

#### **Department of Land Conservation and Development**

635 Capitol Street, Suite 150 Salem, OR 97301-2540 (503) 373-0050 Fax (503) 378-5518 www.lcd.state.or.us

#### NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT

December 22, 2006

TO: Subscribers to Notice of Adopted Plan

or Land Use Regulation Amendments

FROM: Mara Ulloa, Plan Amendment Program Specialist

SUBJECT: City of Roseburg Plan Amendment

DLCD File Number 003-06

The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) received the attached notice of adoption. A copy of the adopted plan amendment is available for review at the DLCD office in Salem and the local government office.

Appeal Procedures\*

#### DLCD ACKNOWLEDGMENT or DEADLINE TO APPEAL: January 4, 2007

This amendment was submitted to DLCD for review 45 days prior to adoption. Pursuant to ORS 197.830 (2)(b) only persons who participated in the local government proceedings leading to adoption of the amendment are eligible to appeal this decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

If you wish to appeal, you must file a notice of intent to appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) no later than 21 days from the date the decision was mailed to you by the local government. If you have questions, check with the local government to determine the appeal deadline. Copies of the notice of intent to appeal must be served upon the local government and others who received written notice of the final decision from the local government. The notice of intent to appeal must be served and filed in the form and manner prescribed by LUBA, (OAR Chapter 661, Division 10). Please call LUBA at 503-373-1265, if you have questions about appeal procedures.

\*NOTE: TH

THE APPEAL DEADLINE IS BASED UPON THE DATE THE DECISION WAS MAILED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT. A DECISION MAY HAVE BEEN MAILED TO YOU ON A DIFFERENT DATE THAN IT WAS MAILED TO DLCD. AS A RESULT YOUR APPEAL DEADLINE MAY BE EARLIER THAN THE ABOVE DATE SPECIFIED.

Cc: Gloria Gardiner, DLCD Urban Planning Specialist John Renz, DLCD Regional Representative Steve Oulman, DLCD Transportation Planner Fred Alley, City of Roseburg

<pa>> ya/

# E 2 DLCD Notice of Adoption

THIS FORM MUST BE MAILED TO DLCD
WITHIN 5 WORKING DAYS AFTER THE FINAL DECISION
PER ORS 197 610, OAR CHAPTER 660, DIVISION 18

☐ In person ☐ electronic ☐ ma	iiled
DEPT OF	
DEC 15 2006	
AND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT	
For DLCD Use Only	

PER ORS 197.610, OAR CHAPTER 660 - DIVISION 18	1. 18	For DLCD Use Only
Jurisdiction: City of Roseburg	Local file number: CPA	-05-8
Date of Adoption: 12/11/2006	Date Mailed: 12/12/200	
Was a Notice of Proposed Amendment (Form 1) mail	ed to DLCD? Select one	Date: 8/2/2006
	☐ Comprehensive Plar	
Land Use Regulation Amendment	☐ Zoning Map Amendr	ment
New Land Use Regulation	Other:	
Summarize the adopted amendment. Do not use ted	chnical terms. Do not writ	e "See Attached".
This is the adoption of the first Transportation System Plan amendment to the City of Roseburg Comprehensive Plan. Ordinance will be submitted at a later date.	•	-
Does the Adoption differ from proposal? No, no expla	aination is necessary	
Plan Map Changed from: N/A	to: N/A	
Zone Map Changed from: N/A	to: N/A	
Location: Roseburg UGB	Acre	es Involved: 0
Specify Density: Previous: N/A	New: N/A	
Applicable statewide planning goals:	•	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	12 13 14 15 16 1	7 18 19
Was an Exception Adopted? ☐ YES ☒ NO		
Did DLCD receive a Notice of Proposed Amendment.		
45-days prior to first evidentiary hearing?		🛛 Yes 🔲 No
If no, do the statewide planning goals apply?		☐ Yes ☐ No
If no, did Emergency Circumstances require immedia	te adoption?	∐ Yes
DLCD # 003-06 (15438)		

Please list all affected State or Federal Agencies, Local Governments or Special Districts:						
ODOT, Douglas County						
Local Contact: Fred Alley		Phone: (541) 440-1177	Extension:			
Address: 900 SE Douglas Ave		Fax Number: 541-440-118	35			
City: Roseburg Zip: 97470- E-mail Address: FAlley@ci.roseburg.or.us						

#### ADOPTION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

This form must be mailed to DLCD within 5 working days after the final decision per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18.

