Angelo planning group

LAND USE PLANNING • TRANSPORTATION PLANNING • PROJECT MANAGEMENT

# Memorandum

**Date:** September 14, 2015

**To:** Pendleton TSP Project Management Team

**From:** Darci Rudzinski and Shayna Rehberg, Angelo Planning Group

**cc:**

**Re:** Technical Memorandum #1: Plans, Goals and Policies Document Review (Task 1.6)

## Overview

This memorandum presents a review of existing plans, regulations, and policies that affect transportation planning in the city of Pendleton. In particular, the review identifies how each document will inform the development of the Pendleton Transportation System Plan (TSP) Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Update ("TSP update").

Some documents included in this review establish policies, guidelines, and requirements related to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities and amenities with which the TSP shall be consistent. Other documents contain improvements that will need to be coordinated with those developed for the updated TSP. Local policy and regulatory documents included in this review – such as the City's Unified Development Code (UDC) – may be subject to recommended amendments, proposed in order to implement the updated TSP. This memorandum helps set the stage for those potential amendments, which will be prepared during the TSP update process as part of Task 8.2.

Table 1 provides a list of the documents reviewed in this memorandum and includes the page number on which they can be found.

**Table 1: Documents Reviewed**

| | Page |
|---|---|
| **National Documents** | |
| National Association of City Transportation Officials Urban Bikeway Design Guide (2014) | 3 |
| **State Documents** | |
| National Association of City Transportation Officials Urban Bikeway Design Guide (2014)<br><br>The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide provides cities with state-of-the-practice guidance to help create complete streets that are safe and enjoyable for bicyclists. The NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide is based on experience and guidelines from cities with robust cycling infrastructure and programming from around the world. The guide addresses six categories of treatments:<br><br>1. Bike lanes<br>2. Cycle tracks<br>3. Intersection treatments<br>4. Bicycle signals<br>5. Bikeway signing and marking<br>6. Bicycle boulevards<br><br>For each treatment in the guide, three levels of guidance are provided:<br><br>• Required – Elements for which there is a strong consensus that the treatment cannot be implemented without.<br>• Recommended – Elements for which there is a strong consensus of added value.<br>• Optional – Elements that vary across cities and may add value depending on the situation.<br><br>To assist with tailoring treatments to particular cities and locations, the guide also provides links to companion reference material and studies.<br><br>**Project Relevance:** It is expected that the Pendleton TSP update will focus on improvements to bicycle facilities that are not in-roadway (e.g., the River Walk multi-use path). However, it is still recommended that opportunities for some of the innovative in-roadway treatments that are presented in the NACTO guide be identified, particularly in areas that are more accessible to riding such as in Downtown. Where general improvements are recommended in the updated TSP, such as a separated bicycle facility, then the NACTO guide can also serve as a resource for implementation (design, engineering, and construction). | 4 |

## National Association of City Transportation Officials Urban Bikeway Design Guide (2014)

The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide provides cities with state-of-the-practice guidance to help create complete streets that are safe and enjoyable for bicyclists. The NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide is based on experience and guidelines from cities with robust cycling infrastructure and programming from around the world.[1] The guide addresses six categories of treatments:

7. Bike lanes
8. Cycle tracks
9. Intersection treatments
10. Bicycle signals
11. Bikeway signing and marking
12. Bicycle boulevards

For each treatment in the guide, three levels of guidance are provided:

- Required – Elements for which there is a strong consensus that the treatment cannot be implemented without.
- Recommended – Elements for which there is a strong consensus of added value.
- Optional – Elements that vary across cities and may add value depending on the situation.

To assist with tailoring treatments to particular cities and locations, the guide also provides links to companion reference material and studies.[2]

**Project Relevance:** It is expected that the Pendleton TSP update will focus on improvements to bicycle facilities that are not in-roadway (e.g., the River Walk multi-use path). However, it is still recommended that opportunities for some of the innovative in-roadway treatments that are presented in the NACTO guide be identified, particularly in areas that are more accessible to riding such as in Downtown. Where general improvements are recommended in the updated TSP, such as a separated bicycle facility, then the NACTO guide can also serve as a resource for implementation (design, engineering, and construction).

[1] While most of the treatments in this guide are not directly referenced in the current version of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide to Bikeway Facilities, the Federal Highway Administration has issued official support of the document.

[2] These references are included in both the online and hard copy version of the guide, available through: http://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/.

## Oregon Transportation Plan (Updated 2006)

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the comprehensive transportation 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 are translated into a series of modal plans, such as the Oregon Highway Plan and Oregon Bike and Pedestrian Plan.

The OTP emphasizes:

- 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

OTP policy promotes multi-modal travel choices that are accessible to all potential users (Policy 1.2 – Equity, Efficiency and Travel Choices) and planning for transportation systems that are environmentally responsible and that create and sustain healthy communities (policies under Goal 4, Sustainability).

> **Project Relevance:** The TSP update's focus on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements builds upon the city's existing transportation system and is strongly consistent with the OTP's emphasis on maximizing assets, providing cost-effective transportation solutions, and promoting multi-modal travel choices.

## Oregon Highway Plan (Updated 2011)

The Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) is a modal plan of the OTP that guides Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT's) Highway Division in planning, operations, and financing. Policies in the OHP emphasize the efficient management of the highway system to increase safety and to extend highway capacity, partnerships with other agencies and local governments, and the use of new techniques to improve road safety and capacity. These policies acknowledge the relationship between state highways and local road, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, rail, and air systems. Given the targeted nature of this planning process and its focus on active transportation, the following policies are particularly relevant to the TSP update.

### Policy 1A: State Highway Classification System

The State highway classification system includes five classifications: Interstate, Statewide, Regional, District, and Local Interest Roads. The five State facilities in Pendleton fall into the three classifications below and are intended to serve the following purposes.

- **Interstate highways** (I-84) 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** (US 395 and OR 11) 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.

- **District highways** (US 30 and OR 37) 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, and also serve local access and traffic. The management objective is to provide for safe and efficient, moderate to high-speed continuous-flow operation in rural areas reflecting the surrounding environment and moderate to low-speed operation in urban and urbanizing areas for traffic flow and for pedestrian and bicycle movements.

In addition to the classifications above, I-84, US 395, and OR 11 are designated freight routes.

**Project Relevance:** While several of the potential projects or programs to be developed as part of the TSP update process may focus on off-roadway pedestrian and bicycle facilities, it will be important to also seek opportunities for improvements that are on-roadway and in the right-of-way. In the cases where these roadways and right-of-ways involve State highways, the potential projects and programs will need to be balanced with the function of those roadways for moving vehicular and freight traffic.

