

TSP Policies - Document C

Rural Land Use and Transportation

INTRODUCTION

This document provides an overview of current policies regarding rural roads in the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan and staff recommendations for revising those policies and creating new policies. The staff recommendations are based on review of the existing County Comprehensive Plan – Chapter 5, State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and TSP Vision, Goals and Objectives.

Key Questions (Draft)

1. Do we need a general policy on the integration of rural land use and transportation? If so – which one?
2. Should we modify the rural access standards so that they are based on the speed of the road?
3. Do we need a policy concerning agricultural equipment on the road way? If so – which one?
4. Do we need specific policies for safety and road condition? If so – which one
5. Do we need specific parking policies for the rural area?
6. Which policies should be used to address equestrian issues in the County?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Policies	2
<i>Integration of Rural Land Use and Transportation</i>	2
<i>Intergovernmental Partnerships and Coordination</i>	2
<i>Road Access Standards</i>	3
<i>Agricultural Equipment Movement on Roads</i>	4
<i>Safety and Road Conditions</i>	5
<i>Parking</i>	5
<i>Traffic Safety Action Plan</i>	6
<i>Equestrian</i>	6

Working Group Issues Definitions

- *O= Overarching*
- *R = Regulatory (in County Code)*
- *M = Mandated (OAR, RTFP, etc)*
- *P = Program / agency*

TSP Policy Review – Rural Land Use and Transportation

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>(proposed changes in red)</i> <i>(PWG comments in blue)</i>	Working Group Issues
Integration of Rural Land Use and Transportation				
83 A	New – Alternate language		<u>Support and promote an integrated approach to land use and transportation planning in rural areas.</u>	0
83 B	New – Alternate language		<u>Support transportation planning and implementation to help create livable and sustainable rural communities and areas.</u>	0
83 C	New – Alternate language		<u>Prioritize transportation investments that support complete and sustainable rural communities as a long term strategy to end reliance on commutes out of the County to employment destinations.</u>	0
Intergovernmental Partnerships and Coordination				
84	New		<u>Support intergovernmental partnerships needed to promote coordination and solve multi-jurisdictional transportation needs in rural areas</u> such as the Mt. Hood Corridor and Government Camp areas.	0

Comment [ad1]: Create hybrid: Support and promote an integrated approach to land use and transportation planning and implementation to help create livable and sustainable rural communities and areas and end reliance on long commutes.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>(proposed changes in red)</i>	Working Group Issues
Road Access Standards				
85 A	Access Standards 14.0	Plan and control access onto roads within the County, as shown on Table V-5, for urban areas and according to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines for rural areas, for both new and existing uses, and coordinate with the Oregon Department of Transportation for access control on state highways. Access standards need to be applied in a flexible manner that maintains reasonable access to property when access cannot be denied. Where access management standards are adopted by the County in Special Transportation Plans, those standards shall apply	Plan and control access onto roads within the County, as shown on Table V-5, for urban areas and according to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines for rural areas, for both new and existing uses, and coordinate with the Oregon Department of Transportation for access control on state highways. Access standards need to be applied in a flexible manner that maintains reasonable access to property when access cannot be denied. Where access management standards are adopted by the County in Special Transportation Plans, those standards shall apply	R
85 B	New – Alternate language		<u>In rural areas, proposed new access locations on County facilities should be located to meet minimum sight distance requirements per the AASHTO Guidelines based on the roadway 85th percentile speed. If the recommended minimum sight distance cannot be achieved along the property frontage due to topographical or other constraints, the access should be located along the site frontage where sight distance is maximized.</u>	R
86	Access Standards 15.0	Support the implementation of state access management standards (OAR Chapter 734, Division 51, as amended, and the Oregon Highway Plan) on state highway facilities within the Interchange Management Areas.	Support the implementation of state access management standards (OAR Chapter 734, Division 51, as amended , and the Oregon Highway Plan) on state highway facilities <u>and</u> within the Interchange Management Areas.	R M