1. Send this Form and TWO Complete Copies (documents and maps) of the Adopted Amendment to:

## ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT 635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150 SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540

- 2. Electronic Submittals: At least **one** hard copy must be sent by mail or in person, but you may also submit an electronic copy, by either email or FTP. You may connect to this address to FTP proposals and adoptions: **webserver.lcd.state.or.us**. To obtain our Username and password for FTP, call Mara Ulloa at 503-373-0050 extension 238, or by emailing **mara.ulloa@state.or.us**.
- 3. <u>Please Note</u>: Adopted materials must be sent to DLCD not later than **FIVE** (5) working days following the date of the final decision on the amendment.
- 4. Submittal of this Notice of Adoption must include the text of the amendment plus adopted findings and supplementary information.
- 5. The deadline to appeal will not be extended if you submit this notice of adoption within five working days of the final decision. Appeals to LUBA may be filed within **TWENTY-ONE** (21) days of the date, the Notice of Adoption is sent to DLCD.
- 6. In addition to sending the Notice of Adoption to DLCD, you must notify persons who participated in the local hearing and requested notice of the final decision.
- 7. Need More Copies? You can now access these forms online at http://www.lcd.state.or.us/. Please print on 8-1/2x11 green paper only. You may also call the DLCD Office at (503) 373-0050; or Fax your request to: (503) 378-5518; or Email your request to mara.ulloa@state.or.us ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST.

#### ORDINANCE NO. 3249

## AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ROSEBURG URBAN AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BY ADOPTING AND INCLUDING THE TRANSPORATION SYSTEM PLAN BY REFERENCE

**WHEREAS**, the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan was originally adopted by the Council and effective July 1, 1982, and all subsequent and future amendments thereto have been and will continue to be adopted and incorporated into Roseburg Municipal Code Chapter 11.02 through the adoption of Ordinance 2980; and

**WHEREAS**, the Roseburg Land Use and Development Regulations set forth in Chapter 11.04 of the Roseburg Municipal Code established the procedures for hearing comprehensive plan amendments; and

**WHEREAS**, after due and timely notice, on September 18, October 2, and October 16, 2006 the Roseburg Planning Commission held public hearings regarding the proposed adoption of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and its incorporation into the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan. Following the conclusions of the hearings, the Planning Commission adopted Findings of Fact and forwarded the matter for Council consideration; and

**WHEREAS**, after reviewing the recommendation of the Planning Commission and conducting a public hearing on the subject TSP on November 27, 2006, the Council concludes that the Transportation System Plan, with certain changes and conditions as specified in the Findings of Fact and Decision Document (Exhibit A), should be adopted and incorporated by reference into the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan:

#### NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY OF ROSEBURG ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

**SECTION I.** The City Council hereby adopts the attached Findings of Fact and Decision Document (Exhibit A) regarding the proposed adoption of the Transportation System Plan, with the changes and conditions attached thereto. Such Plan with the changes and conditions shown in the Findings of Fact and Decision (Exhibit A) are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan and replace the Transportation Element of the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan.

**SECTION II.** The City of Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended by reference to include the Transportation System Plan, with changes and conditions as shown on Exhibit A, to replace the Transportation Element of the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan.

ORDINANCE NO. 3249 - Page 1

**SECTION III.** The City Recorder, at the request of, or with the concurrence of the City Attorney, is authorized to administratively correct any reference errors contained herein or in other provisions of the Roseburg Municipal Code and/or the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan as amended by the provisions added, amended, or repealed herein.

PASSED BY THE COUNCIL THIS 11th DAY OF December, 2006.

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR THIS 11th DAY OF December , 2006.

