

SECTION 2

Findings from Plan and Policy Review

This section summarizes the plans and policies at the federal, state, regional, and local levels that directly influence transportation planning in the city of Dallas. Although each document reviewed contains many policies, only the most pertinent policies and information are presented to help focus the discussion. This section provides a policy framework for the remainder of the Dallas TSP process, and new policies considered as part of this study should be consistent with the currently adopted policies listed. This review also serves as the basis for identifying policies that may be out-of-date or inconsistent with other policies and can serve as the basis for updating policies to reflect current conditions and to achieve consistency with other local, regional, state, and federal plans.

Documents Reviewed

The following federal, state, regional, and local documents were reviewed. The general intent of these documents and the relevance to system and facility plans are summarized in the remainder of this TSP section.

- Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century
- 23 CFR 450
- 49 CFR 613
- Statewide Planning Goals
- 1992 Oregon Transportation Plan
- 1999 Oregon Highway Plan
- Oregon Highway Plan Implementation Handbook
- 1995 Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
- 2001 Oregon Rail Plan
- Freight Moves the Oregon Economy (1999)
- Western Transportation Trade Network Phase II Final Report (1999)
- 1997 Oregon Public Transportation Plan
- 1995 Oregon Transportation Safety and Action Plan
- Transportation Planning Administrative Rule
- Transportation System Planning Guidelines
- Access Management Administrative Rule
- Statewide Congestion Overview for Oregon (1998)
- Willamette Valley Transportation Strategy (1995)

Federal Policies

Potentially applicable federal transportation planning policies are the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), 23 CFR 450, and 49 CFR 613. TEA-21 changed transportation planning activities for states and metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) originally instituted by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991

(ISTEA). The regulations for these state and MPO planning activities are specified in 23 CFR 450 and 49 CFR 613. Dallas does not qualify for membership in an MPO.

State Policies

Since 1973, Oregon has maintained a strong statewide program for land use planning. The foundation of that program is a set of 19 statewide planning goals. The Transportation Planning Rule and the transportation system plans identified therein are results of implementation of the Goal 12—Transportation. Oregon's statewide goals are achieved through local comprehensive planning, of which transportation system plans are a part. The goals that apply to transportation system planning are described below. Other goals may apply depending on the area addressed by transportation system or facility plan.

Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement: Develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

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

Goal 4 – Forest Land: This goal defines forest lands and requires counties to inventory them and adopt policies and ordinances that will "conserve forest lands for forest uses."

Goal 9 – Economic Development: Provide adequate opportunities for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon's citizens.

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

Goal 12 – Transportation: Provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.

Goal 13 – Energy Conservation: Conserve energy.

Goal 14 – Urbanization: Provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use.

Regional and Local Plans and Policies

1992 Oregon Transportation Plan

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is a policy document developed by ODOT in response to the federal and state mandates for systematic planning for the future of Oregon's transportation system. It recognizes the need to integrate all modes of transportation and encourages the use of the mode that is the most appropriate for each type of travel. The Plan defines goals, policies and actions for the state for the next 40 years. The Plan's System Element identifies a coordinated multimodal transportation system, to be developed over the next 20 years, which is intended to implement the goals and policies of

the Plan. The goals and policies of the OTP cover a broad range of issues. The goals and policies most directly applicable to transportation system and facility plans are as follows:

Goal 1: Characteristics of the System

- Policy 1A - Balance
- Policy 1B - Efficiency
- Policy 1C - Accessibility
- Policy 1D - Environmental Responsibility
- Policy 1E - Connectivity among Places
- Policy 1F - Connectivity among Modes and Carriers
- Policy 1G - Safety

Goal 2: Livability

- Policy 2A - Land Use
- Policy 2B - Urban Accessibility
- Policy 2C - Relationship of Interurban and Urban Mobility
- Policy 2D - Facilities for Pedestrians and Bicyclists
- Policy 2E - Minimum Levels of Service
- Policy 2H - Aesthetic Values

Goal 3: Economic Development

- Policy 3B - Linkages to Markets
- Policy 3E - Tourism

Goal 4: Implementation

- Policy 4G - Management Practices
- Policy 4L - Federal and Indian Tribal Governmental Relationships
- Policy 4M - Private/Public Partnership
- Policy 4N - Public Participation

1999 Oregon Highway Plan

The 1999 Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) is one modal element of the Oregon Transportation Plan. The OHP defines the policies and investment strategies for Oregon's state highway system over the next 20 years. Regional and local transportation system plans (TSPs) must be consistent with the State Transportation System Plan, which includes the OHP. OHP policies requiring consistency in TSPs are as follows:

Policy 1A: State Highway Classification System. The state highway classification system includes six classifications: Interstate, Statewide, Regional, District, Local Interest Roads, and Expressways. The OHP emphasizes designation of Expressways as a subset of Statewide, Regional and District Highways to provide a high level of access control along highway segments (long access spacings and limited turning movements).

- *Highway 223 through Dallas is classified as a District Highway. It is not designated as an expressway.*

Policy 1B: Land Use and Transportation. This policy recognizes the role of both state and local governments regarding the state highway system and calls for a coordinated approach to land use and transportation planning. The policy identifies the designation

of highway segments as Special Transportation Areas (STAs), Commercial Centers, and Urban Business Areas (UBAs). Within STAs and UBAs, highways may be managed to provide a greater level of access to businesses and residences than might otherwise be allowed. Commercial Centers encourage clustered development with limited access to a state highway.

- *One segment of Highway 223 through downtown Dallas is designated as an STA. The boundaries of the STA are the Kings Valley Highway (Main Street and Jefferson Street) between Academy Street and Washington Street. The City is recommending that ODOT classify Highway 223 in the vicinity of the north Dallas intersection be classified as an UBA. The boundaries of this proposed UBA are the Kings Valley Highway and Dallas-Rickreall Highway between Polk Station Road and Walnut Avenue.*

Policy 1C: State Highway Freight System. This policy calls for balancing the need to move freight with other highway users by minimizing congestion on major truck routes.

- *Highway 223 is not an ODOT designated freight system route.*

Policy 1D: Byways. This policy promotes the preservation and enhancement of scenic byways by considering aesthetic and design elements along with safety and performance considerations on designated byways.

- *Highway 223 is not an ODOT designated scenic byway.*

Policy 1F: Highway Mobility Standards Access Management Policy. This policy provides specific mobility standards for the state highway sections, signalized intersections, and interchanges. Alternative standards are provided for certain locations and under certain conditions.

