflicts with incompatible land uses and area of congestion.

Trucking routes are established for state roads outside of this amendment process. No changes are proposed to established trucking routes.

4. The adopted Lane County Rural Transportation Plan is a special-function Plan concerned with Goal 12 requirements, and containing a number of Goals and Policies regarding various components of the County's transportation system and Goal 12 requirements. The Transportation System Plan, as amended and adopted in 2004, shall be applied where appropriate; policies shall be considered to be mandatory actions, which are ultimately binding on the County.

The paragraph above reflects changes that will be adopted as part of this amendment. Additional findings regarding the above policy are not necessary.

Goal 13: Energy Conservation

2. Lane County shall encourage energy conservation in the development and of public facilities, services and utilities and in the development and use of electrical and communication systems.

The goals and policies that promote alternatives to single occupancy vehicle travel reflect that the TSP update encourages energy conservation to the extent possible.

3. Lane County shall establish programs when financially reasonable to promote the stated goal through intergovernmental cooperation, to increase public awareness of the benefits of energy conservation and to revise existing programs concerning land use, transportation, existing and new building.

In complying with the Transportation Planning Rule concerning intergovernmental coordination, alternative transportation modes, and integration of land use and transportation facility decision-making, the updated TSP promotes intergovernmental cooperation in energy conservation measures.

Goal 14: Urbanization

Goal 15: Willamette River Greenway

Goal 16: Estuarine Resources

Goal 17: Coastal Shorelands

Goal 18: Beaches and Dunes

Goal 19: Ocean Resources

The TSP update does not include any changes relevant to management of areas subject to the above goals 14 through 19 or associated policies, so those goals are not relevant to this amendment.

7. Based upon all of the above findings, the Board concludes that the proposed TSP update and incorporation of TSP policies into the County General Plan policies is consistent with the requirements set forth in the applicable approval criteria. Therefore, the Board approves adoption of the proposal.