

## Appendix C: Mobility Project Review Criteria

This appendix is a guide used during the mobility project review stage for determining which projects with mobility impacts need to be shared with the Mobility Advisory Committee, and how they should be shared, via email, consent calendar, or a formal presentation (meeting). The Mobility Services Team uses the criteria in this appendix when reviewing projects to help guide their decision making process, and it helps the Region Mobility Liaisons advise their project teams when preparing projects for review.

Projects often have a mixture of low, moderate and high impacts; and the mobility analysts must consider the totality of all impacts to determine if they should be shared with the MAC through email, consent calendar or formal presentation. If needed, the Mobility Services Team can pull oversize permit data to provide additional information to consider the significance of the impact.

**Projects with mobility impacts fall into one of the three categories listed below** depending on the type of impact (permanent or temporary), and if it is permanent, whether it has statutory requirements or not. The type of impact (low to high) helps determine the MAC engagement process.

### 1. PERMANENT REDUCTION PROJECTS SUBJECT TO ORS 366.215 REDUCTION IN VEHICLE-CARRYING CAPACITY

<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate/High</b>
Share via ORS 366.215 Consent Calendar <sup>1</sup>	Share via meeting

### 2. PERMANENT REDUCTION PROJECTS NOT SUBJECT TO ORS 366.215 REDUCTION IN VEHICLE-CARRYING CAPACITY

<b>Low/Moderate</b>	<b>High</b>
Share via email	Share via meeting

### 3. TEMPORARY WORK ZONE IMPACT PROJECTS

<b>No/Low Impact</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>High</b>
Not Required to Share	Share via email	Share via meeting

<sup>1</sup> See page 23 for [Consent Calendar](#) definition.

## ORS 366.215 Projects

### Projects Subject to ORS 366.215 Reduction in Vehicle-Carrying Capacity

Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) Chapter 731, Division 12 (Reduction of Vehicle-Carrying Capacity) was adopted to implement ORS 366.215. The statute states that the Commission may not permanently reduce the “vehicle-carrying capacity” of an identified freight route (aka Reduction Review Route) unless safety or access considerations require the reduction, or a local government requests an exemption and the Commission determines it is in the best interest of the state and freight movement is not unreasonably impeded.

Projects that propose Reductions in Vehicle-Carrying Capacity<sup>2</sup> on a Reduction Review Route<sup>3</sup> per [OAR 731-012-0010](#) are required to be shared with the Stakeholder Forum<sup>4</sup>, which meets as part of the Mobility Advisory Committee. An agreement was made during charter development to share low impact projects via a consent calendar during the meetings instead of a formal presentation.

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
Low	<b>Consent Calendar</b> - Projects with low impact permanent reductions are shared with the Stakeholder Forum via a Consent Calendar.	Projects that propose actions that minimally reduce vehicle-carrying capacity (as described in the Consent Calendar section below).
Moderate/ High	<b>Meeting</b> - All projects with moderate to high impact permanent reductions are shared with the Stakeholder Forum at a Mobility Advisory Committee meeting.	Projects that moderately or significantly reduce vehicle- carrying capacity (e.g. projects that do not meet the criteria defined for the Consent Calendar).

<sup>2</sup> [OAR 731-012-0020 \(11\)](#) Reduction in Vehicle-Carrying Capacity. See definition in Appendix A (Definitions, Standards & Resources).

<sup>3</sup> [OAR 731-012-0020 \(12\)](#) Reduction Review Route. See definition in Appendix A (Definitions, Standards & Resources).

<sup>4</sup> [OAR 731-012-0020 \(15\)](#) Stakeholder Forum. See definition in Appendix A (Definitions, Standards & Resources).

ORS 366.215 Consent Calendar

The Consent Calendar is used to group routine meeting discussion points into a single agenda item. This allows the Stakeholder Forum to support the grouped items in one action so they can focus their time on more complex projects with larger impacts to vehicle-carrying capacity.

The following table is used for determining which projects will be placed on the Consent Calendar. The criteria are based on the level of complexity involved for each type of proposed action and the minimal impact they have on mobility.

