

**OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN MOBILITY STANDARDS  
 ODOT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Draft Framework for Oregon Highway Plan Policy 1F Revisions**

**Objective:** Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) Policy 1F, Highway Mobility Standards, will be updated to address the recommendations of the Joint Subcommittee on the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and OHP, and to address requirements from Senate Bill (SB) 795 from the 2011 Legislative Session. The policy changes will seek additional flexibility for OHP mobility standards that better balance multimodal transportation, land use and economic development objectives. Full project objectives and details for OHP tasks can be found in the Goal/Problem Statement developed by the OHP Mobility Standards Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the final recommendations report of the Joint Subcommittee on the TPR and OHP.

**POLICY/APPLICATION AREA 1: OREGON TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND MODAL/TOPIC PLANS**

Current Status	Future Policy Intent and Objectives	Future OHP Policy Application	Proposed OHP Policy/Action Outline	Addressing Joint Subcommittee/SB 795 Recommendations
<p>OHP mobility standards are currently defined and established in OHP Policy 1F. This policy provides the general framework for applying mobility standards through specific applications described in the more detailed OHP Actions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OHP will continue to serve as the document establishing state highway planning standards, targets and objectives</li> <li>• Implement the mobility objectives of the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) and other OHP policies (e.g. OHP Policy 1A - State Highway Classification System, 1B - Land Use and Transportation, 1C - State Highway Freight System, and 1G - Major Improvements)</li> <li>• Establish the uses of OHP mobility standards, establish acceptable levels of mobility on state highways and provide implementation details for standards where applicable</li> <li>• OHP mobility standards will be used for                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Planning and plan implementation (e.g. system planning considerations)</li> <li>○ TPR Section 0060 analysis and other development review activities</li> <li>○ Guiding operational decisions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide analysis details currently discussed through OHP Action 1F.1 and OHP mobility standard table footnotes to clarify application</li> <li>• Better balance the considerations of other modes and objectives (e.g. economic development, livability)</li> <li>• Track alternate mobility standards through the OHP amendment registry and enhanced planning tools (e.g. Transportation Planning Online Database (TPOD))</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise OHP Policy 1F to provide the needed framework for updating OHP Actions as described below</li> <li>• Provide clear direction on policy intent through revised introductory text for Policy 1F</li> <li>• Provide one OHP Action establishing the OHP mobility standards themselves (e.g. OHP Tables and overarching implementation/analysis details)</li> <li>• Consider potential questions on OHP Table 6                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 30<sup>th</sup> Highest Hour considerations?</li> <li>○ Peak hour factor assumptions?</li> <li>○ Change v/c standard levels (e.g. allow greater congestion for some facilities to account for traffic growth)?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>OHP Policy 1F</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish mobility standard objectives and applications</li> </ul> <p><b>OHP Action 1F.1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish mobility standards and targets                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OHP Table 6 (statewide standards)</li> <li>○ OHP Table 7 (Portland metro area standards)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide general analysis details</li> </ul>	<p>This policy/application area provides a framework to address the full set of Joint Subcommittee/SB 795 recommendations implemented through the detailed OHP Action items discussed in the remainder of this document.</p>

**POLICY/APPLICATION AREA 2: LONG RANGE PLANNING APPLICATIONS (E.G. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS, FACILITY PLANS)**

Current Status	Future Policy Intent and Objectives	Future OHP Policy Application	Proposed OHP Policy/Action Outline	Addressing Joint Subcommittee/SB 795 Recommendations
<p>Elements of long range planning applications are currently addressed in OHP Actions 1F.1 (OHP Tables and primary analysis details), 1F.2 (planning horizon), 1F.3 (alternate mobility standards), 1F.4 (Portland metro area corridor plans) and 1F.5 (improving performance as much as feasible).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide for the identification of system and facility needs and deficiencies</li> <li>• Define and prioritize solutions, including solutions across modes as much as possible</li> <li>• Expand, broaden and supplement measures outside of v/c ratios; include considerations for a complete, multimodal system</li> <li>• Treat mobility standards as the “start of the discussion” not the “end of the discussion” (e.g. use mobility standards as the vehicle for dealing with system issues rather than the sole outcome of the process)</li> <li>• Strengthen the ability/requirement to consider and develop alternate mobility standards                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emphasize flexibility to develop alternate mobility standards</li> <li>○ Streamline development processes so they are a more effective tool</li> <li>○ Allow for the ability to consider corridor and/or area mobility standards</li> <li>○ Expand options for other measures outside of volume to capacity ratios (v/c) through alternate mobility standard development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Clarify the intent of existing Action 1F.5 (improve performance as much as feasible) – and how this fits in with alternate mobility standard applications</li> <li>• Remove existing Action 1F.4 related to Portland area corridor planning (this is a tool and application for all areas)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an independent set of OHP Actions for system and facility planning                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Define the use of mobility standards for Transportation System Plan/Facility Plan development, update and refinement</li> <li>○ Establish planning horizon expectations for mobility analysis in system and facility plans</li> <li>○ Establish a streamlined process for alternate mobility standard development and options for development of other measures</li> <li>○ Clarify and define the role of Action 1F.5 “improve performance as much as feasible”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>OHP Action 1F.2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply OHP mobility standards to system and facility plans</li> <li>• Provide expectations for the planning horizon on state highways</li> </ul> <p><b>OHP Action 1F.3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish alternate mobility standard processes</li> </ul> <p><b>OHP Action 1F.4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide intent to improve performance as much as feasible in long range planning</li> </ul>	<p>Potential revisions to implement long range planning policy objectives address items B3 (streamline alternate mobility standards), B4 (consider corridor or area mobility standards) and B5 (provide a policy framework for non-v/c measures) from the Joint Subcommittee and SB 795 recommendations.</p>

