MEMORANDUM

Technical Memorandum #1: Plans and Policies Review (Task 3.3)

Exit 30 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP)

DATE December 18, 2019
TO Matt Hughart and Matt Bell, Kittelson & Associates
FROM Darci Rudzinski, Clinton “CJ” Doxsee, and Courtney Simms, Angelo Planning Group
CC Project Management Team

OVERVIEW

Pursuant to the scope of work (Task 3.3), this memorandum presents a review of existing plans, regulations, agreements, and policies that affect transportation planning in the study area for the City of Medford and ODOT I-5 Exit 30 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP). The review explains the relationship between the documents and planning in this area, identifying key issues to track through the IAMP development process.

Documents in this review establish transportation-related standards, targets, and guidelines as well as transportation improvements with which the IAMP shall coordinate and be consistent. Other documents in this review – such as the City of Medford Transportation System Plan (TSP) and Land Development Code (LDC) – may be subject to future recommended amendments in order to implement the IAMP. Once the IAMP and implementing ordinances are completed, it is expected that the City will adopt key elements of the IAMP as a refinement to the Medford TSP before the IAMP is considered by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) for adoption. Upon adoption by the OTC, the IAMP becomes an amendment to the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP).

Table 1 provides a list of the documents reviewed in this memorandum, the page in the memo where the applicable information can be found, and a summary of the relevance each document has to the Exit 30 IAMP and the Interchange Management Study Area (IMSA) specifically.
Table 1. Summary of Documents Reviewed and Project Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Project Relevance</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Access to Interstate System Policy</td>
<td>The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is responsible for the submission of access modification requests to the designated FHWA Division office for review. The IAMP must include all information required for submission under this policy.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2021 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>A result of the IAMP planning process may be recommended projects for inclusion in a future cycle of STIP funding. There is no guarantee that the projects will be included in the next version or future STIPs. Available statewide funding for transit-related improvements includes the Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF).</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Title VI Guidance</td>
<td>Development of the IAMP must address any Title VI and Environmental Justice populations to ensure the planning project complies with related federal requirements. Title VI and Environmental Justice populations have been identified as part of demographic analysis performed for the project; project alternatives will be evaluated for impacts on these populations.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT IAMP Guidelines</td>
<td>The project team will use the IAMP Guidelines as a tool during development of the IAMP, specifically considering the appropriateness of implementation measures identified in the guidelines.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Transportation Plan</td>
<td>The Exit 30 IAMP will seek to maximize performance of the existing transportation system through, for example, the use of technology and system management before considering larger and costlier improvements at the interchange.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012)</td>
<td>While OAR 734-051 regulates access management and not the TPR (OAR 660-012), the TPR provides the connection between local development codes and access management, coordinated land use review procedures, and other standards, allowances, and requirements to protect road operations and safety, as well as provide for non-motorized modes of transportation. Planned improvements within the IMSA on local roadways will need to be consistent with Medford’s adopted transportation requirements. Recommended IAMP implementation measures may entail local code amendments to ensure TPR provisions as well as IAMP recommendations are captured in the code.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Project Relevance</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Management Rule (OAR 734-051)</td>
<td>The Exit 30 IAMP will meet compliance with spacing standards in OAR 734-051 and their development will need to be consistent with the applicable criteria established for facility plans and project delivery in the Rule. To be consistent with the direction provided in Senate Bill 408, the development and evaluation of alternatives will acknowledge the impacts and benefits of property access, as measured by adopted local land use designations (allowed uses) and economic development objectives of the property owners. The IAMPs’ access management plan should “include level of detail sufficient to inform affected real property owners of the potential for the modification, relocation or closure of existing private approaches within the area (§4(3)(c)).” The location of local streets that intersect with the state highway system in the vicinity of the subject interchanges will be discussed with the City during the existing conditions phase of the project.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Highway Plan</td>
<td>The Exit 30 IAMP will be adopted as an amendment to the OHP; therefore, they must align will all relevant policies summarized above.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Highway Design Manual</td>
<td>The IAMP alternatives will be developed to be consistent with the applicable HDM Standards for interchanges and state highways. Any proposed bicycle or pedestrian improvements associated with the preferred alternatives will also need to be consistent with the HDM.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Bicycle Bill</td>
<td>Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists will be required where plan recommendations include new or reconstructed roadway associated with the state highways or interchange design.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</td>
<td>The IAMP will consider State bicycle and pedestrian goals and strategies through this planning project and their implementation avenues.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Freight Plan</td>
<td>Maintaining and enhancing efficiency of the truck and freight system in the study area will be an integral part of the IAMP.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Aviation Plan</td>
<td>The Exit 30 IAMP will take into account land use and growth at the Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport and how improvements at Exit 30 may impact access and economic development.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan</td>
<td>Safety factors will be reflected in IAMP Goals and Objectives and the assessment of project alternatives.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Public Transportation Plan</td>
<td>The IAMP process will coordinate with the Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD), the regional public transit agency, and the City’s transit program to ensure that planning outcomes are consistent with transit planning. A representative from RVTD will be invited to participate on the planning advisory committee and will receive copies of each deliverable for review and comment to ensure coordination between the IAMP planning process and outcomes and regional transit operations and long-range planning.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Rogue Valley Corridor Plan (2012)</td>
<td>The Exit 30 IAMP will review and incorporate corridor concepts that are recommended in the Corridor Plan</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Project Relevance</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Bridge Design Manual (2019)</td>
<td>Recommended improvements related to bridge design will be guided by AASHTO specifications.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGIONAL DOCUMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMVPO Regional Transportation Plan (2017)</td>
<td>The projects recommended in the RTP, either proposed or already constructed within the IMSA, will be considered in the development of the IAMP. The IAMP will be adopted as an amendment to the RTP and therefore will need to be found, or made, consistent with standards and policies.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVMPD Transportation Improvement Program (2017)</td>
<td>Improvements recommended in the Exit 30 IAMP will be available for inclusion in a future TIP and may be coordinated with other programmed projects, where applicable.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVMPD Freight Study Report (2006, Updated 2012)</td>
<td>The IAMP will review the status of recommended projects within the study area and factor the planned improvements.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue Valley Area Active Transportation Plan (in progress)</td>
<td>The RVMPD transportation/transit objectives and planned projects will be considered in the development of the IAMP.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue Valley Regional ITS Plan (2016)</td>
<td>The IAMP project will review and incorporate as applicable the recommended ITS projects into the alternatives analysis and recommended alternative.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport Master Plan Update (2010)</td>
<td>The current operations and planned expansions of the airport will be considered in the development of the IAMP.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek Greenway Management Plan (2006)</td>
<td>The IAMP project will consider and plan for mitigation resulting from impacts to the Bear Creek Greenway.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan (2011)</td>
<td>Consistent with the Regional Plan, the TSP update will consider ways to reduce reliance on state facilities and increase local connectivity through the development of local arterials.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVTD 2040 Transit Master Plan (in progress)</td>
<td>The IAMP project will consider and plan for service enhancements identified in the Transit Master Plan</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL DOCUMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford Comprehensive Plan (various)</td>
<td>The IAMP will need to be consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies, either existing or as proposed to be modified. Furthermore, the IAMP will be adopted as an amendment to the City TSP, the Transportation Element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Project Relevance</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Medford Transportation System Plan 2018-2038 (2018)</td>
<td>The projects recommended in the TSP, either proposed or already constructed within the study area, will be considered in the development of the IAMP. The IAMP will be adopted as an amendment to the TSP and therefore will need to be found, or made, consistent with standards and policies in the TSP.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford Capital Improvement Plan (2017)</td>
<td>Improvements recommended in the Exit 30 IAMP will be available for inclusion in a future City’s CIP and may be coordinated with other programmed projects, where applicable.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Development Code for the City of Medford (various)</td>
<td>Future growth in the study area will be based on zoning districts assessed as part of the projects existing conditions analysis. As the IAMP process progresses and recommendations are formed, the standards will guide local street improvements. IAMP recommended improvements on the local street system may require City Engineering approval.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 62: I-5 to Dutton Road Final Environmental Impact Study (2013)</td>
<td>The expressway Preferred Alternative is described in great detail in the OR 62 FEIS. It identifies a split diamond interchange at Exit 30 as shown in Figure 10. The FEIS did not analyze traffic impacts west of the interchange ramps. Two commercial expansions at the intersection of OR 238, OR 99, and OR 62 (the &quot;Big X&quot;) southwest of the interchange will result in an increase in traffic volumes at the interchange. Developable lands at the Big X, which includes service and general industrial uses, may be rezoned to mixed use and/or residential in the future. These developments need to be analyzed in the context of the IAMP. Further, the issues identified in the FEIS related to improvements at the interchange need to be reexamined and resolved. Recommendations will be documented in the draft IAMP for future adoption - by the City of Medford as an amendment to the adopted Transportation System Plan and by the Oregon Transportation Commission as an amendment to the Oregon Highway Plan.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Park Neighborhood Plan (in progress)</td>
<td>The projects recommended in the Neighborhood Plan within the study area will be considered in the development of the IAMP.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Improvement Agreements, Inter-Governmental Agreements, and Traffic Impact Studies relative to development within the IMSA</td>
<td>The IAMP will consider and review additional agreements and studies that are relevant to the IMSA as they become available.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) policy established the federal requirements for new or improved access to the interstate system. The policy states the following:

> It is in the national interest to preserve and enhance the Interstate System to meet the needs of the 21st Century by assuring that it provides the highest level of service in terms of safety and mobility. Full control of access along the Interstate mainline and ramps, along with control of access on the crossroad at interchanges, is critical to providing such service. Therefore, the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) decision to approve new or revised access points to the Interstate System under Title 23, United States Code (U.S.C.), Section 111, must be supported by substantiated information justifying and documenting that decision. The FHWA’s decision to approve a request is dependent on the proposal satisfying and documenting the following requirements.

1) An operational and safety analysis that have proven the proposed access changes does not have “a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation of the Interstate facility” or connected local street network. The area of analysis should at minimum expand from the interstate to the to the nearest major intersection on either side of proposed change in access.

2) The proposed access connects to a public road only and will provide for all traffic movements. The report should demonstrate the proposed change meets the current standards of 23 CFR 625.2(a), 625.4(a)(2), and 655.603(d) and mitigation proposed to compensate for the missing movements, including wayfinding signage, impacts on local intersections, mitigation of driver expectation leading to wrong-way movements on ramps, etc.

**Project Relevance:** The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is responsible for the submission of access modification requests to the designated FHWA Division office for review. The IAMP must include all information required for submission under this policy.