Policy 1G: Major Improvements. This policy identifies the state's priorities for responding to highway needs: protect the existing system; improve efficiency and capacity of existing system; add capacity to existing system.

Policy 2G: Rail and Highway Compatibility. This policy emphasizes increasing safety and efficiency through reduction and prevention of conflicts between railroad and highway users.

- *The Willamette and Pacific Railroad, which serves Dallas, does not cross any state highways within the city.*

Policy 3A: Classification and Spacing Standards. This policy addresses the location, spacing and type of road and street intersections and approach roads on state highways. It includes standards for each highway classification, including specific standards for Special Transportation Areas (STAs) and Urban Business Areas (UBAs).

- *Relevant spacing standards for Highway 223 within the Dallas UGB range from 175 feet to 700 feet. See Section 7 for more information.*

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.

Oregon Highway Plan Implementation Handbook

The Oregon Highway Plan Implementation Handbook contains information interpreting the application of policies and actions in the OHP, particularly relating to land use and transportation policy. The Handbook informed the discussion of requirements for Expressway, STA, UBA, and Commercial Center plans in the summaries. Also taken from the Handbook are the tables and figures illustrating the OHP access management policies and the Access Management Rule (OAR 734-051). The Handbook does not provide any policy direction not contained in other plans, policies, or rules.

1995 Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan provides guidance to regional and local jurisdictions for the development of safe, connected bicycle and pedestrian systems. The plan is a modal element of the Oregon Transportation Plan. The plan includes two major sections: policies and implementation strategies; and design, maintenance and safety information. The plan also outlines the elements of the bicycle and pedestrian plan required for transportation system plans. The goal of the plan is “To provide safe, accessible and convenient bicycling and walking facilities and to support and encourage increased levels of bicycling and walking.”

2001 Oregon Rail Plan

The 2001 Oregon Rail Plan includes two major elements: freight and passenger. The 2001 Rail Plan identifies federal and state policies applicable to passenger and freight rail planning, but does not identify any additional policies specific to the plan. The freight element describes existing conditions in the different regions of the state and improvements that are needed. It also identifies issues that should be considered in rail planning during local land use planning like preparation of a TSP and comprehensive plan policies to support the TSP. The passenger element identifies the need or feasibility of certain passenger and commuter rail improvements in Region 2. The plan also suggests criteria for determining if an area could support a commuter rail line.

1997 Oregon Public Transportation Plan

The Oregon Public Transportation Plan forms the transit modal plan of the Oregon Transportation Plan. The vision guiding the public transportation plan is as follows:

- A comprehensive, interconnected and dependable public transportation system, with stable funding, that provides access and mobility in and between communities of Oregon in a convenient, reliable and safe manner that encourages people to ride
- A public transportation system that provides appropriate service in each area of the state, including service in urban areas that is an attractive alternative to the single-occupant vehicle, and high-quality, dependable service in suburban, rural, and frontier (remote) areas
- A system that enables those who do not drive to meet their daily needs
- A public transportation system that plays a critical role in improving the livability and economic prosperity for Oregonians.”

The plan contains goals, policies, and strategies relating to the whole of the state's public transportation system. The plan is intended to provide guidance for ODOT and public transportation agencies regarding the development of public transportation systems. The OPTP also identifies suggested minimum levels of service, by size of jurisdiction, for fulfilling its goals and policies. The suggested minimum levels of service applicable to a city with less than 25,000 residents:

- Offer services to the general public to provide a modal alternative to single-occupant automobile travel.
- Provide open access to intercity passenger terminals for all intercity carries.
- Coordinate local public transportation services with intercity rail services to provide for timely and convenient connections.
- Provide dial-a-ride services to the general public on weekdays.
- Provide peak period commuter services.
- Provide hourly off-peak public transportation service.
- Provide a guaranteed ride home program to all users of the public transportation system and publicize it well.
- Provide park-and-ride facilities along transit route corridors to meet reasonable peak and off-peak demand for such facilities.
- Incorporate local public transportation services into local land use development, where appropriate.
- Provide at least 1.7 annual hours per-capita of public transportation with fixed-route, dial-a-ride or other service types.
- Provide at least one accessible vehicle for every 40 hours of service.
- Provide ridematching and demand management programs.

The OPTP also provides suggested standards for intercity bus service. These suggestions are as follows:

- Provide hourly service to major communities within the Willamette Valley in conjunction with passenger rail service.
- Provide service on a daily basis for round trip purposes, for an incorporated city or group of cities within 5 miles of one another having a combined population of 2,500 and located 20 miles or more from the nearest city with a larger population and economy.
- Provide a coordinated, centralized scheduling system in each county and at the state level for rural and frontier areas.
- Coordinate intercity bus services with intercity senior and disabled services, local senior and disabled services and local public transportation services.

1995 Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan

The Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan forms the safety element of the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP). The intent of the plan is to improve safety on Oregon's highways for all users. The policy for safety in the OTP (Policy 1G) is as follows: "It is the policy of the State of Oregon to improve continually the safety of all facets of statewide transportation for system users including operators, passengers, pedestrian, recipients of goods and services, and property owners." Many of the actions identified in the plan are programmatic in nature and may not be addressed best through transportation system or facility plans. The following lists the actions that TSPs and corridor plans could address best:

Action 19--Safety Considerations in Transportation Planning Documents

Action 20--Access Management

Action 27--Airports and Surrounding Land Uses

Action 64 – Rail Crossing Safety

Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012)

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), OAR 660 Division 12, implements Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) and promotes the development of safe, convenient, and economic transportation systems that reduce reliance on the automobile. The TPR requires the preparation of regional transportation systems plans by metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) or counties and local TSPs by counties and cities. TSP requirements vary by type (regional vs. local) and community size. Through TSPs, the TPR provides a means for regional and local jurisdictions to identify long-range (20-year) strategies for the development of local transportation facilities and services for all modes, to integrate transportation and land use, to provide a basis for land use and transportation decision-making, and to identify projects for the State Transportation Improvement Program. TSPs need to be consistent with the State Transportation Plan and its modal and multimodal elements.