<p><b>Proposed Action</b> <b>Horizontal Reductions</b></p>	<p><b>Consent Calendar Low Impact Criteria</b></p>
<p><b>Bridge/ Overpass Rail Replacements</b></p>	<p>The proposed reduction meets all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Width reduction resulting from the new railing is 3% or less.</li> <li>• Reduction does NOT restrict any loads currently able to use the bridge (e.g. width still exceeds pinch points for accessing the structure).</li> <li>• Remaining rail-to-rail horizontal width for two lanes exceeds 28 feet or greater after the reduction (<i>28 feet represents the narrowest width from the examples provided below, and is the minimum 2-lane daytime width standard for temporary work zones where a restriction notice would not be required</i>).</li> </ul> <p>Examples (supported with no issues/concerns raised by Stakeholder Forum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">The Dalles Columbia River Bridge</a> (2.6% rail to rail width reduction)</li> <li>• <a href="#">I-5: I-205 Interchange</a> (.35% rail to rail reduction)</li> <li>• <a href="#">OR18: Yamhill River – McDougall Junction (Dayton)</a> (2.1% rail to rail reduction)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Dean Creek Bridge Rail</a> (.21% rail to rail reduction)</li> </ul>

<b>Proposed Action</b> <b>Horizontal Reductions</b>	<b>Consent Calendar Low Impact Criteria</b>
<b>Curb Ramp Extensions</b>	<p>The proposed reductions resulting in ADA curb ramp installation meets all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typical curb ramp designs that utilize the existing sidewalk footprint could <u>not</u> be used due to geometric constraints.</li> <li>• Curb ramp designs that utilize the existing sidewalk footprint without reducing horizontal roadway clearance could not be used or are not recommended due to geometric constraints.</li> <li>• The reduction utilizes existing parking lane width, and existing travel lane &amp; bike lane widths are <u>not</u> affected.</li> <li>• Turning movements for freight that normally turn at the proposed intersection are not affected by the extension.</li> <li>• Remaining available curb-to-curb width is at least 28 feet for two travel lanes. <i>(28 feet represents the minimum two lane width standard for temporary work zones where a restriction notice would not be required.)</i></li> <li>• Reduction will not create a new pinch point.</li> </ul> <p>Examples (supported with no issues/concerns raised by Stakeholder Forum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">US26 Sandy curb ramps</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">US101: Johnson Ave Intersections (Coos Bay)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">OR38 at 3rd Street, and at 4th, 5th and 6th Street in Reedsport</a></li> </ul>
<b>Pedestrian/ Median Islands</b>	<p>The proposed reduction meets all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing travel lane/bike lane widths are <u>not</u> affected.</li> <li>• Remaining available curb-to-curb width is at least 28 feet for two travel lanes, or 22 feet for a single travel lane. <i>(These widths meet the minimum daytime width standard for temporary work zones where a restriction notice would not be required).</i></li> <li>• Reduction will not create a new pinch point.</li> </ul> <p>Examples (supported with no issues/concerns raised by Stakeholder Forum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">US101: 10<sup>th</sup> Ave. to 12<sup>th</sup> Ave. Median Island (Seaside)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">OR42: Cedar Point - Finley Loop (Coquille)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">OR126/US101: Spruce Street to Siuslaw River Bridge (Florence)</a></li> </ul>

<b>Proposed Action</b> <b>Horizontal Reductions</b>	<b>Consent Calendar Low Impact Criteria</b>
<b>Barrier Extension</b>	<p>The proposed reduction meets all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New barrier is being installed to fill in a gap between existing barrier segments, or extending an existing barrier.</li> <li>• Horizontal clearance will not be reduced any less than where the existing barrier segments are located.</li> <li>• Existing travel lane/bike lane widths are not affected.</li> <li>• Installation will not create a new pinch point.</li> </ul> <p>Examples (supported with no issues/concerns raised by Stakeholder Forum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">US97: MP 264 – 265 Barrier Project (Klamath Lake)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">US97: Redmond – Bend</a></li> </ul>

