



# **City of Central Point**

## **Transportation System Plan**



2030

Approved by the Central Point City Council on December 18, 2008  
Implemented by Ordinance #1922



CITY OF CENTRAL POINT – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

# City of Central Point Transportation System Plan 2030

---

Approved by the Central Point City Council on December 18, 2008  
Implemented by Ordinance #1922



## Acknowledgments

### **Central Point Planning Department:**

Tom Humphrey, Community Development Director  
Don Burt, Planning Manager  
David Jacob, Community Planner  
Connie Clune, Community Planner  
Didi Thomas, Planning Secretary

### **Central Point Public Works Department:**

Bob Pierce, Public Works Director  
Chris Clayton, Deputy Public Works Director  
Matt Samitore, Development Services Coordinator/Parks & Recreation Director

### **Transportation System Plan Technical Advisory Committee:**

David Pyles, Oregon Dept. of Transportation  
John Renz, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development  
Susan Lee, Jackson County Development Services  
Craig Anderson, Jackson County Planning  
Mike Kuntz, Jackson County Roads  
James Philip, Jackson County Roads  
Paige Townsend, Rogue Valley Transit District  
Matt Hermen, Rogue Valley Council of Governments/Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Eric Heesacker, Rogue Valley Council of Government/Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

### **City Council:**

|                      |                |                   |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Hank Williams, Mayor | Bruce Dinger   | Michael Quilty    |
| Matthew Stephenson   | Richard Halley | Walter Moczygemba |
| Kay Harrison         |                |                   |

### **Planning Commission:**

|                             |              |               |
|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Connie Moczygemba, Chairman | Chuck Piland | Candy Fish    |
| Damian Idiart               | Mike Oliver  | Justin Hurley |
| Pat Beck                    |              |               |

### **Citizens Advisory Committee:**

|                      |                 |                |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Joe Thomas, Chairman | Herb Farber     | Jake Jakabosky |
| Allen Broderick      | Sam Inkley, Jr. | Larry Martin   |
| David Painter        |                 |                |



ORDINANCE NO. 1922

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF CENTRAL POINT COMPREHENSIVE  
PLAN TO UPDATE THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN

RECITALS:


1. In an effort to maintain its Comprehensive Plan in conformance with the Statewide Planning Goals, the City of Central Point has completed a Transportation System Plan for the City's urban area; and
2. Pursuant to OAR 660-12, the amendment has been prepared in compliance with Oregon state adopted rules governing preparation and coordination of transportation system plans which are collectively referred to as the Transportation Planning Rule and with Oregon Statewide Planning Goal #12 – Transportation; and
3. Pursuant to ORS 197.040(2)(e) and OAR 660-030-0060, the City has coordinated its planning efforts with the State to assure compliance with goals and compatibility with City and County Comprehensive Plans and with OAR 660-12-0015 to assure consistency with the State and Regional TSP; and
4. Pursuant to OAR 660-12-006(1)(a-c) and (2)(a-d), the amendment to the City's acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and land use regulations is consistent with the identified function, capacity and levels of service of local and regional transportation facilities; and
5. Pursuant to the requirements set forth in CPMC Sections 17.5 and 17.10, the City has conducted the following duly advertised public hearings to consider the proposed amendments:
  - a. Planning Commission hearings on September 2, 2008 and November 4, 2008.
  - b. City Council hearing on December 4, 2008.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF CENTRAL POINT, OREGON, DO  
ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:


Section 1. At its public hearing on December 4, 2008, the City Council reviewed the City staff report, received findings of the Central Point Planning Commission, and received public testimony from all interested persons. Based upon all the information received, the City Council adopts the findings and conclusions set forth in the staff report dated December 4, 2008, a copy of which is attached hereto and by reference incorporated herein, and based upon the same, the City Council finds that there is sufficient public need and justification for the proposed updated Transportation System Plan and the proposed Transportation System Plan is adopted entirely.

Section 2. The proposed Transportation System Plan hereby supersedes and replaces the existing Circulation/Transportation Element of the Central Point Comprehensive Plan.

Passed by the Council and signed by me in authentication of its passage the 18<sup>th</sup> day of December 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Hank Williams

ATTESTS:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
City Representative

Approved by me this 22 day of December, 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Table of Contents

|                                                                |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Chapter 1 - Introduction</b>                                | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1. Introduction                                              | 1         |
| 1.2. The Transportation Planning Rule                          | 1         |
| 1.3. The Regional Transportation Plan                          | 2         |
| 1.4. Values, Guiding Principles, Goals and Policies            | 3         |
| 1.5. Public Involvement & Plan Approval Process                | 4         |
| 1.6. Plan Organization                                         | 4         |
| 1.7. The Action Program                                        | 5         |
| 1.8. Program Compliance                                        | 5         |
| <b>Chapter 2 – Plan Compliance</b>                             | <b>6</b>  |
| 2.1. Introduction                                              | 6         |
| 2.2. Plan Compliance, Scope of Review                          | 6         |
| 2.3. Central Point Forward, Fair City Vision 2020              | 7         |
| 2.4. Oregon Transportation Planning Rule                       | 8         |
| 2.5. Plan Conformity, Other                                    | 9         |
| 2.6. Other Plans                                               | 13        |
| 2.7. Conclusion                                                | 13        |
| <b>Chapter 3 – Land Use &amp; Transportation Planning</b>      | <b>14</b> |
| 3.1. Introduction                                              | 14        |
| 3.2. The Land Use Element                                      | 14        |
| 3.3. Buildable Land Inventory (BLI)                            | 15        |
| 3.4. Growth Projections                                        | 15        |
| 3.5. Transit Oriented Development                              | 15        |
| 3.6. Land Use Goals and Policies                               | 18        |
| <b>Chapter 4 – Existing Transportation Conditions</b>          | <b>19</b> |
| 4.1. Introduction                                              | 19        |
| 4.2. Street System                                             | 19        |
| 4.3. Transportation Corridor Studies                           | 29        |
| 4.4. Bicycle System Existing Conditions                        | 33        |
| 4.5. Pedestrian System, Existing Conditions                    | 37        |
| 4.6. Rail System, Existing Conditions                          | 37        |
| 4.7. Transit, Existing Conditions                              | 37        |
| <b>Chapter 5 – Transportation Management</b>                   | <b>40</b> |
| 5.1. Introduction                                              | 40        |
| 5.2. Transportation System Management (TSM)                    | 40        |
| 5.3. Mobility Standards                                        | 41        |
| 5.4. Access Management (AM)                                    | 44        |
| 5.5. Transportation Demand Management (TDM)                    | 47        |
| 5.6. Transportation Management Goals, Objectives, and Policies | 52        |
| <b>Chapter 6 – Parking Management</b>                          | <b>54</b> |
| 6.1. Introduction                                              | 54        |
| 6.2. Current Parking Inventory                                 | 54        |
| 6.3. Parking Performance Measures                              | 54        |

|                                                                         |                                                                            |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 6.4.                                                                    | Parking Strategies .....                                                   | 54  |
| 6.5.                                                                    | Regional Transportation Plan .....                                         | 60  |
| 6.6.                                                                    | Current Parking Code and Policy Changes .....                              | 61  |
| 6.7.                                                                    | Parking Management Goals and Policies .....                                | 61  |
| <b>Chapter 7 – Street System, 2008-2030 .....</b>                       | <b>63</b>                                                                  |     |
| 7.1.                                                                    | Introduction .....                                                         | 63  |
| 7.2.                                                                    | Street System .....                                                        | 63  |
| 7.3.                                                                    | Recommended Street System Improvements .....                               | 72  |
| 7.4.                                                                    | Street System Goals, Objectives and Policies .....                         | 82  |
| <b>Chapter 8 – Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian System .....</b>                | <b>84</b>                                                                  |     |
| 8.1.                                                                    | Introduction .....                                                         | 84  |
| 8.2.                                                                    | Bicycle System Hierarchy .....                                             | 84  |
| 8.3.                                                                    | The Bicycle System .....                                                   | 85  |
| 8.4.                                                                    | In-fill Project Priorities & Implementation / Improvement Strategies ..... | 85  |
| 8.6.                                                                    | The Pedestrian System.....                                                 | 88  |
| 8.7.                                                                    | Priority of Pedestrian Improvements .....                                  | 90  |
| 8.8.                                                                    | Public Awareness .....                                                     | 91  |
| 8.9.                                                                    | Bear Creek Greenway.....                                                   | 91  |
| 8.10.                                                                   | Bicycle and Pedestrian Goals, Policies & Actions .....                     | 92  |
| <b>Chapter 9 – Public Transit System .....</b>                          | <b>95</b>                                                                  |     |
| 9.1.                                                                    | Introduction .....                                                         | 95  |
| 9.2.                                                                    | 2005 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) .....                              | 95  |
| 9.3.                                                                    | Rogue Valley Transportation District.....                                  | 97  |
| 9.4.                                                                    | Strategies to Improve Transit Service .....                                | 98  |
| 9.5.                                                                    | Transit Goals and Policies .....                                           | 101 |
| <b>Chapter 10 – Railroad &amp; Aviation System.....</b>                 | <b>102</b>                                                                 |     |
| 10.1.                                                                   | Railroad System- Introduction.....                                         | 102 |
| 10.2.                                                                   | Railroads - Existing Conditions.....                                       | 103 |
| 10.3.                                                                   | Aviation System – Introduction.....                                        | 110 |
| 10.4.                                                                   | Railroad and Aviation Goals and Policies.....                              | 110 |
| <b>Chapter 11 – Truck Freight System .....</b>                          | <b>111</b>                                                                 |     |
| 11.1.                                                                   | Introduction .....                                                         | 111 |
| 11.2.                                                                   | Land Use.....                                                              | 111 |
| 11.3.                                                                   | Truck Freight - Existing Conditions .....                                  | 111 |
| 11.4.                                                                   | Central Point Truck Freight - Issues & Concerns.....                       | 116 |
| 11.5.                                                                   | Out-of-Direction Travel.....                                               | 116 |
| 11.6.                                                                   | Truck Freight Goals and Policies .....                                     | 117 |
| <b>Chapter 12 – Transportation System Financing System Program.....</b> | <b>118</b>                                                                 |     |
| 12.1.                                                                   | Introduction .....                                                         | 118 |
| 12.2.                                                                   | Project Prioritization Policies .....                                      | 118 |
| 12.3.                                                                   | Project Classification System .....                                        | 119 |
| 12.4.                                                                   | Transportation Funding Sources.....                                        | 120 |
| 12.5.                                                                   | Transportation System Revenue Projections.....                             | 125 |
| 12.6.                                                                   | Transportation Program Costs.....                                          | 126 |
| 12.7.                                                                   | Transportation Financing Goals, Objectives, and Policies.....              | 137 |

|                                                         |            |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Chapter 13 – Implementation Policies.....</b>        | <b>139</b> |
| 13.1 Introduction .....                                 | 139        |
| 13.2 Implementation Goals and Policies by Chapter ..... | 139        |

## Tables

|                                                                                                                                         |      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Table 2.1 Alternative RTP Performance Measure.....                                                                                      | 11   |
| Table 3.1 RTP Alternative Performance Measures .....                                                                                    | 16   |
| Table 3.2 City of Central Point Performance Measures .....                                                                              | 17   |
| Table 4.1 Crash Rate, City of Central Point, 2006 .....                                                                                 | 25   |
| Table 4.2 Highway Capacity Manual Level of Service Designations for Signalized .....                                                    | 26   |
| Table 4.3 Highway Capacity Manual Level of Service for Stopped Controlled<br>Intersections.....                                         | 27   |
| Table 4.4 Level of Service and Vehicle-to-Capacity Ratio .....                                                                          | 28   |
| Table 4.5 RVMPO Freight Study Recommended Projects, City of Central Point.....                                                          | 29   |
| Table 4.5 Central Point Railroad Crossings and Controls.....                                                                            | 37   |
| Table 5.1 Access Management Spacing Standards for District Highway .....                                                                | 45   |
| Table 5.2 Access Management Guidelines.....                                                                                             | 46   |
| Table 6.1 Transportation System Plan Parking Performance Measures.....                                                                  | 54   |
| Table 6.2 Parking Plan Strategies .....                                                                                                 | 55   |
| Table 7.1 Year 2010 PM Peak Hour LOS, City of Central Point.....                                                                        | 67   |
| Table 7.2 Year 2020 PM Peak Hour LOS, City of Central Point.....                                                                        | 70   |
| Table 7.3 Year 2030 PM Peak Hour LOS, City of Central Point.....                                                                        | 71   |
| Table 7.4 Transportation Projects, 2008-2030 .....                                                                                      | 76   |
| Table 7.5 Jackson County/City of Central Point Transportation Projects, 2008-2030 ....                                                  | 81   |
| Table 7.6 City of Central Point Transportation Projects 2008-2030 .....                                                                 | 81   |
| Table 8.1 Regional Transportation Plan Bicycle System Performance Measures .....                                                        | 84   |
| Table 8.2 City of Central Point Bicycle System Performance Measures .....                                                               | 85   |
| Table 8.3 Bicycle Facilities Infill Strategies .....                                                                                    | 85   |
| Table 8.4 Prioritized Bicycle Facility Projects – Short-Term (5 – 10 years) .....                                                       | 86   |
| Table 8.5 Regional Transportation Plan Pedestrian System Performance Measures.....                                                      | 88   |
| Table 8.6 City of Central Point Pedestrian System Performance Measures .....                                                            | 90   |
| Table 9.1 Regional Transportation Plan Public Transportation System Performance<br>Measures .....                                       | 96   |
| Table 9.2 City of Central Point Transportation System Plan Performance Measures.....                                                    | 96   |
| Table 10.1 Central Point Railroad Crossings .....                                                                                       | 103  |
| Table 10.2 Level of Service Explained .....                                                                                             | 106  |
| Table 11.1 Central Point Truck Freight Issues and Concerns .....                                                                        | 1122 |
| Table 12.1 City of Central Point Projected Transportation Program Capital Funding<br>2009-2030 (Measured in 2008 dollars x 1,000) ..... | 126  |
| Table 12.2 City of Central Point Projected Transportation Program Capital Funding,<br>2009-2030 (Measured in 2008 dollars X 1000).....  | 127  |
| Table 12.3 Tier 1 – Short Term Projects .....                                                                                           | 128  |
| Table 12.4 Tier 1 – Medium Term Projects .....                                                                                          | 129  |

|            |                                                                                                                             |     |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 12.5 | Tier 1 – Long Term Projects .....                                                                                           | 131 |
| Table 12.6 | City of Central Point Transportation Projects, Tier 2 Projects.....                                                         | 133 |
| Table 12.7 | City of Central Point Projected Transportation Program Capital Funding,<br>2009-2030 (Measured in 2008 dollars X 1000)..... | 136 |

## Figures

|             |                                                                |     |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 1.1  | Central Point Urban Reserve, 2007 .....                        | 1   |
| Figure 1.2  | Central Point Forward, Fair City Vision 2020 .....             | 3   |
| Figure 4.1  | Functional Classification Map, 2007 .....                      | 23  |
| Figure 4.2  | Jurisdictional Service Map, 2008-2030.....                     | 24  |
| Figure 4.3  | Major Truck Routes, 2008-2030 .....                            | 31  |
| Figure 4.4  | Existing Bicycle System, 2008-2030 .....                       | 36  |
| Figure 4.5  | Existing Pedestrian System Map, 2008-2030 .....                | 38  |
| Figure 4.6  | RVTD Transit Map, 2008-2030.....                               | 39  |
| Figure 7.1  | Functional Classification & Street Network Map, 2008-2030..... | 64  |
| Figure 7.2  | Intersection Deficiencies – 2010, 2020, 2030 .....             | 66  |
| Figure 7.3  | Tier 1 - Short Term Projects.....                              | 73  |
| Figure 7.4  | Tier 1 - Medium Term Projects.....                             | 74  |
| Figure 7.5  | Tier 1 - Long Term Projects.....                               | 75  |
| Figure 8.1  | Bicycle Plan Map, 2008-2030.....                               | 89  |
| Figure 9.1  | Twin Creek Transit Oriented Development.....                   | 97  |
| Figure 9.2  | Transit Plan Map, 2008-2030.....                               | 100 |
| Figure 10.1 | Central Oregon & Pacific Railroad Map.....                     | 102 |
| Figure 10.2 | Railroad System Map, 2008-2030.....                            | 109 |
| Figure 11.1 | RVMPO Freight Route Map, 2008-2030.....                        | 113 |
| Figure 11.2 | Freight Route Plan Map, 2008-2030 .....                        | 114 |
| Figure 11.3 | Problem Routes & Intersections Map, 2008-2030 .....            | 115 |


## Chapter 1 - Introduction

### 1.1. Introduction

Throughout history, transportation has been a major factor in the economic success and growth of cities, states, and nations. The ability of a community to efficiently move people and goods from one place to another offers a distinct competitive advantage over places that have limited transportation systems. The availability of efficient transportation systems, from ancient trade routes to today's highways, railways, waterways, and airways have been synonymous with both economic progress and improved quality of life. Consequently, transportation and transportation related expenditures constitute a significant percentage of the economy, and few issues are as important for the economic development and quality of life of local communities as transportation.

The City of Central Point recognizes the importance of having and maintaining a coordinated network of transportation facilities that serves current and future state, regional and local

**Figure 1.1. Central Point Urban Reserve, 2007**



transportation needs. In response to this objective, the City has prepared this Transportation System Plan (TSP) to assure that not only are the transportation needs of its citizens met in a timely and efficient manner, but that in doing so, the transportation system will continue to be improved in a manner that supports projected growth, while enhancing the quality of life of those living and visiting the City of Central Point.

This TSP has been prepared within the context of an urban area consisting of 2,880 acres, the state's Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as developed by the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RVMPO) and other local transportation plans and programs as described in detail in Chapter 2. This TSP will serve as the Transportation Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

### 1.2. The Transportation Planning Rule

In recognition of the role that transportation plays in the economic success and livability of the state and the magnitude of the cost to provide and maintain a competitive transportation system, Oregon has included it as an element of the statewide planning process. Goal 12 - Transportation provides and encourages the planning and implementation of a convenient, economic, and safe transportation system that integrates local, regional, state and inter-state transportation systems. This goal recognizes the necessity, at all levels of government, of having, and maintaining, a

comprehensive transportation planning program that serves statewide transportation needs<sup>1</sup>. The preferred means to achieving this objective is through the preparation of transportation system plans (TSP). A TSP is a plan for one or more transportation facilities that are planned, developed, operated, and maintained in a coordinated manner to assure continuity of movement between modes and geographic and jurisdictional boundaries.

To facilitate implementation of Goal 12, the state adopted rules governing the preparation and coordination of transportation system plans (OAR 660-12). These rules are collectively referred to as the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The TPR acknowledges the significance in the relationship between transportation and land use planning, and defines transportation systems planning as a mandatory element of a community's comprehensive planning process.

**Transportation** \,tran(t)s-  
pər-'tā-shen\ *n* 1: an act,  
process, or instance of  
transporting or being  
transported.

**Transport** \tran(t)s-  
'pō(ə)rt, 'tran(t)s-,\ *vt* 1:  
to transfer or convey from  
one place to another.

**System** \ˈsis-təm\ *n* 1: a  
regularly interacting or  
interdependent group of  
items forming a unified  
whole. 2: an organized set  
of doctrines, ideas, or  
principles usually  
intended to explain the  
arrangement or working  
of a systematic whole.

The following objectives of the TPR have been incorporated in the guiding principles, goals, and policies presented in this TSP:

- (a) *Promote the development of transportation systems adequate to serve statewide, regional and local transportation needs and the mobility needs of the transportation disadvantaged;*
- (b) *Encourage and support the availability of a variety of transportation choices for moving people that balance vehicular use with other transportation modes, including walking, bicycling and transit;*
- (c) *Provide for safe and convenient vehicular, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle access and circulation;*
- (d) *Facilitate the safe, efficient and economic flow of freight and other goods and services within regions and throughout the state through a variety of modes including road, air, rail and marine transportation;*
- (e) *Protect existing and planned transportation facilities, corridors and sites for their identified functions;*
- (f) *Provide for the construction and implementation of transportation facilities, improvements and services necessary to support acknowledged comprehensive plans;*
- (g) *Identify how transportation facilities are provided on rural lands consistent with the goals;*
- (h) *Ensure coordination among affected local governments and transportation service providers and consistency between state, regional and local transportation plans; and*
- (i) *Ensure that changes to comprehensive plans are supported by adequate planned transportation facilities.*

### 1.3. The Regional Transportation Plan

In accordance with the TPR, the RVMPO is charged with the preparation, management, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Oregon Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines

In 2007, *Central Point Forward, Fair City Vision 2020* (*Vision 2020*) was adopted by the City Council<sup>3</sup>. Preparation of *Vision 2020* included considerable citizen involvement in defining the future of the City, including the role transportation will play as the vision unfolds. *Vision 2020* adopted the following statement as a core value for the planning and development of the City's transportation system:

In addition to this core transportation value, the citizens of Central Point developed a series of transportation related principles. The term “principle” refers to the community’s fundamental position to be used throughout the preparation and implementation of this TSP. The use of principles is intended to serve as a point of reference and a philosophical system of way-finding as the City navigates its way through the goals, policies, and implementation strategies necessary to attain the City’s transportation vision. The following represents the principles that will guide the preparation and implementation of this TSP:

- <sup>2</sup> OAR 660-012-0015(3)(a)

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION  
Page 3 of 161

*minimizing their impact on the character and livability of surrounding neighborhoods, business districts and the environment.*

In addition to guiding principles the City has adopted a series of transportation related goals. The term “Goals” is defined as the City’s major desire, or intent, determined necessary for the attainment of its preferred transportation system. The goals are written to focus attention, to energize the community to action, and to instill the resolve necessary to attain the goal during the life of the Plan.

Goal implementation is generally enforced through what is referred to as policies. The term “Policy” identifies the preferred course of action determined appropriate to the successful attainment of a related goal. Where appropriate each policy is followed with actions related to the implementation of the policy. Actions are typically associated with events such as code amendments, capital improvement plans, etc.

### **1.5. Public Involvement & Plan Approval Process**

In accordance with the Statewide Planning Goal, 1 the preparation and adoption of this TSP included a citizen involvement component that included the following:

**Central Point Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC).** Throughout development of the TSP the CAC served as a reviewing authority, providing input and forwarding recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council. The CAC draft TSP was the first released to the public and to other agencies for review (Oregon Department of Transportation and the Department of Land Conservation and Development). Throughout the CAC review all meetings were noticed to encourage the public to participate in preparation of the draft TSP.

**The Central Point Planning Commission.** The draft TSP, as recommended by the CAC, was forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration and recommendation to the City Council. All Planning Commission meetings were noticed to encourage the public to provide input on preparation of the final draft of the TSP, and City Council meetings at which the TSP was considered.

**Central Point City Council.** Based on recommendations from the CAC and the Planning Commission, the City Council reviewed the TSP and after conducting public hearings the City Council December 4 and 18, 2008 adopted the TSP as presented in this document<sup>4</sup>. The City Council meetings were noticed to further encourage the public to provide final input on TSP.

### **1.6. Plan Organization**

In acknowledgement of the relationship between the TPR, the RTP, and this TSP, the organization of this document closely follows the format described in the TPR - Elements of Transportation System Plans<sup>5</sup>. Central Point’s TSP has been developed through a series of technical evaluations of the City’s transportation system as it currently exists and as it will be expanded and used through the year 2030. In addition, the technical analysis preparation of this TSP has included systematic input and review by the city staff, the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), a Technical

---

<sup>4</sup>Central Point Ordinance #1922

<sup>5</sup>OAR 660-012-0020(2)

Advisory Committee (TAC), the Planning Commission, and the citizens of Central Point. In its entirety, this TSP contains thirteen (13) chapters as follows:

- Chapter 1. Introduction
- Chapter 2. Plan Compliance
- Chapter 3. Land Use and Forecasting
- Chapter 4. Existing Conditions and Needs
- Chapter 5. Transportation Management
- Chapter 6. Parking System & Management
- Chapter 7. Street System
- Chapter 8. Bicycle and Pedestrian System
- Chapter 9. Public Transit System
- Chapter 10. Aviation and Rail System
- Chapter 11. Freight System
- Chapter 12. Transportation System Financing
- Chapter 13. Implementation Policies

Each of these chapters has been prepared in compliance with the TPR and tested for consistency with federal, state, regional, and local transportation plans.

### **1.7. The Action Program**

During the preparation of this TSP, there were numerous occasions where it was determined that the current standards and regulations were in need of modification or that entirely new provisions were required to bring the City's transportation program into compliance with the TPR. Changes to the City's zoning and public works standards are presented in the Implementation subsection of Chapter 13, Implementation Policies. The Implementation subsection identifies required actions, the lead department responsible, the document needing modification, and a schedule for completion of the action throughout the planning period. The design of the Implementation subsection fully expects that as actions are completed that they are noted in the Action Program and that this section will be periodically updated to reflect the action. These periodic updates of the Action Program are not considered amendments to this TSP, but merely reflect an accounting of progress in attaining the objectives of the TSP throughout its life.

### **1.8. Program Compliance**

In collaboration with the TPR and the RTP, the City of Central Point has prepared this TSP. Central Point's TSP is consistent with, and complements, other related transportation system plans, including local, regional, state, and federal transportation policies and programs. The goals, policies, and plans set forth in this TSP represent the City's vision for maintaining and advancing its transportation system in coordination with its land use planning program. The ultimate objective is to efficiently, and effectively provide for the transportation needs of the community while improving the quality of life of its citizens.

## Chapter 2 – Plan Compliance

### 2.1. Introduction

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requires that all local transportation system plans be consistent with the regional transportation system plan and adopted elements of the state transportation system plan<sup>6</sup>. Local transportation system plans are also required to be coordinated with affected federal and state agencies, local governments, special districts, and private providers of transportation services. The purpose of this chapter is to verify coordination, and where appropriate, compliance with applicable transportation plans and programs and to address the consistency of this Transportation System Plan (TSP) with affected state, federal and local transportation plans and programs.

### 2.2. Plan Compliance, Scope of Review

*Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines, Goal 12: Transportation* serves as the principal document governing the preparation and implementation of state, regional and local transportation plans. Goal 12 requires that transportation system plans:

- ☒ Consider all modes of transportation;
- ☒ Be based upon an inventory of local, regional and state transportation needs;
- ☒ Consider the differences in social consequences that would result from utilizing differing combinations of transportation modes;
- ☒ Avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation;
- ☒ Minimize adverse social, economic and environmental impacts and costs;
- ☒ Conserve energy;
- ☒ Meet the needs of the transportation disadvantaged by improving transportation services;
- ☒ Facilitate the flow of goods and services so as to strengthen the local and regional economy; and
- ☒ Conformity with local and regional comprehensive land use plans.

While Goal 12 establishes the state's overall transportation goal, it is the TPR that defines the minimum requirements for the preparation of local transportation system plans, including compliance with other federal, state and regional transportation plans. The goals, policies and plans presented in this TSP have been reviewed for compliance with the following transportation plans and other documents:

- ☒ **Central Point Forward, Fair City Vision 2020** – A review of the City's updated long-term vision for the City of Central Point, with an emphasis on the community's vision for their transportation needs.

---

<sup>6</sup> OAR 660-012-0015(3)(a)

- ☑ **Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)** – The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) was adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission in 1991 and sets forth the requirements for preparation of local transportation system plans. The City of Central Point's TSP is based on, and complies with, the most recent amendments to the TPR as set forth in OAR 660, Division 12 dated October 30, 2006.
- ☑ **Plan Conformity, Other** – Preparation of this TSP included a review of the goals and policies of applicable state, regional, and local transportation plans, as well as the City's Comprehensive Plan and development ordinances. Other plans considered in the preparation of this TSP included:
  - Oregon Transportation Plan
  - 1999 Oregon Highway Plan
  - Oregon Rail Plan, 2001
  - Regional Freight Study
  - Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
  - Oregon Access Management Rules (OAR 734-051)
  - Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
  - Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
  - Jackson County Transportation System Plan, March 2005
  - Jackson County Bicycle Master Plan
  - Transit Oriented Design (TOD) and Transit Corridor Development Strategies for the Rogue Valley
  - Rogue Valley Transit District Plan
  - City of Central Point Comprehensive Plan
  - City of Medford Transportation System Plan
  - City of Central Point Zoning Ordinance
  - City of Central Point Subdivision Ordinance
  - City of Central Point Public Works Standards
  - Other plans

### 2.3. Central Point Forward, Fair City Vision 2020

Over the course of time, there are many documents and plans that are used in guiding the development practices of any community. The most significant of these documents is the one that identifies a community's long-term vision for its future. The City of Central Point has developed such a vision plan, *Central Point Forward, Fair City Vision 2020*. Preparation of this plan was based on considerable citizen involvement in defining the preferred future of the City, including the role transportation will play as the vision unfolds. Within the scope of the visioning process, citizens defined a system of values, goals, strategies, and actions to be applied over the course of the next thirteen years. When completed, there were six categories defining the City's vision and strategies for attaining that vision. One of those categories included Transportation.

For transportation, the citizens of Central Point defined as a core value the planning and development of a system of transportation and infrastructure that is modern, efficient, and sensitive to the environment<sup>7</sup>. For transportation, the Vision Plan identified three goals, thirteen strategies,

---

<sup>7</sup> Central Point Forward, Fair City Vision 2020, April 26, 2007, page 6

and eight actions. Each of these goals, strategies, and actions has been addressed in this TSP.

#### **2.4. Oregon Transportation Planning Rule**

The need to update the TSP is driven by the requirements of the Oregon TPR. In accordance with the TPR, local transportation plans at a minimum must:

- ☒ Establish a system of transportation facilities and services adequate to meet identified local transportation needs and shall be consistent with regional TSPs and adopted elements of the state TSP;
- ☒ Be adopted as part of the City's comprehensive plan (Comprehensive Plan); and
- ☒ Be coordinated with affected state and federal agencies, local governments, special districts, and private providers of transportation services (Plan Conformity).

The goals and policies of the City's TSP have also been reviewed for consistency with the Planning and Implementation Guidelines established by Goal 12, Transportation, and modified as necessary to address the following key provisions of Goal 12:

- ☒ Planning - To the fullest extent possible transportation systems should be planned to utilize existing facilities and rights-of-way;
- ☒ Planning - Population densities and peak hour travel patterns of existing and planned developments should be considered in the choice of transportation modes for trips taken by persons. While high density developments with concentrated trip origins and destinations should be designated to be principally served by mass transit, low-density developments with dispersed origins and destinations should be principally served by all transportation modes, including automobiles, multiple use trails, public transportation, bicycles, etc.;
- ☒ Planning - Plans providing for a transportation system should consider as a major determinant the carrying capacity of the air, land, and water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources;
- ☒ Implementation - The number and location of major transportation facilities should conform to the applicable state or local land use plans and policies designed to direct urban expansion to areas identified as necessary and suitable for urban development;
- ☒ Implementation - Plans for new or for improvement of major transportation facilities should identify the positive and negative impacts on:
  - Local land use patterns;
  - Environmental quality;
  - Energy use and resources;
  - Existing transportation systems; and
  - Fiscal resources in a manner sufficient to enable local governments to rationally consider the issues posed by the construction and operation of such facilities.

- ☒ Implementation - Lands adjacent to major mass transit stations, freeway interchanges, and major air, land and water terminals should be managed and controlled so as to be consistent with and supportive of the land use and development patterns identified in the comprehensive plan of the jurisdiction within which the facilities are located; and
- ☒ Implementation - Plans should provide for a detailed management program to assign respective implementation roles and responsibilities to those governmental bodies operating in the planning area and having interests in carrying out the goal.

Additionally, the TSP goals and policies were reviewed to confirm that the following required elements have been addressed:

- ☒ A coordinated network of transportation facilities adequate to serve state, regional, and local transportation needs;
- ☒ A determination of transportation needs;
- ☒ A road plan for arterial and collector streets and standards for the layout of local streets and other non-collector street connections; and
- ☒ An inventory and general assessment of existing and committed transportation facilities and services by function, type, capacity, and condition;
- ☒ A public transportation plan;
- ☒ A bicycle and pedestrian plan;
- ☒ An air, rail, water and pipeline transportation plan;
- ☒ A transportation system management plan and demand management plan (for areas greater than 25,000 persons)
- ☒ A parking plan;
- ☒ Policies and land use regulations for TSP implementation; and
- ☒ A transportation financing program.

## **2.5. Plan Conformity, Other**

The objective of the state's transportation program is to assure that the preparation and content of local transportation system plans support other local, regional and state transportation plans. The following identifies each of the local, regional and state plans, the City's Comprehensive Plan, and land development regulations, including a summary of changes required for conformity.

**2.5.1. Oregon Transportation Plan, 2006 (OTP):** With the exception of the designation of Hwy. 99 as noted below, the TSP goals and policies are consistent with the OTP goals and policies.

**2.5.2. 1999 Oregon Highway Plan (OHP):** As its name implies the OHP is the state's twenty year plan for managing and improving its highway system. The OHP sets forth the

state's guiding vision for the future of the state highway system, and sets forth goals, policies and actions (the Policy Element) necessary to attain its vision. The OHP also includes an analysis of system needs, revenue forecasts, investment and implementation strategies, and performance measurements.

The goals and policies of this TSP are consistent with the OHP, with one exception resulting from a jurisdictional exchange affecting the District Highway designation of Hwy. 99. On May 14, 2004, by City of Central Point Resolution No. 1015 the jurisdiction of Hwy. 99 from Mile Post 1.64 to Mile Post 2.18 was transferred to the City and re-designated as a Major Arterial. Within the City's urban area there remain two short sections, one north of Mile Post 1.64 and one south of Mile Post .063 that retain the District Highway designation. The City's Street Classification Map has been modified to reflect these changes.

**2.5.3. 2001 Oregon Rail Plan:** The goals, policies and actions set forth in the Air & Rail chapter of the TSP are consistent with the Oregon Rail Plan.

**2.5.4. Regional Freight Study, 2006:** The Regional Freight Study identified the section of Pine Street through the downtown as a freight route. As stated in the City's 2000 TSP and its Vision 2020, the preference is that freight be diverted from that section of Pine Street within the Central Business District.

**2.5.5. Statewide Transportation Improvement Program:** The goals, policies and actions set forth in the TSP are consistent with the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

**2.5.6. Oregon Access Management Rules (ORS 734-015):** The goals, policies and actions set forth in the Access Management chapter of the TSP are consistent with ORS 734-015.

**2.5.7. Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan:** The goals, policies and actions set forth in the Bicycle and Pedestrian chapter of the TSP are consistent with the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

**2.5.8. Regional Transportation Plan 2005-2030 (RTP):** Aside from Goal 12 and the TPR, the RTP is the most significant contributing document with regard to preparation of this TSP. Many of the findings and compliance statements contained in the RTP are relied upon for compliance of this TSP, particularly in reference to state and federal plans and programs. The goals, objectives and policies of this TSP were compared against, and determined to be consistent with, those of the RTP, with the exception of the following two items as follows:

1. **Hwy. 99 Classification** – As discussed, subsequent to the adoption of the OHP and the RTP, Hwy. 99 was transferred to the City and downgraded from District Highway to Major Arterial Street. When the OHP and RTP are updated they will reflect the change in designation of Hwy. 99 to Major Arterial Street.
2. **Regional Freight Study** – In the Regional Freight Study, the RTP designates Pine Street, from Front Street to Hamrick Road as a freight route. The freight designation conflicted with goals and policies of the prior TSP (2000) and the

City's Vision Plan. In this TSP Pine Street, west of I-5 is retained as part of the freight network, but is not identified as a major freight route (Figure 11.12). Additional discussion on this issue is presented in Chapter 11.