**2018–2021 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program**

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is the programming and funding document for transportation projects and programs statewide. The projects and programs undergo a selection process managed by ODOT Regions or ODOT central offices. The document covers a period of four years and is updated every two years. There are no current active STIP (2018-2021) projects proposed within the Exit 30 IAMP study area.¹

---

¹ Note that a draft 2021-2024 STIP will likely be adopted by the OTC before the end of the Exit 30 IAMP planning effort. Proposed projects that are within the IMSA will be considered as future solutions for the interchange are developed and evaluated.
Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF)

House Bill 2017, Keep Oregon Moving, required that starting in 2019 a new state payroll tax of one-tenth of 1 percent would be enacted to fund public transportation improvements around the state. The new revenue is allocated under the Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund Program (STIF), with a majority of the funds allocated to qualified local entities. Rogue Valley Transportation District will receive STIF funds under the STIF Formula Disbursements. The Oregon Transportation Commission awarded over $1 million in STIF Discretionary & Intercommunity Program and Statewide Transit Network Program funding during the 2019 grant cycle. The allocated funds will go to the Eagle Point Intercity Route and Ashland Demand Response Micro-Transit Demonstration projects.

Project Relevance: A result of the IAMP planning process may be recommended projects for inclusion in a future cycle of STIP funding. There is no guarantee that the projects will be included in the next version or future STIPs. Available statewide funding for transit-related improvements includes the Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF).

ODOT Title VI Guidance

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs that receive federal funding, including ODOT, MPO, and local government transportation planning, design, construction, and operations activities. Related statutes and policies prohibit discrimination on other bases, such as Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice), which requires that minority and low-income populations not be disproportionately subjected to impacts of proposed projects.

Title VI Guidance for Transportation Planning was released by the ODOT Transportation Development Division (TDD) in January 2015. It provides direction to local governments, MPOs, and ODOT staff in annual reporting to the FHWA and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regarding the compliance of planning, design, and construction activities with Title VI. The guide provides direction for planning activities in particular, with an emphasis on activities related to scoping the project, identifying Title VI populations in planning study areas, developing and conducting targeted outreach to these populations, conducting alternatives analysis, and documenting activities and findings. The guide essentially provides checklists for local governments, MPOs, and ODOT Region Planning Project Managers, Region Planning Managers, TDD Planning Staff, and the Title VI Program Manager for documenting and reporting for the annual Title VI Accomplishment Report.

Project Relevance: Development of the IAMP will address Title VI and Environmental Justice populations to ensure the planning project complies with related federal requirements. The Public Involvement Plan will include a strategy for Title VI and Environmental Justice community outreach, which should be driven by the Phase 1 (Scoping) section of the Guidance. Title VI and Environmental Justice populations will be identified as part of demographic analysis performed for the project for Task 4.1; project alternatives will be evaluated for impacts on these populations.²

² See Technical Memorandum #2, Existing Inventory and Land Use Assumptions.

The Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) Guidelines provide guidance for the preparation of IAMP. The guidelines include background regarding the purpose and regulatory significance of IAMP and addresses the following:

- IAMP contents and level of analysis,
- Timing of IAMP related to project development;
- IAMP preparation process;
- Relationship of ODOT and local governments;
- Relationship to NEPA; and
- Schedule, cost and funding.

As part of the “IAMP Process,” the guidelines establish local development code, deed restrictions, funding mechanisms, traffic/transportation mechanisms, and access management as IAMP implementation measures. The guidelines identify policy statements, concurrency ordinances, trip capacity/allocation ordinances, trip budgets, overlay districts, and design review and performance standards as specific implementation measures to be pursued through potential local development code amendments.

The 2013 update retained much of the original material in the guidelines and added some new information, including differentiation of access management plans and strategies and expanded explanations related to coordination of the IAMP with project development (NEPA).

**Project Relevance:** The project team will use the IAMP Guidelines as a tool during development of the IAMP, ensuring that the process results in the level of analysis, plan content, and specific measures necessary to guide future improvements at the Exit 30 IAMP.

Oregon Transportation Plan (2006)

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is a comprehensive plan that addresses the future transportation needs of the State of Oregon through the year 2030. The primary function of the OTP is to establish goals, policies, strategies and initiatives that guide the development of the State’s transportation modal plans, such as the OHP and Oregon Bike and Pedestrian Plan.

The OTP emphasizes the following key initiatives for implementation of the OTP:

- Maintaining and maximizing the assets in place
- Optimizing the performance of the existing system through technology
- Integrating transportation, land use, economic development and the environment
- Integrating the transportation system across jurisdictions, ownerships and modes
- Creating sustainable funding
- Investing in strategic capacity enhancements

**Project Relevance:** The IAMP will seek to maximize performance of the existing transportation system through, for example, the use of technology and system management before considering larger and costlier improvements at the interchanges.
Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012)

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) implements Goal 12 (Transportation) of the statewide planning goals. The TPR contains numerous requirements governing transportation planning and project development. The TPR provides the connection between local development codes and access management, coordinated land use review procedures, and other standards, allowances, and requirements to protect road operations and safety. Recommended implementation measures for the Exit 30 IAMP may entail city code amendments to ensure TPR provisions as well as IAMP recommendations are captured in the code.

OAR 660-012-0045 (Section -0045)

Section -0045 requires each local government to amend its land use regulations to implement its TSP. It also requires local government to adopt land use or subdivision ordinance regulations consistent with applicable federal and state requirements “to protect transportation facilities, corridors and sites for their identified functions.” Local governments also must adopt land use or subdivision regulations for urban areas that provide for safe and convenient pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation consistent with adopted access management standards and street functional classification.

Local compliance with -0045 provisions is achieved through a variety of measures, including access control measures, standards to protect future operations of roads, and expanded notice requirements and coordinated review procedures for land use applications. Local development codes should also include a process to apply conditions of approval to development proposals, and regulations ensuring that amendments to land use designations, densities, and design standards are consistent with the functions, capacities, and performance standards of facilities identified in the TSP.

The TPR does not regulate access management. ODOT adopted OAR 734-051 to address access management and this planning project and outcomes will need to be consistent with the Access Management Rule. Requirements include reviewing existing access points within at least one-quarter mile of interchange ramps. See the review of OAR 734-051 in the next section for a discussion of these access management rules.

OAR 660-012-0060 (Section -0060)

The 2012 TPR revisions resulted in new language in Section -0060 that allows a local government to exempt a zone change from the “significant effect” determination if the proposed zoning is consistent with the comprehensive plan map designation and the TSP.

Project Relevance: While OAR 734-051 regulates access management and not the TPR (OAR 660-012), the TPR provides the connection between local development codes and access management, coordinated land use review procedures, and other standards, allowances, and requirements to protect road operations and safety, as well as provide for non-motorized modes of transportation. Planned improvements within the IMSA on local roadways will need to be consistent with Medford’s adopted transportation requirements. Recommended IAMP implementation measures may entail local code amendments to ensure TPR provisions as well as IAMP recommendations are captured in the code.
Access Management Rule (OAR 734-051)

OAR 734-051 defines the State’s role in managing access to highway facilities in order to maintain functional use and safety and to preserve public investment. The rule includes spacing standards for varying types of state roadways and criteria for granting right of access and approach locations onto state highway facilities.

Amendments to OAR 734-051 were adopted in early 2012 based on passage of Senate Bill 1024 and Senate Bill 264 in the 2010 and 2011 Oregon Legislature respectively. The amendments were intended to allow more consideration for economic development when developing and implementing access management rules and involved changes to how ODOT deals with approach road spacing, highway improvement requirements with development, and traffic impact analyses requirements for approach road permits.

Senate Bill 408, which passed in the 2013 legislative session and became effective January 1, 2014, addressed three priorities: existing approaches (private driveways) without ODOT’s written permission; access management in highway facility plans; and access management in highway project delivery. The legislation provides new requirements for access management in the development of highway facility plans such as IAMP and corridor plans, and requires collaboration with local governments in determining the location of local roads that intersect highways in the planning area. The legislation also directs ODOT to develop an access management strategy for each highway modernization or improvement project. ODOT must develop key principles for each facility plan, which will be used to evaluate how abutting properties may retain or obtain access to the state highway during and after plan implementation. In developing the key principles, the department must also develop a methodology to weigh the benefits of a highway improvement to public safety and mobility against the locally adopted TSP and land uses permitted in the local comprehensive plan, as well as the economic development objectives of affected real property owners who require access to the state highway. If a facility plan identifies the need to modify, relocate or close existing private approaches, the plan must include key principles for managing access to the state highway and a timeline for plan implementation. Each facility plan also must document that there was collaborative discussion and agreement between the department and the affected city regarding the location of city streets that intersect a state highway within the study area.

OAR 734-051-4020 (Standards and Criteria for Approval of Private Approaches)

New spacing standards were established in 2012 for new or modified approaches to statewide highways but spacing standards related to interchanges (spacing of tapers between interchanges, spacing between ramp tapers and approaches or intersections with left-turns) were not amended.

---

3 Senate Bill 408 resulted in the adoption of two permanent rules by the OTC: 734-051-1065 Restriction of Turning Movements for Existing Approaches, and 734-051-3015 Presumption of Written Permission for an Existing Private Connection. Additionally, fifteen (15) existing permanent rules were amended, and five previously adopted temporary rules were repealed.

4 Tables 3-6 in OAR 734-051

5 Tables 7-10 and Figures 1-4 in OAR 734-051
The amendments also allow access management plans (AMPs) and IAMPs to establish spacing standards that may take precedence over the highway/approach spacing standards in the rule.  

Interchange improvements that are proposed in the IAMP will need to meet or improve, “by moving in the direction of,” the access management spacing standards by means of an access management strategy, plan, or mitigation proposal.  

OAR 734-051-5120 (Access Management in Project Delivery)

Section -5120 of OAR 734-051 requires ODOT to develop an access management strategy during project delivery for modernization and highway improvement projects in the STIP. ODOT must collaborate with cities, counties, and owners of property adjacent to the highway to develop the access management strategy. The strategy must be consistent with the OTP, the OHP, and other modal plans adopted by the OTC, including Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, Freight Plan, Highway Plan, Public Transportation Plan, and State Rail Plan.

The access management strategy must include a methodology that balances the economic development objectives of properties abutting the state highway with the transportation safety, access management objectives, and mobility of state highways, while also being consistent with local transportation system plans and the local comprehensive plans acknowledged under ORS Chapter 197.

Section -5120 provides a detailed outline for the required contents of the access management strategy. Both Section -5120 for Access Management in Project Delivery and Section -7010 Access Management in Highway Facility Plans, described below will apply to the Exit 30 IAMP. The strategies required for access management in -5120 and -7010 are the same and reflect the guidance in Senate Bill 408.

OAR 734-051-7010 (Access Management in Highway Facility Plans)

Section -7010 of OAR 734-051 identifies ODOT’s responsibilities to address access management during the development of highway facility plans (access management plans and/or IAMPs) for particular sections of a state highway. The IAMP must comply with the following, unless it can be demonstrated that a criterion is not applicable.

- For the public participation process, provide notice and include interested stakeholders in to participate in the planning process. The process must include an opportunity for affected real property owners that abut the highway to review key principals and related methodology.
- Identify the need to modify, relocate, or close one or more existing approaches and how properties will retain or obtain access to the state highway during and after plan implementation.