Preparation of this TSP follows the requirements of the TPR. The TPR requires the determination of transportation needs and the development of modal plans (the road system, public transportation, bicycles, pedestrians, and air, rail, water, and pipeline transportation) to meet those needs. These plans must include an inventory of existing services and facilities and a system of planned facilities, services and major improvements, indicating their location and who is responsible for providing them. Preparation of these plans includes the evaluation and selection of system alternatives, which include the following elements: improvements to existing facilities or services; new facilities and services; transportation system management measures; demand management measures; and a no build system alternative. The evaluation and selection of alternatives is based on consistency with the community's comprehensive plan; consistency with state and federal standards for the protection of air, water, and land; minimization of adverse social, economic and environmental impacts; minimization of conflicts and facilitation of connections between transportation modes; avoidance of relying on one principal transportation mode; and reduction of the reliance on the automobile. The TSP also includes a financing plan.

The TPR also requires communities to amend their land use regulations to implement the TPR and their TSPs. Table 1-3 in Section 1.4.6 evaluates the Dallas Development Code for consistency with the TPR. Where inconsistencies occur, changes are recommended.

Access Management Rules (OAR 734-051)

OAR 734-051 states that the purpose of the rules is to govern the issuance of permits for approaches onto state highways. The policy promotes the protection of emerging development areas rather than the retrofit of existing built-up roadways. The rules also provide access management spacing standards for approaches for various types of state roadways and for interchanges. OAR 734-051-0190 specifies that these standards are to be used in planning processes involving state highways, including corridor studies, refinement plans, state and local TSPs, and local comprehensive plans. The access management rules also include provisions for UBAs, and STAs, as discussed in the OHP. The access management rules also describe the development of access facility management plans and interchange area management plans.

Regional and Local Plans and Policies

Willamette Valley Transportation Strategy (1995)

The Willamette Valley Transportation Strategy (WVTS) is a multimodal element of the OTP. The WVTS identifies strategies for addressing eleven key issues influencing transportation development in the Valley. These strategies address the following issues:

Highways/Roadways

- Select highway projects that maximize the net benefits to the Valley's transportation system as a whole.
- Coordinate highway projects with land use policies and other transportation improvements.
- Make strategic capacity enhancements to controlled access highways.
- Maintain regional highway linkages upon which rural communities depend to build viable communities.
- Improve north-south and east-west links to the existing state highway system.

Local/Regional Transit

- Provide transit service from metropolitan centers to neighboring cities with populations of 2,500 or more.

Freight

- Improve local and state highway networks that provide direct connections to industrial areas and intermodal facilities such as rail/truck reload centers and air and marine ports.

Bicycles and Pedestrians

- Include provisions for bicycle and pedestrian use in all new facilities and major construction.
- Build a stronger network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including routes off highway rights-of-way.

Interchange Development

- Encourage local governments to adopt land use policies and implement transportation strategies that help achieve planned interchange utilization.

Transportation Demand Management Programs (TDM)

- In cooperation with the state, local jurisdictions develop transportation demand management programs which educate and inform the public about motor vehicle use.
- Institute or expand programs such as ridesharing, park-and-ride, transit promotion and parking management, especially in metropolitan areas.
- In partnerships between public and private sectors, expand programs such as trip reduction (commute options), flex time, telecommuting and parking “cashout” programs, especially in metropolitan areas for both public and private employees.
 - Coordinate employer-based programs with community transportation plan objectives.
 - Expand prepaid group transit pass programs in local communities.

User Fees

- Increase parking prices in urban areas of the Valley through a variety of means.
- Introduce peak period pricing techniques on key transportation facilities.

The strategies emphasize connections between places and modes, reduction of reliance on the automobile, development of facilities with maximum benefit for the Valley, and compact development.

Polk County Transportation Systems Plan (1998)

The Polk County Transportation Systems Plan identifies goals and policies for the county’s various transportation systems as well as specific projects. These goals, policies, and projects should be taken into consideration in the development of the Dallas TSP because of potential system connections as well as jurisdictional interests in the city’s urban growth boundary. The city and the county have an urban growth management agreement that addresses the coordination of transportation issues. Pertinent information from that agreement is presented in Section 1.4.5.

Goals and Policies

- **Goal 1.** To provide a convenient, economic, energy efficient, reliable, and safe multimodal (road, rail, air, public transportation, waterway, bicycle, pedestrian and

pipeline) transportation systems for all users; including the young, elderly, disabled, and the disadvantaged.

- **Policy 1-3.** Polk County will discourage direct access from adjacent properties onto those highways designated as arterials whenever alternative access can be made available.
- **Policy 1-6.** Polk County shall explore options to reduce road mileage under the county's jurisdiction by working with the cities in Polk County to transfer the jurisdiction of county roads for maintenance and improvement when urbanization occurs. This will occur when the road functions as a city street and/or when the urban type development makes it apparent that city forces are better equipped to do the work.
- **Policy 1-7.** Polk County will strive to maintain a Level of Service (LOS) A on all county arterials and collectors, and will initiate corrective action to prevent degradation below LOS C.
- **Policy 1-9.** Polk County does not currently designate any truck routes; however, any load limited bridges or roads may prevent trucks from using some routes from time to time.
- **Policy 1-10.** Polk County will evaluate the need for park-and-ride facilities when realigning County roadways and before disposing of resulting surplus right-of-way.
- **Policy 1-11.** Polk County will work with private companies and public agencies to establish an economically feasible public transportation system appropriate to the needs of its citizens, including the disadvantaged and disabled.
- **Policy 1-12.** Polk County will use every practical opportunity to enhance the intermodal connectivity of its transportation system.
- **Goal 2.** To maintain an ongoing transportation planning process keyed to meet the needs of the traveling public and coordinated among the state, regional, and local jurisdictions.
 - **Policy 2-1.** Polk County will continue to coordinate transportation planning with and consider the needs of its cities, other counties, the region, and the state. The county will support the transportation planning efforts of all its municipalities.
 - **Policy 2-7.** Polk County will promote and encourage carpooling.
- **Goal 3.** To maintain a transportation system supportive of a sustained, geographically distributed and diversified economy.
 - **Policy 3-1.** Polk County will encourage rural residential, commercial and industrial development where such development has access to more than one mode of transportation.
 - **Policy 3-2.** Polk County recognizes the importance of resource-related uses, such as agriculture and forestry to the local economy, and the need to maintain a

- transportation system that provides opportunities for the harvesting and marketing of agricultural and forest products.
- **Policy 3-3.** Polk County will resist the abandonment of active railroad lines which contribute to the economic viability of the county.
 - **Policy 3-5.** Polk County encourages and supports the improvement of rail conditions to maintain rail service as an effective mover of goods. Concurrently, the county supports safety improvements at rail crossings.
 - **Goal 4.** To implement a level of transportation development which positively contributes to Polk County's livability.
 - **Policy 4-3.** To prevent exceeding planned capacity of the transportation system, Polk County will consider road function, classification, and capacity as criteria for comprehensive plan map and zoning amendments/changes.
 - **Policy 4-4.** Polk County will strive to take advantage of technologic advances to improve the transportation system.