<b>Proposed Action</b> <b>Vertical Reductions</b>	<b>Consent Calendar Low Impact Criteria</b>
<b>New bridge structure over Reduction Review Route (RRR)</b>	<p>The resulting clearance after the new structure is completed is at least 30 feet (<i>this vertical clearance exceeds state highway standards and meets the proposed vertical clearance for a potential high, wide and heavy corridor (Alberta's high load corridor accommodates loads up to 29.5 feet high, for example).</i>)</p> <p>Example (supported with no issues/concerns raised by Stakeholder Forum):  <a href="#">The Congressman Earl Blumenauer Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge</a></p>
<b>Auxiliary lane added underneath structure</b>	<p>A new auxiliary lane proposed underneath a structure where none existed before, and the other existing lanes already have higher vertical clearances available.</p> <p>Examples (supported with no issues/concerns raised by Stakeholder Forum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">OR217 SB crossing under Denney Rd.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">OR217 SB crossing under Hall Blvd. (north crossing)</a></li> </ul>

### Process for Adding Projects to the ORS 366.215 Consent Calendar

ORS 366.215 projects that meet the low impact criteria outlined above are placed on a Consent Calendar for consideration by the Stakeholder Forum. During the MAC (Mobility Advisory Committee) meeting, the Stakeholder Forum addresses the entire Consent Calendar agenda as a single action, rather than spending time to view a presentation on each project.

1. Regions submit their project information to the Mobility Services Team at least three weeks prior to the meeting, using a Consent Calendar request form. The form is necessary to ensure the Mobility Services Team receives all of the information that is required by administrative rule for an ORS 366.215 review.
2. Mobility analysts review the request to determine if the project can be added to the Consent Calendar agenda, based on the Criteria Table listed above.
  - a. If a complex project has multiple proposed actions that potentially reduce vehicle-carrying capacity, all of them must match the criteria in order to be placed on the Calendar. Projects will not be “split apart” so that some components are on the Consent Calendar while others are discussed in a meeting.
  - b. If there is any uncertainty by the analyst as to whether the project meets the criteria, the project will not be placed on the Calendar and will be scheduled for a full discussion with the committee.
3. The Mobility Services Team notifies the region that its project has been selected for the Consent Calendar, and advises them to be prepared in the event a Stakeholder Forum member requests a full presentation and removal from the Calendar.
4. Mobility analysts prepare a draft Record of Support for each project on the Consent Calendar. (An example of a Record of Support can be viewed [here](#).) If supported by the Stakeholder Forum, the Record of Support can then be quickly finalized and provided back to the project team.
5. The Mobility Services Team distributes the Consent Calendar, project information (from the consent calendar request form), and the draft Record of Support documents to the Stakeholder Forum members one week prior to the MAC meeting for review (along with the full meeting agenda and other meeting materials). The Calendar will be provided as a separate stand-alone document that is included by reference in the MAC agenda (similar to how the Oregon Transportation Commission distributes its Consent Calendar agenda).

### Process for Removing Projects from the ORS 366.215 Consent Calendar

1. Any member of the Stakeholder Forum may request that a project be removed from the Consent Calendar and placed on the regular agenda. Such requests can be made for any reason and at any time during the week prior to the meeting, up to the point when the Stakeholder Forum is asked to approve the Calendar at the beginning of the meeting.
2. If a Stakeholder Forum member requests that a project be removed, the Mobility Services Team will work with the Region Mobility Liaison and the Project Team to determine if there is sufficient time to add the project to the current meeting agenda, or if it should be scheduled for a later meeting.

### Evaluation

The Consent Calendar process will be evaluated after 6 to 12 months to determine if the Calendar adds value to the committee meetings and if any adjustments are needed.

### Consent Calendar Agenda Example

The following table shows what a Consent Calendar agenda might look like with this concept. The projects will be grouped by category along with a summary of the criteria used for each item. If there are no projects for a particular category for the Consent Calendar for a given month, that category would be removed or indicate no projects currently scheduled. In addition to the Calendar, Stakeholder Forum members will also be able to review the project information taken from the consent calendar request form and the draft Record of Support that will be distributed to the committee along with the agenda.

