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## SUBJECT:

Amendment to the CTUIR 2001 Transportation System Plan

## APPLICANT:

CTUIR Planning Department, 46411 Timíne Way, Pendleton, OR 97801

## NATURE OF THE REQUEST:

The Tribal Planning Office seeks a recommendation from the Land Protection Planning Commission (LPPC) that the Board of Trustees adopt the updated Transportation System Plan (TSP) to replace the 2001 TSP. This plan updates the 2001 project list based on research of past plans; traffic analysis; and community input and feedback. It also develops criteria for evaluating future proposed projects based on seven (7) proposed goals: Safety; Environment and Cultural Heritage; Health; Equity and Accessibility; Connectivity; Coordination; and Financial Stability. More information about the plan can be found at: https://ctuir.org/departments/tribal-planning-office/transportation-system-plan-update-2022/

## FACTS

1. CTUIR has compacted transportation services from the BIA under the terms of Public Law 93-638: The Indian Self-Determination Act. This Transportation System Plan serves as the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), as defined by Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 25 Part 170.409-411 which requires public notice, public involvement, and opportunity to comment. Under the relevant CFR regulations, and due to the relationship between the Transportation System Plan and other plans currently under the purview of the LPPC, such as the Land Development Code and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan, the LPPC seems the most relevant body to host this public hearing. The Tribal Planning Office proposes to codify this relationship in the amended Transportation System Plan for future plan amendments.
2. Tribal Planning Office staff have conducted the following public outreach throughout the development of this plan:

|  | March -June 2022 |
| :---: | :--- |
| Phase 1 1 | Background data analysis; prior plan review; and traffic study. Draft plan <br> components, including Introduction and Goals \& Objectives chapters. <br> Web engagement included providing information to the public and an interactive <br> web map for the public to propose projects. <br> Technical Advisory Committee Meeting \#1 comprised of CTUIR staff from <br> transportation-related departments and other adjacent and on-reservation road |


|  | jurisdiction officials <br> Public input solicitations at Senior Center Lunch, Mission Market, the NGC <br> Rotunda during General Council, Yellowhawk Lobby, Tribal Youth Council, <br> and Treaty Day Celebration. |
| :---: | :--- |
| Phase 2September - December 2022 <br> Draft project list made available to the public. <br> Technical Advisory Committee Meeting \#2 <br> Public input solicitation at Mission Market, NGC Rotunda, Senior Center Lunch, <br> Web engagement included providing information to the public and an interactive <br> web map for the public to review and comment on proposed projects. <br> Presentation and input solicitation at CTUIR Commissions/Committees, <br> including Law \& Order Commission; Fish \& Wildlife Commission; Capital <br> Improvements Committee; Health Commission; and Land Protection \& Planning <br> Commission. <br> Phase 3 3 <br> January - March 2023 <br> Draft Plan made available to the public. <br> Technical Advisory Committee Meeting \#3 <br> General Council Presentation <br> Presentations and input solicitation at CTUIR Commissions/Committees, <br> including Capital Improvements Committee, Fish \& Wildlife Commission, <br> Health Commission, Elders Committee, and Tribal Youth Council |  |

2. Summary of Proposed Amendments:

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Plan } \\ \text { Organization } \end{array}$ | Chapter 1: this chapter was changed to the Executive Summary from the former Introduction to provide a highlevel easily referenced summary of the document's contents. <br> Chapter 2: this chapter was changed from "Goals and Objectives" to "Introduction", which was formerly Chapter 1. <br> Chapter 3: the former chapter "Existing Land Uses and the Transportation System" has been dissolved and incorporated into the Introduction chapter, as well as the appendix "Tech Memo 2: Context \& Site Analysis". Chapter 3 is amended to "Goals and Objectives". <br> Chapter 4: the former chapter "Existing Traffic Conditions" has been dissolved and incorporated into the appendix "Tech Memo 2: Context \& Site Analysis". New site analysis and traffic studies were completed and are located in the appendix. Chapter 4 is amended to "Roadway System" and chapters 4-8 comprise the project list organized by travel mode. <br> Chapter 5: the former chapter "Traffic Forecast and Future Conditions" has been dissolved and incorporated into the appendix "Tech Memo 2: Context \& Site Analysis". Chapter 5 is amended to "Pedestrian System - Walking and Rolling". <br> Chapter 6: the former chapter "Potential Transportation Improvement Projects" has been replaced with chapters 4-8 in the amended plan, organized by travel mode. <br> Chapter 7: the former chapter "Access Management Policies and Strategies" has been dissolved as many of the details reference out of date materials, and new access management strategies have been incorporated into Chapter 4: Roadway System. Chapter 7 is amended to "Transit System". <br> Chapter 8: the former chapter "Transportation System Plan" has been dissolved and incorporated into chapters 4-8 organized by travel mode. Chapter 8 is amended to "Rail and Pipeline Systems". <br> Chapter 9: this chapter was renamed from "Funding Sources" to "Funding and Implementation Plan". |
| :---: | :---: |
| Chapter 1 | Replaced "Introduction" and provides a high-level summary of the process of amending the plan, the resulting project list, |


| Executive Summary | and programs and policies proposed to improve efficiency and quality of the Transportation System. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Chapter 2 Introduction | The text of the 2001 Introduction has been re-organized to provide a single paragraph introduction reflecting a change from a focus on the transportation infrastructure to a focus on the people using the transportation system. Regulatory language was moved to its own sub-section. The section "Relationship of Transportation System Plan to other Planning Documents" was removed, parts of it are noted elsewhere, where specific other plans are cross-referenced, and in the appendix "Tech Memo 2: Context \& Site Analysis". Sections were added to detail the public engagement activities completed to develop this plan. Implementation process was moved to Chapter 9. |
| Chapter 3 Goals and Objectives | The vision statement for this plan was amended to change the focus from the transportation infrastructure to the users of the transportation system. Goals were re-organized into a priority-ranked list, and objectives are subordinate to each goal in order to define what successful completion of that goal would entail. The new chapter specifies that these goals were used to rank and prioritize each of the proposed construction projects, and adds 2 new system-wide policies. |
| Chapter 4 <br> Roadway System | Jurisdiction and functional classification was extensively descriptive in the 2001 plan, but has been condensed to a single descriptive paragraph and a map of functional classifications by all road jurisdictions operating on the reservation. 8 new Roadway System Policies have been added. The list of projects in the Roadway System has been amended and is included in this chapter. |
| Chapter 5 Pedestrian System | This chapter has been separated from the prior plan chapter that covered all modes. 4 new Pedestrian System policies have been added. The list of projects in the Pedestrian System has been amended and is included in this chapter. |
| Chapter 6 Bicycle System | This chapter has been separated from the prior plan chapter that covered all modes. 1 new Bicycle System policy has been added. The list of projects in the Bicycle System has been amended and is included in this chapter. |
| Chapter 7 <br> Transit System | Kayak Public Transit did not exist at the time of publication of the 2001 Transportation System Plan. All components of this chapter are new. |
| Chapter 8 | This chapter has been separated from the prior plan chapter |


| Rail and Pipeline Systems | that covered all modes. 2 new rail policies were added. No <br> new pipeline system projects or policies were added. |
| ---: | :--- |
| Fhapter 9 | Funding sources were updated to include currently available <br> funding streams which are categorized by whether they're <br> currently in use by CTUIR; currently being pursued but not <br> in use by CTUIR; or yet unexplored. Proposed <br> Planentation <br> Planplementation measures were moved to this chapter from <br> the Introduction. |
| Appendix | Will include All Modes Project List; Tech Memo 1: <br> Technical Standards for Data Analysis; Tech Memo 2: <br> Context \& Site Analysis; Spring Outreach Summary; and <br> Winter Outreach Summary. |

## FINDINGS

1. 2001 CTUIR Transportation System Plan amendment approval criteria:
A. Is the proposal consistent with the overall goals and purpose of the Transportation Plan?

Yes. The 2001 Transportation System Plan provides background data to inform the development of proposed transportation improvements, as well as their cost estimation, on the Umatilla Indian Reservation. This plan performs the same data analysis using modern techniques and updated information, in order to project the next 20 years potential transportation needs.

The proposed amendments for the updated 2023 Transportation System Plan are attached as Exhibit 2, and will replace the 2001 Transportation System Plan if adopted by the Board of Trustees. This 2021 updated Plan will be printed, distributed and made available on the CTUIR web site. The proposed amendments, updates to the 2001 Plan, are consistent with the established goals and purpose- to achieve the established CTUIR transportation system goals, objectives, and vision.
B. Does the amendment benefit the social, cultural and economic interests and welfare of the Tribes as a whole?

Yes. The Transportation System Plan serves as a public document that can be shared with other jurisdictions to provide a picture of the Umatilla Indian Reservation transportation system. It provides the proposed project list from which the 3-5 year Tribal Transportation Improvement Plan is developed, and grant applications for other competitive funding sources can be derived.

The amendment places a stronger emphasis on meeting the needs of the community members using the Transportation System of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. This refocus includes updates to:

- Vision statement - from infrastructure efficiency focused to meeting community travel needs focused
- long term Goals and Objectives, from a rough system-wide wish-list to a priority ranked list: 1. Safety; 2. Environmental \& Cultural Heritage; 3. Health; 4. Connectivity; 5. Coordination; 6. Financial Stability.
- Project list moved from mainly roadway system to mainly bicycle and pedestrian system (In terms of needed new projects. This plan does not cover maintenance)
- Systematic priority ranking of projects based on how well they accomplish the Goals and Objectives

The proposed amendments provide a new project list which will become the source list for new projects funded by the Tribal Transportation Improvement Plan,

## C. Is there a change in circumstances since adoption of the Transportation System Plan that justifies the amendment?

Yes. Many of the 2001 projects have been completed; all of the population, traffic, and crash data has changed, necessitating a new analysis of the data in order to propose new improvement projects; and new funding streams and competitive grant programs have arisen leading to different considerations for what projects would be eligible for and competitive within those new programs.
D. Is there a clearly stated need or desire for the proposed amendment?

Yes. The Tribal Transportation Program, operated jointly by the BIA and FHWA, state in their operating documents that long range transportation plans must be reviewed every 5 years, and updated every 20 years. This plan has been reviewed once since its adoption in 2001, and as such is very far out of step with the current transportation needs of the community and planning industry best practices regarding community input solicitation. Those requirements did not exist at the time of the 2001 plan adoption, so they were not addressed in the 2001 Transportation System Plan, however they are outlined in 25 CFR Part 170 which governs the use of Tribal Transportation Program formula funding, which we receive from the BIA as compacted roads program.

## E. Has the proposal been given adequate public exposure and review considering its significance to Tribal members?

The amendments to the 2001 Transportation System Plan for amendments were heavily informed by the public. Between May of 2022 and March of 2023, the project team attended or hosted 13 in-person outreach events; hosted 3 virtual open houses; received 15 online comments; conducted a freight survey resulting in 26 responses; and attended 14 stakeholder group meetings including Committees and Commissions, General Council, and a plan-specific Technical Advisory Committee. The results of those outreach events are summarized on the project webpage in the May Outreach Summary, the Fall Outreach Summary, and the Freight Survey Summary. All comments received were taken into consideration, and evaluated against the goals and objectives stated in the plan as well as our regulatory framework, in order to determine if they could be applied
in this plan update. Many public comments resulted in language changes to the plan and newly identified projects which we added to the proposed projects list.

## CONCLUSION

The record and findings support the conclusion that the amendment criteria, identified in 25 CFR part 170.413 have been met.

## DECISION OPTIONS:

In acting on this request, the Land Protection Planning Commission must choose one of the following decision options:

1. Recommend approval of the Amendment request without conditions, to the Board of Trustees;
2. Recommend approve of the Amendment request with conditions, to the Board of Trustees;
3. Recommend the Board of Trustees deny the Amendment request;
4. Recess the hearing until a specified time, date, and place; pending further testimony or Information.
5. Table the decision recommendation until a subsequent Land Protection Planning Commission meeting.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based on the preceding facts, findings and conclusion, staff recommends the Land Protection Planning Commission APPROVAL of this request, to incorporate the proposed amendments into the CTUIR 2001 Transportation System Plan, renamed to "The CTUIR Transportation System Plan", to the CTUIR Board of Trustees without conditions.
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## Chapter 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan Update (TSP) identifies the projects, plans, policies, and programs needed to address gaps and deficiencies within the transportation system in the Umatilla Indian Reservation (UIR) over the next 20 years. By developing projects that promote connectivity, safety, and comfort for all people using the transportation system, CTUIR can realize its vision to support equitable access, active transportation, increased connectivity, and reduced environmental and climate impacts.
The full cost of the preferred plan is approximately $\$ 108.7$ million over the 20-year period, including $\$ 25.3$ million in high priority projects, $\$ 58.3$ million in medium priority projects, and $\$ 25.1$ million in low priority projects. If/when the identified service-based transit projects are established, the total annual operating costs of the projects would be approximately $\$ 615,000$, including $\$ 195,000$ for high priority projects, $\$ 270,000$ for medium priority projects, and $\$ 150,000$ for low priority projects. Chapter 9 contains more information on project costs and implementation. The project list by mode is provided in each modal chapter (Chapters 4-8) or as a whole in Appendix A of Volume II. The plan, including the high priority projects, is aspirational and will be funded through grants and additional funding sources as they become available and/or by private developers as part of future development. CTUIR plans to pursue additional funding to support the high priority plan projects over the next 20 years. Appendix B of Volume II contains the summary sheets for each of the high priority projects. Figures ES1 to ES4, included at the end of this chapter and in each modal chapter (Chapters 4-8), present the planned projects.

## TSP Update Process

The TSP update was completed under the direction of CTUIR staff and informed by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) made up of regional agency representatives, as well as feedback from tribal members and other area residents and visitors. CTUIR staff and the TAC set the following vision to guide this plan.

## Vision Statement

> The transportation system on the Umatilla Indian Reservation provides safe, equitable, and sustainable travel choices that fulfill the needs of those living, working on, and visiting the reservation community, while also fostering cultural connections, protecting treaty rights, and preserving the rural character.
The specific project goals can be found in Chapter 3.
Figure ES1 highlights the process used to update the TSP. The TSP update process began with a review of local, regional, and statewide plans and policies that guide land use and transportation planning in the UIR. Goals and objectives and evaluation criteria were then developed in conjunction with the TAC to guide the development of planned improvements. An inventory of the multimodal transportation system was then conducted to serve as the basis for the existing and future conditions analyses.

The existing and future conditions analyses focused on identifying gaps and deficiencies in the multimodal transportation system based on current and forecasted travel demand. Feedback was gathered from the TAC and the general public to verify the existing gaps and deficiencies. For each gap and deficiency, alternatives were identified, if applicable, and evaluated to address the system needs. This process led to the development of potential projects that were then prioritized using the project evaluation criteria and organized into high, medium, and low priorities. The potential projects were brought back to the TAC and the general public for feedback before the project list was finalized.

The culmination of the TSP update process is this document, which presents the projects, plans, policies, and programs identified to address the existing gaps and deficiencies and future needs for the transportation system within in the UIR in alignment with the project vision.

Figure ES1: Transportation System Plan Update Process


## Public Involvement

The project was informed by several public involvement activities that reached different groups and interests throughout the TSP update process. The opportunities were advertised via web-based communications and included upcoming meetings, online feedback opportunities, and documents for review via the project webpage on CTUIR's website.

The goal of the public involvement process was to develop a TSP that addresses the gaps and deficiencies in the transportation

## Public Involvement At a Glance
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system while meeting the needs of the community. By providing several touchpoints throughout the project schedule, feedback could be incorporated and updated materials then brought back to verify with the members of the public.

The majority of the public involvement opportunities were pop-up outreach activities at locations and events of interest in the community. The project team and CTUIR staff provided handouts, set up posters, and/or asked members of the public to provide feedback at the following locations and events between May 2022 and January 2023:

- Mission Market
- General Council Meetings
- July Grounds Gym After School Program
- Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center
- Treaty Day
- Arrowhead Travel Plaza (focusing on freight community feedback)
- Door-to-door outreach with ODOT staff
- Senior Center luncheon

Additionally, the following specific stakeholder groups were asked to provide feedback:

- Tribal Youth Council
- Kayak drivers
- Umatilla County staff
- Land Protection \& Planning Commission
- Law \& Order Commission
- Fish \& Wildlife Commission
- Capital Improvements Committee
- Health Commission

CTUIR also hosted three virtual open houses via the project webpage. Appendices $C$ and $D$ of Volume II contain summaries of the Spring 2022 and Fall 2022

 outreach efforts.

Lastly, the project team met with the Land Protection Planning Commission and Board of Trustees (BOT) twice each throughout the planning process.


## Projects, Programs, and Plans

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential policy and programmatic direction to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff.

## GENERAL TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

- Develop and institute policies that encourage right-sizing, and adopting appropriate technology for, fleet vehicles and equipment, and encourage the adoption of alternative fuel vehicles through policy, infrastructure, etc.
- This plan updates roadway cross-sectional standards.


## ROADWAY PROGRAMS AND PLANS

The roadway system within the UIR boundary serves most trips across all travel modes. In addition to people driving, the roadway system is used by people walking, biking, riding the bus, and using other forms of transportation to travel to and from essential destinations and neighboring communities. This plan identifies 17 improvements to the roadway system, with an additional six development-driven projects which are only recommended after development occurs in the area around I-84 exit 216, plus the following programs and plans.

- Maintenance program for intersections in the northern UIR where crops limit sight distance during certain times of the year
$\square$ Work with property owners adjacent to roads with limited sight distance to establish formal sight triangle boundaries. One example is Duff Road at Mann Road.
$\square \quad$ Where sight triangles cannot be established, add warning signage.
- Maintenance programs for striping
$\square$ Complete annual striping projects to update worn striping and to add/restripe fog lines on collectors and arterials.
- Coordinate with the County and ODOT on how to address truck parking and routing when I-84 is closed.
- Coordinate with ODOT and Umatilla County on regional connecting roadways.
- Create walkable neighborhoods. Monitor the need for traffic calming measures in neighborhoods and near pedestrian and bicycle activity centers, such as the school, Mission Senior Center, July Grounds residential area, and Nixyáawii Governance Center. Potential mitigations include raised crosswalks, "Children at Play" signage, 20 MPH speed limits, and additional marked crossings.
- Update and maintain CTUIR's parking regulations based on current national guidance and local trends.
- Maintain the Tribal Transportation Program (TTP) National Tribal Transportation Facility Inventory (NTTFI) and update with routes that CTUIR may wish to include as projects move forward. Coordinate with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) as needed. Attachment D includes the existing NTTFI as of September 2022.
- Coordinate with the Range, Agriculture \& Forestry program and other stakeholders to prepare an Upland Access Management Plan to determine a management approach for seasonal road closures, temporary timber harvest roads, and other publicly-used informal trails.
- As new development occurs, create a local street network that provides a high level of connectivity, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and multiple alternative routes. The local street network must tie into the existing network to support emergency access and circulation. New developments shall be planned with a maximum block length of 500 feet with a pedestrian access way provided every 250 feet along the block length. Pedestrian access shall be a dedicated pedestrian access way meeting the requirements of Section 17.015(2) of CTUIR's Land Development Code (LDC).


## PEDESTRIAN PROGRAMS AND PLANS

The pedestrian system within the UIR consists of sidewalks and multi-use paths, as well as marked and/or signed pedestrian crossings. These facilities are primarily provided within the Mission, July Grounds, and Gateway hubs near OR 331 and Mission Road. This plan identifies 23 improvements to the pedestrian system, plus the following programs and plans.

- New development within the Mission Hub should be required to include off-street multi-use paths to create a connected pathway system within the area.
- Parks and Transportation Coordinator
$\square$ Create a new CTUIR staff position to oversee and coordinate multi-use path maintenance and construction, park and river access, and park maintenance.
$\square \quad$ Develop an Invasive Plant Management Plan (including for puncture vine ["goatheads"]) for roads and multi-use paths in coordination with other CTUIR departments.
- Parks and River Access Plan
$\square$ CTUIR is acquiring land impacted by the 2020 flooding, including areas near Cayuse River Road, Cayuse Road, and Sampson Lane. The plan will determine a vision for creating a park(s) with potential river access. Work with property owners adjacent to the river to gain access. Explore other river access locations including previous informal access points, such as Parr Lane and the swimming hole near the railroad bridge.


## BICYCLE PROGRAMS AND PLANS

The bicycle system within the UIR boundary consists of on-street bike lanes, shoulder bikeways, and unmarked shared roadways, as well as off-street multi-use paths and bicycle parking. The only marked bike lanes are on Mission Road, connecting the Mission and July Grounds hubs with residential, school, and commercial uses. This plan identifies 11 improvements to the bicycle system, plus the following program.

- Coordinate installation of future bicycle fix-it stations as part of construction of projects that will attract bicycle activity, such as commercial development, parks, civic centers, transit hubs, multiuse paths, and bike lanes.


## TRANSIT PROGRAMS AND PLANS

CTUIR operates Kayak Public Transit (Kayak) which serves northeastern Oregon via fixed route local and commuter service and paratransit. CTUIR began public transportation services after observing people walking the distance between Pendleton and Mission. Over time, service has grown from one van to a fleet of cutaway vehicles operating seven year-round fixed routes (as of January 2023). In 2014, CTUIR rebranded the service as Kayak Public Transit to help people understand that service is open to the public, not just tribal members.

Outside of the UIR boundary, Kayak also provides the Hermiston Area Regional Transit (HART) fixed route. In addition to Kayak, there are other agencies and operators that serve the UIR or adjacent areas. CTUIR maintains a list of these operators on their website at https://ctuir.org/departments/tribal-planning-office/kayak-public-transit/other-transportation-agencies/.

This plan identifies nine improvements to the transit system, plus the following programs.

- Work with businesses adjacent to existing or planned transit stops to sponsor transit shelters at bus stops. Coordinate with businesses and the proposed Parks and Transportation Coordinator position to determine responsibility for maintenance of transit shelters.
- Work with partner jurisdictions and agencies to ensure that Kayak is part of the development review process where there may be opportunities for new transit facilities or impacts to existing transit service.


## RAIL SYSTEM

There is one Union Pacific rail line within the UIR boundary, connecting Pendleton and La Grande. The line runs east and west, parallel to Mission Road, Short Mile Road, Cayuse Road, and Bingham Roads before turning south along Meacham Creek Road and into the Blue Mountains. There are 29 rail crossings within the UIR. No projects were identified to support the rail system, but the following plan is included:

- Safe Rail Crossing Plan
$\square$ Conduct a planning effort to establish a Quiet Zone Agreement for the Union Pacific railroad adjacent to the Mission area. The plan area would extend from the eastern boundary of the Community Water Sewer System service area to the UIR western boundary near Memory Lane.
$\square$ The plan would include recommended safety upgrades for crossings in the plan area, including any recommended closures of specific crossings to enhance safety in the area.
- Coordinate with regional agencies on potential restoration of passenger rail service between Portland and Boise.
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## Chapter 2 - INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to develop a long-range Transportation System Plan (TSP) for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR). This document addresses the transportation needs of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (UIR) over the next 20 years and considers key modes of travel including roadway, pedestrian, bicycle, transit, rail, and pipeline. The TSP was developed with community and other stakeholder input and considers existing and projected future transportation system needs. By developing projects that promote connectivity, safety, and comfort for all people using the transportation system, CTUIR can support equitable access, active transportation, increased connectivity, and reduced environmental and climate impacts.

## Study Area

The study area for the CTUIR TSP encompasses all lands within the boundaries of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (UIR), which consists of 172,000 acres of land located in northeastern Oregon, just east of Pendleton. This area also includes several roads on off-reservation Trust lands, although the primary focus of the planning effort is on areas within the UIR. Figure 1 shows the UIR and CTUIR off reservation trust and fee lands. Figure 2 illustrates the study area for the CTUIR TSP and highlights the three identified community hubs where multimodal transportation options are specifically desired. Appendix F of Volume II contains the existing land use assessment as part of Technical Memorandum \#2.
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Figure 1


Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary

## TSP Adoption Framework

CTUIR is the sovereign tribal government and road authority on the Umatilla Indian Reservation. CTUIR has compacted transportation services from the BIA under the terms of Public Law 93-638: The Indian Self-Determination Act. This Transportation System Plan is the primary long range transportation planning document for CTUIR, and also serves as the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), as defined by Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 25 Part 170.409-411. As such, it is subject to the approval structure outlined in CFR 25 Part 170.412 requiring BIA consultation and public review; Part 170.413 requiring public notice, public involvement, and opportunity to comment; and Part 170.414 regarding project prioritization and regular review and update of the plan.

This plan must be reviewed at least annually and updated at least once every five years. This plan will also serve as the LRTP for the purposes of CFR 25 Part 170.421(a)(1), and the project list developed herein will serve as the source list for developing the cost-constrained, short-range Tribal Transportation Improvement Plan (TTIP).