In addition to the goals and policies, the RTP also included seven performance measures. The purpose of the performance measures is to provide assurances that a reduction in the region's reliance on the automobile would be achieved. The City of Central Point's TSP acknowledges these performance measures and has included similar supporting performance measures for the City. The RTP performance measures are presented in Table 2.1: Alternative RTP Performance Measures. For comparison purposes the City's performance measures are presented in Table 2.1 in parenthesis .

**Table 2.1 Alternative RTP Performance Measure**

| Measure                                                                                   | How Measured                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Current 2000                                        | Benchmark 2005 (2008)                                           | Benchmark 2010                                                  | Benchmark 2015                                                  | Benchmark 2020                                                    | Benchmark 2030 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Measure 1: Transit & bicycle/pedestrian mode share                                        | The percent of total daily trips taken by transit and the combination of bicycle and walking (non-motorized) modes. Determined from best available data (e.g., model output and/or transportation survey data). | % daily trips<br><br>Transit: 1.0<br>bike/ped.: 8.2 | % daily trips<br><br>Transit: 1.2 (1.2)<br>bike/ped.: 8.4 (8.4) | % daily trips<br><br>Transit: 1.6 (1.6)<br>bike/ped.: 8.4 (8.4) | % daily trips<br><br>Transit: 2.2 (2.2)<br>bike/ped.: 9.8 (9.8) | % daily trips<br><br>Transit: 3.0 (3.0)<br>bike/ped.: 11.0 (11.0) |                |
| Measure 2: Percent of Dwelling Units (DU's) within ¼ mile walk to 30-min. transit service | Determined through GIS mapping. Current estimates are that 12% of DU's are within ¼ mile walking distance of RVTD transit routes.                                                                               | 12%                                                 | 20% (38%)                                                       | 30% (40%)                                                       | 40%                                                             | 50% (55%)                                                         | (65%)          |
| Measure 3: Collectors & arterials w/bicycle facilities                                    | Determined through GIS Mapping. Current estimates are that 21% of collectors and arterials in the City have provisions for bicyclists.                                                                          | 21%                                                 | 28% (16%)                                                       | 37% (21%)                                                       | 48%                                                             | 60% (48%)                                                         | (70%)          |
| Measure 4: Percentage of collectors and arterials in TOD areas with sidewalks.            | Determined through GIS mapping. Current estimates are that 46% of collectors and                                                                                                                                | 47%                                                 | 50% (70%)                                                       | 56% (75%)                                                       | 64%                                                             | 75% 80%)                                                          | (85%)          |

**City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030**

|                                                               |                                                                                                                                    |     |               |                   |                   |                   |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|
|                                                               | arterials in TOD areas have sidewalks                                                                                              |     |               |                   |                   |                   |       |
| Measure 5: Percentage mixed-use DU's in new development       | Determined by tracking building permits – the ratio between new DU's in TODS and total new DU's in the region.                     | 0%  | 9% (25%)      | 26% (35%)         | 41%               | 49% (50%)         | (60%) |
| Measure 6: Percentage mixed-use employment in new development | Estimated from annual employment files from State – represents the ratio of new employment in TODs over total regional employment. | 0%  | 9% (9%)       | 23% (23%)         | 36%               | 44% (44%)         | (50%) |
| Measure 7: Alternative Transportation Funding                 | Estimated from annual employment files from State – represents the ratio of new employment in TODs over regional employment.       | N/A | \$950,000 (-) | \$2.5 million (-) | \$4.3 million (-) | \$6.4 million (-) | (-)   |

**2.5.9. Jackson County Transportation System Plan 2005:** The goals and policies of this TSP have been reviewed against Jackson County's TSP and determined to be consistent. No changes were required.

**2.5.10. Jackson County Bicycle Master Plan:** The goals, policies and actions set forth in the Bicycle and Pedestrian chapter of the TSP is consistent with the Jackson County Bicycle Master Plan.

**2.5.11. Rogue Valley Transit District Plan:** The goals, policies and actions set forth in the Transit chapter of the TSP are consistent with the Rogue Valley Transit Plan.

**2.5.12. City of Medford Transportation Plan:** Similar to Jackson County, the City's transportation network interfaces in several locations with that of the City of Medford. Central Point's TSP was compared with Medford's TSP and was found to be consistent on all levels. The functional classification of streets, particularly the arterials system, is consistent as they traverse jurisdictional lines. Similarly the bicycle and pedestrian systems facilitate inter-jurisdictional movement. No changes were required to assure consistency between the two TSPs.

**2.5.13. City of Central Point Comprehensive Plan:** This TSP has been prepared based on the land use classifications and distribution in the City's Comprehensive Plan.

**2.5.14. City of Central Point Zoning Ordinance:** As a result of the preparation of this TSP, numerous incidents were revealed requiring amendment of the City of Central Point Municipal Code, Title 17, Zoning.

**2.5.15. City of Central Point Subdivision Ordinance:** As a result of the preparation of this TSP, numerous incidents were revealed requiring amendment of the Central Point Municipal Code, Title 16, Subdivisions.

## **2.6. Other Plans**

Over the course of the past five years, the City has completed three significant transportation studies for Hwy. 99, East Pine Street, and the Twin Creeks Transit Oriented Development district. The findings and recommendations from these three plans have been reviewed and incorporated into this TSP. The following is a brief description of each study and its relationship to the TSP.

**2.6.1. Highway 99 Corridor Plan:** This plan was prepared in 2005 for the purpose of identifying improvements to Hwy. 99 consistent with commercial revitalization of the Hwy. 99 corridor through Central Point. The findings and recommendations of the Highway 99 Corridor Plan have been incorporated in this TSP.

**2.6.2. East Pine Street Transportation Plan:** This plan was prepared in 2004 by JRH Transportation Engineering. The purpose of this plan was to provide an assessment of the future transportation infrastructure of the East Pine Street corridor area to accommodate regional and local traffic growth. The plan forecast traffic growth through the year 2023 and recommended improvements necessary to maintain an acceptable level of service. The findings and recommendations of the East Pine Street Transportation Plan have been updated and incorporated in this TSP.

**2.6.3. Central Point Transit Oriented Development Traffic Impact Study:** This study was completed in August 2000 by JRH Transportation Engineers to evaluate the traffic impacts of Central Point's Transit Oriented Development District. The findings and recommendations have been incorporated in this Plan.

## **2.7. Conclusion**

The TSP as presented in this document is found to be consistent with all applicable federal, state, regional and local transportation plans. It is the City's intent, throughout the duration of this TSP, to continue monitoring and managing the TSP as necessary to maintain compliance with federal, state, regional, and local transportation system plans and changing transportation and land use needs.

## Chapter 3 – Land Use & Transportation Planning

### 3.1. Introduction

By the year 2030, it is expected that the City of Central Point's population will approach 26,000, making Central Point the second largest city in the Rogue Valley. To accommodate the City's projected growth, land will be needed for housing and jobs as well as other supporting land uses. Improvements to the City's transportation system will be needed to accommodate continued growth. The amount, use, and distribution of future development, and the policies governing land use and development will determine the need for improvements to the transportation system. Consequently, the ability of the City to effectively incorporate transportation planning as an element of its land use planning process is critical to the continued enhancement of the quality of life offered to the citizens of Central Point.

The purpose of this chapter is to acknowledge the relationship within the City's Comprehensive Plan between land use and transportation planning. The findings, goals, and policies presented in the TSP have been integrated with the findings, goals, and policies of the City's land use program as presented in the Comprehensive Plan. It is not the purpose of this chapter to restate the City's land use program, but instead to reference those elements of the Comprehensive Plan that most directly determine the transportation needs of the City.

Within the City's Comprehensive Plan there are four elements that have a noticeable impact on transportation planning. Those elements are the Land Use Element, the Population Element, the Housing Element, and the Economic Element. Together these elements affect the rate, character, and location of development within the City's urban area, which then determines the need for transportation services. Each of these elements and their role in the City's transportation planning process will be discussed and noted as a reference to the TSP.

### 3.2. The Land Use Element

Currently, within the City's urban area there are 2,890 acres of land distributed over eleven (11) land use classifications. Included in the land use classifications is a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) overlay zone. The land use classifications identified in the Land Use Element are supported by fourteen (14) zoning districts, with nine (9) residential zones and five (5) commercial/industrial zones. Development within each zoning district is regulated by standards set forth in the City's Land Development Code. Collectively, this system of land use classifications, zoning districts, and development standards establish the limits and tools for the development of an efficient and timely transportation system.

**Land Use Classifications:** The land use classifications are the basis for determining traffic generation/services. The transportation modeling used in the preparation and maintenance of the TSP relies on the land use classifications defined in the Land Use Element. Changes in the City's land use classifications should be accompanied by supplemental traffic analysis to identify any impacts and mitigation measures necessary to maintain a balanced transportation system.

**Zoning Districts:** Zoning districts are a higher order refinement of the land use classification system. Zoning districts must be compatible with the underlying land use designation. For each zoning district, specific types of uses are identified and regulated in accordance with the standards set forth in the City's Land Development Code. Allowed

uses within a zoning district are consistent with the underlying land use classification.

**Development Standards:** Throughout the City of Central Point Municipal Code (CPMC) there are codified standards that control improvements to the City's transportation system. Most of these development standards are contained in the City's Land Development Code (Chapter 17). Another source of development standards can be found in the City of Central Point Public Works Standards. The City's development standards are designed to support and implement the multi-modal goals and policies of the TSP.

### **3.3. Buildable Land Inventory (BLI)**

One of the significant considerations in preparation of the TSP is the availability and distribution of vacant lands within the City's urban area. The BLI provides an accounting of buildable lands by land use designation, zoning, and Transportation Area Zones (TAZ) making it possible to determine the location and type of new development, and the future impact of that development on the City's transportation system. The BLI is a support document to the Land Use Element.

### **3.4. Growth Projections**

The rate of development of the City's buildable lands and its impact on the transportation system is a function of the rate of population and employment growth. The Population Element and Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan addresses the City's projected population growth and housing needs throughout the planning period, while the Economic Element addresses the City's expected employment growth. Together these three Comprehensive Plan elements will, in conjunction with the BLI, provide the basis for identifying the rate, location of new development, and the impact of that development on the City's transportation system.

**3.4.1. Population Element:** The Population Element identifies the City's projected population growth and population characteristics throughout the planning period. It is expected that by the year 2030 the City's population will be approaching 29,000 people.

**3.4.2. Housing Element:** The demand for housing is a function of population growth and household characteristics such as housing type, vacancy rate, and persons per household. The Housing Element evaluates the housing needs of the City throughout the planning period. The Housing Element, in conjunction with the Land Use Element, determines the mix and distribution of housing within the urban area. As evidenced in the Housing Element, the City is encouraging use of the TOD overlay to encourage mixed residential development and the use of multi-modal transportation opportunities.

**3.4.3. Economic Element:** Similar to the Housing Element, the Economic Element, using population projections, estimates job creation throughout the planning period. Together with the Land Use Element, the Economic Element provides information on the rate and location of jobs.

### **3.5. Transit Oriented Development**

Any discussion of land use and transportation planning is not complete without the inclusion of transit oriented development (TOD). As used in this chapter, the term "TOD" refers to mixed-

use, pedestrian friendly development<sup>8</sup>. Transit-oriented design is a general description of a set of development strategies designed to create an atmosphere that is safe, convenient, and easily accessible by foot, bicycle and transit users.

With the completion of the *Transit-Oriented Design and Transit Corridor Development Strategies Study* (TOD 1999 Study), cities within the metropolitan area have been successfully applying transit-oriented development (TOD) as a land use strategy. The City of Central Point is an excellent example of the application of TOD strategies. Shortly after completion of the TOD 1999 Study the City adopted TOD standards and in December of 2000, a final plan for the Twin Creeks Transit-Oriented Development, a 230-acre TOD project was approved, and development commenced. Today the Twin Creeks TOD is a successful representation of applied TOD strategies. The Twin Creeks TOD has been a positive influence on the land use planning for the City and has set the standard for new, in-fill and redevelopment standards throughout the City. Today the City has a TOD designation for the City's Central Business District and for the commercial area along Highway 99. Most recently the citizens of Central Point have reasserted in *Vision 2020* their continued endorsement of land use policies that support and enhance the City's transit oriented land use program.

The use of TOD strategies has been endorsed on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and is represented in three of the seven RTP performance measures identified in Chapter 2. These performance standards have been acknowledged by the City and included in the TSP as land use performance measures for the City, and are presented in Table 3.1. The RTP performance measures are presented below and included in the TSP as future performance benchmarks for the City.

**Table 3.1. RTP Alternative Performance Measures**

| Measure                                                                                     | How Measured                                                                                                                       | Current<br>2008 | Benchmark<br>2010 | Benchmark<br>2015 | Benchmark<br>2020 | Benchmark<br>2030 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Measure 2:<br>Percent of Dwelling Units (DUs) within ¼ mile walk to 30-min. transit service | Determined through GIS mapping. Current estimates are that 12% of DUs are within ¼ mile walking distance of RVTD transit routes.   | 12%             | 30%               | 40%               | 50%               |                   |
| Measure 5:<br>Percentage mixed-use DUs in new development.                                  | Determined by tracking building permits – the ratio between new DUs in TODs and total new DU's in the region.                      | 0%              | 26%               | 41%               | 49%               |                   |
| Measure 6:<br>Percentage mixed-use employment in new development.                           | Estimated from annual employment files from State – represents the ratio of new employment in TODs over total regional employment. | 9%              | 23%               | 36%               | 44%               |                   |

---

<sup>8</sup> Transportation Planning Rule

**Table 3.2. City of Central Point Performance Measures**

| Measure                                                                                                          | How Measured                                                                                                                                           | Current<br>2008 | Benchmark<br>2010 | Benchmark<br>2020 | Benchmark<br>2030 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Measure 3.1:<br>Percent of<br>Dwelling<br>Units (DUs)<br>within ¼ mile<br>walk to 30-<br>min. transit<br>service | Determined through<br>GIS mapping.<br>Current estimates are<br>that 12% of DUs are<br>within ¼ mile<br>walking distance of<br>RVTD transit routes.     | 38%             | 40%               | 55%               | 65%               |
| Measure 3.2:<br>Percentage<br>mixed-use<br>DUs in new<br>development.                                            | Determined by<br>tracking building<br>permits – the ratio<br>between new DUs<br>in TODs and total<br>new DU's in the<br>region.                        | 25%             | 35%               | 50%               | 60%               |
| Measure 3.3:<br>Percentage<br>mixed-use<br>employment<br>in new<br>development.                                  | Estimated from<br>annual<br>employment files<br>from State –<br>represents the ratio<br>of new<br>employment in<br>TODs over total<br>city employment. | 9%              | 23%               | 44%               | 50%               |

### 3.6. Land Use Goals and Policies

**GOAL 3.1: TO EFFECTIVELY MANAGE THE USE OF LAND WITHIN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA IN A MANNER THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH, AND THAT SUPPORTS, THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN.**

*Policy 3.1.1. The City shall manage the land use element of the Comprehensive Plan in a manner that enhances livability for the citizens of Central Point as set forth in the Transportation System Plan.*

*Policy 3.1.2. The City shall continuously monitor and update the Land Development Code to maintain best practices in transit oriented design consistent with the overall land use objectives of the City.*

## Chapter 4 – Existing Transportation Conditions

### 4.1. Introduction

Section 660-012-0020(3) of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requires that all transportation system plans include an inventory of existing transportation facilities and services by function, type, capacity and condition. In accordance with the TPR, this chapter will inventory the condition of the City's existing transportation system. The City's transportation system is comprised of five (5) transportation modes:

1. Street System
2. Pedestrian System
3. Bicycle System
4. Transit System
5. Rail System

An inventory of each of these transportation modes has been completed as part of the 2008 TSP planning process. The inventory data comes from a variety of sources including the City's physical inventory of its street, pedestrian, and bikeway systems. For the transit system, the facilities inventory information was provided by the Rogue Valley Transportation District. For the rail system, the inventory information was provided by Central Oregon Pacific Railroad (CORP).

### 4.2. Street System

The City's street system is comprised of over 60 miles of roadway serving a variety of functions from arterial and collector streets to local residential and commercial streets. Each street type within the City has a specific functional classification.

**4.2.1. Functional Classification:** Streets, whether public or private, do not operate independent of one another but as a network of roadways. The City's street system is comprised of a hierarchy of street types, each designed and constructed with the objective of serving a specific function within the City's street system, the regional street system, and the state roadway system. The City's street classification system is derived from the Federal Highway Administration's (FHA) functional classification definitions, which consists of four (4) basic street types: principal arterials, minor arterials, collector streets, and local streets. Each street classification describes the role of that classification in serving the flow of trips through a community's street network, as well as how it interfaces with regional, state, and national street networks. The following describes each of the City's street classifications:

**Principal Arterials.** The City's principal arterial system is designed to link major activity centers within the metro area. Principal arterials have the highest traffic volumes, serve the longest trip desires, and should be integrated with local and regional arterial systems.

To effectively serve its design objective, principal arterials are either partially, or fully, access controlled. In order to preserve the identification of controlled access facilities, the principal arterial system is further classified as interstate freeways (I-5), principal arterials, or minor arterials. The minimum design standard for principal arterials will include bike lanes and sidewalks.

**Intermodal Connectors.** Another, often overlooked function of principal arterials is their role as intermodal connectors linking regional intermodal terminals to the highway network. Although they account for less than one percent (1%) of National Highway System mileage, intermodal connectors are unique in their role as key conduits for the timely and reliable delivery of goods, and hence the regional economy.

The U.S. Department of Transportation identifies Pine/Biddle between I-5 and Hwy. 62 as an intermodal connector<sup>9</sup>. This stretch of arterial street is referred to as the Rogue Valley International Airport intermodal connector. It is described as an Airport intermodal connector connecting I-5 and Hwy. 62 with the Airport. The identification of intermodal connectors, their role in the community's transportation and economic system, and the investment needs necessary for their efficient operation throughout the planning period are deserving of special acknowledgement.

*Changes to this classification require amendment to the TSP and would be based on factors such as changes in land use, including expansion of the urban growth boundary.*

**Minor Arterials.** The minor arterial street system includes all arterials not classified as a principal arterial, contains facilities that place more emphasis on land access than principal arterials, and offer a lower level of traffic mobility. Minor arterials may carry local bus routes and provide intra-community connectivity but ideally should not penetrate identifiable neighborhoods. The minimum design standard for minor arterials will include bike lanes and sidewalks.

*Changes to this classification require an amendment to the TSP and would be based on factors such as changes in land use, including expansion of the urban growth boundary.*

**Collector Streets.** As their name implies, collector streets collect and distribute traffic from principal arterials and minor arterials to the local street system or directly to local destinations. Collector streets differ from the arterial system in that the collector system may penetrate residential neighborhoods, distributing trips from the arterials through the area to their ultimate destination.

*Changes to this classification require an amendment to the TSP and would be based on factors such as changes in land use, including expansion of the urban growth boundary.*

**Local Streets.** The local street system consists of all streets not classified as one of the other higher order streets. As their name implies local streets provide adjacent residential, commercial, and industrial land uses with access to the City's higher order streets. Local streets typically offer the lowest level of mobility. Within the City there are two basic types of local streets as follows:

---

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Official NHS Intermodal Connector Listing, Rogue Valley International Airport

**Residential Streets.** Residential streets provide direct access from the arterial network to local land uses. Residential access streets provide access to low and medium density residentially zoned lands. Residential streets can be further classified based on the number of residential units served.

*Changes to this classification require an amendment to the TSP and would be based on factors such as changes in land use, including expansion of the urban growth boundary.*

**Commercial/Industrial Streets.** Commercial/Industrial streets provide direct access from the arterial network to local commercial and industrial land uses. Commercial/Industrial streets provide access to commercial and industrial land uses and provide localized traffic circulation. They serve commercial, manufacturing, and industrially zoned lands.

*Changes to this classification require an amendment to the TSP and would be based on factors such as changes in land use, including expansion of the urban growth boundary.*

**Private Streets.** Privately owned streets provide direct access from the arterial network to local land uses. Private streets may serve both residential and commercial land uses and provide localized traffic circulation. Private streets are no longer permitted by the City.

*Changes to this classification require the streets to be brought to public street standards and dedicated to the City without modification to this TSP.*

Figure 4.1 *Functional Classification System Map*, illustrates the City's existing arterial and collector street classification system.

**4.2.2. Jurisdictional Responsibility:** Several jurisdictions, including the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Jackson County, are responsible for portions of the existing street system within the study area. Figure 4.2 *Jurisdictional Responsibilities Map* identifies the jurisdictions responsible for each street within the City.

**State Maintained Facilities.** Within the planning area, ODOT maintains Interstate 5 (I-5) as well as portions of Pine Street near the Central Point/I-5 Interchange and portions of Highway 99. Each of these roadways is identified as a four-lane divided interstate freeway with posted speeds of 55 and 65 miles per hour in the Central Point area. It is classified in the 1999 *Oregon Highway Plan* as having interstate significance and serves as the primary north and south route for traffic traveling through the area.

*Interstate 5 (I-5)* is the main Interstate highway on the West Coast, paralleling the Pacific Ocean from Canada to Mexico and serving some of the largest cities in the western U.S., including Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, Salem, Sacramento, San Francisco/Oakland, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Within the planning area, ODOT maintains I-5 which is a four-lane divided freeway with posted speeds of 55 and

65 miles per hour. The City is bisected by I-5, which runs in a northwest to southeast direction on the east side of downtown. There are two I-5 interchanges that serve Central Point. The first is located at Pine Street (Exit 33) near the center of the city and serves the downtown area, residential areas in east Central Point, the airport, and the industrial area located on Biddle Road and Table Rock Road. The second is the Seven Oaks Interchange (Exit 35) located approximately two (2) miles north of the City center.

Highway 99 serves as another north-south access through Central Point. In 2004, a jurisdictional transfer was completed conveying to the City of Central Point the section of Highway 99 from Mile Post 1.64 to Mile Post 2.18. Within the City's urban area there remain two short sections, one north of Mile Post 1.64 and one south of Mile Post .063 that retain the District Highway designation. The City's Street Classification Map has been modified to reflect these changes.<sup>10</sup>.


**County Maintained Facilities.** Jackson County has jurisdiction over many roads within the Central Point UGB, including many sections of the City's arterial and collector street system such as East and West Pine Street, Hanley Road, Beall Lane, Grant Road, Taylor Road, Freeman Road, North 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Upton Road, Beebe Road, and Gebhard Road. As a result of the loss of Timber Revenue Sharing funds, the County has declared that it will no longer maintain or otherwise compensate for the jurisdictional exchange of roads within a city's jurisdiction. The County does not anticipate any short-term solutions to this situation.

**City Maintained Facilities.** As illustrated in Figure 4.2., the City maintains the majority of the streets within the Central Point urban area. The cross-sections range from two lane local streets to five lane arterial streets with posted speed ranges between 20 and 40 mph.


**Privately Maintained Facilities.** Throughout the City there are a limited number of privately owned and maintained streets. The City no longer allows the creation of private streets.

---

<sup>10</sup> City of Central Point Resolution No. 1015/Jurisdictional Transfer Agreement No. 746



**Figure 4.1**  
**Functional Classification Map**  
**2007**



**Figure 4.2**  
**Jurisdictional Service Map**  
**2008-2030**

**4.2.3. Traffic Safety Analysis:** The crash histories on the major intersections within the City were reviewed to identify potential intersection safety concerns. Crash records were obtained from the ODOT Crash Summary Books<sup>11</sup> and the City of Central Point Police Department for the period of January 1, 2002 through December 31, 2006. Table 4.1 provides a summary of this crash data for each of the study intersections. As illustrated in Table 4.1, all study area intersections are currently operating at less than 1.0 accidents per Million Entering Vehicles (MEV), indicating that there are currently no apparent safety issues within the City's street system.

**Table 4.1. Crash Rate, City of Central Point, 2006**

| <i>Intersection</i>                       | <i>Threshold Used in Evaluation (MEV)</i> | <i>2002</i> | <i>2003</i> | <i>2004</i> | <i>2005</i> | <i>2006</i> | <i>ADT</i> | <i>Crash Rate (MEV)</i> |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Beall & Freeman                           | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 1           | 0           | 5,620      | 0.10                    |
| Beall & Bursell                           | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 4,810      | 0.00                    |
| Beall & Grant                             | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 3,360      | 0.00                    |
| Beall & Hanley                            | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 7,000      | 0.00                    |
| Beall & Hwy. 99                           | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 4           | 2           | 1           | 18,480     | 0.21                    |
| Taylor & Grant (south)                    | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 1,550      | 0.00                    |
| Taylor & Grant (north)                    | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 1,740      | 0.00                    |
| Bursell & Hopkins                         | 1.0                                       | 2           | 1           | 0           | 1           | 1           | 4,490      | 0.61                    |
| Wilson & Table Rock                       | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 14,960     | 0.00                    |
| Vilas & Table Rock                        | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 23,870     | 0.00                    |
| New Haven & Hamrick                       | 1.0                                       | 0           | 1           | 0           | 1           | 0           | 11,850     | 0.09                    |
| Gebhard & Wilson                          | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 1,860      | 0.00                    |
| Grant & Scenic                            | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 1,710      | 0.00                    |
| Scenic & Hwy. 99                          | 1.0                                       | 0           | 1           | 0           | 1           | 0           | 9,660      | 0.11                    |
| Haskell & Taylor                          | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 2,840      | 0.00                    |
| Haskell & West Pine                       | 1.0                                       | 1           | 2           | 2           | 3           | 2           | 11,320     | 0.48                    |
| Upton & Peninger                          | 1.0                                       | 0           | 1           | 1           | 0           | 0           | 4,590      | 0.24                    |
| Freeman & Hopkins                         | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 7,650      | 0.00                    |
| Meadowbrook & East Pine                   | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 1           | 0           | 13,540     | 0.04                    |
| Beebe & Hamrick                           | 1.0                                       | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 12,960     | 0.00                    |
| Peninger & East Pine                      | 1.0                                       | 10          | 3           | 3           | 5           | 4           | 27,340     | 0.50                    |
| Hamrick & East Pine                       | 1.0                                       | 2           | 0           | 3           | 1           | 3           | 24,550     | 0.20                    |
| Hwy. 99 & East Pine (Front)               | 1.0                                       | 4           | 7           | 2           | 4           | 4           | 22,230     | 0.52                    |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> & East Pine               | 1.0                                       | 3           | 3           | 5           | 3           | 2           | 15,420     | 0.57                    |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> & East Pine               | 1.0                                       | 5           | 4           | 4           | 4           | 5           | 14,070     | 0.86                    |
| 4 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | 1.0                                       | 2           | 4           | 4           | 1           | 2           | 13,430     | 0.53                    |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | 1.0                                       | 3           | 1           | 1           | 1           | 2           | 15,430     | 0.28                    |
| 10 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine              | 1.0                                       | 12          | 9           | 8           | 10          | 8           | 25,960     | 0.99                    |
| I-5 NB & East Pine                        | 1.0                                       | 2           | 2           | 2           | 2           | 1           | 26,960     | 0.18                    |
| I-5 SB & East Pine                        | 1.0                                       | 2           | 2           | 2           | 2           | 1           | 23,460     | 0.21                    |
| Table Rock & East Pine                    | 1.0                                       | 1           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 16,060     | 0.03                    |
| Hazel & 3 <sup>rd</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 1.0                                       | 3           | 0           | 1           | 0           | 0           | 3,160      | 0.69                    |

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TDATA/car/CAR\\_Publications.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TDATA/car/CAR_Publications.shtml)

**Mobility Measures and Standards:** There are two methods for determining the quality of a street system’s mobility: Level of Service (LOS) and Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (V/C Ratio). The City uses the LOS as its primary methodology for determining the street systems efficiency. The City also uses V/C Ratio methodology as a secondary measurement of efficiency, while ODOT and Jackson County only use the V/C Ratio methodology.

**Level of Service (LOS):** The LOS methodology was developed to quantify the quality of service of transportation facilities. LOS quantifies the degree of comfort (including such elements as travel time, number of stops, total amount of stopped delay and impediments caused by other vehicles) afforded to drivers as they travel through an intersection or along a roadway section. In general, level of service is based on total delay. This parameter is defined as the total elapsed time from when a vehicle stops at the end of a queue until the vehicle departs from the stop line. LOS ranges from “A” to “F”, with LOS “A” indicating the most desirable condition and LOS “F” indicating an unsatisfactory condition. *The Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) LOS designations for signalized and stop-controlled intersections are provided in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 respectively. The City uses LOS as a performance standard for its traffic facilities. The maximum level of service for Central Point facilities is level of service “D”. With the exception of ODOT facilities the LOS methodology will be used in identifying existing and future mobility standards for all other major roadway systems. As previously noted the City acknowledges that the County uses the V/C Ratio methodology. However, it is generally acknowledged that all County roads will at some point come under the City’s jurisdiction, and as such the LOS mobility measure is used.

**Table 4.2. Highway Capacity Manual Level of Service Designations for Signalized**

| Level of Service   | Traffic Flow         | Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Delay Range*  |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| A (Desirable)      | Free                 | Traffic flows freely with minimum or no delay. Drivers can maneuver easily and find freedom in operation.                                                                                                                                                                                  | <=10          |
| B (Desirable)      | Stable               | Traffic still flows smoothly with few delays. Some drivers feel somewhat restricted within groups of vehicles.                                                                                                                                                                             | >10 and <=20  |
| C (Desirable)      | Stable               | Traffic generally flows smoothly but occasionally vehicles may be delayed through one signal cycle. Desired urban area design level. Backups may develop behind turning vehicles. Most drivers feel somewhat restricted.                                                                   | >20 and <= 35 |
| D (Acceptable)     | Approaching Unstable | Traffic delays may be more than one signal cycle during peak hours but excessive back-ups do not occur. Considered acceptable urban design level. Maneuverability is limited during short periods due to temporary back-ups.                                                               | >35 and <=55  |
| E (Unsatisfactory) | Unstable             | Delay may be great and up to several signal cycles. Short period of this level may be tolerated during peak hours in lieu of the cost and disruption attributed to providing a higher level of service. There are typically long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersections. | >55 and <= 80 |
| F (Unsatisfactory) | Forced               | Excessive delay causes reduced capacity. Always considered unsatisfactory. May be tolerated in recreational areas where occurrence is rare. Traffic is backed up from other locations and may restrict or prevent movement of vehicles at the intersection.                                | >= 80         |

\*Delay Range related to the range of average vehicle delay (in seconds per vehicle) that falls within the associated

level of service.

### Volume-to-Capacity Ratio

Volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio is another measure of effectiveness that is used to describe the level of operation of signalized intersections, stop-controlled movements, and roadway segments. A volume-to-capacity ratio measure indicates the percentage of available capacity that is used by traffic demand during a given time period. When the volume-to-capacity ratio exceeds 1.0, traffic queues will form and continue to lengthen until demand reduces to below the capacity. The City of Central Point and Jackson County use the V/C Ratio to provide for consistent traffic analysis with ODOT and because the V/C Ratio is conceptually simpler making it somewhat easier to explain to the general public.

ODOT has jurisdiction over the signalized I-5 ramp terminal intersections at East Pine Street, as well as the intersections of Hwy. 99 & Beall Lane, Hwy. 99 & Scenic Avenue and Peninger Road & East Pine Street. ODOT does not employ LOS methodology. The *1999 Oregon Highway Plan* lists maximum volume-to-capacity ratios for all Oregon highways based on their level of importance within the statewide highway system. Volume-to-capacity ratio provides an indication of capacity sufficiency. The higher the volume-to-capacity ratio, the more congested the facility. The Highway Mobility Standards Policy established standards for mobility that are reasonable and consistent with the directions of other highway plan policies.

The *1999 Oregon Highway Plan* volume-to-capacity ratio standard for I-5 and its interchange components is 0.85. Action 1F.1 of the plan states that the maximum volume-to-capacity ratio for the ramp terminals of interchange ramps shall be the smaller of the values of the volume-to-capacity ratio for the crossroad, or 0.85. All other ODOT intersections within the City of Central Point must operate at a volume-to-capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.90. For both the City and County facilities, the maximum V/C ratio is 0.95.

**Table 4.3. Highway Capacity Manual Level of Service for Stopped Controlled Intersections**

| Level of Service   | Delay Range*  |
|--------------------|---------------|
| A (Desirable)      | <=10          |
| B (Desirable)      | >10 and <=15  |
| C (Desirable)      | >15 and <= 25 |
| D (Acceptable)     | >25 and <= 35 |
| E (Undesirable)    | >35 and <= 50 |
| F (Unsatisfactory) | >50           |

\*Delay Range related to the range of average vehicle delay (in seconds per vehicle) that falls within the associated level of service.

**4.2.4. Existing Operational Analysis:** In 2007, the City completed an operational analysis of the City's existing street system<sup>12</sup>. With the exception of the intersection of Beebe Road and Hamrick Road, the City's arterial and collector street system is currently operating at an acceptable level of service. The LOS at the intersection of Beebe Road

<sup>12</sup> City of Central Point Transportation Plan, Existing Conditions Technical Traffic Report, JRH Transportation Engineering, January 24, 2007

and Hamrick Road is operating at a LOS of E/F (am/pm). All ODOT facilities are operating within their minimum of 0.85 V/C for Interchange 33 ramp terminals and 0.90 V/C for the north and south remaining Oregon Highway 99 segments under state jurisdiction (portions of the intersection at Scenic Road and Beall Lane). The existing operational levels of intersections within the study area are summarized in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4. Level of Service and Vehicle-to-Capacity Ratio**

| Intersection                              | Control Type      | LOS & V/C Standard | Year 2006 A.M. Performance | Year 2006 P.M. Performance |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>WEST SIDE</b>                          |                   |                    |                            |                            |
| Beall & Freeman                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS C                      |
| Beall & Bursell                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Beall & Grant                             | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Beall & Hanley                            | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Beall & Hwy. 99                           | Signalized        | V/C 0.90           | V/C 0.81                   | V/C 0.76                   |
| Taylor & Grant (south)                    | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Taylor & Grant (north)                    | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Bursell & Hopkins                         | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Hwy. 99 & East Pine (Front)               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS C                      |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> & East Pine               | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> & East Pine               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| 4 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS D                      | LOS D                      |
| 10 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine              | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS D                      | LOS C                      |
| Grant & Scenic                            | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Scenic & Hwy. 99                          | Stop/Unsignalized | V/C 0.90           | V/C 0.23                   | V/C 0.64                   |
| Haskell & Taylor                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Haskell & West Pine                       | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS A                      |
| Freeman & Hopkins                         | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Hazel & 3 <sup>rd</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Haskell & Beall                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS C                      |
| <b>EAST SIDE</b>                          |                   |                    |                            |                            |
| Meadowbrook & East Pine                   | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Beebe & Hamrick                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS E                      | LOS F                      |
| Peninger & East Pine                      | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| Hamrick & East Pine                       | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Upton & Peninger                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS B                      |
| I-5 NB & East Pine                        | Signalized        | V/C 0.85           | V/C 0.51                   | V/C 0.77                   |
| I-5 SB & East Pine                        | Signalized        | V/C 0.85           | V/C 0.72                   | V/C 0.65                   |
| Table Rock & East Pine                    | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Wilson & Table Rock                       | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS D                      | LOS D                      |
| Vilas & Table Rock                        | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| New Haven & Hamrick                       | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| Gebhard & Wilson                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS B                      |

#### 4.2.5. Freight Service.

Truck freight transportation within the Central Point UGB is primarily concentrated along the truck routes designated in the Regional Transportation Plan. Figure 4.3 illustrates the City's truck routes, which include Interstate 5 (I-5) and Highway 99 (Front Street). I-5 is the most important freight route in the region carrying approximately 4,000 to 5,000 trucks per day through the area. I-5 not only serves freight heading to destinations within the Central Point UGB, but also serves trucks passing through the region to destinations throughout the West Coast. Currently, the combined volume of freight transported over highway and rail modes in the I-5 corridor through the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Region is estimated at 25 million tons annually, with the majority of this freight carried on the highway system<sup>13</sup>. Additional Central Point Freight Routes as identified in the RVMPO Freight Study (2006) include Table Rock Road, Hamrick Road, East Vilas Road, Pine Street, and Hanley Road.