---

6 Pursuant to OAR 734-051-4020(8)(b)(C), spacing standards in AMPs and IAMPS may take precedence only over spacing standards in Tables 3-5 of OAR 734-051.

7 OAR 734-051-1070(2), (3), and (4)
• Balance economic development objectives with transportation safety, access management, and mobility of state highway consistent with local plans.

• Articulate key principals in sufficient detail and include anticipated timeline for implementation.

• The plan must be consistent with the agreed upon local road connections identified in the TSP or during development of the plan and consider implications to state and local roadway networks and greater transportation systems.

The section also states that the methodology may include the following factors:

• How properties abutting state highways can develop or redevelop consistent with local designations, zoning and comprehensive plan.

• The level of direct highway access needed for properties

• Effects of out of direction travel for customers to recognize differences between destination and pass-by uses

• Effect of changing existing connections and circulation

• Safety and operational implications of traffic congestions or speed

• Creation of permanent jobs in the study area

• Community support for the project

• Reduction of vehicle conflict points where possible

• Safety and operation concerns

• Safety planning tools, data, and resources

**Project Relevance:** The IAMP will need to meet compliance with spacing standards in OAR 734-051 and future improvements will need to be consistent with the applicable criteria established for facility plans and project delivery in the Rule. To be consistent with the direction provided in Senate Bill 408, the development and evaluation of alternatives will acknowledge the impacts and benefits of property access, as measured by adopted local land use designations (allowed uses) and economic development objectives of the property owners. The IAMP’s access management plan should “include level of detail sufficient to inform affected real property owners of the potential for the modification, relocation or closure of existing private approaches within the area (§4(3)(c)).” The location of local streets that intersect with the state highway system in the vicinity of the subject interchanges will be discussed with the City during the existing conditions phase of the project.

**Oregon Highway Plan (1999, last amended 2015)**

The OHP is the modal plan of the OTP that guides ODOT’s Highway Division in planning, operations, and financing. The Exit 30 IAMP is being developed by ODOT and projects, policies, and regulations
proposed as part of the IAMP must comply with or move in the direction of the OHP’s standards and targets related to safety, access, and mobility. The IAMP must be consistent with the OHP when it is reviewed by the OTC for adoption.

The OHP defines policies and investment strategies for all state highways in Oregon. The OHP has three elements: vision for the future highway system; policies and goals for the five areas of: system definition, system management, access management, travel alternatives, and environmental and scenic resources; and a system element that analyzes the highway needs, revenue, investment and implementation strategy.

Policies in the OHP emphasize the need to efficiently manage the highway system to increase safety and to extend highway mobility, partner with other agencies and local governments, and use new techniques to improve road safety and mobility. These policies also link land use and transportation, set standards for highway performance and access management, and emphasize the relationship between state highways and local road, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, rail, and air systems. The following policies are particularly relevant to the Exit 30 IAMP, specifically to three highways located in the IMSA – Interstate 5 (I-5), Oregon Route 62 (OR 62) and Oregon Route 99 (OR 99). Biddle Road is described within the National Highway System as an NHS Intermodal Connector to the Airport.

Policy 1A: State Highway Classification System
The OHP classifies the state highway system into four levels of importance: Interstate, Statewide, Regional, and District. ODOT uses this classification system to guide management and investment decisions regarding state highway facilities. The system guides the development of facility plans, such as the Exit 30 IAMP, as well as ODOT’s review of local plan and zoning amendments, highway project selection, design and development, and facility management decisions including road approach permits. Both Interstate 5 (I-5), Oregon Route 99 (OR 99), and Oregon Route 62 (OR 62) are a part of the National Highway System (NHS). The purpose and management objectives of these highways are provided in Policy 1A, as summarized below.

- **Interstate Highways**, such as I-5, provide connections between major cities in a state, regions of the state, and other states. A secondary function in urban areas is to serve regional trips within the urban area. Their primary objective is to provide mobility and, therefore, the management objective is to provide for safe and efficient high-speed continuous-flow operation in urban and rural areas.

- **Statewide Highways**, such as OR 62, typically provide inter-urban and inter-regional mobility and provide connections to larger urban areas, ports, and major recreation areas that are not directly served by Interstate Highways. A secondary function is to provide connections for intra-urban and intra-regional trips. The management objective is to provide safe and efficient, high-speed, continuous-flow operation. In constrained and urban areas, interruptions to flow should be minimal. Inside Special Transportation Areas (STAs), local access may also be a priority, there are no STAs located in the study area. In addition to the state highway classification system, I-5 and OR 62 are designated freight routes as discussed under Policy 1C.
• **District Highways** are facilities of county-wide significance and function largely as county and city arterials or collectors. They provide connections and links between small urbanized areas, rural centers and urban hubs, as well as serve local access and traffic. OR 99 fulfills this role in the vicinity of Exit 30.

**Policy 1B: Land Use and Transportation**

Policy 1B applies to all state highways. It is designed to clarify how ODOT will work with local governments and others to link land use and transportation in transportation plans, facility and corridor plans, plan amendments, access permitting and project development. Policy 1B recognizes the need to find balance between serving local communities (accessibility) and the through traveler (mobility) on state facilities. This policy recognizes the role of both the state and local governments related to the state highway system and calls for a coordinated approach to land use and transportation planning.

**Policy 1C: State Highway Freight System**

The primary purpose of the State Highway Freight System is to facilitate efficient and reliable interstate, intrastate, and regional truck movement through a designated freight system. This freight system is made up of the Interstate Highways and select Statewide, Regional, and District Highways and includes routes that carry significant tonnage of freight by truck and serve as the primary interstate and intrastate highway freight connection to ports, intermodal terminals, and urban areas. A primary function of the subject interchanges is to provide safe and efficient freight movements by providing free-flow movement for through traffic. I-5 and OR 62 have this designation and consequently higher highway mobility standards than other statewide highways. I-5 and OR 62 are also a designated “Reduction Review Route,” where proposed activities (including those proposed in planning documents approved by a public agency) that will alter, relocate, change or realign these facilities must be reviewed for possible “Reduction of Vehicle-Carrying Capacity.” Oregon Administrative Rule 731-012-0010, last revised in 2012, explains the review process and requirements.

**Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Policy**

Policy 1F sets mobility targets for ensuring a reliable and acceptable level of mobility on the state highway system. The targets are used to assess system needs as part of long range, comprehensive

---

8 September 2013 OHP text amendments provide the following explanation: “The 2003 legislature adopted changes to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 366.215. This statute identifies the Oregon Transportation Commission’s authority to build and modify state highways. The statute states that that the Commission may not permanently reduce the ‘vehicle-carrying capacity’ of an identified freight route unless safety or access considerations require the reduction or a local government requests the reduction. In the context of this statute, ‘vehicle-carrying capacity’ references the vertical and horizontal clearance for larger vehicles. Depending on the size and weight of a truck, oversized vehicles are issued permits on an annual or trip specific basis.

The need to protect existing vertical and horizontal clearance is different from the mobility function of the State Highway Freight System. The designated Reduction Review Routes identify where the Department will apply the OAR 731-012-0010 review of vertical and horizontal clearance.”
planning transportation planning projects (such as the Exit 30 IAMP), during development review, and to demonstrate compliance with the TPR.

Significant amendments to Policy 1F were adopted at the end of 2011. The revisions were made to address concerns that state transportation policy and requirements have led to unintended consequences and inhibited economic development. Policy 1F now provides a clearer policy framework for considering measures other than volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios for evaluating mobility performance. Also as part of these amendments, v/c ratios established in Policy 1F were changed from being standards to “targets.” These targets are to be used to determine significant effect pursuant to TPR Section -0060.

The mobility targets for state facilities in the IAMP study area are

- I-5: 0.85 v/c
- OR 62 (west of the interchange): 0.90 v/c
- OR 62 (east of the interchange): 0.95 v/c
- OR 99: 0.90 v/c

**Policy 1G: Major Improvements.**

This policy requires maintaining performance and improving safety on the highway system by improving efficiency and management on the existing roadway network before adding capacity. The state’s highest priority is to preserve the functionality of the existing highway system. Tools that could be employed to improve the function of the existing interchanges include access management, transportation demand management, traffic operations modifications, and changes to local land use designations or development regulations.

After existing system preservation, the second priority is to make minor improvements to existing highway facilities, such as adding ramp signals, or making improvements to the local street network to minimize local trips on the state facility. The third priority is to make major roadway improvements which could, in the case of interchange improvements, include adding lanes or reconfiguring on- or off-ramps.

**Policy 1H: Bypasses**

This policy seeks to maintain or increase statewide and regional mobility by relocating highway alignments around a downtown, an urban or metropolitan area, or an existing highway. The intent of the policy is to provide effective service for state and regional traffic trips. Because the circumstances of each bypass vary, the application of Policy 1H provides a checklist of considerations rather than the application of an absolute criterion.

The recently constructed OR 62 Bypass has been designated as an Expressway. The Expressway classification begins at the intersection of OR 62 and Bullock Road, within the IMSA.

---

9 The v/c may be the actual or projected rate of flow on a designated lane group during a specific time period (e.g., p.m. peak hour). A v/c ratio over 1.0 indicates the road or intersection is over-capacity; a v/c ratio under 1.0 indicates there is still room to accommodate additional vehicles. Definition from ODOT’s *Analysis Procedures Manual*, June 2007.
Action 1H.3 applies to existing bypasses and recognizes that improvements to them occur incrementally and require multi-jurisdictional cooperation. It identifies the following actions ODOT should implement, where practical, that are applicable to this IAMP planning process.

   a. Planning

   In cooperation with local government:

      3) Consider development of refinement plans or management plans, where appropriate, for the bypass termini with the affected local governments to protect the mobility function of the bypass. These plans should be adopted in the local transportation system plan and as facility plans by the Transportation Commission.

   c. Interchanges/Intersections

      1) Use grade separation and interchanges where possible and appropriate for safety. If a public connection jeopardizes the mobility function of the bypass, it should be grade-separated or closed.

      2) Space any traffic signals and other at-grade intersections in urban areas at appropriate distances, as set forth in OAR 734-051. Traffic signals must be approved according to OAR 734-020.

   d. Local Traffic Circulation

      2) Support provisions in the local transportation system plan for local circulation off of the bypass facility.

Policy 2B: Off-System Improvements
This policy recognizes that the state may provide financial assistance to local jurisdictions to make improvements to local transportation systems if the improvements would provide a cost-effective means of improving the operations of the state highway system. As part of this planning process, improvements to the local road system that support the planned land use designations in the vicinity of the interchanges and that will help preserve capacity and ensure the long-term efficient and effective operation of the interchanges may be identified.

Policy 3A: Classification and Spacing Standards
It is the policy of the State of Oregon to manage the location, spacing, and type of road intersections on state highways to ensure the safe and efficient operation of state highways consistent with the classification of the highways.