Public engagement for updates to both plans must consist of, at minimum, notice to the public of the intent to update the plan; access to the draft plan; opportunity for the public to comment orally or in writing; and a window of at least 30 days to submit comments. A public hearing before the Land Protection \& Planning Commission meets the minimum requirements laid out by the relevant CFRs and is therefore recommended as part of the adoption process. Amendments to the plan must be adopted by the CTUIR Board of Trustees and be accepted by the BIA to receive funding from federal programs such as the Tribal Transportation Program formula funds and competitive grants.

## TSP Organization and Methodology

The TSP is organized into chapters. Chapter 3 presents the goals and objectives along with the criteria used to evaluate and prioritize projects in the TSP. Chapters 4 through 8 present the projects (broken out by travel modes) developed to address gaps and deficiencies and future needs for the transportation system within the UIR. Chapter 4 also includes roadway cross-sectional and design standards. Chapter 9 presents the funding and implementation plan for the TSP, including existing and potential future funding sources to finance the identified projects. This project list is not financially constrained, which means that funding for individual projects has not been secured. Volume II: Technical Appendix contains the Technical Memorandums and supporting documents completed throughout the TSP update process, which document data collected, analyses completed, public engagement, and the project identification process.

## TSP Update Process

The TSP update process began with a review of local, regional, and statewide plans and policies that guide land use and transportation planning in the UIR. Goals and objectives and evaluation criteria were then developed to guide the development of planned improvements. An inventory of the multimodal transportation system was then conducted to serve as the basis for the existing and future conditions analyses. The existing and future conditions analyses focused on identifying gaps and deficiencies in the multimodal transportation system based on current and forecasted travel demand. Feedback was gathered from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the general public to verify the existing gaps and deficiencies. For each gap and deficiency, alternatives were identified, if applicable, and evaluated to address the system needs. This process led to the development of potential projects that were then prioritized using the project evaluation criteria and organized into high, medium, and low priorities. The potential projects were brought back to the TAC and the general public for feedback before the project list was finalized. The culmination of the TSP update process is this document, which presents the projects, plans, policies, and programs identified to address the existing gaps and deficiencies and future needs for the transportation system within in the UIR in alignment with the project vision, described in Chapter 3.


## Committees

The TSP update was developed in coordination with CTUIR and ODOT staff, along with key stakeholders and representatives from the community. One formal committee participated in the TSP update: the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC consisted of representatives from CTUIR, Kayak (including a Kayak rider representative), Umatilla County, Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center, Wildhorse Resort \& Casino, and State and Federal agencies. The TAC provided technical guidance and coordination throughout the project. TAC members reviewed and commented on technical memorandums and participated in three committee meetings.

## Public Involvement

The project was informed by several public involvement activities that reached different groups and interests throughout the TSP update process. The opportunities were advertised via webbased communications and included upcoming meetings, online feedback opportunities, and documents for review via the project webpage on CTUIR's website.

The goal of the public involvement process was to develop a TSP that addresses the gaps and deficiencies in
 the transportation system while meeting the needs of the community. By providing several touchpoints throughout the project schedule, feedback could be incorporated and updated materials then brought back to verify with the members of the public.

The majority of the public involvement opportunities were pop-up outreach activities at locations and events of interest in the community. The project team and CTUIR staff provided handouts, set up posters, and/or asked members of the public to provide feedback at the following locations and events between May 2022 and January 2023:

- Mission Market
- General Council Meetings
- July Grounds Gym After School Program
- Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center
- Treaty Day
- Arrowhead Travel Plaza (focusing on freight community feedback)
- Door-to-door outreach with ODOT staff
- Senior Center luncheon

Additionally, the following specific stakeholder
 groups were asked to provide feedback:

- Tribal Youth Council
- Kayak drivers
- Umatilla County staff
- Land Protection \& Planning Commission
- Law \& Order Commission
- Fish \& Wildlife Commission
- Capital Improvements Committee
- Health Commission

CTUIR also hosted three virtual open houses via the project webpage. Appendices C and D of Volume II contain summaries of the Spring 2022 and Fall 2022
 outreach efforts.

Lastly, the project team met with the Land Protection Planning Commission and Board of Trustees (BOT) twice each throughout the planning process.


## Chapter 3 - GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this TSP is to guide the CTUIR in fulfilling its transportation goals and objectives. The project team and TAC developed goals and objectives early in the TSP update process to guide the TSP's development. The goals and objectives enable CTUIR to plan for, and consistently work towards, achieving the community vision presented in the following vision statement:

## Vision Statement

The transportation system on the Umatilla Indian Reservation provides safe, equitable, and sustainable travel choices that fulfill the needs of those living, working on, and visiting the reservation community, while also fostering cultural connections, protecting treaty rights, and preserving the rural character.

## Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives for the TSP are described below. The goals provide direction for where CTUIR would like to go, while the objectives provide a more detailed breakdown of the goals with specific outcomes CTUIR desires to achieve.

## GOAL 1 - SAFETY

Provide a safe multimodal transportation system for all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.

Objective 1A: Improve locations with a history of fatal and/or severe injury crashes
Objective 1B: Implement strategies that systemically reduce the potential for crashes

## GOAL 2 - ENVIRONMENT AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Preserve existing cultural connections and the rural landscape.
Objective 2A: Develop projects that respect the rural landscape and cultural context
Objective 2B: Develop projects that help the community achieve its economic potential
Objective 2C: Establish land-use strategies and policies that support desired development that is culturally sensitive and facilitates the exercise of tribal treaty rights

## GOAL 3 - HEALTH

Develop a transportation system that supports active transportation and encourages healthy and active choices for the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.

Objective 3A: Increase the user-friendliness and comfort of active transportation options available to all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community
Objective 3B: Provide connections to community health centers, schools, and parks

## GOAL 4 - EQUITY AND ACCESSIBILITY

Provide a multimodal transportation system that is accessible to all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.

Objective 4A: Provide access to essential destinations for all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community
Objective 4B: Develop a plan that responds to the range of needs within the community

## GOAL 5 - CONNECTIVITY

Provide a multimodal transportation system that increases connections to the key hubs within the reservation and works to overcome existing barriers to regional connectivity.

Objective 5A: Improve existing, and/or create new multimodal connections between the Mission, July Grounds, and Gateway hubs
Objective 5B: Improve existing, or create new, regional multimodal connections

## GOAL 6 - COORDINATION

Develop a transportation system that works together with Federal, State, regional, and local partners.
Objective 6A: Ensure consistency with Federal, State, regional, and local planning rules and regulations
Objective 6B: Coordinate with partners to gain consensus on the planned system for the region

## GOAL 7 - FINANCIAL STABILITY

Develop attainable funding solutions for transportation system improvements.
Objective 7A: Prioritize investments and maximize partnerships to provide maximum benefit and return on investment for the associated cost.
Objective 7B: Develop projects that can be realistically achieved given CTUIR's existing, and potential, funding sources, including developing projects that will be compatible with Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) requirements and position CTUIR for future grant sources.

## Project Selections and Prioritization

The selection and prioritization of projects included in the TSP update was determined based on the goals and objectives described above, application of the project evaluation criteria, and TAC feedback. See Technical Memoranda \#3 and \#5 in the Volume II Technical Appendix for additional information.

## General Transportation Policies

Mode-specific policies are provided in Chapters 4 through 8. The following policies are relevant for all modes and/or the overall transportation system within the UIR.

- Develop and institute policies that encourage right-sizing, and adopting appropriate technology for, fleet vehicles and equipment, and encourage the adoption of alternative fuel vehicles through policy, infrastructure, etc.
- This plan updates roadway cross-sectional standards.


Photos: Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.

## Chapter 4 - ROADWAY SYSTEM

The roadway system within the UIR boundary serves most trips across all travel modes. In addition to people driving, the roadway system is used by people walking, biking, riding the bus, and using other forms of transportation to travel to and from essential destinations and neighboring communities.

## Jurisdiction and Functional Classification

The roadway network is owned and operated by multiple entities, consisting of CTUIR, ODOT, Umatilla County, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Each jurisdiction is responsible for determining the functional classification of the streets, defining major design and multimodal features, and approving construction and access permits. Coordination is required among the jurisdictions to ensure that the streets are planned, operated, maintained, and improved to safely meet public needs. Figure 3 illustrates the jurisdiction and functional classification of streets within the UIR boundary.
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## CTUIR ROADS

CTUIR owns and maintains most roads that serve CTUIR-affiliated facilities and housing. These roadways include Short Mile Road, Easy Street, Cedar Street, Aspen Way (and other local spur streets serving the adjacent residential area), Timíne Way, Wildhorse Boulevard, Kusi Road, Coyote Road, Spilya Road, Tokti Road, and Arrowhead Road. CTUIR also owns and maintains Mission Road west of OR 331 to the western UIR border.

## ODOT FACILITIES

Within the study area, ODOT owns and maintains Interstate 84 (I-84) and OR 331. I-84 is classified by the Oregon Highway Plan as an Interstate Highway, on the National Highway System and National Network, a Freight Route, and a Reduction Review Route. OR 331 (Umatilla Mission Highway) is classified by the Oregon Highway Plan as a District Highway, a Freight Route, and a Reduction Review Route.

## UMATILLA COUNTY FACILITIES



Umatilla County owns and maintains regionally significant roadways within the study area. Mission Road (County Road \#900) is the primary east-west roadway, connecting the Mission area to the city of Pendleton to the west. Classified as a Major Collector, Mission Road consists of two travel lanes with a posted speed limit of 40 mph . Other County roads are classified as Minor Collectors, including Emigrant Road, Cayuse Road, and Kirkpatrick Road.

## BIA ROADS

Within the study area, the BIA owns and maintains several local roadways that primarily serve BIA tribal agency offices and affiliated housing. These paved roads include "A" Street, "B" Street, Alder Drive, Cayuse Loop, Confederated Way, Cottonwood Lane, Umatilla Loop Road, Walla Walla Court, Whirlwind Drive, and Willow Drive. CTUIR operates and maintains BIA roads as part of the compacted roads program.

## PAVED AND UNPAVED PUBLIC USE ROADS



All remaining roadways within the study area are considered to be "Public Use" roads. These paved and unpaved roads may or may not have a dedicated right-of-way and are not owned or maintained by any government entity.

## Freight Routes

Single-unit trucks and semi-truck and trailer combination vehicles deliver goods to and from various businesses within the UIR boundary.

## FREIGHT ROUTES

The OHP identifies all Interstate Highways and certain Statewide, Regional, and District Highways as freight routes. These routes are intended to facilitate efficient and reliable interstate, intrastate, and regional truck movement through a designated freight route system. As shown in Figure 4, OR 331 is designated by ODOT as a Freight Route and primarily accommodates the movement of freight between I84 to the south and OR 11, which provides access to Washington, to the north.

There are no CTUIR-designated freight routes in the UIR; however, Mission Road is also used for local freight-related movements. There are no known freight restrictions on any roadways within the UIR. However, the Mission Community Master Plan (MCMP) noted that trucks will attempt to utilize Mission Road's connection to Old Emigrant Hill Road during periods of inclement weather when I-84 is shut down. This road is narrow and steep and cannot accommodate all truck types, especially during times of inclement weather.

## NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The National Highway System (NHS) is a network of highways, including Interstate Highways, that serve strategic economic, defense, and transportation facilities, such as airports, ports, rail or truck terminals, railway stations, and pipeline terminals. I-84 is designated as an NHS route within the UIR boundary.

## Bridges

There are nine documented bridges within the UIR boundary. Table 1 summarizes the bridge owner, repair status (if known), and relevant projects in this plan for each structure.

Table 1: Bridges within the Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary

| Bridge Title | Bridge Owner | Repair Status (Year) | Relevant TSP Projects |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 331/Umatilla <br> River Bridge | ODOT | Fair (2018) | R11, P10 |
| Cayuse River Bridge | Umatilla County | Unknown | R05, R15 |
| Thornhollow Bridge | Umatilla County | Demolished, <br> reconstruction <br> estimated for 2025 | None (work in progress, <br> funding secured) |
| Iskuulpa Creek Bridge | Umatilla County | Unknown | R13, R20 |
| Meacham Creek Bridge | CTUIR | Fair (2021) | R13 |
| Umatilla River Bridge | CTUIR | Fair (2021) | R13 |
| Sumac Road Bridge | Umatilla County | Unknown | R08 |
| McKay Creek Bridge | Umatilla County | Unknown | R09 |
| Mckay Creek Forks <br> Bridge | Umatilla County | Unknown | R09 |

Table source: CTUIR staff correspondence


## Roadway Plan

Streets serve most trips within the UIR across all travel modes. This section identifies alternatives to address gaps and deficiencies in the street system as well as alternatives that will facilitate improvements to the pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit systems.

The projects developed for the roadway system include realignments, repaving, and updates to existing roadways, traffic calming, intersection reconfiguration, and more. Table 2 describes the projects for the roadway system. The priority levels shown in Table 2 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the TAC and community. Figure 5 illustrates the location of the projects. Technical Memorandum \#5 in Volume II includes assumptions used to develop the planning-level cost estimates shown in Table 2. Appendix B of Volume II contains the summary sheets for each of the high priority projects.


Table 2: Roadway System Projects

| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R01 | Kash Kash Road | Kusi Road to east of OR 331 | Close existing access to OR 331 and reroute Kash Kash Road north to a new intersection with Kusi Road. | County | Medium | \$1,900,000 |
| R02 | Spilya Road | Eastern end of roadway to Kash Kash Road realignment | Extend Spilya Road east to Kash Kash Road realignment. | CTUIR | Low | \$385,000 |
| R03 | Emigrant Road | Cayuse Road to Poverty Flat Road | Widen, add shoulders, and repave Emigrant Road (County Road \#937) from Cayuse Road to Poverty Flat Road. | County | Medium | \$21,800,000 |
| R04 | 56th Street-Theater Road | Mission Road to US $30$ | Widen, add shoulders, and pave/repave 56th StreetTheater Road to help support rerouting of trucks and other regional/state traffic during I-84 closures. | County/BIA | Low | \$3,900,000 |
| R05 | North Cayuse Road | River Road to Mann Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave North Cayuse Road (County Road \#925) from River Road north to Mann Road. | County | Low | \$2,400,000 |
| R06 | Mann Road | Crawford Hollow Road to North Cayuse Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave Mann Road (County Road \#925) from Crawford Hollow Road south to North Cayuse Road. | County | Low | \$7,000,000 |
| R07 | Motanic Road | Best Road to Spring Creek Road | Widen, add shoulders, pave, and improve stormwater management on Motanic Road (County Road \#1031) from Best Road south to Spring Creek Road. | County | Medium | \$10,000,000 |
| R08 | Sumac Road | Spring Creek Road to McKay Creek Road | Widen, add shoulders, pave, and improve stormwater management on Sumac Road (County Road \#1050) from Spring Creek Road south to McKay Creek Road. | County | Low | \$6,000,000 |
| R09 | McKay Creek Road | Sumac Road to North Fork McKay Creek Road | Widen, add shoulders, add gravel, and improve stormwater management on McKay Creek Road (County Road \#1050) from Sumac Road east to North Fork McKay Creek Road. | County | Medium | \$4,700,000 |
| R10 | Exit 2016 Truck Overflow Parking | South of I-84 Exit 216 | Parking lot for overflow truck parking from I-84 winter closures. Could include a shuttle service from parking lot to Arrowhead during events. The location is still to be determined based on direction from ODOT - one option is shown in the figures. There should be consideration of electrification during design and | ODOT | High | \$3,200,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | construction in preparation for future needs. Install a road camera at the I-84/OR 331 interchange to better inform winter travel coordination and truck information. |  |  |  |
| R11 | OR 331 Speed Study | UIR northern boundary to I-84 | Perform a speed study along the OR 331 corridor and determine whether to modify any speed zones. Coordinate with Umatilla County to extend study north to OR 11. | ODOT | High | \$20,000 |
| R12 | Mission Road Traffic Calming | From Mustanger Lane to Parr Lane | Install speed feedback signage and other traffic calming measures. | CTUIR/ County | High | \$30,000 |
| R13 | County Road \#900 (Cayuse Road and Bingham Road) | Emigrant Road to UIR eastern boundary | Perform a speed study at key intersections on the County Road \#900 corridor to determine potential traffic calming or intersection safety treatments. Consider stormwater management improvements as part of any future projects. | County | Medium | \$20,000 |
| R14 | Kirkpatrick Road, vertical curve east of McKinley Lane | Intersection extents | Evaluate sight distance and install advisory signage if warranted. | County | Low | \$25,000 |
| R15 | Cayuse Road/ Cayuse River Road intersection | Intersection extents | Reconstruct northern leg to connect at a more perpendicular angle. | County | Low | \$1,200,000 |
| R16 | River Road/White Road intersection | Intersection extents | Reconstruct southern leg to connect at a more perpendicular angle. | County | Low | \$1,200,000 |
| R17 | Confederated Way | B Street to Mission Road (east intersection) | Construct flood remediation projects on Confederated Way from B Street to Mission Road (east intersection). Mitigations may include building a levy, raising the roadway, creating water retention areas, and rerouting the roadway. | BIA | High | To be determined by ongoing study |
| R18 | Short Mile Road Traffic Calming | From Mission Road to roadway extents | Perform a speed study. Install speed feedback signage and other traffic calming measures. | CTUIR | Medium | \$30,000 |
| R19 | Riverside Avenue Traffic Calming | From UIR western boundary to roadway extents | Perform a speed study. Install speed feedback signage and other traffic calming measures. | CTUIR/ <br> County/ Pendleton | Medium | \$30,000 |
| R20 | Iskuulpa Creek Bridge | Bridge extents | Replace the bridge, including a higher deck based on annual flooding. | CTUIR/ <br> County | Low | \$2,100,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R21 ${ }^{\text {3,4 }}$ | OR 331/ Mission Road | Intersection extents | Install safety and traffic operations improvements. Future traffic control could include a single lane roundabout, traffic signal, or other alternative configuration. ${ }^{1}$ | ODOT/ <br> County/ <br> CTUIR | Development-Driven |  |
| R22 ${ }^{3}$ | Mission Road/Timíne Way | Intersection extents | Install an eastbound right-turn lane and/or a westbound left-turn lane when warranted. <br> OR <br> Construct a single lane roundabout. <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal, with necessary turn lanes, when warranted. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ODOT/ } \\ & \text { CTUIR } \end{aligned}$ | Development-Driven |  |
| R23 ${ }^{3,4}$ | OR 331/ Wildhorse Boulevard | Intersection extents | Install safety and traffic operations improvements. Future traffic control could include a single lane roundabout, traffic signal, or other alternative configuration. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ODOT/ } \\ & \text { CTUIR } \end{aligned}$ | Development-Driven |  |
| R24 ${ }^{\text {3,4 }}$ | OR 331/ Spilya Road | Intersection extents | Install safety and traffic operations improvements. Future traffic control could include a single lane roundabout, traffic signal, or other alternative configuration. ${ }^{1}$ Consider options to modify access at Kusi Road and/or Arrowhead Travel Plaza depending on the future traffic control selected. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ODOT/ } \\ & \text { CTUIR } \end{aligned}$ | Development-Driven |  |
| R25 ${ }^{3,4}$ | OR 331/I-84 Eastbound Ramps | Intersection extents | Install safety and traffic operations improvements. Future traffic control could include a single lane roundabout, traffic signal, or other alternative configuration. ${ }^{1}$ Consider whether to install exclusive left- and right-turn lanes on the off ramp approach depending on the future traffic control selected. | ODOT | Development-Driven |  |
| R26 ${ }^{3}$ | OR 331/I-84 <br> Westbound Ramps | Intersection extents | Install safety and traffic operations improvements. Future traffic control could include a traffic signal, single lane roundabout, or other alternative configuration. ${ }^{1}$ Consider whether to install exclusive left- and right-turn lanes on the off ramp approach and an exclusive right-turn lane on the north approach depending on the future traffic control selected. | ODOT | Development-Driven |  |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total High Priority Cost |  | \$3,250,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Medium Priority Cost |  | \$38,480,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Low Priority Cost |  | \$24,210,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost |  | \$65,940,000 |

Note: The cost estimates presented do not include costs associated with right-of-way acquisition due to its high variability depending on location, parcel sizes, and other characteristics. The cost estimates also reflect the full cost of the projects, including costs likely to be funded by others, such as ODOT or private developers.
${ }^{1}$ Depending on the reconfiguration of the intersection, consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design.
${ }^{2}$ This project may be completed in conjunction with future replacement of the Exit 216 I-84 overpass.
${ }^{3}$ Project will require coordination with ODOT and approval from the State or Regional Traffic Engineer. Further evaluation may be required to determine the most appropriate form of traffic control.
${ }^{4}$ Planning concept potentially reduces vehicle-carrying capacity of the highway; further evaluation of the project design will be required at the time of implementation to ensure compliance with ORS 366.215.
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## DEVELOPMENT DRIVEN CAPACITY AND INTERSECTION PROJECTS ON OR 331

Although the operations analysis presented in Technical Memorandum \#2: Context and Site Analysis, provided in Volume II, did not highlight intersection capacity deficiencies based on generalized growth projections, previous planning efforts have identified potential intersection and roadway projects that may be needed to accommodate localized development or expansions of existing businesses and destinations.

These growth opportunities, such as expansion of the Coyote Business Park, further expansion of the Wildhorse Resort and Casino, and expansion of Arrowhead Travel Plaza, are not imminent, but could have local and regional impacts to the transportation system. If and when projects like this were to occur, the potential impacts and mitigation measures would have to be determined based on detailed traffic studies for the specific development scenario. Intersection solutions that have been identified through previous planning studies and preliminary traffic impact studies are included in Table 2. The identified solutions have historically included constructing roundabouts or installing traffic signals. Cost and benefit considerations for these two intersection control types are discussed below:

- Construct a roundabout
$\square$ Cost considerations: Potentially higher construction cost and lower long-term maintenance cost.
$\square \quad$ Benefit considerations: Improved safety, including reducing the potential for fatal and serious injury crashes and lowering speeds near the intersection. Adds capacity and reduces delay.


## - Install a traffic signal

$\square$ Cost considerations: Potentially lower construction cost (depending on turn lane impacts) and higher long-term maintenance cost.
$\square$ Benefit considerations: Adds capacity and reduces delay. May also reduce crash potential, but not to the same extent as a roundabout.

Due to the potential for development-related growth to influence traffic conditions along OR 331 from Mission Road to the I-84 interchange, CTUIR and ODOT will require traffic impact studies for all new development projects requiring access along the corridor and that are expected to generate more than 500 daily trips.

## ROADWAY PROGRAMS AND PLANS

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential roadwayrelated policy and programmatic direction to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff. The roadway system programs and plans are provided below:

- Maintenance program for intersections in the northern UIR where crops limit sight distance during certain times of the year
$\square$ Work with property owners adjacent to roads with limited sight
 distance to establish formal sight triangle boundaries. One example is Duff Road at Mann Road.
$\square \quad$ Where sight triangles cannot be established, add warning signage.
- Maintenance programs for striping
$\square$ Complete annual striping projects to update worn striping and to add/restripe fog lines on collectors and arterials.
- Coordinate with the County and ODOT on how to address truck parking and routing when I-84 is closed.
- Coordinate with ODOT and Umatilla County on regional connecting roadways.
- Create walkable neighborhoods. Monitor the need for traffic calming measures in neighborhoods and near pedestrian and bicycle activity centers, such as the school, Mission Senior Center, July Grounds residential area, and Nixyáawii Governance Center. Potential mitigations include raised crosswalks, "Children at Play" signage, 20 MPH speed limits, and additional marked crossings.
- Update and maintain CTUIR's parking regulations based on current national guidance and local trends.
- Maintain the Tribal Transportation Program (TTP) National Tribal Transportation Facility Inventory (NTTFI) and update with routes that CTUIR may wish to include as projects move forward. Coordinate with the BIA as needed. Attachment D includes the existing NTTFI as of September 2022.
- Coordinate with the Range, Agriculture \& Forestry program and other stakeholders to prepare an Upland Access Management Plan to determine a management approach for seasonal road closures, temporary timber harvest roads, and other publicly-used informal trails.
- As new development occurs, create a local street network that provides a high level of connectivity, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and multiple alternative routes. The local street network must tie into the existing network to support emergency access and circulation. New developments shall be planned with a maximum block length of 500 feet with a pedestrian access way provided every 250 feet along the block length. Pedestrian access shall be a dedicated pedestrian access way meeting the requirements of Section 17.015(2) of CTUIR's Land Development Code (LDC).
Figure 6: Street Grid Template

(A) Pedestrian access way shall meet the requirements of Section 17.015(2).