**AGENDA EXAMPLE**

**ORS 366.215 Stakeholder Forum Consent Calendar Agenda for 1/14/2021**

**Note:** A member of the Stakeholder Forum may request any of these projects be pulled from the Consent Calendar and added to the meeting agenda for discussion in the committee.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Consent Calendar Category</b> <b>Proposed Horizontal Reductions</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Projects</b></p>
<p><b>1. Projects Proposing Bridge/ Overpass Rail Replacement</b> These projects meet the following criteria for the Consent Calendar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Width reduction resulting from the new railing is 3% or less.</li> <li>• Reduction does NOT restrict any loads currently able to use the bridge (e.g. width still exceeds pinch points for accessing the structure).</li> <li>• Remaining rail-to-rail horizontal width for two lanes exceeds 28 feet or greater after the reduction.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. US101: 10th Ave to 12th Ave Median Island (Seaside)</li> <li>2. I-5: I-205 Interchange</li> <li>3. OR18: Yamhill River –McDougall Junction (Dayton)</li> <li>4. Dean Creek Bridge Rail</li> </ol>
<p><b>2. Projects Proposing Curb Ramp Extensions</b> These projects meet the following criteria for the Consent Calendar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typical curb ramp designs that utilize the existing sidewalk footprint could not be used due to geometric constraints.</li> <li>• The selected design is optimized for minimal encroachment into the roadway (e.g. no other design options are available for providing more roadway width).</li> <li>• The reduction utilizes existing parking lane width, and existing travel lane &amp; bike lane widths are not affected.</li> <li>• Turning movements for freight that normally turn at the proposed intersection are not affected by the extension.</li> <li>• Remaining available curb-to-curb width is at least 28 feet for two travel lanes.</li> <li>• Reduction will not create a new pinch point.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. US97: MP 264 – 265 Barrier Project (Klamath Lake)</li> <li>2. US97: Redmond – Bend</li> </ol>

<p><b>3. Projects Proposing Pedestrian/Median Islands</b> These projects meet the following criteria for the Consent Calendar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing travel lane/bike lane widths are not affected.</li> <li>• Remaining available curb-to-curb width is at least 28 feet for two travel lanes, or 22 feet for a single travel lane.</li> <li>• Reduction will not create a new pinch point.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. US101: 10th Ave to 12th Ave Median Island (Seaside)</li> <li>2. OR42: Cedar Point - Finley Loop (Coquille)</li> <li>3. OR126/US101: Spruce Street to Siuslaw River Bridge (Florence)</li> </ol>
<p><b>4. Projects Proposing Barrier Extensions</b> These projects meet the following criteria for the Consent Calendar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New barrier is being installed to fill in a gap between existing barrier segments, or extending an existing barrier.</li> <li>• Horizontal clearance will not be reduced any less than where the existing barrier segments are located.</li> <li>• Existing travel lane/bike lane widths are not affected.</li> <li>• Installation will not create a new pinch point.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. US97: MP 264 – 265 Barrier Project</li> <li>2. US97: Redmond – Bend</li> </ol>
<p><b>3. Projects Proposing a New Bridge Structure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These projects propose a new bridge structure over a Reduction Review Route that will result in at least 30 feet of clearance.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Congressman Earl Blumenauer Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge</li> </ol>
<p><b>4. Projects proposing a new auxiliary lane underneath an existing structure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These projects propose a new auxiliary lane underneath a structure where none existed before, and the other existing lanes already have higher vertical clearances available.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OR217 SB crossing under Denney Rd.</li> <li>2. OR217 SB crossing under Hall Blvd. (north crossing)</li> </ol>

## Non-ORS 366.215 Projects

### Projects with Proposed Permanent Reductions/Restrictions NOT Subject to ORS 366.215

Permanent reductions and restrictions on state highways that are NOT on a Reduction Review Route (RRR)<sup>5</sup> subject to [OAR 731-012-0010](#) may be shared with the Mobility Advisory Committee per ODOT policy. ODOT's Mobility Services Team will use the table below to determine if the proposed reduction has a low or moderate/high impact.