Comment [ad2]: Would like to see new language based on TAC feedback at TAC meeting. Larry will draft up and provide to PWG.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>(proposed changes in red)</i>	Working Group Issues
Road Access Standards				
87 A	Access Standards 16.0	Improve highway operations and safety by supporting construction of public roads that provide reasonable alternative access within Interchange Management Areas. When reasonable access is provided, support the elimination of direct access to state highway facilities.	No Change	R
87 B	New – Alternate language		<u>Improve multimodal operations and safety by ensuring that Interchange Management Area plans and other access plans and projects are coordinated with multimodal connectivity standards and are designed to support safe and convenient travel for all modes, as well as safe and convenient access for all modes, when appropriate.</u>	R
88	New		<u>Ensure safe and convenient access for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users for land uses that are open to the general public.</u>	O
Agricultural equipment movement on roads				
89 A	New – Alternate language		<u>Support the safe movement of agricultural equipment in rural areas by improving existing road to county standards.</u>	O
89 B	New – Alternate language		<u>Ensure that the needs of the County’s diverse agricultural sector are supported through transportation planning and investment.</u>	O

Comment [ad3]: Recommend keeping 89A and then a second policy something like: “Develop a study to address conflicts between ag equipment and cyclists by education, signage, pullouts etc.” Group agreed that County would review and make suggestion to the language.

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>(proposed changes in red)</i>	Working Group Issues
		<i>Safety and Road Condition</i>		
90 A	New – Alternate language		<u>The County will undertake actions to improve road safety and reduce the number of preventable fatalities and serious injuries on roadways in Clackamas County by one-half in the next 10 years.</u>	O
90 B	New – Alternate language		<u>The County will work collaboratively with state, regional, and local agencies and County residents to pursue its road safety programs.</u>	O
90 C	New – Alternate language		<u>Safety shall be the first priority in making decisions for the Capital Improvement Program and for roadway operations, maintenance, and repair.</u>	O
		<i>Parking</i>		
91	Parking 1.0	Set minimum and maximum limits on allowed off-street parking relative to building size, location and use, and adjacent land uses.	Set minimum and maximum limits on allowed off-street parking for motor vehicles <u>and minimum parking for bicycles</u> relative to building size, location and use, and adjacent land uses. <i>This may not be needed in the Rural Policies</i>	R
92	Parking 8.0	On-street parking may be prohibited in front of schools as needed to assure student safety and school security, and shall be reviewed on a school by school basis.	<u>In rural areas</u> , on-street parking may be prohibited in front of schools as needed to ensure student safety and school security, and shall be reviewed on a school by school basis.	R

ID #	Current Location in Comp Plan	Current Policy	Staff Recommendations <i>(proposed changes in red)</i>	Working Group Issues
		Traffic Safety Action Plan		
93	New		<u>The Clackamas County Safety Action Plan will be adopted by reference as a Transportation System Plan implementing strategy. As it is necessary, the County Board of Commissioners will update and amend the Clackamas County Safety Action Plan to reflect any needed changes</u>	O
94	New		<u>Require a Predictive Method analysis of impacted roadway facilities along with a capacity analysis as part of traffic impact studies (TIS).</u>	R
95	New		<u>Work with state and local partners to implement the "Oregon Transportation Safety Plan"</u>	O
		Equestrian		
96	New		<u>The County's land use and transportation planning shall protect existing equestrian trails where feasible.</u>	O
97	New		<u>Soft-surface multiple-use trails, located in corridors separate from roadways are the preferred option for equestrian travel for safety reasons and to avoid conflicts with vehicles.</u>	O
98	New		<u>Support equestrian trail use by:</u> a) <u>Working with local communities and organizations to identify, protect, create and maintain multiple use trails that support horse travel.</u> b) <u>Maintaining County-owned equestrian trails.</u> c) <u>Planning for parking areas at trailheads that support trail riding and accommodate horse trailer parking.</u>	O
99	New		<u>Representatives from the equestrian community should be given the opportunity to participate in planning and development actions that may impact equestrian facilities.</u>	O

Comment [ad4]: Elizabeth suggests new policies: "Work to safely accommodate the equestrian use of the road system." "Make existing county right of ways available for equestrian use."

Comment [ad5]: Mike W and OET support 96, 97, 98 & 99 from recreation standpoint.

Comment [ad6]: This is more aspiration than a policy. Modify language to make it a policy.