## ACCESS MANAGEMENT

CTUIR supports the access spacing standards for County roads within the UIR. CTUIR also elects to apply these standards to the roads maintained and/or owned by CTUIR or BIA. To handle any discrepancies between functional classifications, the County standards for major and minor collectors should apply to all CTUIR rural and urban collectors. The County standards for local roads should apply to all CTUIR rural and urban local roads.

The OR 331 Access Management Plan was referenced in developing the roadway projects described in Table 2 and Figure 5. The standards in this updated CTUIR TSP will supersede the OR 331 Access Management Plan.

## ROADWAY CROSS-SECTIONS AND DESIGN STANDARDS

Roadway cross sections were developed for the TSP update based on the characteristics of the existing roadways within the UIR. The design of a roadway can (and will) vary from street to street and segment to segment due to adjacent land uses and demand. The roadway cross sections are intended to define a system that allows standardization of key characteristics to provide consistency, but also to provide criteria for application that provides some flexibility while meeting the design standards. Figures 7 to 19 illustrate the cross-section standards for each functional classification. Unless prohibited by significant topographic or environmental constraint, newly constructed streets should meet the maximum standards indicated in the cross sections. When widening an existing street, CTUIR may use lesser standards than the maximum to accommodate physical and existing development constraints where determined to be appropriate by the CTUIR staff.

Road design standards ensure the design of a roadway supports its intended use. Road standards consist of design parameters necessary to provide a community with roadways or streets, which are relatively safe, aesthetically pleasing, and easy to administer when new facilities are planned or constructed or existing facilities are reconstructed. Figures 20 to 23 provide roadway design standards for select functional classifications.

## OR 331 AREA PROJECTS

Figure 24 illustrates projects on, and around, OR 331 from Wildhorse Boulevard to the I-84 interchange. This figure incorporates the projects identified across all chapters of this TSP, including projects that were originally identified in the 2006 OR 331 Access Management Implementation Strategy and Circulation Plan.

Figure 7: Cross-section for Arterial Roadway (i.e., OR 331 or Mission Road) - Multi-use Path Option


Figure 8: Cross-section for Arterial Roadway (i.e., OR 331 or Mission Road) - Curb and Gutter Option


Right-of-Way
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Figure 9: Cross-section for Rural Collector - Shoulder Option


Figure 10: Cross-section for Rural Collector - Multi-use Path Option
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Figure 11: Cross-section for Rural Collector - Gravel Option


Figure 12: Cross-section for Urban Collector
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Figure 13: Cross-section for Rural Local Street


Figure 14: Cross-section for Rural Local Street - Gravel Option


Figure 15: Cross-section for Urban Local Street - Standard Residential Street


Figure 16: Cross-section for Urban Local Street - Minor Residential Street


Figure 17: Cross-section for Alley


Figure 18: Cross-section for Multi-use Path


Figure 19: Cross-section for Umatilla River Multi-use Path and Horse Trail



TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTION - ASPHALT RURAL COLLECTOR


TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTION - GRAVEL RURAL COLLECTOR




TYPICAL SECTION
MULTI-USE PATHWAY

Figure 24: Detailed Concept OR 331 from Wildhorse Boulevard to the I-84 Interchange


## The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

## Chapter 5 - PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM WALKING AND ROLLING

The pedestrian system within the UIR consists of sidewalks and multi-use paths, as well as marked and/or signed pedestrian crossings. These facilities are primarily provided within the Mission, July Grounds, and Gateway hubs near OR 331 and Mission Road.

## Pedestrian Plan

The projects developed for the pedestrian system include sidewalk infill and reconstruction, new multi-use path connections, pedestrian crossing treatments, and more. Table 3 describes the projects for the pedestrian system. The priority levels shown in Table 3 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the TAC and community. Table 3 also shows if a project is within a 2 -mile radius of the Nixyáawii Community School. If it was, the priority was increased one level, if possible. Technical Memorandum \#5 in Volume II includes the CTUIR Safe Routes to School Plan as an attachment, which has been used to develop the projects shown in Table 3. Figure 25 illustrates the location of the projects. Technical Memorandum \#5 in Volume II includes assumptions used to develop the planning-level cost estimates shown in Table 3. Appendix B of Volume II contains the summary sheets for each of the high priority projects.

Table 3: Pedestrian System Projects

| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P01 | Mission Road | East of Huckleberry <br> Street to Cedar <br> Street | Install six-foot sidewalks along the north side of Mission Road from east of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street. Consider incorporating bus pullouts into the project design. | County | High | X | \$1,500,000 |
| P02 | Mission Road | Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection) | Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of Mission Road from Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection). Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$680,000 |
| P03 | Mission Road | OR 331 to <br> Confederated Way (western intersection) | Widen sidewalks to six feet on the south side of Mission Road from OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) and address the existing mailbox obstructions. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$490,000 |
| P04 | Confederated Way | East of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection) | Complete the sidewalk network along the north side of Confederated Way from east of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection). | BIA | High | X | \$435,000 |
| P05 | Cedar Street | Short Mile Road to Mission Road | Widen sidewalks to six feet wide on both sides of Cedar Street from Short Mile Road to Mission Road. | BIA | Medium | X | \$580,000 |
| P06 | Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase I) | Purchase Lane to OR 331 | Construct a multi-use path on the south side of Mission Road from Purchase Lane to OR 331. <br> This project is the first phase of a larger multi-use path connection to the City of Pendleton. Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. | CTUIR | High | X | \$775,000 |
| P07 | Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase II) | UIR western boundary to Purchase Lane | Construct the second phase of the multi-use path to Pendleton, connecting at Purchase Lane. West of Purchase Lane, the alignment of the multi-use path connection may occur in the area between Mission Road and the south bank of the Umatilla River. | CTUIR/ <br> County/ <br> Pendleton | High | X | \$3,500,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. If possible, connect to the Pendleton Riverwalk or the Riverside neighborhood. Include benches, lighting, and safety amenities (such as emergency call boxes and security cameras). |  |  |  |  |
| P08 | Short Mile Road <br> Multi-use Path | Mission Road to Cayuse Bridge | Construct a multi-use path along Short Mile Road to Sampson Lane adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad maintenance road to River Road to North Cayuse Road Bridge. | CTUIR | Medium |  | \$3,900,000 |
| P09 ${ }^{1}$ | OR 331 Multi-use Path (Phase I) | Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway. | CTUIR | High |  | \$1,900,000 |
| P10 ${ }^{1}$ | OR 331 Multi-use <br> Path (Phase II) | Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road, depending on feasible options for crossing the Umatilla River Bridge. River access could potentially be included as part of this project. | CTUIR | High | X | \$2,900,000 |
| P11 | South Market Road Multi-use Path | Arrowhead Travel <br> Plaza driveway to <br> Tutuilla Church Road | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331-South Market Road from Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway to Tutuilla Church Road. The Exit 216 overpass may need to be replaced to fit the desired facilities. | CTUIR | Medium |  | \$3,900,000 |
| P12 | Wildhorse Boulevard Multiuse Path | OR 331 to the Tamástslikt Trail | Construct a multi-use path along Wildhorse Boulevard, along the north side of the median or within the median. | CTUIR | Medium |  | \$675,000 |
| P13 | Parr Lane Multiuse Path | Umatilla River to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path in the vicinity of Parr Lane and extending to the Umatilla River. | CTUIR | Low |  | \$305,000 |
| P14 | East-West Multiuse Path | OR 331 to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path along the top of the bluff connecting OR 331 to Mission Road, intersecting the Tamástslikt Trail. Include lighting, benches, and security cameras or call boxes. Coordinate with Project P19 - OR 331/Timíne Way pedestrian crossing and Project P23 Mission Road/Cedar Street pedestrian crossing. | CTUIR | High | X | \$1,600,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P15 | Tamástslikt Trail Lighting | Confederated Way to Tamástslikt Cultural Institute | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | High |  | \$530,000 |
| P16 | Timíne Way Multiuse Path Lighting | Mission Road to OR 331 | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | Medium | X | \$320,000 |
| P17 | July Ground Multi-use Path System Lighting | n/a | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | Medium | X | \$480,000 |
| P18 | Mission Road Lighting | Short Mile Road to Cedar Street | Install pedestrian-scale lighting. | County | High |  | \$195,000 |
| P19 ${ }^{1}$ | OR 331/ <br> Timíne Way | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include signalization or a pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), or a grade separated undercrossing of OR 331. Coordinate with Project P14 - East-West Multiuse Path. | ODOT | High | X | \$2,000,000 |
| P20 | Mission Road Mid-block Crossing | n/a | Install enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments at the existing mid-block crossing on Mission Road east of Short Mile Road. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and/or curb extensions. | County | High | X | \$105,000 |
| P21 ${ }^{1}$ | OR 331/ <br> Kusi Road | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), raised median island, high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. | ODOT | High |  | \$105,000 |
| P22 | Mission Road/ <br> Confederated <br> Way (east intersection) | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. | County | High | X | \$105,000 |
| P23 | Mission Road/ Cedar Street | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high | County | High | X | \$105,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a <br> School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. Coordinate with Project P14 - EastWest Multi-use Path. |  |  |  |  |
| P24 | Riverside Avenue | From UIR western boundary to roadway extents | Install sidewalk and lighting along one side of Riverside Avenue. Cost shown is for the roadway segment within the UIR. Coordinate with planned project in City of Pendleton TSP, if possible. | CTUIR/ <br> County/ Pendleton | Medium |  | \$540,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total High Priority Cost |  |  | \$16,925,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Medium Priority Cost |  |  | \$10,395,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Low Priority Cost |  |  | \$305,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost |  |  | \$27,625,000 |
| Note: The c ost estima Project will | estimates presented also reflect the full c quire coordination with | o not include costs assoc t of the projects, including ODOT and approval from | ted with right-of-way acquisition due to its high variability costs likely to be funded by others, such as ODOT or private he State or Regional Traffic Engineer. | ending on locat evelopers. | ation, parcel size | other cha | ristics. The |

This page intentionally left blank

## PEDESTRIAN PROGRAMS AND PLANS

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential pedestrian-related policy and programmatic direction to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff. The pedestrian system programs and plans are provided below:

- New development within the Mission Hub should be required to include off-street multi-use paths to create a connected pathway system within the area.
- Parks and Transportation Coordinator
$\square$ Create a new CTUIR staff position to oversee and coordinate multi-use path maintenance and construction, park and river access, and park maintenance.
$\square$ Develop an Invasive Plant Management Plan (including for puncture vine ["goatheads"]) for roads and multi-use paths in coordination with other CTUIR departments.
- Parks and River Access Plan
$\square \quad$ CTUIR is acquiring land impacted by the 2020 flooding, including areas near Cayuse River Road, Cayuse Road, and Sampson Lane. The plan will determine a vision for creating a park(s) with potential river access. Work with property owners adjacent to the river to gain access. Explore other river access locations including previous informal access points, such as Parr Lane and the swimming hole near the railroad bridge.


## JULY GROUNDS ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

The project team created a detailed concept design graphic for the July Grounds enhanced pedestrian crossing shown in Figure 26. This figure incorporates the projects identified throughout this memorandum, not just pedestrian-related projects. It also provides an example of what an enhanced crossing could look like within the UIR beyond just this location.




Figure 26: Detailed Concept for July Grounds Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing
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## Chapter 6 - BICYCLE SYSTEM

The bicycle system within the UIR boundary consists of on-street bike lanes, shoulder bikeways, and unmarked shared roadways, as well as off-street multi-use paths and bicycle parking. The only marked bike lanes are on Mission Road, connecting the Mission and July Grounds hubs with residential, school, and commercial uses.

## Bicycle Plan

The projects developed for the bicycle system include buffered bike lanes, shoulder bikeways, and shared roadways. Table 4 describes the projects for the bicycle system. The priority levels shown in Table 4 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the TAC and community. Table 4 also shows if a project is within a 2-mile radius of the Nixyáawii Community School. If it was, the priority was increased one level, if possible. Technical Memorandum \#5 in Volume II includes the CTUIR Safe Routes to School Plan as an attachment, which has been used to develop the projects shown in Table 4. Figure 27 illustrates the location of the projects. The figure also includes the multi-use path projects previously shown in Chapter 5 - Pedestrian System. Technical Memorandum \#5 in Volume II includes assumptions used to develop the planning-level cost estimates shown in Table 4. Appendix B of Volume II contains the summary sheets for each of the high priority projects.

Table 4: Bicycle System Projects

| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B01 | Mission Road | OR 331 to Cayuse Road | Widen Mission Road and install buffered or separated/ raised bicycle lanes along both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to Cayuse Road. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$4,200,000 |
| B02 | Kirkpatrick <br> Road | OR 331 to McKinley Lane | Widen Kirkpatrick Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to McKinley Lane. | County | Medium | X | \$2,400,000 |
| B03 | Cayuse Road | Emigrant Road to River Road | Widen Cayuse Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from Emigrant Road to River Road. | County | Medium |  | \$6,800,000 |
| B04 | Confederated Way | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X | \$30,000 |
| B05 | Whirlwind Drive | Mission Road to Confederated Way | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X | \$5,000 |
| B06 | Cedar Street | Short Mile Road to Mission Road | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X | \$35,000 |
| B07 | Kusi Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$25,000 |
| B08 | Spilya Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$30,000 |
| B09 | Coyote Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$20,000 |
| B10 | Arrowhead Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$15,000 |
| B11 ${ }^{1}$ | Bicycle Fix-it Stations | Within UIR boundaries | Evaluate where bicycle fix-it stations would be beneficial to install within the UIR, such as trailheads, community hubs, or the school. | CTUIR | High |  | \$10,000 per station |


| Project <br> ID | Name |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$\quad$ Extents | Roadway | Nescription |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | Jurisdiction |

${ }^{1}$ Project not shown on the project map.

## BICYCLE PROGRAMS AND PLANS

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified the following potential bicyclerelated item for incorporation into CTUIR programs and plans:

- Coordinate installation of future bicycle fix-it stations as part of construction of projects that will attract bicycle activity, such as commercial development, parks, civic centers, transit hubs, multiuse paths, and bike lanes.
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## Chapter 7 - TRANSIT SYSTEM

CTUIR operates Kayak Public Transit (Kayak) which serves northeastern Oregon via fixed route local and commuter service and paratransit. CTUIR began public transportation services after observing people walking the distance between Pendleton and Mission. Over time, service has grown from one van to a fleet of cutaway vehicles operating seven year-round fixed routes (as of January 2023). In 2014, CTUIR rebranded the service as Kayak Public Transit to help people understand that service is open to the public, not just tribal members.

Outside of the UIR boundary, Kayak also provides the Hermiston Area Regional Transit (HART) fixed route and more-recently began operating the City of Milton-Freewater's service. In addition to Kayak, there are other agencies and operators that serve the UIR or adjacent areas. CTUIR maintains a list of these operators on their website at https://ctuir.org/departments/tribal-planning-office/kayak-public-transit/other-transportation-agencies/.

CTUIR and Kayak staff noted the following transit-specific goals to consider in 2023 and beyond:

- Increase system capacity
- Ensure safety for all users
- Protect livability and ensure equity and access
- Begin environment-electric vehicle service for the Mission Metro and campus shuttle routes
- Establish a regional outlook and future focus regional transit authority (RTA)


## Transit Plan

The projects developed for the transit system include bus stop enhancements, modified service, and new service. Table 5 describes the projects for the transit system. The priority levels shown in Table 5 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the TAC and community. Figure 28 illustrates the location of the projects. Technical Memorandum \#5 in Volume II includes assumptions used to develop the planning-level cost estimates shown in Table 5. Appendix B of Volume II contains the summary sheets for each of the high priority projects.
As CTUIR explores the transit system projects, coordination with other transit providers that serve the reservation and nearby areas will be needed. These other providers include Kayak, SafeT Transportation, Elite Taxi, Wildhorse Resort \& Casino Shuttle, Greyhound, and Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center transportation through the Allied Health Service Department.


Table 5: Transit System Projects

| Project ID | Location/Name | Description | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T01 ${ }^{1}$ | Park-and-ride Locations | Coordinate with regional transit providers for park-and-ride locations that help facilitate the use of transit by community members and maximize regional connectivity. | High | TBD, depends on partnerships available |
| T02 | Bus Stop <br> Enhancements | Evaluate transit stops for additional amenity needs, such as shelters, lighting, and signage. | High | One-time cost: \$324,000 <br> ( $\$ 18,000 /$ stop for 18 bus stops) |
| T03 | OR 331 Transit Hub | Consolidate bus stops at Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus into one pair of transit hubs on OR 331 north of Spilya Road, reducing need for transit vehicles to turn to and from OR 331. Coordinate with Project T04 - Wildhorse Campus Shuttle. If a roundabout is constructed on OR 331 based on development-driven projects, a single transit hub on one side of OR 331 may be appropriate. | High | One-time cost: \$400,000 |
| T04 | Wildhorse Campus Shuttle | Partner with adjacent businesses to purchase one shuttle bus to transport people from Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus to the OR 331 Transit Hub. Coordinate with Project T03-OR 331 Transit Hub. | High | One-time cost: \$175,000 <br> Annual operating cost: \$195,000 |
| T05 | Kayak Transit Hub Expansion | Install public restrooms for passengers at the Kayak Transit Hub. | Low | One-time cost: \$500,000 |
| T06 ${ }^{1}$ | Electric Vehicle and Shuttle Pilot | Acquire two six-passenger electric vehicles, install charging facilities, and begin electric vehicle service for the Metro and campus shuttle routes. | Medium | One-time cost: \$130,000 <br> Annual operating cost: \$195,000 |
| T071 | More frequent transit service | Explore adding more trips per day on the highest ridership routes including Hopper, Whistler, Metro, HART, Arrow, and Rocket. | Low | Annual operating cost: \$150,000 |
| T08 ${ }^{1}$ | Extended hours of service | Explore additional hours of service to serve the morning and evening shifts at Wildhorse Resort \& Casino. | Medium | Annual operating cost: \$75,000 |
| T09 ${ }^{1}$ | Extended Coverage Study | Conduct a study to understand the need for extended coverage for transit services to reach residential area near Riverside Avenue, Pendleton Airport, and Walla Walla Airport. Coordinate with surrounding jurisdictions and transit agencies who already provide services to these areas, specifically the city of Pendleton. Coordinate with local health and fitness facilities when locating new bus stops. | Medium | One-time cost: \$50,000 |


| Project |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ID |  |  |  |
|  | Location/Name |  |  |
|  | Description |  |  |

## Transit Programs and Plans

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential transit-related policy and programmatic direction to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff. The transit system programs and plans are provided below:

- Work with businesses adjacent to existing or planned transit stops to sponsor transit shelters at bus stops. Coordinate with businesses and the proposed Parks and Transportation Coordinator position to determine responsibility for maintenance of transit shelters.
- Work with partner jurisdictions and agencies to ensure that Kayak is part of the development review process where there may be opportunities for new transit facilities or impacts to existing transit service.
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## Chapter 8 - RAIL AND PIPELINE SYSTEMS

No specific projects are proposed for the air, rail, water or pipeline systems. However, one plan is proposed for the rail system.

## Rail System

There is one Union Pacific rail line within the UIR boundary, connecting Pendleton and La Grande. The line runs east and west, parallel to Mission Road, Short Mile Road, Cayuse Road, and Bingham Roads before turning south along Meacham Creek Road and into the Blue Mountains. There are 31 rail crossings within the UIR, which are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Rail Crossings within the Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary

|  | ODOT <br> Crossing <br> Number | Jurisdiction |  | Device Type | Crossing <br> Surface <br> Material |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nr Pendleton - Mission <br> Frontage Road | 2A-217.90 | Local Access | Mainline at <br> Grade | Stop | Unknown |
| Nr Pendleton - Mission <br> Frontage Road | 2A-218.43 | County | Mainline at <br> Grade | Stop | Concrete |
| Nr Pendleton - Private Road | 2 A-218.66-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |

Exhibit \#2 - Page 87 of 94

| Location Name | ODOT Crossing Number | Jurisdiction | Type | Device Type | Crossing Surface Material |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nr Pendleton - Private Road | 2A-219.12-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Nr Pendleton - Private Road | 2A-219.45-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Munra - Mckay Lane | 2A-218.70 | Local Access | Private | Stop | Unknown |
| Mission - Private Road | 2A-219.71-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Mission - Davis Lane | 2A-219.90 | Federal | Mainline at Grade | Stop | Paved |
| Mission - Umatilla-Mission Hwy | 2A-221.00 | State | Mainline at Grade | Active | Paved |
| Mission - Parr Lane | 2A-221.50 | Local Access | Mainline at Grade | Stop | Gravel |
| Mission - Private Road | 2A-222.25-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Mission - Private Road | 2A-222.75-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Minthorn - Niktyoway Road | 2A-224.10 | Federal | Mainline at Grade | Stop | Gravel |
| Minthorn - Old River Road \#918 | 2A-225.20 | County ${ }^{2}$ | Mainline at Grade | Stop | Gravel |
| Minthorn - Private Road | 2A-225.60-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Minthorn - Private Road | 2A-225.88-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Minthorn - Old River Road \#927 | 2A-226.20 | County ${ }^{2}$ | Mainline at Grade | Stop | Gravel |
| Cayuse - Private Road | 2A-226.68-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Cayuse - Cayuse-Adams Road 925 | 2A-227.30 | County | Mainline at Grade | Stop | Combination |
| Cayuse - Private Road | 2A-229.34-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Thorn Hollow - Thorn Hollow Road | 2A-231.10 | County | Mainline at Grade | Active | Paved |
| Thorn Hollow - Private Road | 2A-232.04-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Thorn Hollow - Bingham Road | 2A-232.40 | County | Mainline at Grade | Stop | Paved |
| Thorn Hollow - Private Road | 2A-233.44-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Thorn Hollow - Private Road | 2A-233.85-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Thorn Hollow - Private Road | 2A-234.36-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Gibbon - Private Road | 2A-234.92-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Gibbon - Private Road | 2A-235.53-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Gibbon - Private Road | 2A-236.27-P | Private | Private | Unknown | Concrete |
| Gibbon - Bingham Road | 2A-236.60-C | County | Spur | Stop | Paved |
| Gibbon - Bingham Road | 2A-237.30 | County | Mainline at Grade | Active | Paved |

[^0]Although no projects were identified to support the rail system, the following plan and policy were identified:

- Safe Rail Crossing Plan
$\square$ Conduct a planning effort to establish a Quiet Zone Agreement for the Union Pacific railroad adjacent to the Mission area. The plan area would extend from the eastern boundary of the Community Water Sewer System service area to the UIR western boundary near Memory Lane.
$\square$ The plan would include recommended safety upgrades for crossings in the plan area, including any recommended closures of specific crossings to enhance safety in the area.
- Coordinate with regional agencies on potential restoration of passenger rail service between Portland and Boise.


## Pipeline System

There are liquid and natural gas pipelines within the UIR boundary. Figure 29 shows the existing pipeline system, in addition to other utility lines within the UIR. No future projects, programs, or plans were identified to support the pipeline system.

Figure 29: Pipeline System


## Chapter 9 - FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

To implement any of the projects identified in the previous sections, CTUIR will have to secure funding that covers the estimated planning-level costs as well as addresses the unknown factors and considerations that will become apparent through the design process.

## Potential Transportation Funding Sources

Given limited funding, CTUIR will need to identify revenue sources to implement the capital projects identified in this plan over the next 20 years. CTUIR will likely rely upon grants, partnerships with regional and State agencies and private landowners, and other funding sources to help implement the projects. Table 7 summarizes current potential funding opportunities, including eligible project types.