Larry Rich, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sheila P Cov City Recorder

### BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEBURG

IN THE MATTER OF a Legislative Comprehensive Plan Amendment to adopt the Roseburg Transportation System Plan by reference into the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan. FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION

CPA-05-8 (TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN)

- 1. This matter came before the City Council for public hearing on November 27, 2006 in the Council Chambers of Roseburg City Hall, 900 SE Douglas Avenue, Roseburg, Oregon.
- 2. This matter came before the Planning Commission for public hearing on September 18, October 2, and October 16, and was deliberated on November 6, 2006 in the Council Chambers of Roseburg City Hall, 900 SE Douglas Avenue, Roseburg, Oregon.
- 3. The City Council takes official notice of the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan adopted by the City Council in Ordinance No. 2345, effective on July 1, 1982, and re-adopted in Ordinance No. 2980 on December 9, 1996 and of the Roseburg Land Use and Development Ordinance No. 2363, as originally adopted July 1, 1984, and re-adopted in Ordinance No. 2981 on December 9, 1996, as both may have been amended from time to time. The City Council takes official notice of the records of the Community Development Department.
- 4. The City Council also takes official notice of the Transportation Planning Rule, Oregon Administrative Rule, Chapter 660, Division 12.
- 5. Notice of the legislative hearing was given by publication in the News-Review, a newspaper of general circulation, at least 20 days prior to the date of the hearing.
- 6. According to Land Use and Development Ordinance Section 2.00.050, legislative action proposals shall be analyzed for consistency with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, state-wide planning goals, and other provisions of this Ordinance.
- 7. The City Council finds that the following Policies of the Comprehensive Plan apply to adoption of the Transportation System Plan:

Transportation Policy No. 1

Page 1

The City shall develop a transportation master plan which will serve as the basis for guiding surface transportation improvements in the Roseburg urban area. The master plan shall be coordinated with the transportation planning activities of Douglas County.

#### Transportation Policy No. 2

The City shall continue to work with Douglas County to ensure a continuous roadway system is maintained, and compatible classifications and standards are enforced throughout the urban area.

#### Transportation Policy No. 3

The City will encourage the development of alternate traffic routes which will reduce traffic volumes.

#### Transportation Policy No. 4

The special needs of the transportation disadvantaged shall be considered when developing and implementing transportation improvements.

#### Transportation Policy No. 5

The City will continue to develop and refine street standards as necessary, particularly for local streets where site-specific characteristics are most important. Flexibility in the design of local streets shall be encouraged.

#### Transportation Policy No. 6

The City will formulate and adopt a public transit master plan which shall assess future transit needs and provide a program and policies designed to meet those needs.

#### Transportation Policy No. 7

The City and County shall jointly reevaluate, revise as appropriate, and adopt the <u>Roseburg Area Bikeway Plan</u>. Such plan shall serve as the basis for guiding development of an urban area bikeway system.

#### Transportation Policy No. 8

The various transportation studies and water master plans referenced in the Comprehensive Plan shall be evaluated and revised as necessary to achieve overall consistency and compatibility with other elements of the plan, as well as the transportation plans of Douglas County, to ensure the transportation needs of the urban area are met in a timely, orderly, economic, and coordinated manner.

8. The City Council finds that adoption of the Transportation System Plan complies with Transportation Policy No. 1 because it serves as the referenced transportation master plan which provides guidance for transportation improvements, and is coordinated with the transportation planning activities of Douglas County.

CPA-05-8 City Council Findings of Fact

Page 2

- 9. The City Council finds that the Transportation System Plan complies with Transportation Policy No. 2 because goals and objectives are included that provide for compatible roadway classifications and standards.
- 10. The City Council finds that the Transportation System Plan complies with Transportation Policy No. 3 because the Transportation System Plan does examine and plan for alternate traffic routes to reduce traffic volumes.
- 11. The City Council finds that the Transportation System Plan complies with Transportation Policy No. 4 as the needs of the transportation disadvantaged have been considered in the development of the Transportation System Plan. The improvements to sidewalks and transit in particular will address some of the needs to the transportation disadvantaged. Additionally, the Transportation System Plan includes objectives to regularly consult with the disabled community regarding transportation needs, plans and improvements, and to actively seek representation from such groups on the Public Works Commission and similar groups.
- 12. The City Council finds that the Transportation System Plan complies with Transportation Policy No. 5 because it addresses refined street standards for specific situations such as hillsides.
- 13. The City Council finds that the Transportation System Plan complies with Transportation Policy No. 6 because it assesses future transit needs, suggests bus stop pullouts in street standards to assure a convenient area for buses to load and unload, provides a priority ranking of transit improvements and provides a means to meet those needs.
- 14. The City Council finds that the Transportation System Plan complies with Transportation Policy No. 7 because the Transportation System Plan inventories current facilities, considers deficiencies, examines attractors, identifies needed improvements, and lists recommended bicycle projects, including the Bicycle Facilities Plan map. The Transportation System Plan is therefore considered a revision and update to the Roseburg Area Bikeway Plan.
- 15. The City Council finds that adoption of the Transportation System Plan complies with Transportation Policy No. 8 because the Transportation System Plan has evaluated and revised transportation to be compatible with plans for growth and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the transportation plans of Douglas County.
- 16. The City Council finds that the following Statewide Planning Goals apply to adoption of the Transportation System Plan:

Statewide Planning Goal No. 1 – Citizen Involvement To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

Statewide Planning Goal No. 12 - Transportation To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.

- 17. The City Council finds that adoption of the Transportation System Plan meets Statewide Planning Goal 1 by mass mailings and public meetings to determine citizen desires, as well as by publishing notice of and conducting public hearings. Through the review process, many comments were heard from the public and from the City Historic Resources Review Commission, Economic Development Commission, Public Works Commission and Planning Commission regarding areas of the TSP which were suggested for correction, further work, or revision.
- 18. The City Council finds that the Transportation System Plan complies with provisions of Statewide Planning Goal 12 because the Transportation System Plan provides the plan for a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.
- As evidenced from correspondence in the record from the Department of Land Conservation and Development and from the Oregon Department of Transportation, the City Council finds the Transportation System Plan meets the requirements of the Transportation Planning Rule, Oregon Administrative Rule, Chapter 660, Division 12.
- 20. The City Council finds that there are no other provisions of the Land Use and Development Ordinance that are applicable to this amendment.

Conclusion: The City Council concludes that the request complies with applicable Statewide Planning Goals, the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan and other provisions within the City of Roseburg Land Use and Development Ordinance (LUDO).

#### **DECISION**

In consideration of the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions, the City Council APPROVES CPA-05-8, the Roseburg Transportation System Plan, with changes noted below, which is adopted by reference into the Roseburg Urban Area Comprehensive Plan as a replacement of the Transportation Element. Changes are as follows:

1. The City shall seek funds, time and resources to update 3 sections of the TSP, in order of priority: 1) Bicycle and Pedestrian, 2) Financial, and 3) Transit. Updates to these sections should be completed within 5 years.

CPA-05-8 City Council Findings of Fact

Page 4

- 2. The TSP be supplemented with all new Mass Transit plans, goals and policies recently completed by Douglas County.
- 3. Support the legislative changes recommended in the TSP to further enhance city land use practices that provide a better utilization of a more balanced city/county transportation plan and program.
- 4. Accept changes by ODOT to mobility standards. ODOT changed the mobility and performance standards on a state-wide basis since this draft of the TSP was completed. Attached in Exhibit 1 are the mobility and performance tables in the TSP affected by the update.
- 5. Add the improvements needed at Edenbower and the Garden Valley
  Boulevard and Stephens Street intersection to the text (Exhibit 2) and to table
  8-3 under 0 –5 years. See Exhibit 3.
- 6. Accept ODOT's clarifications to the cost estimates. These more accurately reflect the costs of given proposals, e.g., costs for a "study" to connect Harvard to Diamond Lake Blvd, not costs for a new bridge (as a new bridge is not the only option). See also Exhibit 3.
- 7. Finally, language has been added such that the City or ODOT are not committed to fund, allow, or construct any project in the TSP until that project is reviewed and adopted in respective capital improvement programs. See Exhibit 4.

DATED THIS 11th DAY OF December

, 2006

Larry Rich, Ma**yo**r

Sheila R. Cox, City Recorde

Table 5-34. ODOT Mobility Standards (v/c ratio) by Type of Facility

Table 5-34. ODOT Mobility Standards (V/C ratio) by 1940								
Highway-Category		Land Use Type/Speed Limits						
_		G	Inside Urban rowth Boundar	Outside Urban Growth-Boundary				
	STA's	MPO	Non-MPO outside of STA's where non- freeway speed limit < 40 mph	Non-MPO where non- freeway speed limit >= 40 mph	Unincorporated Communities	Rural Lands		
Interstate Highways and Statewide (NHS) Expressways	A\\A	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7		
Statewide (NHS) Freight Routes	0.85	0.8	0.75	0.7	0.7	0.7		
Statewide (NHS) Non-Freight Routes and Regional or District Expressways	0.9	0.85	· <del>0.8</del>	0.75	0.75	0.7		
Regional Highways	0.95	0.85	<del>0.8</del>	0.75	0.75	0.7		
District/Local Interest Roads	0.95	0.8	<del>0.85</del>	0.8	0.8	0.75		