**POLICY/APPLICATION AREA 3: TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW**

<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Future Policy Intent and Objectives</b>	<b>Future OHP Policy Application</b>	<b>Proposed OHP Policy/Action Outline</b>	<b>Addressing Joint Subcommittee/SB 795 Recommendations</b>
<p>Transportation Planning Rule applications are currently addressed in OHP Actions 1F.2 (planning horizon and development considerations) and 1F.6 (avoiding further degradation).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide the basis for identifying significant affect                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide a clear definition for significant affect on state highways</li> <li>○ Address the scale of analysis for significant affect determinations (geographic or impact thresholds)?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Provide mitigation objectives, rather than firm requirements (e.g. practical mitigation)</li> <li>• Promote the identification of transportation issues as the primary objective with less emphasis on fully meeting standards through mitigation                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fully meet standards?</li> <li>○ Provide options for off site/off system mitigation</li> <li>○ Consider options for multimodal mitigation (may not be an option for all areas)</li> <li>○ Consider the nexus of proportionality for mitigation</li> <li>○ Mitigation credits</li> <li>○ Safety considerations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Direction may require revisions in TPR</li> <li>• Clarify roles for TPR and development review applications (e.g. state vs. local)</li> <li>• Other development review actions will likely follow the general policy direction for TPR applications for mobility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an independent set of OHP Actions that address TPR applications and provide guidance on mobility considerations for development review                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clarify significant affect for state highways (if clarification is not addressed fully in TPR work)</li> <li>○ Define planning horizon expectations for TPR applications on state highways</li> <li>○ Provide direction on considerations for analyzing zone changes consistent with comprehensive plans</li> <li>○ Provide opportunity for assuming average trip generation and average land use assumptions in analysis</li> <li>○ Clarify mitigation expectations</li> <li>○ Refine OHP Action 1F.6 - avoid further degradation (continue direction and improve on OHP policy intent statements (May 2011), including analysis expectations)</li> <li>○ Provide a clarifying Action on the role/applicability of OHP mobility standards in development review applications outside of the TPR</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>OHP Action 1F.5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide direction on mobility standards in TPR 0060 applications</li> <li>• Clarify significant affect determination/definition for state highways</li> <li>• Provide direction on mitigation objectives</li> </ul> <p><b>OHP Action 1F.6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define details for avoiding further degradation and considering small increases in traffic</li> </ul> <p><b>OHP Action 1F.7</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify development review applications (Non-TPR)</li> </ul>	<p>This category considers items B1 (exempting proposals with small increases in traffic) and B2 (using average trip generation not reasonable worst case) from the Joint Subcommittee recommendations report. These considerations also address item (i) in SB 795 (concerning analysis requirements under avoid further degradation).</p>

**POLICY/APPLICATION AREA 4: ACCESS MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE**

Current Status	Future Policy Intent and Objectives	Future OHP Policy Application	Proposed OHP Policy/Action Outline	Addressing Joint Subcommittee/SB 795 Recommendations
<p>OHP Policy 1F identifies “guiding operational decisions such as managing access and traffic control systems to maintain acceptable highway performance” as one use for mobility standards. However, current language on access management and operations in Policy 1F and associated Actions is very limited.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement direction from SB 264                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SB 264 significantly impacts OHP Goal 3 and Appendix C (Access Management),</li> <li>○ Impacts to the existing language in OHP Policy 1F is limited</li> <li>○ Per SB 264, ODOT may not apply highway mobility standards to turning movements from an approach unless the v/c ratio on the approach is 1.0 or greater</li> </ul> </li> <li>• OHP mobility standards for operational considerations should be used as guidance, not as firm requirements</li> <li>• Safety considerations for access management and operations will play a larger role if there is less emphasis on mobility analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify the role of OHP mobility standards in access management decisions (reference revised statute and rule for details)</li> <li>• Clarify the role of OHP mobility standards in operational analyses and decisions through guidance</li> </ul>	<p><b>OHP Action 1F.8</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify role of OHP mobility standards in access management</li> </ul> <p><b>OHP Action 1F.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide guidance for mobility standards in operational decisions</li> </ul>	<p>Access management and development review applications outside of the TPR are not directly applicable to the Joint Subcommittee recommendations or SB 795. However, these applications are closely related to development issues and clarification will help OHP Policy 1F overall. Many of these changes are necessary given SB 264 requirements.</p>

**OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relationship of OHP mobility standards to highway design standards and practical design is an important item that is on a parallel track to this work                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Currently OHP mobility standards do not apply to project design</li> <li>○ The Agency is considering enhanced coordination between planning decisions, including OHP mobility standards, with design standards and decisions</li> <li>○ OHP Policy 1F revisions may provide a stronger emphasis on coordination and streamlined processes between planning and design</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>OHP Action 1F.10</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen coordination between planning and design</li> </ul>
--	--