Table 7: Funding Opportunities Summary

| Funding Source | Intended Use | Part of CTUIR Funding Plan in 2021-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Federal Sources |  |  |
| BIA Tribal Transportation Program | Supports transportation needs of tribes by funding planning, design, construction, and maintenance projects for public roads withing the National Tribal Transportation Facility Inventory (NTTFI) | Funding utilized |
| FTA Formula Grants for Rural Areas - Section 5311 | Supports federally recognized Indian Tribes operating public transportation or intercity bus service. Specific relevant subsections include 5311(c) Tribal Transit Formula Grants and 5311(f) Rural Transit \& Intercity Bus | Funding utilized |
| FTA Enhanced Mobility of Seniors \& Individuals with Disabilities - Section 5310 | Supports transportation services planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special transportation needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities in all areas | Funding utilized |
| FTA Grants for Buses and Bus Facilities Formula Program Section 5339(a) | Supports capital projects to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses, vans, and related equipment, and to construct bus-related facilities, including technological changes or innovations to modify low or no emission vehicles or facilities | Funding utilized |
| FHWA Tribal Technical Assistance Program (TTAP) | Build funding for Tribes to administer and manage their transportation programs and systems | Funding utilized |
| FHWA Tribal Transportation Program Safety Fund (TTPSF) | Address safety issues identified by federally recognized Indian tribes through plans, data assessment, implementation of systemic roadway departure countermeasures, and other safety-focused infrastructure improvements | Interested in pursuing |
| BIA/Tribal Bridge Inspection Program | Record conditions in the FHWA National Bridge Inventory (NBI) and meet the National Bridge Inspection standards | Interested in pursuing |
| FHWA Tribal High Priority Projects (THPP) Program | Projects that will decrease the need for private vehicles on the road and increase transit ridership, promote carpooling and ridesharing, and be in coordination with regional transitoriented development planning | Interested in pursuing |
| USDOT Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Program | Projects and strategies to reduce roadway deaths and serious injuries, including developing a safety action plan and carrying out projects and strategies from that plan | Interested in pursuing |
| FHWA Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Program | Focus on resilience planning, making resilience improvements to existing transportation assets and evacuation routes, and addressing at-risk highway infrastructure | Interested in pursuing |


| Funding Source | Intended Use | Part of CTUIR Funding Plan in 2021-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USDOT Rural Opportunities to Use Transportation for Economic Success (ROUTES) | Address disparities in rural transportation infrastructure by developing user-friendly tools and information, aggregating DOT resources, and providing technical assistance | Interested in pursuing |
| FHWA Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) | Preserve and improve surface transportation investments from a flexible funding source not limited by mode; $55 \%$ of the funding must support specific areas of the state based on population density |  |
| FHWA Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside | Smaller-scale transportation projects ranging from pedestrian and bicycle facilities to construction of turnouts and overlooks to historic preservation and vegetation management |  |
| FHWA Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) | Support programs that reduce emissions from transportation-related activities |  |
| FHWA Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Grants | Install electric vehicle charging and alternative fuel in locations on public roads, schools, parks, and in publicly accessible parking facilities | Interested in pursuing |
| USDOT Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing <br> Transportation (SMART) Grants Program | Projects focused on advanced smart community technologies and systems to improve transportation efficiency and safety | Interested in pursuing |
| USDOT Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program | Planning and capital construction projects to reconnect communities that were previously cut off from economic opportunities by transportation infrastructure | Interested in pursuing |
| FHWA Wildlife Crossings Pilot Program | Projects that reduce the number of wildlifevehicle collisions and improve habitat connectivity for terrestrial and aquatic species | Interested in pursuing |
| FHWA Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) | Reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads |  |
| USDOT Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) | Road, rail, transit, and port projects that achieve national objectives and have significant local and regional impact | Interested in pursuing |
| USDOT Nationally Significant Multimodal Freight \& Highway Projects (INFRA) Grants Program | Multimodal freight and highway projects of national or regional significance to improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of the movement of freight | Interested in pursuing |
| FHWA Recreational Trails | Develop and maintain recreational trails and trailrelated facilities |  |
| FHWA National Highway <br> Performance Program (NHPP) | Projects that improve conditions along NHS Routes |  |
|  | State Sources |  |
| Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) | Multimodal projects on federal, state, and local facilities | Funding available |
| Statewide Transportation Improvement Funds (STIF) | Supports public transportation services, except light rail, and can be used for creating new | Funding utilized |

$\left.\begin{array}{lll} & & \begin{array}{l}\text { Part of CTUIR } \\ \text { Funding Source }\end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{l}\text { services, maintenance of services, planning, and } \\ \text { pedestrian and bicycle improvements that } \\ \text { provide connections to transit facilities }\end{array} & \\ \text { in 2021-2022 }\end{array}\right]$

## Implementation Plan

Table 8 summarizes the full cost of the projects for the TSP Update. As shown, the full cost of the preferred plan is approximately $\$ 108.7$ million over the 20 -year period, including $\$ 25.3$ million in high priority projects, $\$ 58.3$ million in medium priority projects, and $\$ 25.1$ million in low priority projects. If/when the identified service-based transit projects are established, the total annual operating cost would be approximately $\$ 540,000$, including $\$ 195,000$ for high priority projects, $\$ 270,000$ for medium priority projects, and $\$ 75,000$ for low priority projects.

Table 8: Planned Transportation System Cost Summary

| Project Type | High Priority | Medium Priority | Low Priority | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Roadway | $\$ 3,250,000$ | $\$ 38,480,000$ | $\$ 24,210,000$ | $\$ 65,940,000$ |
| Pedestrian | $\$ 16,925,000$ | $\$ 10,395,000$ | $\$ 305,000$ | $\$ 27,625,000$ |
| Bicycle | $\$ 4,200,000$ | $\$ 9,270,000$ | $\$ 90,000$ | $\$ 13,560,000$ |
| Transit | $\$ 899,000$ | $\$ 180,000$ | $\$ 500,000$ | $\$ 1,579,000$ |
| Rail/Pipeline | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 25,274,000$ | $\$ 58,325,000$ | $\$ 25,105,000$ | $\$ 108,704,000$ |
| Annual Operating Cost <br> (Transit Services) | $\$ 195,000$ | $\$ 270,000$ | $\$ 150,000$ | $\$ 615,000$ |

Appendix B of Volume II contains the summary sheets for each of the high priority projects. The summary sheets provide information helpful for moving the high priority projects forward, including estimated cost, potential funding sources, responsibility jurisdictions, potential project partners, and other constraints and considerations.
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Table A1: Roadway System Projects

| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R01 | Kash Kash Road | Kusi Road to east of OR 331 | Close existing access to OR 331 and reroute Kash Kash Road north to a new intersection with Kusi Road. | County | Medium | \$1,900,000 |
| R02 | Spilya Road | Eastern end of roadway to Kash Kash Road realignment | Extend Spilya Road east to Kash Kash Road realignment. | CTUIR | Low | \$385,000 |
| R03 | Emigrant Road | Cayuse Road to Poverty Flat Road | Widen, add shoulders, and repave Emigrant Road (County Road \#937) from Cayuse Road to Poverty Flat Road. | County | Medium | \$21,800,000 |
| R04 | 56th Street-Theater Road | Mission Road to US 30 | Widen, add shoulders, and pave/repave 56th StreetTheater Road to help support rerouting of trucks and other regional/state traffic during I-84 closures. | County/BIA | Low | \$3,900,000 |
| R05 | North Cayuse Road | River Road to Mann Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave North Cayuse Road (County Road \#925) from River Road north to Mann Road. | County | Low | \$2,400,000 |
| R06 | Mann Road | Crawford Hollow Road to North Cayuse Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave Mann Road (County Road \#925) from Crawford Hollow Road south to North Cayuse Road. | County | Medium | \$7,000,000 |
| R07 | Motanic Road | Best Road to Spring Creek Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave Motanic Road (County Road \#1031) from Best Road south to Spring Creek Road. | County | Medium | \$10,000,000 |
| R08 | Sumac Road | Spring Creek Road to McKay Creek Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave Sumac Road (County Road \#1050) from Spring Creek Road south to McKay Creek Road. | County | Low | \$6,000,000 |
| R09 | McKay Creek Road | Sumac Road to North Fork McKay Creek Road | Widen, add shoulders, and add gravel along McKay Creek Road (County Road \#1050) from Sumac Road east to North Fork McKay Creek Road. | County | Medium | \$4,700,000 |
| R10 | Exit 2016 Truck Overflow Parking | South of I-84 Exit 216 | Parking lot for overflow truck parking from I-84 winter closures. Could include a shuttle service from parking lot to Arrowhead during events. The location is still to be determined based on direction from ODOT - one option is shown in the figures. There should be consideration of electrification during design and construction in preparation for future needs. | ODOT | High | \$3,200,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R11 | OR 331 Speed Study | UIR northern boundary to I-84 | Perform a speed study along the OR 331 corridor and determine whether to modify any speed zones. | ODOT | High | \$20,000 |
| R12 | Mission Road Traffic Calming | From Mustanger Lane to Parr Lane | Install speed feedback signage and other traffic calming measures. | CTUIR/ <br> County | High | \$30,000 |
| R13 | County Road \#900 (Cayuse Road and Bingham Road) | Emigrant Road to UIR eastern boundary | Perform a speed study at key intersections on the County Road \#900 corridor to determine potential traffic calming or intersection safety treatments. | County | Medium | \$20,000 |
| R14 | Kirkpatrick Road, vertical curve east of McKinley Lane | Intersection extents | Evaluate sight distance and install advisory signage if warranted. | County | Low | \$25,000 |
| R15 | Cayuse Road/ Cayuse River Road intersection | Intersection extents | Reconstruct northern leg to connect at a more perpendicular angle. | County | Low | \$1,200,000 |
| R16 | River Road/White Road intersection | Intersection extents | Reconstruct southern leg to connect at a more perpendicular angle. | County | Low | \$1,200,000 |
| R17 | Confederated Way | B Street to Mission <br> Road (east <br> intersection) | Construct flood remediation projects on Confederated Way from B Street to Mission Road (east intersection). Mitigations may include building a levy, raising the roadway, creating water retention areas, and rerouting the roadway. | BIA | High | To be determined by ongoing study |
| R18 ${ }^{3,4}$ | OR 331/ Mission Road | Intersection extents | Construct a single lane roundabout. Realign the northbound and southbound approaches to avoid impacts to the Mission Market. ${ }^{1}$ <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. Construct separate left-turn lanes on all four intersection approaches. Construct a separate right turn lane on the northbound approach. ${ }^{1}$ | ODOT/ <br> County/ <br> CTUIR | Developmen |  |
| R19 ${ }^{3}$ | Mission Road/Timíne Way | Intersection extents | Construct a single lane roundabout. <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. | CTUIR | Development-Driven |  |
| R20 ${ }^{3,4}$ | OR 331/ Wildhorse Boulevard | Intersection extents | Construct a single lane roundabout. OR | ODOT/ CTUIR | Development-Driven |  |



Table A2: Pedestrian System Projects

| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P01 | Mission Road | East of Huckleberry <br> Street to Cedar <br> Street | Install six-foot sidewalks along the north side of Mission Road from east of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street. Consider incorporating bus pullouts into the project design. | County | High | X | \$1,500,000 |
| P02 | Mission Road | Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection) | Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of Mission Road from Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection). Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$680,000 |
| P03 | Mission Road | OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) | Widen sidewalks to six feet on the south side of Mission Road from OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) and address the existing mailbox obstructions. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$490,000 |
| P04 | Confederated Way | East of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection) | Complete the sidewalk network along the north side of Confederated Way from east of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection). | BIA | High | X | \$435,000 |
| P05 | Cedar Street | Short Mile Road to Mission Road | Widen sidewalks to six feet wide on both sides of Cedar Street from Short Mile Road to Mission Road. | BIA | Medium | X | \$580,000 |
| P06 | Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase I) | Purchase Lane to OR 331 | Construct a multi-use path on the south side of Mission Road from Purchase Lane to OR 331. <br> This project is the first phase of a larger multi-use path connection to the City of Pendleton. Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. | CTUIR | High | X | \$775,000 |
| P07 | Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase II) | UIR western boundary to Purchase Lane | Construct the second phase of the multi-use path to Pendleton, connecting at Purchase Lane. West of Purchase Lane, the alignment of the multi-use path connection may occur in the area between Mission Road and the south bank of the Umatilla River. | CTUIR/ <br> County/ Pendleton | High | X | \$3,500,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. If possible, connect to the Pendleton Riverwalk. Include benches, lighting, and safety amenities (such as emergency call boxes and security cameras). |  |  |  |  |
| P08 | Short Mile Road Multi-use Path | Mission Road to Cayuse Bridge | Construct a multi-use path along Short Mile Road to Sampson Lane adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad maintenance road to River Road to North Cayuse Road Bridge. | CTUIR | Medium |  | \$3,900,000 |
| P09 ${ }^{1}$ | OR 331 Multi-use <br> Path (Phase I) | Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway. | CTUIR | High |  | \$1,900,000 |
| P10 ${ }^{1}$ | OR 331 Multi-use <br> Path (Phase II) | Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road, depending on feasible options for crossing the Umatilla River Bridge. River access could potentially be included as part of this project. | CTUIR | High | X | \$2,900,000 |
| P11 | South Market Road Multi-use Path | Arrowhead Travel <br> Plaza driveway to <br> Tutuilla Church Road | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331-South Market Road from Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway to Tutuilla Church Road. The Exit 216 overpass may need to be replaced to fit the desired facilities. | CTUIR | Medium |  | \$3,900,000 |
| P12 | Wildhorse Boulevard Multiuse Path | OR 331 to the Tamástslikt Trail | Construct a multi-use path along Wildhorse Boulevard, along the north side of the median or within the median. | CTUIR | Medium |  | \$675,000 |
| P13 | Parr Lane Multiuse Path | Umatilla River to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path in the vicinity of Parr Lane and extending to the Umatilla River. | CTUIR | Low |  | \$305,000 |
| P14 | East-West Multiuse Path | OR 331 to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path along the top of the bluff connecting OR 331 to Mission Road, intersecting the Tamástslikt Trail. Include lighting, benches, and security cameras or call boxes. Coordinate with Project P19 - OR 331/Timíne Way pedestrian crossing and Project P23Mission Road/Cedar Street pedestrian crossing. | CTUIR | High | X | \$1,600,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P15 | Tamástslikt Trail Lighting | Confederated Way to Tamástslikt Cultural Institute | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | High |  | \$530,000 |
| P16 | Timíne Way Multiuse Path Lighting | Mission Road to OR 331 | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | Medium | X | \$320,000 |
| P17 | July Ground Multi-use Path System Lighting | n/a | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | Medium | X | \$480,000 |
| P18 | Mission Road Lighting | Short Mile Road to Cedar Street | Install pedestrian-scale lighting. | County | High |  | \$195,000 |
| P19 ${ }^{1}$ | OR 331/ <br> Timíne Way | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include signalization or a pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), or a grade separated undercrossing of OR 331. Coordinate with Project P14 - East-West Multiuse Path. | ODOT | High | X | \$2,000,000 |
| P20 | Mission Road Mid-block Crossing | n/a | Install enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments at the existing mid-block crossing on Mission Road east of Short Mile Road. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and/or curb extensions. | County | High | X | \$105,000 |
| P21 ${ }^{1}$ | OR 331/ <br> Kusi Road | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), raised median island, high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. | ODOT | High |  | \$105,000 |
| P22 | Mission Road/ <br> Confederated <br> Way (east intersection) | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. | County | High | X | \$105,000 |
| P23 | Mission Road/ Cedar Street | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high | County | High | X | \$105,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. Coordinate with Project P14 - EastWest Multi-use Path. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total High Priority Cost |  |  | \$16,925,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Medium Priority Cost |  |  | \$9,855,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Low Priority Cost |  |  | \$305,000 |
| Total Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$27,085,000 |

Note: The cost estimates presented do not include costs associated with right-of-way acquisition due to its high variability depending on location, parcel sizes, and other characteristics. The cost estimates also reflect the full cost of the projects, including costs likely to be funded by others, such as ODOT or private developers.
${ }^{1}$ Project will require coordination with ODOT and approval from the State or Regional Traffic Engineer.

Table A3: Bicycle System Projects

| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B01 | Mission Road | OR 331 to Cayuse Road | Widen Mission Road and install buffered or separated/ raised bicycle lanes along both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to Cayuse Road. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$4,200,000 |
| B02 | Kirkpatrick <br> Road | OR 331 to McKinley Lane | Widen Kirkpatrick Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to McKinley Lane. | County | Medium | X | \$2,400,000 |
| B03 | Cayuse Road | Emigrant Road to River Road | Widen Cayuse Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from Emigrant Road to River Road. | County | Medium |  | \$6,800,000 |
| B04 | Confederated Way | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X | \$30,000 |
| B05 | Whirlwind Drive | Mission Road to Confederated Way | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X | \$5,000 |
| B06 | Cedar Street | Short Mile Road to Mission Road | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X | \$35,000 |
| B07 | Kusi Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$25,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B08 | Spilya Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$30,000 |
| B09 | Coyote Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$20,000 |
| B10 | Arrowhead Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$15,000 |
| B11 ${ }^{1}$ | Bicycle Fix-it <br> Stations | Within UIR boundaries | Evaluate where bicycle fix-it stations would be beneficial to install within the UIR, such as trailheads, community hubs, or the school. | CTUIR | High |  | \$10,000 per station |
|  |  |  |  | Total High Priority Cost |  |  | \$4,200,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Medium Priority Cost |  |  | \$9,270,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Low Priority Cost |  |  | \$90,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost |  |  | \$13,560,000 |

${ }^{1}$ Project not shown on the project map.

Table A4: Transit System Projects

| Project ID | Location/Name | Description | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T01 ${ }^{1}$ | Park-and-ride Locations | Coordinate with regional transit providers for park-and-ride locations that help facilitate the use of transit by community members and maximize regional connectivity. | High | TBD, depends on partnerships available |
| T02 | Bus Stop Enhancements | Evaluate transit stops for additional amenity needs, such as shelters, lighting, and signage. | High | One-time cost: \$324,000 <br> ( $\$ 18,000 /$ stop for 18 bus stops) |
| T03 | OR 331 Transit Hub | Consolidate bus stops at Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus into one pair of transit hubs on OR 331 north of Spilya Road, reducing need for transit vehicles to turn to and from OR 331. Coordinate with Project T04-Wildhorse Campus Shuttle. If a roundabout is constructed on OR 331 based on development-driven projects, a single transit hub on one side of OR 331 may be appropriate. | High | One-time cost: \$400,000 |
| T04 | Wildhorse Campus Shuttle | Partner with adjacent businesses to purchase one shuttle bus to transport people from Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse | High | One-time cost: \$175,000 |


| Project ID | Location/Name | Description Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Resort \& Casino campus to the OR 331 Transit Hub. Coordinate with Project T03-OR 331 Transit Hub. | Annual operating cost: \$195,000 |
| T05 | Kayak Transit Hub Expansion | Install public restrooms for passengers at the Kayak Transit Hub. Low | One-time cost: \$500,000 |
| T06 ${ }^{1}$ | Electric Vehicle and Shuttle Pilot | Acquire two six-passenger electric vehicles, install charging facilities, and begin electric vehicle service for the Metro and campus shuttle routes. | One-time cost: \$130,000 <br> Annual operating cost: \$195,000 |
| T07 ${ }^{1}$ | More frequent transit service | Explore adding more trips per day on the highest ridership routes including Hopper, Whistler, Metro, HART, Arrow, and Rocket. | Annual operating cost: \$150,000 |
| T08 ${ }^{1}$ | Extended hours of service | Explore additional hours of service to serve the morning and evening shifts at Wildhorse Resort \& Casino. | Annual operating cost: \$75,000 |
| T09 ${ }^{1}$ | Extended Coverage Study | Conduct a study to understand the need for extended coverage for transit services to reach residential area near Riverside Avenue, Pendleton Airport, and Walla Walla Airport. Coordinate with surrounding jurisdictions and transit agencies who already provide services to these areas, specifically the City of Pendleton. Coordinate with local health and fitness facilities when locating new bus stops. | One-time cost: \$50,000 |
| Total High Priority Cost |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { One-time cost: } \$ 899,000 \\ \text { Annual operating cost: } \$ 195,000 \end{array}$ |
| Total Medium Priority Cost |  |  | One-time cost: \$180,000 <br> Annual operating cost: $\mathbf{\$ 2 7 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Total Low Priority Cost |  |  | One-time cost: \$500,000 <br> Annual operating cost: $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| Total Cost |  |  | One-time cost: \$1,579,000 <br> Annual operating cost: \$615,000 |

1 Project not shown on the project map.

## Appendix B. High Priority Project Summary Sheets

## Project ID

## R10

## Exit 216 Truck Overflow Parking

## Description:

Parking lot for overflow truck parking from I-84 winter closures. Could include a shuttle service from parking lot to Arrowhead during events. The location is still to be determined based on direction from ODOT - one option is shown in the figures. There should be consideration of electrification during design and construction in preparation for future needs.

Project Type: Roadway

Responsible Jurisdiction: ODOT

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Kayak, Umatilla County, Trucking Companies, Arrowhead Travel Plaza

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns. Other - ODOT is currently designing the parking lot.

Potential Funding Sources: STIP

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?

| Safety | Environment and <br> Cultural Heritage | Health | Equity and <br> Accessibility | Connectivity Coordination | Financial <br> Stability |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |

## Project Location/Images



## Project ID R11

## OR 331 Speed Study

## Description:

Perform a speed study along the OR 331 corridor and determine whether to modify any speed zones.

Project Type: Roadway

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$20,000
Potential Funding Sources: FHWA TTPSF, CTUIR/ODOT planning funds

Responsible Jurisdiction: ODOT

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Umatilla County, Local Businesses/Property Owners along OR 331

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - OR 331 is the primary walking and biking route to the Wildhorse complex and other surrounding commercial development.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?

## Safety

Environment and
Cultural Heritage
Health


Connectivity Coordination

## Project Location/Images



## Project ID R12

## Mission Road Traffic Calming

## Description:

Install speed feedback signage and other traffic calming measures.

Project Type: Roadway

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$30,000
Potential Funding Sources: FHWA TTPSF, SRTS, ARTS and CTUIR Capital Improvements Fund

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: Local Businesses/Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Other planned improvements (P01, P03, and B01) along Mission Road may help with traffic calming.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?


## Project Location/Images



## Project ID R17

## Confederated Way Flood Remediation

## Description:

Construct flood remediation projects on Confederated Way from B Street to Mission Road (east intersection). Mitigations may include building a levy, raising the roadway, creating water retention areas, and rerouting the roadway.

Project Type: Roadway

Project Priority: High

Cost: To be determined by ongoing study

Potential Funding Sources: To be determined by ongoing study

Responsible Jurisdiction: BIA
Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Local
Businesses/Property Owners along Confederated Way

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential for significant impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - Project is highly linked to environmental outcomes.
Other - The study to determine which projects would be needed is currently ongoing.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?


Project Location/Images


## Project ID <br> P01 <br> Mission Road Sidewalks - East of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street

## Description:

Install six-foot sidewalks along the north side of Mission Road from east of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$1,500,000

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, ODOT, Local
Businesses/Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - Potential impacts to culverts.
Environmental impacts - Potential impacts to wetlands.
Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, STIF, SRTS, ARTS

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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# Project ID <br> P02 <br> Mission Road Sidewalk Infill - Between Confederated Way Intersections 

Description:
Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of
Mission Road from Confederated Way (western
intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection).
Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project
design.
Project Type: Pedestrian
Project Priority: High
Cost: $\$ 680,000$
Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, STIF, SRTS,
ARTS, TTPSF

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID Mission Road Sidewalk Widening - OR 331 to P03 Confederated Way (Western Intersection)

## Description:

Widen sidewalks to six feet on the south side of Mission Road from OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) and address the existing mailbox obstructions. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$490,000

Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, SRTS

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Local Businesses/Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - Potential utility impacts. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID <br> P04 <br> Confederated Way Sidewalk Infill - East of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection)

## Description:

Complete the sidewalk network along the north side of Confederated Way from east of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection).

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$435,000
Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, SRTS, TTPSF

Responsible Jurisdiction: BIA

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Property Owners along Confederated Way

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - Potential impacts.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

## P06

## Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase I)

## Description:

Construct a multi-use path on the south side of Mission Road from Purchase Lane to OR 331. This project is the first phase of a larger multi-use path connection to the City of Pendleton. Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$775,000

Potential Funding Sources: CMAQ, Recreational Trails, SRTS, OCP, TTPSF

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR

Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

## P07

## Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase II)

## Description:

Construct the second phase of the multi-use path to Pendleton, connecting at Purchase Lane. West of Purchase Lane, the alignment of the multi-use path connection may occur in the area between Mission Road and the south bank of the Umatilla River.

Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. If possible, connect to the Pendleton Riverwalk. Include benches, lighting, and safety amenities (such as emergency call boxes and security cameras).