Proposed Projects

Road and Intersection Improvement Projects. Although the Polk County TSP does not propose any road or intersection improvements within the City of Dallas, two projects recommended in the County TSP would serve City of Dallas residents. These projects are the extension of Webb Lane to connect with the Kings Valley Highway north of Dallas city limits, and the extension of James Howe Road northward to connect with the newly extended Webb Lane. These projects are also recommended as part of the Dallas TSP. The TSP states that “Polk County will purchase or require the dedication of right-of-way or obtain easements for these future road locations as the affected properties are partitioned or subdivided.”

Public Transportation. The Polk County TSP recommends the implementation of a commuter shuttle service between Dallas and Salem, starting in approximately 2006. The commuter shuttle service would be composed of two to three buses with a capacity of 20 to 25 passengers and would run during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods. The Polk County TSP also outlines a potential test period and potential costs and funding.

The Polk County TSP also recommends the coordination of para-transit services in two regions: Monmouth/Independence and Dallas. Para-transit services are the most commonly available public transportation services in Polk County and its communities. Polk County Mental Health is envisioned as the lead to organize existing service providers to overcome operating differences and to maximize resources by coordinating and exchanging services.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Systems. The Polk County TSP lists conceptual bikeway, road, and intersection projects. One project is identified as a possible joint venture with Dallas. The project is the construction of a 6-foot-wide paved shoulder contiguous to each traffic lane on Ellendale Road from Rueben Boise Road to James Howe Road.

City of Dallas Evaluation and Recommendations for TPR Compliance (1995)

The policies presented in the TPR Compliance Document are similar to those presented in the Dallas Comprehensive Plan. Please refer to the next section for a listing of these policies. The following presents other pertinent information from the TPR Compliance Document.

Street System

The TPR Compliance Document proposed street improvements, functional classifications, design standards, and access management standards. The street improvements proposed in the TPR Compliance Document are similar to those presented in the Comprehensive Plan (listed on the next page). Map 1 of the Comprehensive Plan document also shows the designated arterial and collector streets.

The street standards presented in the TPR Compliance Document are not consistent with those presented in the DDC. The standards included in the Development Code are the most current and were referenced during the preparation of this TSP.

The 1995 Dallas TSP also identified access management standards. These standards were based on the 1991 Oregon Highway Plan but the standards were never adopted as part of the DDC.

Public Transportation

Options for intra-city public transportation are limited. Elderly and handicapped residents are served by Wheels, a dial-a-ride service that covers Dallas, Monmouth, and Independence. The service may be used by the general public on a space available basis. Other transportation services are directed to a specific client base and are not available to the general public. Dallas does not have an intercity bus service.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan proposes nine bicycle improvements to connect activity centers and provide a safe system. The routes are primarily shared roadways: routes that are marked with signs and are part of roadway without a painted stripe or other separation. The routes are listed in Table 2-1.

TABLE 2-1. 1995 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN—PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

Location	Type
Ash St/Miller St	Shared roadway/shoulder bikeway ^a
Maple St	Shared roadway
Kings Valley Hwy/Fairview Ave	Bike lanes
Hayter St/Levens St	Shared roadway
W Ellendale/Orchards/Kings Valley Hwy	Shared roadway/bike bath or sidewalk bikeway
Walnut Street	Shared roadway/bike lane or path
Ugflow/Hankel/LaCreole	Shared roadway
Mill St/Ugflow	Shared roadway
Rikreall Bridge/Mill St	Shared roadway

The plan does not propose any specific pedestrian improvements, but calls for ensuring a well-connected street system.

City of Dallas Comprehensive Plan Volume I: Goals and Policies (1998)

Transportation Goal

To develop a balanced and safe transportation system that minimizes community disruption and promotes the economic and energy-efficient movement of goods and people around and through the community.

Circulation System Policies

1. The City's transportation system should be fully integrated into the regional and state transportation system.
3. The transportation system shall provide adequate access to all planned land uses and shall:
 - Focus on direct multi-modal access to business districts.
 - Achieve a balanced traffic flow through each section of the City.
 - Reduce congestion on arterial streets by providing alternative transportation routes.
4. The major street network should function so that the livability of neighborhoods is preserved and enhanced. Street design should consider the need for landscaping and noise reduction.
5. The City shall adopt an arterial and collector street system plan to ensure that Dallas continues to develop in a grid system.
6. A system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be fully integrated into the transportation system.
7. The City will help provide for the needs of the transportation disadvantaged.
8. The City will develop and use land use and land division regulations that set standards for needed transportation facilities and improvements and direct development patterns that enhance opportunities for pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel.
9. The TSP shall:
 - Encourage alternatives to, and reduce reliance upon, the automobile.
 - Guide comprehensive planning and project development activities.
10. The City shall protect transportation facilities, corridors and sites for their intended functions as identified in this plan.
11. A bridge across Rickreall Creek at Mill Street will be required in the City to support better traffic circulation and an additional north-south traffic route, as shown on Comprehensive Plan Map #1.

Rail Transport Policy

The City shall coordinate with the applicable railroad company to improve rail service and public right-of-way crossings.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Policies

1. To accommodate the bicyclist and pedestrian now and during the planning period, the City shall plan for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and integrate them into the street circulation system.
2. The facility needs and safety of individuals walking or using their bicycles as a means of transportation should be given priority over the needs of recreationalists. In other words, bike lanes and bike routes should be given first consideration over bike paths, except where the latter clearly provides for both.
3. Bikeways and pedestrian ways should connect residential neighborhoods to schools, parks, shopping areas, and places of work.
4. Bicycle parking facilities shall be required as part of new multi-family residential developments of four units or more, new retail, office and institutional developments, and all transit transfer stations and park-and-ride lots.
5. Facilities providing safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access within and from new subdivisions, planned developments, shopping centers, and industrial parks to nearby residential areas, transit stops and neighborhood activity centers, such as schools, parks and shopping shall be required. This shall include:
 - Sidewalks along arterials and collectors
 - Bikeways as provided in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
 - Areas and developments identified in this policy should be connected with separate bike or pedestrian ways, where appropriate to minimize travel distance
6. Internal pedestrian circulation in new office parks and commercial developments shall be provided through the master planning, design review and planned development processes. To achieve this objective, methods such as clustering buildings, construction of pedestrian ways or skywalks, and similar techniques shall be considered.