### 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 that state highways serve as the main streets of many communities and strives to maintain a balance between serving local communities (accessibility) and the through traveler (mobility). Special land use designations for highway segments may change or allow for flexibility in the applicable ODOT design standards, mobility standards, and access management spacing standards within the segment. For example, inside a designated Special Transportation Area (STA), local access is a priority. US 30 in Downtown Pendleton is designated as a STA.

**Project Relevance:** Potential improvements that are developed and recommended as part of the TSP update process within the segment of US 30 designated as a STA will be evaluated through the lens of providing more accessibility within this area.

### 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.

**Project Relevance:** This TSP update will focus on multi-modal improvements to the local transportation system and recommended improvements that may reduce future vehicular traffic on roadways. ODOT will work with the City and project stakeholders to identify improvements to the local road system that are consistent with and that will support the safety and function of State facilities in the city.

### Policy 2F: Traffic Safety

This policy emphasizes the state's efforts to improve the safety of all users of the highway system. Action 2F.4 calls for the development and implementation of the Safety Management System to target resources to sites with the most significant safety issues.

**Project Relevance:** Improving the safety of walking and bicycle riding is critical in getting significantly more residents and visitors walking and riding in the city. Therefore, safety will be a focus of developing and prioritizing projects and programs as part of TSP update process.

### Policy 4B: Alternative Passenger Modes

This policy encourages the development of alternative passenger services and systems as part of broader corridor strategies. It promotes the development of alternative passenger transportation services located off the highway system to help preserve the performance and function of the state highway system.

**Project Relevance:** The City, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), and a few other smaller organizations provide public transportation service in the city. Improving safety, access, and mobility for transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists is the primary objective of this TSP update process.

## Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (Updated 2011)

The purpose of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan is to facilitate safe and accessible bicycling and walking facilities in an effort to encourage increased levels of bicycling and walking. The plan is comprised of two parts: the Policy and Action Plan and the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide.

Originally adopted in 1995 and reaffirmed as an element of the OTP in 2006, the Policy and Action Plan is currently being updated as the "Bicycle and Pedestrian Mode Plan." The second part of the plan – the Design Guide – was updated in 2011.

The existing Policy and Action Plan provides background information, including relevant state and federal laws, and includes goals, actions, and implementation strategies proposed by ODOT to improve bicycle and pedestrian transportation. The plan states that bikeway and walkway systems will be established on state highways as follows:

- As part of modernization projects (bike lanes and sidewalks will be included);
- As part of preservation projects, where minor upgrades can be made;
- By restriping roads with bike lanes;
- With improvement projects, such as completing short missing segments of sidewalks;
- As bikeway or walkway modernization projects;
- By developers as part of permit conditions, where warranted.

The Design Guide is the technical element of the plan that guides the design and management of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on state-owned facilities. It has been designated as a companion piece to the Highway Design Manual (Appendix L) and includes updated and innovative pedestrian and bicycle treatments.

- On-road bikeways
- Restriping roads (road diets)
- Bicycle parking
- Walkways
- Street crossings
- Intersections
- Shared-use paths

**Project Relevance:** Along with NACTO guide and the Highway Design Manual the standards and guidelines for pedestrian and bicycle improvements in the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide can serve as "best practices" to inform recommended bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the updated TSP. Like the NACTO guide, the Design Guide offers guidance and standards for bike lanes, cycle tracks, bicycle boulevards, signs and marking, and intersections. Importantly, the Design Guide also addresses shared-use paths, which the NACTO guide does not include.

Pedestrian and bicycle interests are represented on the TSP update Advisory Committee.

## Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012) (Updated 2011)

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), OAR 660-012, implements Goal 12 (Transportation) of the statewide planning goals. The TPR contains numerous

requirements governing transportation planning and project development, including the required elements of a TSP.

In addition to plan development, the TPR requires local government to ensure that its land use regulations implement its TSP (Section -0045), even if that entails making amendments to the land use regulations. 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 compliance with Section -0045 requirements is achieved through a variety of measures, including code requirements for pedestrian and bicycle connections within sites and to the surrounding transportation system and for the provision of transit-related amenities.

The most recent amendments to TPR, which went into effect in 2012, include 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. The amendments also allow a local government to amend a functional plan, comprehensive plan, or land use regulation without applying mobility targets (V/C, for example) if the subject area is within a designated multi-modal mixed-use area (MMA).

> **Project Relevance:** The TPR provides direction for the development of local TSPs and requires specific transportation elements be implemented in the local development code. Implementation measures that will be developed through the TSP update process may involve amendments to the Unified Development Code to ensure consistency with TPR requirements, as well as to reflect TSP recommendations.

## Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 366.215 (2013)

ORS 366.215 states the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) may not permanently reduce the vehicle-carrying capacity of an identified freight route, specifically "when altering, relocating, changing or realigning a state highway unless safety or access considerations require the reduction." State highways in Pendleton that are subject to reduction of capacity review (otherwise referred to as "Reduction Review Routes") are I-84, US 395, and OR 11, which are designated freight routes in the OHP. Pursuant to the statute, the OTC may grant a local government an exemption if it finds that the exemption is "in the best interest of the state and that freight movement is not unreasonably impeded by the exemption."

OAR 731-012 implements ORS 366.215; it defines terms used in the statute and establishes a review process for potential reductions of vehicle carrying capacity. Key terms are defined as follows:

- "Reduction of vehicle-carrying capacity" means a permanent reduction in the horizontal or vertical clearance of a highway section, by a permanent physical obstruction to motor vehicles located on useable right-of-way subject to Commission jurisdiction, unless such changes are supported by the Stakeholder Forum, which is established as part of the administrative rule.

- "Permanent reduction" refers to a reduction that is intended to be permanently left in place after installation and is not easily removable for short-term expansion of vehicle-carrying capacity. Permanent structures could include, but are not limited to, traffic signals, signposts, stationary bollards, curbs, trees, medians, roundabouts, streetlights, and overhead wiring. If there is uncertainty as to whether a structure is permanent, ODOT will consult with the Stakeholder Forum.

Pursuant to Section -0050, ODOT staff is responsible for determining if the proposed action has the potential for reducing vehicle-carrying capacity. Staff is to involve other appropriate ODOT staff and, as needed, outside professionals in order to make a determination. According to the definitions in Section -0010, street markings such as bike lane striping or on street parking are not considered a reduction of vehicle-carrying capacity.