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High
Cost: If fully along Boundary 1 : $\$ 3,500,000$
If fully along Boundary 2 : $\$ 3,000,000$
Potential Funding Sources: CMAQ, Recreational Trails, SRTS, OCP, TTPSF

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Umatilla County, City of Pendleton

Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - Potential constraints like bridge structures or water management facilities depending on the alignment.
Environmental impacts - Likely impacts.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

## P09

## OR 331 Multi-use Path (Phase I)

## Description:

Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$1,900,000
Potential Funding Sources: CMAQ, Recreational Trails, State Highway Trust Fund, OCP, TTPSF, ARTS

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR

Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

## P10

## OR 331 Multi-use Path (Phase II)

## Description:

Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road, depending on feasible options for crossing the Umatilla River Bridge. River access could potentially be included as part of this project.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$2,900,000

Potential Funding Sources: Recreational Trails, State Highway Trust Fund, SRTS, OCP, TTPSF, ARTS

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR

Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - Likely impacts along Umatilla River Bridge.
Environmental impacts - Potential impacts.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?

| Safety | Environment and <br> Cultural Heritage |
| :--- | :--- |

Health $\begin{gathered}\text { Equity and } \\ \text { Accessibility }\end{gathered}$

Financial Stability
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The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

## Project ID

## P14

## East-West Multi-use Path

## Description:

Construct a multi-use path along the top of the bluff connecting OR 331 to Mission Road, intersecting the Tamástslikt Trail. Include lighting, benches, and security cameras or call boxes. Coordinate with Project P19 - OR 331/Timíne Way pedestrian crossing and Project P23Mission Road/Cedar Street pedestrian crossing.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$1,600,000

Potential Funding Sources: CMAQ, Recreational Trails, SRTS, OCP, TTPSF

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR

Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - Likely impacts, depending on alignment. Barriers include significant topography changes and historical sites. Environmental impacts - Potential impacts.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

P15

## Tamástslikt Trail Lighting

## Description:

Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$530,000

Potential Funding Sources: Recreational Trails

# Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR 

Potential Project Partners: None

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - A power source will be needed for this project.
Solar may be an option in areas with adequate year-round sun exposure, but not in all areas.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID <br> P18

## Mission Road Lighting

Description:<br>Install pedestrian-scale lighting.<br>Project Type: Pedestrian<br>Project Priority: High<br>Cost: \$195,000<br>Potential Funding Sources: BIA Tribal Transportation<br>Program, TTPSF

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P01, P02, P20, P22, P23, and B01).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID <br> P19

## OR 331/Timíne Way Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing

## Description:

Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include signalization or a pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), or a grade separated undercrossing of OR 331.
Coordinate with Project P14 - East-West Multi-use Path.
Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$2,000,000

Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, SRTS, TTPSF, ARTS

Responsible Jurisdiction: ODOT

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P09).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

## P20

## Mission Road Mid-block Crossing

## Description:

Install enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments at the existing mid-block crossing on Mission Road east of Short Mile Road. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and/or curb extensions.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$105,000
Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, SRTS, TTPSF, ARTS

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P01, P02, P18, P22, P23, and B01).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

## P21

## OR 331/Kusi Road Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing

## Description:

Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), raised median island, high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$105,000
Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, TTPSF, ARTS

Responsible Jurisdiction: ODOT

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

## Project ID <br> P22 <br> <br> Mission Road/Confederated Way Enhanced <br> <br> Mission Road/Confederated Way Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing

 Pedestrian Crossing}
## Description:

Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$105,000
Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, SRTS, TTPSF, ARTS

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P01, P02, P18, P20, P23, and B01).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID Mission Road/Cedar Street Enhanced Pedestrian P23 Crossing

## Description:

Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. Coordinate with Project P14-East-West Multi-use Path.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$105,000
Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, SRTS, TTPSF, ARTS

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P01, P02, P18, P20, P22, and B01).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID B01 <br> Mission Road Bicycle Lane Separation - OR 331 to Cayuse Road

## Description:

Widen Mission Road and install buffered or separated/raised bicycle lanes along both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to Cayuse Road. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design.

Project Type: Bicycle

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$4,200,000

Potential Funding Sources: TA Set-Aside, TTPSF, ARTS

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID <br> B11 <br> Bicycle Fix-it Stations

## Description:

Evaluate where bicycle fix-it stations would be beneficial to install within the UIR, such as trailheads, community hubs, or the school.

Project Type: Bicycle

Project Priority: High

Cost: $\$ 10,000$ per station

Potential Funding Sources: CMAQ, SRTS (dependent on location)

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?


## Project ID

## T01

## Park-and-ride Locations

## Description:

Coordinate with regional transit providers for park-andride locations that help facilitate the use of transit by community members and maximize regional connectivity.

## Project Type: Transit

Project Priority: High

Cost: TBD, depends on partnerships available
Potential Funding Sources: FTA Section 5310, THPP, CMAQ, STIF, Innovative Mobility Program, public/private partnerships

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Kayak

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts. Implementation of specific locations may require partnering with private property owners or purchasing lots. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

# HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS? 

| Safety | Environment and <br> Cultural Heritage | Health | Equity and <br> Accessibility Connectivity Coordination |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | Financial |
| :---: |
| Stability | | Project Outcomes |
| :---: |
| Positive |

## Project ID

T02

## Bus Stop Enhancements

## Description:

Evaluate transit stops for additional amenity needs, such as shelters, lighting, and signage.

Project Type: Transit

Project Priority: High

Cost: $\$ 324,000$ ( $\$ 18,000 /$ stop for 18 bus stops)
Potential Funding Sources: FTA Section 5310, THPP, STIF, Innovative Mobility Program

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Kayak

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns. Other - A power source will be needed for any enhancements requiring electricity. Solar may be an option if hardwiring is not, especially in areas with adequate year-round sun exposure.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?


## Project ID

## T03

## OR 331 Transit Hub

## Description:

Consolidate bus stops at Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus into one pair of transit hubs on OR 331 north of Spilya Road, reducing need for transit vehicles to turn to and from OR 331. Coordinate with Project T04-
Wildhorse Campus Shuttle. If a roundabout is constructed on OR 331 based on development-driven projects, a single transit hub on one side of OR 331 may be appropriate.

Project Type: Transit

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$400,000
Potential Funding Sources: FTA Section 5310, THPP, CMAQ, STIF, Innovative Mobility Program

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Kayak

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Assumes project is able to be constructed within CTUIR and/or ODOT right-of-way.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

## HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?

| Safety | Environment and <br> Cultural Heritage | Health | Equity and <br> Accessibility | Connectivity Coordination | Financial <br> Stability |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Project Location/Images


## Project ID

## T04

## Wildhorse Campus Shuttle

## Description:

Partner with adjacent businesses to purchase one shuttle bus to transport people from Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus to the OR 331 Transit Hub. Coordinate with Project T03-OR 331 Transit Hub.

Project Type: Transit

Project Priority: High
Cost: One-time cost: $\$ 175,000$ (for one shuttle bus) Annual operating cost: \$195,000

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Kayak

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

Potential Funding Sources: STIF

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Appendix C. <br> Comprehensive Plan Policy and Land Development Code Amendments

## DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICY AND CODE AMENDMENTS

Date: January 12, 2023

To: Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR)

From: MIG|APG

Project: CTUIR Transportation System Plan

Subject: Implementing Policy and Code Language

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this memorandum is to recommend amendments to the CTUIR Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code (LDC) that will implement the 2023 Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update. The TSP update aims to foster cultural connectedness, deliver community-focused healthy lifestyle solutions, and prioritize safety for all modes of travel on the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Reservation).

Information about the TSP update and needed changes to the Comprehensive Plan and LDC are drawn from the following sources:

- Technical Memorandum \#2 - Context and Site Analysis
- Technical Memorandum \#5 - Revised Concept Design
- Discussions with the Project Management Team and Technical Advisory Committee


## CTUIR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

The CTUIR Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2010 and most recently updated in 2018. ${ }^{1}$ Chapter 5 of the document is titled Plan Elements: Goals \& Objectives and addresses issues including land use and transportation.

Relevant policies and recommended amendments are shown in Table 1. New language is shown in underline and struck language shown in strikeout.

[^1]
## Table 1. Recommended CTUIR Comprehensive Plan Amendments

| Comprehensive Plan Language with Recommended Amendments | Discussion |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.3 Land Base Restoration | This section describes CTUIR's land acquisition, management, and regulation, including the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. This section provides the basis for the Land Development Code. No changes recommended. |
| 5.4 Work Force Development <br> Objectives: <br> 8. Utilize Land Use and Transportation Policies and Programs to Support Access to Employment Opportunities for Tribal Members | New suggested language to tie work force development/unemployment policies to transportation (public transit in particular) |
| 5.5 Community Development | Addresses a wide range of community development issues. The TSP is listed as an implementing document though there are no transportation-focused policies currently. |
| 5.6 Natural Resources |  |
| Objectives <br> 10. Coordinate with property owners to explore options for safe and environmentally friendly public river access locations. | Addresses natural resources on the reservation. Not currently linked to transportation issues (VMT, climate, runoff from impervious surfaces). <br> Consider new language related to river access, here or elsewhere. |
| 5.7 Cultural Heritage | To the extent that transportation routes (walking and horse trails) are part of cultural heritage, consider policy linkage here. |
| 5.11 Health and Human Services |  |
| Objectives | Suggested new policy to support healthy lifestyle through active transportation. |
| $\ldots$ |  |


| 6. Support an active and healthy lifestyle through land use and transportation planning to create opportunities to access housing, recreation, and employment by walking and biking. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.12 Community Facilities <br> Objectives <br> 4. Create and sustain a CTUIR staff position to oversee and coordinate multi-use path maintenance and construction, park and river access, and park maintenance. <br> 5. Coordinate with Tribal and County partners to manage and minimize invasive species along roads and multi-use paths. | Addresses long range transportation planning. <br> Suggested new objective and policy language to ensure staff availability for new and continued access to multi-use paths, parks, and river access points. <br> Alternatively, these items could be added to the "Performance Indicators and Benchmarks" section. |
| 5.13 Transportation <br> 1. Develop and maintain a transportation asset system that is safe, environmentally sensitive and economically sound and promotes the public health with future transportation in mind. <br> 2. Ensure public or personal transportation to meet cultural, economic, personal employment, recreational, health and other needs for all residents, particularly at-risk populations. <br> 3. Ensure required foad transportation and transit planning documents are completed accurately in a timely manner and implemented as appropriate. <br> 4. Work toward providing access throughout the coded and traditional use areas through transportation infrastructure and transit options. As new development occurs, create a local street network that provides a high level of connectivity, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and multiple alternative routes. <br> 5. Coordinate land use and transportation planning to create walkable neighborhoods that are safe for all road users and provides opportunities to access daily needs without relying on a private automobile. <br> 6. Coordinate with Umatilla County, ODOT, and the Oregon Office of Emergency Management (OEM) to manage freight and passenger vehicle traffic and | 1. Minor rewording, "transportation system" is generally sufficient, <br> 2. Add recreation. <br> 3. Removing "road" broadens this to apply to trails, etc. <br> 4. Replace with language from TSP update. <br> 5. New policies/objectives to coordinate with partner agencies on the following: <br> - Coordinate with the County and ODOT on how to address truck parking and routing when I-84 is closed. <br> - Coordinate with ODOT and Umatilla County on regional connecting roadways (such as OR 331). |

```
parking during Interstate 84 closures. Ensure traffic
and parking management strategies are consistent
with applicable strategies from the Umatilla County
Emergency Operations Plan.
7. Coordinate with Umatilla County and ODOT on maintenance, management, and operations of regional roadways.
```


## LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (LDC) AMENDMENTS

The LDC ${ }^{2}$ regulates development of all land on the Umatilla Indian Reservation, and also applies to offreservation Trust lands. It establishes zoning designations, their allowed uses, and specific development standards. Table 2 identifies sections where changes are needed to implement the TSP. In some cases, specific edits are shown in underline and strikeout, while in other cases general concepts are noted for further discussion.

## Table 2. Recommended CTUIR LDC Amendments

|  | LDC Code Section |
| :--- | :--- |
| Discussion |  |
| Section 3.025 - Uses Permitted (AG-1) |  |
| Section 3.050 - Uses Permitted (AG-2) |  |
| Section 3.075 - Uses Permitted (AG-3) |  |
| Section 3.100 - Uses Permitted (AG-4) |  |
| Section 3.130 - Uses Permitted (R-1) |  |
| Section 3.155 - Uses Permitted (R-2) |  |
| Section 3.185 - Uses Permitted (I-D) |  |
| Section 3.210 - Uses Permitted (C-D) |  |
| Section 3.235 - Uses Permitted (P-1) |  |
| Section 3.2443 - Uses Permitted (P-1 Overlay) | transportation facility/improvement identified in the |
| Section 3.260 - Uses Permitted (F-2) |  |
| Section 3.285 - Uses Permitted (G-1) |  |
| Section 3.415 - Permitted Uses (P-2) |  |
| Section 3.445 - Uses Permitted (CR-1) |  |
| Section 3.520 - Uses Permitted (NR) |  |
| Section 3.560 - Uses Permitted (NS) |  |
| ‥ |  |
| xx. Transportation facilities, services, or improves. |  |
| identified in the CTUIR Transportation System Plan. |  |

[^2]
## Chapter 7 - Planned Unit Developments <br> Section 7.350 - Approval Criteria

6. The PUD must include any applicable transportation improvements (including bicycle and pedestrian improvements) identified in the CTUIR Transportation System Plan (TSP) to support a complete and cohesive multimodal network.
7. The PUD must implement the spacing and connectivity requirements identified in the TSP. Proposed street design and location must not preclude future multimodal connections to adjacent properties.

## Chapter 12 - Administrative Provisions

## [...]

## Section 12.065 - Street and Sidewalk Modifications

1. When allowing for modifications to street and sidewalk standards, the Comprehensive Planning Manager shall consider modifications of location, width, and grade of streets in relation to the following:
a. Existing and planned streets
b. Topography or other geological/environmental conditions
c. Cultural heritage sites
d. Public convenience and safety
e. The proposed use of land to be served by the streets.
2. Modifications must maintain adequate traffic circulation with regard to intersection angles, grades, tangents, and curves. Where location is not shown in the Transportation System Plan (TSP), the arrangement of streets shall provide for the continuation of existing streets in surrounding areas
3. Modifications to half-street improvements, street widths, or right-of-way widths are allowed where it is impractical to meet the width requirements due to topography, geology, environmental constraints, or existing development patterns.

Recommend adding approval criteria that requires consistency with the adopted TSP, including connectivity requirements, to ensure the desired multimodal transportation network is built out.

Consider adding language in Chapter 12 related to roadway design that differs from the adopted TSP. This provision is intended to allow flexibility for half street improvements (when a property develops on one side of a road but will not fund the full street improvement), and other situations

Chapter 17 - Provisions applying to special uses
Section 17.015 Streets and Pedestrian Access Ways

1. Street Profiles. Where required within a zone, new streets shall conform to one of the following street cross sections.

## [see cross section table below]

A. Urban Local - Minor Residential Street Cross Section...
*update graphic to Figure 12 from TM5*
B. Urban Local - Standard Residential Street Cross Section...
*update graphic Figure 11 from TM5*
C. Urban Collector Street Cross Section. This cross section shall generally be used to accommodate higher traffic volumes than the Urban Local Street classifications. Urban collectors are intended to serve land uses that generate higher traffic volumes than low-density residential development, including high-density/multi-family residential, commercial, and institutional land uses. Collectors are often used to connect local streets and arterial streets.
*new graphic - Figure 8 from TM5*
D. Arterial Roadway Cross Section (OR 331 or Mission Road). These cross sections shall serve as the roadway profile standards for OR 331 or Mission Road. This cross section is intended to support the highest traffic volumes in the CTUIR Reservation and these roads are designed to accommodate vehicles traveling at higher speeds. Design standards on OR 331 must be coordinated with ODOT. The Arterial Roadway cross section also has a multi-use path option.
*new graphics for multiuse path and curb and gutter options - Figures 3 and 4 from TM5*
E. Rural Local Street Cross Sections. These cross sections shall generally be used for rural roads with low traffic volumes. Rural local streets may have a paved surface or a gravel surface.

Add a new table that summarizes the profile widths of each cross section or functional classification. Add cross section standards and diagrams for Arterial Roadways, Rural Collectors, Rural Collectors with a multi-use path, Rural Collectors with gravel surface, Urban Collectors, Rural Local, and a Rural Local with gravel option. Update existing street and pedestrian cross section names and diagrams. Update references in $3.505,3.545$, and elsewhere as needed.

```
*new graphics for rural local and rural local gravel
option - Figures }9\mathrm{ and }10\mathrm{ from TM5*
F. Rural Collector Street Cross Sections. These cross
sections shall generally be used to support higher
traffic volumes than Rural Local streets. Collectors are
often used to connect local streets and arterial streets.
Rural Collectors include a shoulder option and a multi-
use path option.
*new graphic - Figures 5, 6, and 7 from TM5 *
G. Multi-Use Path Cross Section. This cross section
shall be used for multi-use paths. Multi-use paths are
intended to provide bicycle, pedestrian, and other
non-vehicular forms of transportation.
*new graphic - Figure 14 from TM5*
H. Alley Cross Section. This cross section shall be
used for alleyway access that serves driveways
located behind primary uses.
*new graphic - Figure 13 from TM5*
Chapter 3- Use Zones
Section 3.200 Acreage-Dimensional Standards (C-D)
Section 3.225 Acreage-Dimensional Standards (P-1)
Section 3.435 Acreage-Dimensional Standards (CR-1)
Section 7.500 Development Standards (PUD)
...
xx. Blocks,Streets and Alleys. Subdivisions [and
PUDs) shall be planned with a maximum block length
```

To implement the street grid in urbanized areas, consider adding block length/dimension standards consistent with the NR and NS zones. Apply the grid/block dimensions standards to PUDs to support a cohesive and connected street and block pattern between PUDs and adjacent urban areas.
of 500 feet with a pedestrian access way provided
every 250 feet along the block length. Streets within
subdivisions [and PUDs] shall conform to one of the
profiles in Section 17.015 as appropriate based on the
use of the street. Pedestrian access shall be a
dedicated pedestrian access way meeting the
requirements of Section 17.015(2).

## Section 4.020 Subdivision Manual

2.15 Minimum Standards: No proposed subdivision shall be approved unless it complies with the Comprehensive Plan for the reservation and the Land Development Code.

## [...]

2.25 Subdivision Committee Review Factors: (1) In review of proposed subdivisions, the committee shall consider the following factors:
...
(B) Conformance to zoning and Comprehensive Plan
...
(D) Adequacy of public services, existing or committed and funded, in the area of the proposed development, such as schools, police and fire protection, health facilities, highway and arterial road networks and other transportation facilities, parks and other recreational facilities, to serve the increase in population expected to be created by the development.
...
(Q) Possible adverse impacts or conflicts with planned transportation facilities identified in the TSP.
…
3.05 Additional Findings for Approval

1. Proposed transportation facilities or improvements are consistent with the adopted TSP Stroets, alloys, and adjacent areas.
...
4.30 Improvements Required:
...
(5) Streets and Roads

Easements serving subdivisions shall conform to the Street and Pedestrian Access Way standards in the Section 17.015 of the Land Development Code. In addition to the standards in Section 17.015 streets

The Subdivision Manual includes provisions to ensure proposed developments comply with the Comprehensive Plan and LDC. Recommended amendments included in this memo are intended to implement and ensure consistency with the TSP. These amendments to the subdivision manual will help clarify transportation improvement requirements and standards associated with subdivisions.

The street surface, right-of-way, and sidewalk dimensions (4.020.4.30(5)-(6)) are recommended for removal from this document but should be included in the CTUIR engineering standards or manual (if they are not already).
that serve subdivisions with lots less than one acre must ensure road surface materials use a Class C asphalt mix. Extruded curbs are an acceptable design alternative to the curb specifications in Section 17.015. with lots of one acre or more shall conform to the following minimum specifications:
a) Right of Way or easement width shall be 30 feet.
b) Road surface shall be 20 feet.
c) Material s base-4" minus sub-base, 4 inch eonsisting of $1-1 / 2$ " or $3 / 4$ "minus.
6) Streets serving subdivisions with lots of less than an acre shall conform to the following minimum specifications for all weather roads:
a) Right of ways or streets shall be 40 feet.
b) Road surface shall be 24 feet.
c) Materials
(1) Base 4" minus.
(2) Sub-base-4-11 consisting of $1-1 / 2$ " or $3 /$ 4" minus.
(3) Asphalt 2 inches.
(4) Asphalt mix s hall be-Class $G$.
(5) Extruded curbs are considered acceptable.
7) Sidewalks: Podestrian traffic shall be accommodatod by sidewalks of lot less than 5 foet in width.
...
5.20 Improvement Requirements (partitions):
...
(2) Existing Streets. The dedication of additional right-of-way and widening of the existing roadway shall be required whenever existing streets adjacent to or within a tract area are inadequate to safely accommodate traffic anticipated by the Natural Resource Commission and the County Road Department. Right-of-way improvements shall conform to the Street and Pedestrian Access Way standards in Section 17.015 of the Land Development Code.
(3) Dedication of additional right-of-way widening shall be required where topography requires cut or fill slopes for roads under the criteria above, where state

Language regarding asphalt mix and extended curbs added to this paragraph so it is not lost with the removal of subsequent text.
law requires rights-of-way for utilities to be dedicated or where a rationally supported traffic engineering study states that additional through lanes, lanes for turning, exits, bike paths, or walkways are needed for public safety or efficient traffic flow.

## Section 12.070 Right of Way Review

1. The right-of-way review evaluates conformance of an existing or proposed right-of-way cross section with the required right-ofway widths in LDC Section 17.015. A right-ofway review is triggered through the following:
a. Any proposed development action that is anticipated to exceed 250 Average Daily Trips (ADT).
b. A proposed development action that is anticipated to increase use by vehicles exceeding 20,000 pound gross vehicle weights by 10 or more vehicles a day.
2. Applicable land use proposals/actions (12.070.1) must provide improvements to the adjacent right-of-way to conform to right-ofway standards in LDC 17.015, which may include but is not limited to;
a. Planned ROW improvements identified in the TSP
b. Increased right-of-way width (dedication)
c. Half-street improvements
d. Construction of bike lanes, sidewalks, shoulders, vegetative buffers, and/or multi-use paths
3. Right-of-way review is exempt under the following circumstances:
a. The adjacent right-of-way conforms with the cross section requirements in LDC 17.015.
b. It is impractical to meet the width requirements due to topography, geology, environmental constraints, or existing development patterns, as determined by the Comprehensive Planning Manager.

Recommend describing the "Right of Way Review Process" in code as referenced in this Section 17.015. "CTUIR Right of Way Policy" is mentioned in the comprehensive plan.

## Table 3. Functional Classification and Cross Sections Table

This new table provides dimensional standards for the cross sections within the TSP. The table is recommended for inclusion in Section 17.015 - STREETS AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESSWAYS along with new cross-section graphics.

| Cross Section | Right-ofWay Width | Pavement or Gravel Width | \# of <br> Travel <br> Lanes | Travel Lane | Shoulder | Bike Lane | Sidewalk <br> (SW) or <br> Multi- <br> Use Path (MP) | Parking | Vegetated Buffer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Urban <br> Local - <br> Minor <br> Residential | 50' | 28' | 1 | 14' | N/A | N/A | SW: 5' | 7' | 6' |
| Urban <br> Local - <br> Standard <br> Residential | 60' | 36 | 2 | 11' | N/A | N/A | SW: 5' | $7 \times$ | 6 ' |
| Urban Collector | $70^{\prime}$ | 46'-48' | 2 | 10-11' | N/A | 6 ' | SW: 5' | $7 \times$ | 6 ' |
| Arterial <br> (multi-use <br> path <br> option) | 80' | 46'-54' | 2 <br> (plus <br> center <br> turn <br> lane) | $\begin{aligned} & 11^{\prime}-12^{\prime} ; \\ & \text { turn } \\ & \text { lane: } \\ & 12-14^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | 6'-8' | N/A | MP: 10' | N/A | Remaining ROW varies |
| Arterial (curb/gutter option) | 60' | 34-40' | 2 | 11-12' | N/A | 6-8' | SW: 6' | N/A | 5 |
| Rural Local | 50' | 30'-32' | 2 | 11'-12' | 4' | N/A | N/A | N/A | 10' |
| Rural Local (gravel) | $50^{\prime}$ | 30'-32' | 2 | 11-12' | 4' | N/A | N/A | N/A | $10^{\prime}$ |
| Rural Collector (Shoulder) | 60' | 32'-40' | 2 | 11-12' | 5-8' | N/A | N/A | N/A | 10'-13' |
| Rural Collector (Multi-Use Path) | 60' | 30'-32' | 2 | 11'-12' | 4' | N/A | MP: 10' | N/A | 10'-14' |
| Rural Collector (Gravel) | 60' | 34'-36' | 2 | 11-12' | 6 ' | N/A | N/A | N/A | 12-13' |
| Alleyway | 16' | 12'-16' | 1 | 12'-16' | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
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## INTRODUCTION

The project team recently completed outreach efforts to guide the development of the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update, with the support of CTUIR and ODOT staff. These efforts included:

- Senior Center Outreach
- Mission Market Outreach
- Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center Tabling
- General Council Meeting Tabling
- Nixyaawii Gym Outreach
- Tribal Youth Council Meeting
- Treaty Day Outreach
- Online Input


## Spring 2022 Outreach

Overall, a total of approximately 75 people were reached in person during the Spring 2022 outreach events, with 54 providing comments.

This memorandum summarizes the feedback received from these events as of June 14, 2022. Key and recurring themes from the feedback included:

- Road maintenance and condition are a concern, especially when I-84 is closed and trucks and other traffic try to reroute onto local roads.
- Additional lighting is desired on Mission Road, in the July Grounds Hub, and on multi-use paths.
- There was concern about cougars along the TCI trail.
- People would like dedicated space for walking and biking along OR 331 and on Mission Road.
- Focus on safety improvements and connections near schools and other essential destinations (e.g., Nixyawii Government Center, Wildhorse Resort \& Casino).
- Desire for additional river access.
- People would like more frequent transit service and extended coverage.
- Many people get rides from relatives when transit service is not an option.
- There is interest in a walking and biking connection to Pendleton.