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
<b>Low</b>	Shared with the Mobility Advisory Committee via email and document responses.	New permanent size and/or weight restrictions are minimal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Width reduction is less than 3%.</li> <li>• Reduction does not include a vertical clearance reduction.</li> <li>• Does not include road diet, lane reconfigurations/lane reduction, traffic calming, or other project types that reduce travel lanes or travel lane widths.</li> <li>• Weight restriction will not affect freight that currently uses the route.</li> <li>• Reduction is within design standards and does not create a new pinch point.</li> <li>• Reduction is on a highly restricted route as shown in black &amp; yellow routes on the Freight Mobility Map.</li> </ul>
<b>Moderate</b>		New permanent size and/or weight restrictions are moderate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed permanent size and weight restrictions do not meet ODOT horizontal or vertical mobility standards<sup>6</sup> but the restriction will not create a new pinch point.</li> <li>• There may be mitigations available to bypass.</li> <li>• Does not include road diet, lane reconfiguration/lane reduction, traffic calming, or other project types that reduce travel lanes or travel lane widths.</li> <li>• Proposed vertical clearance reductions are not on high routes per the Oregon Vertical Clearance Standards Map.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Reduction Review Routes can be viewed as a layer in [ODOT TransGIS](#). Click on the "Display" tab and then select "Layer Catalog." Select Reduction Review Routes from the Freight Menu and click Apply.

<sup>6</sup> See Horizontal Width and Vertical Clearance Mobility Standards in Appendix A (Definitions, Standards & Resources).

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
<b>High</b>	Shared at a Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting.	<p>New permanent size and/or weight restrictions are high:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New permanent size, weight, or height restrictions create new pinch points or do not meet mobility horizontal width or vertical clearance standards per the highway design manual.</li> <li>• Restrictions result in significant mobility impacts.</li> <li>• Project proposes a roundabout.</li> <li>• New permanent size, weight, or height restrictions create new pinch points or do not meet highway design standards<sup>7</sup> on a freight route per the Highway Design Manual and the Traffic Structures Design Manual.</li> <li>• Road diet, lane reconfiguration/lane reduction, traffic calming, or other project types that reduce the number of travel lanes or travel lane widths.</li> </ul>

## Temporary Work Zone Impacts Projects

### Horizontal Width Impacts – Mainline Highway Considerations

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
<b>No Impacts</b>	Not required to share with the Mobility Advisory Committee	<p>Work Zone Traffic Control does not impact mobility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobility staff determines there will be no oversize load restrictions for width/height/length/weight or delay.</li> <li>• Workers can safely accommodate all unannounced oversize loads through the work zone (non-interstate) with minimal delay (less than 20 minutes) No restriction.</li> <li>• Routes are already restricted, the project duration is short, and there are large windows of opportunity for unrestricted movement.</li> <li>• Restrictions are off-system on a local facility.</li> <li>• Traffic control maintains a minimum 22 feet of width for a single lane of travel or 28 feet for 2 lanes of travel (2 lanes of one-way, or 2 lanes of opposing traffic (with no traffic separator)).<sup>8</sup></li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> See Horizontal Width and Vertical Clearance Mobility Standards in Appendix A (Definitions, Standards & Resources).

<sup>8</sup> See notification requirements in chapter 5 of the [Mobility Procedures Manual](#).