**Project Relevance**: Unless improvements being considered during the TSP update process involve potential permanent reductions on a highway designated a Reduction Review Route, a review of potential reduction of vehicle-carrying capacity pursuant to ORS 366.215 and OAR 731-012 will not be needed. As established in OAR 731-012-0010, bicycle-related improvements such as bike lane striping do not constitute a reduction of vehicle-carrying capacity.

## Highway Design Manual (2012)

The Highway Design Manual (HDM) provides uniform design standards and procedures for ODOT and is generally consistent with the 2001 AASHTO *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*. Some key areas where guidance is provided are the location and design of new construction, major reconstruction, and resurfacing, restoration, or rehabilitation (3R) projects.

### Chapter 12 Public Transit Guidelines

This chapter in the HDM provides guidance for integrating public transportation design into ODOT projects, local agency projects, and developer projects. Guidance is provided for the following transit-related design elements:

- Transit stops – Including spacing, location, and design of bus stops
- Accessibility and amenities – Sidewalks, fully accessible transit stops, shelters, shade, seating, signage, trash receptacles, bicycle parking, transit arrival information, and accommodation for future amenities
- Safety and security – Transit stop location, visibility, illumination, soundwalls, and landscaping

- Roadway and intersection design – Shoulder width, right-of-way, clearance, turning radii, curbs, and pads for buses
- Park-and-ride facilities – Needs assessment, site selection, access, site design, internal circulation, amenities, lighting and security, signs and pavement markings, bicycle parking, and ADA accessible parking

### Chapter 13 Pedestrian and Bicycle

This chapter provides guidance for bicycle and pedestrian facilities on State highways. Other chapters address the design of intersections, interchanges, and public transportation and provide similar or additional bicycle and pedestrian design considerations. Appendix L of the HDM contains the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide, which also serves as the technical element of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and is a comprehensive guide for bicycle and pedestrian design.

Chapter 13 identifies the parts of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide that apply to State highways, given that the Design Guide also contains design guidance that only applies to city and county roads. The following is an outline of design guidelines for State highways that are addressed in Chapter 13.

- On-road bikeways – Greater accommodation on Scenic Bikeways, National Bike Routes, and other specially designated bikeways (note: there are no such specially designated bikeways currently in Pendleton)
- Urban bicycle accommodation – Shoulders and bike lanes, shared lanes, and parallel streets
- Lane reconfigurations – Requires Region Traffic Engineer/Manager approval and a freight mobility review (described in HDM Appendix C), design examples in Appendix L
- Bicycle parking – Design criteria for bicycle parking in right-of-way and for transit stops/park-and-ride lots
- Walkways – Pedestrian accommodation (e.g., sidewalks, crossing facilities even when no sidewalks), ADA accessibility (e.g., widths, grades, cross-slopes, curb ramps), sidewalk dimensions, 4R sidewalks widths, buffer strips, surfacing, railings, transit stops
- Street crossings – Locations, design, medians and islands, curb extensions, lighting/illumination, crosswalks (including pedestrian-activated beacons, signing), issues covered in more detail in Appendix L (e.g., transit stops, maintenance)
- Intersections – Intersection design (covered in-depth in HDM Chapter 8), other pedestrian and bicycle considerations
- Separated paths – Types of paths that can be constructed related to ODOT facilities (shared-use paths adjacent to expressways, bike lanes on separate alignment (cycle tracks), and off-highway trail connections), design standards (AASHTO, design exception), one-way and two-way separated paths, clearance/shy distance/grade

Because Chapter 12 limits its guidance to bicycle and pedestrian facilities on State facilities, the NACTO guide and Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide can serve as the preferred references for city facilities.

**Project Relevance:** Given the focus of this TSP update on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements, it is key to consider design guidance from documents such as the NACTO guide, HDM Chapters 12 and 13, and the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide. While there is ample guidance for pedestrian and bicycle facilities in all of these resources, HDM Chapter 12 is the only of these documents to provide design guidance for transit projects. Guidance related to park-and-ride facilities in HDM Chapters 12 and 13 is of particular interest, as establishing park-and-ride site(s) and general design is an objective of the TSP update.

## US 395 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) (2010)

The I-84/US 395 interchange is an urban interchange that connects US 395, a statewide highway and freight route, with I-84. US 395 serves as a major connection between the north and south sides of the Pendleton community, being one of the few roadways under I-84. The US 395 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) was prepared and adopted to ensure that development will occur in the vicinity of the interchange without compromising the operation of the facility. In addition to this general purpose, a set of objectives was established for the IAMP process, the following of which most closely relate to objectives of the TSP update process:

- *Identify and prioritize transportation improvements needed to maintain acceptable traffic operations at the proposed interchange while providing safe access to land uses in the management area.*

- *Collaborate throughout the planning process with design professionals, jurisdictional representatives, developers, and local property owners and citizens.*

To address the general and more specific objectives of the IAMP process, the IAMP document includes recommended transportation improvements, land use strategies, and implementation policies that apply to a defined management area[3].

As noted in the existing transportation inventory in the IAMP, there are no public transit (fixed-route) operations within the IAMP management area. However, the City operates an on-demand service and contracts with local taxi service to provide transportation options for senior and disabled residents citywide. In terms of pedestrian and bicycle

[3] The management area (Figure 1-1 in the IAMP) extends more than a one-quarter mile north and south of the interchange, reaching to SW 14th and Emigrant/Frazer on the east side of the area north of interchange and to the vacant land west of the Walmart Supercenter on the west side of the area north of the interchange. In the area south of the interchange, the management area extends along US 395 south of SW 30th Avenue, plus reaches west to include land on the hillside behind Burger King and the US Forest Service office and east to include Olney Cemetery and vacant land adjacent to the cemetery.

facilities, sidewalks are found adjacent to basically all of the roadways in the management area. Bike lanes are generally found on collectors and arterials in the management area, with the significant exception of SW 20th Street, which connects SW Court Place and Westgate Avenue (US 30). Pedestrian and bike counts conducted for the IAMP north of SW 30th Street in the management area found the greatest pedestrian activity on SW Emigrant Avenue (and at the SW 17th Street/SW Emigrant Avenue intersection), followed by the I-84 eastbound ramp terminals. The greatest bicycle activity was found at the SW 17th Street intersections with the SW Emigrant Avenue/SW Frazer Avenue couplet, followed by SW Dorion Avenue.

Transportation improvements are recommended in three phases (Table 7-1 and Figures 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3 in the IAMP).

- Phase 1, north side of interchange (Figure 7-1) – Recommended improvements consist primarily of realignment of westbound ramp terminal, SW 20th Street, SW Emigrant Avenue, and US 395 into single signalized intersection. Widening of SW 20th Street and SW Court Avenue is also recommended.