## SENIOR CENTER OUTREACH

Members of the project team and CTUIR staff visited the Senior Center during lunch on May 18, 2022 from 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM. This provided the opportunity to introduce the project to attendees, answer questions related to the vision and goals, and solicit input via a handout. There were approximately 20 people present, with about 4 people providing comments.

Comments included:

- Bus system is not close enough to housing and only comes twice a day.
- Roads in Tutuilla need to be paved or maintained more efficiently. Very hard on vehicles and floods often. It is a County road but a lot of tribal members use it.
- Need safe places for kids to go to school.
- Thorn Hollow Road bridge washed away, still being replaced.
- Kanine Ridge Road not actually open to public travel.
- N Cayuse Road - shoulders need to be wider, and road is eroding.
- Bike trails from housing areas to Nixyaawii Governance Center, school, and clinic that are not along the main road.
- Transit needs - more frequent routes, express lines so you can go to Safeway/Walmart directly, dial-a-ride, and student routes.
- Top destinations include TCI, Yellowhawk, Wildhorse Casino, Pendleton, housing, clinic, Walmart, Safeway, Walla Walla.
- County roads need more attention.
- People still ride horses sometimes. Mostly through fields and sometimes you'll see them near Nixyaawii Governance Center. One thing that prevents people from riding more is the lack of places to hitch their horses at their destinations.
- Like the greenery in the area and the care CTUIR puts into things.
- Kids need more things to do. Traditions are fading.
- Services for homeless kids would be good. They often walk places.
- Transportation is generally good. Roads need to be repaired upriver.
- They no longer give out tokens for the bus. Miss this. Taxi rides are expensive and so is gas.
- There was interest in a new road connecting Burke Road to Kanine Ridge Road near I-84. There is less snow there than on I-84.


## MISSION MARKET OUTREACH

The project team and CTUIR staff solicitated public input at Mission Market during two time periods: 3:00 to 5:00 PM on May 18, 2022 and 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM on May 19, 2022. Community members were able to provide verbal comments or mark comments on a poster board of the study area. Six people provided input to the project team on May $18^{\text {th }}$ and nine provided input on May $19^{\text {th }}$.

Comments included:

- Food pantry on Tokti Road. Public transport to here or delivery services.
- Parked cars occur on Kash Kash Road.
- Need transit to airport/hotels from Wildhorse.
- Tourists ride e-bikes around Wildhorse.
- Need lighting in July Grounds.
- Bears and cougars are present in July Grounds.
- Need walking/biking access along OR 331.
- Mission Road/OR 331 intersection can get busy.
- E-scooters on Rothrock Road.
- Near Kusi Road and Spilya Road east of OR 331, expanded parking would be safer than on street with casino shuttle.
- Trail in July Ground needs maintenance (cracks).
- Used to have access to river from Parr Lane. Would be good to have a park on river.
- East-west off-road path connecting Mission and July Grounds.
- Wildlife was a common theme for July Grounds.
- Fill sidewalk gaps in July Grounds.
- Biking on Mission is tough, especially on way to Pendleton and by Cayuse.
- On Mission Road, stopping downhill is a challenge in the winter (approaching OR 331).

- Trail to Pendleton along Mission Road. Trails to walk in Riverside.
- Mountain bike trails on undeveloped CTUIR land.
- Public transportation to Wildhorse on holidays.
- Kayak - more frequent trips; stops throughout UIR (especially for Mission service and new transitional housing by BIA building on B street)); service to Riverside area.
- Kayak coverage is generally excellent.
- Lots of people get rides from relatives when other options aren't available.


## JULY GROUNDS GYM OUTREACH

```
Member of the project team and CTUIR staff were available at the July Grounds Gym during afterschool
programs on May 18, 2022 from 3:00 to 5:00 PM, soliciting feedback via a handout. Six people provided input to
the project team.
Comments included:
- Johnson Creek area.
- Horse trailers hard on roundabouts.
- How to deal with truck traffic and parking during snow events? Unsafe driving/walking conditions during snow events currently.
- Need to run buses more often for those that can't drive.
- Stop sign at Mission/Short Miles bus stop would be nice.
- Mission Road sidewalks from July Grounds to Yellowhawk are heavily used.
- Trails in July Ground are not safe at night.
- GIS plant trail connection to community garden in July Grounds.
- Sidewalks on Mission Road/Emigrant Road.
- Sidewalk needed along OR 331.
- Better bike/pedestrian connection to casino from Mission area.
- Horses need to cross I-84 just east of OR 331.
```


## GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING TABLING

CTUIR staff manned a table in the rotunda outside the General Council meeting at the Nixyaawii Governance Center on May 19, 2022 from 1:00 to 3:00 PM. This provided the opportunity to introduce the project to attendees, answer questions related to the vision and goals, discuss the transportation system history in the area, and solicit input via a handout and larger maps. Approximately 18 people provided input.

Comments included:

- Connect to Levy Trail to the west.
- Steep on Mytinger Lane. Need help at assisted living.
- Need better bike lane eastbound on Mission Road at west CTUIR boundary.
- Bike lane on Mission Road east of $56^{\text {th }}$ Street is dirty and feels unsafe.
- River near OR 331 - pull out for river, ADA platform for fishing.
- Distance markers on walking path in Mission.
- Walk path and bike lanes along OR 331 - very scary with pedestrians, especially just south of Timíne Way where there is a narrow shoulder.
- Nixyaawii Governance Center labeled incorrectly on map.
- Trails feel unsafe. Too dark at night and need lighting.
- Trail access on river.
- Transportation needs for young people near Short Mile Road and railroad area.
- Walkability over I-84.
- Truck left turns from Kusi Road.
- Truck parking north of Kash Kash Road.
- Kayak has improved.
- Expand transit routes and service hours for WRC staff. Coordinate service with WRC.
- Need notifications for cancelled transit pickups.
- UPRR drivers can cause issues and drive dangerously.
- Lack of school bus signs and follow-up with Umatilla County Roads staff.
- Fix roads in the southern area of the reservation boundary (south of E Birch Creek Road).
- Guard rails on Sumac Road.
- Frequently washed out on Spring Creek Road.
- Emigrant Road - signage to turn around sooner, sinking of road surface and bad road conditions.
- Maintenance issues on Kash Kash Road.
- Thornhollow Road Bridge.
- Snow and ice south of railroad near Butcher Creek Road and Weather Road.
- Need Kayak routes to St. Anthony and Les Schwab.
- Info hub for regional transit, other agencies, transfers (Arrowhead, senior center).
- Links at bottom of page.
- Mile point 12.2 - raise road grade.
- Mile point 16 - add guard rail.
- Paint fog stripe on all paved roads.
- Do D.E.M. analysis and add guard rails wherever needed.
- People walking along OR 331.
- Transit for outlying residences.
- Google maps aren't accurate.
- School trail near Mission.
- Add bus stop signs on Mission Road and Short Mile Road.
- Truck traffic on Mission Road/Emigrant Road when I-84 closes is dangerous, and noise is irritating to residents.
- Kanine Ridge Road is gated and not open to the public.
- Like walking paths in housing projects.
- Security cameras on trails with lighting.
- More signs where kids may be near roads (slow, kids at play, etc.). Traffic calming too.
- Improvements nears schools/places kids go, especially 4 Corners.
- Vision and Goals
$\square \quad$ Coordinate with other transit agencies in the region.
$\square \quad 70 \%$ of CTUIR energy costs are transport fuel.
$\square$ Awareness of drivers/other roadway users.
$\square$ Awareness of cyclist rights and needs.


## YELLOWHAWK TRIBAL HEALTH CENTER TABLING

During May 19, 2022 from 2:00 to 4:00 PM, members of the project team and CTUIR staff manned a table with handouts and larger maps in the lobby of the Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center to solicit public comment on the existing transportation system and future needs. Seven members of the public provided input.

Comments included:

- Improvements to roads and sidewalks for biking in July Grounds.
- Need sidewalks where you turn into housing/Whirlwind.
- Sidewalks on Short Mile.
- Need more parking near Arrowhead for when I-84 closes. Could provide shuttle to enjoy amenities whiles waiting for road.


## TRIBAL YOUTH COUNCIL MEETING

CTUIR staff attended an engagement session with the Tribal Youth Council on May 22, 2022 from 1:15 to 2:00 PM. Staff led a conversation with the seven youth council members in attendance and solicited additional feedback via a handout.

Discussion around what projects the students think of when envision meeting each of the Technical Memo \#3 goals:

- Safety
- More lighting.
- New crosswalks and sidewalks.
- More space to ride bikes and keep away from vehicular traffic.
- Repaint speed bumps or have "speed bumps ahead" signs for Whirlwind Drive and Confederated Way.
- Safety of railroad crossings has improved greatly. Need more pedestrian access, and all of the crossings should have traffic-blocking arms.
- CTUIR prompted discussion of new funding for reduction of at-grade rail crossings. Potential useful for the heavier traffic roads, such as OR 331 and Memory Lane.
- Environment and Cultural Heritage
- There used to be a path down to the river by Parr Lane. It might have been shut down prior to the 2020 flood by the property owner, but the flood washed it out. It would be nice to have trails that are official and maintained to access the river for fishing and swimming. Interested in public access and potentially some locations with gravel parking areas.
- Extension of the levy trail.
- Can there be walkways along the river? Potential negative impact on environmental protection; might be better to have access points and with a multi-use trail along the Mission Road.
- River access off of Parr Lane and Short Mile Road (near housing).
- Health
- Cross country team runs near Nixyaawii Governance Center and July Grounds; safer trails needed.
- Official and maintained scenic trails.
- Add trail features, like benches, for elders/disabled people who exercise.
- Equity \& Accessibility
- More benches and shade along existing walkways.
- Golf cart or other electric device check-out system (i.e. e-bikes and e-scooters) to get around the Mission-to-Wildhorse area. Could include a couple designated pick-up/drop-off locations.
- Connectivity
- Connect with the levy trail.
- Extended taxi or dial-a-ride service to help seniors to do time-sensitive errands with limited mobility (e.g. can't get to a Kayak stop).
- CTUIR plane out of Pendleton's airport. Add another destination like Spokane, Las Vegas, or other place CTUIR community has connections with.
- No comments on goals around Coordination and Financial Stability.

Handout comments included:

- Safety concerns with traffic around Arrowhead gas station.
- Add crosswalks on all legs at Mission Market intersection.
- Provide better pathway to Nixyaawii Governance Center.
- Sidewalks up the hill to Wildhorse.
- Repaint speed bumps.
- New paths to river.
- New walking path along the river.
- On the TCI trail, need light to allow youth and elders to walk at night and improve safety.
- Provide path between school and Mission Market.
- Top destinations include school, grocery store, neighborhoods, and Mission Market.


## TREATY DAY OUTREACH

CTUIR staff set up a table at the annual Treaty Day celebration on June 9, 2022.
Comments received include:

- Goathead seeds (spiked vine) on the shoulder of roads in the July Grounds area, it causes pedestrians to walk in the middle of the road.
- There are no sidewalks in the neighborhoods northeast of Mission Road, south of Short Mile (including both of those roads).
- Would like to see the sidewalk continued on Confederated Way all the way to the east end.
- Would like to see a pedestrian crossing on the Umatilla River bridge (Highway 331) and an ADA accessible fishing platform there.
- Lots of pedestrians on the shoulder near Wildhorse on Highway 331.
- Connect to Pendleton Riverwalk
- Two people thought the youth council comment regarding a sidewalk or trail on Mission Road to Pendleton was a good idea

Comments received include:

- Short Mile Road - River access.
- Parr Lane - River access.
- Mission Road near A Street - More crosswalks and signs for pedestrian on Mission, traffic is fast.
- Mission Road \& OR 331 - Lighting at intersection. It's dark at night!
- Mission Road \& OR 331 - Crosswalks across Mission and Highway 331.
- Mission Road - Sidewalk or trail to Pendleton.
- OR 331 - Sidewalk or trail along Highway 331.
- Theater Road, $56^{\text {th }}$ Street - Heavy trucks cut through here when there's bad weather and the freeway is closed. Is there any way to get Google to stop directing traffic that way? It destroys the dirt and gravel road.


## SURVEY RESPONSES

At the in-person meetings described above, surveys were distributed to members of the public who did not have time to participate. Three surveys were returned to CTUIR between June and September 2022.

Comments received include:

- Construct a bicycle/pedestrian facility on River Road and along railroad maintenance route.
- Maintain bicycle routes to be free of goatheads.
- Cayuse Road is not safe for bicyclists or drivers who enter opposite lane to provide safe distance.
- Path from Nixyaawii Governance Center to Mission Market needed.
- Does CTUIR need to have warning signs about wildlife attack risks placed on walking and biking paths?
- Provide rides from residences to Yellowhawk for those with accessibility needs.
- Add a westbound bus stop at Mission Road/Short Mile Road intersection.
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## INTRODUCTION

The project team recently completed a second round of outreach efforts to guide the development of the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update, with the support of CTUIR and ODOT staff. These efforts included:

- Mission Market Outreach
- After School Program Outreach
- Kayak Driver Outreach
- Senior Center Outreach
- General Council Meeting
- Arrowhead Travel Plaza Freight Outreach
- Umatilla County Staff Meeting
- Land Protection \& Planning Commission
- Law \& Order Commission
- Fish \& Wildlife Commission
- Capital Improvements Committee
- Health Commission
- Online Input

Fall 2022 Outreach
Overall, a total of approximately 109 people were reached in person during the Fall 2022 outreach events, between project-specific outreach events and attendance at council, commission, and committee meetings.

This memorandum summarizes the feedback received from these events as of February 1, 2023. Key and recurring themes from the feedback included:

- CTUIR and the project team received a lot of general support for the project list as a whole.
- Adding more walking and biking options was well received, especially along Mission Road and OR 331 and in support of student trips.
- People are supportive of adding lighting to multi-use paths and Mission Road.
- Projects R07, R08, and R09 had mixed reviews. Some members of the public were worried about attracting more traffic on these roadways, while more comments supported updates to the roadways to help during rainy conditions.
- People support the OR 331 transit hub project.
- Bus stop enhancements were well received, especially providing shelters and lighting.
- Roundabouts were discussed by different groups, both in support and in concern.
- There were conflicting opinions about the idea to construct a multi-use path along the river. Many people want access to the river and a route further west, while others are concerned about litter and vandalism if access is publicly provided. Umatilla County may have applicable experience to share with the community to further consider when P06 and P07 move forward.


## MISSION MARKET OUTREACH

The project team and CTUIR staff solicitated public input at Mission Market during two time periods: 12:00 to 3:00 PM on September 21, 2022 and 12:00 to 1:00 PM on September 22, 2022. Community members were able to provide verbal comments or mark comments on two poster boards showing proposed projects for the study area. 21 people provided input to the project team on September $21^{\text {st }}$ and six provided input on September $22^{\text {nd }}$.

Comments included:

- Symbol for intersection reconfiguration is confusing.
- Will R03 include adding drainage?
- Four people liked projects R07, R08, and R09. Those roads get washed out during rainy conditions.
- Two people are worried about projects R07, R08, and R09 bringing additional traffic to those roadways.
- Is project R10 necessary?
- Straighten the River Road/White Road intersection.
- One person liked project R06.
- Kanine Ridge Road is not a good detour route when there are events on I-84.

- Two people liked project R01.
- Whirlwind Drive and Willow Lane need maintenance for potholes.
- Add a southbound truck lane on OR 331 from Mission Road to I-84.
- One person liked the transit hub concept.
- One person liked the traffic control concept at the OR 331/Spilya Road intersection.
- Within Arrowhead area, can trucks and passenger vehicles be separated?
- If roundabouts move forward, the community will need education.
- One person liked project P07.
- Four people noted that more biking and walking options are good, especially trails.
- One person liked the walking options connecting the school to Mission Market. Students walk between these locations frequently.
- Four people liked project P09 and three noted how dark that corridor currently is for walking at night.
- Can a rest area be included with project P09?
- Three people liked project P14 and creating a walking/biking loop.
- One person liked projects filling sidewalk and bicycle facility gaps on Mission Road in the July Grounds area, noting the facilities are currently narrow or non-existent.
- Two people liked project P12.
- One person liked project P22.
- Two people liked project P18.
- Can there be a road connection from Wildhorse Boulevard to Cayuse Road?
- The current Arrowhead bus stop is dangerous with drivers speeding through the parking lot.
- The Wildhorse shuttle serves Mission area at the top of the hour and can be in the way of Kayak vehicles.
- Bring back 4 PM Walla Walla bus service.


## AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM OUTREACH

Members of the project team and CTUIR staff were available at the July Grounds Gym during afterschool program pickup on September 21, 2022 from 3:00 to 4:30 PM, soliciting feedback via two poster boards showing proposed projects. A traffic safety maze was set up for kids to explore when the adults were providing feedback. Nine people provided input to the project team.

Comments included:

- One person liked project R03.
- One person liked projects R07, R08, and R09. These roads are bumpy and difficult for emergency response access.
- One person liked roundabouts as the long-term traffic control at the OR 331 intersections with Wildhorse Boulevard and Spilya Road.
- One person liked the concept of reducing access at Kusi Road to right-in, right-out only.
- There are near-misses often at the Kusi Road/Arrowhead Road intersection.
- With development up the hill, like the idea of more sidewalks and walkability.
- Two people noted that Riverside Avenue needs sidewalks.
- One person liked project P07 and noted how it can connect to the levy.
- One person liked project P10 and noted that it will support the high school running team.
- Two people liked projects filling sidewalk and bicycle facility gaps on Mission Road in the July Grounds area.
- Mission Road is too dark to walk at night and during the winter season.
- Trains that go through the community are supposed to go 40 MPH but most travel faster.



## KAYAK DRIVER OUTREACH

The project team and CTUIR staff solicitated input from Kayak drivers on September 22, 2022. Eight people provided input to the project team.
Comments received include:

- Need more signs/shelters so passengers know where the stops are located. Signs get vandalized.
- Like the Arrowhead area transit shelter. Going into the Arrowhead area is tough, especially during summertime.
- Put one shelter on either side of OR 331, instead of only on east side.
- Safe crossings of OR 331 are needed. Please improve any existing crossings of OR 331.
- Could there be a truck right-in into Arrowhead?
- Interested in pullouts for stops.
- Ridership in Tutuilla, McKinley, and other rural areas is close to zero.
- Turning onto OR 331 from Timíne Way is challenging. Will go to Mission instead.
- Turning onto Timíne Way from the bus barn is challenging. People drive fast on Timíne Way and people walking don't use crosswalks.
- July Grounds is dark at night. Can the shelter be moved to other entrance? Lots of elders ask to be dropped off at other entrance.


## SENIOR CENTER LUNCH

CTUIR staff visited the Senior Center during lunch in November 2022. There were approximately 25 people attendees.

Comments included:

- Are you going to bring back taxi tickets?
- Are you going to get any new trails? Like up to the casino?
- When is the Thornhollow Bridge going to be finished?
- Concerns about lights, safety on TCI trail, and young cottonwood trees falling over in the Wetlands Park area, causing trail maintenance issues.
- Kayak used to go to Thornhollow, it would be nice if they did again. Maybe the flood buyouts mean there's not enough houses there anymore.
- Sheltered bus stops are a good idea, especially this time of year.
- Umatilla County is difficult, they don't care when we ask for road maintenance on their roads. They don't plow Thornhollow grade.
- Mission - better lighting on mission between 4-corners and Wetlands Park. "I'm an elder, it's scary driving there at night."


## GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING TABLING

CTUIR staff manned a table in the rotunda outside the General Council meeting at the Nixyaawii Governance Center on October 20, 2022. This provided the opportunity to provide project updates to attendees and solicit input via larger maps. Due to community circumstances, the meeting was covering three months' worth of agendas, and many attendees did not take time to stop to discuss the TSP. No comments were received.

## ARROWHEAD TRAVEL PLAZA FREIGHT OUTREACH

A Freight Survey was conducted from 1:00 to 4:00 PM on Tuesday, January $10^{\text {th }}$ at the Arrowhead Travel Plaza. CTUIR staff received 26 responses. A few Arrowhead Travel Plaza staff members took the survey or asked questions about the project in addition to the target population of truck drivers. The survey had four questions:

1. How often do you travel through the Umatilla Indian Reservation?
2. What routes do you travel most frequently on the Umatilla Indian Reservation?
3. What feedback would you like to share about your general experience driving in the area?
4. What feedback would you like to share about the proposed improvements in this area of Highway 331?

Most respondents did not look at the map in detail and were provided by the surveyors with a summary of the suggested Highway 331 improvements. Improvements highlighted included pedestrian amenities like trails, sidewalks, and crosswalks, and intersection improvements like traffic signals or roundabouts.

## Frequency of UIR Travel

$62 \%$ of respondents travel through the UIR at least once a week. The route most frequently used by all but two respondents (who did not respond to this question) was l-84. This question allowed respondents to "select all that apply" so additional routes identified included Highway 331 and Highway 11. One respondent specified "Other: Mission Road", however all other "other" routes identified were not located on the Umatilla Indian Reservation.


## General Feedback

The word cloud below shows the top 50 topic-relevant words (i.e. excluding "and" and "the" type connecter words) recorded in the surveys. The most frequently cited concern was parking. Five respondents replied "none" to the question about general feedback, which we interpret to mean they're generally satisfied with the facilities available. The most frequently repeated topics were: 1. More parking (8); 2. Driver education (6); and; 3. More activities nearby (6).

Of the desired activities nearby, some cited the proposed Highway 331 trail as a possible recreation facility, as they would like to be able to exercise during their breaks at Arrowhead. Many wished for a greater variety of dining opportunities near Arrowhead, and one

Frequently Cited Concerns
 respondent would like to see children's activities, as they drive with their children during the summer.


Some of the unique suggestions included:

1. Add a wind speed meter/sign
2. Heated roads for winter ice
3. In addition to RRFBs for pedestrians, higher visibility tools like lights embedded in the crosswalk paint on the ground (driver suggested an example from California).
4. [Freight] truck ride-alongs for road designers, to see what the limitations are in-person.

## Highway 331 Improvements

Two respondents were pleased to see the overflow parking project, identified as R10 on the map. However, a third respondent suggested it would be better if it were on the north side of the freeway, closer to Arrowhead and other amenities in case drivers would prefer not to wait for a shuttle or are willing to walk but would rather not walk over the overpass.

Of the three new project types highlighted in the project map, feedback was distributed into one of three feedback groups where the respondent gave input about a specific feature - positive, neutral, or negative. Constructive feedback which did not explicitly support or dislike a project was categorized as neutral, as was feedback where the respondent indicated they could go either way. Such constructive feedback includes responses such as "put crosswalks north [of Spilya] to avoid pedestrians making it harder to get in and out [of Arrowhead]."

| Project | Positive | Neutral | Negative |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roundabouts | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Trails | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| Crosswalks | 3 | 1 | 1 |

## Arrowhead-specific Feedback

Arrowhead Travel Plaza-specific feedback has fairly little bearing on the Transportation System Plan as a whole but may inform local business development by Arrowhead or the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). As such, l'll include some of the comments we received specific to Arrowhead:

1. Would like to see overflow truck parking area with basic amenities - restrooms, showers, vending machines.
2. More dining options
3. More parking for smaller commercial rigs
4. Truck wash
5. Pet area would be nice/larger pet area.

## UMATILLA COUNTY STAFF MEETING

CTUIR staff met with Umatilla County staff in September 2022 to gather feedback on the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Four County staff were present.

Comments received include:

- Generally thought it is a good list. Suggested that they should incorporate this project list into their County TSP update. The County recently won a TGM award for, so might get rolling in a year or so.
- Called out R04 and R12 as not being on County roads, and CTUIR staff noted that they were partially on county roads but not completely. Is there enough room in the column to list both owners in the project table? R04 is County/BIA, R12 is County/CTUIR.
- The County didn't think that R13 was necessary because there's a stop sign just north of the river at the railroad crossing. Thought it was unlikely people could travel too fast between the sharp curve coming down off Cayuse and the railroad stop sign.
- The group was able to answer the question of whether the Wildhorse Creek bridge is on or off the reservation. Technically Wildhorse Creek is the reservation boundary, so it's both. However, the bridge is
really just someone's driveway bridge, it only serves one house, and our GIS system doesn't even identify the road it's on as a road, tribal county or otherwise. So R16 can be removed from the project list.
- CTUIR noted that had previously listed the Highway 11/331 intersection and removed it since it's offreservation but nearby and is important to the community. The County didn't have a preference either way, so keep out of the project list for now.
- The Country had questions about the alignment of P07. CTUIR discussed prioritizing the path of least resistance during the project design process, and that some of the floated ideas are the road, the river, and the sewer main easement. This was a good conversation to establish some coordination with their part of the trail, since it will have to cross county land before it reaches Pendleton.
- County staff asked about cross sections for bus pull outs. CTUIR noted that there aren't that many bus stops and it might be a bit much, but it could be worth including in the next proposal for the road standards - what width of pavement should be provided to accommodate bus pull-outs. Currently, mostly stop in-lane unless that's prohibited or not safe, which is pretty much just on Mission Road and Highway 331.
- It could also be included in the text of the Mission Road pedestrian improvements, to incorporate bus pull-outs into the improvement designs for cost efficiency.


## COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

## Land Protection \& Planning Commission

Four CTUIR planning staff attended the September 2022 commission meeting to gather feedback on community needs and the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Four commission members were present.

Comments received include:

- One commissioner took issue with the exclusion of transit that's outside the reservation boundary since it's outside our jurisdiction. Concerned about the removal of the bus stop on the east end of Pendleton which was removed without our knowledge when construction began for a new gas station, next door to Tum-aLum Lumber. Kayak is currently working with ODOT and the City of Pendleton to re-establish the bus stop.
- Pleased with the improvement to bus stops and shelters. Suggested that we add lighting.
- The commission was generally favorable to roundabouts. They initiated a conversation about how much safer they are, and how they just take some getting used to. CTUIR staff noted that have received some negative opinion through public comment, and a few of members had heard about their proposal from disapproving friends and family members.


## Law \& Order Commission

CTUIR staff attended the October 4, 2022 commission meeting to gather feedback on community needs and the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Four commission members were present.

Comments received include:

- One member expressed concern about horses on Mission, safety, spooking \& proximity to cars.
- People speed on Mission, concerned about pedestrian safety.
- In response to possible speed reductions on Mission/331: "my brothers are gonna hate that."
- Suggest a signal at Timíne Way and Mission intersection


## Fish \& Wildlife Commission

CTUIR staff attended the October 11, 2022 commission meeting to gather feedback on community needs and the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Five commission members were present.
Comments received include:

- Public river access - one member expressed staunch opposition to that. Concern about protecting treaty rights, fishing poachers, protecting fisheries and water quality, and restricted access as a means to manage fish resources.
- When CTUIR raised the topic of official facilities to make fishing accessible to community members with disabilities, they seemed more amenable, but wanted to make sure any program like that would consider policing and prevention of poaching.
- One member stated that they were anti-lighting because of protecting lamprey and fisheries in general.
- Concerns about who is responsible for policing any new trail alignments - TPD is already spread thin.
- Suggest emergency phones on trails as a safety feature.


## Capital Improvements Committee

CTUIR staff attended the October 11, 2022 commission meeting to gather feedback on community needs and the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Ten commission members were present.

Comments received include:

- One member noted concern about mapping affecting negotiations with property owners. not liking roundabouts, and that ODOT should pay for the Kash Kash road fix.
- One proposal for a fix for the land negotiation impact - incorporate the "grid" mandate component into the site plan process that's required for subdivisions, PUD, and large commercial development. This would make sure that any major new use of land would be required to grid out as part of the zoning permitting process, rather than requiring an extra reviewer (which is anticipated for things like the cross sections adherence).
- There was a lot of discussion about roundabouts.


## Health Commission

CTUIR staff was scheduled to present the 20-Year Transportation Plan at the October 11, 2022 regular commission meeting. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the commission had to cancel that meeting, and chose to email a comment document instead. Commissioners were provided a Planning PowerPoint Presentation and the website link to develop comments. The commission voted to provide the following comments to CTUIR staff at their November 2, 2022 meeting.

- We would like to preface that a walk or bicycle ride is a great, simple and free preventative action patients can do on their own. There are multiple deterrents that make a simple walk or bike ride difficult in our community, and we are focusing on those in our preliminary comments.
- Responding to the PowerPoint "TSP Update Presentation" is a little confusing without staff dialogue. Commissioners attempted to reflect on whether changes were made and reactions to environmental and social events that may have impacted the 2001 plan.
- Projects from 2001 TSP: Road to access Agency Cemetery would improve access for community.
- Suggestion: add parking lot (gravel or paved) to Agency cemetery, and make remainder of path beyond cemetery going west (28) a bike path only
- Concern: if used in 2022 update, road would reopen concern about "East Bench" development, building a road could unearth more human remains, and if area west of cemetery were a bike path you would not have to dig into potential garbage from the old dump site.
- All areas of additional develop should include proper lighting and more lighting is needed for existing neighborhoods and walking paths for safety reasons and to encourage healthy choices
- Warning signs about wildlife should be added to current and future walking paths; bears, cougars, coyotes and even raccoons.
- Identify transportation changes and improvements over time that were completed and have to be redone now. The projects that were in this plan, were they funded, since this was passed by previous committees and commissions and BOTs -are there resolutions to accompany previous decisions?
- Greater UIR area projects from 2001 TSP
- Were the "reservation wide" transportation projects a reaction to flooding incidents or were these infrastructure updates? Where did the funds come from? What does this map look like now since at least one of the bridges is out right now due to flooding?
- Safety for drivers should be a priority in plan development of prioritizing: sections on North Cayuse Road continue to have limited visibility and road must be widened or adjusted to protect families who use this road
- Bike Path options for reservation-wide map. Existing partnership with UPRR could make it so a "bike route" exists along River Road, to Sampson Lane and Short Mile Road to reach Mission and Wildhorse areas. Goatheads must be exterminated. The 2001 transportation plan excluded community members who want to have a "green" or healthy transportation option to ride their bicycles to work or appointments. If managing goatheads is a part of the URPP Agreement, this would suffice for local non-Mission area residents, so bicycles are a transportation option.
- Identify transportation changes over time to show community how much change has occurred for RESERVATION-WIDE map. How much work has been "reactionary" to environmental changes and how much has been done due to partnerships (landowners, UPRR, federal and state)?
- Commissioner comments regarding an updated Transportation Plan
- More community engagement to ensure decisions being made are for the good of people who actually live in and use this area
- What looks good on paper or sounds good to reduce a carbon footprint may not always work for the ones who live here now
- Understand the need to build more so more tribal members can move home, please don't forget about those who have lived here
- Streetlights need improvement and there needs to be more
- Consider the safety needs at bus stops; lights and signage
- Contact Pendleton, Athena and Pilot Rock school districts to coordinate with their transportation managers to ensure bus routes are safe for students reservation-wide
- Lots of pedestrians right now, lights will improve safety

More bike paths and walkways
Work with departments to prioritize extinguishing goat heads from roads and pathways (Housing, Public Works, DNR, DECD [TERF and Coyote Biz Park])

- Create A Weed/Invasive Plant Management Plan specifically for roads and pathways
- Having A Plan available for community members, departments or partners to reference could enable community-sponsored activities. Example: sports teams could address invasive plants per A Plan in return for a donation from a private tribal member or department. Also having A Plan could be a tool for tribal court to reference for restorative justices sentencing options
- If we are separating transportation options into "Mission Area" and "Reservation Wide" suggest expanding Reservation Wide into subsections. Get those residents' comments, dedicate meetings and comments for those areas, and identify per subsection any partnerships (state, federal, private, NGOs) the tribe has regarding transportation options and hurdles
- Riverside-Pendleton
- North Reservation (Johnley Rd to Adams-Weston areas)
- Cayuse-N. Cayuse Road Route
- Up-River-Bingham
- The Flats (Tutuilla-Holmes-Reservoir)
- South Reservation (Upper Spring Creek Road-McKay Creek-Pilot Rock)
- Foothills-Meacham (Emigrant Hwy past Cayuse Rd to Meacham)
- Although Tribes are exempt from ADA, we should follow it in good faith to provide adequate access to our ever increasing disabled or handicap population. Easy access to sidewalks, properly designated handicap parking and signage to inform the public of accessibility are vital. We have a large population of Baby Boomers who are aging, and easy access will be important in the near future.
- Partner with CTUIR departments to add permanent restrooms on or near TCI path.
- Add safety features like fencing around playgrounds or recreation buildings, so children and families can play outside day or night to address fear of strangers entering play zones without parental knowledge.

The one comment received was:

- T02 - Bus Stop Enhancements: It would seem to be a priority to ensure that each bus stop is well lit (not the case in several); safe and kept clean. Some of the stops do not even have shelter for people waiting in the rain or other weather.


## OTHER INPUT

CTUIR staff conducted door-to-door outreach with ODOT during November 2022 to discuss the Exit 216 project.
One comment was received that was related more to the CTUIR TSP than to the Exit 216 project:

- Thompson Road gets flooded by Patawa Creek; it's getting worse each year. This issue may be exacerbated by the new truck traffic on Thompson Road during winter weather events on Cabbage Hill, as it's already creating unsafe conditions with the trucks that travel from the gravel mine at the end of Thompson Road.
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## INTRODUCTION

This memorandum summarizes information related to existing and future (no-build) transportation system conditions within the Umatilla Indian Reservation (UIR). The information provided in this memorandum will serve as the foundation for identifying existing and projected future gaps and deficiencies in the transportation system, which will then serve as the basis for developing and evaluating transportation system alternatives and identifying improvement projects for the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) update.

The study area for the CTUIR TSP update encompasses all lands within the boundaries of the UIR, including several roads on off-reservation Trust lands. The primary focus of the planning effort will be on areas within the UIR. Figure 1 shows the Umatilla Reservation and CTUIR off reservation trust and fee lands. Figure 2 illustrates the study area for the CTUIR TSP update. Attachment $A$ contains the existing land use assessment.


Figure 1
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## ROADWAY SYSTEM

## Roadway System Inventory

The roadway system within the UIR boundary serves most trips across all travel modes. In addition to people driving, people walking, biking, riding the bus, and using other forms of transportation use the roadway system to travel to and from essential destinations and neighboring communities. This section describes the existing roadway system.

The roadway system within the UIR boundary was inventoried based on Geographic Information System (GIS) data obtained from CTUIR and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), as well as a review of recent aerial imagery. The inventory was supplemented by information provided in the 2001 CTUIR TSP and by information provided by CTUIR and ODOT.

## JURISDICTION AND FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICAITON

The roadway network is owned and operated by multiple entities, consisting of CTUIR, ODOT, Umatilla County, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Each jurisdiction is responsible for determining the functional classification of the streets, defining major design and multimodal features, and approving construction and access permits. Coordination is required among the jurisdictions to ensure that the streets are planned, operated, maintained, and improved to safely meet public needs. Figure 3 illustrates the jurisdiction and functional classification of streets within the UIR boundary.

## CTUIR Roads

CTUIR owns and maintains most roads that serve tribal affiliated facilities and housing. These roadways include Short Mile Road, Easy Street, Cedar Street, Aspen Way (and other local spur streets serving the adjacent residential area), Timíne Way, Wildhorse Boulevard, Kusi Road, Coyote Road, Spilya Road, Tokti Road, and Arrowhead Road. CTUIR also owns and maintains Mission Road west of OR 331 to the western UIR border.

## ODOT Facilities

Within the study area, ODOT owns and maintains Interstate 84 (I-84) and OR 331. I-84 is classified by the Oregon Highway Plan as an Interstate Highway, on the National Highway System and National Network, a Freight Route, and a Reduction Review Route. OR 331 (Umatilla Mission Highway) is classified by the Oregon Highway Plan as a District Highway, a Freight Route, and a Reduction Review Route.

## Umatilla County Facilities

Umatilla County owns and maintains regionally significant roadways within the study area. Mission Road (County Road \#900) is the primary east-west roadway, connecting the Mission area to the city of Pendleton to the west. Classified as a Major Collector, Mission Road consists of two travel lanes with a posted speed limit of 40 mph . Other County roads are classified as Minor Collectors, including Emigrant Road, Cayuse Road, and Kirkpatrick Road.

## BIA Roads

Within the study area, the BIA owns and maintains several local roadways that primarily serve BIA tribal agency offices and affiliated housing. These paved roads include "A" Street, "B" Street, Alder Drive, Cayuse Loop, Confederated Way, Cottonwood Lane, Umatilla Loop Road, Walla Walla Court, Whirlwind Drive, and Willow Drive.

## Paved and Unpaved Public Use Roads

Based on the 2001 TSP, all remaining roadways within the study area are considered to be "Public Use" roads. According to the TSP, these paved and unpaved roads may or may not have a dedicated right-of-way and are not claimed or maintained by any government entity.


## FREIGHT ROUTES

Single-unit trucks and semi-truck and trailer combination vehicles deliver goods to and from various businesses within the UIR boundary.

## Freight Routes

The OHP identifies all Interstate Highways and certain Statewide, Regional, and District Highways as freight routes. These routes are intended to facilitate efficient and reliable interstate, intrastate, and regional truck movement through a designated freight route system. As shown in Figure 4, OR 331 is designated by ODOT as a Freight Route and primarily accommodates the movement of freight between I-84 to the south and OR 11, which provides access to Washington, to the north.

There are no Tribal designated freight routes in the UIR; however, Mission Road is also used for local freightrelated movements. There are no known freight restrictions on any roadways within the UIR. However, the Mission Community Master Plan (MCMP) noted that trucks will attempt to utilize Mission Road's connection to Old Emigrant Hill Road during periods of inclement weather when l-84 is shut down. This road is narrow and steep and cannot accommodate all truck types, especially during times of inclement weather.

## National Highway System

The National Highway System (NHS) is a network of highways, including Interstate Highways, that serve strategic economic, defense, and transportation facilities, such as airports, ports, rail or truck terminals, railway stations, and pipeline terminals. I-84 is designated as an NHS route within the UIR boundary.

## Intersection Operations Analysis

The study intersections for the CTUIR TSP update were determined based on direction provided by ODOT and CTUIR staff. There are 13 study intersections located along tribal, County, and ODOT facilities, all of which are unsignalized. Figure 2 illustrates the location of the study intersections. Figure 5 illustrates the current lane configurations and traffic control devices at the study intersections. The Analysis Methodology and Assumptions Memorandum outlines the procedures used to conduct the intersection operations analysis. The analysis results include level-of-service (LOS), delay (del), and volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratios at all intersections, regardless of jurisdiction. The LOS, del, and v/c ratios are reported for the critical movement (CM) at unsignalized intersections in accordance with the methodologies outlined in ODOT's Analysis Procedures Manual (APM).

## EXISTING OPERATIONS

The Analysis Methodology and Assumptions Memorandum includes information related to the turning movement counts, peak hour development, and seasonal adjustment factors used to develop traffic volumes for the traffic operations analysis. Per the memorandum, a system-wide peak hour of $3: 30$ to 4:30 PM was selected as a basis for the analysis. The traffic volumes were also balanced as appropriate. Figure 6 summarizes the traffic volumes developed at the study intersections for the traffic operations analysis.

The traffic operations analysis identifies how the study intersections operate under existing traffic conditions during the weekday PM peak hour. The weekday PM peak hour was selected as a basis for the analysis given that it generally represents the most critical time period throughout the day.

Table 1 summarizes the results of the intersection operations analysis and compares the results to the applicable mobility standards and targets which were presented in the Analysis Methodology and Assumptions Memorandum.

$=$ Minor Collectors
—— Local Roads



Table 1: Existing Intersection Operations, Weekday PM Peak Hour

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Map } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Intersection | Control Type ${ }^{1}$ | Mobility <br> Standard/ <br> Targe | Intersection Operations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | CM ${ }^{3}$ | LOS | Del | v/c |
| 1 | Mission Road/Timíne Way | TWSC | LOS E ${ }^{2}$ | NBL | B | 12.6 | 0.16 |
| 2 | Mission Road/OR 331 | AWSC | 0.75 | NB | B | 12.9 | 0.45 |
| 3 | Mission Road/Short Mile Road | TWSC | LOS E ${ }^{2}$ | SB | A | 9.5 | 0.04 |
| 4 | Mission Road/Emigrant Road-Cayuse Road | TWSC | LOS E ${ }^{2}$ | EB | A | 9.6 | 0.00 |
| 5 | OR 331/Timíne Way | TWSC | 0.75 | EBL | B | 14.9 | 0.13 |
| 6 | OR 331/Wildhorse Boulevard | TWSC | 0.75 | WBL | B | 12.6 | 0.12 |
| 7 | OR 331/Kusi Road | TWSC | 0.75 | WB | B | 14.4 | 0.30 |
| 8 | OR 331/Spilya Road | TWSC | 0.75 | WBL | D | 28.8 | 0.36 |
| 9 | OR 331/Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access | TWSC | 0.75 | WB | C | 18.3 | 0.32 |
| 10 | OR 331/Kash Kash Road | TWSC | 0.75 | WB | B | 12.4 | 0.01 |
| 11 | I-84/OR 331 Interchange WB Ramps | TWSC | 0.70 | WB | B | 11.7 | 0.16 |
| 12 | I-84/OR 331 Interchange EB Ramps | TWSC | 0.70 | EB | C | 19.6 | 0.55 |
| 13 | S Market Road/Tokti Road | TWSC | LOS E ${ }^{2}$ | EB | B | 10.1 | 0.03 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1) } \\ & \text { 2) } \\ & \text { 3) } \end{aligned}$ | AWSC = All-way stop control; TWSC = Two-way If $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ is less than or equal to 1.0 , LOS is based TWSC intersections is associated with a maxim <br> $E B=$ Eastbound; $\mathrm{WB}=$ Westbound; $\mathrm{NB}=$ North | control average d; SB = Sou | ntrol delay for f 50 seconds ound; L = Leff | e critic vehic rn |  |  | arget |

As shown in Table 1, all study intersections currently operate acceptably during the weekday PM peak hour. Attachment $B$ includes the intersection operations analysis worksheets.

## Seasonal Challenges

According to CTUIR staff and public feedback, the local roadway system on the UIR experiences challenges when I-84 is closed. These include vehicles parking on freeway ramp shoulders and people trying to use local roads to go around closures and getting stuck in the snow or damaging muddy roads. Cayuse Road, Old Emigrant Road, and 56 th Street have been identified as the most attempted alternate routes. ODOT's 2024-2027 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program includes the I-84 Exit 216 Snow Zone/Truck Parking project, which is intended to help address some of these closure-related concerns.

## FUTURE NO-BUILD OPERATIONS

The project team used ODOT's Pendleton travel demand model and existing counts to develop future year 2040 traffic volume forecasts. The travel demand model provides base year 2015 and forecast year 2040 traffic volume projections that reflect anticipated land use changes and planned transportation improvements within the study area. The forecast traffic volumes were developed by applying the post-processing methodology presented in the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 765 Highway Traffic Data for Urbanized Area Project Planning and Design, in conjunction with engineering judgment and knowledge of the study area.
Attachment $C$ contains the travel demand model data provided by ODOT.
Figure 7 illustrates the year 2040 forecast traffic volumes at the study intersections during the weekday PM peak hour. Table 2 summarizes the results of the future traffic operations analysis at the study intersections under year 2040 traffic conditions.

As shown in Table 2, all study intersections are forecast to operate within their applicable mobility standards and targets during the weekday PM peak hour. Attachment $B$ includes the intersection operations analysis worksheets.


Although the operations analysis presented here did not highlight intersection capacity deficiencies based on the volumes provided, previous projects have established needs at several of the study intersections. The MCMP identified the long-term need to construct a single-lane roundabout or signal at the Mission Road/OR 331 intersection once volumes grow to meet warrants. Similarly, the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino Expansion Traffic Impact Study identified the long-term need to either construct a single-lane roundabout or construct separate turn lanes for the OR 331/I-84 eastbound ramp terminal to mitigate queuing on the I-84 eastbound ramp. The OR 331 Access Management Implementation Strategy and Circulation Plan discusses the need for consolidating and/or closing accesses on OR 331 between Wildhorse Boulevard and I-84 with queuing and safety in mind, particularly due to the highway-oriented uses in that section of OR 331These alternatives will be moved forward through the TSP update process.
Table 2: Future No-Build Intersection Operations, Weekday PM Peak Hour

| Map ID | Intersection | Control Type ${ }^{1}$ | Mobility Standard/ Target | Intersection Operations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | CM ${ }^{3}$ | LOS | Del | v/c |
| 1 | Mission Road/Timíne Way | TWSC | LOS E ${ }^{2}$ | NBL | B | 13.6 | 0.20 |
| 2 | Mission Road/OR 331 | AWSC | 0.75 | NB | C | 16.0 | 0.56 |
| 3 | Mission Road/Short Mile Road | TWSC | LOS E ${ }^{2}$ | SB | A | 9.6 | 0.04 |
| 4 | Mission Road/Emigrant Road-Cayuse Road | TWSC | LOS E ${ }^{2}$ | EB | A | 9.8 | 0.00 |
| 5 | OR 331/Timíne Way | TWSC | 0.75 | EBL | C | 16.6 | 0.18 |
| 6 | OR 331/Wildhorse Boulevard | TWSC | 0.75 | WBL | B | 13.3 | 0.15 |
| 7 | OR 331/Kusi Road | TWSC | 0.75 | WB | B | 15.4 | 0.36 |
| 8 | OR 331/Spilya Road | TWSC | 0.75 | WBL | D | 33.0 | 0.41 |
| 9 | OR 331/Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access | TWSC | 0.75 | WB | C | 19.9 | 0.35 |
| 10 | OR 331/Kash Kash Road | TWSC | 0.75 | WB | B | 12.7 | 0.01 |
| 11 | I-84/OR 331 Interchange WB Ramps | TWSC | 0.70 | WB | B | 12.2 | 0.19 |
| 12 | I-84/OR 331 Interchange EB Ramps | TWSC | 0.70 | EB | C | 23.2 | 0.64 |
| 13 | S Market Road/Tokti Road | TWSC | LOS E ${ }^{2}$ | EB | B | 10.9 | 0.05 |

1) AWSC = All-way stop control; TWSC = Two-way stop control
2) If $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ is less than or equal to 1.0 , LOS is based on the average control delay for the critical movement. An LOS E for TWSC intersections is associated with a maximum control delay less than or equal to 50 seconds per vehicle.
3) $\mathrm{EB}=$ Eastbound; $\mathrm{WB}=$ Westbound; $\mathrm{NB}=$ Northbound; $\mathrm{SB}=$ Southbound; $\mathrm{L}=$ Left-turn

## Motor Vehicle Safety Analysis

Crash records were obtained from ODOT for the five-year period from January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020 for the overall study area. Figure 8 illustrates the location, severity, and type of crashes that occurred within the study area over the five-year period. Based on the data, a total of 392 crashes occurred within the UIR, of which six resulted in a fatality, 12 resulted in suspected serious injuries, 135 resulted in suspected moderate or minor injuries, and 239 resulted in property-damage-only. Most (256) of the crashes within the UIR occurred on I84, including three of the crashes resulting in fatalities and four of the crashes resulting in suspected serious injuries. There were 136 crashes reported within the UIR boundary outside I-84, including three fatal crashes and eight suspected serious injury crashes. The following summarizes the results of the intersection and segment crash analysis based on the five years of crash data.


- Fatal or Serious Injury
(3) Fatal or Serious Injury (Bike Related)
(4) Fatal or Serious Injury (Ped Related)
- Moderate and Minor Injury
- PDO

Figure 8

## INTERSECTION CRASH ANALYSIS

The intersection crash analysis evaluates intersection crash rates, including critical crash rates. According to the data, 24 of the 136 non-l-84 reported crashes occurred at the study intersections. Table 3 summarizes the collision type and crash severity for all reported crashes at the study intersections.
Table 3: Intersection Crash History (January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020)

| Map ID | Intersection | Collision Type |  |  |  |  | Crash Severity |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Angle | Turn | Rear -end | Ped/ <br> Bike | Other | Fatal and Serious Injury | NonSerious Injury | PDO |  |
| 1 | Mission Road/Timíne Way | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | Mission Road/OR 331 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 3 | Mission Road/Short Mile Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Mission Road/Emigrant Road-Cayuse Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | OR 331/Timíne Way | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 6 | OR 331/Wildhorse Boulevard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | OR 331/Kusi Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 8 | OR 331/Spilya Road | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 9 | OR 331/Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 10 | OR 331/Kash Kash Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | I-84/OR 331 Interchange WB Ramps | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 12 | I-84/OR 331 Interchange EB Ramps | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 13 | S Market Road/Tokti Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Other: All other collision types, such as fixed-object, head-on, and parking maneuver
PDO: Property Damage Only

Intersection crash rates were developed for the study intersections based on the total number of crashes reported at the intersections over the five-year period and the total entering volume, or million entering vehicles (MEV). Intersection crash rates were compared to $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile crash rates developed by ODOT and documented in Table 4-1 of the ODOT APM. Table 4 summarizes the total number of crashes reported at the study intersections over the five-year period, the intersection crash rates, and the corresponding $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile crash rates as identified in the APM.