Street Improvement Policies

Developer's Obligation

All new development shall be responsible for providing an adequate vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian access through the following methods:

1. All streets and bicycle and pedestrian facilities within a new subdivision or development shall be fully improved to City standards.
2. Owners of abutting properties shall pay the cost of abutting street improvements, including the paved surface, curbs, sidewalks, bicycle facilities and drainage to City standards.
3. "Over-width" street improvements (greater than local street standards) may be paid for with funds accumulated in the System Development Charge Fund as determined by City as to the need.
4. Benefiting property owners may be required to sign a "non-remonstrance" agreement stating their willingness to participate in future off-site street improvements on a proportional, "fair share" basis.

Transportation Project Funding. To plan for and fund needed transportation projects, the City should consider the following methods:

1. Local improvement districts (LID)
2. Initiation of full improvement projects on existing unimproved streets when 50 percent or more of the property abutting said street is developed or improved.
3. Elections to seek voter approval for a serial tax levy or bond measure to be used exclusively for street improvements.
4. Preparation of a 5-year capital improvements program (CIP) to identify alternative funding sources for needed transportation improvement projects.

Access Management Policies

Access Management Methods. The purpose of access management is to ensure the effective functioning of streets, especially arterial and collector streets. To achieve this objective, the City shall:

1. Develop and apply access control measures (e.g., driveway and public road spacing, median control and signal spacing standards) that are consistent with the functional classification of roads and which limit development on rural land to rural uses and densities.
2. Adopt standards to protect future operation of roads, transit ways, and major transit corridors.
3. Provide for the coordinated review of future land use decisions affecting transportation facilities, corridors or sites, including a process to apply conditions to development proposals in order to minimize impacts and protect transportation facilities, corridor or sites.
4. Work with adjacent property owners to develop creative approaches to access management, in light of competing demands on arterial and collector streets.

5. Adopt regulations to provide notice to provide public agencies providing transportation facilities and services, including the Oregon Department of Transportation, of land use applications that affect private access to roads.
6. Adopt regulations assuring that amendments to land use designations, densities, and design standards are consistent with the functions, capacities and levels-of-service of facilities identified in Chapter 7 of the Comprehensive Plan.
7. Remain flexible in its response to future development proposals on its arterial/collector streets, considering creative access solutions but maintaining a firm commitment to negotiating agreements that uphold the objectives of safety and mobility.

Access Management Coordination. Recognizing that the City of Dallas, Polk County, and the Oregon Department of Transportation each have a role to play in effective access management, the City shall cooperate with these agencies in order to:

1. Ensure that ODOT and Polk County are notified of development proposals that impact the state highways or county roads.
2. Maintain an acceptable level of service on county and state roads (good mobility).
3. Minimize capital costs by ensuring efficient use of existing and proposed facilities.
4. Improve safety by minimizing potential conflict points.
5. Improve bicycle/pedestrian access and mobility.

Access Management Techniques. In order to accomplish the access management objectives, the City shall consider access management techniques, such as the following, in the review of development applications:

1. Provide for common driveways (sharing access with adjacent properties)
2. Provide access to collector and local streets
3. Encourage connections between adjacent properties
4. Construct local service roads
5. Avoid offsetting streets and major driveways, especially in commercial areas.

Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards

The Dallas Development Code shall establish “level-of-service” standards that must be met in order for new development to be approved. LOS standards shall be included in the Master Planning, Land Division and Planned Development chapters of DDC and are interpreted by engineering policies on file with the City Engineer.

Level of service (LOS) D or below is considered unacceptable for collector or arterial street links or intersections.

Required System Improvements

Transportation system improvements required to support planned development in Dallas include the following:

- Traffic signals NE Polk Station Road/E Ellendale to support planned mixed commercial/multi-family node at this location.
- Intersection, traffic signal and vehicle movement improvements at Main/SE Hankel, Main/SE and SW Walnut, and SE Jefferson/Washington to support Dallas' downtown and general commercial districts.
- Bridges overall Rickreall Creek at SW Mill/River Drive to facilitate east-west traffic flow through Dallas.
- Intersection improvements at SW Maple/Fairview, SW Oakdale/Fairview and SW Bridlewood/Fairview in southwest Dallas.

Transportation system improvements identified outside the 1996 urban growth boundary (UGB) include:

- A major collector street improvement located north of the UGB, connecting James Howe Road with State Highway 223. The purpose of this street is to provide an alternative (to W Ellendale) truck route through the city. Dallas recognizes that, in order for this street to be constructed, a Statewide Planning Goal exception (to allow an urban facility outside the UGB) would be required, or the UGB itself would have to be amended.
- And, a major collector located immediately to the southeast of the UGB, extending from Fir Villa Road to the Monmouth Cut-off. This extension is necessary to provide an alternative (to E Ellendale) truck route through the city, and to serve the southeast industrial area. Dallas proposes to expand the UGB to include industrial land abutting this road to the west.

Street Standards

Street standards are described in the TSP and have been incorporated into the Dallas Land Division Ordinance.

Dallas-Polk County Urban Growth Management Agreement

The Dallas-Polk County Urban Growth Management Agreement is an agreement between the city and the county regarding the responsibilities of both parties relating to the development of land and the provision of services inside and outside the Dallas urban growth boundary. The following provisions relate to the provision of urban services, which includes streets dedicated and developed to urban standards.

Article III—Annexation and the Provision of Urban Services

1. Annexation to the City shall be required for the approval of urban development within the Dallas UGB or the provision of urban services within Dallas UGB.
2. The City shall be the sole provider of urban services within the UGB.

Dallas Development Code (2002)

The Dallas Development Code (DDC) combines zoning, specified use standards, development guidelines and standards (including street standards), partition and use standards, administration and procedures, and application requirements in one ordinance.

Table 2-2 at the end of this section summarizes Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements from OAR Section 660-012-0045, and indicates where the DDC does or does not comply with the TPR and the steps that can be taken to comply.

