

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	PC Recommendation	Staff Comment	Board Decision Points	
1	Should the Board include a County-wide prohibition on multi-use pathways in the updated TSP based on proximity to farm and forest resource-zoned lands and wildlife habitat fragmentation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSP Goal 5: Equity and Accessibility, Policy 5.6 (pg. 15) TSP Section 5 (Transportation Investment Priorities - Bicycle Facilities pg. 51-56) TSP Goal 2: Safety, Policy 2.8 (pg. 12) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support: Citizen Comment Opposition: BPAC, COTA, Bend Bikes, DTC, ODOT, BPRD, Citizen Comment, Bend MPO, City of Bend 	The PC deliberated on this issue area and ultimately decided not to prohibit multi-use pathways in Deschutes County.	<p>Staff notes that, while there are clearly anticipated impacts related to multi-use pathways adjacent to farm and forest uses/properties and wildlife habitat, the benefits of an active and integrated transportation system in the County that offers a variety of transportation modes and options (including multi-use pathways) are significant. Staff includes a briefing of LUBA's <i>Van Dyke</i> case law in the attached memo, providing further legal context for this issue area.</p>	<p>Should the Board include a County-wide prohibition on multi-use pathways in the updated TSP when bordering or within farm and forest resource-zoned lands or wildlife habitat areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, the Board may add language prohibiting multi-use pathways in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area. If no, the Board may retain the existing language in the updated TSP document related to multi-use pathways and move on to the next issue area.
2	Should the Board include a conceptual Community Connection multi-use pathway in the updated TSP between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSP Goal 5: Equity and Accessibility, Policy 5.6 (pg. 15) TSP Section 5 (Transportation Investment Priorities - Bicycle Facilities pg. 51-56) TSP Table 5-6 Bicycle Route Community Connections (pg. 54-56) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support: Citizen Comment, BPAC Opposition: Citizen Comment 	The PC deliberated on this issue area and ultimately made a recommendation to amend the draft TSP by removing the "Sisters to Black Butte Ranch" Community Connection from the list of Bicycle Route Community Connections on pages 53-56 of the draft TSP.	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the Board, but staff notes that there are no specific design or alignment proposals associated with this conceptual connection at this time. The conceptual connections are reflective of public input related to a desire for connectivity between certain locations. Public input from certain residents of Black Butte Ranch expresses concern around potential trespassing, traffic congestion, and degradation of infrastructure from overuse related to this proposed connection.</p>	<p>Should the Board include a conceptual Community Connection multi-use pathway in the updated TSP between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, the Board may retain the existing language in the updated TSP document related to a conceptual multi-use pathway Community Connection between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community and move on to the next issue area. If no, the Board may remove the conceptual multi-use pathway Community Connection between the City of Sisters and the Black Butte Ranch Resort Community from the draft TSP and/or add language prohibiting such a Community Connection and move on to the next issue area.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	PC Recommendation	Staff Comment	Board Decision Points
3	Should the Board include a conceptual Community Connection multi-use pathway in the updated TSP between Baker Road and Lava Butte?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSP Goal 5: Equity and Accessibility, Policy 5.6 (pg. 15) TSP Section 5 (Transportation Investment Priorities - Bicycle Facilities pg. 51-56) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support: BPAC, COTA, DTC, Bend Bikes, ODOT Opposition: Citizen Comment 	The PC deliberated on this issue area and ultimately made a recommendation to amend the draft TSP by changing the location of the proposed Baker Road-Lava Butte multi-use pathway to the west side of Highway 97 rather than the east side.	This decision point is at the discretion of the Board, but staff notes that representatives of ODOT have indicated that the proposed Baker Road-Lava Butte multi-use pathway Community Connection has gone through some preliminary planning phases undertaken by ODOT. The conceptual connections are reflective of public input related to a desire for connectivity between certain locations. Public input from property owners adjoining ODOT's project area have expressed concerns with the pathway's impacts to forest and farm uses as well as wildlife habitat. Other supportive comments highlight the benefits of active transportation networks and the need for connectivity between Baker Road and Lava Butte.	<p>Should the Board include a conceptual Community Connection multi-use pathway in the updated TSP between Baker Road and Lava Butte on the <u>west side of Highway 97</u>, as recommended by the PC?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, the Board may incorporate the PC's recommendation to locate the proposed pathway on the west side of Highway 97 rather than the east side. If the Board disagrees with the PC's recommendation, the Board may retain the existing language in the updated TSP document related to a conceptual multi-use pathway Community Connection between Baker Road and Lava Butte and move on to the next issue area. If the Board disagrees with the PC's recommendation <u>and</u> the existing language in the updated TSP document, the Board may remove the conceptual multi-use pathway Community Connection between Baker Road and Lava Butte from the draft TSP and move on to the next issue area.
4	Should the Board support inclusion by reference of the BPRD Master Plan within the updated TSP, including a bridge connecting the Deschutes River Woods neighborhood to the west side of the Deschutes River?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSP Goal 5: Equity and Accessibility, Policy 5.8 (pg. 15) TSP Section 5 (Transportation Investment Priorities - Bicycle Facilities pg. 51-56) TSP Section 5 (Transportation Investment Priorities – Bridges pg. 56-58) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support: Citizen Comment Opposition: Citizen Comment 	The PC did not deliberate on this issue area and made no recommendation to the Board concerning the inclusion of a bridge in the draft TSP document.	This decision point is at the discretion of the Board, but staff notes that there has been no contemplation by the County Road Department of adding this project to the County Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).	<p>Should the Board support inclusion by reference of the BPRD master plan within the updated TSP, including a bridge connecting the Deschutes River Woods neighborhood to the west side of the Deschutes River?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, the Board may utilize the existing language in the updated TSP document referencing the BPRD Master Plan which includes a bridge connection between the Deschutes River Woods neighborhood and the west side of the Deschutes River and move on to the next issue area. If no, the Board may remove BPRD Master Plan references from the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

	Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	PC Recommendation	Staff Comment	Board Decision Points
5	Should the Board include language in the updated TSP responsive to concerns regarding Local Access Roads (LARs) in Special Road District #1, including replacement of a canal crossing on Island Loop Way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSP Local Access Road Tools and FAQs “How are Local Access Roads maintained?” (pg. 68) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support: Citizen Comment Opposition: The County Road Department opposes this request and has provided citizen commenters with clarification on Special Road District #1’s responsibility for improvement and maintenance projects on Island Loop Way and the surrounding area. 	The PC did not deliberate on this issue area and made no recommendation to the Board concerning in the inclusion of a bridge in the draft TSP document.	The County Road Department has provided citizen commenters with clarification on Special Road District #1’s responsibility for improvement and maintenance projects on Island Loop Way and the surrounding area. Per state statute ORS 368.031, Deschutes County is not liable for failure to improve or repair a LAR and is legally restricted from expending funds on LARs unless there are emergency circumstances. No emergency circumstances have been identified in association with Island Loop Way or other infrastructure within the Special Road District #1 boundaries.	<p>Should the Board include language in the updated TSP responsive to concerns regarding Local Access Roads (LARs) in Special Road District #1, including replacement of a canal crossing on Island Loop Way?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, the Board may add language related to Island Loop Way and Special Road District #1 and move onto the next issue area, though staff reiterates the County is legally restricted from maintaining infrastructure within Special Road District #1’s boundaries or expending funds on such improvements. If no, the Board may retain the existing language in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.
6	Should the Board eliminate the column labeled “Priority” from Table 5-6 of the drafted TSP document related to Bicycle Route Community Connections?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSP Figure 5-6, Table 5-6 Bicycle Route Community Connections (pg. 53-56) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support: N/A Opposition: N/A 	The PC did not deliberate on this issue area and made no recommendation to the Board concerning priority status for the Bicycle Route Community Connections outlined in Figure 5-6 and Table 5-6 of the drafted TSP document.	This decision point is at the discretion of the Board, but staff notes that the effect of eliminating the priority status from the various projects outlined in Figure 5-6 and Table 5-6 of the drafted TSP document may have the effect of assigning an equal priority to all projects outlined in Figure 5-6 and Table 5-6.	<p>Should the Board eliminate the column labeled “Priority” from Table 5-6 of the drafted TSP document related to Bicycle Route Community Connections?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, the Board may remove the “Priority” column included in Table 5-6 of the drafted TSP document and move on to the next issue area. If no, the Board may retain the existing “Priority” column in Table 5-6 of the drafted TSP document and move on to the next issue area.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN 2020-2040 UPDATE

Land use File No. 247-23-000507-PA, 508-TA

Issue Area	Applicable Plan Provision	Support / Opposition	PC Recommendation	Staff Comment	Board Decision Points	
7	Should the Board adopt ODOT's proposed language related to ODOT Intersection Changes outlined in <u>S-9 and S-11</u> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities – Table 5.4 ODOT Intersection Changes and Associated Cost Estimates – ID S-9, S-11 (pg. 47) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support: ODOT Opposition: N/A 	The PC deliberated on this issue area and ultimately decided to recommend adoption of ODOT's proposed language related to priority status for ODOT Intersection Changes included in Table 5-4, project ID S-9 (US20: Powell Butte Hwy) and S-11 (US20: Locust St, within the City of Sisters) and additional language included for project ID S-11.	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the Board, but staff notes that the effect of increasing a priority status for a given project or action item may place those projects before or after other identified projects with relatively similar scope and impacts. Staff finds no issues with the additional language ODOT has proposed for project ID S-11.</p>	<p>ODOT recommends the following changes to the updated TSP document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> S-9: Recommend changing the priority level from Low to High S-11: Recommend changing the priority level from Low to High and noting that the project, with contributions from Deschutes County, City of Sisters, and ODOT, is funded for construction in 2024. <p>Should the Board adopt ODOT's proposed language related to <u>ODOT Intersection Changes outlined in S-9 (US 20 / Powell Butte Highway Roundabout) and S-11 (US 20 / Locust St Roundabout)</u>?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, the Board may adopt ODOT's proposed language related to ODOT Intersection Changes outlined in S-9 and S-11 and move on to the next issue area. If no, the Board may retain the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.
8	Should the Board adopt the citizen comment's recommendation to include a High priority category associated with <u>Table 5.5 Project ID BP-3 related to 2nd Street / Cook Ave sidewalks in Tumalo</u> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSP Section 5 - Transportation Investment Priorities – Table 5.5 Pedestrian Facilities and Associated Cost Estimates – ID BP-3 (pg. 51) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support: Citizen Comment Opposition: N/A 	The PC deliberated on this issue area and ultimately decided to recommend adoption of the proposed priority changes for Pedestrian Facilities and Associated Cost Estimates included in Table 5-5, project ID BP-3.	<p>This decision point is at the discretion of the Board, but staff notes that the effect of increasing a priority status for a given project or action item may place those projects before or after other identified projects with relatively similar scope and impacts.</p>	<p>One public comment includes a recommendation to change the priority from Medium to High associated with <u>Table 5.5 ID BP-3 related to 2nd Street / Cook Ave sidewalks in Tumalo</u>.</p> <p>Should the Board adopt the citizen comment's recommendation to include a High priority category associated with Table 5.5 ID BP-3?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, the Board may change the BP-3 priority from Medium to High and move on to the next issue area. If no, the Board may retain the existing language included in the updated TSP document and move on to the next issue area.