The Freight Study finds that the freight system is in need of improvements to maintain adequate levels of service to remain competitive and safe. The Freight Study recommended twenty-nine (29) projects that would improve the region's freight system. Of these twenty-nine projects, seven (7) were within Central Point's urban area. These projects and their scoring are listed in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5. RVMPO Freight Study Recommended Projects, City of Central Point**


| Rank | Project                                               | Importance to Freight | Create & Sustain Jobs | Multi-Modal | Remove Barriers | Total Score |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| 6    | Table Rock Rd. & West Vilas Rd. Intersection          | 30                    | 14                    | 0           | 30              | 80          |
| 7    | Table Rock Rd. & Hamrick Rd. Intersection             | 20                    | 30                    | 0           | 30              | 80          |
| 9    | Improve East/West Flow on Pine Street                 | 30                    | 10                    | 6           | 30              | 78          |
| 10   | Improve Traffic Flow at Central Point I-5 Interchange | 30                    | 10                    | 6           | 30              | 76          |
| 21   | Repair Hamrick Rd. South of Pine St.                  | 5                     | 30                    | 0           | 18              | 53          |
| 23   | East Pine St. & Peninger Intersection                 | 10                    | 10                    | 0           | 30              | 50          |
| 27   | Table Rock Rd.: Bear Creek to Pine St./Biddle Rd.     | 20                    | 10                    | 0           | 10              | 40          |

#### 4.3. Transportation Corridor Studies

Within the City, there are two major transportation corridors: Hwy. 99 and Pine Street. Over the years each of these transportation corridors have had studies prepared addressing the transportation role of each in the community and preferred design solutions.

<sup>13</sup> I-5 State of the Interstate Report, ODOT, 2000.

**Pine Street Transportation Corridor.** Pine Street serves as the City's primary east/west major arterial and is also the primary street serving the Central Business District. Additionally, Pine Street is a designated freight route. Because of its history and abutting land uses, Pine Street has been segregated in to two unique sections: East Pine Street and West Pine Street.



**Figure 4.3**  
**Major Truck Routes**  
**2007**

**East Pine Street Plan** (JRH Transportation Engineering, October 2004) – East Pine Street serves as a typical major arterial with limited access. In 2005, the City completed an East Pine Street Corridor Study. This study identified limitations on East Pine Street due to continued growth in the area. The study also identified mitigation measures needed to maintain an acceptable level of service along East Pine Street. Recommended improvements have been incorporated in this TSP as part of the roadway improvements presented in Chapter 7.

**West Pine Street** serves the Central Business District and is considered an urban arterial through the downtown with on-street parking, curb-extension, and other design features to emphasize the pedestrian nature of the downtown. Because West Pine Street traverses the downtown, it is critical that the design standards for West Pine Street be formalized as a by-product of a downtown master plan. Although West Pine Street is classified as a major arterial, it is imperative that on-street parking continue to be a part of the design for West Pine Street through the downtown.

**Highway 99 Corridor Plan** (OTAK/DKS, June 13, 2005). Historically Hwy. 99 has been a north/south state highway that runs through Central Point. As is typical of the State's old highway system, business developed and received direct access from Hwy. 99. Although a major arterial street, there are many businesses that have direct access to Hwy. 99. Through a Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant, the City has prepared a corridor plan for Hwy. 99 that will serve as a blueprint for future private and public development along the highway using Smart Growth techniques<sup>14</sup>. It is the objective of this plan to provide an aesthetically pleasing and safe multi-modal environment along the corridor.

In 2005, the City and the State agreed on a jurisdictional transfer conveying to the City the jurisdiction of Hwy. 99 between Mile Post 1.64 and Mile Post 2.18. During that same period the City, after considerable community and ODOT input, adopted the Highway 99 Corridor Plan. The acknowledged function of Hwy. 99 is as a major arterial with a posted speed of 45 mph. The proposed design of Hwy. 99 intends to slow the traffic through the inclusion of the following:

- Gateway medians
- Frontage improvements to Fire Station No. 3
- Enhanced pedestrian crossings
- Continuous pedestrian sidewalks and pathways
- Narrower curb-to-curb distances and travel widths
- Landscape improvements to the street edges, e.g., street trees and landscape planter strips

These design components have been compiled into a boulevard design standard that addresses the unique character of Hwy. 99. Figure 9.2 illustrates the City's typical cross-section as applied to Hwy. 99. The primary challenge in managing the redevelopment of Hwy. 99 will be access management. Typical access

---

<sup>14</sup> Smart Growth is an urban planning and transportation theory that concentrates growth in the center of a city to avoid urban sprawl and advocates compact, transit-oriented, walkable, bicycle-friendly land use, including mixed-use development with a range of housing choices.

management regulations will be difficult to apply to Hwy. 99 as a result of existing land use patterns and driveways. An access management plan unique to Hwy. 99/Front Street should be prepared and adopted by the City.

The recommendations presented in each of these studies are discussed in other chapters of this TSP, such as Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Streets.

#### 4.4. Bicycle System Existing Conditions

The City's existing bicycle system is illustrated in Figure 4.4. While existing bicycle facilities are located on a few of the arterial and collector streets in Central Point, much of the City's arterial and collector systems lack bicycle facilities. The bicycle facilities that do exist cover only a limited geographic area and, in some cases, are disconnected from each other. Many of the City's public schools and parks are poorly connected with surrounding neighborhoods, reducing the opportunity for convenient and safe bicycle travel for students and employees. What follows are descriptions of the status of bicycle facilities on arterial and collector streets. The focus is on these streets because they provide the essential connectivity needed to develop an effective bicycle facilities system. The most significant arterial and collector streets with limited or no bicycle facilities are:

**Front Street:** There are no bicycle facilities located on Front Street. *The Highway 99 Corridor Plan* was completed in June 2005<sup>15</sup> and recommended that adding bike lanes to Front Street is not a recommended improvement. Within the current curb-to-curb distances, the bicycle lanes would be substandard and the differential between the average vehicle speeds and bike speeds are too great to support a convenient and safe bicycle system. It was proposed that safe and continuous north to south bicycle lanes could be provided along two parallel routes:

- Second Street (north bound), with bikes and vehicles sharing a travel lane; and
- A multi-use pathway west of the existing railroad tracks and connecting Crater High School with the Twin Creeks TOD and the future Snowy Butte TOD (south bound). A fence separating the railroad lines and the pathway will be required.

**East Pine Street (Freeman Road to Front Street).** This section of East Pine Street has limited bicycle facilities located near the I-5 Interchange and Front Street. While East Pine Street may be designated as a bicycle route, due to issues related to traffic flow, parking and access to shopping areas, bicycle lanes may not be located on the street. Since this is the case, Manzanita Street and/or Oak Street have been designated as bikeways.

**Biddle Road (Table Rock Road to Hamrick Road).** From Hamrick Road to Table Rock Road, bicycle facilities are not available. This section of Biddle Road (Biddle Road changes to East Pine Street at the intersection of Hamrick Road) is

---

15 Central Point Highway 99 Corridor Plan, OTAK/DKS, May 24, 2005

designated as a bicycle route consistent with the City of Medford's designation of Biddle Road.

**Upton Road – I-5 Overpass:** The Upton Road – I-5 overpass provides one of only two means for crossing I-5 in Central Point. A new overpass was completed in 2008 which provides both bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Bicycle lanes were also added to the west side of Upton which now connects to 10<sup>th</sup> Street/Scenic Avenue providing improved connectivity to the existing bicycle system.

#### **4.4.1. Links to Other Existing Regional & Municipal Bicycle Facilities and Plans**

The City's Bicycle Plan as illustrated in Figure 8.1 provides connectivity to other local and regional bicycle facilities and plans. These links should be included to the Bear Creek Greenway, and the City of Medford TSP, and Jackson County TSP which are described below.

**Bear Creek Greenway Plan:** The Bear Creek Greenway is a narrow corridor of publicly-owned land that follows the Bear Creek streambed from Ashland (Nevada Street) to Central Point (Pine Street). Development of the Bear Creek Greenway bicycle and pedestrian path began in 1973 when the Oregon Department of Transportation built the first 3.4 mile stretch of the pedestrian/bicycle path through Medford. The Greenway currently includes two primary sections:

- Pine Street in Central Point to Barnett Road in Medford; and
- Blue Heron Park in Phoenix to Nevada Street in Ashland.


When complete, the Greenway will provide a 20-mile, multi-use path from the I-5/Seven Oaks Interchange in Central Point to Nevada Street in Ashland. It will serve as an important facility for intercity travel in the I-5/OR 99 corridor. Additionally, a Rogue River Greenway is currently in the planning stages. This greenway will connect the communities of Grants Pass, Rogue River, and Gold Hill and would eventually be linked to the Bear Creek Greenway at the Seven Oaks Interchange. In terms of the bicycle component of the Central Point TSP, the Bear Creek Greenway not only offers a relatively safe and efficient means of transportation but also provides an essential connection to other communities located along the path. The links from the Central Point bicycle system to the Bear Creek Greenway are via Upton Road / Peninger Road and East Pine Street near the I-5 Interchange.

**The Jackson County Transportation System Plan (March 2005):** Jackson County adopted its Bicycle Master Plan, which identified conditions, needs, and projects in 1997. The current Jackson County Transportation Plan adopted in March 2005 incorporates the projects identified in the master plan that have not yet been completed. The plan also adds projects that were not in the Master Plan where traffic volumes are expected to exceed 3,000 Average Daily Traffic Count (ADT) and adequate shoulders or bike lanes are not provided.

The primary connections that need to be considered as Central Point bicycle facilities are planned, developed, and improved are Hanley Road, Beall Lane, and

Taylor Road. The Jackson County section of Taylor Road from Grant Road to Old Stage Road has been scheduled for improvement, including bicycle facilities. Once completed, Taylor Road will provide an additional link from Central Point to Old Stage Road. The county section of Beall Lane from Hanley Road to Old Stage Road has bicycle facilities.

**City of Medford Transportation System Plan (April 2003).** The City of Medford Transportation System Plan – Bicycle Plan identifies the existing and planned bicycle system within the Medford urban area. On arterial and collector streets, it is important that Medford's and Central Point's bicycle systems be coordinated and supportive. The primary connections described in Medford's Bicycle Plan that need to be considered as Central Point bicycle facilities are planned, developed, and improved are Merriman Road via Beall Lane, Front Street connection to North Pacific Highway (Hwy. 99), West Vilas Road via Hamrick Road, and E. Pine Street connections to Biddle Road. Within the City of Medford these streets have, or are planned to have, bicycle lanes.



**Figure 4.4**  
**Bicycle System**  
**2007**

#### 4.5. Pedestrian System, Existing Conditions

The City's existing pedestrian system is illustrated in Figure 4.5. The City has been aggressively constructing sidewalks within activity centers, i.e. schools, shopping, etc. The City's current development standards require sidewalks along all public streets.

#### 4.6. Rail System, Existing Conditions


A single rail line runs through the City parallel to Hwy. 99. The rail line is operated by Central Oregon Pacific Railroad (CORP) and is used for freight purposes only. Throughout the City's urban area, there are three (3) public at-grade railroad crossings and one (1) proposed crossing.

**Table 4.5. Central Point Railroad Crossings and Controls**


| Crossing Name        | Crossing No.      | Crossing Control |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Beall Lane           | U.S. DOT #756030T | Full             |
| W. Pine Street       | U.S. DOT #756050T | Full             |
| Scenic Avenue        | U.S. DOT #756051A | Full             |
| Twin Creeks Crossing | Proposed          | Full             |

#### 4.7. Transit, Existing Conditions

The Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD) serves most of the urbanized area in Jackson County with public transit and paratransit services. It also serves other roles such as providing medical-purpose transportation for Medicaid clients, coordination with other government agencies for transportation planning and houses the region's rideshare program. Central Point is currently served by Route 40 (Figure 4.6) and has very strong ridership. Based on the City's GIS mapping, Route 40 is within a ¼ mile walk of approximately 40% of the City's residential population. Route 40 travels from Medford to Central Point and has received increased frequency from one hour to 30-minute headways (the time between buses on the same line).



**Figure 4.5**  
**Pedestrian System Map**  
**2007**



Legend

- Urban Area
- RVTD Transit Route 40
- Public Parks

**Figure 4.6**  
**RVTD Transit Map**  
**2007**

## Chapter 5 – Transportation Management

### 5.1. Introduction

The Transportation Management chapter addresses transportation management best practices. There are three basic components to transportation management:

- Transportation System Management
- Access Management
- Transportation Demand Management

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requires that cities over 25,000 population include in their Transportation System Plan (TSP) strategies for Transportation System Management, Access Management, and Transportation Demand Management. With a current population of less than 25,000, the City of Central Point is not required by the TPR to include these elements in its TSP. However, because of the significance of these elements in maximizing the efficiency of a transportation system, coupled with the fact that during the life of this TSP the City will exceed 25,000, the City has elected to include these transportation management techniques as a part of its TSP. Additional information on these elements is provided in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

In this chapter, it is the City's objective to establish, as a guiding principle, the use of transportation management strategies that maximize the utility of public right-of-way; is appropriate to the functional classification of each street; and provides for multiple travel modes, while minimizing their impact on the character and livability of surrounding neighborhoods, business districts, and the general environment.

### 5.2. Transportation System Management (TSM)

The TPR defines TSM as “techniques for increasing the efficiency, safety, and capacity or level of service of a transportation facility without increasing its size.” TSM strategies are aimed at making the most efficient and timely use of the existing transportation infrastructure, thus reducing the need for costly roadway capacity expansions. Techniques include, but are not limited to:

- Intersection and signal improvements:
  - Signal timing optimization
  - Controller/cabinet and signal head upgrades
  - Vehicle detectors repair/replace
  - Communication with central system
  - Turning lanes
  - Grade separations
  - Pavement Striping
  - Lane assessment changes
  - Signage and lighting
  - Using one-way streets
  - Signal prioritization for mass transit
- Freeway bottleneck removal programs
- Data Collection to monitor system performance
- Special events management

TSM strategies emphasize policies that can guide implementation of solutions to problems when they are discovered. Specific TSM measures most applicable to the City's transportation system are presented below. The listing and discussion of TSM strategies below does not represent any priority order. The broad range of TSM strategies must be considered for the individual problems associated with traffic operations at each location.

### 5.3. Mobility Standards

**5.3.1. Update Existing Traffic Signals:** Local governments traditionally base their decisions on the installation of traffic signals on the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. Central Point has a history of successfully using signals to achieve optimum traffic flow, and will continue to give priority to improving existing traffic signals and signal systems. Such improvements should include regular signal maintenance, updating the signal equipment and signal timing plan improvements.

The need for traffic signal equipment modernization, timing plan improvements, and traffic signal removal should be evaluated based on detailed analyses of traffic operations at the existing intersections where signals are in place. Recent advances in signal technology and acceptance have led to installation of signals that offer a broader menu of traffic movement options, such as protective-permissive left turns. Depending on the traffic and the precise characteristics of individual intersections, installation of such equipment may prove desirable. The Pine Street traffic calming project, which is a part of this TSP, includes the replacement of the mechanical downtown Pine Street signals with protective-permissive left turn signals. Signal evaluations must be made on a case-by-case basis and can be more easily evaluated using software packages such as, but not limited to, TRANSYT, SYNCHRO, and Passer II.

**5.3.2. Coordinate Traffic Signals:** The coordination of new traffic signals through interconnection with existing traffic signals is a management technique that has demonstrated mobility improvements in corridor level traffic operations. Experience in other communities has shown an eight to ten percent improvement in travel time along arterials after interconnected systems have been installed. Reduction of some types of automobile-generated emissions is also cited as a possible benefit of improved signal systems.

Whenever additional intersections are signalized, Central Point needs to consider how they can be best integrated with nearby signalized intersections. In some cases, signals operate most efficiently as independent signals, but in other cases, they are best integrated into a signal system. Some of the existing systems may need to be expanded to attain maximum benefit with the addition of more signals.

The RTP identifies East Pine Street between the I-5 interchange and Rogue Valley Highway in Central Point as a candidate corridor for consideration, or for re-evaluation, of existing traffic signal systems. The East Pine Street signal needs were evaluated and recommendations presented in the *East Pine Street Transportation Plan, October 2004*. The recommendations from the East Pine Street Plan have been included in this TSP. Installation of master controllers, interconnection systems, and other equipment may help to achieve increased efficiency and reduce congestion of the street system. The Pine Street traffic calming project includes the coordination of the downtown Pine Street signals.

**5.3.3. Eliminate Unnecessary Traffic Signals:** Intersection traffic control improvements such as traffic signals are generally based on identified traffic congestion and safety problems. Over time, a change in the surrounding land use and/or street system may reduce travel demand at the signalized intersection, or roadway and intersection geometric improvements may mitigate the safety problems at the intersection. Such changes in travel demand and safety at the intersection may make the signal unnecessary, thereby requiring that the signal be removed for optimum system performance.

Intersections requiring removal of traffic signals may be converted to two-way stop control with free flow in the major direction of travel, or they may be converted to all-way stop control. The placement of traffic signals in downtown Central Point is likely to be re-evaluated during the Pine Street traffic calming project.

**5.3.4. Intersection Geometric Improvements:** Intersection improvements such as the provision of turning lanes, traffic islands, channelization, and improved design can generally be implemented at relatively modest cost depending on their complexity. The benefits, though, in terms of improved vehicular traffic flow and pedestrian safety are substantial.

Central Point should consider following recognized national standards for geometric improvements at intersections. The following are guidelines established by the Institute of Transportation Engineers in designing and improving arterial intersections at grade:

- Reduce the number of conflicts among vehicular movements.
- Control the relative speed of vehicles both entering and leaving the intersection.
- Coordinate different types of traffic control devices used with the traffic volume at the intersection.
- Select proper types of intersections to serve the traffic volume. Low volumes can be served with minimal control, whereas higher volumes require turning lanes and sophisticated actuated signal operations.
- Use separate left- and right-turn lanes at high volume intersections.
- Avoid multiple and compound merging and diverging maneuvers. These require complex driver decisions and create additional conflicts.
- Separate conflict points. Intersection hazards and delays are increased when intersection maneuver areas are too close together or overlap.
- Favor the heaviest and fastest flows.
- Reduce areas of conflict by channelization (striping, islands, etc.).
- Segregate non-homogenous flows. Separate lanes should be provided where appreciable volumes of traffic are traveling at different speeds (e.g. turning lanes for slowing vehicles).
- Consider the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists.

Geometric improvements at qualifying intersections are included in this TSP's project list (see Chapter 7- Street System).

**5.3.5. One-Way Streets:** Streets carrying high traffic volumes in major activity centers, such as in the central business district (CBD) areas of cities, are often regulated to carry traffic in only one direction. The one-way designation increases the vehicle carrying capacity of the street by offering additional lanes for travel in the same direction and increases capacity of signalized intersections along the highway through improved signal

progression and reduction in the number of signal phases (turning movements). The increased capacity along the corridor can result in reduced delays thereby providing significant travel time savings.

One-way streets can also result in increased safety by reducing vehicle-pedestrian and vehicle-vehicle conflicts; preventing the entrapment of pedestrians between opposing traffic streams; and improving the driver's field of vision at intersection approaches. Along with increasing capacity and safety, one-way streets can help meet community objectives by saving sidewalks, trees, and other valuable frontage assets that would otherwise be lost because of the need to widen existing two-way streets. Additionally, the one-way designation can also permit improvements in public transit operations such as routings without turn-back loops. Overall, one-way streets provide a cost-effective operational solution to busy streets in highly developed areas, such as CBD or other activity centers, without requiring large capital expenditures.

One-way street systems must be adequately signed and enough cross-connections must be provided for adequate accessibility. Without such provisions, traffic congestion and vehicle miles of travel could actually increase.

One-way streets are not universally accepted. Where one-way streets have been proposed or implemented, many business owners object, fearing that access by customers will be lost. Many communities where one-way streets have been implemented have subsequently reversed their direction or have changed them back to two-way operation. Such changes make it clear that implementation of one-way street systems must be carefully considered, requiring involvement of all parties including business owners, motorists, and all other transportation system users.

Several alleys in Central Point are one-way alleys. Currently, no streets are identified for being changed to one-way.

**5.3.6. Install New Traffic Signals at Intersections:** Traffic signal improvements generally provide the most cost-effective solution to improving traffic congestion on existing arterial and collector streets. The need for traffic signal control at intersections that are currently under two-way or four-way stop-control has been evaluated as part of this TSP and the need for new traffic signals has been identified in Chapter 7 - Street System Plan.

**5.3.7. Ramp Metering:** Ramp meters are employed at freeway on-ramp entrances with the objective of optimizing throughput capacity on the mainline freeway. The optimization is achieved by regulating the entry of vehicles onto the freeway during the peak hours of operation through the use of ramp signals at the on-ramps. Very often, optimization of freeway throughput capacity is achieved at the expense of additional delays at the metered on-ramps. Another key consideration is the ability to provide adequate queuing or storage capacity for the stopped vehicles on the ramps leading to the through road.

Ramp metering has proven to be one of the most cost-effective techniques to improve traffic flow on the freeway. A Federal Highway Administration study of seven ramp metering sites in the United States and Canada revealed that average highway speeds increased by 29 percent after installing ramp metering. An analysis of the system in

Seattle revealed that in addition to speed and corresponding travel time improvements, highway volumes increased between 12 and 40 percent as a result of ramp metering. Also, accident rate reductions between 20 and 58 percent have been recorded as a result of improved merging operations associated with ramp metering at freeway and on-ramp merge points.

The need for metering on-ramps to I-5 should be evaluated by ODOT in cooperation with local governments as the region grows and travel demands increase along I-5. Although I-5 and the ramps are under the jurisdiction of ODOT, it will be important for agencies to work cooperatively to balance the competing demands on the interstate system.

The ramps at the Central Point interchange are forecast to be operating at an acceptable level of service through 2010, but by 2020 the northbound ramp is forecast to exceed ODOT's minimum acceptable V/C ratio. By 2030, it is forecast that the southbound ramp will have similar capacity problems. Whether ramp metering is a solution to the capacity limitations of these two I-5 ramps is a question to be answered by ODOT. This TSP does not identify any projects for meter installation at the I-5 interchange.

**5.3.8. Goods Movement Management:** The efficient movement of goods into and out of urban areas is essential for the economic vitality of the region. Goods movement management strategies are aimed at improving congestion and safety conditions along the arterials. Strategies include restricting truck deliveries and pick-ups to off-peak periods, using alleys for loading and unloading, and providing additional curb space for loading and unloading operations. Such strategies should be investigated in commercial areas along heavily congested roads.

In preparation of this TSP the issue of freight movement has resulted in a chapter dedicated to freight. Chapter 11 - Freight will discuss the role of freight movement, issues, and solutions.

#### **5.4. Access Management (AM)**

Access Management is an effective and rational approach to maximizing the City's street system. As its name implies, access management regulates access to land development while preserving the flow of traffic on the surrounding road system in terms of safety, capacity needs, and speed. To be effective, access management requires coordination between land use planning and transportation planning, which is the primary objective of the State's transportation planning rule. Access management calls for land use controls that are keyed to development policies and transportation system capabilities. The product of an effective access management program is a street system that is efficient, safe, accessible, and viable. The challenge is to develop effective access standards that find a balance between transit needs, land development plans, and the functional integrity of the roadways that serve local and regional development and transportation needs.

Access issues can be highly controversial since access management often regulates and limits access to individual businesses or requires access from side streets or frontage roads. The key elements to a successful access management program include:

- Defining allowable access levels and spacing for various classes of roadways;

- Providing a mechanism for granting variances when reasonable access cannot be provided; and
- Establishing a means of enforcing standards.

Without an access management program along arterials and collectors, roadways may need to be periodically widened to accommodate demands of new development. This cycle is a result of continually trying to satisfy traffic demands, which are often a result of increased business activity, which is influenced by improved traffic conditions, which leads to further traffic demands. The number of conflict points among vehicles rises as a result of an increase in the number of driveways, causing capacity to diminish. Vehicle delay increases and safety and comfort are reduced. The following are some of the more important elements of an access management strategy that are applicable in the Central Point area:

- Regulate minimum spacing of driveways.
- Regulate maximum number of driveways per property frontage.
- Require access on adjacent cross-street (when available).
- Consolidate access for adjacent properties.
- Encourage connections between adjacent properties that do not require motorists to traverse the public streets.
- Require adequate internal site design and circulation plan.
- Regulate the maximum width of driveways.
- Improve the vertical geometrics of driveways.
- Optimize traffic signal spacing and coordination.
- Install raised median divider with left-turn deceleration lane.
- Install continuous two-way left-turn lane.

Access management standards associated with state facilities are a required component of local transportation system plans. Table 5.1 identifies the access management standards the City of Central Point utilizes along state facilities<sup>16,17</sup>. Table 5.2 identifies access management guidelines for all other facilities within Central Point.

**Table 5.1. Access Management Spacing Standards for District Highway**

| Posted Speed  | Urban Highway | Urban Business District | Special Transportation Area                                                                                                                 |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| >= 55 mph     | 700 feet      | -                       |                                                                                                                                             |
| 50 mph        | 550 feet      | -                       |                                                                                                                                             |
| 40 and 45 mph | 500 feet      | -                       |                                                                                                                                             |
| 30 and 35 mph | 400 feet      | 350 feet                | Existing block spacing specified in Comprehensive Plan or other spacing as permitted. See complete description in 1999 Oregon Highway Plan. |
| >= 25 mph     | 400 feet      | 350 feet                |                                                                                                                                             |

<sup>16</sup> 1999 Oregon Highway Plan, Appendix C: Access Management Standards, Table 15

<sup>17</sup> 1999 Oregon Highway Plan, Policy Element, Policy 1B: Land Use and Transportation (definitions)

**Table 5.2. Access Management Guidelines**

| Functional Classification | Minimum Posted Speed | Minimum Spacing between Driveway and/or Street* | Spacing between Intersections | Appropriate Adjacent Land Use                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Major Arterial            | 35-50 mph            | See Table 5.1                                   | See Table 5.1                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➔ Community/neighborhood commercial near major intersections.</li> <li>➔ Industrial/office/low volume retail and buffered medium or higher density residential between intersections.</li> </ul>   |
| Minor Arterial            | 35-50 mph            | 300 feet                                        | ¼ Mile                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➔ Light industry/offices and buffered medium or low density.</li> <li>➔ Neighborhood commercial near some major intersections.</li> </ul>                                                          |
| Collector                 | 25-35 mph            | 50 feet                                         | 300 feet                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➔ Neighborhood commercial near some major intersections.</li> <li>➔ Medium or low density residential.</li> <li>➔ Primarily lower density residential.</li> <li>➔ Primarily industrial.</li> </ul> |
| Local                     | 25                   | Access to each lot permitted                    | 300 feet                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➔ Primarily low density residential.</li> <li>➔ Primarily industrial.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                   |

\*Desirable design spacing (existing spacing will vary).

**5.4.1. Access Management Planning:** In recognition of the value of access management, the City of Central Point has prepared access management plans and standards for its arterial and collector street system.

**Access Management Plan for Front Street (Highway 99)/Pine Street.** This plan was prepared in 2003 to identify access management strategies for the section of Highway 99 generally defined as Front Street. The Plan also included the section of Pine Street from Haskell Street to First Street. Both short-term and long-term access strategies were developed. The findings and recommendations of the Access Management Plan for Front Street (Highway 99)/Pine Street Plan are incorporated in this TSP by reference.

**Central Point Highway 99 Corridor Plan.** This plan was prepared in 2005 and addressed the land use and transportation needs of Highway 99 as a major transportation corridor. This plan differed from the 2003 Access Management Plan for Front Street (Highway 99)/Pine Street Plan only to the extent that its purpose was broader in scope, including roadway geometry options, bicycle and pedestrian systems, urban design solutions, etc. The access management recommendations in both plans are consistent for the section of Highway 99 referred to as Front Street.

The findings and recommendations of the Central Point Highway 99 Corridor Plan are incorporated in this TSP by reference.

### **5.5. Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**

The objective of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies is to reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles using the road system while providing a wide variety of mobility options to those who wish to travel. In accomplishing this objective, TDM measures increase the carrying capacity of the transportation system, without the expense and inconvenience of adding capacity to the system. If implemented on an area-wide basis and actively supported by agencies, businesses, and residents, TDM strategies may be able to reduce or delay the need for street improvements as well as reduce energy consumption and air quality problems. TDM strategies are aimed at reducing travel demand by influencing people's travel behavior in one of two ways: (1) by reducing the need to travel, or (2) by encouraging travel utilizing a mode other than a single-occupant automobile.

To manage the demand upon a transportation system, there are a number of basic approaches that a community may take. First, decreasing peak demand either by shifting person-trips from the peak hour of demand or by eliminating person-trips. Person-trips represent the number of trips made by an individual, while vehicle trips account for multiple person-trips depending upon the number of people traveling in the vehicle. Second, for the person-trips that are necessary during the peak hour of demand, a community may encourage non-vehicular and vehicular alternatives to single-occupant vehicles (SOVs). Non-vehicular alternatives such as bicycling and walking are most applicable for short trips, while vehicular alternatives such as ridesharing and transit are necessary for intermediate and long trips. Finally, a community may reduce the demand on its surface transportation system by decreasing the distances traveled by vehicle trips through different methods including, but not limited to, transit-oriented type development and increasing the attractiveness of alternative modes of transportation such as transit, bicycling, and walking. There is an important inter-relationship between the TDM element and land use.

The major effect of the TDM programs would be on the home to work and return trips, which comprise about one-fifth of the total daily trips and about half of the peak hour traffic. Although other types of trips may be impacted, the effect would be considerably less because the trips are not as regular (e.g., shopping or business trips), often have a higher vehicle occupancy (e.g., school trips), and sometimes involve the transfer of goods (e.g., shopping trips).

TDM strategies recommended for the Rogue Valley metropolitan area focus on the home to work and return trips. These include establishing alternative work arrangements, promoting telecommuting and ridesharing, and adopting a trip reduction ordinance. TDM strategies are also closely tied to the provision of adequate pedestrian/bicycle facilities and transit services and modifying parking requirements. The following describes the recommended plan for alternative work arrangements, telecommuting, ridesharing, and a trip reduction ordinance. RVTDC houses the "Way to Go Program" which is Transportation Demand Management programs for the entire Rogue Valley. Programs focus on bicycle and pedestrian safety, carpools and vanpools, etc.

**5.5.1. Alternative Work Arrangements:** Local governments and major employers can encourage work arrangements providing an alternative to the 8-to-5 work schedule. These arrangements could include, but not be limited to, employee flex-time programs, staggered work hours, and compressed work weeks as described below:

**Employee Flex-Time Programs.** One opportunity employers have to affect total trip demand is through influencing their own employees' peak versus off-peak travel behavior. A flexible schedule may allow employees to match their work hours with transit schedules, make carpool arrangements, or merely avoid peak congestion times. Active promotion of alternative schedules might slightly decrease total peak hour traffic.

Flex-time is most useful in offices, particularly for administrative and information workers. It may not be as applicable for non-office employers since their employees often have to work hours that are not during the peak hour of traffic demand anyway (e.g., retail employers) or because their work requires continuous communication between workers. In addition, flex-time may be difficult to implement for small employers.

**Staggered Work Hours.** Staggered work hours is a policy of established starting and finishing times for different groups of employees. Unlike flex-time, the employer, rather than the employee, determines the staggered work hours. Like flex-time, this tool has greater applicability to employees of large offices, since many non-office employees already work staggered work hours or work in a highly interdependent manner.

Government agencies can take a lead by establishing a standard work schedule that differs from the historic 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. schedule. For example, employees can be encouraged to work a 7-to-4 or 9-to-6 five-day work schedule. This is often done for the street and parks crews in public works situations because of summer hours and weather conditions. It might also be established for other employees, although some agencies and local governments have encountered opposition from employee groups claiming they should have additional compensation for unusual work hours. Staggered work hours have to be considered in light of the need to have service desk hours that meet the needs of citizens. Staggered work hours could actually increase the opportunities for citizen contact.

**Compressed Work Week.** Compressed work weeks involve employees working fewer days and more hours per day. One common form of this policy is the 4-day/40-hour week where the employee works four 10-hour days. A second common form is the 9-day/80 hour schedule in which the employee works 9 days and 80 hours over a two-week period. With the 4/40 schedule, the employee gets one business day off each week; with the 9/80 schedule, the employee gets one business day off each two weeks.

Because of the extended hours, both policies usually shift one "leg" of a work trip per working day (either the arriving or departing "leg") out of the peak hours. The 4/40 policy additionally eliminates an entire work trip every five business days (1/5 of the work trips). The 9/80 policy eliminates an entire work trip every ten business days (1/10 of the work trips).

One of the problems with any of the compressed work schedules is the potential for increases in non-work trips during the "off day." Increases from non-work travel may

off-set gains made from the shift in employee schedule. Such trips, however, may not be taken during peak periods and could still produce benefits related to peak hour congestion and air quality.

**5.5.2. Telecommuting:** Local governments and major employers can encourage telecommuting. Telecommuting is another opportunity available to employers to affect total trip demand. It is similar to work-at-home policies, except that the employee connects to the workplace via a computer and fax/modem. Telecommuting arrangements can also involve more than one employee, e.g., when an employer provides a satellite work center connected to the principal work center. Another telecommuting alternative is a neighborhood work center operated by more than one employer, or by an agency. Recent advances in communications technology (e.g., Internet capabilities) should greatly enhance telecommuting options. Telecommuting for even one or two days per week could save significant trip miles and still reap the benefits of working at the central work site.

**5.5.3 Ridesharing:** Local governments and major employers can encourage ridesharing by subsidizing ridesharing or by making ridesharing more convenient. Ridesharing includes two principal categories: carpooling and vanpooling. Carpooling involves the use of an employee's private vehicle to carry other employees to work, either using one car and sharing expenses or rotating driving responsibilities and vehicles. Vanpooling involves the use of a passenger van driven by one of the employees with the fixed and operating costs at least partially paid by the other riders through monthly fares. A common feature of vanpooling is that the van is often owned by the employer, a public agency (such as a transit district), or a private, non-profit corporation set up for that purpose.