The following sections of the DDC are pertinent to the TSP:

4.2.30 Streets

Required public street improvements shall meet the following design standards:

- (1) **Streets and Highways.** Streets, roads, or highways shall be in alignment with existing streets in the vicinity of the proposed land division, either by continuing the existing center lines or by connection with the suitable curves.
 - (a) Streets shall conform to the location, alignment, and width as indicated by the Development Official.
 - (b) All streets or roads shall intersect at or as near to right angles as practicable.
- (2) **Dedication of a Right-of-Way.** Right-of-way dedication shall be required of land divisions or development where:
 - (a) Indicated on adopted plans or there is a clearly defined public purpose; and
 - (b) There is a roughly-proportional relationship between the impact of the development and the dedication requirement.
- (3) **Continuation of Dead-End Streets.** When it appears necessary to continue a street into a future land division or adjacent acreage, streets shall be platted to the boundary of the land division without a turnaround.
- (4) **Street - Residential Driveway Grades.**
 - (a) Street grades shall not exceed eight percent, unless the Commission (through a Type III process and after considering engineering and lot layout alternatives) finds that topographic conditions require a steeper grade and that no reasonable design alternative exists.
 - (b) Driveway grades shall not exceed fifteen (15) percent, unless approved by the Development Official through a Type II process, in which case the Development Official shall find that topographic conditions require a steeper grade and that no reasonable design alternative exists.
- (5) **Radius at Street Intersection.** The property line radius at street intersections shall be approved by the Director of Public Works.
- (6) **Reserve Block.** Reserve blocks controlling the access to public ways, or which will not prove taxable for special improvements, may be required by the

Commission. The land comprising such strips must be placed in the name of the City of Dallas.

- (7) **Minimum Street, Sidewalk and Bikeway Standards.** Table 4.2.1 specifies street, sidewalk and bikeway right-of-way, paving and design standards.

Table 4.2.1: Minimum Street, Sidewalk and Bikeway Standards

Type of Street	Right-of-Way	Sidewalks/ Parkrows	Paved Roadway	Bicycle Lane
Arterial Street	80-100' unless more is required by City Engineer	5' sidewalks on both sides; 4' parkrows	52' or more per City Engineer	6' both sides if on adopted plan
Collector Street	70'	5' sidewalks on both sides; 4' parkrows	36-40'	6' both sides if on adopted plan
Local Street	60' if no alley; 50' if alley	5' sidewalks on both sides; 4' parkrows in Mixed Use Nodes	36' if no alley; 32' if alley	6' both sides if on adopted plan
Cul-de-Sacs	50' street + 5' utility easements on both sides; 50' bulb radius + 10' utility easements	5' sidewalks on both sides	32' street + 40' bulb radius	None Required
Ped/Bike Connections	20' pedestrian connection	6' paved walkway with landscaping	Not Applicable	6' both sides if on adopted plan
Alleys	16' residential; 20' commercial	Not required except in Mixed Use Nodes	16' residential; 20' commercial	Not Applicable

- (a) Right-of-way and street width shall be determined by the Director of Public Works and recommended to the Commission. When an area within a land division or development review is set aside for commercial uses, or where probable future conditions warrant, the Commission may require dedication of streets to a greater width than indicated by Table 4.2.1.
- (b) Wheelchair ramps and other facilities shall be provided as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The lower lip of the wheelchair ramp shall be flush with the roadway surface. Mailboxes and utility cabinets shall not infringe on public sidewalks or accessways.
- (c) Bikeways shall be designed and constructed consistent with the design standards in the 1992 Oregon Bicycle Plan, and AASHTO's "Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 1991."

- (d) Street trees of at least 10 feet in height and two inches in diameter shall be installed at not less than 30-foot intervals within all parkrows on arterial and collector streets. The Commission shall determine whether parkrows will be required for local streets. If parkrows are not present, the Commission may require street trees to be installed in the front yards of each lot.
- (e) Temporary dead-end streets which may be extended in the future shall have a right-of-way and pavement width that will conform to the development pattern when extended.
- (f) Where topographical requirements necessitate either cuts or fills for the proper grading of the streets, additional easements or rights of way shall be required to allow all cut and fill slopes to be within the easements or right-of-way. The Director of Public Works shall determine the required extra width.
- (8) **Two-Level Streets.** Where it is determined that two-level streets best serve hillside lots or parcels, the right-of-way shall be of sufficient width to provide on each level space for one sidewalk, and a minimum width of 20 feet for pavement, curbs, and drainage facilities. Between the two street levels and out to the right-of-way lines there shall be space for all cut and fill slopes.
- (9) **Street Improvements.** All plans and specifications for street improvements – including pavement, curbs, sidewalks, utilities and surface drainage – shall be approved by the Director of Public Works prior to construction.
- (10) **Subdivision Blocks.** Block lengths and widths shall be determined by the distance and alignment of existing blocks and streets adjacent to or in the general vicinity of a proposed land division and by topography, adequate lot size, need for, and direction of flow of through and local traffic.
 - (a) Blocks shall not exceed 600 feet between street lines unless the adjacent layout or special conditions justify greater length.
 - (b) Except where topographical or other physical features prohibit it, block widths shall be not less than 200 nor more than 300 feet.

Accessways

Accessways shall be constructed in accordance with the following standards. Where topographical or other conditions such as cul-de-sacs make it necessary or desirable, the Commission may require a walkway through a block on a public right-of-way consistent with Table 4.2.1 and this section. Accessways shall be provided in the following situations:

- (1) **In Residential Areas**, where:
 - (a) a street connection is not feasible, and
 - (b) the provision of a walkway or bikeway would reduce walking or cycling distance to a school, shopping center, or neighborhood park by 400 feet or more.