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
<p><b>Low Impacts</b></p>	<p>Not recommended to share with the Mobility Advisory Committee</p>	<p>Work Zone Traffic control impacts are low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work is on a highly restricted route per the <a href="#">Freight Mobility Map</a>.</li> <li>• Work does <b>not</b> restrict the following on Interstate/Multilane Highways, Critical Route Pairs, or heavily used freight routes per the Freight Mobility Map:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Annual Permits as identified on the freight mobility daytime and nighttime annual permit maps:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="#">Freight Mobility Nighttime Width Map</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="#">Freight Mobility Daylight Width Map</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Single trip permits (except superloads), and they can be accommodated with advanced notice (e.g. over-dimension permit staff will work with the district to coordinate movement through the work zone with the Resident Engineer).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Work takes place at night only and will not encroach into the daytime hours when oversize loads are allowed to move (as defined in Oregon Administrative Rules, Divisions 75 &amp; 82 (for oversize loads) as one-half hour before sunrise until one-half hour after sunset).</li> <li>• There are large windows of opportunity for oversize loads to move through the work zone unrestricted when work is not in progress.</li> <li>• For maintenance, parades, and races, work is short term – no more than three days max as defined in the Maintenance Mobility Requirements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Moderate Impacts</b></p>	<p>Share with Mobility Advisory Committee via email and document responses</p>	<p>Work Zone Traffic control impacts mobility moderately.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Width restrictions are during the day or night and restrict Annual Permits, but local detour route is available or there are windows of opportunity for unrestricted travel.</li> <li>• Horizontal width standards<sup>9</sup> will be maintained, but Single Trip Permits are restricted, including superloads on the Interstate, Critical Route Pairs, or highly used freight routes (orange routes) per the Freight mobility map. Single trip permits can be accommodated with advance notice (e.g. over-dimension permit staff will work with the district to coordinate movement through the work zone with the Resident Engineer).</li> <li>• Width restrictions are planned on other routes (non-Interstate, non-Critical Route Pairs) that cannot accommodate wider loads with advance notice; OR there are no large windows/times provided for unrestricted travel.</li> <li>• Width restrictions are planned day and/or night for Maintenance/Emergency Railroad/Utility work that will restrict Single Trip and Annual Permits.</li> </ul>

<sup>9</sup> See Appendix A (Definitions, Standards & Resources) for Horizontal Width Mobility Standards.

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
<b>High Impacts</b>	Share at a Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting	<p>Work Zone Traffic control results in high impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot meet horizontal width standards<sup>10</sup> on the Interstate Highways or Critical Route Pairs.</li> <li>• There are a variety of width &amp; height restrictions impacting Annual and/or Single Trip permits (Including Superloads).</li> <li>• Restrictions are in place over a long duration (e.g. weeks/months/duration of the project).</li> <li>• No large windows/times when oversize loads can move through the work zone unrestricted.</li> <li>• Hard barrier is used and cannot be moved resulting in width restrictions even when no work taking place (cannot accommodate).</li> <li>• No detour route available, or the detour is the Critical Route Pair, causing out of direction travel.</li> <li>• The critical route pair has conflicts and there is no other route available.</li> <li>• There are multiple stages and phases of work that are challenging to share via email.</li> </ul>

Ramp Partial & Full Closure Impact Considerations

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
<b>No/Low Impacts</b>	Not recommended to share with the Mobility Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ramp closures to/from local jurisdictions (if not heavily used by freight).</li> <li>• Brief ramp closures to/from state highways due to parades or other local events (e.g. running/biking events, etc.).</li> <li>• Does not restrict Annual Permits and only impact single trip permits minimally.</li> </ul>
<b>Moderate Impacts</b>	Share with Mobility Advisory Committee via email and document responses	<p>Ramp closures to/from state highways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual &amp; Single Trip permits restricted.</li> <li>• Oversize loads can be accommodated either unannounced or with advanced notice.</li> <li>• There are adequate detour routes available.</li> <li>• There is a good signing and communication plan.</li> </ul>
<b>High Impacts</b>	Share at a Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting	<p>Ramp partial and full closures from system to system (mainline) highways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ramp full closures are on Interstate/Multilane Highways, Critical Route Pairs, and/or heavily used freight routes per the <a href="#">Freight Mobility Map</a>.</li> </ul>

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix A (Definitions, Standards & Resources) for Horizontal Width Mobility Standards.