- Phases 2 and 3, south side of interchange (Figures 7-2 and 7-3) – Widening roads to accommodate (dual) left-turn lanes is recommended, as is closure and realignment of SW Hailey Avenue to intersect with US 395 further south and then signalization when warranted.

The IAMP also includes an access management plan that generally calls for consolidation and relocation of existing access points to support proposed transportation improvements and move closer to compliance with access spacing standards in the OHP and OAR 734-051. At the time the IAMP was being prepared, there were 26 private approaches and 17 public street approaches on the north side of the interchange and nine private and three public approaches on the south side of the interchange within 1,320 feet of the interchange ramp terminals.

**Project Relevance:** The recommendations from the IAMP will be reviewed and integrated into this TSP update as appropriate. The sidewalk and bicycle system in the IAMP management area will at the very least be maintained with the implementation of recommended improvements. However, the roadway recommendations in the IAMP – which will result in more turning lanes and greater roadway widths – present crossing challenges to walking and biking in the area. Thus, strategies to mitigate those conditions may be explored in the TSP update process. Recommended access management can improve walking and biking conditions in the IAMP management area by reducing the number of potential points of conflict between pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists, so long as pedestrian and bicycle access is otherwise provided from sites to the sidewalk (a current City of Pendleton Unified Development Code (UDC) requirement, Section 8.05 Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation).

## Barnhart Road Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) (2007)

The I-84/Barnhart Road Interchange is a rural interchange that primarily provides access to farmland as well as several Rural Industrial and Rural Tourist Commercial properties in the interchange vicinity. An IAMP was prepared for the I-84/Barnhart Road Interchange to ensure that the interchange area continues to operate and function as designed and includes a new connection between Barnhart Road and Airport Road in order to serve the Eastern Oregon Regional Airport and Airport Industrial Park. The interchange is west of the city of Pendleton and the Pendleton urban growth boundary (UGB). However, the connection to Airport Road travels into the city and its UGB in order to serve the airport and the Airport Industrial Park.

As part of the existing transportation inventory, the IAMP established that there were no public transportation (fixed-route) operations within the IAMP study area. There were no identified bicycle or pedestrian facilities along any of the roadways within the study area, and field observations found no pedestrian or bicycle activity, which was expected in this rural environment with limited commercial uses.

Recommendations in the IAMP address short-term and medium-/long-term transportation improvements, street cross-sections, traffic control, and access management. Short-term interchange area improvement projects consist primarily of a connector roadway between Barnhart Road and the Airport Industrial Area (Table 6-1 and Figure 6-1 in the IAMP). The cross section for improvements in this area (Figure 6-2) shows two 11-foot travel lanes, 6-foot paved shoulders, and 2-foot gravel shoulders. The 6-foot paved shoulders provide a standard shoulder bikeway and walkway in a rural environment.

Medium-/long-term interchange area improvement projects feature realignment of off-ramps to bring its intersections with Barnhart Road close to 90-degree angles (Table 6-2 and Figure 6-3). The access management plan consists of consolidation of accesses to the new connector road north of interchange (Table 6-1 and Table 6-3) and consolidation and relocation of access south of interchange, subject to transportation impact analysis (Table 6-2 and Table 6-3).

Additional implementation measures involve establishment of an Interchange Management Area and Airport Industrial Area in which additional inter-agency coordination and transportation analysis is required when development is proposed in these areas. In order to fund recommended medium/long-term improvements, the City of Pendleton committed to developing a system development change (SDC) ordinance and overlay zone for the Airport Industrial Area and, likewise, Umatilla County committed to developing a funding mechanism and overlay zone for the Interchange Management Area.

**Project Relevance:** To the extent that IAMP policies and projects are not already incorporated into the Pendleton TSP, they will be considered during this TSP update. Seeing as this IAMP primarily addresses rural area outside of the city of Pendleton and the UGB, it does not provide much relevance for the TSP update in

terms of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements. However, the recommended new connection between Barnhart Road and Airport Road should be considered for future transit service as it provides increased access to the airport and Airport Industrial Park. Improved multi-modal access between Pendleton and the airport area is also addressed by the Pendleton Airport Industrial Park Transportation Impact Analysis, reviewed later in this memorandum.

## Umatilla County Transportation System Plan (2002)

The Umatilla County Transportation System Plan (TSP) is the County's long-range plan for developing and managing its transportation system. It establishes goals, policies, and improvements to support planned land uses and population growth over the next 20 years. Umatilla County is affected and involved in the Pendleton TSP update process to the extent that recommended system improvements involve county roads in the city or in urban growth areas (areas inside the City UGB but outside city limits).

Goals and objectives in the Umatilla TSP that address the County's relationship to the City in transportation and land use planning and relate to the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit focus of the Pendleton TSP update include the following:

- Goal 1, Objective C – Promote alternative modes of transportation.
- Goal 1, Objective D – Promote transportation demand management programs.
- Goal 2 – Ensure that the road system within the county is adequate to meet public needs, including those of the transportation disadvantaged.
- Goal 4, Objective F – Continue to work with cities planning for the county land within their urban growth boundaries.

Roadway improvement projects that are recommended in the County TSP and that involve roadways within Pendleton include the following:

- SW Hailey Avenue – From SW 30th to SW 37th Street, install curb, gutter, sidewalk, and pavement
- SW 28th Drive extension – To proposed extension of SW 37th Street, construct new City collector (City standards)
- Set of "City Acquisition/Urban Upgrades" – SW 28th Drive, SW 30th Street, SE 100th Street, Southgate Place, Reith Road West, Clopton Road, Riverside Avenue, and SW 44th Street

**Project Relevance:** Existing County policies support the objectives of the Pendleton TSP update and Pendleton-related projects in the County TSP have been captured in the current adopted Pendleton TSP. Where improvements

involving County roads or to roadways in urban growth areas are considered during this TSP update process, the City will undertake focused coordination with the County to ensure consistency between adopted plans.

## Umatilla County Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan (2014)

The Umatilla County Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan guides the investment of Special Transportation Fund (STF) funds to maximize service to seniors and people with disabilities within the county. ODOT's Public Transit Division oversees the STF and Oregon Administrative Rule requires every STF agency to develop a coordinated plan that establishes a long-range vision for public transportation in its service area. Federal MAP-21 legislation in 2012 affirmed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requirements to use coordinated plans to target rural areas for funding and serve the needs of seniors and those with disabilities. Additionally, consolidation of the federal Job Access program with the 5311 program promotes consideration of employment transportation as part of the coordinated planning process.

The Umatilla County Special Transportation Committee, appointed by the Umatilla County Board of Commissioners, serves as the STF agency for the County and, in addition to CTUIR, oversees and provides direction for special transportation services in the county.