Action 3A.2 calls for spacing standards to be established for state highways based on highway classification, type of area, and posted speed. Tables in OHP Appendix C present access spacing standards which consider urban and rural highway classification, traffic volumes, speed, safety, and operational needs. Where the crossroad is a state highway the required distance may be superseded by the Access Management Spacing standards, if they are greater than the requirements.
The access management spacing standards established in the OHP are implemented by access management rules in OAR 734, Division 51, addressed earlier in this report.

Appendix C provides access management spacing standards applicable to highways based on their classification, traffic volumes, and speed. Table 2 identifies these attributes for I-5, OR 62, and OR 99.

Table 2: Highway Classification Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway</th>
<th>I-5</th>
<th>OR 62</th>
<th>OR 62 Bypass</th>
<th>OR 238</th>
<th>OR 99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHP Expressway</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Flow (AADT)</td>
<td>43,400 – 54,000</td>
<td>35,600 – 43,300</td>
<td>20,000(^\text{10})</td>
<td>14,500 – 18,200</td>
<td>15,400(^\text{10})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted Speed Limit</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 lists access spacing standards for the highways in the IMSA, based on the classifications listed in Goal 3, Policy 3A. Access spacing standards are defined based on the highway’s classification, AADT, and posted speed limit (see Table 2).

Table 3: Highway Access Management Spacing Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway</th>
<th>I-5</th>
<th>OR 62</th>
<th>OR 62 Bypass</th>
<th>OR 238</th>
<th>OR 99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interchange Spacing</td>
<td>3 mi.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Management Spacing Standards</td>
<td>1,320 ft.</td>
<td>500-800 ft.</td>
<td>2,640 ft.</td>
<td>500 ft.</td>
<td>500 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy 3C: Interchange Access Management Areas

This policy addresses management of grade-separated interchange areas to ensure safe and efficient operation between connecting roadways. Action items include developing interchange area management plans to protect the function of existing interchanges, provide safe and efficient operations between connecting roadways, and minimize the need for major improvements. Consistent with this policy, the Exit 30 IAMP planning process will include developing and analyzing alternatives for optimizing the function and capacity of the existing interchanges prior to selecting a package of improvements that will comprise a preferred alternative.

Table 4 shows the access spacing standards applicable to Interchange Access Management for interchanges.

\(^{10}\) Traffic flow data available only for segment.
Table 4: Interchange Access Management Spacing Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway</th>
<th>I-5</th>
<th>OR 62</th>
<th>OR 62 Bypass</th>
<th>OR 238</th>
<th>OR 99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance between adjacent interchanges</td>
<td>1 mi.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between start/end tapers</td>
<td>1 mi.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between at-grade and ramp terminal intersection or end/start of taper.</td>
<td>1 mi.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First approach on the right, right in/right out only</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>750 ft.</td>
<td>750 ft.</td>
<td>750 ft.</td>
<td>750 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First intersection where left turns allowed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,320 ft.</td>
<td>1,320 ft.</td>
<td>1,320 ft.</td>
<td>1,320 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last right-in/right-out and on-ramp</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>750 ft.</td>
<td>750 ft.</td>
<td>750 ft.</td>
<td>750 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy 4A: Efficiency of Freight Movement

This policy emphasizes the need to maintain and improve the efficiency of freight movement on the state highway system. I-5 and OR 62 east of the interchange are designated Freight Routes. A principal function of the interchanges is to accommodate safe and efficient freight movements by providing free-flow movements for through-traffic on the Interstate system and for traffic accessing existing (and future planned) industrial areas.

Project Relevance: The Exit 30 IAMP will be adopted as an amendment to the OHP; therefore, they must align will all relevant policies summarized above.

ODOT Highway Design Manual (2012)

The Highway Design Manual includes ODOT standards and procedures for the location and design of new construction, major reconstruction, and resurfacing, restoration or rehabilitation (3R) projects. The Highway Design Manual is used for all projects that are located on state highways. Section 9.5, Interchange Design, includes the design standards, guidelines, and processes for designing interchanges for State Highways. ODOT, through the Roadway Engineering Unit, and FHWA must approve the reconstruction of an interchange on the Interstate system. The proposed interchange design must be prepared on the Standard Interchange Layout Sheet by the Roadway Engineering Unit or authorized representative. The approved design is then used for contract plans.

The Highway Design Manual establishes ODOT standards and procedures for the location and design of new construction, major reconstruction, and resurfacing/restoration/rehabilitation
projects. The manual is used for all projects that are located on state highways. Design standards for state highways are dependent on the highway’s functional classification and the project type.

Chapter 6 addresses urban highway design (non-freeway), applicable to the state highways in the IMSA that are not I-5. Chapter 9 addresses grade-separated interchanges. ODOT, through the Engineering Services Unit, and FHWA must approve the reconstruction of an interchange on the Interstate system. Chapter 13 addresses bicycle and pedestrian facilities on State Highways; detailed standards for ODOT highways and other facilities are found in the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide (Appendix L of the Highway Design Manual). Chapter 13 standards are applicable to state highways in the IMSAs, excluding I-5.

**Project Relevance:** The IAMP alternatives will be developed to be consistent with the applicable HDM Standards for interchanges and state highways. Any proposed bicycle or pedestrian improvements associated with the preferred alternatives will also need to be consistent with the HDM.

**Oregon Bicycle Bill (1971)**

The Oregon Bicycle Bill is codified in ORS 366.514. Pursuant to the bill, the inclusion of facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists is required on new construction or reconstruction of roads, streets, or highways. However, footpaths and trails are not required, where the following exception conditions apply:

1. Where the establishment of such paths and trails would be contrary to public safety;
2. If the cost of establishing such paths and trails would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use; or
3. Where sparsity of population, other available ways or other factors indicate an absence of any need for such paths and trails

ORS 366.514 requires funds received from the State Highway Fund in “reasonable amounts” be used to provide necessary footpaths and bicycle trails, including providing improvements such as curb cuts and ramps. The funds may also be used for maintenance of footpaths and trails.

**Project Relevance:** Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists will be required where plan recommendations include new or reconstructed roadway associated with the state highways or interchange design.

**Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (2016)**

The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (OBPP) provides actions that will assist local jurisdictions in understanding the principals and policies that ODOT follows in providing bike and walkways along state highways. In order to reach the plan’s objectives, the strategies for system design are outlined, including:

- Providing bikeway and walkway systems and integrating with other transportation systems.
- Providing a safe and accessible biking and walking environment.
- Developing educational programs that improve bicycle and pedestrian safety.
The OBPP is an element of the OTP. The plan includes nine goal areas that support the vision for “people of all ages, incomes, and abilities can access destinations in urban and rural areas on comfortable, safe, well connected biking and walking route.” There are policies and strategies associated with each of the plan’s nine goals. The goals are the following:

1. Safety
2. Accessibility and Connectivity
3. Mobility and Efficiency
4. Community and Economic Vitality
5. Equity
6. Health
7. Sustainability
8. Strategic Investment
9. Coordination, Cooperation, and Collaboration

The plan also addresses implementation measures for the plan’s policies and strategies. The implementation section also identifies the state, local, and regional stakeholders’ roles as “implementation avenues.” The implementation avenues are as follows:

- **Planning** - The polices and strategies in the plan provide an overall framework for planning decisions, safety needs and mobility challenges addressed through planning. Considers a holistic approach to planning and considering the needs for walking and biking in the context of the entire transportation system.

- **Programming** - Strategic investment to use limited fund as efficiently as possible.

- **Design** - Design guidelines reflect consideration of various users and contexts.

- **Project Development and Delivery** - A key consideration for Plan implementation will be leveraging opportunities to institutionalize pedestrian and bicycle transportation within the project development and delivery processes. Plan strategies identify the need for developing project check lists, where explicit walking and biking needs are considered in project development or including health criteria into project development processes.

- **Maintenance** - Facility maintenance is important to the functionality and safety of existing and new facilities.

**Project Relevance**: The IAMP will consider State bicycle and pedestrian goals and strategies through this planning project and their implementation avenues.

**Oregon Freight Plan (2011, Updated 2017)**

The Oregon Freight Plan (OFP) is another modal plan of the OTP and implements the state’s goals, and policies related to the movement of goods and commodities. Its purpose statement is “to improve freight connections to local, Native American, state, regional, national and global markets in order to increase trade-related jobs and income for workers and businesses.” The objectives of the plan include prioritizing and facilitating investments in freight facilities (including rail, marine,
air, and pipeline infrastructure) and adopting strategies to maintain and improve the freight transportation system.

To achieve the purpose statement, the OFP does the following:

- Supports identifying, prioritizing and facilitating investments in Oregon’s highway, rail, marine, air and pipeline transport infrastructure to advance a safe, seamless multimodal and interconnected freight system;
- Identifies institutional and organizational barriers to an efficient and effective freight transportation system in Oregon, and develops strategies for addressing issues associated with overcoming these barriers; and
- Adopts strategies for implementation of OTP goals and policies related to the maintenance and improvement of the freight transportation system.

The plan defines a statewide strategic freight network. The Western Corridor (I-5 Rail Portion), including I-5, is designated as a strategic corridor in the OFP.

Policy and strategic direction provided in the OFP prioritizes preservation of strategic corridors as well as improvements to the supply chain achieved through coordination of freight and system management planning.

**Strategy 1.2: Strive to support freight access to the Strategic Freight System. This includes proactively protecting and preserving corridors designated as strategic.**

**Action 1.2.1. Preserve freight facilities included as part of the Strategic Freight System from changes that would significantly reduce the ability of these facilities to operate as efficient components of the freight system unless alternate facilities are identified or a safety-related need arises.**

**Strategy 2.4: Coordinate freight improvements and system management plans on corridors comprising the Strategic Freight System with the intent to improve supply chain performance.**

**Project Relevance:** Maintaining and enhancing efficiency of the truck and freight system in the study area will be an integrated part of the IAMP.

**Oregon Aviation Plan (2007)**

The Oregon Aviation Plan (OAP) is a modal plan of the OTP that defines policies and investment strategies for Oregon’s public use aviation system for the next 20 years. The plan addresses the existing conditions, economic benefits, and jurisdictional responsibilities for the existing aviation infrastructure. The plan contains policies and recommended actions to be implemented by Oregon Department of Aviation in coordination with other state and local agencies and the Federal Aviation Administration.

The OAP categorizes airports based on functional role and service criteria. The Rogue Valley International Medford Airport is located near Exit 30, approximately 1 mile from the interchange, is considered a Category I, Commercial Service Airport. Category I airports support some level of
scheduled commercial airline service in addition to supporting a full range of general aviation aircraft activities. See the overview of the Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport Master Plan Update later in this memorandum.

**Project Relevance:** The Exit 30 IAMP will take into account land use and growth at the Rogue Valley International Medford Airport and how improvements at Exit 30 may impact access and economic development.

**Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan (2016)**

An element of the OTP, the Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan (OTSAP) establishes a safety agenda to guide the investments and actions of ODOT and the State for the next 20 years. As indicated in the name of the plan, the emphasis of the OTSAP is on action and implementation. Actions included in the OTSAP were chosen based on crash data and information provided by transportation safety experts. The OTSAP is guided by six long-term goals:

- **Goal 1** - Improving safety culture,
- **Goal 2** - Improving infrastructure,
- **Goal 3** - Facilitating healthy and livable communities,
- **Goal 4** - Utilizing best available technologies,
- **Goal 5** - Collaborate and communicate, and
- **Goal 6** - Strategic investments.

Each of the six major goals include several policies and strategies. Relevant policies related to the Exit 30 IAMP include the following:

*Policy 2.2:* Continually improve and implement design and analysis techniques for safety-related decision-making in transportation planning, programming, design, construction, operations and maintenance for all modes.

*Policy 2.3:* Plan, design, construct, operate, and maintain the transportation system to achieve healthy and livable communities and eliminate fatalities and serious injuries for all modes.

*Policy 4.1:* Actively monitor technological advances and plan, design, maintain, and operate the system in a way that takes full advantage of opportunities to use technology to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries.

*Policy 6.1:* Allocate infrastructure safety funds strategically, considering all modes, to maximize total safety benefits.

The action plan includes emphasis areas as a framework for near-term (5 year) components of the plan. Emphasis areas related to the IAMP process include infrastructure and improved systems, as described below.
Infrastructure - Transportation facilities in Oregon can be constructed or retrofitted to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes, which can be implemented through the inclusion of implementing safety treatments on a site-specific basis or implementing low-cost treatments system-wide. Actions for the infrastructure emphasis area include identified to minimize intersection and roadway departure crashes.

Improved Systems - Opportunities to address and improve transportation safety come in various forms. Improved systems across professions actions starting with safety should be incorporated into responsibilities. Action items include to improve data, support law enforcement and minimize commercial vehicle crashes.

**Project Relevance:** Safety factors will be reflected in IAMP Goals and Objectives and the assessment of project alternatives.

**Oregon Public Transportation Plan (2018)**

The Oregon Public Transportation Plan (OPTP) is the OTP modal plan that provides guidance to ODOT and public transportation agencies regarding the development of public transportation systems. The guiding vision is to create:

> A public transportation system that is an integral, interconnected component of Oregon’s transportation system that makes Oregon’s diverse cities, towns, and communities work.

> Public transportation that is convenient, affordable, and efficient helps further the state’s quality of life and economic vitality and contributes to the health and safety of all residents, while reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The OPTP is designed to respond to trends, opportunities, and challenges that exist today, while providing an adaptable foundation for the future. The policies and strategies advance public transportation as an important piece of the overall transportation system, linking people to destinations, services, and opportunities, as well as to communities in neighboring states.

Relevant policies applicable to the Exit 30 IAMP include the following.

> **Policy 2.1:** Enhance existing and identify new public transportation connections and services.

> **Policy 2.2:** Improve access to and ease of use for public transportation by connecting routes and services, including linking stops and stations to bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

> **Policy 5.1:** Provide access to healthy lifestyle options by supporting the ability of people to reach goods and services such as groceries, recreation, parks and natural areas, health care, and social opportunities via public transportation.

> **Policy 7.1:** Support public transportation investments as a key approach to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, as emphasized in state policy.

These policies are reflected and will be implemented through the RVTD Transit Plan reviewed later in this technical memorandum.
**Project Relevance:** The IAMP process will coordinate with RVTD, and the regional public transit agency to ensure that planning outcomes are consistent with transit planning. A representative from RVTD will be invited to participate on the project advisory committee and will receive copies of each deliverable for review and comment to ensure coordination between the IAMP planning process and outcomes and regional transit operations and long-range planning including the RVTD Transit Plan.

**I-5 Rogue Valley Corridor Plan (2012)**
The I-5 Rogue Valley Corridor Plan assess the existing and future transportation condition along 25 miles of I-5 between Interchange 11 south of Ashland to Interchange 35 north of Central Point. It identifies strategies and improvements to enhance transportation safety and capacity within the corridor.

The Corridor Plan evaluated future conditions for two scenarios: year 2034 using the RTP forecasting assumptions and year 2050 using the growth assumptions that were the basis for the Regional Problem Solving (RPS), which assumes that population in the Rogue Valley doubles. The 2034 RTP scenario indicate the freeway system would generally operate with relatively free flow operation except in both directions on I-5 between Interchanges 27 and 30, which could experience some congestion during the PM peak hour. Operations along the freeway system with the 2050 scenario show congestion would be present between Interchanges 21 and 33 in the northbound direction and between Interchanges 19 and 30 in the southbound direction.

Analysis of the transportation network within the urbanized Rogue Valley region for the 2034 scenario suggests that the system would not be over capacity except in a few circumstances including portions of OR 62 and OR 99. The 2050 RPS scenario suggests roadway sections will worsen, but generally will continue to operate within capacity.

The Corridor Plan includes corridor concepts, which are strategies to improve future traffic operation and safety deficiencies. Concepts are intended to be refined and developed into improvement projects. The 2034 Potential Concepts are shown in Figure 1 and 2050 Potential Concepts are shown in Figure 2. Potential concepts for Interchange 30 and the connecting I-5 segments include ramp meters and northbound auxiliary lanes.
Figure 1: 2034 Potential Concepts (Source: Figure 4-1, I-5: Rogue Valley Corridor Study)

Figure 2: 2050 Potential Concepts (Source: Figure 4-2, I-5: Rogue Valley Corridor Study)

Project Relevance: The Exit 30 IAMP will review and test solutions related to the corridor concepts that are recommended in the Corridor Plan.

Bridge Design Manuals

ODOT Bridge Design Manual (2019)

The Bridge Design Manual (BDM) provides a reference for projects involving ODOT bridge design deliverables. It’s intended to be used in the design of State Highway bridges. It includes three sections; design standards and detailing practices (Section 1), selective design and bridge type selection and geometric layout (Section 2), and bridge design roles and responsibilities, design and quality processes, and discipline coordination (Section 3).

The AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications are intended for the design, evaluation, and rehabilitation of both fixed and movable highway bridges. The provisions employ the Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) methodology. Seismic design is intended to be in accordance with the provisions of these specifications or AASHTO Guide Specifications for LRFD Seismic Bridge Design below. The document is organized into 15 sections that provide specification guidance on several design factors, including load factors, structural analysis, structure materials, and foundations and support structures.


The AASHTO Guide Specifications for LRFD Seismic Bridge Design covers seismic design for typical bridges and applies to noncritical and non-essential bridges. This document differs from the current procedures in the LRFD Specifications in the use of displacement-based design procedures, instead of the traditional, force-based “R-Factor” method. This new approach is split into a simplified implicit displacement check procedure and a more rigorous pushover assessment of displacement capacity. The selection of which procedure to use is based on seismic design categories, similar to the seismic zone approach used in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications.

Project Relevance: Recommended improvements related to bridge design will be guided by AASHTO specifications.

REGIONAL DOCUMENTS

RVMPO Regional Transportation Plan (2017)

The Rogue Valley Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a multi-modal transportation plan designed to meet the anticipated 25-year transportation needs within the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization planning area boundary. It provides a list of highway and transit capital investment as well as strategies for operating, managing, maintaining, and financing the regional transportation system.

The RTP contains the following policies that support or will guide development of the Exit 30 IAMP.

Goal 5. Identify, plan and develop transportation infrastructure which maximizes the efficient use for all user and modes.

Policy 5-2 Consider and support measures to optimize intersection and interchange design.

Policy 5-3 Support an access management strategy to improve traffic flow.

Potential Actions: Increase intersection capacity through geometric improvements and elimination of turn movements.

The RTP identifies all regional transportation actions anticipated to occur through the 2042 planning horizon. Projects are listed as Tier 1 or Tier 2 and further distinguished by the timing with which the project is expected to be completed.
- I-5: California to Gold Hill (Project #928). Repair or replace culverts, address scour and road embankment problems near culverts. The timing for this project is anticipated between 2017 and 2021.
- OR 62: I-5 to Dutton Road (Medford, JTA Phase). Right-of-way acquisition and construct phase funded by Oregon Jobs and Transportation Act; 2.76 miles.\textsuperscript{11}

Appendix B in the RTP summarizes the MPO’s Alternative Measures used to address state requirements. It includes seven measures for reducing automobile reliance as an alternative to the TPR’s per capita VMT reduction measure. They include:

- Measure 1: Transit, Bicycle, and Walking Mode Share.
- Measure 2: Percentage of Dwelling Units within ¼-mile Walking Distance of 30-minute Transit

\textbf{Table 5: RVMPO Adopted Alternative Measures for TPR Compliance}\\

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2015 Benchmark</th>
<th>2020 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1: Transit and bicycle pedestrian mode share</td>
<td>2% transit 8.4% bike/ped</td>
<td>3% transit 11% bike/ped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2: Percentage of dwelling units within ¼-mile walking distance of 30-minute transit</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 3: Percentage of Collectors and Arterials with bicycle facilities</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4: Percentage of Collectors and Arterials in TOD areas with sidewalks</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 5: Percentage of new dwelling units in Activity Centers</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 6: Percentage of new employment in Activity Centers</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 7: Alternative transportation funding</td>
<td>$4.3 million</td>
<td>$6.4 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Project Relevance:} The projects recommended in the RTP, either proposed or already constructed within the study area, will be considered in the development of the IAMP. The IAMP will be adopted as an amendment to the RTP and therefore will need to be found, or made, consistent with standards and policies in the regional plan.

\textbf{RVMPO Transportation Improvement Program (2017)}

The Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RVMPO) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) identifies transportation projects in the RVMPO that are expected to be implemented in federal fiscal years 2018-2021. Projects included in the TIP are drawn from the RVMPO RTP. The projects listed in the TIP are “financially constrained,” meaning that funds are identified and expected to be available to complete the project.

\textsuperscript{11} Note, the JTA phase of the bypass project has been constructed.
- I-5: California to Gold Hill (Project #928). Repair or replace culverts, address scour and road embankment problems near culverts.
- OR 62: Corridor Solutions Unit 2 Phase 3 (Medford, Project #930). Planting of vegetation for storm water treatment facilities.

**Project Relevance:** Improvements recommended in the Exit 30 IAMP will be available for inclusion in a future TIP and may be coordinated with other programmed projects, where applicable.


The RVMPO Freight Study Report was released in 2006 and updated in 2012. It provides a freight industry profile for the RVMPO area, a review of freight movement through the region, and identifies improvements to facilities used by the industry. Appendix B in the report identifies OR 62 east of the interchange and Biddle Road north of OR 62 as problem routes. Both routes are classified as Major Freight Routes in the report. The list of recommended freight project improvements is provided on pages 69-70 of the report. Project 13 (Delta Waters at Highway 62) is listed as a recommended project for freight improvement with the descriptor “no action, but could be affected by Hwy 62 bypass.” Only projects that were listed in Tier 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan that were funded and could be built are shown in the table.