- (2) **For Schools and Commercial Uses**, where the addition of a walkway or bikeway would reduce walking or cycling distance to an existing or planned transit stop, school, shopping center, or neighborhood park by:
 - (a) 200 feet; and
 - (b) at least 50 percent over other available and clearly defined pedestrian routes.
- (3) **For Cul-de-Sacs or Dead-End Streets**. The Dallas Comprehensive Plan has already made the policy choice to develop a connecting trail system in association with its riparian corridors, especially Rickreall Creek, and to encourage pedestrian and bicycle connections through to existing streets. Recognizing that accessways are required in most instances, the following factors may be considered should the developer request an adjustment pursuant to Chapter 3.5 of this Code:
 - (a) Whether other Federal, State or local requirements prevent construction of an accessway; or
 - (b) Whether the nature of abutting existing development makes construction of an accessway impractical; or
 - (c) Whether the accessway would cross a designated riparian area and the City has determined that a connecting trail would be inappropriate at any time in the future; or
 - (d) Whether a cul-de-sac or dead-end street abuts rural resource land in farm or forest use at an urban growth boundary.
- (4) **To Adjacent Developments**. When public streets cannot be provided at appropriate intervals, accessways shall be provided to adjacent developments. In no case shall development patterns preclude eventual site-to-site connections, even if such a connection is not feasible at the time of development.
- (5) **Fencing**. Accessways shall be screened by a 6-foot fence.
- (6) **Pedestrian Circulation in New Business Parks and Commercial Development**. Internal pedestrian circulation in new office parks and new commercial developments shall be provided in development plans through clustering of buildings and construction of pedestrian ways as follows:
 - (a) Walkways shall connect building entrances to one another and from building entrances to public street entrances.
 - (b) On-site walkways shall connect with walkways, sidewalks, bike paths, alleyways and other bicycle or pedestrian connections on adjacent properties used or planned for commercial, multi-family, institutional or park use.
 - (c) Walkways and driveways shall provide a direct connection to walkways and driveways on adjacent developments.
 - (d) Potential pedestrian connections between the proposed development and existing or future development on adjacent properties other than connections via the street system shall be identified.
 - (e) The development application shall designate these connections on the proposed site plan or evidence shall be submitted demonstrating that the connection is not feasible.

- (f) Rights-of-way or public easements shall be provided for all required walkways which provide a direct connection to adjacent properties.
- (g) Accessways shall be located to provide routes that minimize out-of-direction travel for most of the people likely to use the walkway/bikeway, considering terrain, safety and likely destinations.
- (h) Accessways shall be as short as possible (not more than 400 feet), and where possible, straight enough to allow one end of the accessway to be seen from the other.
- (i) Accessways shall be lighted either by street lights on adjacent streets or pedestrian lighting along the accessway. Lighting shall not shine into adjacent residences.
- (j) Pedestrian walkways shall be directly linked to entrances and the internal circulation of the building. The on-site pedestrian circulation system shall directly connect the street to the main entrance of the primary structure on the site.
- (k) Walkways shall be at least five feet in paved unobstructed width. Walkways bordering parking spaces shall be at least seven feet wide unless concrete bumpers, bollards, or curbing and landscaping or other similar improvements are provided which prevent parked vehicles from obstructing the walkway.
- (l) Pedestrian scale lighting fixtures shall be provided along all walkways. On-site pedestrian walkways must be lighted to a level where the system can be used at night by employees, residents and customers.
- (m) Stairs or ramps shall be provided where necessary to provide a direct route. Walkways without stairs shall have a maximum slope of eight percent and a maximum cross slope of two percent. Where walkways provide principal access to building entrances, maximum slope shall conform to ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) standards. Stairways and ramps shall be at least five feet wide with a handrail on both sides.
- (n) Where the pedestrian system crosses driveways, parking areas and loading areas, the system must be clearly identifiable through the use of elevation changes, speed bumps, a different paving material or other similar method.
- (o) Walkways on private property that provide direct links between publicly-owned pedestrian routes shall be placed in public easements or be dedicated to the public.

Table 2-2 summarizes Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements from OAR Section 660-012-0045, and indicates where the current Dallas Development Code does or does not comply with TPR and recommends steps that can be taken to comply.

TABLE 2-2 TPR REQUIREMENTS AND DALLAS LAND USE REGULATIONS	
TPR Requirement (OAR 660-012-0045)	Dallas Development Code (DDC) Compliance/Recommendations
(1) Each local government shall amend its land use regulations to implement the TSP.	
(b) A transportation facility, service, or improvement	The DDC does not explicitly address transportation

TABLE 2-2 TPR REQUIREMENTS AND DALLAS LAND USE REGULATIONS	
TPR Requirement (OAR 660-012-0045)	Dallas Development Code (DDC) Compliance/Recommendations
may be allowed without further land use review if it is permitted outright or if it is subject to standards that do not require interpretation or the exercise of factual, policy or legal judgment.	facilities, services, or improvements that may be permitted outright. Recommend that the DDC be amended to do so.
(c) Local governments shall amend regulations to provide for consolidated review of land use decisions required to permit a transportation project.	The DDC does not explicitly address the consolidated review of land use decisions necessary to permit a transportation project. Recommend that the DDC be amended to do so.
(2) Local governments shall adopt land use or subdivision ordinance regulations, consistent with applicable federal and state requirements, to protect transportation facilities for their identified functions.	
(a) Access control standards	While the DDC contains some provisions related to access, such as block length, it does not address other standards such as access points or access spacing. Recommend that the DDC be amended to include these standards based on the results of the TSP Update.
(b) Standards to protect the future operations of roadways and transit corridors	The DDC does not expressly address standards to protect future operation of roadways, like level of service or access controls. Recommend that the DDC be amended to include these standards based on the results of the TSP Update.
(c) Control of land use around airports	Dallas does not have an airport within its city limits or urban growth boundary.
(d) Coordinated review of future land use decisions affecting transportation facilities	Sections 3.7.40(1)(b)(iii) of the DDC allows the city to require the preparation of a traffic impact study, which at a minimum needs to demonstrate that proposed amendment does not degrade traffic operations below a certain LOS. In addition, Section 3.7.40(2) requires that comprehensive plan map and street designation amendments address the TPR and transportation policies of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan.
(e) Process to apply conditions to development proposals in order to minimize impacts and protect transportation facilities	Section 3.3.70 of the DDC allows the city to apply conditions to approvals to ensure the provision of adequate public facilities, including transportation facilities.
(f) Regulations to provide notice to public agencies providing transportation facilities and services, MPOs, and ODOT of: land use applications that require public hearings, subdivision and partition applications, applications which affect private access to roads, applications within airport noise corridor and imaginary surfaces which affect airport operations.	Section 1.3.60 of the DDC identifies notice requirements for Type III and Type IV actions, which include those actions listed in OAR 660-012-0045(f). These notification requirements do not include specific mention of ODOT or any other transportation facility provider like the County. Recommend the DDC be amended to include such notice requirements.
(g) Regulations assuring amendments to land use designations, densities, design standards are consistent with the function, capacities, and levels of	Sections 3.7.40(1)(b)(iii) of the DDC allows the city to require the preparation of a traffic impact study, which at a minimum needs to demonstrate that a proposed

