

**From:** [FRICKE Daniel L](#)  
**To:** [Matt Hastie](#)  
**Cc:** [Julie Warncke](#); [COLE Terry D](#)  
**Subject:** RE: SRC - Schedule and Status of Adoption of Alternate Mobility Standards into OHP  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 19, 2016 11:22:12 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Matt –

ODOT is in the process of developing alternative mobility targets for the state highway intersections affected by, and consistent with, the Preferred Alternative for the Salem River Crossing project. Region 2 will prepare documentation and a recommendation for the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to amend the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) to include the alternate mobility targets. By ODOT and OTC policy, the proposed amendment will not be presented to the OTC until the local land use adoption process for the Salem River Crossing has been completed. This is consistent with other ODOT and local planning processes where OHP amendments are adopted as the last step after local adoption to demonstrate the local agency support for the amendment.

Let me know if you need anything else.

***Dan Fricke, Senior Transportation Planner***  
***Oregon Department of Transportation***  
***Region 2***

*455 Airport Road SE Building B*

*Salem, OR 97301-5395*

*Ph: 503-986-2663*

*e-mail: [daniel.l.fricke@odot.state.or.us](mailto:daniel.l.fricke@odot.state.or.us)*

---

**From:** Matt Hastie [mailto:mhastie@angeloplanning.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 19, 2016 10:42 AM  
**To:** FRICKE Daniel L  
**Cc:** Julie Warncke  
**Subject:** SRC - Schedule and Status of Adoption of Alternate Mobility Standards into OHP  
**Importance:** High

Hi Dan,

In identifying material needed to respond to comments and prepare supplemental findings for the Salem River Crossing project, we noted that it would be helpful to have some kind of communication from you/ODOT on the status and schedule of adoption of Alternative Mobility Standards into the OHP. I recall that you told us during or after the last Team Oversight Meeting that you planned to do that concurrently with the UGB amendment process. Is that still the plan?

A statement from you about this (email response is fine) would be very helpful to add to the record and if you can send me a quick email about it later today, that would be great since 5 pm today is our deadline for adding new materials to the record. Thanks for whatever you can do and my apologies for the short notice. This one of a long list of things we're working getting into the record and it sort of slipped through the cracks on my end until this morning.

Matt



**Matt Hastie, AICP / Project Manager**

503.542.3403 / [mhastie@angeloplanning.com](mailto:mhastie@angeloplanning.com)

921 SW Washington St. Suite 468  
Portland OR 97205

<http://www.angeloplanning.com>



ODOT Region 2 Headquarters  
455 Airport Rd. S. E., Bldg. B  
Salem, OR 97301-5395  
Fax: (503) 986-2630  
Phone: (503) 986-2600

# Interoffice Memo

**DATE:** December 30, 2009  
**FROM:** *Erik M. Havig*  
Erik Havig, Planning, Development Review and Local Programs Manager  
**TO:** ODOT Region 2 Planning Staff  
**SUBJECT:** Methodology for OHP Alternate Mobility Standards in Region 2

The Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) establishes Volume/Capacity ratios as highway mobility standards in Policy 1F. These standards apply to traffic conditions in the traffic design hour—the 30<sup>th</sup> highest annual hour of traffic volume. The standards are applicable to the entire state highway system except where the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) has decided that an alternate mobility standard is necessary. Because it is likely that funding for road improvements will be insufficient to provide the level of mobility necessary to support local agencies adopted land use plans and subsequent updates to meet Goal 14, it is likely that communities in Region 2 will be asking ODOT to consider alternate mobility standards. OHP Action 1F.3 and 1F.5 provide the policy basis to establish an alternate mobility standard and the Alternative Mobility Guidelines provide general guidance and tools, but neither the OHP or Alternative Mobility Guidelines provide a methodology to develop an alternative mobility standard.

The Region 2 Planning Unit has been working with TPAU to develop the following methodology. Documentation of the results for each necessary step will need to be provided in order to justify an alternate mobility standard from the OTC. The following methodology is to be followed for developing alternative mobility standards for state highways within Region 2.

## Region 2 Alternate Mobility Standard Methodology

1. Where an alternate mobility standard is proposed, the TSP must first include all feasible improvements. If, with the improvements:
2. Mobility Standards are met (by intersection or segment) using the standard analysis procedures, no alternate mobility standard is needed.
3. V/C is greater than the OHP mobility standard but less than capacity ( $V/C=1.0$ ) during the design hour using the standard analysis procedures. Establish the proposed alternate standard consistent with the V/C values used in the OHP (0.75, 0.80, 0.85, 0.90, etc.) and go to Step 7, below.
4. V/C is greater than or equal to capacity during the design hour using the standard analysis procedures. Modify the design hour volume by using the actual peak hour traffic volume for future year design hour projections rather than expanding the peak 15 minutes to be the design hour traffic volume for projection purposes. If V/C is less than 1.0, establish the proposed alternate standard and go to Step 7, below.

5.  $V/C$  is greater than or equal to capacity during the design hour using the actual peak hour projection of traffic. In areas where design hours are affected by high seasonal traffic volumes, evaluate the Annual Average Weekday PM Peak as the future year design hour rather than the 30th highest hour. If  $V/C$  is then  $<1.0$ , establish the proposed alternate standard and go to Step 7, below.
6.  $V/C \geq 1.0$  using the Annual Average Weekday PM Peak as the future design hour. Determine the duration of the period during which the future Annual Average Weekday PM Peak hour will have a  $V/C \geq 1.0$ . Establish the proposed alternate standard (i.e.,  $V/C \geq 1.0$  for not more than 1 hour, or not more than 2 hours, etc.) and go to Step 7.
7. Request adoption of an alternate standard from the OTC.

Feasible – means based upon reasonable expectations of funding likely through the planning horizon and requires consent from the Region Planning and Development Manager.

Cc: Doug Norval  
Michael Rock  
Jerri Bohard  
Jane Lee  
Steve Cooley