**Project Relevance:** The IAMP will review the status of recommended projects within the study area and factor the planned improvements.

**Rogue Valley Area Active Transportation Plan (in progress)**

Jackson County and RVMPO are in the process of creating and adopting the Rogue Valley Area Active Transportation Plan. To date, there are seven technical memorandums available on the project’s website. The technical memorandum include:

- TM#1 - Existing Conditions & Existing Data Memorandum - Final
- TM#2 - Plan & Policy Review Memorandum - Final
- TM#3 - Vision & Goals Memorandum - Final
- TM#4 - Developing Regionally Classified Routes – Final
- TM#5 - Needs, Level of Traffic Stress, and Potential Barriers - Draft
- TM#6 - Design Guidance Toolkit - Draft
- TM#7 - Prioritization Process – Draft

The plan is scheduled to be adopted in June of 2020. Once adopted, the Rogue Valley Active Transportation Plan will identify regional active transportation routes within the Rogue Valley MPO area that connect communities, transit, and other places where people live, work, and play. It will identify missing links and barriers between key destinations and provides concepts for connections to promote walking and biking.

---

**Project Relevance:** The RVMPO transportation/transit objectives and planned projects will be considered in the development of the IAMP.

**Rogue Valley Regional ITS Plan (2016)**

The Rogue Valley Regional ITS Plan provides a 10-year plan for improving transportation system operations by enhancing safety, addressing congestion hotspots, providing traveler information, and assisting system operators in implementing traffic management strategies. The plan’s focus is on maximizing the efficiency of the existing transportation infrastructure, which enhances the overall system performance and reduces the need to add roadway capacity.

The plan identifies the following projects near the IAMP study area.

- **Traffic Signal Interconnect, Connection to ODOT Central Traffic Signal Server, Signal Timing Improvements, Adaptive Signal System (Project # TM02).** Along OR 62 in the Medford area, install traffic signal interconnect and connect traffic signals to ODOT Central Signal Server for remote access to traffic signals. Update traffic signal timing along corridors to improve network efficiency and explore adaptive signal solutions.

- **Install Variable Message Signs (Project # TI01).** Install variable message signs to inform drivers of road conditions and detours on OR 62 expressway, OR 62 business route, and I-5.

- **Truck Signal Priority (Project #FM02).** Install detection at traffic signals along designated freight routes that identifies approaching heavy vehicles and speed, and either extends green or conflicting red to prevent collision potential. Key locations include OR 62 at I-5 Exit 30

**Project Relevance:** The IAMP project will review and incorporate as applicable the recommended ITS projects into the alternatives analysis and recommended alternative.

**Rogue Valley International Medford Airport Master Plan Update (2010)**

The Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport is owned and operated by Jackson County. It defines the current, short-term, and long-term needs of the airport.

The Conceptual Development Plan chapter of the Master Plan forms the basis of the airport’s long-term development program. Phase I of the Conceptual Development Plan includes major runway modifications and infill development with aviation related uses on the west side of the airport. It also considers land acquisition and potential aviation related development on the east side of the airport. The land acquisition recommendations include approximately 21.5 acres north the airport and approximately 80 acres on the east side of the airport. The land acquisition also factors the development of the proposed Highway 62 Bypass alignment as a constraint for future development. Phase II of the Conceptual Development Plan includes all of the proposed development in Phase I with a few modifications. The modifications include additional changes to the runways, relocation or channelization of Upton Creek, and the relocation of existing facilities.
**Project Relevance:** The current operations and planned expansions of the airport will be considered in the development of the IAMP.

**Bear Creek Greenway Management Plan (2006)**

The Bear Creek Greenway is a 20-mile, paved, multi-use trail that links the cities of Ashland, Talent, Phoenix, Medford, and Central Point. The Greenway is continuous from the Ashland Dog Park to the Dean Creek Frontage Road near Seven Oaks Interchange on I-5, north of Central Point.

The Bear Creek Greenway Management Plan is a management plan that provides a preliminary list of maintenance and operation needs. Management functions are divided into high, medium, and low level options. The management needs are grouped into categories and include:

- Management
- Public Safety, Emergency Services, Litter and Vandalism Control
- Surface Management
- Vegetation Management
- Natural Resource Protection
- Future Capital Facilities

Of the management categories, the Future Capital Facilities may potentially have a bearing on the IAMP. The management category lists information kiosks, off-street parking, restrooms, drinking fountains and benches as improvements that are considered on a case-by-case basis.
Although not specifically identified in the management plan, the Bear Creek Greenway includes the Railroad Park, located adjacent to the interchange to the northwest. Railroad Park includes off-street parking, restrooms, drinking fountains, and benches.

**Project Relevance:** The Exit 30 IAMP project will consider and plan for mitigation resulting from impacts to the Bear Creek Greenway.

**Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan (2011)**
The Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan is an amendment to the Jackson County comprehensive plan. It establishes Urban Reserve Areas (URAs) for Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford, Phoenix, and Talent. The URAs are intended to accommodate planned residential, commercial, and industrial growth for the respective areas.

There are no URA’s identified near the Exit 30 IAMP Study Area.

**Project Relevance:** Consistent with the Regional Plan, the TSP update will consider ways to reduce reliance on state facilities and increase local connectivity through the development of local arterials.

**RVTD 2040 Transit Master Plan (in progress)**
Rogue Valley Transportation District is currently in the process of adopting an updated Transit Master Plan (TMP). Adoption is anticipated to occur by the end of 2019. The TMP is a framework for providing transit and related services to the Rogue Valley for the next 25 years. It identifies new services, provides policy guidance, and informs how Statewide Transportation Improvement Funds (STIF) transit funds will be spent. The TMP identifies near-term (2027), mid-term (2037), and long-term (2042) transit service enhancements that help meet the vision and goals for transit in the region established through the TMP process.
Route 21 – Poplar Square. Route 21 is a 5.3-mile bus route that connects north Medford to Front Street Station. Stops are spaced approximately 0.25-miles apart and buses operate at 60-minute frequencies during the week. In the mid-term, the route frequency and hours will be increased, including adding weekend service.

Route 40 – Central Point. Route 40 is a 12.9-mile route that connects Central Point to Front Street Station. The route has stops that are spaced approximately 0.2-miles apart and buses operate at 30-minute frequencies during the week and 60-minute frequencies on Saturday. In the short-term, the route will be shortened and frequency will be increased. In the mid-term, route frequency and hours are further increased, including adding Sunday service.

J. Beltway (Route 8). The Beltway route is identified as part of the mid-term preferred system. It would be a 10.5-mile bus route that connects central and northern Medford, looping around the Rogue Valley International-Medford Airport. The route is anticipated to have stops spaced 0.25-miles apart with 30-minute frequency during the week. I-5 is identified as a constraint, bisecting the route’s service area and creating connectivity challenges.

Q. HCT Eagle Point (Route 3X). The HCT Eagle Point route is identified a part of the long-term preferred system. It would be a 26.0-mile route that connects Eagle Point to downtown Medford. The route would have stops spaced approximately 0.25 miles apart and would operate at 10-minute frequencies every day. Oregon Highway 62 is the only viable connection between White City, Eagle Point, and Medford, posing potential challenges to service during congestion or roadwork.
The Transit Master Plan identifies a new transfer center at the intersection of Delta Waters and OR 62. The transfer station is intended to serve new routes as they are established.

**Project Relevance:** The IAMP project will consider and plan for service enhancements identified in the Transit Master Plan within the IMSA.


The RVTD Transit Master Plan 2007-2017 is a multi-modal document focused on revenue forecasting, fixed-route and paratransit services, departmental needs assessment, and establishing creative programs. An updated version of the Transit Master Plan is scheduled for adoption by December of 2019. The updated draft adoption version is currently available and summarized above.

**Project Relevance:** The RVTD Transit Master Plan 2007-2017 is anticipated to be replaced by the RVTD 2040 Transit Master Plan. No relevance is anticipated.
LOCAL DOCUMENTS

Medford Comprehensive Plan (various)
The Medford Comprehensive Plan is an extensive document that states the City’s adopted goals and policies regarding land use and transportation. The goals and policies establish a framework upon which the City bases its decisions and actions. Background information about the City of Medford, including inventories and identified issues and alternatives. The plan contains relevant to planning within the IMSA.

The Plan contains select Policies relevant to planning within the IMSA.

NATURAL RESOURCES—WATER QUALITY, WETLANDS AND, WILDLIFE HABITAT—GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

Goal 7: To preserve and protect plants and wildlife habitat in Medford

Policy 7-B: The City of Medford shall strive to maintain, rehabilitate, and enhance Medford’s waterways, using features such as gently sloped banks, natural riparian vegetation, and meandering alignment.

Implementation 7-B (2): Ensure that improvements, such as multi-use paths and storm drainage facilities sited in or near riparian corridors, waterways, wetlands, or other fish and wildlife habitat, include protective buffers, preserve natural vegetation, and comply with the requirements of Oregon Administrative Rule 660-23.

DISASTERS AND HAZARDS—GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

Goal 12: To protect the citizens of Medford from the potential damage caused by hazards such as flooding, earthquakes, noise, wildfires, and airport hazards.

Policy 12-D: The City of Medford shall strive to upgrade all city-owned buildings and facilities to meet earthquake standards.

GENERAL PUBLIC FACILITIES—GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

Goal 2: To assure that General Land Use Plan (GLUP) designations and the development approval process remain consistent with the City of Medford’s ability to provide adequate levels of essential public facilities and services.

Policy 2-B: The City of Medford shall strive to ensure that new development does not create public facility demands that diminish the quality of services to current residences and businesses below established minimum levels.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT – GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES.

Goal 1: To protect citizens of Medford from the potential damage caused by flooding.

Implementation 1-A-4. Through the development review process, require development and stormwater system improvements to comply with the standards in the current stormwater management plan.
Implementation 1-A-6. Require stormwater facilities to be designed to safely conduct less frequent, higher flows through or around facilities without damage to the facilities.

Policy 1-C: The City of Medford shall assure that stormwater is managed (infiltrated, detained and treated) on or as close as practicable to development sites in order to reduce the impact of new development on the stormwater management system and natural streams.

Implementation 1-C-1. Require stormwater to be infiltrated onsite to the greatest extent possible through a combination of provisions, such as site design standards, that reduce impervious surfaces and protect natural areas.

Goal 2: To achieve and maintain a high level of water quality in Medford’s waterways and groundwater.

Policy 2-A: The City of Medford shall protect surface and groundwater resources, including current and potential wellhead areas, from pollution through a variety of regulatory measures relating to land use, transportation, and hazardous substance management.

Implementation 2-A-4. Require the quality of stormwater leaving a site after development to be equal to or better than that leaving the site before development.

Policy 2-C: The City of Medford shall utilize stormwater management strategies that sustain natural streams and wetlands consistent with Environmental Element—Water Quality Section—Goal 6 and its policies and implementation strategies.