Ridesharing can be greatly influenced by special treatment at the work place. Participation can be increased by employer actions, which make ridesharing more convenient through incentives such as providing guaranteed ride home services, preferential car/vanpool parking, and area-wide and employer-based commuter matching services:

**Guaranteed ride.** A guaranteed ride home often makes ridesharing more attractive. Surveys have shown that many employees drive to work because they feel they need their automobile during the day or because they may work late. In some cases, they need their automobile for work trips or errands. In other cases, they do not use their automobile but simply want it available for emergencies. Provision of daytime and emergency transportation by allowing use of a company vehicle or employer-sponsored free taxi can encourage ridesharing by eliminating some of the barriers. On the other hand, ridesharing also reduces individual "freedom" and is not widely accepted until there is real congestion or financial benefits.

**Preferential car/vanpool parking.** Preferential carpool and vanpool parking is a simple, inexpensive way for an employer to encourage employees to rideshare by increasing the ease of access to the workplace. Generally, preferential carpool and vanpool parking spaces are provided close to the building entrance. This makes it convenient for the employees to access the building, particularly during inclement weather conditions.

**Commuter matching services.** Commuter matching services, whether area-wide or employer-based, permit those who wish to rideshare to find others with similar locations and schedules. An employer-based matching service offers the advantage of a shared destination, but presents the disadvantage of limiting the pool of potential riders. A carpool matching service can be one-time or continuous. The Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD) serves as the carpooling agency and performs a wide variety of services to support and encourage the use of carpools, including matching of potential riders.

**5.5.4. Trip Reduction Ordinance:** Local governments can encourage major employers to adopt trip reduction goals designed to reduce site vehicular trip generation. A voluntary Trip Reduction Ordinance (TRO) is recommended for the Rogue Valley metropolitan area, applicable to major employers with more than 50 employees. The ordinance would apply to both existing and proposed development, thereby distributing the responsibility equitably between existing and future development.

A TRO is not a TDM strategy itself, but is a device by which TDM measures are implemented. TROs typically require employers and developers to share some of the responsibility for reducing single-occupant automobile use by their employees. Some communities place the burden on the initial developers of office parks or other major employment centers, including obligating them to fund a transportation management organization. The developer then passes these costs on to tenants of the facilities. TROs identify specific trip reduction targets, such as the percentage reduction of commuter vehicle trips. The decrease in trip generation can be achieved by decreasing auto trips and by increasing ridesharing and transit trips and trips by other alternative modes.

Ordinances are usually slowly phased into many communities as a way of easing the compliance burden. A voluntary compliance period is initially implemented for employers to voluntarily adapt to the requirements and learn the various demand management tools, such as promoting ridesharing, subsidizing transit passes, and developing parking incentives. During this period, studies are conducted to determine if voluntary compliance is meeting the community trip reduction goals. If the goals are not met, then a community may choose to make the trip reduction goals mandatory for major employers and/or expand it to smaller ones.

**5.5.5. Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Programs:** Bicycle, pedestrian, and transit are often treated as TDM measures because promotional programs aimed at encouraging their use are a major part of an area plan. The Central Point TSP project improvement list calls for facilities as well as operational or promotional programs for all three modes. Because of the importance of these modes to the overall transportation strategy for the region, these modes are addressed in separate plan elements.

**5.5.6. Park-and-Ride Facilities:** Local governments should consider the development of park-and-ride facilities as a cost-effective means of increasing the

efficiency of the existing transportation system. Park-and-ride facilities are one of many TDM tools designed to increase efficiency, reduce energy consumption, and provide options to the single occupant vehicle trip. Park-and-ride facilities increase the effectiveness of transit service by expanding the area from which transit draws. Patrons living outside of walking distance of an established transit stop can drive or bike to the park-and-ride and use transit instead of driving or cycling long distances to their destination. Ease of access, security and safety, easy to understand layouts and good, direct pedestrian and bicyclist connections make use of park-and-ride lots desirable.

Park-and-rides are frequently located near freeway interchanges or at transit stations and may be either a shared use, such as at a church or Transit Oriented Development (TOD) center, or an exclusive use. Shared use facilities are generally designated and maintained through agreements reached between the local transit operator and nearby businesses, churches, or other entities.

The Rogue Valley Council of Governments completed *The Park-and-Ride Feasibility/Location Study* in January 2001 for the RVTD service area. Feasible locations for park-and-ride sites were one of the tasks of the study. For Central Point, it was suggested that a park-and-ride site could be located at East Pine Street and Freeman Road in the Albertson's parking lot located on RVTD's Route 40 (Medford to Central Point). This site could be accessed by southbound I-5 commuters or those coming from within Central Point. This site would be most logical if it could be served by an express transit line running on the I-5 corridor. Current routing would require buses to slightly deviate on their in-bound journey. In most other respects, this lot would work well as a park-and-ride facility<sup>18</sup>.

The City should remain open to other alternative park-and-ride facility options. As an example it was suggested by RVTD that strategically located churches could also serve as effective park-and-ride facilities.

---

18 Park and Ride Feasibility/Location Study. Rogue Valley Council of Governments, January 2001

## 5.6. Transportation Management Goals, Objectives, and Policies

### **GOAL 5.1: TO MAXIMIZE, THROUGH TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, THE EFFICIENCY, SAFETY, AND CAPACITY OF THE CITY'S EXISTING TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES.**

*Policy 5.1.1. The City shall make every effort to maintain mobility standards that result in a minimum level of service (LOS) "D." The City defines LOS D as the equivalent to a volume-capacity ratio of 0.9.*

*Policy 5.1.2. The City shall facilitate implementation of bus bays by RVTB on transit routes as a means of facilitating traffic flow during peak travel periods. The feasibility, location and design of bus bays shall be developed in consultation between the City and RVTB.*

### **GOAL 5.2: TO EMPLOY ACCESS MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES TO ENSURE SAFE AND EFFICIENT ROADWAYS CONSISTENT WITH THEIR DESIGNATED FUNCTION.**

*Policy 5.2.1. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain, either within the zoning ordinance or the Public Works Standards and Details manual, access management standards based on best practices.*

*Policy 5.2.2. The City shall implement the access management strategies presented in the Access Management Plan for Front Street (Highway 99)/Pine Street and the Central Point Highway 99 Corridor Plan.*

### **GOAL 5.3: TO REDUCE THE DEMANDS PLACED ON THE CURRENT AND FUTURE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM BY THE SINGLE-OCCUPANT VEHICLE.**

*Policy 5.3.1. The City shall serve as a leading example for other businesses and agencies by maximizing the use of alternative transportation modes among City employees through incentive programs. The City shall provide information on alternative transportation modes and provide incentives for employees who use alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.*

*Policy 5.3.2. The City shall offer flexible schedules and compressed work-week options whenever feasible, as a way of reducing travel demand. The City shall encourage employees to telecommute, whenever feasible.*

### **GOAL 5.4: TO REDUCE THE VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT) IN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA BY ASSISTING INDIVIDUALS IN CHOOSING ALTERNATIVE TRAVEL MODES.**

*Policy 5.4.1. The City shall encourage major employers to promote work arrangements providing an alternative to the 8-to-5 work schedule. These arrangements*

*shall include, but are not limited to, employee flex-time programs, staggered work hours, and compressed work weeks.*

*Policy 5.4.2. The City shall encourage major employers to promote telecommuting where feasible.*

*Policy 5.4.3. The City and major employers shall encourage ridesharing by making ridesharing more convenient.*

*Policy 5.4.4. The City shall encourage major employers to work with RVTD to adopt trip reduction goals designed to reduce site vehicular trip generation.*

**GOAL 5.5: TO MAINTAIN CONSISTENCY BETWEEN TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) MEASURES PROMOTED BY THE CITY WITH THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN STRATEGIES AIMED AT REDUCING RELIANCE ON THE SINGLE OCCUPANT VEHICLE (SOV) AND REDUCING VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT) PER CAPITA.**

*Policy 5.5.1. The City shall coordinate and maintain a consistency in the implementation of transportation demand management strategies with similar regional strategies as presented in the Regional Transportation Plan.*

## Chapter 6 – Parking Management

### 6.1 Introduction

The Oregon State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) encourages and promotes a variety of transportation choices that balance vehicular use with other transportation modes, including the reasonable management of vehicular parking spaces. In accordance with OAR 660-012-0045(5)(c), the City of Central Point has elected to prepare, as part of its Transportation System Plan (TSP), a chapter addressing management of on-street and off-street parking within the City's urban area. The primary goal in regulating parking is to responsibly reduce auto dependence, and to encourage use of alternative modes of transportation where they are available. This chapter will address objectives and strategies for the management of the City's parking supply that integrates land use planning and best practices for on-street and off-street vehicular parking consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the TPR. The contents of this chapter are intended to provide a basis for the development and implementation of parking regulations for the City of Central Point.

### 6.2. Current Parking Inventory

The TPR defines the term "parking space" as on-street and off-street parking spaces designated for automobile parking in areas planned for industrial, commercial, and institutional or public use. Based on this definition, a parking inventory for the City was completed in 2008 with a count of 4,585 parking spaces located within the City's urban area. The Parking Inventory will be maintained on an annual basis.

### 6.3. Parking Performance Measures

The primary means of measuring the City's progress in attaining its parking objectives will be determined using a per capita parking ratio (Parking Ratio). The Parking Ratio is measured by dividing the parking inventory by the most current population. Over the course of this TSP, it is the City's objective to reduce parking spaces per capita by 10%. Currently, the City's Parking Ratio is 0.27. A 10% reduction will reduce the Parking Ratio to 0.24 by the year 2030. The parking performance benchmark is defined in Table 6.1.

**Table 6.1. Transportation System Plan Parking Performance Measures**

| Measure                                                                   | How Measured                                                                                                                    | Current<br>2008 | Benchmark<br>2010 | Benchmark<br>2015 | Benchmark<br>2020 | Benchmark<br>2030 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Measure 6-1: Ratio of parking spaces to population within the urban area. | Calculated based on the City of Central Point Parking Inventory and annual population estimates from Portland State University. | 0.270           | 0.265             | 0.260             | 0.250             | 0.240             |

### 6.4. Parking Strategies

There are many parking strategies addressing a wide variety of techniques that manage parking supply and demand. The appropriateness of any individual parking strategy is dependent on the needs of the community. Not all parking strategies are appropriate for a community at any particular period in time, but may be appropriate during later stages of a community's

development. Consequently, the list of potential parking strategies includes strategies that may not be appropriate at this time, but may be appropriate within the planning period.

In Table 6.2, a comprehensive listing of parking strategies is identified and cross referenced to both the RTP and TSP. A discussion of each of the strategies and their applicability to the City is included in this section. There are two categories of parking strategies presented in Table 6.2: Parking Facility Efficiency and Reduce Parking Demand. As their names imply, strategies that address Parking Facility Efficiency are intended to maximize the use of parking spaces (supply) while strategies to Reduce Parking Demand are directed to reductions in the demand for parking.

**Table 6.2 Parking Plan Strategies**

| STRATEGY                              | TSP<br>POLICY | RTP<br>POLICY |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>PARKING FACILITY EFFICIENCY</b>    |               |               |
| Shared Parking                        | 6             | NA            |
| Regulate Parking                      | 6             | NA            |
| Accurate & Flexible Standards         | 6             | 6.B-2         |
| Parking Maximums                      | 6             | 6.B-1         |
| Remote Parking & Shuttle Service      | 6             | 6.B-6         |
| Smart Growth Policies                 | 3             | 6.B-5         |
| Walking & Bicycle Alternatives        | 8             | NA            |
| Increase Capacity of Existing Parking | 6             | NA            |
| <b>REDUCE PARKING DEMAND</b>          |               |               |
| Mobility Management                   | 5             | 6.B-3, 6.B-4  |
| Price Parking                         | 6             | NA            |
| Improve Pricing Methods               | 6             | NA            |
| Financial Incentives                  | 6             | NA            |
| Unbundle Parking                      | 6             | NA            |
| Parking Taxes                         | 6             | NA            |
| Improved Bicycle Facilities           | 8             | NA            |
| User Information & Marketing          | 6             | NA            |
| Enforcement & Control                 | 6             | NA            |
| Transportation Management Assoc.      | 6             | NA            |
| Overflow Parking Plans                | 6             | NA            |
| Spillover Problems                    | 6             | NA            |
| Parking Facility Design & Operation   | 6             | 6.B-5         |

**6.4.1 Shared Parking:** The term “shared parking” refers to a parking facility that serves multiple destinations/uses. The key to the effective use of shared parking relies on the mix of uses sharing the parking facility. The use of shared parking is most effective in a mixed use development where there is a variety of uses that have different peak hour parking demands.

Traditionally, parking lots have been sized to accommodate 90 percent of peak hour and peak month usage, typically the Christmas season, and serve a single development. For the most part, these lots are operating at levels considerably less than the number of spaces provided. Shared parking standards allow different uses with different peak period parking demand to share parking facilities.

For example, a series of buildings may include such land uses as restaurants, theaters, offices, and retail, all of which have varying peak use times. A restaurant generally experiences parking peaks from 6 to 8 p.m., while offices typically peak around 10 a.m. and again around 2 p.m. on weekdays. Some retail establishments have their peak usage on weekends. Theaters often peak from 8 to 10 p.m. Without a shared parking plan, these uses would develop parking to serve each of their individual peaks. This generally results in each lot being heavily used while the other lots operate at far less than capacity. Depending upon the combination of uses, a shared parking plan may allow some developments to realize a parking reduction of 10-15 percent without a significant reduction in the availability of parking at any one time, due solely to the different peak periods for parking.

One of the major stumbling blocks to implementing shared parking standards is local jurisdictions themselves. Quite often, parking codes are written to express parking minimums as opposed to maximums. In some cases, the implementation of shared parking strategies may require changes to the minimum parking requirements contained in the parking policies.

Other issues surrounding shared parking are liability, insurance, and the need for reciprocal access agreements allowing patrons of one establishment to cross land owned by another establishment.

*The City zoning ordinance currently contains some provisions permitting shared parking, and will continue efforts to expand the use of shared parking. It is acknowledged that the success of shared parking is in the understanding of a peak parking demand and the mix of uses to assure different peak parking demand.*

**6.4.2. Regulate Parking:** Parking regulations refer to the adoption of controls regulating who can use parking, when the parking can be used, and for how long a vehicle may park in a given location. As an example the establishment of loading zones is a parking regulation, as is handicapped parking, time limits, no parking zones, etc. The primary objective of regulating parking is to ensure that parking is available to a specific user group.

*The City's parking regulations follow conventional practices and laws. Since the City already employs parking regulations, it is only necessary that the City periodically evaluate the efficiency of its parking regulation program and update as necessary to maintain optimal efficiency.*

**6.4.3. Accurate and Flexible Standards:** Generally referred to as efficiency-based parking standards, this strategy refers to the use of parking requirements adjusted to a location's needs based on parking demand and supply that addresses the demographic, geographic, and management factors unique to the area. The use of lower parking standards for retirement housing is an example of accurate and flexible parking standards.

*The City will continue efforts to establish lower minimum parking requirements in the current zoning districts to encourage in-fill development and the use of alternative travel modes. This is particularly true of commercial and industrial zoning. Lower parking minimums could have an impact on the total parking inventory, but there is no guarantee*

*that development would choose fewer parking spaces for their developments. Lower minimum parking requirements, however, might encourage some in-fill development. In-fill development can be encouraged to increase densities and remove land from its temporary status as parking lots. Both the reduction of existing parking and increasing building densities will help lead to a more pedestrian friendly environment and encourage transit ridership - a primary goal of the TPR.*

**6.4.4. Parking Maximums:** Most often zoning regulations address parking in terms of the minimum parking required for any given use. This often leads to an over abundance of parking, particularly in retail environments. As its name implies, maximum parking standards establish a maximum amount of parking allowed per use or area. Depending upon how the zoning regulation is structured, the amount of parking built in connection with new development could be reduced by as much as 30 percent. The exact levels of parking permitted for new development would be figured on the rate of expected construction by land use type.

*The City does not currently regulate the maximum amount of parking allowed. The adoption of maximum parking standards is an effective means of reducing excessive parking and is a stated policy of the City. As a product of this TSP, the City will be updating the parking regulations in its Land Development Code to provide maximum parking requirements for all uses and development (new, in-fill, redevelopment).*

**6.4.5. Remote Parking and Shuttle Service:** Remote parking typically involves off-site parking, and is very similar to shared parking. Remote parking essentially addresses parking needs by providing parking in outlying areas. Consequently, users of remote parking are required to walk further, or use transit/shuttle services to reach the intended destination.

*The City's current zoning regulations support remote parking, provided that it is located within a minimum specified distance. With respect to transit/shuttle service, the City does support efforts by ODOT and RVTD to develop shuttle service and park-and-ride facilities.*

**6.4.6. Smart Growth:** Smart growth is a term that represents land use planning techniques that encourage compact, mixed-use, pedestrian friendly, and transit-oriented development. Smart growth techniques are aimed at reducing reliance on the automobile by providing an environment that encourages walking and bicycling.

*The City has been very aggressive in its pursuit of smart growth techniques, with projects such as Twin Creeks TOD, Snowy Butte Station, and the adoption of transit oriented development standards.*

**6.4.7. Walking and Bicycle Alternatives:** To the extent that they reduce reliance on use of the automobile, walking and bicycle policies are an effective parking strategy. An effective and connected pedestrian and bicycle system will reduce the demand for parking.

*In Chapter 8, the City's policies and plans for development of a convenient and safe pedestrian and bicycle system are stated.*

**6.4.8. Capacity of Existing Parking Facilities:** Increases in the capacity of existing parking facilities applies to both on-street and off-street parking. It is not unusual for older parking facilities to have areas of waste, or parking dimensions which can yield additional parking. Many cities also have parking requirements that don't allow flexibility in dimensional standards, i.e. compact parking.

*The City will continuously evaluate its parking standards to maintain use of best practices for parking management.*

**6.4.9. Mobility Management:** Mobility management, more commonly referred to as transportation demand management (TDM) addresses strategies that increase the efficiency of a transportation system by changing travel behavior. This change in behavior can be in the form of routes use, transportation mode, time of travel, etc., or a combination thereof. An effective TDM program can cause a reduction in the demand for parking.

*Chapter 5 of the TSP discusses the City's use of TDM strategies. When successfully implemented, many TDM strategies will also result in a reduction in the parking demand.*

**6.4.10. Price Parking:** Another approach to reducing the supply of parking is to impose a fee on the use of parking spaces, particularly within commercial areas. There are a number of responses, both positive and negative, to pricing parking. One of the negative responses is to work, shop, or visit other destinations that are not subject to pricing of parking.

*At this time, the pricing of parking is not considered a reasonable parking reduction technique for the City. However, it is acknowledged that it is merely a matter of time before the pricing of parking will be a viable strategy, this will be particularly true of the successful revitalization of the downtown.*

**6.4.11. Improve Pricing Methods:** Improvements to pricing methods relates to the actual means by which motorists pay for parking, i.e. meters, parking passes, debit cards, etc. These payment systems are often an aggravation to the motorist, because of the general inconvenience they cause versus the preferred free parking that they have become accustomed to.

*The improvement in pricing methods strategy requires that a pricing system be in place (6.4.10). As noted above, it is not expected that the City will generate sufficient demand in parking to support price parking and pricing methods. However, when considering plans for the downtown, price parking and pricing methods will be a consideration.*

**6.4.12. Financial Incentives:** Financial incentives refer to strategies that encourage motorists to use alternative means of commuting to work/shopping. Examples include, discounted transit passes, rideshare incentives, and what is referred to as cash-out which is a direct cash incentive to employees to use an alternative travel mode less reliant on parking.

*In the foreseeable future, the City does not anticipate its direct use of this strategy but does support its use by RVTD.*

**6.4.13. Unbundle Parking:** The term “unbundle parking” refers to the leasing or sale of parking spaces separate from the building space. The objective is to allow users to purchase only the parking that is needed. Because of the administrative sophistication (legal) of unbundled parking, its use is primarily limited to metropolitan, high density environments with very high parking demand.

*At this time unbundled parking is not an appropriate parking strategy for the City of Central Point. Parking demand and general land use characteristics do not support consideration of this strategy.*

**6.4.14. Parking Taxes:** The taxation of parking is another strategy for managing the supply of parking. Parking taxation strategies refer to a wide range of taxation related to parking, including the actual taxation of parking, storm water management fees, etc.

*Through its storm water systems development fee and maintenance fees the City does indirectly tax parking based on the impervious surface area parking creates. The use of a parking tax, other than the storm development and maintenance fee, is not a realistic consideration until it becomes a common practice throughout the metropolitan area.*

**6.4.15. User Information and Marketing:** Often parking is available, but the location of that parking is unknown. Proper signage and marketing can improve the efficiency of parking use.

*Parking information and marketing will primarily apply to the City’s downtown area. As the downtown revitalizes, parking will become a premium and the location and availability of parking will be a functional component of the downtown revitalization process.*

**6.4.16. Enforcement and Control:** As its name implies, this parking strategy addresses improvement in the efficiency of a City’s parking enforcement and control program. This strategy is primarily a management strategy focusing on the attainment of a City’s parking objectives.

*Until the City has an enforcement or formal parking management program, this strategy is premature. It is probable that over the next twenty years revitalization of the downtown will result in the need for parking management. When a parking management program is developed, it is important to define the mission of the program.*

**6.4.17. Parking Management Association:** Parking management and parking management associations (PMAs) are mechanisms that can facilitate shared parking among non-adjacent land uses by providing off-site centralized parking facilities. These facilities can be large parking structures or surface lots. Parking management can employ a wide range of techniques that will result in the more efficient use of existing parking facilities.

PMAs are entities responsible for conducting this management and providing access to resources that will ease the burden on the parking supply. Often PMAs are non-profit groups supported by retail or business district associations.

*With the exception of the downtown, it is not anticipated that during the planning period covered by this TSP that the intensity of development within the City will be such as to support a PMA. Currently, within the downtown, development is not intense enough to support a PMA. However, as the downtown's revitalization efforts mature there will be a definite role for the creation of a PMA. This is particularly true considering the many small properties lacking current parking and the cost of developing new parking within the downtown.*

## **6.5. Regional Transportation Plan**

The Regional Transportation Plan 2005-2030 (RTP) contains six (6) parking related policies. The policies adopted in the RTP address some, but not all, of the strategies noted above. The RTP parking policies are as follows:

**RTP Policy 6.B-1:** Local Governments shall consider the adoption of maximum parking requirements (or parking caps) in their zoning codes to reduce excessive off-street parking supply.

**RTP Policy 6.B-2:** Local governments should establish low minimum parking requirements in their zoning codes to encourage in-fill development.

**RTP Policy 6.B-3:** Local governments should re-designate existing, general use parking spaces to a different, special use as to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes.

**RTP Policy 6.B-4:** Local governments are required to manage roadway space as necessary to provide for bike lanes, bus stops, turn lanes, no parking zones, and other such uses that promote use of alternative transportation modes. On-street parking can be eliminated as required to provide for these facilities. The management of roadway space also includes the use of narrower streets. Management of the roadway space and the allocation for these uses can have a measurable impact on the amount of on-street parking.

**Bike Lanes:** In limited locations, the removal of on-street parking and re-striping for a bicycle lane is a possibility, rather than by widening the roadway. However, since most arterial and collector streets currently do not include on-street parking, elimination of a significant number of parking spaces is unlikely.

**Bus Stops:** From time-to-time throughout the planning period, the placement of bus stops will be needed as the Rogue Valley Transportation District's expands routes and service.

**Turn Lanes:** Re-striping for turn lanes is a transportation system management strategy that can be used to increase the capacity of intersections. In many cases, queuing distances at stop signs or traffic signals will require that no-parking zones be extended for more than 100 feet from the intersection. This could require removal of parking that is sometimes permitted as close as 20 feet from a cross-walk at an intersection.

**No-Parking Zones:** Designating larger no-parking zones to increase sight distances at intersections is already implied in the code. Parking is not permitted

within 50 feet of a stop sign, yield sign, or other traffic control device where such parking hides it from view. A blanket prohibition on parking within 50 feet of a corner would have a measurable impact on the number of parking spaces and would have other benefits related to sight distance.

**Street Standards:** Adopting street standards for residential streets could include reducing street width to the extent that on-street parking would be permitted only on one side or eliminated completely. This technique needs to be carefully considered and managed through strict design controls to assure that residential neighborhoods have adequate parking for visitors.

**RTP Policy 6.B-5:** Local governments shall utilize and encourage appropriate parking policies and strategies to reduce auto dependence and discourage auto use where other alternative modes of access are possible. Where appropriate, parking needs to be oriented to the back or side of buildings with entrances to the front for pedestrian access.

The TPR presented two techniques in this category: Shared Parking; and Parking Management

**RTP Policy 6.B-6:** Local government and ODOT shall plan park-and-ride facilities near transit routes and major transportation connections to encourage transit and shared rides to discourage single occupancy vehicles.

The parking strategies presented in this chapter have been prepared in coordination, and are compliant with, the parking policies adopted in the RTP.

## **6.6. Current Parking Code and Policy Changes**

The City's current parking standards were last updated in 1998. Current parking regulations specify only minimum standards, resulting in some developments, such as retail stores, to provide an excess of parking supply. It is the City's policy that parking regulations as set forth in the Land Development Code be periodically reviewed against best practices, and the Land Development Code appropriately amended.

## **6.7. Parking Management Goals and Policies**

### **GOAL 6.1: TO MANAGE AUTOMOBILE PARKING WITHIN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA AS NECESSARY TO REDUCE PARKING CONSISTENT WITH STATE AND REGIONAL GOALS.**

*Policy 6.1.1. The City shall manage the supply, operation, enforcement and demand for parking in the public right-of-way to encourage economic vitality, traffic safety, transportation system efficiency, and livability of neighborhoods.*

*Policy 6.1.2. Except within the Central Business District, where on-street parking is considered an element of the Central Business District's economic vitality, the provision for on-street parking is second in priority to the needs of the travel modes (i.e., vehicle, transit, bicycle, pedestrian) using the street right-of-way, and shall be removed when necessary to facilitate street widening.*

*Policy 6.1.3. In those areas where demand exists, an adequate supply of off-street carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be provided. The location of these spaces shall have preference over those intended for general purpose off-street parking.*

**GOAL 6.2: TO PROMOTE AND MANAGE THE PARKING NEEDS OF THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA IN A MANNER THAT REASONABLY BALANCES THE DEMAND FOR PARKING AGAINST THE USE OF TRANSIT, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN TRANSPORTATION MODES, WHILE MAINTAINING THE ECONOMIC VITALITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD LIVABILITY.**

*Policy 6.2.1. The City shall prepare, adopt and maintain parking standards that reflect best parking practices that further the parking goals of the City..*

*Policy 6.2.2. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain effective development standards for paved off-street parking areas to include provisions for landscaping, planting strips, pedestrian walkways, curbs, and sidewalks.*

## Chapter 7 – Street System, 2008-2030

### 7.1. Introduction

The City of Central Point's street system contains over sixty miles of roadways serving a variety of functions ranging from local streets, collectors and arterials providing a broad range of transportation services for the City's residential, commercial, and industrial needs. Within this system there are thirty-five key intersections, which by the year 2030, these intersections and their related street segments will require both modernization and extension to accommodate the City's projected growth as discussed in Chapter 3. In anticipation of this growing demand the City has completed four major traffic studies. These studies and their objectives are:

**Central Point Transit Oriented Development Traffic Impact Study**, JRH Engineers, Planners & Project Managers, August 1, 2000.

**Central Point Highway 99 Corridor Plan**, OTAK/DKS Associates, 2005.

**East Pine Street Transportation Plan**, Central Point, Oregon, JRH Transportation Engineering, July 2004. Most of the City's vacant land is served by E. Pine Street, a major arterial. The City recognizes the impact of development on the service level of E. Pine Street and commissioned a traffic study to evaluate future growth impacts and mitigation options.


**City of Central Point Transportation Plan, Existing & Future Conditions Technical Traffic Report**, JRH Transportation Engineering, June 30, 2007. In preparation of this TSP the City commissioned a more comprehensive traffic analysis that took into consideration prior findings of prior traffic studies

As the City proceeds with implementation of its transportation plans it is important that inter-jurisdictional coordination on those projects that involve other governmental agencies be communicated in a timely and productive manner. One of the primary purposes of this TSP is to identify and acknowledge projected improvements that are inter-jurisdictional, and to provide an estimate of the timing of those projects from concept through construction. Table 7.1 identifies each project, the estimated timing of the project completions, and the jurisdictions involved in the project's design and development.

### 7.2. Street System

The City's 2030 Street System is illustrated in Figure 7.1, which provides an overview of the City's existing and planned arterial and collector street system.

**7.2.1. Future Conditions:** In Chapter 4, the existing conditions of the City's street system were discussed, including current deficiencies. As of 2008 the City's street system is operating at an acceptable level of service. In order to maintain this level of service it will be necessary that the street system be monitored and improved to meet the City's growing demand for transportation services. In recognition of this challenge the City has prepared, as part of this TSP, forecasts of future demands on the City's arterials and collectors for the years 2010, 2020, and 2030. The purpose of these forecasts is to determine improvements necessary to accommodate growth while maintaining an acceptable level of mobility (LOS D) throughout the City's street system.



**Figure 7.1**  
**Functional Classification & Street Network Map**  
**2008-2030**

**7.2.2 Operational Analysis and LOS “D”:** For each of the forecast years (2010, 2020, and 2030), an operational analysis was conducted for each of the thirty-five intersections. The City’s policy is to maintain a minimum level of service (LOS) of “D” or better. Based on land development forecasts, development volume scenarios were prepared for each of the forecast years. These volume scenarios included growth in regional traffic volumes and traffic resulting from local development. The future year projections are based on the availability, probability, and location of vacant lands within the Central Point urban area as discussed in Chapter 3. If, throughout the planning period, the average rate of development changes from that used in the model, project timing will similarly change through either acceleration, or postponement of the project. Throughout the duration of this TSP, the rate of land use development and mobility level (LOS) should be continuously monitored with forecasts and project timing adjusted as appropriate.

**7.2.2.1. Year 2010 Roadway Deficiencies:** By 2010, it is projected that nine (9) intersections will approach, or exceed, minimum performance standards during one or both peak hours without any improvements. This represents 26% of the City’s key intersections. Table 7.2 summarizes the results of the operational analysis for the Year 2010 scenario. The table lists each intersection within the study area separately with the corresponding mobility standard for A.M. and P.M. conditions.

Additionally, the fourth railroad crossing and intersection improvement for Twin Creeks Crossing Drive will be needed to accommodate the continued development of the Twin Creeks TOD. Without this improvement, the recently upgraded intersections of Front St. & Pine and Pine & Haskell will exceed acceptable levels of service. The following identifies each of the ten intersections and a general description of the improvements needed to meet a minimum LOS “D”:

- 1. Scenic Avenue & Hwy. 99.** Install a traffic signal when signal warrants are met. The intersection is shown to exceed minimum performance standards by the year 2010 in the P.M. peak hour. Although the level of service will exceed minimums, the criteria for preliminary signal warrants will not be met. Planning and engineering should proceed in the short-term in preparation of construction. The intersection should be monitored until such time that signal warrants are met.
- 2. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street & East Pine Street.** Install a new traffic signal. The intersection is shown to exceed performance standards by the year 2010 during the P.M. peak hour. The existing signal at 3<sup>rd</sup> Street & East Pine Street is planned for removal when the signal is constructed at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street & Pine Street. Preliminary signal warrants are not met in the year 2010. The intersection should be monitored and signalized when signal warrants are met.
- 3. 6<sup>th</sup> Street & East Pine Street.** Install a traffic signal. The intersection is shown to exceed performance standards by the year 2010 during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. Preliminary signal warrants are not met in the year 2010. The intersection should be monitored and signalized when signal warrants are met.




Figure 7.2

## Intersection Deficiencies 2010, 2020, 2030

**Table 7.1. Year 2010 PM Peak Hour LOS, City of Central Point**

| Intersection                              | Control Type      | LOS & V/C Standard | Year 2010 A.M. Performance | Year 2010 P.M. Performance |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>WEST SIDE</b>                          |                   |                    |                            |                            |
| Beall & Freeman                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS C                      |
| Beall & Bursell                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Beall & Grant                             | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Beall & Hanley                            | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Beall & Hwy. 99                           | Signalized        | V/C 0.90           | V/C 0.85                   | V/C 0.90                   |
| Taylor & Grant (south)                    | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Taylor & Grant (north)                    | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Bursell & Hopkins                         | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Hwy. 99 & East Pine (Front)               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> & East Pine               | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS F                      |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> & East Pine               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS B                      |
| 4 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS B                      |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS E                      | LOS E                      |
| 10 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine              | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS D                      | LOS C                      |
| Grant & Scenic                            | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Scenic & Hwy. 99                          | Stop/Unsignalized | V/C 0.90           | V/C 0.27                   | V/C 0.93                   |
| Haskell & Taylor                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Haskell & West Pine                       | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS B                      |
| Freeman & Hopkins                         | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Hazel & 3 <sup>rd</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS B                      |
| Haskell & Beall                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| <b>EAST SIDE</b>                          |                   |                    |                            |                            |
| Meadowbrook & East Pine                   | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B restricted         | LOS F/B restricted         |
| Beebe & Hamrick                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B (signal)           | LOS F/B (signal)           |
| Peninger & East Pine                      | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| Hamrick & East Pine                       | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| Upton & Peninger                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| I-5 NB & East Pine                        | Signalized        | V/C 0.85           | V/C 0.74                   | V/C 1.00                   |
| I-5 SB & East Pine                        | Signalized        | V/C 0.85           | V/C 0.76                   | V/C 0.77                   |
| Table Rock & East Pine                    | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| Wilson & Table Rock                       | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F                      | LOS F                      |
| Vilas & Table Rock                        | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| New Haven & Hamrick                       | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS E                      | LOS F                      |
| Gebhard & Wilson                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |

**4. Wilson Road & Table Rock Road.** Install a signal or restrict movements to right-in/right-out/left-out. The intersection is shown to exceed performance standards by the year 2010 during the A.M. and P.M. peak hour. Preliminary signal warrants are not met at the intersection in the year 2010. The intersection should be monitored and signalized when signal warrants are met or restricted by median control when the intersection begins to experience excessive delays and/or an increase in accidents as an unsignalized intersection.

**5. New Haven Road & Hamrick Road.** Install a signal or restrict with median control. The intersection is shown to exceed performance standards by the year 2010, but preliminary signal warrants are not met by the year 2010. The

intersection should be monitored and signalized when signal warrants are met or restricted by median control when the intersection begins to experience excessive delays and/or an increase in accidents as an unsignalized intersection.

**6. Beebe Road & Hamrick Road.** Install a new signal. The intersection is shown to exceed performance standards under existing year 2006 conditions; however, preliminary signal warrants are not met under existing conditions. The intersection should be monitored and signalized when signal warrants are met when the intersection begins to experience excessive delays and/or an increase in accidents as an unsignalized intersection.

**7. Meadowbrook Drive & East Pine Street.** Restrict intersection movements to right-in/right-out/left-in movements. The intersection is shown to exceed performance standards when the development to the south (Hamrick Business Park) is developed. Seventy-five (75) percent of the Hamrick Road Business Park project is estimated to be developed by the year 2010, with the remaining twenty-five (25) percent being developed by the year 2020. Median control prohibiting northbound and southbound left-turn movements will mitigate the intersection through the year 2030.