The following vision statement was established for the coordinated plan development process, to help guide discussions and direct special transportation services:

> *To work together in order to accurately assess existing operations & services (what's working now), needs, and strategies in order to provide the framework towards providing efficient, affordable transportation to best meet the needs of users in our County, specifically low income, seniors and people with disabilities and furthermore, to assist patrons with limited English proficiency.*

The following transportation services and resources are documented for Pendleton in the coordinated plan:

- The City participates in the STF and Discretionary Fund programs and is an STF provider/agency.
- The City runs a demand response dial-a-ride van service for the general public, which operates from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. weekdays, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Saturdays, and from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. Sundays.
- The City provides tickets for taxi service for seniors and people with disabilities, which operates all days, except holidays, for 22 hours a day.
- The City also provides senior meal site transportation, parks and recreation inter-park rides in the summer, and aquatic center transport in the summer. These services are contracted with Elite Taxis, Inc.

At the time this plan was developed, the City owned four vans and one 14-passenger bus; the bus and one van were leased to CTUIR and the three other vans were being used in its dial-a-ride service.

The number of trips provided by the City is not broken out in the coordinated plan. Overall, the plan reports that providers, including CTUIR, provided approximately 18,000 trips per month. Distances and hours traveled vary from month to month. A significant portion of the trips made each month are trips for medical appointments. Two other top-ranked trip purposes registered in surveys include shopping and senior-related activities.

Transportation needs were reported by the human service agencies, Special Transportation users, and the general public during the coordinated plan development process. These needs were reviewed and prioritized by the STF Advisory Committee and by participants in stakeholder meetings, resulting in the following transit service recommendations in which Pendleton is a "responsible party" as a STF provider.

1. Advocate for consistent funding to maintain existing transportation programs/levels. Responsible Parties: Blue Mountain Inter-Regional Transportation Administration (BIRTA), County, STF Committee, STF Providers.
2. Provide outreach and education – marketing. Strategy: Provide services in English and Spanish. Responsible Party: Not identified at this time due to concerns about lack of funding. Note: The BIRTA website is up and running, and is supposed to be a way for each organization to update information on the website, subject to a nominal membership fee.
3. Obtain new funding to address unmet transportation needs and the ability to administer a coordinated effort for the County's transportation needs. Responsible Parties: County, STF Committee, STF Providers.
4. Enhance fixed routes/intercity routes between Pendleton and Hermiston. Strategies: Match up ridership with available systems; assess need for graduated scale and pay for riders; and list county providers with service areas. Responsible Parties: County, STF Committee, STF Providers, CTUIR.
5. Make capital purchase as useful life and community requires. Responsible Party: Providers.

**Project Relevance:** The TSP update will consider incorporating recommended priorities from the coordinated plan as appropriate.

## Mobility Management Project (2011)

The primary aim of the Mobility Management Project was to assess the range of current specialized and public transportation services operating within Umatilla County and examine opportunities to enhance and coordinate marketing and public information tools for local transportation providers.

Recommendations in the report focus on cost-effective solutions, working to maximize existing services and resources. Recommendations include:

- Create a transit consortium to coordinate local and regional transit services in Umatilla County. The focus of the consortium can be on marketing and information, but could also address issues such as schedule compatibility, transfers, fares, joint operating opportunities, and elimination of service duplication.
- Use coordinated marketing to improve access to public transportation in Umatilla County, particularly to improve understanding about the services that are available to the public and who is eligible to use them.
- Create centralized regional transit information, including printed information, a website, and a phone service.
- Develop a regional brand for transit services in Umatilla County (a name and logo) that would not replace the existing transit service names or logos, but would be used to supplement them, highlighting the fact that all of the agencies work together, and can help riders make trips locally and regionally.
- Improve the visibility of existing transit services with improved signage.
- Participate in shared advertising and public relations, such as advertising in local newspapers, billboards, and possibly logo placement (of the consortium's brand) within other advertisements. Press releases regarding improved transit services that highlight collaboration and the availability of transit may be a more effective and cost-efficient way to promote transit.

The report identifies funding sources for specialized and public transportation services in the county in 2009-2011, including Special Transportation Fund (STF)/Special Transportation Operating (STO) program, 5311 program (including FTA 5311, FTA 5311 Inter-City, and ARRA 5311), FTA 5310 program, local general funds, tribal funds, and fares and donations. In 2009-2011, over $3 million (or about $1.7 million per year) was spent on providing specialized and public transportation services within Umatilla County.

The report does not identify potential new funding sources. However, as part of next steps, it recommends securing a grant for a mobility manager position to help advance these, and other, coordination goals and objectives, which could include exploration of funding opportunities. Other next steps that the report recommends include:

- Establish a formal mechanism for the transit operators to work together to agree on priority collaborative public information efforts and to prioritize those tools which can be carried out in the immediate term and longer term.

- Establish a marketing consortium as a forum for carrying forward any of the other public information tasks.

**Project Relevance:** The TSP update should consider incorporating recommendations and next steps, in part or in full, from the Mobility Management Project report.

## Umatilla County Public Transit Needs Assessment (1999)

The Umatilla County Public Transit Needs Assessment report presents the results of an evaluation of the public transportation needs of the general public and of those with special needs in Umatilla County. It identifies gaps in service and proposes strategies to meet those gaps. Service gaps and needs were identified and strategies to address those needs were developed based on a review of existing information and phone interviews with service providers, employers, social service staff, and representatives of community groups.

The report makes the following recommendations regarding strategies to address identified needs.

- Service providers, the County, and its jurisdictions should consider establishing a brokerage to support coordination and cooperation among both transit and social service trip providers.
- Communities and social service providers should work together to coordinate and expand local intra-city programs. These services may expand to serve some of the rural unserved or underserved areas.
- Umatilla County should work with its jurisdictions, CTUIR, and Department of Human Resources to expand or establish general public intercity transit service.
- Umatilla County should work with employers in Hermiston and Pendleton to establish rideshare service between Hermiston and Pendleton. This includes the development of a park-and-ride lot each at I-84 interchanges near Pendleton and Hermiston.

To support these recommendations, the report also identifies general comprehensive plan policies for the county and its jurisdictions to consider for adoption.

- The County, its jurisdictions, and the State should coordinate to provide public transportation.
- Support the coordination of existing transportation services.
- Support the development of intercity transit service. Part of this policy should reference the need to have access to the other modes including Amtrak, Greyhound, and commercial air service. Specify communities that should be served by improved intercity service.
- Develop transportation demand management strategies.
- Public transportation shall serve the transportation disadvantaged.
- Large employers shall work with jurisdictions to develop rideshare programs.