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ramp partial closures result in width restrictions to both Annual and Single Trip Permits.</li> <li>Detour routes are not available, or require an off-site detour resulting in significant out of distance travel.</li> </ul>

### Highway Full Closure Impact Considerations

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
<b>Low Impacts</b>	Not recommended to share with the Mobility Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short-term highway closures due to parades or other local events (e.g. running/biking events, etc.).</li> </ul>
<b>Moderate Impacts</b>	Share with Mobility Advisory Committee via email and document responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highway closures that have a detour route that accommodates Annual and Single Trip Permits.</li> <li>Closures are primarily at night with a detour that accommodates Annual Permits.</li> <li>Closure is not on an Interstate or Critical Route Pair<sup>11</sup>.</li> <li>Closures are on Highly Restricted Freight Routes (see <a href="#">Freight Mobility Map</a>).</li> <li>Short-term highway closures for Maintenance/Railroad work.</li> </ul>
<b>High Impacts</b>	Share with Mobility Advisory Committee via email and document responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highway closure is on the Interstate or a Critical Route Pair.</li> <li>Closure is in place for a long duration (e.g. more than three days during the day).</li> <li>The detour route does not allow Annual and Single Trip Permits that are normally allowed to use the road to be closed.</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> See Critical Route Pair definition in Appendix A (Definitions, Standards & Resources).

## Construction Projects with Proposed Changes - PD-16 Impact Considerations

Projects with mobility impacts that have been shared with the Mobility Services Team and the Mobility Advisory Committee are documented on the [Mobility Considerations Checklist](#) per Operational Notice [PD-16](#). Changes to traffic control, duration, hours/days may need to be re- vetted with Mobility Services Team and the Mobility Advisory Committee.

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
<b>Low Impacts</b>	Not recommended to share with the Mobility Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-vetted projects with minor changes to mobility impacts/restrictions, duration, or schedule. (E.g. the hours change, but do not create a new restriction by encroaching into daytime hours, the size and weight restrictions change but do not impact the annuals and single trip permits allowed to move, etc.)</li> <li>• Changes do not restrict Annual Permits.</li> <li>• Work is not on an Interstate or Critical Route Pair Route.</li> </ul>
<b>Moderate Impacts</b>	Shared with the Mobility Advisory Committee via email and document responses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-vets w/changes to mobility impacts/restrictions.</li> <li>• Durations are significantly longer, and the detour route is not ideal (e.g. requires an additional pilot car and there are extra out of distance miles, causing a monetary hardship).</li> <li>• Changes result in new restrictions, or restrictions are more significant than originally proposed. (Example: when originally shared, a project may have indicated Annual Permits will not be impacted and Single Trip Permits could move up to 18 feet wide. A proposed change in width still allows Annual Permits; but Single Trips are now restricted to 14 feet, potentially impacting oversize loads that planned on moving during the specified time.)</li> </ul>
<b>High Impacts</b>	Share at a Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in schedule cause conflicts with a Critical Route Pair. ODOT has committed to ensuring one route will always be unrestricted while the other route is restricted.</li> <li>• Changes in schedule conflict with other projects and restrictions will affect movement of planned oversize loads (e.g. windmills).</li> </ul>

Delay Impact Considerations

Impact Category	Action	Criteria
<b>Low Impact</b>	Not recommended to share with the Mobility Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term delays due to rolling slow-downs, stop/holds, etc. less than 20 minutes.</li> <li>• Performed during non-peak times or not expected to cause long delays.</li> <li>• Only impact freight (less than 20 minutes).</li> <li>• Longer delays located on a route that is highly restricted to freight.</li> </ul>
<b>Moderate Impact</b>	Share with Mobility Advisory Committee via email and document Responses	Projects that exceed delay thresholds <sup>12</sup> occasionally.
<b>High Impact</b>	Share at a Mobility Advisory Committee Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects that regularly exceed delay thresholds and require a delay exception.</li> <li>• Delays are anticipated to be significant and will impact all traffic.</li> </ul>

<sup>12</sup> See Delay Thresholds definition in Appendix A (Definitions, Standards & Resources).