**8. Peninger Road & East Pine Street.** Remove signal and restrict intersection movements to right-in/right-out through median control. The proximity of this intersection to the northbound I-5 off-ramp intersection will necessitate the need to remove the signal and convert the intersection to a right-in/right-out stop-controlled intersection. The success of this improvement is contingent on its coordination with improvements to the connectivity of Peninger Road north and south of East Pine Street as illustrated in Figure 7.1, which will necessitate the crossing of Bear Creek in two locations.

The proposed improvement will impact the use of this intersection for freight purposes. The significance of this intersection on the City's freight system reinforces the simultaneous need to improve the extensions of Peninger as noted above.

The design of this project needs to be closely coordinated with development plans for the Jackson County Fairgrounds (the "Expo"). Throughout the planning period the Expo will continue to be a significant influence on the transportation needs of the general area. Currently, the County is preparing a master plan for the development of the Expo. This master plan should address transportation needs consistent with those set forth in this TSP.

**9. I-5 Northbound Ramps & East Pine Street<sup>19</sup>.** Initial improvements will add capacity to the northbound off-ramp to accommodate the high right-turn volume demand forecast by the year 2010. Additional capacity improvements are needed to accommodate local development traffic.

---

<sup>19</sup> Improvements to the I-5 Interchange are informational only and intended to acknowledge that capacity issues are expected in the future and that a thorough analysis of the interchange needs to be prepared by ODOT. Improvements to the I-5 Interchange are the responsibility of ODOT.

This improvement is listed in the RVMPO Freight Study as a priority freight system improvement.

**10. Twin Creeks Crossing Drive & Hwy. 99.** Construct the three-way signalized intersection at Hwy. 99 and the easterly extension of Twin Creeks Crossing Drive. The extension of Twin Creeks Crossing Drive will also require installation of a railroad crossing.

**7.2.2.2 Year 2020 Roadway Deficiencies:** By 2020 it is projected that sixteen (16) intersections will exceed performance standards during one or both peak hours without any improvements. This represents 46% of the City's key intersections. The results of the operational analysis for the Year 2020 scenario are summarized in Table 7.3. The table lists each intersection within the study area separately, with the corresponding mobility standard for A.M. and P.M. conditions. The following identifies each of the sixteen intersections and a general description of the improvements needed to meet a minimum LOS "D":

**1. Table Rock Road & Vilas Road.** Widen to increase capacity. The intersection is shown to exceed performance standards by the year 2020. Adding an eastbound lane to allow a dual eastbound left turn movement and shared through-right turn movement mitigates the intersection in the year 2020. Additional widening is required to mitigate for the future year 2030 conditions.

**2. East Pine Street, Table Rock Road to I-5.** An additional westbound through lane will eventually be required based on projected traffic volumes.

**3. Gebhard Road Extension.** By Year 2020, it is forecast that Gebhard Road will be extended to intersect with E. Pine Street approximately 700 feet west of Hamrick Road. In addition to the extension of Gebhard Road, its intersection with East Pine Street would need to be signalized.

**4. Beall Lane & Hwy. 99.** Add protected-permissive phasing to the eastbound and westbound left turn movements. The intersection is shown to exceed performance standards by the year 2020. Changing to protected-permissive phasing mitigates the intersection through future year 2030 conditions during both A.M. and P.M. peak hours.

**5. Hwy. 99 & Pine Street.** Widen Pine Street. The intersection exceeds performance standards by the year 2020. Possible improvements at that time include striping the eastbound movements to include an exclusive left turn and two through lanes with a shared right-turn, as well as adding protected-permissive phasing to the eastbound and westbound left-turn movement.

**6. Hamrick Road & East Pine Street & Table Rock Road/Biddle Road.** Major capacity improvements are necessary for these intersections to accommodate heavy left-turn volume demand and added traffic due to developments along East Pine Street that will use existing and proposed cross-streets versus direct access to East Pine Street.

**Table 7.2. Year 2020 PM Peak Hour LOS, City of Central Point**

| Intersection                              | Control Type      | LOS & V/C Standard | Year 2020 A.M. Performance | Year 2020 P.M. Performance |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>WEST SIDE</b>                          |                   |                    |                            |                            |
| Beall & Freeman                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Beall & Bursell                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Beall & Grant                             | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Beall & Hanley                            | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Beall & Hwy. 99                           | Signalized        | V/C 0.90           | V/C 0.98                   | V/C 0.90                   |
| Taylor & Grant (south)                    | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Taylor & Grant (north)                    | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Bursell & Hopkins                         | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Hwy. 99 & East Pine (Front)               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS                        | LOS                        |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> & East Pine               | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B (signal)           | LOS F/B (signal)           |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> & East Pine               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B/D (unsignalized)     | LOS B/F (unsignalized)     |
| 4 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS A                      |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B (signal)           | LOS F/B (signal)           |
| 10 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine              | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS D                      | LOS D                      |
| Grant & Scenic                            | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Scenic & Hwy. 99                          | Stop/Unsignalized | V/C 0.90           | V/C 0.27                   | V/C 0.99                   |
| Haskell & Taylor                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Haskell & West Pine                       | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS B                      |
| Freeman & Hopkins                         | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Hazel & 3 <sup>rd</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Haskell & Beall                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| <b>EAST SIDE</b>                          |                   |                    |                            |                            |
| Meadowbrook & East Pine                   | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B restricted         | LOS F/B restricted         |
| Beebe & Hamrick                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B (signal)           | LOS F/B (signal)           |
| Peninger & East Pine                      | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS (unsignalized)         | LOS (unsignalized)         |
| Hamrick & East Pine                       | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS F                      |
| Upton & Peninger                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| I-5 NB & East Pine                        | Signalized        | V/C 0.85           | V/C 0.72                   | V/C 1.23                   |
| I-5 SB & East Pine                        | Signalized        | V/C 0.85           | V/C 0.79                   | V/C 0.99                   |
| Table Rock & East Pine                    | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS E                      |
| Wilson & Table Rock                       | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F                      | LOS F                      |
| Vilas & Table Rock                        | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS F                      |
| New Haven & Hamrick                       | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F                      | LOS F                      |
| Gebhard & Wilson                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Gebhard Rd. & E. Pine St.                 | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS F                      |

**7.2.2.3 Year 2030 Roadway Deficiencies:** By 2030, it is projected that nineteen (19) intersections will exceed performance standards during one or both peak hours without any improvements. This represents 54% of the City's existing key intersections. The results of the operational analysis for the Year 2030 scenario are summarized in Table 7.4. The table lists each intersection within the study area separately with the corresponding mobility standard and type of control listed.

The following identifies each of the nineteen intersections and a general description of the improvements needed to meet a minimum LOS “D”:

**Table 7.3. Year 2030 PM Peak Hour LOS, City of Central Point**

| Intersection                              | Control Type      | LOS & V/C Standard | Year 2030 A.M. Performance | Year 2030 P.M. Performance |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>WEST SIDE</b>                          |                   |                    |                            |                            |
| Beall & Freeman                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS C                      |
| Beall & Bursell                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Beall & Grant                             | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Beall & Hanley                            | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS D                      |
| Beall & Hwy. 99                           | Signalized        | V/C 0.90           | V/C 1.01                   | V/C 0.92                   |
| Taylor & Grant (south)                    | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS B                      |
| Taylor & Grant (north)                    | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS B                      |
| Bursell & Hopkins                         | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| Hwy. 99 & East Pine (Front)               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS                        | LOS                        |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> & East Pine               | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B (signal)           | LOS F/C (signal)           |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> & East Pine               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B/E (unsignaled)       | LOS B/F (unsignaled)       |
| 4 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine               | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B (signal)           | LOS F/B (signal)           |
| 10 <sup>th</sup> & East Pine              | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS D                      | LOS E                      |
| Grant & Scenic                            | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Scenic & Hwy. 99                          | Stop/Unsignalized | V/C 0.90           | V/C 0.31                   | V/C 1.82                   |
| Haskell & Taylor                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS A                      | LOS A                      |
| Haskell & West Pine                       | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Freeman & Hopkins                         | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS D                      |
| Hazel & 3 <sup>rd</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Haskell & Beall                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS D                      |
| <b>EAST SIDE</b>                          |                   |                    |                            |                            |
| Meadowbrook & East Pine                   | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B restricted         | LOS F/B restricted         |
| Beebe & Hamrick                           | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F/B (signal)           | LOS F/C (signal)           |
| Peninger & East Pine                      | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS (unsignaled)           | LOS (unsignaled)           |
| Hamrick & East Pine                       | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS F                      |
| Upton & Peninger                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS C                      |
| I-5 NB & East Pine                        | Signalized        | V/C 0.85           | V/C 0.93                   | V/C 1.45                   |
| I-5 SB & East Pine                        | Signalized        | V/C 0.85           | V/C 0.88                   | V/C 1.26                   |
| Table Rock & East Pine                    | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS F                      |
| Wilson & Table Rock                       | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F                      | LOS F                      |
| Vilas & Table Rock                        | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS D                      | LOS F                      |
| New Haven & Hamrick                       | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS F                      | LOS F                      |
| Gebhard & Wilson                          | Stop/Unsignalized | LOS D              | LOS B                      | LOS B                      |
| Gebhard Rd. & E. Pine St.                 | Signalized        | LOS D              | LOS C                      | LOS F                      |

1. **10<sup>th</sup> Street & Pine Street & Freeman.** Signal timing improvements. The intersection is shown to exceed performance standards by the year 2030 during the P.M. peak hour, but can be mitigated with signal timing.
2. **New Signal on East Pine Street.** A new north-south public street is proposed between the existing Peninger Road and Hamrick Road. The new roadway will extend from Beebe Road to a new east-west street south of East Pine Street. The new east-west street will allow Peninger Road traffic to use the new signalized intersection at East Pine Street. A new east-west street is also proposed north of East Pine Street to accommodate traffic to and from the Fairgrounds site once the Peninger Road and East Pine Street signal is removed. The new public streets will relieve traffic demand on East Pine Street to facilitate the regional function of this roadway while accommodating local access.
3. **I-5 & East Pine Street Interchange<sup>20</sup>.** Currently, there are no planned or programmed improvements scheduled or approved for Exit 33. There is a need for detailed analysis of the interchange to ensure that projects will meet long-term needs. Initial improvements will add capacity to the northbound off-ramp to accommodate the right-turn volume demand. Additional capacity improvements are needed to accommodate added local development traffic.

### 7.3. Recommended Street System Improvements


Based on the above, a listing of recommended street projects has been prepared and presented in Table 7.5. Projects are presented by short-term (2008-2012), medium (2013-20), and long-term (2021-2030) implementation. It is important to note that the recommendations in this table are based on the most recent growth forecasts. Throughout the planning period 2008-2030, the City needs to continuously monitor its needs and make adjustments to this TSP as justified, both on a need basis and a financial basis. Circumstances will change and so will street improvement needs.


It is also important to understand that some of the listed projects are dependent on other projects to either precede them or to be developed concurrently. If developed alone, they will not resolve any traffic capacity issue and most likely would aggravate existing levels of service. An example of such a project would be removing the signals at Peninger Road and East Pine Street. Without new bridge crossings of Bear Creek and the extension of Hamrick Road and Beebe Road an unacceptable level of service would immediately occur.

Tables 7.6 and 7.7 list Jackson County and ODOT projects within the City's urban area that have been identified as necessary to support the City's transportation objectives. These listed projects, although a part of this TSP, are not included in Chapter 12 Transportation System Financing Program, as a financial responsibility of the City. It is expected that as the County and state update their transportation plans that the projects listed in Tables 7.6 and 7.7 will be included in those plan updates.

---


<sup>20</sup> Ibid.





**Figure 7.4**

**Tier 1 - Medium Term Projects**  
For Use with Table 12.4



**Figure 7.5**

**Tier 1 - Long Term Projects**  
For Use With Table 12.5

**Table 7.4 Transportation Projects, 2008-2030**

| Ref. No. | Project Location                                      | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                                     | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|
| 201      | New Haven Rd. & Hamrick Rd. intersection              | p                | Install traffic signal for pedestrian crossing when warranted by traffic volumes and/or pedestrian activity.            | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          | ✓      | ✓          |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 202      | Hwy. 99 & Twin Creeks Drive RR-Xing/Intersection      | major            | New signalized intersection at Hwy. 99 & Twin Creeks Dr. and new railroad crossing at Twin Creeks Dr.                   | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          | ▪       |         | ▪      |          | ✓      | ✓          |               |               | ♦    |        | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 203      | Hwy. 99, Project No. 1, Traffic Calming               | minor            | Landscape medians, crosswalks, off-street pathways, bike lanes, street lighting, & control fencing.                     | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        | ✓        | ✓      |            |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 204      | S. Haskell St.; Pine St. to Ash St.                   | uu               | Widen to three lanes with curb, gutter, bike lanes & sidewalks.                                                         | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            | ✓             |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 205      | 10th St. & Pine St. & Freeman Rd. Intersection        | minor            | Add protective-permissive phasing to eastbound and westbound left turn movements.                                       | ▪       |         |            |         |         |        |          | ✓      |            |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 206      | Hwy. 99, Project No. 2, Traffic Calming               | p                | Pedestrian crossings, on-street parking, streetscape improvements, & traffic calming in vicinity of the Rogue Creamery. |         | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        | ✓        | ✓      |            |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 207      | 10th St., Hazel St. to Lathrop                        | uu               | Widen to add turn lane with bike lanes & sidewalks.                                                                     | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | ✓      | ✓          |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 208      | Oak St.: Second - Third & First St.: Manzanita-Laurel |                  | Improve alleys and parking facility                                                                                     | ▪       |         |            |         |         |        | ✓        |        |            |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 209      | Beebe Rd.: Gebhard Rd. to Hamrick Rd.                 | uu               | Widen to collector standards with sidewalks & bike lanes.                                                               | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | ✓      |            |               | ✓             |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 210      | E. Pine St. & Meadowbrook Dr.                         | minor            | Restrict intersection movement to right-in, right-out, left-in.                                                         | ▪       |         |            |         |         | ▪      |          | ✓      | ✓          |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 211      | Beebe Rd. & Hamrick Rd. intersection                  | p                | Add traffic signal for pedestrian crossing.                                                                             |         | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          | ✓      |            |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 212      | Hwy. 99, Project No. 4                                | p                | Cupp Street Gateway.                                                                                                    |         | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        | ✓        | ✓      |            |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         | ♦     |

City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030

| Ref. No. | Project Location                                | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|
| 213      | Table Rock Rd. & South Hamrick Rd. Intersection |                  | Add Traffic Signal                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |         |         |            |         | ▪       |        |          | √      | √          |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             | ♦       |       |
| 214      | Scenic Av.: Mary's Way to Scenic Middle School. | uu               | Widen 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      | √          |               | √             |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 215      | Hwy. 99, Project No. 3                          | p                | Pedestrian crossings, streetscape improvements & traffic calming.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        | √        | √      |            |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 216      | E. Pine St. & Hamrick Rd. Intersection          | minor            | Widen west and south approaches to add a second eastbound left turn lane and second receiving lane. Restripe northbound approach to include dual left turns and a single through-shared-right turn. Restripe southbound approach to include a left turn, through, and exclusive right turn lanes. | ▪       |         |            |         | ▪       |        |          | √      | √          |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 217      | E. Pine St. & 2nd St. & 6th St. & 3rd St.       | s                | Traffic calming, remove 4th St. signal, add new signals at 2nd and 6th St., remove 3rd. St. signal and install median control.                                                                                                                                                                    | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      | √          |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 218      | E. Pine St. & Table Rock Rd.                    | minor            | Widen west approach to add second eastbound left turn lane.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | ▪       |         |            |         | ▪       |        |          | √      | √          |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             | ♦       |       |
| 219      | Table Rock Rd. & Vilas Rd. Intersection         | major            | Widen to increase capacity, add eastbound lane & shared through-right turn movement                                                                                                                                                                                                               | ▪       |         |            |         | ▪       |        |          | √      | √          |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             | ♦       |       |
| 220      | Gebhard Rd.: UGB to Beebe Rd.                   | uu               | Realign, widen to 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade (collector standards).                                                                                                                                                                                                            | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 221      | Hwy. 99 & Beall Ln. intersection                | major            | Realign & upgrade signals & railroad crossing, urban upgrade.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          | √      |            |               | √             | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             | ♦       | ♦     |
| 222      | 3rd St.: E. Pine St. to Hazel St.               | uu               | Add bike lanes and sidewalks                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 223      | Hazel St.: Third to 10th St.                    | p                | Pave and improve, adding sidewalks.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |

City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030

| Ref. No. | Project Location                                 | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                                         | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|
| 224      | Scenic Av.: Tenth St. to Scenic Middle School    | uu               | Widen 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks (collector standards).                                                                 |         |         |            |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 225      | Hwy. 99: Phase 3                                 | pb               | Widen to provide bike lanes & sidewalks.                                                                                    |         | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 226      | E. Pine St.; I-5 to Penninger Rd.                | minor            | Add right turn lane with sidewalks.                                                                                         | ▪       |         | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          |        | √          |               |               | ♦    |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 227      | W. Pine St.; Hanley Rd. to Haskell St.           | uu               | Widen 3 lanes (continuous turn lane), bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade.                                                 |         | ▪       |            |         |         |        |          | √      | √          |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 228      | E. Pine Street traffic calming                   | major            | Misc. enhancements such as bulb-outs, cross-walks, signals, etc. that improve the pedestrian environment along Pine Street. |         | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        | √        | √      | √          |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 229      | 2nd St.; E. Pine St. to Hazel St.                | pb               | Add bike lanes & sidewalks, redesignate as one-way southbound.                                                              | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 230      | Hwy. 99 & Scenic Av. Intersection                | major            | Install a traffic signal when signal warrants are met                                                                       | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 231      | Scenic Av.: Hwy. 99 to Grant Rd.                 | uu               | Widen 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks. Box culvert developer driven                                                          | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      | √          |               | √             | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 232      | Taylor Rd.: Grant Rd. to Silver Creek            | uu               | Widen 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade. Culvert crossings (2)                                                  | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 233      | E. Pine St.: Hamrick Rd. to Bear Creek Bridge    | pb               | Widen for decel/accel lanes, add bike lanes and sidewalks.                                                                  | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 234      | E-W Hamrick Rd. extension (south of E. Pine St.) | nc               | Extend Hamrick Rd. westerly to intersect with Penninger Rd. (collector standards).                                          | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          |        | √          |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 235      | Freeman Rd.: Hopkins Rd. to Beall Ln.            | b                | Rebuild to collector standards                                                                                              |         | ▪       |            |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 236      | E. Pine St.: Bear Creek Bridge to Peninger Rd.   | pb               | Widen for turn lanes, bike lanes, add sidewalks. And third lane                                                             | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          | √      |            |               |               | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |

City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030

| Ref. No. | Project Location                       | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other |
|----------|----------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|
| 237      | Freeman Rd.: Oak St. to Hopkins Rd.    | uu               | Widen 3 lanes (continuous turn lane), bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade.                                                                                                                                                                  | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 238      | 10th St.: E. Pine St. to Hazel St.     | uu               | Widen to add continuous turn lane, bike lanes & sidewalks.                                                                                                                                                                                   | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 239      | Grant Rd.: Scenic Av. to Taylor Rd.    | uu               | Realign, widen to 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade.                                                                                                                                                                             | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 240      | Peninger Rd. Extension, South          | nc               | Extend Penninger Rd. from E. Pine St. south across Bear Creek to Hamrick Rd. & construct new bridge across Bear Creek                                                                                                                        | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        | √          |               |               | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 241      | 3rd St.: Hazel St. to Scenic Ave.      | minor            | Widen to 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade (collector standards).                                                                                                                                                                | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      | √          |               |               |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 242      | Grant Rd.: Taylor Rd. to Beall Ln.     | uu               | Realign, widen to 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade (collector standards).                                                                                                                                                       | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 243      | Bursell Rd.: Beall Ln. to Hopkins Rd.  | uu               | Urban upgrade; 2 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks.                                                                                                                                                                                               | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 244      | Upton Rd., Scenic Av. Raymond St.      | ru               | Widen to rural 2 lanes with bike lanes, sidewalks.                                                                                                                                                                                           | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 245      | Peninger Rd. Project                   | nc               | Extend Penninger Rd. from E. Pine St. north across Bear Creek to Beebe Rd. & remove signal at Penninger /Pine St. and construct bridge across Bear Creek. Also, extend Peninger Rd. south across Bear Creek to intersect with S. Hamrick Rd. | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        | √          |               |               | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 246      | Freeman Rd. & Hopkins Rd. Intersection | s                | Install new signal.                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | ▪       |         |            |         |         |        |          |        | √          |               | √             | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |
| 247      | 3rd St.; E. Pine St. to Ash St.        | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 248      | Maple St.; Hwy. 99 to 10th St.         | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 249      | 4th St.; Ash St. to Cedar St.          | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         |       |

City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030

| Ref. No. | Project Location                       | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                        | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other |
|----------|----------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|
| 250      | Ash St.; Hwy. 99 to Freeman Rd.        | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                 |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 251      | Oak St.; Hwy. 99 to Freeman Rd.        | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                 |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 252      | Rachel Dr.; Saxbury Dr. to W. Pine St. | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                 |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 253      | Saxbury Dr.; Brad Wy. To Rachel Dr.    | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                 |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 254      | Brad Wy.; Taylor Rd. to Saxbury Dr.    | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                 |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             |      |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 255      | E. Pine St.; I-5 to Table Rock Rd.     | major            | Widen E. Pine St. to add third westbound through lane from east side of Table Rock Rd. to I-5 SB off-ramp. | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        | √          | √             |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       |

LEGEND:

uu = urban upgrade

ru = rural upgrade

s = signalization

p = pedestrian

b = bicycle

pb = pedestrian/bicycle

minor = minor capacity improvement

major = major capacity improvement

nc = new construction

**Table 7.5. Jackson County/City of Central Point Transportation Projects, 2008-2030**

| Ref. No. | Project Location                           | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                                                       | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other |
|----------|--------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|
| 802      | Beall Ln., Hwy. 99 to Merriman Rd.         | uu               | Widen to add continuous turn lane with bike lanes and sidewalks.                                                                          | •       | •       | •          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             | ♦       |       |
| 812      | Table Rock Rd., Bear Creek to Biddle Rd.   | uu               | Widen to add continuous turn lane with bike lanes & sidewalks.                                                                            | •       | •       | •          |         | •       |        |          |        |            |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 813      | Table Rock Rd. & Wilson Rd.                | minor            | Widen to five lanes with sidewalks and bike lanes. Install a signal when warranted or restrict movements to right-in, right-out, left-in. | •       |         |            |         | •       |        |          |        |            |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             | ♦       |       |
| 816      | E. Pine St., Table Rock Rd. to Hamrick Rd. | ps               | Add bike lanes & sidewalks.                                                                                                               |         | •       | •          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |
| 823      | Hanley Rd.: W. Pine to Beall Ln.           | uu               | Widen 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks.                                                                                                     | •       | •       | •          |         |         |        |          | ✓      |            |               | ✓             |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     |

**Table 7.6. City of Central Point Transportation Projects, 2008-2030**

| Ref. No. | Project Location                        | Improv. Category | Project Description                           | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Upgrade | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other |
|----------|-----------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|
| 916      | I-5 & E. Pine St., SB Off-Ramp          | major            | Extend and channelize southbound off ramp     | •       |         |            |         | •       |        |          |        |            |               |         | ♦    |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 917      | I-5 Central Point Interchange (Exit 33) | major            | Interchange reconfiguration.                  | •       |         |            |         | •       |        |          |        |            |               |         | ♦    |        | ♦             |         |       |
| 918      | I-5 & E. Pine St. NB                    | major            | Northbound & eastbound capacity improvements. | •       |         |            |         | •       |        |          |        |            |               |         | ♦    |        |               |         |       |

**LEGEND:**

uu = urban upgrade

ru = rural upgrade

s = signalization

p = pedestrian

b = bicycle

pb = pedestrian/bicycle

minor = minor capacity improvement

major = major capacity improvement

nc = new construction

## 7.4. Street System Goals, Objectives and Policies

### **GOAL 7.1: PROVIDE A COMPREHENSIVE STREET SYSTEM THAT SERVES THE PRESENT AND FUTURE MOBILITY AND TRAVEL NEEDS OF THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES<sup>21</sup>**

- Policy 7.1.1. The City shall fulfill its system wide travel capacity needs through the use of multiple travel modes within the public rights-of-way.*
- Policy 7.1.2. The City's street system shall contain a network of arterial and collector streets and highways that link the central core area and major industry with regional and statewide highways.*
- Policy 7.1.3. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain street design standards consistent with the policies of this TSP.*
- Policy 7.1.4. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain standards that promote connectivity of the street system consistent with the Functional Classification Map.*
- Policy 7.1.5. The City shall actively pursue construction of I-5 interchange improvements at Pine Street.*
- Policy 7.1.6. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain design standards for its streets to safely accommodate pedestrian, bicycle and motor vehicle travel as has been accomplished in the TOD Districts.*
- Policy 7.1.7. The City Standards and Details shall be the basis for all street design within the Central Point urban area.*
- Policy 7.1.8. Wherever possible the City shall incorporate safely designed, aesthetic features into the streetscape of its public rights-of-way. These features may include: street trees, shrubs, and grasses; planting strips and raised medians; meandering sidewalks on arterial streets; and, in some instances, street furniture, planters, special lighting, public art, or non-standard paving materials.*
- Policy 7.1.9. When existing streets are widened or reconstructed they shall be designed to the adopted street design standards for the appropriate street classification where practical. Adjustments to the design standards may be necessary to avoid existing topographical constraints, historic properties, schools, cemeteries, problems with right-of-way acquisition, existing on-street parking and significant cultural features. The design of the street shall be sensitive to the livability of the surrounding neighborhood.*
- Policy 7.1.10. The City shall work with federal, state and local government agencies to*

---

<sup>21</sup> OAR 660-012-0020(2)(b)

*promote traffic safety education and awareness, emphasizing the responsibilities and courtesies required of drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians.*

- Policy 7.1.11. The City shall place a higher priority on funding and constructing street projects that address identified vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety problems than those projects that solely respond to automotive capacity deficiencies in the street system. Exceptions are those capacity improvements that are designed to also resolve identified safety problems.*
- Policy 7.1.12. The City shall select street improvement projects from those listed in the Central Point Transportation System Plan when making significant increases in system capacity or bringing arterial or collector streets up to urban standards. The selection of improvement projects should be prioritized based on consideration of improvements to safety, relief of existing congestion, response to near-term growth, system-wide benefits, geographic equity, and availability of funding.*
- Policy 7.1.13. To maximize the longevity of its capital investments, the City shall design street improvement projects to meet existing travel demand and, whenever possible to accommodate anticipated travel demand for the next 20 years for that facility.*
- Policy 7.1.14. The City shall involve representatives of affected neighborhood associations, citizens, developers, surveyors, engineering and planning professionals in an advisory role in the design of street improvement projects.*
- Policy 7.1.15. The City shall require Traffic Impact Analyses as part of land use development proposals to assess the impact that a development will have on the existing and planned transportation system and to identify reasonable on-site and off-site improvements necessary to mitigate impacts.*
- Policy 7.1.16. The City may require new development to pay charges towards the mitigation of system-wide transportation impacts created by new growth in the community through established Street System Development Charges (SDCs) and any other street fees that are established by the City.*

## Chapter 8 – Bicycle & Pedestrian System

### 8.1. Introduction

The provision and adequacy of facilities and programs that support and promote the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians is an important transportation strategy in promoting alternatives to the automobile. The goal of this chapter is to provide guidance in developing transportation alternatives through the design and implementation of a comprehensive, convenient, accessible and safe system of bike and pedestrian ways throughout the City. It is the City's goal to continually seek improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian system that will encourage the increased use of the bicycle and pedestrian system for journey-to-work trips as well as the non-work/recreational trip. Increases in bicycle and pedestrian use will reduce the City's reliance on automobile use through reductions in vehicular miles traveled and parking demand.

### 8.2. Bicycle System Hierarchy

There are two basic uses for bicycles: as a means of transportation, and for recreational purposes. The focus of this TSP is on the use of bicycles as a means of transportation, with the recreational use of bicycles a secondary consideration. It is the City's position that a well planned and maintained bicycle transportation system will also effectively serve the needs of the recreational bicyclist.

As a means of transportation, the bicyclist relies on a network that links local neighborhood use of the bicycle with intra-city and inter-city uses. In order to meet this objective an effective bicycle system will offer connectivity from neighborhoods to schools, recreation and employment centers, commercial districts, transit centers, institutions and recreational destinations. The most common means of accomplishing this objective is through the provision of dedicated bikeways on arterial and collector streets. Because of the traffic volumes and speeds on arterial and collector streets, it is prudent to set aside travel lanes dedicated to the use of bicyclists. Additionally, by their very nature, arterial and collector streets offer connectivity between intra-city and inter-city activity centers.

In recognition of this means of improving the connectivity and safety of the bicycle system, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) has established as a performance measure (Measure 3) the provision of bicycle facilities on all collector and arterial streets with targeted percentages. Measure 3 is presented in Table 8.1.

**Table 8.1. Regional Transportation Plan Bicycle System Performance Measures**

| Measure 3                                              | How Measured                                                                                                               | 2000 | Benchmark 2005 | Benchmark 2010 | Benchmark 2015 | Benchmark 2020 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Measure 3: Collectors & arterials w/bicycle facilities | Determined through GIS Mapping. Current estimates are that 21% of collectors and arterials have provisions for bicyclists. | 21%  | 28%            | 37%            | 48%            | 60%            |

### 8.3. The Bicycle System

As discussed in Chapter 4 approximately 17% of the City's current arterial and collector street systems contain bike lanes. As illustrated in Figure 8.1 *City of Central Point Bicycle Plan*, it is the objective of the City to provide bicycle lanes along all arterial and collector streets, linking the City's major activity centers such as schools, shopping centers, community parks, etc. Over the course of the next twenty years, it is the City's goal to increase the presence of bicycle lanes on arterial and collector streets by 40%. Table 8.2 presents the City's benchmarks to the year 2030.

**Table 8.2. City of Central Point Bicycle System Performance Measures**

| Measure 8.1                                 | How Measured                                                                                                                                                            | 2008 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Collectors & arterials w/bicycle facilities | Determined through Street Inventory and Geographic Information System (GIS). Current estimates are that 16% of collectors and arterials have provisions for bicyclists. | 16%  | 21%  | 35%  | 48%  | 59%  | 70%  |

### 8.4. In-fill Project Priorities & Implementation / Improvement Strategies

The City's current street standards for arterial and collectors include provisions for bike lanes. Since 2000 all new arterial and collector streets have been required to include bike lanes as a standard provision. However, on the City's older arterial and collector streets, there are gaps where bike lanes do not currently exist. Over time, it is expected that these street sections will be modernized to include bike lanes. Short-term and long-term strategies for closing these gaps are presented in Table 8.3. The short-term strategies focus on creating critical linkages for developing a more integrated bicycle facilities system using arterial and collector streets. The long-term strategies are primarily focused on providing safe and efficient linkages to the City's major activity centers.

**Table 8.3. Bicycle Facilities In-fill Strategies**

| Short-Term Strategy                       | Description                                                                                         | Objectives of the Strategy                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Fill in Gaps                              | Improve/construct facilities linking existing and planned bikeways (filling in "missing links")     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase percentage of bicycle facilities on arterial and collector streets</li> <li>• Improve connections to employment centers, commercial districts, transit centers, institutions, and recreational destinations when possible</li> <li>• Increase percentage of daily trips made via bicycle</li> </ul>                                                                                                                              |
| Long-Term Strategy                        | Description                                                                                         | Objectives of the Strategy                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Focus on Schools                          | Provide bikeways to/from all public schools where none exist (emphasis on arterials and collectors) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primarily improve connections to schools</li> <li>• Secondly improve connections to employment and commercial districts, transit, institutions and recreation</li> <li>• Encourage and facilitate safe and convenient bicycle transportation for younger riders</li> <li>• Increase percentage of daily trips made via bicycle</li> <li>• Secondly increase percentage of bicycle facilities on arterial and collector streets</li> </ul> |
| Focus on Parks and other Activity Centers | Provide bikeways to/from commercial and neighborhood                                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primarily improve connections to employment and commercial districts, transit, institutions, and recreation</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

|                           |                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                           | employment centers and parks where none exist (emphasis on arterials and collectors)                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase percentage of daily trips made via bicycle</li> <li>• Increase percentage of bicycle facilities on arterial and collector streets</li> <li>• Encourage and facilitate safe and convenient bicycle</li> </ul>                                                                                                     |
| Connect to Transit Routes | Provide bikeways to/from major transit stops where none exist (emphasis on arterials and collectors) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primarily improve connections to transit</li> <li>• Secondly improve connections to employment and commercial districts, institutions and recreation</li> <li>• Increase percentage of daily trips made via bicycle and transit</li> <li>• Encourage and facilitate safe and convenient bicycle transportation</li> </ul> |

As described in Table 8.3, the short-term strategy for developing an effective bicycle facility system will focus on filling in existing gaps in the system. While this approach will eventually help to meet bicyclists' needs for a comprehensive bicycle system, there is also a need to prioritize critical projects. Table 8.4 provides a prioritized short-term (5 to 10 years) list of those projects that are essential for needed connectivity and bicycle safety.

**Table 8.4. Prioritized Bicycle Facility Projects – Short-Term (5–10 years)**

| Priority | Project                                                                                                 | Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1        | Front Street                                                                                            | Front Street is the primary north-south route through Central Point, but it is very unlikely that bicycle facilities will be developed along Front Street due to a lack of right-of-way and general driveway conflicts. <i>The Central Point Highway 99 Corridor Plan</i> <sup>22</sup> evaluated bike lanes along Front Street and recommended alternative bike routes using the west side of the railroad right-of-way (south bound) and Second Street (north bound). This alignment is illustrated in Figure 8.1.                                                                                                                                               |
| 2        | East Pine Street<br> | East Pine Street is the primary east-west route through Central Point. The designation of bicycle lanes on Pine Street would negatively impact parking and access to local businesses. To preserve the character of the downtown it is suggested that E. Pine Street be designated a bicycle route through the downtown area. Traffic speeds through the downtown should be reduced through traffic calming, on-street parking, and other site design strategies that make this section of Pine Street compatible with bicycle users. Under no circumstance should on-street parking on Pine Street, within the downtown, be removed to accommodate bicycle lanes. |
| 3        | Taylor Road                                                                                             | Taylor Road provides access to Mae Richardson Elementary School, Twin Creeks Development, and is an important connection to the Jackson County Bicycle System along Grant Rd.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 4        | Bursell Road                                                                                            | Bursell Road is an important north-south link in the Central Point System, providing connectivity between Beall Lane and Scenic Avenue via Hopkins/Freeman/10 <sup>th</sup> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 5        | N. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street                                                                               | N. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street from Hazel Street to N. 10 <sup>th</sup> Street provides a critical north-south connection and also an important link to both Crater High School and Scenic Middle School.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

<sup>22</sup> Central Point Highway 99 Corridor Plan Preferred Plan, OTAK, May 24, 2005

|   |                           |                                                                                                                                                                           |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6 | S. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street | There is currently no connection from existing Hazel Street bicycle facilities to East Pine Street. Bicycle lanes need to be improved along South 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street. |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## 8.5. Bicycle Parking, Safety Programs, and Facility Maintenance

While developing and implementing a bicycle facilities improvement program is a priority, consideration must also be given to bicycle amenities such as parking and safety. Also, once bicycle facilities are completed, there is a need to maintain them so that bicycling is both safe and convenient.