Highway Category		Land Use Type/Speed Limits								
		<u>in</u>	<u>Urban</u> oundary							
	STAs	STAs MPO Non-MPO outside of STAs where non-freeway posted speed <= 35 mph, or a Designated UBA Non-MPO where non-freeway speed limit speed > 35 mph				Unincorpor ated Communiti es	<u>Rural</u> <u>Lands</u>			
Interstate Highways	N/A	0.80	N/A	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70			
Statewide Expressways	N/A 0.80 0.70 0.70 0.70 0.70									
1							5-10			

11 = 1 1 1 5	<del></del>	<del></del>	<del></del>				·
Freight Route o a Statewide Highway	0.85	0.80	0.80	0.75	0.70	0.70	0.70
Statewide (not a freight Route)	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.80	0.75	0.75	0.70
Freight Route on a Regional or District Highway	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.80	0.75	<u>0.75</u>	0.70
Expressway on a Regional or District Highway	N/A	<u>0.85</u>	<u>N/A</u>	0.80	<u>0.75</u>	<u>0.75</u>	0.70
Regional Highways	0.95	0.85	<u>0.85</u>	0.80	0.75	<u>0.75</u>	0.70
District / Local Interest Roads	<u>0.95</u>	0.90	<u>0.90</u>	0.85	0.80	0.80	0.75

Table 5-4. City of Roseburg Performance Standards

Roadway Category	V/C/LOS
<u>Arterial</u>	0.85/LOS D or E
Collector	0.85/ LOS D or E
Local Street	0.90/LOS D or E
Downtown Arterial	0.95/LOS E
Downtown Collector	0.95/ LOS E

Note: LOS D used at signalized intersections. LOS E used at unsignalized intersections.

The transportation system alternatives developed in Chapters 6 and 7 to mitigate transportation system deficiencies utilize the v/c standards included in the Oregon Highway Design Manual and provided in Table 5-.

Table 5-55. Mobility Standards for Mitigation Alternatives – Oregon Highway Design Manual

	Highway Category		Land Use Type/Speed Limits						
.			G	Inside Urban rowth Bounda	ry	Outside Ur Growth Bour			
		STA's	MPO	Non-MPO outside of STA's where non- freeway speed limit < 40-45 mph	Non-MPO where non- freeway speed limit >= 40-45 mph	Unincorporated Communities	Rural Lands		
	Interstate Highways and Statewide (NHS) Expressways	·N/A	0.75	0.7 <u>0</u>	0.65	0.6 <u>0</u>	0.6 <u>0</u>		
11	Statewide (NHS) Freight Routes	<del>0.85</del>	0.75	<del>0.7<u>0</u></del>	<del>0.7<u>0</u></del>	<del>0.6</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0.60</del>		
	Statewide (NHS) Non-Freight Routes and Regional or District Expressways	0.9 <u>0</u>	0.8 <u>0</u>	0.75	0.7 <u>0</u>	0.6 <u>0</u>	0.6 <u>0</u>		
1	Regional Highways	0.95	0.85	0.75	0.75	0.7 <u>0</u>	0.65		
"	District/Local nterest-Roads	<del>0.95</del>	0.85	<del>0.8<u>0</u></del>	0.75	0.75	0.70		

This project proposes to add a new east-west collector street from Summit Drive to Ramp Street to Pearce Road. This connection will provide access for new residential development and a route to downtown Roseburg and Diamond Lake Boulevard. Exact roadway alignment to be determined by topographical and environmental conditions.

CC. Edenbower Widening: With increased development around exit 127, continued growth in the Hucrest area, and development on Stewart Parkway and NE Stephens, Edenbower will need to be widened to 5 lanes between Stewart Parkway and Stephens. Because the predominate traffic movements between Stewart Parkway and Edenbower are east to north and vice versa, consideration should be given to realigning the intersection making that the through movement. Ramp Street Extension: With anticipated growth in southeast Reseburg, this connection provides connectivity and improved access. The proposed project extends Ramp Street to Diamond Lake Boulevard.