TABLE 2-2 TPR REQUIREMENTS AND DALLAS LAND USE REGULATIONS	
TPR Requirement (OAR 660-012-0045)	Dallas Development Code (DDC) Compliance/Recommendations
service of facilities designated in the TSP.	amendment does not degrade traffic operations below a certain LOS. In addition, Section 3.7.40(2) requires that comprehensive plan map and street designation amendments address the TPR and transportation policies of the Dallas Comprehensive Plan. While these requirements address the intention of this TPR requirement, the lack of a clearly adopted level of service and capacity standards for the city's streets make compliance difficult to define. Recommend that the DDC be amended to include these designated street functions, capacities and levels of service based on the results of the TSP Update.
(3) Local governments shall adopt land use or subdivision regulations for urban areas and rural communities as set forth in 660-012-0040(3)(a-d):	
(a) Provide bike parking in multifamily developments of 4 units or more, new retail, office and institutional developments, transit transfer stations and park-and-ride lots	Section 4.5.70 requires a minimum of two bicycle parking spaces at commercial, public and multi-family residential developments.
(b) Provide "safe and convenient" (per subsection 660-012-0045.3(d)) pedestrian and bicycle connections from new subdivisions/multifamily development to neighborhood activity centers; bikeways are required along arterials and major collectors; sidewalks are required along arterials, collectors, and most local streets in urban areas except controlled access roadways	Section 4.2.40(1) provides pedestrian accessways in residential areas where "a walkway or a bikeway would reduce walking or cycling distance to a school, shopping center, or neighborhood park by 400 feet or more." Section 4.2.30(7) requires sidewalks on arterial, collector, and local streets. Bikeways are not specifically required on all arterial and major collector streets. Recommend the DDC be amended to include right-of-way standards that include adequate width on arterials and major collectors for bikeways based on the TSP Update.
(c) Off-site road improvements required as a condition of development approval must accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel, including facilities on arterials and major collectors	Section 3.3.70 of the DDC provides for conditions of approval necessary to ensure compliance with the DDC. Section 4.2.30(7) identifies minimum street, sidewalk, and bike lane standards, which includes sidewalks on all streets and bike lanes on certain designated streets. Recommend the DDC be amended to include right-of-way standards that include adequate width on arterials and major collectors for bikeways based on the TSP Update.
(e) Provide internal pedestrian circulation within new office parks and commercial developments	Section 4.2.40(6) of the DDC addresses pedestrian circulation in new business parks and commercial developments.
(6) As part of the pedestrian and bicycle circulation plans, local governments shall identify improvements to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian trips to meet local travel needs in developed areas.	The 1995 Dallas TSP identifies eight bikeway routes and one bicycle/pedestrian bridge but does not propose any specific pedestrian improvements. Recommend the DDC be amended to reflect facilities proposed as part of the TSP Update.
(7) Local governments shall establish standards for local streets and accessways that minimize pavement width and total ROW consistent with the operational	Section 4.2.30(7) of the DDC identifies minimum street, sidewalk and bikeway standards. These street standards do not explicitly state an intention to

TABLE 2-2 TPR REQUIREMENTS AND DALLAS LAND USE REGULATIONS	
TPR Requirement (OAR 660-012-0045)	Dallas Development Code (DDC) Compliance/Recommendations
needs of the facility.	minimize pavement width. The TSP will evaluate street standards for each functional classification. The DDC should be amended as necessary to reflect any changes to those standards.

Transportation Impact Report and Congestion Management Plan: Barberry and LaCreole Mixed Use Nodes (1999)

The Transportation Impact Report and Congestion Management Plan for the Barberry and LaCreole Mixed Use Nodes identify impacts of proposed land use changes in these two areas. The report includes the following:

- A description of existing transportation conditions and demand within the nodes and within the study’s transportation impact area.
- A description of the increased traffic generation from propose land use plans for the two nodes
- Recommendations for facility improvements and regulatory measures to meet projected demand. The recommended improvements including the following:
 - Upgrade four intersections, including new lane configurations and signals
 - Install five new traffic lights on Ellendale Avenue at the intersections of Kings Valley Highway, Polk Station Road, SE Hawthorne Ave, and SE Fir Villa Road.
 - Realign intersection of E Ellendale Avenue and Kings Valley Highway.
 - Realign intersection of Kings Valley Highway and Polk Station Road.
 - Upgrade Kings Valley Highway along the border of the LaCreole node and E Ellendale Avenue between Fir Villa Road and Kings Valley Highway to arterial standards, including one through lane in each direction, a center left-turn lane, and sidewalks and bike lanes on each side of the street.
 - Construct new collector and local streets.
 - Modify striping from median lane to two-way left-turn lane.
 - Install median barriers as necessary to eliminate left turns to or from driveway access locations.

The report also suggests some “transportation system management measures:”

- Provide sidewalks on all new streets and retrofit existing streets as part of adjacent development.
- Provide bicycles facilities on streets identified as major collector and arterial streets.

- Install a combination bicycle and pedestrian path along the drainageway north of NE Boulevard and between NE Barberry Road and a proposed school complex.
- Support carpools and van pools, dissemination of ride share information, and the addition of park-and-ride facilities.

Oregon Transportation Investment Act Draft Access Management Plan: OR 223 Kings Valley Highway at Dallas-Rickreall Highway (ODOT Key No. 12915)

The draft Access Management Plan establishes the steps to be taken to manage highway access for a transportation improvement project at the intersection of Kings Valley Highway and Dallas-Rickreall Highway. The plan identifies the following actions that needed to take place in conjunction with the implementation of the project:

- **Short-Term Criteria**

- Close accesses that fall within the new curb radii.
- Close access where multiple driveways exist to the highway from a single property or property use.
- Maintain functionality of existing businesses based on existing use.
- For corner lots with alternative access to local street, close access to highway.
- Issue access permits to 100% of all accesses constructed by the project.
- Evaluate site circulation for non-conventional movements at the access throat.
- Review existing permits for future easement requirements or any condition that may influence the newly constructed access.
- No full-movement accesses will be allowed within the opening day peak-hour left-turn queue (stacking) areas. The project will implement median control to protect the left-turn queues.

- **Medium-Term Criteria**

- Allow City and ODOT permitting processes and evaluation along highway to require conformance to long-term criteria.

- **Long-Term Criteria**

- The TSP shall identify, establish, and implement beltline routes designed to reduce traffic volumes within the project intersections and project area.
- Meet the spacing standards as defined in the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan.

The plan also identifies certain driveways that would need to be closed.