**8.5.1. Bicycle Parking:** Currently, the City does not have standards for bicycle parking. The City needs to develop standards in its zoning ordinance requiring bicycle parking, along with other amenities to help meet bicyclists' needs. Bicycle parking should include short-term parking for customers or visitors and all-day parking for employees or students. Safe, convenient and secure bicycle parking is particularly important if bicycling is to become a viable mode of transportation.

Bicycle parking requirements can be specified in the municipal code as a percentage of automobile parking, or building square footage. For some uses, relatively little bicycle parking needs to be provided, but there are very few land uses for which no bicycle parking can be justified. The code can also specify locations which provide for safe, convenient and secure bicycle parking. For example, it is preferable for bicycle parking to be located in high-visibility areas near high traffic pedestrian entrances to buildings.

**8.5.2. Bicycle Promotion & Safety Programs:** The use of the media, bicycle committees, and other methods are effective tools for the promotion of bicycling for transportation purposes. Promotional campaigns and other strategies that encourage the use of bicycling for transportation can have a positive impact. Encouraging major employers to provide amenities such as showers, lockers, and related facilities that encourage bicyclists to commute to work. Bicycle suitability maps or bicycle system maps can help cyclists choose the most appropriate route and can also be used for educational purposes. RVTD also provides a variety of bicycle safety and commuting education programs of which the city can provide links to and increase awareness.

Along with promoting bicycle riding, the City Central Point needs to promote safe bicycle riding practices. Children should be taught at an early age basic bicycle riding skills and safety. The Central Point Police Department is developing a Dare-like program for 5<sup>th</sup> Grade students that will provide basic bicycle safety education and a free helmet as well. A consistent problem faced by the police department is that citations/warnings for not wearing helmets have not proved to be effective in increasing helmet use. Bicycle safety programs may also be planned in conjunction with summer Parks and Recreation programs.

Educating drivers to the rights of bicyclist is also a critical issue. Areas of particular concern are those locations where bicycle lanes end and bicyclists enter traffic. This situation exists throughout Central Point where street improvements have occurred and short sections of bicycle lanes have been added. Areas of critical concern are located on East Pine Street near the I-5 Interchange and the Front Street Intersection. In both cases, once through these intersections bicyclists enter the flow of traffic without warning

provided to drivers. Another area of concern is the bicycle lanes located on the I-5 / Pine Street overpass. Drivers moving from Pine Street onto the freeway entrance ramp may not be aware of bicycle riders. Visible signage and stripes would be an effective means of educating the public on their obligation to share the road with bicyclists.

**8.5.3. Bicycle Facilities Maintenance:** Once bicycle facilities are developed, they need to be maintained on a regular basis in order to remove broken glass, mud, vegetation, etc. Because most of the bicycle system is located within the street system, routine maintenance can be accomplished in conjunction with regularly scheduled street maintenance. The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan includes the following bicycle facility maintenance recommendations:


- Establish a seasonal sweeping schedule;
- Sweep walkways and bikeways whenever there is an accumulation of debris on the facility;
- In curbed sections, sweepers should pick up debris; on open shoulders, debris can be swept onto gravel shoulders;
- Pave gravel driveway approaches to reduce loose gravel on paved roadway shoulders; and
- Provide extra sweeping in the fall in areas where leaves or pine cones accumulate in bike lanes.

## 8.6. The Pedestrian System

In 2008 approximately 30% of the City's arterial and collector street system contained sidewalks. The Oregon TPR requires sidewalks along all collector and arterial streets within a city's urban area. The City's current standards for development are consistent with the TPR, and also include standards for sidewalks on all public streets. As a sidewalk performance measure (Measure 4) the RTP sets benchmarks for the percentage of arterial and collectors that contain sidewalks. Table 8.5 describes the RTP performance objectives for sidewalks.

**Table 8.5. Regional Transportation Plan Pedestrian System Performance Measures**

| <i>Measure</i>                                | <i>How Measured</i>                                                                                        | <b>2000</b> | <b>2005</b> | <b>Benchmark 2010</b> | <b>Benchmark 2015</b> | <b>Benchmark 2020</b> |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Measure 4: Collectors & arterials w/sidewalks | Determined through GIS Mapping. Current estimates are that 47% of collectors and arterials have sidewalks. | 47%         | 50%         | 56%                   | 64%                   | 75%                   |



**Figure 8.1**  
**Bicycle Plan**  
**2008-2030**

In recognition of the RTP performance Measure 4 the City has established its own performance measure for the improvement of sidewalks on the arterial and collector street system. Table 8.6 presents the City's benchmarks over the course of the next twenty years.

**Table 8.6. City of Central Point Pedestrian System Performance Measures**

| Measure                                               | How Measured                                                                                               | 2008 | 2010 | 2015 | 2015 | 2020 | 2020 |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Measure 8.2:<br>Collectors & arterials<br>w/sidewalks | Determined through GIS Mapping. Current estimates are that 30% of collectors and arterials have sidewalks. | 30%  | 56%  | 60%  | 64%  | 70%  | 75%  |

Within the TOD districts, the City has adopted additional standards addressing the design of sidewalks within commercial areas, including provisions for landscaping, lighting, delineation, and on-site connectivity between adjacent developments. The purpose of these design standards is, through both land use and urban design, to provide an environment that encourages walking.

### 8.7. Priority of Pedestrian Improvements

The City's most significant pedestrian challenge is the in-filling of areas where sidewalks do not exist, which is generally the older neighborhoods. A systematic approach to filling gaps in the sidewalk system and an annual allocation for construction is recommended. The primary consideration in the in-fill of sidewalks is safety, particularly of school age children. Excluding new development, which is required to construct sidewalks, the priority for sidewalk in-fill construction should be based on the following considerations:



**Street Upgrade:** As the City upgrades the existing street system, it will do so to the standards for city streets, which includes the provision of sidewalks.

**Pedestrian Connections to Schools:** Many of the streets servicing the schools within the City are lacking sidewalk improvements, resulting in not only an inconvenience, but also a safety concern for students walking to and from school.

**Pedestrian Connections with Transit:** Central Point should provide sidewalks and other amenities to make pedestrian access to bus stops easier. Current efforts at providing pedestrian access to transit could be significantly expanded by providing better walkways to commercial centers and providing walkways from subdivisions to bus stops on arterials. It is vitally important to RVT that its riders or potential riders have safe, convenient access to bus stops and passenger shelters. The provision of sidewalks is expected to significantly increase the ability of RVT to attract riders. RVT needs the cooperation of other area governments with infrastructure improvements, especially sidewalks, to implement high quality transit service between activity centers.

**Pedestrian Connections to Commercial Activity Centers:** Commercial Activity Centers are defined as commercial, civic, and to a lesser extent industrial areas, that attract large numbers of employees, customers, visitors, etc. For these areas convenient access throughout the area, to transit and to adjacent neighborhoods is important.

### **8.8. Public Awareness**

The use of the media, pedestrian committees, pedestrian plans, and other methods to promote use of walking as a mode of transportation is an important strategy in facilitating the community's awareness of the pedestrian system and its many transportation and recreational opportunities. Promotional campaigns and other strategies that encourage the use of walking for transportation can have a positive impact.

### **8.9. Bear Creek Greenway**

The Bear Creek Greenway is a project that has been in progress for more than 25 years. When complete, the Greenway will provide a 20-mile, multi-use path from the I-5/Seven Oaks Interchange in Central Point to Nevada Street in Ashland. In addition to its recreational use, the Bear Creek Greenway will serve as an important facility for intercity pedestrian and bicycle travel along the I-5 corridor. Within the City, the Greenway is divided into two sections:

1. East Pine Street in Central Point, south to Barnett Road in Medford; and
2. East Pine Street, north to the limits of the Urban Growth Boundary.

The East Pine Street south section is complete and in use. The East Pine Street north section is unimproved. Part of this section (between East Pine Street and Upton Road) has been designed and approved for construction but not funded.

## 8.10. Bicycle and Pedestrian Goals, Policies & Actions

### **GOAL 8.1: TO PLAN FOR AND FACILITATE THE INCREASED USE OF BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION IN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA BY ASSURING THAT CONVENIENT, ACCESSIBLE AND SAFE BICYCLE FACILITIES ARE PROVIDED<sup>23</sup>.**

- Policy 8.1.1. The City of Central Point recognizes bicycle transportation as a necessary and viable component of the transportation system, both as an important transportation mode, and as an air quality improvement strategy.*
- Policy 8.1.2. The Bicycle Element of this plan shall serve as the Central Point Bicycle Master Plan.*
- Policy 8.1.3. The City of Central Point shall progressively develop a linked bicycle network, focusing on, but not inclusive to the arterial and collector street system, and concentrating on the provision of bicycle lanes, to be completed within the planning period (20 years). The bikeway network will serve bicyclists needs for travel to employment centers, commercial districts, transit centers, schools, institutions and recreational destinations.*
- Policy 8.1.4. The City of Central Point shall use all opportunities to add bike lanes in conjunction with road reconstruction and re-striping projects on collector and arterial streets.*
- Policy 8.1.5. The City of Central Point shall maintain public improvement standards that assure that the design of all streets and public improvement projects facilitate bicycling by providing proper paving, lane width, traffic control, storm drainage grates, striping, signage, lighting, parking, etc.*
- Policy 8.1.6. The City of Central Point shall prepare, adopt, and maintain on-site development standards that assure the provision of bicycle access, parking, racks and/or shelters in business developments, institutions, duplexes and multi-family developments and other locations where bicycle parking facilities are required.*
- Policy 8.1.7. The City of Central Point shall support the local transit provider in their efforts to facilitate “bikes on buses” and bicycle facilities at transit stations and stops.*
- Policy 8.1.8. Except within the Central Business District, the City of Central Point shall give priority to bicycle traffic over parking within public rights-of-way designated on the Bicycle Master Plan or otherwise determined to be important bicycling routes.*
- Policy 8.1.9. The City shall require pedestrian and bicycle easements to provide neighborhood connectors and reduce vehicle trips. The City shall modify*

---

<sup>23</sup> OAR 660-012-0020(2)(d)

*the street vacation process so pedestrian and bicyclist through access is maintained.*

**GOAL 8.2: THE CITY WILL PROMOTE BICYCLE SAFETY AND AWARENESS.**

*Policy 8.2.1. The City of Central Point shall actively support and encourage local and state bicycle education and safety programs intended to improve bicycling skills, observance of laws, and overall safety for both children and adults.*

*Policy 8.2.2. The City shall consider the use of the media, bicycle committees, bicycle plans and other methods to promote use of bicycling for transportation purposes.*

**GOAL 8.3: TO FACILITATE A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF CONVENIENT, ACCESSIBLE AND SAFE SIDEWALKS AND WALKWAYS THAT WILL ENCOURAGE AND INCREASE PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL THROUGHOUT THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA.<sup>24</sup>**

*Policy 8.3.1. The City shall establish and maintain a Sidewalk Construction Program to complete the pedestrian facility network.*

*Policy 8.3.2. Sidewalks and walkways shall complement access to transit stations/stops and multi-use paths. Activity centers, schools and business districts should focus attention on and encourage pedestrian travel within their proximity.*

*Policy 8.3.3. The City of Central Point shall maintain standards that require sidewalk and pedestrian access and standards for improvement, i.e. crosswalks at signalized intersections and high volume pedestrian areas such as the Central Business District. All road construction or renovation projects shall include sidewalks.*

*Policy 8.3.4. The City shall require pedestrian and bicycle easements to connect neighborhoods and reduce vehicle trips. The City shall modify the street vacation process so pedestrian and bicyclist through-access is maintained.*

*Policy 8.3.5. Pedestrian walkway or accessway connections shall be required between adjacent developments when roadway connections cannot be provided.*

*Policy 8.3.6. The City shall prepare a plan and implement a multi-use trail system, using linear corridors including, but not limited to: utility easements, rail lines, Bear Creek, Griffin Creek, Jackson Creek and other creeks that complement and connect to the sidewalk system.*

---

<sup>24</sup> OAR 660-012-0020(2)(d)

**GOAL 8.4: TO ENCOURAGE EDUCATION SERVICES AND PROMOTE SAFE PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS INVOLVING PEDESTRIANS.**

- Policy 8.4.1. The City of Central Point shall encourage schools, safety organizations, and law enforcement agencies to provide information and instruction on pedestrian safety issues that focus on prevention of the most important accident problems. The programs shall educate all roadway users of their privileges and responsibilities when driving, bicycling and walking.*
- Policy 8.4.2. The City shall include in the Sidewalk Construction Program (Policy 9.1.1) inclusion of a street lighting system.*
- Policy 8.4.3. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain standards for the separation of pedestrian traffic from auto traffic on streets and, where determined appropriate, in parking lots.*

## Chapter 9 – Public Transit System

### 9.1. Introduction

Public transportation services fulfill two roles. First, these services provide transportation for those who cannot or choose not to drive their own automobile. The majority of Central Point transit riders would likely fall into this category. Secondly, the provision of a comprehensive local transit service is a key measure of quality of life within a community. In concert with walking and bicycling, transit provides an alternative to driving. Transit is also an important component in the toolbox of strategies that can support Smart Growth through higher density, mixed use development, and a more compact form of urban development where the dependency on automobile use is minimized.

### 9.2. 2005 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

The RTP Transit System Element provides a comprehensive review of the region's transit system and future potential for growth. The primary constraint confronting transit service is the limited amount of funds available to service the current system, not to mention the funds needed to support expansion of ridership.

The RTP includes nine (9) transit related goals 6.D-1 through 6.D-9 focusing on funding, market demographics, and increased ridership. Of the nine policies five apply to local governments. Those policies include:

***Policy 6.D-1*** Local funding actions should be taken to ensure a long term stable operating and capital-funding basis for RVTD.

This policy is a general statement regarding local funding as a source of income for RVTD. The term “local” does not specifically refer to individual cities, but rather to the region as opposed to state and federal funding. The City of Ashland was used as an example of one city in the region that contributes annually to RVTD for transit services.

***Policy 6.D-2*** Local governments shall, through RVTD, continue provision of transportation services and facilities that enhance mobility/livability and quality of life options for the transportation-disadvantaged.

The City of Central Point supports this policy as evidenced in this TSP.

***Policy 6.D-4*** Local governments, RVTD, and ODOT where appropriate, shall consider the development of park-and-ride facilities as a cost-effective means of increasing the efficiency of the existing transportation system.

The City of Central Point supports this policy as evidenced in this TSP. The Parking Plan presented in this TSP sets forth as a parking reduction strategy the appropriate use of park-and-ride facilities (see Chapter 6).

***Policy 6.D-8*** Local governments, ODOT where appropriate, and RVTD should support transit-friendly design including appropriate inclusion of bus-only lanes on arterial streets, bus bays or turnouts on district level State highways, arterial and collector streets as a means of facilitating traffic flow during peak travel periods, and should revise building codes that enhance pedestrian access to major destination buildings. This

*transit-friendly design approach will also encourage connectivity to transit by enhancing pedestrian, wheelchair and bicycle access to bus stops.*

The City acknowledges the importance of including transit needs in its development and street standards. This acknowledgement is not only limited to functional design needs but also design standards that improve the attractiveness and convenience of the transit system.

**Policy 6.D-9** *Where warranted by traffic speeds, volume, and average bus schedule dwell time; where consistent with maintaining a positive pedestrian environment; and where approved by RVTB, local governments, and ODOT where appropriate, shall facilitate implementation of bus bays on congested arterial streets as a means of facilitating traffic flow during peak travel periods.*

The appropriateness of bus bays on congested major streets is a justifiable design consideration, but one that is time sensitive and dependent of the presence of stable bus routes. The City will work with RVTB in identifying the need and timing of bus bays on arterial streets and the development of acceptable bus bay standards as part of the City's street standards.

In addition to the above policies, the RTP also includes a performance measure for transit service. Table 9.1 represents Measure 2 of the RTP. In support of the RTP Measure 2, the City as part of this TSP establishes a similar performance measure. Table 9.2 represents the City's transit performance measure. It is important to note that attainment of this performance measure relies on the expansion of transit service to the east side of the City and other planned transit oriented development areas.

**Table 9.1. Regional Transportation Plan Public Transportation System Performance Measures**

| Measure                                                                       | How Measured                                                                                                                      | Current 2000 | Benchmark 2005 | Benchmark 2010 | Benchmark 2015 | Benchmark 2020 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Measure 2: Percentage of DU's within ¼ mile walk to 30-minute transit service | Determined through GIS Mapping. Current estimates are that 12% of DU's are within ¼ mile walking distance of RVTB transit routes. | 12%          | 20%            | 30%            | 40%            | 50%            |

**Table 9.2. City of Central Point Transportation System Plan Performance Measures**

| Measure                                                                       | How Measured                                                                                                                      | Current 2008 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Measure 2: Percentage of DU's within ¼ mile walk to 30-minute transit service | Determined through GIS Mapping. Current estimates are that 35% of DU's are within ¼ mile walking distance of RVTB transit routes. | 38%          | 45%  | 50%  | 60%  | 65%  | 70%  |

### 9.3. Rogue Valley Transportation District

The Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTd) provides public transit within the City of Central Point, offering a combination of services including a fixed-route, fixed-schedule bus system, and paratransit (Valley Lift) service - a specialized service for people with disabilities that prevent them from riding the bus. Additionally, RVTd operates the Valley Rideshare and Vanpool programs which provide ride matching support and commuter van service to employers and their employees.


Currently, RVTd ridership is less than one percent of total daily and peak-hour vehicular trips. Although not unusual for a small metropolitan area, public transportation has the potential for accommodating a greater portion of total daily trips in the region provided RVTd is adequately funded as necessary to increase transit services, including enhancements that will make transit more convenient to people who generally use automobiles.

Transit's ability to serve an expanded role would be significantly enhanced by other elements of this plan including the TDM, pedestrian, bicycle and land use elements. Access to transit routes and stops will be improved by development of more sidewalks as specified in the Pedestrian Element. Development of mixed use activity centers and higher densities adjacent to major corridors are among the strategies in the Land Use Element that would make travel by transit between activity centers a viable option. With the support of policies and projects in other elements of the plan, transit may be able to help reduce the need for street and highway system improvements.

The preferred transit system for RVTd is fully described in the Regional Transportation Plan. Central Point is currently served by Route 40 of RVTd. The preferred transit system would provide for an additional route in Central Point as well as increased headways and weekend service. The present financial forecast does not support additional service to Central Point. During Phase II of the Regional Transportation Plan Update, the Rogue Valley MPO will be investigating methods of increasing transit service.

**9.3.1. Rogue Valley Transportation District – Ten-Year Long Range Plan (2007-2017):** The RVTd Ten-Year Plan 2007-2017 is a multi-modal document focused on enhancing ridership through appropriate best practices. The Plan is designed to address the community's public transportation needs, with the realization that there will be revenue constraints to be addressed throughout the Plan's implementation.

**Figure 9.1. Twin Creeks Transit Oriented Development**



Central Point is currently served by Route 40 of RVTD (Figure 9.1), which has a very strong ridership. Route 40 travels from Medford to Central Point and has received increased frequency from one hour to 30-minute headways. South of Route 40 the City has created a TOD overlay district for the Twin Creeks area. Within this overlay district, future transit facilities have been planned. The long-range plan proposes the following priorities and future needs:

#### Priorities and Immediate Needs:

- Service along Hwy 99;
- Service to the Twin Creeks TOD (Figure 9.2);
- Downtown reverse service (currently only the north side of Pine Street receives service);
- Expanded hours and increased frequency;
- Provide Saturday service;
- Express route that connects all City Centers; and
- Determine location for transfer station and major bus stops.


#### Future Needs:

- East Central Point; and
- Area near South Haskell St. and Ash St.


### 9.4. Strategies to Improve Transit Service

The growth of transit service, in terms of ridership, will necessitate a variety of strategies that need to be simultaneously employed. These strategies include a variety of disciplines such as economics, land use and transportation planning, and urban design that when considered collectively will provide a solid infrastructure to build future transit ridership. The following is a listing of actions that will facilitate growth in transit ridership:


- Additional site plan standards can be incorporated into the land development code to encourage transit oriented development.
- Prepare code amendments that provide standards and incentives fostering enhancements to parking lot design, integration of transit facilities, flexibility to



Minor Transit Stop Standard Design Sketch




Major Transit Stop Standard Design Sketch



Transit Station Standard Design Sketch

support various uses over time, such as temporary parking zones, or parking areas that convert to plazas to support programmed activities; shared parking facilities.

- Transportation infrastructure can be designed to support redevelopment of future building construction.
- Provide clear pathways to transit vehicles from shelters.
- Sidewalks should be constructed to the nearest intersection or to the nearest section of existing sidewalk from all urban transit facilities.
- Provide suitable and universally accessible waiting areas for transit users.
- Coordinate locations of crosswalks with placements of way-finding signage and shelters.
- On streets with parking, consider curb extensions at near-side bus stops so passengers can board transit directly from the curb without stepping onto the street and to comply with ADA universal accessibility standards.
- Encourage and promote high quality design, durable, easy to maintain materials, and modern vehicles to encourage ridership.
- Develop a consistent graphic system for wayfinding and information to facilitate increased ridership for all community sectors.



**Figure 9.2**  
**Transit Plan - 2008-2030**

## 9.5. Transit Goals and Policies

**GOAL 9.1: IN COOPERATION WITH TRANSIT PROVIDERS FACILITATE THE PROVISION OF A TRANSIT SYSTEM THAT PROVIDES CONVENIENT AND ACCESSIBLE TRANSIT SERVICES TO THE CITIZENS OF THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA.<sup>25</sup>**

*Policy 9.1.1. The City shall work with RVTB to encourage transit services that meet the City's transit needs.*

*Policy 9.1.2. To encourage accessibility and increased ridership, the City shall continue to encourage future transit-supportive land uses, such as mixed uses, multiple-family, and employment centers to be located on or near transit corridors.*

*Policy 9.1.3. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain development standards and regulations facilitating accessibility to transit services through transit-supportive streetscape, subdivision, and site design requirements that promote pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, convenience and safety.*

**GOAL 9.2: INCREASE OVERALL DAILY TRANSIT RIDERSHIP IN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA, TO MITIGATE A PORTION OF THE TRAFFIC PRESSURES EXPECTED BY REGIONAL GROWTH.**

*Policy 9.2.1. Through Transportation Demand Management efforts, the City shall work with Central Point employers and other government agencies to increase commuter transit ridership.*

---

<sup>25</sup>OAR 660-012-0020(c)

## Chapter 10 – Railroad & Aviation System

### 10.1. Railroad System- Introduction

In February 1976, Congress passed the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act (the 4R Act), which set up a nationwide local rail service assistance program and a rail planning process. As a prerequisite for obtaining federal assistance funds, a state was required to establish:

“.....An adequate plan for rail services in such state as overall planning process for all transportation services in such state, including a suitable process for updating, revising and amending such plan....and that....such state plan is administered and coordinated by a designated state agency and provides for the equitable distribution of resources.”

The purpose of the rail transportation element is to address both freight and passenger components of the railway system relative to this TSP. The long-term potential for both freight and passenger service for the Rogue Valley region is greater than present service provides. This is particularly true as the increasing cost of gasoline affects the cost of the automobile and truck transportation. Rail service offers specific advantages for various bulk commodities or loads longer than those normally permitted on highways. Even with recent increases in railroad traffic, the total volume of rail freight is far less than the highway freight tonnage for the region. The combined highway and rail freight tonnage along the I-5 corridor alone is estimated at 25 million tons annually. The rail freight portion accounts for between 5 and 10 percent of this total in the I-5 corridor.<sup>26</sup>

**Figure 10.1. Central Oregon & Pacific Railroad Map**



<sup>26</sup> Regional Transportation Plan 2005 - Rail Transportation Element, Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2005

## 10.2. Railroads - Existing Conditions

The railroad has a long history in Central Point and was one of the driving forces behind the founding of the city. The Southern Pacific railroad came to the valley in 1885, four years prior to the incorporation of Central Point in 1889.

Today within the City of Central Point's transportation inventory, there is a single north-south railroad track operated by the Central Oregon Pacific Railroad (CORP). This trackage is part of CORP's Siskiyou Line which provides connections from Eugene-Springfield to Cottage Grove, Roseburg, Glendale, Grants Pass, Medford, Ashland and on into California (Figure 10.1).

CORP is Oregon's second largest short line railroad, operating on 378 route miles and 8 miles of trackage rights in Oregon. Its route miles comprise 13.8 percent of all route miles statewide<sup>27</sup>. CORP is strictly a freight line that carries local forest and agricultural products. Steep grades and tight turns limit operating speeds, which mostly fall in the range of 25 to 35 miles per hour. Forty-three miles of track is limited to an operating speed of only ten miles per hour. In recent years, CORP carried approximately 28,000 cars on the Siskiyou Line.

**10.2.1. Land Use:** The CORP line through Central Point is generally bound predominantly by residential and commercially zoned properties with some industrial properties south of Pine Street. With the exception of the Grange Co-op, which does have a spur and occasionally uses the rail for shipment of materials, the City's commercial/industrial use of the railroad is non-existent.

The speed (low) and frequency (very limited) of the rail traffic is not a cause for concern at this time. Along much of the rail line, adjacent land uses are effectively buffered from rail traffic impacts such as noise and vibration. With the exception of the commercial lands along the west side of Front Street, the remaining lands are buffered by either Hwy. 99 on the east and planned open space/ landscaped berms along the west side of the tracks. These buffering systems are anticipated to be sufficient to mitigate any increases in rail speed and frequency that may occur in the future. Within the City's urban area, there are three existing (3) and one (1) proposed public at-grade railroad crossings (Table 10.1). Each of these crossings is located on one of the City's arterial streets.



**Table 10.1. Central Point Railroad Crossings**

| Crossing Name        | Crossing No.      | Crossing Control |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Beall Lane           | U.S. DOT #756030T | Full             |
| W. Pine Street       | U.S. DOT #756050T | Full             |
| Scenic Avenue        | U.S. DOT #756051A | Full             |
| Twin Creeks Crossing | Proposed          | Full             |

<sup>27</sup> 2001 Oregon Rail Plan, An Element of the Oregon Transportation Plan. Oregon Dept. of Transportation, November 2001.

**10.2.2. Rail Freight – Existing Conditions:** Currently, the CORP line is used only for freight, which can be divided into two major segments: 1. A large wood products operation at Dillard, south of Roseburg, contributes most of the traffic on the northern end of the line. 2. Shippers south of Grants Pass (Timber Products, Boise Cascade, and Sierra Pine, Ltd.) are the major source of business on the southern end of the line. While the railroad operates a through train between Medford and Roseburg, most of the traffic heads either north out of Roseburg or south out of Medford. CORP's line south from Medford is one of the most rugged rail lines in the western part of the United States with gradients that approach 3.25 percent. The portion of the line south from Ashland to Black Butte, California has no weight restrictions but has height and length restrictions in the Siskiyou Mountains due to size limitations related to tunnels.

In 2002, the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RVMPO) undertook a survey entitled ***Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current Freight Transportation System***. The survey asked shippers if they were interested in improving their connections with rail. While there was interest among some manufacturers in increasing their use of rail for inbound raw materials and outbound finished product, it was very selective. Shippers with the greatest interest tended to have a spur either on their property or one nearby and were producing heavy, bulk products or needed large quantities of bulk raw materials.

The reasons shippers gave for not using rail more extensively had to do with the length of time it takes to move freight by rail and concerns of the reliability of delivery times. Rail freight is typically carried by more than one railroad company before reaching its destination, which means that the originating company loses hands-on control of the freight in the process. Local rail personnel point to the inconsistency of schedules as an important issue that they have been working to correct.

The findings of the 2002, ***Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current Freight Transportation System***, particularly as it pertains to timely and cost effective rail service, have been reinforced by CORP's most recent cutbacks. Any increased shipping times and costs will ultimately result in increases in demand for motor freight services.

In September 2007, CORP discontinued operations between Vaughn, OR and Coquille, OR due to unsafe tunnel conditions. CORP estimates the cost for repairing the tunnels at \$23 million and is seeking federal financial assistance for this purpose. Additionally, in December 2007, CORP notified shippers south of Eugene that the railroad's Siskiyou Line would be closed to train service into California. Effective January 2008, no freight trains will be allowed south of Ashland. Instead, companies that want to ship cargo by rail south into California will have their products loaded onto railcars bound for Eugene. From Eugene, railcars will be directed to Klamath Falls and then into California. This change will have a direct impact on businesses using the Siskiyou Line by increasing shipping times and, potentially, shipping costs.

Based on recent events, the future role of rail freight service to and from the Rogue Valley is questionable. Based on the most recent actions by CORP it appears that the market share of products shipped by rail will decline in the near future.

**10.2.3. Passenger Rail Service – Existing Conditions:** Passenger rail service to and from Southern Oregon was terminated in 1958. Currently north-south rail passenger service in the California-Oregon-Washington corridor is provided through Klamath Falls,

bypassing the Rogue Valley region on the way to Eugene. State sponsored thruway bus service with one daily round trip via the I-5 freeway between Eugene and Ashland started in May 2000. This bus connects with the mid-morning *Amtrak Cascades* train departure from Eugene.

**10.2.4. Passenger Rail Service – Future Feasibility:** The primary advantage of rail is its ability to move larger numbers of passengers at approximately the same cost as a small number of passengers and to move them in a comfortable, time-competitive manner. Passenger service also can provide peaking capacity parallel to congested highway corridors. Because of the high infrastructure cost, rail works best where passenger volumes are high enough to justify the investment, and generally this means where multiple frequencies can be operated.

Rail's advantage declines where the available rail route is not competitive with driving times, either due to a circuitous route or to poor track conditions that limit operating speeds. Nevertheless, there is a general perception that rail service is more reliable, more comfortable, and safer because the railway cars provide more passenger space and travel over a fixed guideway that is not affected by highway congestion.

Recently, interest has been expressed in bringing passenger rail service to southwestern Oregon. Several studies have been completed providing various scenarios that could potentially reintroduce passenger service to the area, but in all cases, the cost would be prohibitive and federal and state support at this time is very limited. These studies include:

**The 2001 Oregon Rail Plan.** The 2001 Oregon Rail Plan provided an analysis of potential rail passenger service between Medford and Eugene. In the Plan, it was stated that rail service is disadvantaged in southern Oregon by an antiquated rail line alignment built in the 1880s, twisting track alignment, slow speeds, and relatively light population. The line is maintained to Class 2 standards with maximum speed over the route of 25 mph, with many segments limited to 20 mph. A passenger rail service would be unable to match highway times. Rail running time on the present 205-mile rail route between Eugene and Medford would require over 8 hours, and the improvements necessary to reduce the rail running time to competitive levels would require major reconstruction.

**Southern Oregon Commuter Rail Study, 2001.** The 1999 session of the Oregon Legislature instructed the Oregon Department of Transportation to examine the potential for local passenger service (commuter rail) between Grants Pass and Ashland, a distance of approximately 45 miles. The operation being contemplated would operate on trackage owned by CORP. The *Southern Oregon Commuter Rail Study* was a joint effort of the Rail Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation, the Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD) and the Rogue Valley Council of Governments (RVCOG). The overall goal of the study was to define costs, benefits, and impacts of the project to allow regional partners to compare the feasibility of commuter rail against other regional transportation options.

The plan presented a highly visionary concept of rail service in the Rogue Valley that was determined to be infeasible under current, or foreseeable, levels of financial support for rail improvements. Key findings are:

- ☑ With substantial upgrading of the track and signal system, the rail line connecting the eight Rogue Valley communities is well suited to serve as the backbone of an effective commuter transportation system for the region.
- ☑ With top speeds of up to 60 miles per hour, commuter trains can travel the 45-mile corridor from Ashland to Grants Pass in about 80 minutes, making seven (7) intermediate stops.
- ☑ The estimated costs for upgrading the rail infrastructure, including track, ties, switches, a new 1.5-mile track through Medford Yard, new sidings, a modern train movement signaling system, grade crossing safety improvements, acquiring passenger equipment, and operating the system at three potential levels of service are summarized in Table 10.2 below:

**Table 10.2. Level of Service Explained**

| Service Level | Elements                                                                                                                             |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| LEVEL 1       | Full service (six (6) round trips in the morning and six (6) in the evening) between Ashland and Central Point.                      |
| LEVEL 2       | Level 1, plus limited service (two (2) round trips in the morning and two (2) in the evening) between Central Point and Grants Pass. |
| LEVEL 3       | Full service (six (6) round trips in the morning and six (6) in the evening) between Ashland and Grants Pass.                        |

**Commuter and Inter-Urban Corridors Plan.** The focus of this rail plan was primarily on intercity service, rather than commuter service. However, the Plan did discuss commuter service, which is getting increasing attention nationwide, both in major urban centers and in less populous communities where increasing traffic congestion encourages people to look for transportation alternatives. The recent introduction of such service between Seattle and Tacoma shows that this trend has moved to the Pacific Northwest. Several Oregon communities have conducted commuter rail feasibility studies, and others continue to show interest. The discussion that follows is intended to provide a perspective on these efforts.

Once considered viable only as a means to move suburban residents into major downtown employment centers, many communities are now investigating commuter service potential between suburban areas where employment and housing patterns are more diverse. Lightly used or abandoned rail lines are seen as having commuter service potential with minimal or no conflicts with freight operations. A determination of commuter rail feasibility depends on a number of factors that vary widely from community to community, but ultimately the viability of commuter rail hinges largely on a calculation of the balance between its costs and ridership, which translates to revenue. A number of indicators can be used to measure the potential success for a commuter service. The checklist below covers the primary attributes that affect a viable commuter operation:

- ☑ **Direct Rail Link:** An existing rail line with a reasonably direct route between the communities to be served and with sufficient unused capacity to accommodate relatively frequent rush hour passenger service.

- ☑ **Supporting Regional Goals:** Land use and transportation system goals that seek to reduce motor vehicle trips, concentrate commercial and residential development in and near the urbanized areas in the corridor, and to promote higher-density development within the corridor and specifically, near rail station sites.
- ☑ **Population Growth and Density:** Continuing moderate to rapid growth in population within and along the corridor, with a high concentration of residences and/or business/commercial activity close to proposed station sites.
- ☑ **Limited Funding for Highway Projects:** Difficulty in raising funds for new highway projects which would increase traffic capacity in the corridor.
- ☑ **Commuting within the Corridor:** A high level of daily commuting within the rail corridor.
- ☑ **Traffic Congestion:** Growing traffic congestion on highways paralleling the rail line.
- ☑ **Limited Parking:** Limited and expensive parking at commuter destination points.
- ☑ **Competitive Transit Times:** Ability to provide rail commuter service competitive with auto commute times.
- ☑ **Availability to Funding:** Ability to provide rail commuter service at a cost competitive with auto commuting.
- ☑ **Willingness to Use Transit:** Daily commuters in the corridor with a relatively high propensity to use transit. A number of commuter or localized (inter-urban) rail services have been proposed in Oregon during the past decade. The status of each service is summarized below.

**Rogue Valley Commuter Rail Project, 2006.** In 2006, the RVMPO examined an additional option for bringing commuter rail service to the Rogue Valley. This study was brought about as a result of the availability of several self-propelled rail diesel cars (RDC) owned by ODOT Rail Division. Under this scenario, these RDCs would be purchased or leased and would provide service to Central Point, Medford, Bear Creek Orchards, Phoenix, Talent, and Ashland. The operation would be less extensive and require less capital and operating costs than the concept developed as part of the *2001 Southern Oregon Commuter Study*. The estimated costs for required infrastructure improvements would be approximately \$12,500,000, while the cost of the Southern Oregon Commuter would approach \$38,000,000.