Implementation 2-C(4): Require buffering, setback requirements, maintenance of tree canopy and vegetative cover, and other best management practices (BMPs) as necessary to enhance water resources and protect their functions.

Policy 2-D: The City of Medford shall strive to eliminate sediment entering waterways consistent with Environmental Element - Soils Section - Goal 8 and its policies and implementation strategies.

Implementation 2-D-1. Require stormwater control facilities to be designed so that the rate of discharge is equivalent to a site’s predevelopment stormwater discharge for a determined storm frequency or multiple frequencies.

PARKS, RECREATION, AND LEISURE SERVICES—GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

Goal 2: To preserve natural resources in the Medford Urban Growth Boundary that provide open space or have unique recreational potential, encouraging development with parks and recreation facilities if appropriate.

OVERALL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES
GOAL 1: To provide a multi-modal transportation system for the Medford planning area that supports the safe, efficient, and accessible movement of all people and goods, and recognizes the area’s role as the financial, medical, tourism, and business hub of Southern Oregon and Northern California.

Policy 1-A: The City of Medford shall manage projected travel demand consistent with community, land use, environmental, economic and livability goals.

OVERALL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—FUNDING—GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

Policy 1-C: The City of Medford’s top priority for the use of transportation funds shall be to address the maintenance, operational, and safety needs of the transportation system.

Policy 1-D: The City of Medford’s second priority for the use of transportation funds shall be to maximize efficient use of the existing transportation system through use of Transportation System Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures prior to expending transportation funds on capacity improvements.

Policy 1-E: The City of Medford’s third priority for the use of transportation funds shall be to fund capital improvements that add capacity to the transportation system. These improvements shall be prioritized based on availability of funds, reducing reliance on the automobile, improving safety, relieving congestion, responding to growth, and system-wide benefits.

Implementation 1-E(1): Give priority to funding projects that most increase capacity and relieve congestion, such as intersection improvements as opposed to general street widening, consistent with the adopted level of service (LOS) standards.

GOAL 2: To provide a comprehensive street system that serves the mobility and multi-modal transportation needs of the Medford planning area.

Policy 2-C: The City of Medford shall design the street system to safely and efficiently accommodate multiple travel modes within public rights-of-way.

Implementation 2-C(2): Limit Major Arterial streets to a total cross-section width of no more than five travel lanes, except at intersections. Accommodate travel demand that would otherwise require a width of more than five lanes through increased system connectivity, transit service, use of transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, and other alternative modes of transportation.

Implementation 2-C(5): Design the transportation system with consideration of the needs of persons with disabilities by meeting the requirements in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
Implementation 2-C(6): Assure that the design and operation of the transportation system allows for the safe and rapid movement of fire, medical, and police vehicles.

Policy 2-D: The City of Medford shall balance the needed street function for all travel modes with adjacent land uses through the use of context-sensitive street and streetscape design techniques.

Implementation 2-D(3): When designing new or reconstructed streets, make adjustments as necessary to avoid valuable topographical features, natural resources, historic properties, schools, cemeteries, significant cultural features, etc. that affect the livability of the community and the surrounding neighborhood.

Policy 2-F: The City of Medford shall bring Arterial and Collector streets up to full design standards where appropriate, and facilitate improving existing local streets to urban design standards where appropriate.

Implementation 2-F(1): Balance the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicles when reconstructing streets that cannot meet full functional classification standards.

Policy 2-H: The City of Medford shall manage and maintain the transportation system in an efficient, clean, and safe manner.

Implementation 2-H(3): Continue to modernize the traffic signal system and improve its efficiency by ultimately connecting all signals to the centralized traffic control center. Employ traffic signal timing plans that maximize efficiency during different time periods. Provide a program to identify locations for new/modified signals.

Implementation 2-H(4): Utilize Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) such as realtime traffic monitoring cameras and management projects, that provide motorist information and incident response/clearance programs, to alleviate traffic congestion.

BICYCLE SYSTEM—GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

GOAL 4: To facilitate the increased use of bicycle transportation in the Medford planning area, as bicycle facilities are a measure of the quality of life in a community.

Policy 4-A: The City of Medford shall undertake efforts to increase the percentage of total daily trips taken by bicycling in Medford consistent with the target benchmarks in the “Alternative Measures” of the 2001-2023 Rogue Valley Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Implementation 4-A(2): Design streets and other public improvement projects to facilitate bicycling by providing bicycle-friendly paving, lane width, traffic control, storm drainage grates, striping, signage, lighting, etc.

Implementation 4-A(5): Provide interconnected off-street multi-use paths along stream and waterway corridors, such as Bear Creek and Larson Creek, and in other
suitable locations where multiple street or driveway crossings are unlikely and where such facilities can be constructed without causing significant environmental degradation.

**Policy 4-B:** The City of Medford shall undertake efforts to increase the percentage of Arterial and Collector street miles in Medford having bicycle facilities, consistent with the targeted benchmarks in the “Alternative Measures” of the Rogue Valley Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

**Implementation 4-B(2):** Utilize all opportunities to add bike lanes on Collector and Arterial streets, such as during reconstruction and re-striping projects. Give priority to bicycle traffic over on-street parking on Collector and Arterial streets designated in the Transportation System Plan as, or otherwise determined to be, important bicycling routes. Alternatives should be considered where on-street parking is determined to be essential to the success of adjacent businesses in a pedestrian-friendly environment, such as in Downtown, other TODS, activity centers, etc.

**PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM—GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES**

**GOAL 5:** To facilitate the increased use of pedestrian transportation in the Medford planning area.

**Policy 5-A:** The City of Medford shall develop a connected, comprehensive system of pedestrian facilities that provides accessibility for pedestrians of all ages, focusing on activity centers such as Downtown, other Transit Oriented Districts (TODs), commercial centers, schools, parks/greenways, community centers, civic and recreational facilities, and transit centers.

**Implementation 5-A(2):** Design street intersections, particularly Arterial and Collector street intersections, with convenient, safe, and accessible pedestrian crossing facilities.

**FREIGHT MOVEMENT—GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES**

**GOAL 7:** To facilitate the provision of a multi-modal transport system for the efficient, safe, and competitive movement of goods and services to, from, and within the Medford planning area.

**Policy 7-A:** The City of Medford shall promote accessibility to transport modes that fulfill the needs of freight shippers.

**Implementation 7-A(2):** Utilize street design standards that meet the weight and dimensional needs of trucks for streets that serve industrial and commercial areas and those designated as “truck routes”.

The General Land Use Plan serves as the City’s comprehensive plan map. It shows the City’s long-range land use areas for all lands inside the City’s UGB and designates specific areas as Greenways. Portions of the Bear Creek Greenway are located within the IMSA. These areas are regulated so that improvements along waterways are designed to ensure that disturbance of banks and natural
vegetation in the riparian area is minimal, and that disturbed areas are promptly revegetated and protected from erosion. Uses permitted within the Greenways are usually limited to:

A. Streets, roads, bridges, and paths where necessary for access or crossings, provided these uses are designed and constructed to minimize intrusion into e riparian areas.
B. Drainage facilities, utilities, and irrigation pumps.
C. Water-related and water-dependent uses.
D. Replacement of existing structures with structures in the same location that do not disturb additional riparian area.
E. Interpretive and educational displays, and overlooks, including benches and outdoor furniture.
F. Interpretive and educational displays.
G. Habitat enhancement activities.

**Project Relevance.** The IAMP will need to be consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies, either existing or as proposed to be modified. Furthermore, the IAMP will be adopted as an amendment to the City TSP, the Transportation Element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

**City of Medford Transportation System Plan 2018-2038 (2018)**

The City of Medford’s Transportation System Plan (TSP) is the City’s long-range plan for developing and managing its transportation system. It establishes goals, objectives, standards, and improvements to support planned land uses and population growth through a 20-year planning horizon.\(^{13}\)

**Street Plan Classification and Cross-sections**

The street element of the TSP includes the roadway functional classifications, typical cross-sections, and prioritized project list including intersection projects. Figure 6 provides the TSP classifications assigned to roadways near Exit 30.

\(^{13}\) Transportation policies are located in the Medford Comprehensive Plan summarized above.
Figure 6: Roadway Functional Classification (Source: Figure 18, Medford TSP)

Medford’s roadway cross-section standards apply to new and reconstructed roads. All new and unimproved roads are required to be built to the TSP cross-section standards. Existing improved roads that do not meet the cross-section standards are considered Legacy Street, subject to additional criteria summarized below. Cross-sections may be adjusted through adopted plans, including the TSP, and include Crater Lake Highway among others.

Cross-section for Major Arterials is shown in Figure 7.
Legacy Streets

Legacy Streets are existing improved higher order streets that do not meet the cross-section width standards; existing higher order streets that are mostly improved but have unimproved segments; or existing higher order streets that are predominantly surround by developed properties on both sides. As development occurs on Legacy Streets, deviations from standard cross-section widths will allow improvement while reducing impacts to developed properties. The TSP provides circumstances under which right-of-way dedication or pavement widths may be reduced, or cross-sectional elements reduced, or eliminated at the City engineer’s discretion. The legacy street provisions are incorporated into the Medford Municipal Code.

TSP Projects

The TSP identifies the following projects associated with the Exit 30 IAMP.

OR 62 Bypass Project. The OR 62 Bypass Project will result in a new four-lane access-controlled expressway from I-5 to OR 62 north of White City. The JTA Phase (Phase 1) was completed in May 2019, with an extent between Bullock Road/Poplar Drive to Corey Road, outside of city limits. The Phase 2 improvements are documented in OR 62: I-5 to Dutton Road Project Final Environmental Impact Statement. See the Environmental Impact Statement summary for more information.

OR 62 Refinement Plan (OR62-5). Completion of the OR 62 Corridor Project is expected to significantly reduce traffic volumes. The refinement plan would identify potential improvements to OR 62, including access management, streetscape enhancements,

---

14 Note, this is not a Tier 1 or Tier 2 project. The JTA phase was completed in May 2019. Remaining expressway improvements are documented in the OR 62 FEIS
pedestrian crossing treatments, sidewalk and bicycle facility improvements, and transit needs.

I-5 Rogue Valley Corridor Plan. The plan focuses on the 25 mile section of I-5 that extends from Interchange 11 to Interchange 35. The plan assesses existing and future transportation conditions and identifies strategies and improvements.

OR62 (Crater Lake Highway)/Bullock Road/Poplar Drive Intersection. The OR62 (Crater Lake Highway)/Bullock Road/Poplar Drive intersection is not projected to meet ODOT’s mobility standards with the JTA Phase of the OR62 Bypass. The TSP acknowledges that the split diamond interchange will significantly reduce traffic volumes at this intersection, which was not modeled as part of the TSP analysis.

OR99/OR62/OR238 Intersection (Project I-80). This intersection is projected to operate a v/c ratio above 1.0. The TSP states the intersection needs to be studied as part of the Exit 30 IAMP and may need alternative mobility target.