**Project Relevance:** Although this report is relatively dated, its recommendations dovetail with those from other transit-related documents reviewed in this memorandum. As will be the case for those documents, the updated TSP will need to be consistent with the recommendations of this report. Recommendations related to comprehensive plan policies will be reviewed and considered as transit policies are updated for the TSP.

## City of Pendleton Comprehensive Plan (Updated 2013)

The City of Pendleton Comprehensive Plan is intended to be a long-range policy guide for land use within the city's UGB. According to City staff, there is no one single City Comprehensive Plan document currently, but rather a collection of documents and reports that contain the City's land use and transportation policies.

Discrete elements of the Comprehensive Plan were updated during a periodic review work program in 2011-2013. Elements that were updated include:

- Historic Resource Inventory and historic preservation amendments (Goal 5)
- Commercial Buildable Lands Inventory (Goal 9)
- Residential Buildable Lands Inventory (Goal 10)
- Comprehensive Plan map amendments, including Residential and Mixed Use Opportunity Areas

The 1996 and 2007 TSPs have served as the Transportation Element (Goal 12) of the Comprehensive Plan, and the updated TSP, once adopted, will serve in the same capacity. Currently, there is not a consolidated set of transportation policies that City staff use for making findings of consistency for proposed zone changes and other legislative amendments [have City confirm, modify, or remove this statement]. Pedestrian, bicycle, and transit policies will be developed during this TSP update.

**Project Relevance:** The updated TSP is intended to be adopted as the Transportation Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, replacing the bicycle, pedestrian, and transit portions of the 2007 TSP. New pedestrian, bicycle, and transit policies will be drafted as part of implementation tasks in the TSP update process. These policies will be informed by goals and objectives established in Technical Memorandum #2, by documents reviewed in this memorandum, and by input received from participants in the Project Management Team meetings, Advisory Committee meetings, and public outreach events that are part of the TSP update process.

## City of Pendleton Unified Development Code (2014)

The City of Pendleton Unified Development Code (UDC) regulates development within the city and implements the long-range land use vision that is embodied in the City Comprehensive Plan.

The UDC contains several sets of key requirements that relate to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit modes. Requirements of particular relevance to the TSP update are found in the following code sections.

- Section 8.05 (Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation) – Connections between building entrances and the street
- Section 8.06.8 (Design Requirements for Parking Lots), Subsection O (Bicycle Parking) – Bicycle parking location and design
- Section 9.01 (Blocks) – Block length and perimeter standards for land divisions
- Section 9.08 (Pedestrian Walkways) – Sidewalks on streets, variances, materials, and access easements
- Section 9.09 (Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Ways) – Access ways to connect cul-de-sacs and through long blocks
- Section 9.11 (Design of Streets) – Street design consistency with AASHTO and MUTCD standards, option of NACTO guidelines, table of design standards for public streets
- Section 11.01.4 (Development Permit Required), Subsection E – Construction and dedication of public improvements, improvement districts, potential waivers

**Project Relevance:** Existing UDC requirements generally align with the objectives of the TSP update, requiring provision of important pedestrian and bicycle facilities and amenities. As the TSP update process progresses and recommendations are formed, the UDC will be evaluated to assess if amendments are needed to implement the recommendations in the updated TSP. UDC amendments will also be considered where needed to provide consistency between the UDC, TSP, and Standard Specifications and to strengthen compliance with the TPR.

## City of Pendleton Transportation System Plan (2007)

The City of Pendleton Transportation System Plan (TSP) is the City's long-range plan for developing and managing its transportation system. It establishes goals, objectives, and improvements to support planned land uses and population growth over the next 20 years.

The City's current TSP was adopted in 2007. While the 2007 TSP is oriented toward motorized transportation and the roadway system, it includes the following documents, some of which address non-motorized and transit improvements:

- Long Range Projects
- Proposed Roadways
- Proposed Bike Facilities
- Proposed Pedestrian Facilities
- Proposed Development Code Amendments

By updating the transit, bicycle, and pedestrian components of the TSP, the City seeks to improve its ability to construct safe and efficient infrastructure for alternative and active transportation in Pendleton and between Pendleton and other communities in the region.

**Project Relevance:** This TSP update will build upon the 2007 TSP by updating its pedestrian, bicycle, and transit elements. It will be adopted as the Transportation Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. As part of the update process (Task 8.2), new pedestrian, bicycle, and transit policies will also be developed to guide major land use decision making in the city.

## City of Pendleton Capital Improvement Plan (2014-2015 – 2018-2019)

The City of Pendleton Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) programs the funding and construction of significant capital projects in the city for five-year periods. As prefaced in the cover letter for the 2014-2015 – 2018-2019 CIP, recent funding of street maintenance and capital projects has fallen short of needed funding. Even with the passage of the State gas tax increase, approximately 40% of needed funding is available.

The following special transportation projects and street projects are programmed for 2015-2019, with the corresponding funding sources.

- Replacement vehicles (ODOT grant and City matching funds)
- Bus shelter at Grecian Heights Park (ODOT grant and City matching funds)
- Preservation/overlays (State Tax Street Fund and unfunded)
- Sidewalk Local Improvement Districts (LID)
- 8th Street Bridge (Federal Highway Bridge Renewal/Replacement (HBRR) and City/County matching funds)
- SW Hailey Bridge and extension (Undetermined)

**Project Relevance:** Improvements recommended in the updated TSP will be coordinated with projects programmed in the existing CIP and will be incorporated in the future CIP. If there is the potential for coordination with a CIP project that is partially unfunded or funding is currently undetermined, then the TSP will identify where the opportunity exists to help fund the CIP project. There may also be opportunities to coordinate projects recommended in in the updated TSP with non-transportation projects, such as storm drainage and water projects.

## Pavement Management Program Budget Options Report (2013)

The Pavement Management Program Budget Options Report was prepared in order to assist the City in identifying street maintenance priorities. Preparation of the report involved the development and analysis of multiple scenarios to determine the most cost-effective plan for maintaining the City's street networks over 10 years and at various funding levels.

Pavement condition of local streets was assessed using a pavement condition index (PCI), and prior PCI scores for local streets were updated. The assessment of the City's approximately 74 centerline miles of paved streets, with an estimated value of $154.8 million (2013 cost to reconstruct all streets), yielded an overall PCI score of 68 out of 100, placing roadway system in the upper range of "fair" condition. Individual streets with a PCI under 25 require complete reconstruction, which applies to 9% of local streets in Pendleton.