#### Safety Improvement Projects

This section summarizes recommended safety improvement projects to mitigate areas within the City of Roseburg experiencing high crash rates.

As discussed in Chapter 3, collision data collected from ODOT show 1,464 total collisions inside the Roseburg UGB between January 2001 and December of 2003. Three intersections as discussed in Chapter 3 exceed the statewide average of collisions per million vehicle miles which follow:

- Oak Avenue at Pine Street
- · Garden Valley Boulevard at Stewart Parkway
- · Harvard Avenue at Stewart Parkway

In addition, several of the high crash locations occurred on Stephens Street and Garden Valley Boulevard.

The following are recommended projects to improve safety:

### 1. Stephens Street / Pine Street Safety Improvement Project (from Mosher Avenue to Edenbower Blvd)

This project needs include traffic signal coordination along the corridor (as recommended per roadway improvement projects), intersection turn lanes (as recommended under intersection improvements), and multimodal considerations. As part of the project, specific intersection improvements for high crash locations follow:

Table 8-1. Cost Estimates for Roadway Projects

rable 8-1. Cost Estima	ites in ivi	Gadvay 1 (G)COLO		
Roadway Project	Map Code	Project Prioritization	Cost Estimate in FY2006 Dollars (Design, ROW, Construction)	
YEA	1			
Stewart Parkway Improvements	A, B, C	0 – 5 Years	\$22,330,000	-
Troost Street: Straighten Curves/Realign Intersection	E	0 – 5 Years	\$2,420,000	
Harvard Avenue Bridge and Harvard Avenue, west of Lookingglass Road	F, G	0 – 5 Years	\$9,310,000	
Garden Valley Boulevard Refinement Study to Evaluate Safety and Capacity Improvements; Phase 1 Construction	M	0 – 5 Years	\$8,110,000	
Stephens Street Safety and Capacity Improvements	T	0 – 5 Years	\$17,310,000	
Harvard Avenue Interchange Access Management Plan and <del>New Bridge</del> study a connection from Harvard Avenue to Diamond Lake Boulevard	V	0 – 5 Years (IAMP)	\$1,000,000	:
Edenbower Boulevard: New northbound ramp, widening both off-ramps and signalization of southbound ramp		<u>0 – 5 Years</u>	<u>\$3,200,00</u>	
Subtotal Years 0-5:			\$63,680,000	
			60,480,000	
YEARS	6-10			
Harvard Avenue Interchange Improvements and New Bridge connection from construct improvements between Harvard Avenue to and Diamond Lake Boulevard	V	6 – 10 Years	\$12,680,000	
New Arterial from West Harvard Connector to Garden Valley (Troost/Charter Oaks/West Harvard Connector)	н	6 – 10 Years	\$11,510,000	
Alameda Avenue/Cloverdale		6 - 10 Years	\$1,730,000	
		8-2	through 8-4 EXHIBIT 3	er e en e

Roadway Project  Fulton Street Improvements  Lookingglass Road – South of Harvard Avenue  New Collector from Diamond Lake Boulevard at Lake Street or Gardiner Street	Map Code L Q	Project Prioritization 6 – 10 Years 6 – 10 Years	Cost Estimate in FY2006 Dollars (Design, ROW, Construction) \$2,230,000 \$4,740,000		
New Collector Connection - Odell Avenue to Rifle Range Street	R	6 – 10 Years	\$3,450,000		
Subtotal Years 6-10:			\$40,370,000		
YEARS	11-15				
Rifle Range Street - North of Diamond Lake Boulevard	N	11 – 15 Years	\$7,570,000		
Rifle Range Street Extension across Deer Creek to Douglas Avenue	0	11 – 15 Years	\$2,000,000		
Vine Street Improvements (north of Alameda) and Extension	Ρ.	11 – 15 Years	\$4,370,000		
New East-West Collector from Summit Drive to Ramp Street to Pearce Road	BB	11 – 15 Years	\$16,360,000		
Ramp Street ExtensionWiden Edenbauower Boulevard	CC	11 – 15 Years	\$ <del>2,710,000</del> <u>8,</u> 500,000		
Portland Avenue Bridge and Interchange Improvements	U	11 – 15 Years	\$10,300,000		
Subtotal Years 11-15:			\$43 <u>49,9</u> 310,0 00		
YEARS 16-20					
New N/S Collector	W	16 – 20 Years	\$3,970,000		
New North-South Collector between Alameda Avenue and Newton Creek Road	Y	16 - 20 Years	\$8,330,000		
New North-South Connection from Rifle Range Street to Newton Creek Road	Z	16 - 20 Years	\$12,820,000		