Funding for the *Rogue Valley Commuter Rail Project* was limited, and additional information is required before it can be seriously considered, particularly information related to travel market demand.

While these studies have, for the most part, focused on infrastructure needs, questions that need to be answered in future service assessments include:

- o Will the service attract sufficient ridership and revenue to justify the service?
- o What are the potential costs and revenue?
- o What are the economic and social benefits to the state and local communities?
- o Can a service be provided at an affordable cost?
- o What are the alternatives to providing the service?
- o How does the service satisfy Oregon's transportation goals?
- o Will the service contribute positively to other services through connections?
- o Does the service accommodate disabled travelers and comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act?


In summary, the feasibility of passenger rail service must take into consideration not only infrastructure requirements, but also the following key operational thresholds:

**Patronage:** To justify rail service, a train should have a minimum average occupancy of about 75 passengers per train. Occupancy might be lower at the extreme end of a run, but average occupancy should justify the operation of a train with at least 180 seats (typically a three car train). The economic efficiency of rail is significantly reduced if usage falls below this level, and bus operation often may provide more effective use of transportation dollars. Most of Oregon's current trains meet this threshold.

**Cost Recovery:** Typical train operating costs are about \$26 per mile. A new rail service should be expected to attain a 30-40 percent fare box recovery ratio (the proportion of operating costs covered by fare revenue) to be viable. With a lower cost recovery, the amount of subsidy per passenger becomes excessive and alternative transportation by bus becomes a more attractive option. Oregon's long term goal is to achieve or exceed 100 percent operating cost recovery on its rail services.

**Running Time:** Rail service has to be reasonably competitive with auto driving times to be successful. Unfortunately, some branch lines that otherwise might have passenger service potential drop out of consideration because they follow alignments that cannot be upgraded to provide time-competitive service at a cost commensurate with the potential service level. Many of Oregon's branch lines fall into this category. Freight service levels are insufficient to justify major capital investment in track upgrades or curve reductions that would also benefit passenger operations, so the entire cost of improvements would be a passenger-related responsibility. Parallel highways, however, have been improved to the extent that driving times (and potential bus times) have been significantly reduced over time, rendering establishment of rail service more difficult to justify.


**Other Factors:** In certain situations, rail service may be warranted even though it would not meet the general parameters given above. Justifications may include rail service that contributes substantially to the patronage of other trains, service that provides special benefits to the area served or operations that assist in the mobility of certain travelers (i.e. handicapped).



**Figure 10.2**  
**Railroad System Map**  
**2008-2030**

### 10.3. Aviation System – Introduction

Although the City of Central Point does not provide aviation service, it is fortunate to have convenient access to the Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport. The airport is located to the east of the City just outside the urban area. The Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport is the third largest commercial service airport in Oregon providing air passenger and air freight services to seven counties in Southern Oregon and northern California. The airport provides national and international connections to the region with commercial air service provided by Horizon Airlines and United Airlines/United Express. Because of the airport's proximity to the City, it is considered to be a transportation asset.



The governing planning document for the Airport is the *Medford-Jackson County Airport Master Plan Update*, which will continue to serve as the airport's guiding document governing anticipated development of the airport, including the on-site facilities. It is the City's goal, through this TSP, to maintain convenient and efficient vehicular transportation access to the Rogue Valley International-Medford airport.

### 10.4. Railroad and Aviation Goals and Policies

**GOAL 10.1: TO PROVIDE EFFICIENT, SAFE, AND EFFECTIVE MOVEMENT OF GOODS, SERVICES AND PASSENGERS BY RAIL WHILE MAINTAINING THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR THE CITIZENS OF THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA.<sup>28</sup>**

*Policy 10.1.1. The City shall encourage both freight and passenger service as part of statewide rail transportation planning efforts.*

*Policy 10.1.2. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain site development standards that mitigate railroad noise and vibration.*

**GOAL 10.2: TO PROVIDE EFFICIENT, SAFE, AND EFFECTIVE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE AND GOODS VIA INTER-MODAL CONNECTIONS WITH THE ROGUE VALLEY INTERNATIONAL-MEDFORD AIRPORT.<sup>29</sup>**

*Policy 10.2.1. The City shall support the Rogue Valley Transportation District efforts to provide service to the Rogue Valley International Airport from established routes serving Central Point.*

---

<sup>28</sup> OAR 660-012-0020(2)(e)

<sup>29</sup> OAR 660-012-0020(2)(e)

## Chapter 11 – Truck Freight System

### 11.1. Introduction

Efficient truck movement plays a vital role in the economical transportation of raw materials and finished products. The establishment of through truck routes provides for this efficient movement while at the same time maintaining neighborhood livability, public safety, and minimizing maintenance costs of the roadway system. The significance of freight movement is supported by the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Most recently the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RVMPO) completed a freight study addressing the freight needs of the Rogue Valley<sup>30</sup>. As a result of the findings presented in the RVMPO Freight Study (2006), truck freight movement warrants a special chapter in the Transportation System Plan (TSP) in order to maintain focus of truck freight issues.

### 11.2. Land Use

The safe and efficient movement of goods is a common goal for both truck and rail freight, but trucks use different infrastructure, have different land use implications, and must be integrated with other modes in the broader transportation system. Commercial trucks have specific travel needs such as adequate lane widths, adequate turning at intersections, and adequately designed loading and unloading areas. Truck services also need roadways operating at an adequate level of service so that goods and services can move efficiently through the city, the region, and the state.

Most of the Central Point's freight intense land uses are located on the eastside of the freeway with access predominantly via East Pine Street and Table Rock Road. The downtown and the area along Highway 99 also contribute but to a lesser degree. Aside from these areas most of the City is residential in character with limited freight needs.

### 11.3. Truck Freight - Existing Conditions

Truck freight transportation within the Central Point urban area is primarily concentrated along the truck routes designated in the Regional Transportation Plan. Figure 11.1 illustrates the truck routes within the City as identified in the RVMPO Freight Study. The major truck routes include Interstate 5 (I-5) and Highway 99 (Front Street). I-5 is the most important freight route in the region carrying approximately 4,000 to 5,000 trucks per day through the area. I-5 not only serves freight heading to destinations within the Central Point UGB, but also serves trucks passing through the region to destinations throughout the West Coast. Currently, the combined volume of freight transported over highway and rail modes in the I-5 corridor through the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Region is estimated at 25 million tons annually, with the majority of this freight carried on the highway system<sup>31</sup>. Additional Central Point Freight Routes as identified in the RVMPO Freight Study (2006) include: Table Rock Road, East Vilas Road, Pine Street, and Hanley Road. As part of the RVMPO Freight Study, the Rogue Valley Council of Governments conducted a series of interviews with major freight shippers and carriers providing issues and concerns related to specific Central Point freight routes. Table 11.1 lists the freight issues taken from the RVMPO Freight Study that affect facilities within the City's urban area.

---

<sup>30</sup> Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Freight Study, 2006

<sup>31</sup> I-5 State of the Interstate Report, ODOT, 2000.

**Table 11.1. Central Point Truck Freight Issues and Concerns**

| <b>Freight Route</b> | <b>Issues &amp; Concerns</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I-5 Interchange      | General concerns expressed about the capacity of the interchange and the potential for continued growth in the area around the interchange which will increase congestion in the future.                                    |
| Hwy. 99/Pine Street  | East Pine Street through downtown Central Point is congested and relatively narrow for truck freight traffic.                                                                                                               |
| Table Rock Road      | Table Rock Road deliveries are difficult due to the lack of turning lanes. [Please note: Since the publication of the RVMPO Freight Study sections of Table Rock Road have been widened and turning lanes added.]           |
| East Vilas Road      | The four corners intersection at Table Rock Road and Vilas Road is very tight. Turning lanes on Vilas Road are needed. [Please note: This intersection has been improved since the publication of the RVMPO Freight Study.] |






Figure 11.1

RVMPO Freight Route Map - 2008-2030



**Figure 11.2**

## Freight Route Plan 2008-2030



- Legend
- Urban Area
  - Public Parks
  - Railroad
  - Problem Intersections
  - Problem Routes

Figure 11.3

## Problem Routes & Intersections

#### 11.4. Central Point Truck Freight - Issues & Concerns

As presented in the RVMPO Freight Study, the City of Central Point's capacity to accommodate truck freight has numerous challenges ranging from capacity and land use conflicts, to inappropriate route designations.

**East Pine Street/Central Point Interchange:** Freight trucks moving south on I-5 often choose to connect with I-5 via the East Pine Street/Central Point Interchange, rather than face the congestion on Highway 62 en route to the North Medford Interchange. USF Reddaway, the largest bulk facility in the Rogue Valley, is located off Pine Street on Hamrick Road. Counting just Reddaway traffic, 300 trucks per day exit from I-5 and another enter I-5. Gordon Trucking, a long haul company, is likely to relocate near this interchange. East Pine Street connects freight on Highway 99 with Table Rock Road, the route to industrial sites in White City. Issues include the high levels of congestion leading to and occurring within the area. Freight companies are concerned that conditions at the Central Point Interchange are starting to mirror those at the north and south Medford interchanges. This is troublesome, since the Central Point Interchange is currently their only viable alternative south of the Seven Oaks Interchange<sup>32</sup>.

**Hamrick Road.** In the RVMPO Freight Study, Hamrick Road was identified as part of the MPO freight system. This section of Hamrick Road is predominantly residential in character and has been eliminated from the City's freight route map as illustrated in Figure 11.2. As presented in this TSP, it is proposed that the section of Hamrick Road from East Pine Street to Table Rock Road be removed as a designated truck freight route from the RVMPO regional freight route map. Table Rock Road is adequate to serve the designated freight needs.

**East Pine Street (Downtown Core).** By its very nature, the downtown core has always been, and will continue to be, a less than desirable truck route. This is particularly true given the City's plans for revitalization of the downtown, which include pedestrian oriented uses and traffic calming along East Pine Street<sup>33</sup>. To avoid the downtown section of East Pine Street, truck drivers often travel out-of-direction to the Seven Oaks I-5 interchange.

#### 11.5. Out-of-Direction Travel

Out-of-direction travel is defined as drivers taking an indirect non-designated route rather than a more direct designated route. The use of out-of-direction routes typically occurs as a result of regular routes being blocked during construction, drivers avoiding bottlenecks and congestion, and restrictions that prevent oversized freight. According to the RVMPO Freight Study, there has been an increase in out-of-direction travel. The result is that manufacturers and shippers are using alternative routes to Hwy. 99 and I-5 placing significant burdens on the Central Point Interchange, Table Rock Road, and Vilas Road.

---

<sup>32</sup> 2005-2030 Regional Transportation Plan, April 2005

<sup>33</sup> City of Central Point Downtown Revitalization Plan, 2000

## 11.6. Truck Freight Goals and Policies

**GOAL 11.1:** To identify and maintain a truck freight system within the City that serves the City's and region's freight needs in an efficient and safe manner, with minimal adverse impacts on adjacent land uses.

*Policy 11.1.1. The City shall cooperate with the RVMPO, Jackson County, ODOT and the City of Medford in the coordination of design, funding, and improvement of the freight system within the City that enhances freight movement, while improving the overall capacity of the City's street system.*

*Policy 11.1.2. The Freight System Map presented in Figure 11.2 shall be considered by the City as the official freight route system for the City of Central Point. The design and improvement of the street system designated on the Freight System Map shall accommodate large vehicles typical of freight movement.*

*Policy 11.1.3. The City shall ensure access to truck freight via the local street system, with emphasis on maintaining an efficient and safe designated truck route system.*

## Chapter 12 – Transportation System Financing System Program

### 12.1. Introduction

In accordance with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)<sup>34</sup>, this chapter presents the City of Central Point's financing program for its transportation system. By definition the financing program shall include:

1. Policies that guide the selection of transportation facility and improvement projects for funding in the short-term that meet the standards and benchmarks established pursuant to the TPR;
2. A list of planned transportation facilities and major improvements;
3. An estimate of the timing for planned transportation facilities and major improvements; and
4. A determination of rough cost estimates for the transportation facilities and major improvements identified in the TSP.

In Chapter 7, a list of transportation improvements were identified. These are projects that are forecast to be needed during the planning period of this TSP. In the aggregate, the total cost of all projects approaches \$112 million. These costs do not include the cost of County and ODOT projects as identified in Tables 7.2 and 7.3 of this TSP. The City readily acknowledges that it is beyond the realm of feasibility to fund all projects over the next twenty years, and not all projects are necessary to maintain an acceptable level of service throughout the planning period. Consequently, it is the purpose of this chapter to prioritize the projects based on need, and to reconcile the cost of the projects with the City's ability to fund.

Development of this chapter is based on the following documents:

- The RVMPO Regional Transportation Plan 2005-2030 dated April 5, 2005 and draft information for the 2009-2034 RTP;
- City of Central Point's FY 2007 -08 Budget;
- City of Central Point's Five-Year Capital Improvements Plan 2008-2012; and
- Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), 2008 – 2011.

All expense and revenue estimates presented in this chapter are in terms of 2008 dollars. Funding has been estimated over the duration of this TSP.

### 12.2. Project Prioritization Policies

The TPR requires that the selection of transportation projects be based on policies that establish standards and benchmarks for project selection. To this end the City relies on its Strategic Plan, the Comprehensive Plan, the RTP, and the STIP.

---

<sup>34</sup>Transportation Planning Rule, Section 660-012-0040

Initially, one of the standards to be achieved in local TSPs was a 5% reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) during the planning period of the TSP. On April 3, 2002, the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), by Order 02-LCDC-026, approved alternative standards to accomplish reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as required by OAR 660-012-0035(5). LCDC's approval was conditional subject to completion of certain tasks. The RVMPO completed the necessary tasks in 2004. The 2005-2030 RTP contains the LCDC approved alternative measures. In total seven (7) alternate measures were approved. These alternative measures have been incorporated in this TSP. Where applicable these alternate measures have been used in developing the standards and benchmarks for prioritization of transportation projects.

Project prioritization is based on the following criteria:

1. **Safety.** Projects that improve the safety of the City's transportation system. This includes all modes of transportation;
2. **RTP Benchmarks.** Projects that facilitate compliance with the RTP Benchmarks;
3. **Economic Development.** Projects that reinforce the City's economy, either through improvements to freight routes, or improvements that facilitate development of land uses that support the City's employment base;
4. **Regional Coordination.** Projects undertaken in coordination with the State, County, and/or City of Medford;
5. **Livability.** Projects that improve the City's livability through maintenance of minimum levels of service, connectivity, and modal choice; and
6. **Cost/Benefit.** Projects that demonstrate cost effectiveness in relationship to benefits derived.

### 12.3. Project Classification System

The transportation projects presented in this TSP have been assigned to one of two classifications referred to as either Tier 1 or Tier 2 projects.

**Tier 1 Projects.** By definition, Tier 1 projects are financially constrained. Financially constrained projects are projects that can be reasonably funded within the next twenty years. Tier 1 projects are further classified as either: short, medium or long-term projects. These time periods correspond to the years 2008 - 2012 (short-range), 2013 - 2017 (medium-range) and 2018 - 2030 (long-range).

**Tier 2 Projects.** Tier 2 projects are those projects identified as having an eventual need beyond the timeframe of this TSP, and for which funding is unavailable. Tier 2 projects can advance to Tier 1 as funds become available, or priorities change. Advancing Tier 2 projects requires an amendment to the TSP with justification for the advancement and the impact on the timing and funding of designated Tier 1 projects.

## 12.4. Transportation Funding Sources

Revenue for transportation system projects predominantly comes from three sources: federal, state, and local. The Federal, State, and local revenue sources that are used to fund street system projects are described in the RTP. This section will provide a summary of the different funding sources available to the City. A more comprehensive discussion of each funding source is available in the RTP.

**12.4.1. Federal Revenue Sources:** There are numerous federal programs that fund transportation projects. The forecast federal figure in Table 12.1 is derived from some of the following programs:

***Federal Earmarks:*** Earmarks are funding allocations that are tied directly to a project through the legislative process. An example of federal earmarks is Congressional authorization of TEA 21 to include \$2 million of funding for Unit 1 of the Bear Creek Greenway and \$1.25 million for sidewalk projects in Medford. Although additional earmarks may be awarded in future years, no such assumptions have been made in forecasting revenues for the City of Central Point.

***Surface Transportation Program (STP):*** The STP is a flexible inter-modal block grant-type program that provides funds for a broad range of transportation uses. Projects can include highway and transit capital projects, carpool projects, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, planning, and research and development. STP funds are allocated to the State and sub-allocated to cities and counties on a formula basis by the Oregon Transportation Commission. The RVMPO is expected to receive \$51.5 million in STP funds *through 2034*, of which \$4.1 million has been programmed for projects in the RTP and \$250,000 for un-programmed short-term (2009-13) projects through the short-term. Half of the \$51.1 million in STP funds will be allocated to RVTD.

***Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ):*** The Inter-modal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) created the CMAQ program to deal with transportation related air pollution. States with areas which are designated as non-attainment for ozone or carbon monoxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) must use their CMAQ funds in those non-attainment areas. The City is within a non-attainment area. The projects and programs must either be included in the air quality State Implementation Plan (SIP), or be good candidates to contribute to attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

***STP Transportation Enhancements Program:*** Each state must set aside 10% of its yearly STP revenues for Transportation Enhancement Activities, which comprise a broad range of projects. Enhancement funds are allocated to local jurisdictions throughout the state on a competitive basis. Eligible transportation enhancement projects include pedestrian and bicycle facilities; preservation of abandoned railway corridors; landscaping and other scenic beautification; control and removal of outdoor advertising; acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites; scenic or historic highway programs; historic preservation;

rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities; archaeological planning and research; and mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff. Enhancement projects require a 20 percent non-federal match.

**STP Safety Funds:** Each state must set aside 10 percent of its base STP funds for safety programs (hazard elimination, rail-highway crossings, etc.). The match rate for safety projects is 80 percent federal, 20 percent state or local.

**Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (HBRR):** The HBRR Program provides funds to replace or maintain existing bridges; new bridges are not eligible for funding under this program. Currently, Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation funds are distributed through the STIP process. In the future, these funds will be distributed according to the Unified Bridge Program, a rating system that indicates the condition and traffic level on each bridge in the State.

**Timber Receipts:** The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) shares 25 percent of national forest receipts with counties. By Oregon law (ORS 294.060), counties then allocate 75 percent of the receipts to the road fund and 25 percent to local school districts. The availability of timber receipt revenues is no longer a reliable source of transportation funding.

**12.4.2. State Revenue Sources:** The forecast for state funding is illustrated in Table 12.1 and is derived from some of the following programs:

**State Highway Fund:** The major source of funding for transportation capital improvements and activities statewide is the State Highway Fund. The Highway Fund derives its revenue through fuel taxes, licensing and registration fees, and weight-mile taxes assessed on freight carriers. Revenues have historically been divided as follows: 15.57% to cities, 24.38% to counties, and 60.05% to ODOT. Revenue from increased tax rates will be shared on a 20-30-50% basis, respectively. Allocations to the cities are based on population.

**Special Public Works Fund (SPWF):** The State of Oregon allocates a portion of state lottery revenues for economic development<sup>35</sup>. The Oregon Economic Development Department provides grants and loans through the SPWF program to construct, improve and repair infrastructure in commercial/industrial areas to support local economic development and create new jobs. While primarily a loan program, grants are available for projects that will create or retain trade-sector jobs. A trade-sector industry sells its goods or services in nationally or internationally competitive markets. The SPWF provides a maximum grant of \$500,000 for projects that will help create or retain a minimum of 50 jobs.

**OTIA III – Oregon Transportation Investment Act:** The 2003 Legislation continued its prior commitments toward solving Oregon’s highway infrastructure

---

<sup>35</sup> ORS 285B.419 and OAR 123.042.0010, Division 42

problems. House Bill 3415, also referred to as the Oregon Transportation Investment Act III (OTIA III), committed to the funding of \$3.3 billion in bonds to increase lane capacity and improve interchanges, repair and replace bridges, and preserve road pavement. Cities are allocated shares of this fund based on percentage share of statewide population. For the planning period it is estimated that Central Point will be allocated .636 %, or roughly six tenths of one percent. For purposes of this TSP the City percentage of statewide population will remain constant.

***Traffic Control Projects (TCP):*** The State maintains a policy of sharing installation, maintenance, and operational costs for traffic signals and luminar units at intersections between State highways and city streets/county roads. Intersections involving a State highway and a city street/county road, which are included on the statewide priority list, are eligible to participate in the cost sharing policy. ODOT establishes a statewide priority list for traffic signal installations on the State Highway System. The priority system is based on warrants outlined in the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Local agencies are responsible for coordinating the statewide signal priority list with local road requirements.

***State Highway Fund Bicycle/Pedestrian Program:*** ORS 366.514 requires that at least 1% of the Highway Fund received by ODOT, counties, and cities shall be expended for the development of footpaths and bikeways. ODOT administers its bicycle/pedestrian funds, handles bikeway planning, design, engineering and construction, and provides technical assistance and advice to local governments concerning bikeways.

***Oregon Transportation Enhancement Program:*** The Transportation Enhancement program provides federal highway funds for projects that strengthen the cultural, aesthetic, or environmental value of our transportation system. The funds are available for twelve "transportation enhancement activities" specifically identified in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). These activities fall into four main groups: Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects, Historic Preservation related to surface transportation, Landscaping and Scenic Beautification, and Environmental Mitigation (highway runoff and wildlife protection only). The intent of the program is to fund special or additional activities not normally required on a highway or transportation project.

***Oregon Department of Transportation - Pedestrian and Bicycle Grant Program:*** The Pedestrian and Bicycle Grant Program is a competitive grant program that provides approximately \$5 million dollars every two years to Oregon cities, counties and ODOT regional and district offices for design and construction of

pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Proposed facilities must be within public rights-of-way. Grants are awarded by the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

***Immediate Opportunity Fund (IOF):*** The IOF is intended to support economic development in Oregon by funding road projects that assure job development opportunities by influencing the location or retention of a firm or economic development project. The fund may be used only when other sources of funding are unavailable or insufficient, and is restricted to job retention and committed job creation opportunities. To be eligible, a project must require an immediate commitment of road construction funds to address an actual transportation problem. The applicant must show that the location decision of a firm or development depends on those transportation improvements, and the jobs created by the development must be “primary” jobs such as manufacturing, distribution, or service jobs.

***Safe Routes to School:*** This program is to assist communities in identifying and reducing barriers and hazards to children, K-12, walking or bicycling within two miles of the school. It may provide grants for education, engineering and enforcement; however, if grants are to be awarded, the program must adopt Administrative Rules specifying criteria that will be used in awarding grants. In addition, HB 2742 requires that School Districts have a Safe Routes to School Plan (as described in 2001 Oregon legislation, ORS 195.115) in place as the prerequisite for potential funding.

***Oregon Department of Transportation – Mini-Grants:*** The Community Cycling Center (CCC) has funding through ODOT for grants up to \$5,000 for programs that encourage bicycle safety by educating program participants. The CCC is the largest non-profit organization in the country that uses the bicycle as a tool for teaching positive life skills to youth. Children in our programs learn bicycle safety and maintenance and earn their own bicycles, locks and helmets. CCC uses the bicycle as a tool for learning because no child can resist the draw of a bicycle. Funding has been available for youth and adult programs, with a focus on programs that incorporate a strong educational element.

Please note that inclusion of an improvement in this TSP does not represent a commitment by ODOT to fund, allow, or construct the project. Projects on the State Highway System that are contained in the TSP are not considered “planned” projects until they are programmed into the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). As such, projects proposed in the TSP that are located on a State Highway cannot be considered as mitigation for future development or land use actions until they are programmed into an adopted STIP. Highway projects that are programmed to be constructed may have to be altered

or cancelled at a later time to meet changing budgets or unanticipated conditions such as environmental constraints.

**12.4.3. Local Revenue Sources:** From the local perspective there are numerous sources of revenue that can be used to fund local transportation projects. The forecast in Table 12.1 is based on the following local revenue sources:

***Street System Development Charges (SSDCs):*** Street Systems Development Charges are fees paid by developers, and are structured to recover the increased capital costs incurred by a jurisdiction or utility as a result of real property development. The SDC typically varies by the type of development, i.e. residential, commercial, and industrial.

The City of Central Point has a system development charge program in place for street funding. Table 12.1 includes SSDC projections through the year 2030. The SSDC estimate is based on household formation and employment projections presented in Chapter 3 – Land Use.

***Street Utility Fees (SUFs):*** A Street Utility Fee is a use fee paid by all residents and businesses of a city, and is used to maintain the existing street system. SUFs are assessed to all businesses and households in the city based on the amount of traffic typically generated by each use category. Most city residents pay water and sewer utility fees to maintain and operate these utility systems. Street utility fees apply the same concepts to city streets. Street utility fees differ from water and sewer fees because usage cannot be easily monitored. Street user fees are used to pay for operation and maintenance of the City's transportation system.

On February 28, 2008 the City of Central Point adopted its first transportation utility fee program to assist in the funding of transportation planning and management, and the construction maintenance of the City's transportation system. The Transportation Utility Fee will sunset on February 28, 2011 unless extended by action of the City Council. Table 12.1 includes the SUF through fiscal year 2011.

***Revenue and General Obligation Bonds:*** Revenue bonds can be used for a variety of local transportation projects. Revenue bonds are financed by user charges, such as street system development charges and street utility fees, local gas tax, or any other transportation-related revenue source that provides a stable stream of revenue. General obligation bonds are supported by a city's property tax base, and must be approved by a majority of a city's voters.

***Special Assessments /Local Improvement Districts (LID)/Urban Renewal Agency:*** Special assessments are charges levied on property owners for neighborhood public facilities and services, with each property assessed a portion of total project costs. Special assessments are commonly used for such public works projects as street improvement, drainage, parking facilities, and sewer lines. The justification for such levies is that many of these public works activities provide services to or directly enhance the value of a defined area of

benefit, thereby providing direct financial benefit to the owners.

Local Improvement Districts (LID) are similar to special assessment districts. An LID is a legal entity established by local governments to levy special assessments to fund improvements that have local benefits. Through an LID, streets and other transportation improvements can be constructed and a fee assessed to adjacent property owners.

Urban renewal agencies are essentially a form of a special assessment district that uses tax increment financing as a funding tool (ORS 457). The use of tax increment financing has a successful track record of funding infrastructure improvements within blighted areas.

#### ***Developer Paid Improvements***

To an increasing degree developers are funding all, or a major portion, of transportation improvements required to make a specific development projects possible. Many of the Tier 2 projects listed in Table 12.2 rely on future developer financing for advancement to Tier 1. The availability of revenue from this category is identified in the “Other” column in Table 12.1.

### **12.5. Transportation System Revenue Projections**

Projecting revenue over long periods – in this case, 20 years – involves making several assumptions which may, or may not, prove valid over time. For example, changing social, economic and political conditions cannot be predicted, yet these factors play important roles in determining future funding levels for Street System projects. The Tier 1 revenue projections presented in this plan are based on the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), with adjustments based on recent changes in the City’s SDC and SUF fees. As illustrated in Table 12.1 it is forecast that there will be approximately \$64 million in revenue that will be available to fund the City’s transportation projects, both non-capital and capital needs, in the short-term, medium-term, and long term.

It is important to remember that the revenue identified in Table 12.1 is forecast. It is recommended that the revenue figures be re-evaluated annually and appropriately adjusted.

**Table 12.1. City of Central Point Projected Transportation Program Capital Funding 2009-2030  
(Measured in 2008 dollars x 1,000)**

| Time Frame                | Revenues             |                    |                   |                   |                    |               |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|
|                           | Federal <sup>1</sup> | State <sup>1</sup> | Local             |                   |                    | Total Revenue |
|                           |                      |                    | SDCs <sup>2</sup> | Fees <sup>3</sup> | Other <sup>4</sup> |               |
| Tier 1 Short (FY2009-13)  | \$ 2,506             | \$ 4,357           | \$ 2,604          | \$ 1,004          | \$ 1,424           | \$ 11,895     |
| Tier 1 Medium (FY2014-19) | \$ 735               | \$ 5,687           | \$ 3,581          | \$ -              | \$ 443             | \$ 10,446     |
| Tier 1 Long (FY2020-2030) | \$ 2,900             | \$ 16,590          | \$ 9,670          | \$ -              | \$ 12,653          | \$ 41,813     |
| Tier 2                    | \$ -                 | \$ -               | \$ -              | \$ -              | \$ -               | \$ -          |
| Total                     | \$ 6,141             | \$ 26,634          | \$ 15,855         | \$ 1,004          | \$ 14,520          | \$ 64,154     |

<sup>1</sup> Source Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

<sup>2</sup> City of Central Point with 3% annual inflation factor

<sup>3</sup> City of Central Point SUF through 2010 only

<sup>4</sup> Developer contributions, urban renewal

## 12.6. Transportation Program Costs

Chapter 7 presented a comprehensive list of transportation projects identified as necessary to address the City's transportation needs between 2009-and 2030. Table 12.2 summarizes project costs; including an estimate of non-capital costs, for City sponsored projects. The costs presented in Table 12.2 are estimates and should be updated annually to reflect budgeted and actual expenditures. The total estimated cost for Tier 1 projects is approximately \$35 million, while non-capital costs are approximately \$27 million, for a total of \$62 million. When combined with Tier 2 projects (\$50 million) the total transportation program is estimated to cost in excess of \$112 million.

Tables 12.3 through 12.6 categorize each project as either a Tier 1 project, or a Tier 2 project. Tier 1 projects are financially constrained, i.e. it is necessary that sufficient revenues are available to complete these projects by 2030. Tier 1 projects are further prioritized by short-term (FY2009-013), medium-term (FY2014-19), and long-term (FY2020-30). Included in Table 12.3 is an estimate of the cost of each project.

Table 12.7 provides a comparison of forecast revenue against total costs. Based on forecast revenue and estimated project costs there is sufficient revenue to fund the Tier 1 projects. As with forecasted revenue, it is recommended that the project costs be re-evaluated annually and modified as necessary.