Bullock Road, Crater Lake Highway to Lawnsdale Road (Project 640). This project is listed a Long-term Tier 1 project. It will upgrade the facility to major collector standards including one lane in each direction, center-turn lane, bike facilities, and sidewalks.

Court Street & Ohio Street (Project I-07). This intersection project is listed as a Tier 2 project. It will modify the existing signal to add a westbound left turn lane.

McAndrews Road & Riverside Avenue (Project I-63). This intersection project is listed as a Tier 2 project. It will include intersection improvements such as re-striping the westbound approach to one through, a shared through/right, and right-turn lane, signal modifications, and second westbound right-turn lane when needed.

Activity Centers
The southeast quadrant of the Exit 30 Interchange and the areas to the north, west, and south of the OR 62/OR 238/OR 99 intersection are identified as Activity Centers. The TSP identifies Activity Centers as areas for focused investment in transportation facilities and other community needs. Activity Centers are evaluated at a regional level for compliance with RVMPO’s various Alternative Measures. The current Alternative Measure targets set for 2020 are detailed on pages 28-29 in the TSP. See Table 1 for a summary of the Alternative Measures.

Project Relevance: The projects recommended in the TSP, either proposed or already constructed within the study area, will be considered in the development of the IAMP. The IAMP will be adopted as an amendment to the TSP and therefore will need to be found, or made consistent with, standards and policies in the TSP.

Medford Capital Improvement Plan (2017)
The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is provided in the City’s 2017-2019 Adopted Biennial Budget. CIP projects involve additions, or enhancements to the City’s infrastructure and include buildings, roads, sidewalks, storm drains, parks, and waste water treatment facilities. There are no transportation improvements within roughly one-quarter mile of Exit 30 identified in the CIP.
**Project Relevance:** Improvements recommended in Exit 30 IAMP will be available for inclusion in a future City’s CIP and may be coordinated with other programmed projects, where applicable.

**Land Development Code for the City of Medford (various)**

The City’s Land Development Code (LDC) implements the policies established in the City’s Comprehensive Plan and regulates development through zoning designations and provisions that apply generally to all development and specifically to land divisions within the City. Articles that have standards, procedures, and criteria applicable to public facilities and improvements are summarized below.

Article 2 establishes land use review procedures, designates and defines responsibilities of approving authorities, and sets forth procedural requirements and substantive criteria and standards for each land use review.

As set out in Article 2, City Council has the authority to conduct land use review and approval of transportation facility development. Transportation facility development review is subject to a Minor Type IV review procedure under Section 10.226. The approval criteria is included below.

**B) Transportation Facility Development Approval Criteria.** Preliminary plans for transportation facility development projects shall be consistent with the following criteria:

1. Transportation facility development projects shall be consistent with the Transportation Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Transportation facility projects should not prevent development of the remainder of the property under the same ownership or development of adjoining land.
3. If the project includes the creation of new streets, such streets should be laid out to conform to the plats of land divisions already approved for adjoining property.
4. All transportation projects must be consistent with the adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP).

Article 3 of the LDC includes land use provisions through zoning districts, overlays, and administrative mapping categories for Medford. The zoning districts et al. implement the General Land Use Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The location of the districts are established in the City of Medford Zoning Map; the area around the I-5 Interchange is shown in Figure 8.

As shown in Figure 8, there is a mix of Residential, Commercial, and Public zoning near Interchange 30 as well as a number of overlays including Freeway, Restricted Zoning, and Planned Development. The exact location and presence of land use zoning and applicable overlays in the study area will be verified as part of future project tasks.
Figure 8: Medford Zoning and Overlays (Source: Official City of Medford Zoning Map)
Of note is the Freeway Overlay District, which applies to most of the area surrounding the Interchange. The Freeway Overlay District is intended to allow and regulate the use of freeway signage.

Similarly, the Restricted Zoning Overlay applies to parcels that have received a zone change with conditions of approval or stipulations as set forth in the LDC. The applicable conditions or stipulations are recorded by deed restriction or covenant and are available at the Planning Department.

Article 4 provides public improvement standards and criteria required for all public right-of-way elements, including streets, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, planter strips, street lights, alleys, and other related elements.

Sections 10.427 through 10.430 establishes the street classification system and is used to determine right-of-way improvement design standards. Cross-sections are contained in each subsection as identified in 10.429, 10.429, 10.430, 10.430A, and 10.430B. The cross-sections are consistent with the TSP. See Figure 7 in this memorandum for applicable cross-sections.

Unless specified in an adopted Zoning Overlay, Neighborhood Circulation Plan, or other special area plan, the Legacy Street standards in 10.427 (D-E) apply to all existing streets that do not meet the cross-section standards. Legacy Streets are reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and must meet specific approval criteria.

Section 10.550 establishes access standards, including driveway spacing and location standards. Driveway spacing standards for arterial and collector streets are shown in Figure 9. As shown in the Figure, access spacing standards are a function of the posted speed limit and range between 145 to 385 feet. Generally, lots are limited to one driveway access to an arterial street and all lots are required to place driveways on the lowest street classification if possible.

Figure 9: Minimum Driveway Spacing Arterial and Collector Streets (Source: Table 10.550-3, LDC Section 10.550)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEED LIMIT (MPH)</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRIVEWAY SPACING</td>
<td>145 ft</td>
<td>195 ft</td>
<td>250 ft</td>
<td>315 ft</td>
<td>385 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Relevance: Future growth in the study area will be based on zoning districts assessed as part of the projects existing conditions analysis. As the IAMP process progresses and recommendations are formed, the standards will guide local street improvements. IAMP recommended improvements on the local street system may require City Engineering approval.

OR 62: I-5 to Dutton Road Final Environmental Impact Study (2013)

The OR 62: I-5 to Dutton Road Final Environmental Impact Study (FEIS) identifies the Preferred Alternative to construct a 7.5 mile, four-lane, access-controlled expressway that will serve as a bypass of existing OR 62 from Medford to north of White City. The project includes the bypass, four interchanges, and changes to local streets and roads to accommodate the bypass. Chapter 2 of the FEIS provides a complete description of the Preferred Alternative. The map set included in Figure 2-4 FEIS in Chapter 2 depicts the Preferred Alternative alignment and design details.
A portion of the improvements were funded with authorization from the 2009 Oregon Jobs and Transportation Act (JTA) authorized by HB 2001. The FEIS identifies this as the JTA phase. Figure 2-9 in Chapter 2 of the FEIS depicts the JTA phase alignment and design details. The JTA phase does not include Exit 30. Instead, the FEIS recognizes that subsequent phases of the Preferred Alternative, including improvements to Exit 30, have not been identified due to financial constraints. When adequate funding is available for subsequent, federally-funded phases, that work will include appropriate NEPA considerations and a possible re-evaluation of the FEIS.

The preferred alternative identifies a Split Diamond Interchange at Exit 30 as shown in Figure 10. While the FEIS provided a significant amount of information, issues were identified for the split diamond design interchange that require additional discussion to inform future decisions. These issues include: (1) the need for a Highway Design Manual ("HDM") exception for the northbound I-5 ramp due to latent traffic demand; (2) access management strategies for facilities west of Poplar Drive/Bullock Road; (3) removing a Bear Creek Greenway bridge; (4) adding two new bridges; (5) the displacement of two businesses, one of which needs hazmat review; and (6) Section 6(f) determination for the Bear Creek Greenway.

**Figure 10: Split Diamond Interchange**

The FEIS also identifies an extensive list of mitigation measures. The mitigation measures are intended to be complete with the delivery of the project. Measures are grouped by environmental subject area and whether they are related to the JTA or subsequent phases. The mitigation measure environmental groupings include the categories listed below. Additional details can be found in the Record of Decision.

---

The JTA funds were used to construct the expressway from the intersection of OR 62 and Delta Waters north to the intersection of OR 62 near Corey Rd. This phase of the expressway was completed in May 2019 and has changed traffic patterns near the Exit 30 interchange.
- Transportation
- Land Use
- Right-of-Way
- Socioeconomics
- Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Wildlife Refuges
- Cultural Resources
- Visual Resources
- Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff
- Natural Systems and Communities
- Wetlands and Other Waters
- Threatened and Endangered Species
- Non-threatened and Endangered Species
- Invasive Species
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Energy
- Geology
- Hazardous Materials

**Project Relevance:** The expressway Preferred Alternative is described in great detail in the OR 62 FEIS. It identifies a split diamond interchange at Exit 30 as shown in Figure 10. The FEIS did not analyze traffic impacts west of the interchange ramps. Two commercial expansions at the intersection of OR 238, OR 99, and OR 62 (the "Big X") southwest of the interchange will result in an increase in traffic volumes at the interchange. Developable lands at the Big X, which includes service and general industrial uses, may be rezoned to mixed use and/or residential in the future. These developments need to be analyzed in the context of the IAMP.

Further, the issues identified in the FEIS related to improvements at the interchange need to be reexamined and resolved. Recommendations will be documented in the draft IAMP for future adoption - by the City of Medford as an amendment to the adopted Transportation System Plan and by the Oregon Transportation Commission as an amendment to the Oregon Highway Plan.

**Liberty Park Neighborhood Plan (in progress)**

The City of Medford is in the process of adopting the Liberty Park Neighborhood Plan. The most recent draft plan available is dated October 2019. The Neighborhood Plan is intended to guide public and private investment and revitalization efforts to improve the neighborhood’s livability and economic health for its residents, visitors, and business-owners. In 2018, the Medford Urban Renewal Agency allocated $17 million toward funding future improvements and development. The Neighborhood Plan helps prioritize that allocation.

The Neighborhood Plan includes recommendations for land use and transportation improvements within the neighborhood. A summary of the improvements are shown in Figure 11.
The plan recommends several transportation-related improvements. A summary of the recommendations involving Court Street, OR 99 (N Riverside Avenue), and E McAndrews Road are provided below.

- Reduce speed limit to 25 mph on OR 99. Riverside Ave and Central St/Court Ave from McAndrews to Jackson (Project TC1).
- Re-stripe OR 99 to facilitate two 11’ lanes and a bike lane. Court St./Central Ave between McAndrews Rd and Jackson St, and Riverside between McAndrews and Jackson (Project TC2).
- Reconfigure lanes on Riverside Avenue and Court/Central Street to include protected bike lane. Riverside/Court/Central between McAndrews and Jackson St (Project LR1)

**Project Relevance:** The projects recommended in the Neighborhood Plan within the study area will be considered in the development of the IAMP.
Cooperative Improvement Agreements, Inter-Governmental Agreements, and Traffic Impact Studies relative to development within the IMSA

The project scope of work lists cooperative improvement agreements, inter-governmental agreements, and traffic impact studies relative to development within the IMSA as part of the documents for review under this task. At this time, no documents that fit this description are available for review.

**Project Relevance:** The IAMP will consider and review additional agreements and studies that are relevant to the IMSA as they become available.