Roadway Project	Map Code	Project Prioritization	Cost Estimate in FY2006 Dollars (Design, ROW, Construction)
New East-West Collector between Rifle Range Street Extension and New North- South Collector	AA	16 – 20 Years	\$9,610,000
Black Street Extension	J	16 – 20 Years	\$580,000
Broad Street reconstruction to Edenbower Boulevard	К	16 – 20 Years	\$3,46 <b>8,0</b> 00
New West Side Collector – north of Garden Valley Boulevard	S	16 – 20 Years	\$15,020,000
Widen Valley View Drive – Keasey Street to Kline Street	D	16 – 20 Years	\$1,380,000
Subtotal Years 16-20:			\$55,170,000
ROADWAY PROJECTS TOTAL		20 YEARS	\$199,330,000 \$205,120,000 \$208,320,000

Table is a summary of total capital cost by type of project and by possible funding source. The last category is to be determined by City of Roseburg. In general the State of Oregon DOT would be responsible for roadways, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities associated with the I-5 Freeway interchanges. The total estimated cost for all projects is about \$245.6 million in 2006 dollars. The City's share of these projects is divided between its urban renewal district and other city funding sources.

Table 8-3. Summary of Capital Improvements List by Funding Sources

	State	County	Urban Renewal	Other	Total Cost
Bike	364,000	36,400	_	2,504,200	2,904,600
Intersections	425,000		250,000	2,644,400	3,319,400
Multi	3,861,200	- ,	-	4,425,700	8,286,900
	10,300,000		22	163	199,330,000
Roadways	12,800,000	3,460,000	<u>27,330,000</u>	<u>164,240,000</u>	207,830,000
Sidewalks	-	- (		30,120,000	30,120,000
Signals	200,000	- }	-	800,000	1,000,000
Transit	-	-		675,000	675,000
					245,635,900
Total	15,150,200	3,496,400	22,580,000	204,409,300	254.135.900

The amounts shown in Table 8-3 do not represent firm funding commitments and some of the projects may be jointly funded among the state, the county, and the city. Also, the total amount shown for the urban renewal district likely exceeds its total funding capabilities. It will have to share the costs with other agencies.

To fund these projects the City likely will require additional revenue sources. A review of the City's current funding ability shows why new sources are needed.

Chapter8:

Finance Plan

#### <u>Introduction</u>

This chapter describes various funding sources that could be used to meet the needs of the transportation system in the City of Roseburg. Costs for individual elements of the transportation system plan are outlined and compared to potential revenue sources. Subsequently, options for balancing plan costs and revenues are discussed.

#### Capital Improvements List

Order-of-magnitude cost estimates were developed for the projects identified in the bicycle, intersection, and pedestrian, roadway, and transit elements of this plan. Project costs were estimated using typical unit costs for transportation improvements in 2006 US dollars, and do not reflect unique project costs such as significant environmental mitigation, possible relocation. Development of more detailed project costs (and additional financial analysis) should be prepared in the future as these projects are further studied and refined. Since many of the projects address multiple transportation modes (e.g., autos and bikes), projects costs were developed by project and include all elements of each relevant mode.

Tables 8-1 and 8-2 show the cost estimate for each proposed transportation improvement project.

Inclusion of a project in the TSP does not represent a commitment by the City of Roseburg or ODOT to fund, allow, or construct the project. Projects in the TSP are not considered officially approved and authorized projects and cannot be used for mitigation until they are programmed in the adopted CIP or STIP, or a letter from the affected transportation provider is received that states the project is reasonably likely to be constructed within the next 20 years. Projects that are programmed to be constructed may have to be altered or cancelled at a later time to meet changing budgets or unanticipated conditions such as environmental constraints.