**Table 12.2. City of Central Point Projected Transportation Program Capital Funding, 2009-2030 (Measured in 2008 dollars X 1000)**

| <b>Time Frame</b>         | <b>Non-Capital Expenses</b> | <b>Capital Funds Available</b> | <b>Tier 1 Projects (financially constrained)</b> | <b>Tier 2 Projects (unfunded)</b> | <b>Revenue Surplus/(Deficit)</b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Tier 1 Short (FY2009-13)  | \$ 3,705                    | \$ 8,190                       | \$ 7,875                                         |                                   | \$ 315                           |
| Tier 1 Medium (FY2014-19) | \$ 5,233                    | \$ 5,213                       | \$ 4,682                                         |                                   | \$ 531                           |
| Tier 1 Long (FY2020-2030) | \$ 17,965                   | \$ 23,848                      | \$ 22,029                                        |                                   | \$ 1,820                         |
| Tier 2                    | \$ -                        | \$ -                           | \$ -                                             | \$ 49,986                         | \$ (49,986)                      |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>\$ 26,903</b>            | <b>\$ 37,251</b>               | <b>\$ 34,586</b>                                 | <b>\$ 49,986</b>                  | <b>\$ (47,321)</b>               |

<sup>1</sup>Source Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

<sup>2</sup>City of Central Point with 3% annual inflation factor

<sup>3</sup>City of Central Point SUF through 2010 only

<sup>4</sup>Developer contributions, urban renewal

**Table 12.3. Teir 1 – Short Term Projects**

| Ref. No. | Project Location                                 | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                                     | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | Tier          | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other | Total Project Cost |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| 201      | New Haven Rd. & Hamrick Rd. intersection         | p                | Install traffic signal for pedestrian crossing when warranted by traffic volumes and/or pedestrian activity.            | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          | √      | √          |               |               | Tier 1, Short |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$376,072          |
| 202      | Hwy. 99 & Twin Creeks Drive RR-Xing/Intersection | major            | New signalized intersection at Hwy. 99 & Twin Creeks Dr. and new railroad crossing at Twin Creeks Dr.                   | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          | ▪       |         | ▪      |          | √      | √          |               |               | Tier 1, Short | ♦    |        | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$1,860,480        |
| 203      | Hwy. 99, Project No. 1, Traffic Calming          | minor            | Landscape medians, crosswalks, off-street pathways, bike lanes, street lighting, & control fencing.                     | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        | √        | √      |            |               |               | Tier 1, Short |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$350,000          |
| 204      | S. Haskell St.; Pine St. to Ash St.              | uu               | Widen to three lanes with curb, gutter, bike lanes & sidewalks.                                                         | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        | √          |               |               | Tier 1, Short |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$938,160          |
| 205      | 10th St. & Pine St. & Freeman Rd. Intersection   | minor            | Add protective-permissive phasing to eastbound and westbound left turn movements.                                       | ▪       |         |            |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               |               | Tier 1, Short |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$19,461           |
| 206      | Hwy. 99, Project No. 2 Traffic Calming           | p                | Pedestrian crossings, on-street parking, streetscape improvements, & traffic calming in vicinity of the Rogue Creamery. |         | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        | √        | √      |            |               |               | Tier 1, Short |      |        | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$395,000          |

City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030

| Ref. No.                       | Project Location                                     | Improv. Category | Project Description                                       | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | Tier          | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other | Total Project Cost |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| 207                            | 10th St., Hazel St. to Lathrop                       | uu               | Widen to add turn lane with bike lanes & sidewalks.       | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      | √          |               |               | Tier 1, Short |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$1,678,372        |
| 208                            | Oak St.: Second -Third & First St.: Manzanita-Laurel |                  | Improve alleys and parking facility                       | ▪       |         |            |         |         |        | √        |        |            |               |               | Tier 1, Short |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$717,000          |
| 209                            | Beebe Rd.: Gebhard Rd. to Hamrick Rd.                | uu               | Widen to collector standards with sidewalks & bike lanes. | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             | Tier 1, Short |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$1,540,500        |
| <b>TIER 1 SHORT TERM COSTS</b> |                                                      |                  |                                                           |         |         |            |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               |               |      |        |               |         |       | <b>\$7,875,045</b> |

**Table 12.4. Tier 1 - Medium Term Projects**

| Ref. No. | Project Location                     | Improv. Category | Project Description                                             | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | Tier         | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other | Total Project Cost |
|----------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| 210      | E. Pine St. & Meadowbrook Dr.        | minor            | Restrict intersection movement to right-in, right-out, left-in. | ▪       |         |            |         |         | ▪      |          | √      | √          |               |               | Tier 1, Med. |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$135,100          |
| 211      | Beebe Rd. & Hamrick Rd. intersection | p                | Add traffic signal for pedestrian crossing.                     |         | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          | √      |            |               |               | Tier 1, Med. |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$647,179          |

City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030

| Ref. No.                 | Project Location                                | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | Tier         | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other | Total Project Cost |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| 212                      | Hwy. 99, Project No. 4                          | p                | Cupp Street Gateway.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |         | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        | √        | √      |            |               |               | Tier 1, Med. |      |        | ◆             |         | ◆     | \$375,000          |
| 213                      | Table Rock Rd. & South Hamrick Rd. Intersection |                  | Add Traffic Signal                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |         |         |            |         | ▪       |        |          | √      | √          |               |               | Tier 1, Med. |      | ◆      | ◆             | ◆       |       | \$350,000          |
| 214                      | Scenic Av.: Mary's Way to Scenic Middle School. | uu               | Widen 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      | √          |               | √             | Tier 1, Med. |      | ◆      | ◆             |         |       | \$584,416          |
| 215                      | Hwy. 99, Project No. 3                          | p                | Pedestrian crossings, streetscape improvements & traffic calming.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        | √        | √      |            |               |               | Tier 1, Med. |      |        | ◆             |         | ◆     | \$175,000          |
| 216                      | E. Pine St. & Hamrick Rd. Intersection          | minor            | Widen west and south approaches to add a second eastbound left turn lane and second receiving lane. Restripe northbound approach to include dual left turns and a single through-shared-right turn. Restripe southbound approach to include a left turn, through, and exclusive right turn lanes. | ▪       |         |            |         | ▪       |        |          | √      | √          |               |               | Tier 1, Med. |      | ◆      | ◆             |         |       | \$582,018          |
| 217                      | E. Pine St. & 2nd St. & 6th St. & 3rd St.       | s                | Traffic calming, remove 4th St. signal, add new signals at 2nd and 6th St., remove 3rd. St. signal and install median control.                                                                                                                                                                    | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      | √          |               | √             | Tier 1, Long |      |        | ◆             |         | ◆     | \$1,833,446        |
| TIER 1 MEDIUM TERM COSTS |                                                 |                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |         |            |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               | \$4,682,159  |      |        |               |         |       |                    |

**Table 12.5. Tier 1 – Long Term Projects**

| Ref. No. | Project Location                              | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                    | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | Tier         | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other | Total Project Cost |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| 218      | E. Pine St. & Table Rock Rd.                  | minor            | Widen west approach to add second eastbound left turn lane.                            | ▪       |         |            |         | ▪       |        |          | ✓      | ✓          |               |               | Tier 1, Long |      | ♦      | ♦             | ♦       |       | \$500,920          |
| 219      | Table Rock Rd. & Vilas Rd. Intersection       | major            | Widen to increase capacity, add eastbound lane & shared through-right turn movement    | ▪       |         |            |         | ▪       |        |          | ✓      | ✓          |               |               | Tier 1, Long |      | ♦      | ♦             | ♦       |       | \$799,500          |
| 220      | Gebhard Rd.: UGB to Beebe Rd.                 | uu               | Realign, widen to 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade (collector standards). | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | ✓      |            |               | ✓             | Tier 1, Long |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$4,497,612        |
| 221      | Hwy. 99 & Beall Ln. intersection              | major            | Realign & upgrade signals & railroad crossing, urban upgrade.                          | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          | ✓      |            |               | ✓             | Tier 1, Long | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             | ♦       | ♦     | \$3,385,600        |
| 222      | 3rd St.: E. Pine St. to Hazel St.             | uu               | Add bike lanes and sidewalks                                                           | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | ✓      |            |               | ✓             | Tier 1, Long |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$242,209          |
| 223      | Hazel St.: Third to 10th St.                  | p                | Pave and improve, adding sidewalks.                                                    | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | ✓      |            |               | ✓             | Tier 1, Long |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$489,600          |
| 224      | Scenic Av.: Tenth St. to Scenic Middle School | uu               | Widen 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks (collector standards).                            |         |         |            |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               | Tier 1, Long |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$510,000          |
| 225      | Hwy. 99: Phase 3                              | pb               | Widen to provide bike lanes & sidewalks.                                               |         | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          |        |            |               | ✓             | Tier 1, Long |      |        | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$450,000          |
| 226      | E. Pine St.; I-5 to Penninger Rd.             | minor            | Add right turn lane with sidewalks.                                                    | ▪       |         | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          |        | ✓          |               |               | Tier 1, Long | ♦    |        | ♦             |         |       | \$125,912          |

City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030

|                        |                                        | Improv.<br>Category |                                                                                                                             |         |         |            |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               |              |      |        |               |             |       |                       |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------|--------|---------------|-------------|-------|-----------------------|
|                        | Project Location                       |                     | Project Description                                                                                                         | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | Tier         | ODOT | County | Central Point | Ref.<br>No. | Other | Total Project<br>Cost |
| 227                    | W. Pine St.; Hanley Rd. to Haskell St. | uu                  | Widen 3 lanes (continuous turn lane), bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade.                                                 |         | ▪       |            |         |         |        |          | ✓      | ✓          |               |               | Tier 1, Long |      | ♦      | ♦             |             |       | \$1,500,000           |
| 228                    | E. Pine Street traffic calming         | major               | Misc. enhancements such as bulb-outs, cross-walks, signals, etc. that improve the pedestrian environmemt along Pine Street. |         | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        | ✓        | ✓      | ✓          |               |               | Tier 1, Long |      |        | ♦             |             |       | \$3,750,000           |
| 229                    | 2nd St.; E. Pine St. to Hazel St.      | pb                  | Add bike lanes & sidewalks, redesignate as one-way southbound.                                                              | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | ✓      |            |               |               | Tier 1, Long |      |        | ♦             |             |       | \$250,000             |
| 230                    | Hwy. 99 & Scenic Av. Intersection      | major               | Install a traffic signal when signal warrants are met                                                                       | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | ✓      |            |               | ✓             | Tier 1, Long | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |             |       | \$2,737,300           |
| 231                    | Scenic Av.: Hwy. 99 to Grant Rd.       | uu                  | Widen 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks. Box culvert developer driven                                                          | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | ✓      | ✓          |               | ✓             | Tier 1, Long | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |             | ♦     | \$2,737,300           |
| 232                    | Taylor Rd.: Grant Rd. to Silver Creek  | uu                  | Widen 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade. Culvert crossings (2)                                                  | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | ✓      |            |               | ✓             | Tier 1, Long |      | ♦      | ♦             |             | ♦     | \$52,817              |
| TIER 1 LONG TERM COSTS |                                        |                     |                                                                                                                             |         |         |            |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               | \$20,728,350 |      |        |               |             |       |                       |

**Table 12.6. Tier 2 Projects**

| Ref. No. | Project Location                                 | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                                   | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | Tier   | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other | Total Project Cost |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| 233      | E. Pine St.: Hamrick Rd. to Bear Creek Bridge    | pb               | Widen for decel/accel lanes, add bike lanes and sidewalks.                                                            | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             | Tier 2 | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$800,000          |
| 234      | E-W Hamrick Rd. extension (south of E. Pine St.) | nc               | Extend Hamrick Rd. westerly to intersect with Penninger Rd. (collector standards).                                    | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          |        | √          |               |               | Tier 2 |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$1,200,000        |
| 235      | Freeman Rd.: Hopkins Rd. to Beall Ln.            | b                | Rebuild to collector standards                                                                                        |         | ▪       |            |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               |               | Tier 2 |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$31,300           |
| 236      | E. Pine St.: Bear Creek Bridge to Peninger Rd.   | pb               | Widen for turn lanes, bike lanes, add sidewalks. And third lane                                                       | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         | ▪       |        |          | √      |            |               |               | Tier 2 | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$120,000          |
| 237      | Freeman Rd.: Oak St. to Hopkins Rd.              | uu               | Widen 3 lanes (continuous turn lane), bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade.                                           | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2 | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$1,151,697        |
| 238      | 10th St.: E. Pine St. to Hazel St.               | uu               | Widen to add continuous turn lane, bike lanes & sidewalks.                                                            | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               | Tier 2 |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$5,955,600        |
| 239      | Grant Rd.: Scenic Av. to Taylor Rd.              | uu               | Realign, widen to 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade.                                                      | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2 |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$7,321,621        |
| 240      | Peninger Rd. Extension, South                    | nc               | Extend Penninger Rd. from E. Pine St. south across Bear Creek to Hamrick Rd. & construct new bridge across Bear Creek | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        | √          |               |               | Tier 2 | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$145,800          |

City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030

| Ref. No. | Project Location                       | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | Tier   | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other | Total Project Cost |
|----------|----------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| 241      | 3rd St.: Hazel St. to Scenic Ave.      | min or           | Widen to 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade (collector standards).                                                                                                                                                                | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      | √          |               |               | Tier 2 |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$7,321,629        |
| 242      | Grant Rd.: Taylor Rd. to Beall Ln.     | uu               | Realign, widen to 3 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, urban upgrade (collector standards).                                                                                                                                                       | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             | Tier 2 |      | ♦      | ♦             |         | ♦     | \$1,500,000        |
| 243      | Bursell Rd.: Beall Ln. to Hopkins Rd.  | uu               | Urban upgrade; 2 lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks.                                                                                                                                                                                               | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          | √      |            |               | √             | Tier 2 |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$2,506,000        |
| 244      | Upton Rd., Scenic Av. Raymond St.      | ru               | Widen to rural 2 lanes with bike lanes, sidewalks.                                                                                                                                                                                           | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               | Tier 2 |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$1,584,709        |
| 245      | Peninger Rd. Project                   | nc               | Extend Penninger Rd. from E. Pine St. north across Bear Creek to Beebe Rd. & remove signal at Penninger /Pine St. and construct bridge across Bear Creek. Also, extend Peninger Rd. south across Bear Creek to intersect with S. Hamrick Rd. | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        | √          |               |               | Tier 2 |      | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$10,566,108       |
| 246      | Freeman Rd. & Hopkins Rd. Intersection | s                | Install new signal.                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | ▪       |         |            |         |         |        |          |        | √          |               | √             | Tier 2 | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$175,000          |
| 247      | 3rd St.; E. Pine St. to Ash St.        | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2 |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$250,000          |
| 248      | Maple St.; Hwy. 99 to 10th St.         | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2 |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$503,650          |
| 249      | 4th St.; Ash St. to Cedar St.          | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2 |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$127,818          |
| 250      | Ash St.; Hwy. 99 to Freeman Rd.        | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2 |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$468,800          |

City of Central Point  
Transportation System Plan, 2008-2030

| Ref. No.           | Project Location                       | Improv. Category | Project Description                                                                                        | Vehicle | Bicycle | Pedestrian | Transit | Freight | Access | Economic | Safety | Operations | Truck Traffic | Urban Upgrade | Tier         | ODOT | County | Central Point | Medford | Other | Total Project Cost |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|--------------------|
| 251                | Oak St.; Hwy. 99 to Freeman Rd.        | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                 |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2       |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$558,484          |
| 252                | Rachel Dr.; Saxbury Dr. to W. Pine St. | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                 |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2       |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$261,193          |
| 253                | Saxbury Dr.; Brad Wy. To Rachel Dr.    | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                 |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2       |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$186,800          |
| 254                | Brad Wy.; Taylor Rd. to Saxbury Dr.    | p                | Construct sidewalks, repair curb & gutter.                                                                 |         |         | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        |            |               | √             | Tier 2       |      |        | ♦             |         |       | \$250,000          |
| 255                | E. Pine St.; I-5 to Table Rock Rd.     | major            | Widen E. Pine St. to add third westbound through lane from east side of Table Rock Rd. to I-5 SB off-ramp. | ▪       | ▪       | ▪          |         |         |        |          |        | √          | √             |               | Tier 2       | ♦    | ♦      | ♦             |         |       | \$7,000,000        |
| TOTAL TIER 2 COSTS |                                        |                  |                                                                                                            |         |         |            |         |         |        |          |        |            |               |               | \$49,986,209 |      |        |               |         |       |                    |

**Table 12.7. City of Central Point Projected Transportation Program Capital Funding, 2009-2030 (Measured in 2008 dollars X 1000)**

| Time Frame                | Revenues             |                    |                   |                   |                    |               | Non-Capital Expenses | Capital Funds Available | Tier 1 Projects (financially constrained) | Tier 2 Projects (unfunded) | Revenue Surplus/(Deficit) |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
|                           | Federal <sup>1</sup> | State <sup>1</sup> | Local             |                   |                    | Total Revenue |                      |                         |                                           |                            |                           |
|                           |                      |                    | SDCs <sup>2</sup> | Fees <sup>3</sup> | Other <sup>4</sup> |               |                      |                         |                                           |                            |                           |
| Tier 1 Short (FY2009-13)  | \$2,506              | \$4,357            | \$2,604           | \$1,004           | \$1,424            | \$11,895      | \$3,705              | \$8,190                 | \$7,875                                   |                            | \$315                     |
| Tier 1 Medium (FY2014-19) | \$735                | \$5,682            | \$3,581           | \$0               | \$443              | \$10,441      | \$5,233              | \$5,208                 | \$4,682                                   |                            | \$526                     |
| Tier 1 Long (FY2020-2030) | \$2,900              | \$16,532           | \$9,670           | \$0               | \$12,653           | \$41,755      | \$17,965             | \$23,790                | \$22,029                                  |                            | \$1,762                   |
| Tier 2                    | \$0                  | \$0                | \$0               | \$0               | \$0                | \$0           | \$0                  | \$0                     | \$0                                       | \$49,986                   | (\$49,986)                |
| Total                     | \$6,141              | \$26,571           | \$15,855          | \$1,004           | \$14,520           | \$64,091      | \$26,903             | \$37,188                | \$34,586                                  | \$49,986                   | (\$47,384)                |

<sup>1</sup> Source Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

<sup>2</sup> City of Central Point with 3% annual inflation factor

<sup>3</sup> City of Central Point SUF through 2010 only

<sup>4</sup> Developer contributions, urban renewal

## 12.7. Transportation Financing Goals, Objectives, and Policies

### **GOAL 12.1: TO DEVELOP A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA THAT IS ADEQUATELY FUNDED TO MEET THE CITY'S CURRENT AND FUTURE CAPITAL, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS NEEDS.**

- Policy 12.1.1. Transportation system development charges (SDCs), as defined by Oregon Revised Statutes and City ordinances, will be collected by the City to offset costs of new capacity development. The City will continue to collect SDCs as an important and equitable funding source to pay for transportation capacity improvements.*
- Policy 12.1.2. For all Tier 2 projects the City shall require those responsible for new development to mitigate their development's impacts to the transportation system, as authorized in the Central Point Zoning Ordinance and Oregon Revised Statutes, concurrent with the development of the property.*
- Policy 12.1.3. The City shall continue to set-aside one-percent of its allocation of State Highway Fuel Tax funds for creation of on-street bicycle, pedestrian and transit capital facilities.*
- Policy 12.1.4. When the City agrees to vacation of a public right-of-way at the request of a property owner, conditions of such agreement shall include payment by the benefitted property owner of fair market value for the land being converted to private ownership. Funds received for vacated lands shall be placed in a trust fund for the acquisition of future rights-of-way.*

### **GOAL 12.2: SECURE ADEQUATE FUNDING TO IMPLEMENT A STREET MAINTENANCE PROGRAM THAT WILL SUSTAIN A MAXIMUM SERVICE LIFE FOR PAVEMENT SURFACE AND OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES.**

- Policy 12.2.1. Assuming no changes in State funding mechanisms, the primary funding sources for street system maintenance activities shall be the City's allocation of the State Highway Fuel Tax and allocation of fees supplemented by street maintenance fees.*
- Policy 12.2.2. The City shall seek additional funding sources to meet the long-term financial requirements of sustaining a street maintenance program, including alternative modes of transportation.*
- Policy 12.2.3. The City shall continue to participate in cooperative agreements with other State and local jurisdictions for maintenance and operation activities based on equitable determinations of responsibility and benefit.*

GOAL 12.3: SECURE ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR THE OPERATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM INCLUDING ADVANCE PLANNING, DESIGN ENGINEERING, SIGNAL OPERATIONS, SYSTEM MANAGEMENT, ILLUMINATION, AND CLEANING ACTIVITIES.

*Policy 12.3.1. Assuming no changes in State funding mechanisms, transportation system operations shall be funded primarily from the City's allocation of the State Highway Fuel Tax. Other funding sources should be pursued to augment the financial requirements of providing adequate future system operations.*

*Policy 12.3.2. The City shall continue to pursue federal, state and private grants to augment operations activities, especially in the planning and engineering functions.*

## Chapter 13 – Implementation Policies

### 13.1 Introduction

The transportation system goals and objectives listed below are broad statements of philosophy that describe the hopes of the people of the City of Central Point for the future of their community and its transportation system. Goals and objectives have been developed around each TSP chapter. A goal and/or objective may never be completely attainable but is used as a point toward which to strive and should be used to monitor future transportation strategies and improvements. Policies are statements that provide a specific course of action moving the community toward the attainment of its goals and objectives. Each new capital improvement project, land use application, or implementation measure must be consistent with the policies. Once adopted, the goals, objectives, and policies, as well as the project lists, will become part of the City of Central Point's Comprehensive Plan.

### 13.2 Implementation Goals and Policies by Chapter

#### Chapter 3 – Land Use & Forecasting

**GOAL 3.1: TO EFFECTIVELY MANAGE THE USE OF LAND WITHIN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA IN A MANNER THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH, AND THAT SUPPORTS, THE SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN.**

*Policy 3.1.1. The City shall manage the land use element of the Comprehensive Plan in a manner that enhances livability for the citizens of Central Point as set forth in the Transportation System Plan.*

*Policy 3.1.2. The City shall continuously monitor and update the Land Development Code to maintain best practices in transit oriented design consistent with the overall land use objectives of the City.*

#### Chapter 5 – Transportation System Elements

**GOAL 5.1: TO MAXIMIZE, THROUGH TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, THE EFFICIENCY, SAFETY, AND CAPACITY OF THE CITY'S EXISTING TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND SERVICES.**

*Policy 5.1.1. The City shall make every effort to maintain mobility standards that result in a minimum level of service (LOS) "D." The City defines LOS D as the equivalent to a volume-capacity ratio of 0.9.*

*Policy 5.1.2. The City shall facilitate implementation of bus bays by RVTB on transit routes as a means of facilitating traffic flow during peak travel periods.*

*The feasibility, location and design of bus bays shall be developed in consultation between the City and RVTD.*

**GOAL 5.2: TO EMPLOY ACCESS MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES TO ENSURE SAFE AND EFFICIENT ROADWAYS CONSISTENT WITH THEIR DESIGNATED FUNCTION.**

- Policy 5.2.1. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain, either within the zoning ordinance or the Public Works Standards and Details manual, access management standards based on best practices.
- Policy 5.2.2. The City shall implement the access management strategies presented in the Access Management Plan for Front Street (Highway 99)/Pine Street and the Central Point Highway 99 Corridor Plan.

**GOAL 5.3: TO REDUCE THE DEMANDS PLACED ON THE CURRENT AND FUTURE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM BY THE SINGLE-OCCUPANT VEHICLE.**

- Policy 5.3.1. *The City shall serve as a leading example for other businesses and agencies by maximizing the use of alternative transportation modes among City employees through incentive programs. The City shall provide information on alternative transportation modes and provide incentives for employees who use alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.*
- Policy 5.3.2. *The City shall offer flexible schedules and compressed work-week options whenever feasible, as a way of reducing travel demand. The City shall encourage employees to telecommute, whenever feasible.*

**GOAL 5.4: TO REDUCE THE VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT) IN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA BY ASSISTING INDIVIDUALS IN CHOOSING ALTERNATIVE TRAVEL MODES.**

- Policy 5.4.1. *The City shall encourage major employers to promote work arrangements providing an alternative to the 8-to-5 work schedule. These arrangements shall include, but are not limited to, employee flex-time programs, staggered work hours, and compressed work weeks.*
- Policy 5.4.2. *The City shall encourage major employers to promote telecommuting where feasible.*
- Policy 5.4.3. *The City and major employers shall encourage ridesharing by making ridesharing more convenient.*
- Policy 5.4.4. *The City shall encourage major employers to work with RVTD to adopt trip reduction goals designed to reduce site vehicular trip generation.*

**GOAL 5.5: Transportation demand management (TDM) measures promoted by the City shall be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan**

**strategies aimed at reducing reliance on the single occupant vehicle (SOV) and reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita.**

Chapter 6 – Transportation System Elements

**GOAL 6.1: TO MANAGE AUTOMOBILE PARKING WITHIN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA AS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE REDUCTIONS IN PARKING SPACES CONSISTENT WITH STATE AND REGIONAL GOALS.**

- Policy 6.1.1. The City shall manage the supply, operation, enforcement and demand for parking in the public right-of-way to encourage economic vitality, traffic safety, transportation system efficiency, and livability of neighborhoods.*
- Policy 6.1.2. Except within the Central Business District, where on-street parking is considered an element of the Central Business District's economic vitality, the provision for on-street parking is second in priority to the needs of the travel modes (i.e., vehicle, transit, bicycle, pedestrian) using the street right-of-way, and shall be removed when necessary to facilitate street widening.*
- Policy 6.1.3. In those areas where demand exists, an adequate supply of off-street carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be provided. The location of these spaces shall have preference over those intended for general purpose off-street parking.*

**GOAL 6.2: TO PROMOTE AND MANAGE THE PARKING NEEDS OF THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA IN A MANNER THAT REASONABLY BALANCES THE DEMAND FOR PARKING AGAINST THE USE OF TRANSIT, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN TRANSPORTATION MODES, WHILE MAINTAINING THE ECONOMIC VITALITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD LIVABILITY.**

- Policy 6.2.1. The City shall prepare, adopt and maintain parking standards that reflect best parking practices that further the parking goals of the City.*
- Policy 6.2.2. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain effective development standards for paved off-street parking areas to include provisions for landscaping, planting strips, pedestrian walkways, curbs, and sidewalks.*

## Chapter 7 – Streets System

**GOAL 7.1: PROVIDE A COMPREHENSIVE STREET SYSTEM THAT SERVES THE PRESENT AND FUTURE MOBILITY AND TRAVEL NEEDS OF THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES.**

*Policy 7.1.1. The City shall fulfill its system wide travel capacity needs through the use of multiple travel modes within the public rights-of-way.*

*Policy 7.1.2. The City's street system shall contain a network of arterial and collector streets and highways that link the central core area and major industry with regional and statewide highways.*

*Policy 7.1.3. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain street design standards consistent with the policies of this TSP.*

*Policy 7.1.4. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain standards that promote connectivity of the street system consistent with the Functional Classification Map.*

*Policy 7.1.5. The City shall actively pursue construction of I-5 interchange improvements at Pine Street.*

*Policy 7.1.6 The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain design standards for its streets to safely accommodate pedestrian, bicycle and motor vehicle travel as has been accomplished in the TOD Districts.*

*Policy 7.1.7. The City Standards and Details shall be the basis for all street design within the Central Point urban area.*

*Policy 7.1.8. Wherever possible the City shall incorporate safely designed, aesthetic features into the streetscape of its public rights-of-way. These features may include: street trees, shrubs, and grasses; planting strips and raised medians; meandering sidewalks on arterial streets; and, in some instances, street furniture, planters, special lighting, public art, or non-standard paving materials.*

*Policy 7.1.9. When existing streets are widened or reconstructed they shall be designed to the adopted street design standards for the appropriate street classification where practical. Adjustments to the design standards may be necessary to avoid existing topographical constraints, historic properties, schools, cemeteries, problems with*

*right-of-way acquisition, existing on-street parking and significant cultural features. The design of the street shall be sensitive to the livability of the surrounding neighborhood.*

*Policy 7.1.10. The City shall work with federal, state and local government agencies to promote traffic safety education and awareness, emphasizing the responsibilities and courtesies required of drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians.*

*Policy 7.1.11. The City shall place a higher priority on funding and constructing street projects that address identified vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety problems than those projects that solely respond to automotive capacity deficiencies in the street system. Exceptions are those capacity improvements that are designed to also resolve identified safety problems.*

*Policy 7.1.12. The City shall select street improvement projects from those listed in the Central Point Transportation System Plan when making significant increases in system capacity or bringing arterial or collector streets up to urban standards. The selection of improvement projects should be prioritized based on consideration of improvements to safety, relief of existing congestion, response to near-term growth, system-wide benefits, geographic equity, and availability of funding.*

*Policy 7.1.13. To maximize the longevity of its capital investments, the City shall design street improvement projects to meet existing travel demand, and whenever possible to accommodate anticipated travel demand for the next 20 years for that facility.*

*Policy 7.1.14. The City shall involve representatives of affected neighborhood associations, citizens, developers, surveyors, engineering and planning professionals in an advisory role in the design of street improvement projects.*

*Policy 7.1.15. The City shall require Traffic Impact Analyses as part of land use development proposals to assess the impact that a development will have on the existing and planned transportation system and to identify reasonable on-site and off-site improvements necessary to mitigate impacts.*

*Policy 7.1.16. The City may require new development to pay charges towards the mitigation of system-wide transportation impacts created by new growth in the community through established Street System Development Charges (SDCs) and any other street fees that are established by the City.*

## Chapter 8 – Bicycle and Pedestrian System

### **GOAL 8.1: TO PLAN FOR AND FACILITATE THE INCREASED USE OF BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION IN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA BY ASSURING THAT CONVENIENT, ACCESSIBLE AND SAFE BICYCLE FACILITIES ARE PROVIDED<sup>36</sup>.**

- Policy 8.1.1. The City of Central Point recognizes bicycle transportation as a necessary and viable component of the transportation system, both as an important transportation mode, and as an air quality improvement strategy.*
- Policy 8.1.2. The Bicycle Element of this plan shall serve as the Central Point Bicycle Master Plan.*
- Policy 8.1.3. The City of Central Point shall progressively develop a linked bicycle network, focusing on, but not inclusive to the arterial and collector street system, and concentrating on the provision of bicycle lanes, to be completed within the planning period (20 years). The bikeway network will serve bicyclists needs for travel to employment centers, commercial districts, transit centers, schools, institutions and recreational destinations.*
- Policy 8.1.4. The City of Central Point shall use all opportunities to add bike lanes in conjunction with road reconstruction and re-striping projects on collector and arterial streets.*
- Policy 8.1.5. The City of Central Point shall maintain public improvement standards that assure that the design of all streets and public improvement projects facilitate bicycling by providing proper paving, lane width, traffic control, storm drainage grates, striping, signage, lighting, parking, etc.*
- Policy 8.1.6. The City of Central Point shall prepare, adopt, and maintain on-site development standards that assure the provision of bicycle access, parking, racks and/or shelters in business developments, institutions, duplexes and multi-family developments and other locations where bicycle parking facilities are required.*
- Policy 8.1.7. The City of Central Point shall support the local transit provider in their efforts to facilitate “bikes on buses” and bicycle facilities at transit stations and stops.*

---

<sup>36</sup> OAR 660-012-0020(2)(d)

*Policy 8.1.8. Except within the Central Business District, the City of Central Point shall give priority to bicycle traffic over parking within public rights-of-way designated on the Bicycle Master Plan or otherwise determined to be important bicycling routes.*

*Policy 8.1.9. The City shall require pedestrian and bicycle easements to provide neighborhood connectors and reduce vehicle trips. The City shall modify the street vacation process so pedestrian and bicyclist through access is maintained.*

**GOAL 8.2: THE CITY WILL PROMOTE BICYCLE SAFETY AND AWARENESS.**

*Policy 8.2.1. The City of Central Point shall actively support and encourage local and state bicycle education and safety programs intended to improve bicycling skills, observance of laws, and overall safety for both children and adults.*

*Policy 8.2.2. The City shall consider the use of the media, bicycle committees, bicycle plans and other methods to promote use of bicycling for transportation purposes.*

**GOAL 8.3: TO FACILITATE A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF CONVENIENT, ACCESSIBLE AND SAFE SIDEWALKS AND WALKWAYS THAT WILL ENCOURAGE AND INCREASE PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL THROUGHOUT THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA.<sup>37</sup>**

*Policy 8.3.1. The City shall establish and maintain a Sidewalk Construction Program to complete the pedestrian facility network.*

*Policy 8.3.2. Sidewalks and walkways shall complement access to transit stations/stops and multi-use paths. Activity centers, schools and business districts should focus attention on and encourage pedestrian travel within their proximity.*

*Policy 8.3.3. The City of Central Point shall maintain standards that require sidewalk and pedestrian access and standards for improvement, i.e. crosswalks at signalized intersections and high volume pedestrian areas such as the Central Business District. All road construction or renovation projects shall include sidewalks.*

*Policy 8.3.4. The City shall require pedestrian and bicycle easements to connect neighborhoods and reduce vehicle trips. The City shall modify the*

---

<sup>37</sup> OAR 660-012-0020(2)(d)

*street vacation process so pedestrian and bicyclist through-access is maintained.*

*Policy 8.3.5. Pedestrian walkway or accessway connections shall be required between adjacent developments when roadway connections cannot be provided.*

*Policy 8.3.6. The City shall prepare a plan and implement a multi-use trail system, using linear corridors including, but not limited to: utility easements, rail lines, Bear Creek, Griffin Creek, Jackson Creek and other creeks that complement and connect to the sidewalk system.*

**GOAL 8.4: TO ENCOURAGE EDUCATION SERVICES AND PROMOTE SAFE PEDESTRIAN TRAVEL TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS INVOLVING PEDESTRIANS.**

*Policy 8.4.1. The City of Central Point shall encourage schools, safety organizations, and law enforcement agencies to provide information and instruction on pedestrian safety issues that focus on prevention of the most important accident problems. The programs shall educate all roadway users of their privileges and responsibilities when driving, bicycling and walking.*

*Policy 8.4.2. The City shall include in the Sidewalk Construction Program (Policy 9.1.1) inclusion of a street lighting system.*

*Policy 8.4.3. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain standards for the separation of pedestrian traffic from auto traffic on streets and, where determined appropriate, in parking lots.*

**Chapter 9 – Public Transit System**

**GOAL 9.1: IN COOPERATION WITH TRANSIT PROVIDERS, FACILITATE THE PROVISION OF A TRANSIT SYSTEM THAT PROVIDES CONVENIENT AND ACCESSIBLE TRANSIT SERVICES TO THE CITIZENS OF THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA.<sup>38</sup>**

*Policy 9.1.1. The City shall work with RVTB to encourage transit services that meet the City's transit needs.*

*Policy 9.1.2. To encourage accessibility and increased ridership, the City shall continue to encourage future transit-supportive land uses, such as mixed uses, multiple-family, and employment centers to be located on or near transit corridors.*

---

38OAR 660-012-0020(c)

*Policy 9.1.3. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain development standards and regulations facilitating accessibility to transit services through transit-supportive streetscape, subdivision, and site design requirements that promote pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, convenience and safety.*

**GOAL 9.2: INCREASE OVERALL DAILY TRANSIT RIDERSHIP IN THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA, TO MITIGATE A PORTION OF THE TRAFFIC PRESSURES EXPECTED BY REGIONAL GROWTH.**

*Policy 9.2.1. Through Transportation Demand Management efforts, the City shall work with Central Point employers and other government agencies to increase commuter transit ridership.*

#### Chapter 10 – Rail and Aviation System

**GOAL 10.1: TO PROVIDE EFFICIENT, SAFE, AND EFFECTIVE MOVEMENT OF GOODS, SERVICES AND PASSENGERS BY RAIL WHILE MAINTAINING THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR THE CITIZENS OF THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA.<sup>39</sup>**

*Policy 10.1.1. The City shall encourage both freight and passenger service as part of statewide rail transportation planning efforts.*

*Policy 10.1.2. The City shall prepare, adopt, and maintain site development standards that mitigate railroad noise and vibration.*

**GOAL 10.2: TO PROVIDE EFFICIENT, SAFE, AND EFFECTIVE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE AND GOODS VIA INTER-MODAL CONNECTIONS WITH THE ROGUE VALLEY INTERNATIONAL-MEDFORD AIRPORT.<sup>40</sup>**

*Policy 10.2.1. The City shall support the Rogue Valley Transportation District efforts to provide service to the Rogue Valley International Airport from established routes serving Central Point.*

#### Chapter 11 – Freight System

**GOAL 11.1: TO IDENTIFY AND MAINTAIN A TRUCK FREIGHT SYSTEM WITHIN THE CITY THAT SERVES THE CITY'S AND REGION'S FREIGHT NEEDS IN AN EFFICIENT AND SAFE MANNER,**

---

<sup>39</sup> OAR 660-012-0020(2)(e)

<sup>40</sup> OAR 660-012-0020(2)(e)

WITH MINIMAL ADVERSE IMPACTS ON ADJACENT LAND  
USES.

*Policy 11.2.1. The City shall cooperate with the RVMPO, Jackson County, ODOT and the City of Medford in the coordination of design, funding, and improvement of the freight system within the City that enhances freight movement, while improving the overall capacity of the City's street system.*

*Policy 11.2.2. The Freight System Map presented in Figure 11.2 shall be considered by the City as the official freight route system for the City of Central Point. The design and improvement of the street system designated on the Freight System Map shall accommodate large vehicles typical of freight movement.*

*Policy 11.2.3. The City shall ensure access to truck freight via the local street system, with emphasis on maintaining and efficient and safe designated truck route system.*

Chapter 12 – Transportation System Financing

**GOAL 12.1: A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR THE CENTRAL POINT URBAN AREA THAT IS ADEQUATELY FUNDED TO MEET THE CITY'S CURRENT AND FUTURE CAPITAL, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS NEEDS.**

*Policy 12.1.1. Transportation system development charges (SDCs), as defined by Oregon Revised Statutes and City ordinances, will be collected by the City to offset costs of new capacity development. The City will continue to collect SDCs as an important and equitable funding source to pay for transportation capacity improvements.*

*Policy 12.1.2. For all Tier 2 projects the City shall require those responsible for new development to mitigate their development's impacts to the transportation system, as authorized in the Central Point Zoning Ordinance and Oregon Revised Statutes, concurrent with the development of the property.*

*Policy 12.1.3. The City shall continue to set aside one-percent (1%) of its allocation of State Highway Fuel Tax funds for creation of on-street bicycle, pedestrian and transit capital facilities.*

*Policy 12.1.4. When the City agrees to vacation of a public right-of-way at the request of a property owner, conditions of such agreement shall include payment by the benefitted property owner of fair market value for the land being converted to private ownership. Funds*

*received for vacated lands shall be placed in a trust fund for the acquisition of future rights-of-way.*

**GOAL 12.2: SECURE ADEQUATE FUNDING TO IMPLEMENT A STREET MAINTENANCE PROGRAM THAT WILL SUSTAIN A MAXIMUM SERVICE LIFE FOR PAVEMENT SURFACE AND OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES.**

*Policy 12.2.1 Assuming no changes in State funding mechanisms, the primary funding sources for street system maintenance activities shall be the City's allocation of the State Highway Fuel Tax and allocation of fees supplemented by street maintenance fees.*

*Policy 12.2.2 The City shall seek additional funding sources to meet the long-term financial requirements of sustaining a street maintenance program, including alternative modes of transportation.*

*Policy 12.2.3 The City shall continue to participate in cooperative agreements with other State and local jurisdictions for maintenance and operation activities based on equitable determinations of responsibility and benefit.*

**GOAL 12.3: SECURE ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR THE OPERATION OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM INCLUDING ADVANCE PLANNING, DESIGN ENGINEERING, SIGNAL OPERATIONS, SYSTEM MANAGEMENT, ILLUMINATION, AND CLEANING ACTIVITIES.**

*Policy 12.3.1. Assuming no changes in State funding mechanisms, transportation system operations shall be funded primarily from the City's allocation of the State Highway Fuel Tax. Other funding sources should be pursued to augment the financial requirements of providing adequate future system operations.*

*Policy 12.3.2. The City shall continue to pursue federal, state and private grants to augment operations activities, especially in the planning and engineering functions.*