Identified 2013 funding streams for street preservation included the Federal Highway Fund pass-through (which was potentially going to go bankrupt in September 2014) and the City's share of State gas tax. The City's funding was split evenly between these two sources. The report consists of the following four scenarios, with corresponding expenditures over a 10-year period.

- Current funding – Continue current level of spending ($3 million)
- Maintain current PCI – Maintain streets in current condition ($7 million)
- Increase PCI by 5 points – Slightly improve streets ($17 million)
- Unconstrained budget – All streets improved to "good" condition, increase PCI by up to 15 points ($36 million)

Given these scenarios and 2013 funding streams for street preservation, the City Manager and Public Works Director presented the following alternatives to the Mayor and City Council.

1. Provide no additional local funding for street preservation.
2. Direct staff to work on level of funding for:
   a. Maintaining street system PCI;
   b. Increasing street system PCI by 5 points;
   c. Increasing street system PCI by 15 points; or
   d. Increasing street system PCI between 5 to 15 points.
3. If item 2, direct staff to work on funding options:
   a. Solely a gas tax ($125,000 for every $0.01 per gallon);
   b. Blend of gas tax and other options (frontage, access, etc.); or

c. Blend of other options.

4. If item 3 with a gas tax:
   a. Flat rate with no increase over time;
   b. Provide an inflationary index for increase over time; and/or
   c. Provide reduction in local gas tax for any increase from federal or state.

Staff presented the scenarios and options above at a City Council meeting, and recommended that they be directed to focus on local funding alternatives to raise the PCI by 5 to 15 points. Council action was not formally requested or made at that time.[4]

[4] Minutes from November 5, 2013 City Council meeting, http://pendleton.or.us/sites/pendleton.or.us/files/File/city-council/minutes/11-5-13%20Minutes.pdf

**Project Relevance:** The state of transportation funding for pavement maintenance projects emphasizes the need to seek creative ways to implement transportation projects and maximize existing funding. Where improvements developed and recommended as part of the TSP update process involve streets and existing public right-of-way, opportunities will be sought to coordinate these with needed pavement improvements, with the possibility of finding ways to achieve multiple objectives. Further, given the TSP update's emphasis on improving transportation options, increasing the number of community members who are not driving alone can reduce impacts on and degradation of the City's road and pavement system.

## City of Pendleton Standard Specifications (2001)

The City's Standard Specifications provide technical specifications for public works projects. General (narrative) specifications are provided for streets (Section 3:04) and for curbs, gutter, sidewalks, and driveways (Section 3:05).

Engineering drawings of street elements are provided in the 200 series of the Standard Plans (dates on the drawings ranging from 1981 to 2004). They include the following drawings:

- Standard Plan 201 – Typical roadway section for Arterial Street, Collector Street, Minor Street (industrial), and Minor Street (residential)
- Standard Plan 201A – Minimum typical roadway sections for Collector and Minor Streets
- Standard Plan 201B – Minimum typical roadway sections for Arterial Street
- Standard Plan 201C – Minimum typical roadway sections for Industrial Street
- Standard Plan 203 – Standard Cul-de-sac for Residential Streets
- Standard Plans 206-209 and 214-215 – Curb, gutter, and sidewalk details
- Standard Plans 211A-211B – Wheelchair ramp standards
- Standard Plans 212-213 – Driveway approach and standards

**Project Relevance:** The Standard Specifications document can guide designs for pedestrian-, bicycle-, and transit-related improvements in the TSP update. The specifications will also be reviewed once recommendations and improvements are identified during the TSP update process, in order to assess whether changes to the specifications are needed to ensure consistency between them, the updated TSP, and the UDC.

## Pendleton Downtown Plan (2011)

The Pendleton Downtown Plan was prepared through a consensus and community-based process to support and promote community identity, economic development, and transportation options – including connections to surrounding neighborhoods and the Umatilla Riverfront – in Downtown Pendleton. The plan builds on prior planning efforts

for specific planning districts, including the Riverside and Railroad Subdistricts, the South Main Historic District, and the River Quarter Plan Overlay District.

The following recommendations from the plan address improvements in pedestrian, bicycle, and transit conditions in Downtown Pendleton.

- Multi-modal circulation plan – Address and balance motorized and non-motorized transportation needs. Through modifications to existing Downtown streetscape, improve pedestrian mobility and safety, improve accommodations for cyclists, trucks, and deliveries, and ensure progression of traffic through Downtown at appropriate speeds.

- Bicycle system improvements – Install sharrows in outside lanes on Main Street, install wayfinding and route signage; and install short-term and long-term (covered) bicycle parking.

- Pedestrian system improvements – Install curb extensions at each intersection and at existing mid-block crossings on Main Street. Apply paving and striping treatments to accentuate crossings. Install appropriate and consistent street trees on Main Street. Add parking lot perimeter and island landscaping and swales. Create public plaza and festival space.

- Transit system improvements – Develop transit amenities such as bus stop shelters with posted schedules and transit kiosks. Combine transit-specific amenities with seating areas, bicycle parking, and lighting. Coordinate with CTUIR and other transit providers to improve service between hotels, airports, Wildhorse Resort and Casino, and Downtown.

The plan also includes recommendations specific improvements to existing subdistricts within the Downtown Plan area.

- Umatilla River Subdistrict, north side of river – Install multi-use path. Improve landscaping and existing parking lot. Install overlook. Add access to river. Improve NW Bailey Avenue/N Main Street crosswalk.

- Umatilla River Subdistrict, north side of river – Redevelop land north (on riverfront) and south of Byers Avenue. Differentiate pedestrian zone and bike zone on River Walk. Construct overlook. Improve SW Byers Avenue/S Main Street crosswalk.

- Railroad Subdistrict – Add parking lot landscaping and shading. Install public art on sidewalks/at intersections. Make pedestrian treatment and street trees consistent along S Main Street. Improve SW Frazer Avenue/S Main Street crosswalk.

In terms of implementation, the plan makes recommendations under the categories of strategic planning actions and community investments. Strategic planning action recommendations include the following:

1. Form an Implementation Steering Committee
2. Develop and adopt Comprehensive Plan amendments that would consist of policies regarding Goal 9 (Recreation), Goal 10 (Housing), and Goal 12 (Transportation)
3. Develop and adopt Development Code amendments that would include changes to base zone(s) and creation of a form-based overlay zone similar to the River Quarter Overlay

Community investment recommendations distinguish funding responsibilities for improvements as follows:

- City and ODOT responsibility – Main Street improvements (including potential festival street improvements), SE 1st Street and SW 1st Street improvements [Have City confirm, modify, or remove inclusion of festival street improvements and SE 1st and SW 1st Street improvements in this bullet]
- City and private property/business owner responsibility – Parking lot improvements, landscape improvements
- City responsibility – Umatilla River Subdistrict improvements and Railroad Subdistrict gateway/right-of-way improvements

**Project Relevance:** The TSP update will incorporate multi-modal, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit recommendations from the Downtown Plan as appropriate. It will confirm funding responsibilities for these improvements as well as identify funding sources more specifically.

## River Quarter Enhancement Plan (2010)

The River Quarter is bounded by the Umatilla River on the north and the first public street to the south of the river, from Westgate Bridge on the west to the eastern border of the Urban Renewal District to the east. As stated at the outset of the plan, the River Quarter Enhancement Plan was adopted to "promote the health, safety and general welfare of the City of Pendleton, Oregon and its citizens, including protection of the environment, conservation of land, energy and natural resources, reduction in vehicular traffic congestion, more efficient use of public funds, health benefits of a pedestrian environment, historic preservation, education and recreation, reduction in sprawl development, and improvement of the built environment." The plan implements an urban renewal plan for this part of Downtown Pendleton.

The plan establishes several elements that strongly influence the pedestrian (and, by extension, bicycle and transit) environment in this part of Downtown Pendleton.

- "The block and building" – Establishes objectives for buildings, landscaping, and right-of-way treatment including accommodating all modes, creating inviting and safe public spaces, and reflecting local climate, topography, and history.

- "Community scale plans"
    - Thoroughfares – Includes "thoroughfare" standards in which pedestrian comfort and safety shall be primary and north-south streets in the central subdistrict shall provide pedestrian/open space areas at their termini at the River Walk, which can also be used secondarily for parking.
    - Sidewalk amenities – Specifies required sidewalk amenities and a menu of options for other amenities.
    - Sidewalk zones – Establishes sidewalk zones for all sidewalks along the Court Avenue frontage, including the Storefront Zone, Hallway Zone, Outside Zone, and Parking/Pedestrian Zone.

- "Building scale plans"
    - Landscaping and stormwater – Sets standards for landscaping and stormwater such as street tree spacing and height along Court and Byers Avenues, requirements for species (particularly native and hardy plants), and support for swales, planters, and other features that capture run-off.
    - Bicycle parking – Establishes off-street parking standards that require four outdoor bicycle parking spaces for every 200 feet of frontage along Court Avenue and along River Walk, and a bicycle parking plan for all applications in the River Quarter that shows the location and type of bicycle parking and how it will not interfere with pedestrian traffic.

**Project Relevance:** The River Quarter Enhancement Plan has been implemented by the City's adoption of a River Quarter Overlay Zone in the UDC. Elements of this zone, established in plan, can serve as a model for pedestrian-, bicycle-, and transit-related guidelines, standards, and improvements used and included in the TSP update.

## Pendleton Parkway Plan (2013)

This report from the River Quarter Committee to the Pendleton Development Commission (PDC) was intended to provide ideas for improving the Pendleton River Parkway so that it better serves residents, business owners, visitors, and wildlife in the area. The committee strongly recommended that security, maintenance, and cleanliness issues be addressed as a budgetary priority before any new large scale projects are undertaken.

The following recommendations from the committee relate primarily to security, maintenance, and cleanliness and are intended to be made budgetary priorities:

- Landscaping improvements and/or screening (decorative fences) for properties on south side of River Walk

- Landscape improvements on river side of River Walk, particularly in partnership with organizations such as the Umatilla Basin Watershed Council
- Trash and smoking receptacles
- Decorative and security lighting
- Art installations and murals, particularly in partnership with organizations such as the Pendleton Arts Commission

The master plan also presents the following recommendations related to access and larger-scale improvement projects:

- Access enhancements
    - Provide more points of ADA accessible access along River Walk
    - Provide/improve accessible river access at east end of River Walk, from Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) Shelter area, at 8th Street Bridge, and at Trail-Head Park

- Master plan projects
    - UPRR overlook – Improve UPRR overlook area with landscaping and restrooms
    - Little League ball fields – Install terraced seating and erosion control at the Little League park
    - Riverfront Park – Provide restrooms at Riverfront Park
    - Bedford Pedestrian Bridge – Provide lighting, landscaping, and other gateway treatments at Bedford Bridge
    - Habitat restoration – Use partnerships (e.g., Umatilla Basin Watershed Council and landowners) and grants for habitat restoration projects on the north side of the river
    - Past plans – Implement project recommendations from past plans, including the 2011 River Quarter Enhancement Plan (note: reviewed earlier in this memorandum)

The master plan calls for development, including new sections of the River Walk, to be restricted on the north side of the Umatilla River in order to protect and promote wildlife habitat there.

**Project Relevance:** Recommendations from the master plan regarding maintenance and capital needs will be considered for incorporation into recommendations developed in the TSP update. They will also inform the City's upcoming Parks Master Plan update. The recommendation for preservation of habitat on the north side should be balanced with recommendations from the Downtown Plan and preliminary considerations during the TSP update to develop sections of path and overlooks on the north side of the river.

## Pendleton Airport Industrial Park Transportation Impact Analysis (2011)

The City of Pendleton proposed to rezone approximately 520 acres of land west of the Eastern Oregon Regional Airport from Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) to Light Industrial (M-1). Approximately 350 of the 520 rezoned acres of this area, known as the Pendleton Airport Industrial Park, are considered buildable. Pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060 regarding zone changes, a transportation impact analysis (TIA) was required to be prepared. The Pendleton Airport Industrial Park TIA, prepared by Kittelson & Associates, addressed this requirement through evaluation of the traffic operational impacts at the following two locations:

1. US 30/I-84 Westbound Off-Ramp Terminal
2. US 30 (Westgate)/NW Airport Road intersection

The analysis showed that, with development of the rezoned Pendleton Airport Industrial Park, the ramp Terminal and US 30/NW Airport Road intersection were forecast to operate acceptably in the year 2030, with preliminary signal warrants not forecast to be met. While operational deficiencies were not identified within the timeframe required for analysis in the TIA, the TIA makes the following long-term recommendations for continuing development and build-out in the airport area:

- Consolidate study intersections into one intersection in order to improve safety and comfort for all modes of travel.
- Signalize this intersection as traffic volumes grow and are anticipated to meet warrants in the long term.
- Construct planned non-motorized improvements in order to improve accessibility to the area.
- Consider a multi-use path between the industrial area and the northern neighborhoods of Pendleton in future planning efforts in order to avoid some of the topographic issues presented by the existing connections to the area.

**Project Relevance:** Recommendations from the TIA, particularly a multi-use path, should be further developed and considered for incorporation into the TSP update**.**