Table 4: Intersection Crash Rates versus ODOT 90 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Rates versus Critical Crash Rates

| Map ID | Intersection | Total Crashes | Intersection Crash Rate | $90^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Rate | Exceed 90 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Rate? | Critical Crash Rate | Exceed Critical Crash Rate? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mission Road/Timíne Way | 1 | 0.12 | 0.48 | No | 0.41 | No |
| 2 | Mission Road/OR 331 | 4 | 0.29 | 1.08 | No | N/A | N/A |
| 3 | Mission Road/Short Mile Road | 0 | 0.00 | 0.48 | No | 0.47 | No |
| 4 | Mission Road/Emigrant Road-Cayuse Road | 0 | 0.00 | 0.48 | No | 0.88 | No |
| 5 | OR 331/Timíne Way | 1 | 0.10 | 0.48 | No | 0.38 | No |
| 6 | OR 331/Wildhorse Boulevard | 1 | 0.09 | 0.48 | No | 0.37 | No |
| 7 | OR 331/Kusi Road | 3 | 0.25 | 1.08 | No | N/A | N/A |
| 8 | OR 331/Spilya Road | 4 | 0.29 | 1.08 | No | N/A | N/A |
| 9 | OR 331/Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access | 3 | 0.19 | 0.48 | No | 0.32 | No |
| 10 | OR 331/Kash Kash Road | 0 | 0.00 | 0.48 | No | 0.32 | No |
| 11 | I-84/OR 331 Interchange WB Ramps | 3 | 0.19 | 0.48 | No | 0.32 | No |
| 12 | I-84/OR 331 Interchange EB Ramps | 4 | 0.42 | 0.48 | No | 0.38 | Yes |
| 13 | S Market Road/Tokti Road | 0 | 0.00 | 0.48 | No | 0.62 | No |

None of the study intersections exceeds the corresponding 90th percentile crash rate. Attachment $D$ contains the intersection crash rate analysis worksheet.

For the study intersections with sufficient reference populations, critical crash rates were developed based on the total number of crashes reported at the intersections over the five-year period, intersection type, and the total entering volume or average annual daily traffic (AADT). This method is only applicable where at least 5-10 intersections are available with similar characteristics (i.e. traffic control and legs/approaches). Otherwise, the critical crash rate defaults to the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile crash rates outlined above. Critical crash rates were calculated for the study intersections using ODOT's Critical Crash Rate Calculator tool and are summarized in Table 4. As shown, the I-84/OR 331 Interchange Eastbound Ramps intersection currently exceeds the corresponding critical crash rate. At this location, there were four crashes, which is less than one crash per year. Three of the four crashes were rear-end and occurred on the ramp. Based on the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino Expansion Traffic Impact Study, this interchange experiences queuing that may create conditions that increase the risk for rear-end crashes. The fourth crash involved one vehicle turning left from the ramp and one vehicle traveling southbound. All four crashes resulted in PDO Attachment D contains the critical crash rate analysis worksheet.

## SEGMENT CRASH ANALYSIS

This section evaluates crashes along study area roadways, excluding crashes at study intersections, by comparing their overall crash rates in Table II of the 2019 statewide Crash Rate Book. Table II lists crash rates for mainline State highways for the past five years, by federally defined urban and rural areas and functional classification.

Segment crash rates were developed for study area roadways and roadway segments based on the total number of crashes reported along the segments over the five-year period, along with the segments lengths and traffic volumes. The total number of crashes along the segments and the segment lengths were obtained from GIS data. Traffic volume data was estimated for the segments based on the traffic counts collected at the study
intersections. Per ODOT's direction, several local road segments with similar characteristics were combined (Kusi Road, Spilya Road, and Kash Kash Road) to minimize exaggerated crash rates due to short roadway lengths. Table 5 summarizes the segment crash rates for each study segment and compares them to ODOT's state highway system crash rates.

Table 5: Segment Crash Rates versus ODOT State Highway System Crash Rates

| Roadway | To | From | Number of Crashes | Segment Length (mile) | Segment Crash Rate | State Highway Crash Rate | Exceed <br> State <br> Highway Rate? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OR 331 | Northern UIR boundary | Mission Road | 5 | 1.48 | 0.64 | 1.22 | No |
| OR 331 | Mission Road | Timíne Way | 2 | 0.24 | 1.05 | 1.22 | No |
| OR 331 | Timíne Way | Wildhorse Boulevard | 4 | 0.97 | 0.47 | 1.22 | No |
| OR 331 | Wildhorse Boulevard | Kusi Road | 1 | 0.31 | 0.39 | 1.22 | No |
| OR 331 | Kusi Road | Spilya Road | 0 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 1.22 | No |
| OR 331 | Spilya Road | Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access | 0 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 1.22 | No |
| OR 331 | Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access | I-84 WB Ramps | 0 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 1.22 | No |
| OR 331 | I-84 WB Ramps | I-84 EB Ramps | 2 | 0.17 | 1.27 | 1.22 | Yes |
| Market Road | I-84 EB Ramps | Best Road | 2 | 0.42 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mission Road | western UIR boundary | Mustanger Lane | 10 | 2.11 | 0.79 | 1.45 | No |
| Mission Road | Mustanger Lane | Timíne Way | 0 | 0.59 | 0.00 | 1.45 | No |
| Mission Road | Timíne Way | OR 331 | 1 | 0.46 | 0.32 | 1.45 | No |
| Mission Road | OR 331 | Cayuse Road | 7 | 1.64 | 0.53 | 1.45 | No |
| Emmigrant Road | Cayuse Road | St. Andrews Road | 1 | 2.08 | 0.88 | 2.81 | No |
| Timíne Way | Mission Road | OR 331 | 1 | 0.64 | 0.41 | 2.81 | No |
| Short Mile Road | Mission Road | roadway eastern end | 1 | 0.97 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Cayuse Road | Mission Road | Burke Road | 2 | 4.68 | 0.33 | 1.45 | No |
| Wildhorse Boulevard | OR 331 | roadway eastern end | 0 | 1.38 | 0.00 | 2.81 | No |
| Combined Kusi <br> Road, Spilya <br> Road, and Kash <br> Kash Road | roadway western end | roadway eastern end | 4 | 0.87 | 0.55 | 2.81 | No |
| Tokti Road | roadway western end | OR 331 | 0 | 0.85 | 0.00 | 2.81 | No |

Locations with N/A results did not have enough reference population sites to conduct the analysis per ODOT's APM.
As shown in Table 5, the segment of OR 331 between the two l-84 ramp terminals currently exceeds the crash rates for similar facilities throughout the state. The segment is assigned only two crashes, but the low average daily traffic volume and short length results in a crash rate higher than the critical crash rate for similar facilities.

Two crashes occurred on this OR 331 segment in the last five years. One crash was located south of the I-84 westbound ramp terminal and included a pedestrian, resulting in a severe injury. The second crash was located
north of the I-84 eastbound ramp terminal and was a head-on crash that resulted in PDO. Attachment D contains the segment crash analysis worksheet.

## FATAL CRASH REVIEW

Six fatal crashes were reported between 2016 and 2020 within the UIR boundary. The crashes occurred along roadway segments ranging from l-84 to local roads. A high-level summary of each crash is provided below.

- Sunday April 3, 2016 at 1AM on I-84 east of the merge with Highway 30
- Head-on collision
- Clear and dry in darkness with no streetlights
- Wrong way driving on one-way roadway
- Alcohol involved
- Tuesday April 19, 2016 at 3PM eastbound on I-84 east of OR 331 interchange
- Fixed-object collision with guardrail, traveling eastbound
- Clear and dry day during daylight
- Improper driving
- September 24, 2016 at 8PM on Mission Road west of Cedar Street
- Fixed-object collision into cut slope or ditch embankment, traveling westbound
- Clear and dry in darkness with no streetlights
- Improper driving
- Alcohol involved
- Wednesday 12, 2016 at 5PM on River Road west of White Road
- Angle collision with railway train flagged (description notes train hit vehicle), vehicle traveling southbound
- Clear and dry during daylight
- Disregarded other traffic control device and failed to yield right-of-way
- Saturday March 3, 2018 at 6PM westbound on I-84 west of Emigrant Road interchange
- Rear-end collision, traveling westbound
- Clear but icy in darkness with no streetlights
- Speed was too fast for conditions (but not exceeding speed limit) and following too closely
- Friday June 8, 2018 at 7AM on OR 331 north of Wildhorse Boulevard
- Bicycle-involved collision, marked as a rear-end type crash traveling southbound
- Clear and dry during daylight
- Driving left of center on two-way road
- Drugs involved

Three of the fatal crashes occurred on I-84. Alcohol and drugs were also involved in three of the crashes. Three crashes occurred at night and only one involved icy road surface conditions. Two crashes involved a single vehicle, one involved a bicyclist, and one involved a train.

## SAFETY PRIORITY INDEX SYSTEM

The Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) was developed by ODOT to identify sites along state and local roads that may warrant further investigation. The SPIS compares the total number of crashes reported on roadway facilities and generates a list of sites (intersections and roadway segments) with calculated SPIS scores. The scores are based on crash frequency, crash rate, and crash severity. SPIS sites with scores in the top five percent are investigated by ODOT staff and reported to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Per the most recent

SPIS list (2019), there are two groups of sites within the UIR boundary in the top 15 percent. These sites are located along Goad Road near the intersection with Tutuilla Church Road, where one fixed-object suspected serious injury crash occurred, and on I-84 at approximately milepoint 223.7, where two fixed-object PDO crashes occurred.

## Blueprint for Urban Design Review

The project team reviewed ODOT's Blueprint for Urban Design (BUD) to determine the contexts for OR 331 within the UIR boundary. Due to varying characteristics, OR 331 was broken into two segments. The defining attributes and context selected are described below.

OR 331 FROM NORTHERN UIR BOUNDARY TO WILDHORSE BOULEVARD
OR 331 north of Wildhorse Boulevard is sparsely developed. Land uses that are present are mixed, included residential, commercial, and institutional. Off-street parking is provided, mostly in front of the buildings it serves. Block sizes range greatly.

## Recommended BUD Land Use Context: Rural Community

## OR 331 FROM WILDHORSE BOULEVARD TO I-84 EASTBOUND RAMPS

OR 331 south of Wildhorse Boulevard has a mix of commercial and auto-oriented development. Large off-street parking lots are provided, mostly in front of the buildings they serve. Block sizes are generally large, although there are some smaller block sizes where there is greater roadway connectivity. It is a relatively small concentration of development surrounded by lesser developed area.

## Recommended BUD Land Use Context: Rural Community

## Roadway System Planned Projects and Previous Feedback

Attachment E contains a list of planned projects and previous feedback provided via the 2001 CTUIR TSP, MCMP, OR 331 Access Management Implementation Strategy and Circulation Plan, and Umatilla County TSP. Most of the previously planned roadway system projects were provided in the 2001 CTUIR TSP. Figure 9 shows the project map from the 2001 CTUIR TSP.

Figure 9: 2001 CTUIR TSP Project Map


## TRANSIT SYSTEM

The transit system within the UIR was inventoried based on information from CTUIR staff and their website, as well as a review of recent aerial imagery.

## Transit Service and Facilities

CTUIR operates Kayak Public Transit (Kayak) which serves northeastern Oregon via fixed route local and commuter service and paratransit ${ }^{1}$. CTUIR began public transportation services after observing people walking the distance between Pendleton and Mission. Over time, service has grown from one van to a fleet of cutaway vehicles operating seven year-round fixed routes. In 2014, CTUIR rebranded service as Kayak Public Transit to help people understand that service is open to the public, not just tribal members.

Table 6 and Figure 11 summarize the Kayak routes serving the UIR as of January 2022. CTUIR provides updated Kayak service information and schedules at the beginning of each calendar year. Because of service changes and traveler pattern changes due to COVID-19 during 2020 and 2021, the ridership for 2019 is shown for each route. In addition, Figure 10 provides a monthly overview of ridership during 2019 for the routes serving the UIR area. As shown, the highest monthly ridership during 2019 was approximately 9,670 rides in September. The lowest monthly ridership was approximately 5,225 rides in February.
Table 6: Kayak Services with Stops within the Umatilla Indian Reservation

| Route Name | Type of Service | Days of Operation | Span of Service | 2019 Annual Ridership |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hopper | Commuter | Monday - Saturday | 4:55 a.m. - 7:02 p.m. | 32,035 |
| Whistler | Commuter | Monday - Saturday | 4:39 a.m. - 7:12 p.m. | 23,652 |
| Metro | Local | Monday - Friday | 5:00 a.m. $-8: 43$ p.m. | 22,719 |
| Arrow | Commuter | Monday - Friday | 5:05 a.m. $-7: 10$ p.m. | 10,668 |
| Rocket | Commuter | Monday - Friday | 6:07 a.m. $-6: 30$ p.m. | 5,642 |
| Tripper | Local | Monday-Friday | 7:20 a.m. $-4: 20$ p.m. | 2,950 |

Figure 10: 2019 Ridership for Kayak Routes Serving the Umatilla Indian Reservation
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Figure 11

| r | Gateway Hub |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| UIIII/ | Pendleton UGB |

## BUS STOPS SERVING UMATILLA INDIAN RESERVATION

As of January 2022, there are 18 Kayak bus stops located within the UIR boundary and shown in Figure 11. Eight of the stops have shelters available for waiting riders and seven have sidewalks immediately adjacent to the stop. No bus stops within the UIR boundary have designated bicycle facilities (e.g., bike lanes or multi-use paths) immediately adjacent.

## OTHER SERVICES

Outside of the UIR boundary, Kayak also provides the Hermiston Area Regional Transit (HART) fixed route. This service operates within Hermiston on weekdays from approximately 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. with five daily trips. In addition to Kayak, there are other agencies and operators that serve the UIR or adjacent areas. CTUIR maintains a list of these operators on their website at https://ctuir.org/departments/tribal-planning-office/kayak-public-transit/other-transportation-agencies/.

## Transit Qualitative Multimodal Assessment

A transit qualitative multimodal assessment was conducted in accordance with the methodology described in ODOT's APM. Transit factors that are considered are frequency and on-time reliability, schedule speed/travel times, transit stop amenities, and connecting pedestrian/bicycle network. This methodology applies a rating system of: excellent, good, fair, and poor. Table 7 outlines the methodology used for conducting a transit qualitative multimodal assessment within the UIR. Due to the rural nature of the service in the study area, the frequency and on-time reliability methodology was adjusted to review number of daily round trips. This methodology has been used in other Oregon TSPs, such as the Independence TSP.
Table 7: Transit Qualitative Multimodal Assessment Methodology - For Rural Service

| Category | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frequency and on-time reliability | 12 daily round trips | 8-10 daily round trips | 5-7 daily round trips | 4 or fewer daily round trips |
| Schedule speed/ travel times | <20\% slower than driving | $20 \%$ to $40 \%$ slower than driving | $40 \%$ to $60 \%$ slower than driving | $>60 \%$ slower than driving |
| Transit stop amenities | Shelter | Bench | Sign with waiting area | No waiting area and/or no sign |
| Connecting pedestrian/ bike network | BLTS and PLTS 2 or better and crossing | BLTS and PLTS 2 or better with no crossing | BLTS or PLTS >2 and no crossing | BLTS and PLTS >2 and no crossing |

## FREQUENCY

Frequency is how many times an hour a user has access to transit service, assuming that service is provided within acceptable walking distance and at the times the user wishes to travel. Frequency helps determine the convenience of transit service to riders and is one component of overall transit trip time (helping to determine the wait time at a stop). Table 8 provides the assessment for Kayak services within the UIR boundary.

Table 8: Transit Qualitative Multimodal Assessment - Frequency

|  | Route Name | Daily Trips |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Hopper | 4 weekday trips, 2 Saturday trips | Assessment |
| Whistler | 4 weekday trips, 2 Saturday trips | Poor |
| Metro | 6 weekday trips | Poor |
| Arrow | 3 weekday trips | Fair |
| Rocket | 3 weekday trips | Poor |
| Tripper | 3 weekday trips | Poor |

Due to the rural nature of the area and long service routes supporting the region, Kayak's routes operate just a few trips day. The commuter service routes only operate at peak commute times and are not intended to provide convenient service throughout the day.

## SCHEDULE SPEED/TRAVEL TIMES

Schedule speed and travel time refer to the time it takes to complete a transit route in full. The bus travel time includes wait time between an outbound trip and inbound trip, as well as diversions off the most direct motor vehicle routes to reach all bus stops. Table 9 provides the assessment for Kayak services within the UIR boundary.

Table 9: Transit Qualitative Multimodal Assessment - Schedule Speed/Travel Times

| Route Name | Maximum Number <br> of Roundtrip Stops | Bus Scheduled <br> Roundtrip Travel Time <br> (Hours:Minutes) | Vehicle Travel Time <br> (Hours:Minutes)* | Assessment |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hopper | 37 | $3: 40$ | $2: 15$ | Poor |
| Whistler | 33 | $3: 00$ | $2: 10$ | Good |
| Metro | 47 | $2: 10$ | $1: 10$ | Poor |
| Arrow | 22 | $2: 40$ | $2: 10$ | Good |
| Rocket | 16 | $1: 35$ | $1: 30$ | Excellent |
| Tripper | 22 | $1: 20$ | $1: 10$ | Excellent |

* Google Maps was used to estimate the vehicle travel time to reach major stops along the routes.


## TRANSIT STOP AMENITIES

Amenities at transit stops, such as bus benches and bus shelters, enhance a transit route and make it more userfriendly. Steps that can make taking the bus as comfortable and accommodating as possible may help encourage ridership. Table 10 provides the assessment for Kayak services within the UIR boundary. Bus stop amenities in the area include shelters and signage.

Table 10: Transit Qualitative Multimodal Assessment - Transit Stop Amenities

| Route Name | Condition | Assessment |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Hopper | 5 of 7 stops have shelters; 2 have signage | Good |
| Whistler | 4 of 5 stops have shelters; 1 has signage | Good |
| Metro | 7 of 13 stops have shelters; 1 has signage; 4 stops have no amenities | Fair |
| Arrow | 4 of 5 stops have shelters; 1 has signage | Good |
| Rocket | 5 of 8 stops have shelters, 2 have signage; 1 stop has no amenities | Good |
| Tripper | 5 of 10 stops have shelters; 1 has signage; 4 stops have no amenities | Fair |

## CONNECTING PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE NETWORK

Table 11 provides the assessment for Kayak services within the UIR boundary. There are no designated bicycle facilities adjacent to the bus stops within the UIR boundary, therefore the assessment focused on whether sidewalk was present immediately adjacent to the route bus stops within the UIR.

Table 11: Transit Qualitative Multimodal Assessment - Connecting Pedestrian/Bicycle Network

| Route Name |  | Condition | Assessment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hopper | Sidewalk adjacent to 5 of 7 stops; no adjacent dedicated bicycle facility | Fair |  |
| Whistler | Sidewalk adjacent to 4 of 5 stops; no adjacent dedicated bicycle facility | Fair |  |
| Metro | Sidewalk adjacent to 6 of 13 stops; no adjacent dedicated bicycle facility | Poor |  |
| Arrow | Sidewalk adjacent to 4 of 5 stops; no adjacent dedicated bicycle facility | Fair |  |
| Rocket | Sidewalk adjacent to 5 of 8 stops; no adjacent dedicated bicycle facility | Poor |  |
| Tripper | Sidewalk adjacent to 5 of 10 stops; no adjacent dedicated bicycle facility | Poor |  |

## Transit System Planned Projects and Previous Feedback

Attachment E contains a list of planned projects and previous feedback provided via the 2001 CTUIR TSP, MCMP, OR 331 Access Management Implementation Strategy and Circulation Plan, and Umatilla County TSP. CTUIR staff also noted the following transit system goals and potential project types to consider moving forward:

- Transit system goals:
$\square \quad$ Increase system capacity
$\square$ Ensure safety for all users
$\square$ Protect livability and ensure equity and access
$\square$ Begin environment-electric vehicle service for the Mission Metro and campus shuttle routes
$\square$ Establish a regional outlook and future focus Regional Transit Authority (RTA)
- Potential project types:
$\square$ Traffic signals on OR 331 to provide safe crossing opportunities for transit riders and to better enable transit vehicles to turn onto OR 331
$\square$ Crosswalks and mid-block crossings near stops for connectivity to pedestrian and bicycle facilities or key destinations
$\square$ Capital improvements including Kayak Transit Center expansion to include public restrooms for passengers at the Kayak Hub
$\square$ Increase number of bus shelters and bus stop signs


## PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM

The following section describes the pedestrian system in the UIR boundary. It includes a system inventory, pedestrian level of traffic stress analysis, and a systemic safety risk analysis. It also summarizes previously planned projects.

## Inventory

The pedestrian system within the UIR was inventoried based on GIS data from the MCMP, as well as a review of recent aerial imagery. The inventory was supplemented by information provided in the 2001 CTUIR TSP and by information provided by the CTUIR.

The pedestrian system consists of sidewalks and multi-use paths, as well as marked and/or signed pedestrian crossings. These facilities are primarily provided within the Mission, July Grounds, and Gateway hubs near OR 331 and Mission Road. Figure 12 illustrates the pedestrian network within the UIR.


* Mid-block crossing
* Crosses uncontrolled intersection leg
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## SIDEWALKS

Sidewalks are primarily provided within the July Grounds hub, on side streets off OR 331 south of the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino, and along portions of Mission Road. Sidewalks within the UIR boundary are approximately 4-6 feet wide, although obstructions may be located within the sidewalk width. One example from a MCMP field review includes a series of mailbox obstructions. These obstructions occur periodically along the south side of Mission Road, reducing the effective width of the sidewalk and presenting barriers for the passage of wheelchairs.

## MULTI-USE PATHS



Mission Road Sidewalk Obstructions Source: Mission Community Master Plan

Multi-use paths are used by people walking, biking, and rolling. They can create connections within, or between, communities, as well as provide recreational opportunities for residents and visitors. The following multi-use paths are located within the UIR boundary:

- A paved five-foot wide multi-use path network linking the residential areas between Cayuse Road and Short Mile Road.
- The paved nine-foot wide Tamastslikt Trail linking the Tamastslikt Cultural Institute to the July Grounds.
- The paved eight-foot wide Timíne Way multi-use path on the north side of the roadway.


## PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

Based on a review of aerial imagery, there are approximately 13 marked crossings within the UIR boundary. Figure 12 shows the locations of these crossings, including five marked mid-block crossings. A field review will be conducted at these locations in May 2022.



Marked Mid-block Crossing on Cayuse Road Source: Google Earth

## Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress

Pedestrian level of traffic stress (PLTS) is a perception-based analysis methodology that is used to evaluate the adequacy of streets to accommodate pedestrians in urban and rural environments. As applied by ODOT, this methodology classifies four levels of traffic stress that a pedestrian can experience on the street, ranging from PLTS 1 (little traffic stress) to PLTS 4 (high traffic stress). A street or street segment that is rated PLTS 1 generally has low traffic volumes and travel speeds and has a sidewalk that is separated from vehicle traffic. These segments are generally suitable for all pedestrians, including children. A street or street segment that is rated PLTS 4 generally has high traffic volumes and travel speeds and is perceived as unsafe by most adults. Segments rated PLTS 4 also include those with no sidewalks or other pedestrian facilities. Per the APM, PLTS 2 is considered a reasonable target for streets due to its acceptability with most pedestrians.

The PLTS score is determined based on four criteria, including sidewalk condition, physical buffer type, total buffering width, and general land use. All four criteria are scored from 1 to 4 and the highest score determines the overall score for the road segment.

Figure 13 illustrates the results of the PLTS analysis for the roadways scoped for this analysis by CTUIR and ODOT. Some segments shown as PLTS 3 or 4 may have shorter segments with lower PLTS scores.

Several of the analyzed streets have segments that are rated PLTS 3 and PLTS 4. Most segments rated PLTS 4 have no sidewalks or other pedestrian facilities, such as along OR 331 and Short Mile Road. For these segments to be rated PLTS 2, sidewalks with appropriate sidewalk and buffer widths would need to be installed along the full length of the gap. Other common characteristics related to the PLTS 3 and PLTS 4 ratings are described below:

- A few segments rated PLTS 3 or 4 have curb-tight sidewalks on roadways with speeds of 30 mph or higher, such as the sidewalks on Mission Road just east of OR 331. For these segments to be rated PLTS 2, the speeds would need to be reduced to 25 mph or a buffer would need to be installed between the sidewalk and vehicle travel lane.
- Other segments rated PLTS 3 have narrow sidewalks of 4 feet, including the sidewalks on Cedar Street. For these segments to be rated PLTS 2, the sidewalks would need to be widened to at least five feet wide.
- Other segments are be located adjacent to auto-oriented land uses, such as those near Arrowhead Travel Plaza. Per the APM, these segments are automatically rated PLTS 3 or 4 given the auto-oriented nature of these land uses. For these segments, the priority is filling gaps. Alternatives for these segments will be analyzed without respect to the land-use criteria to understand the effects of the proposed solutions.


## Pedestrian Systemic Safety Risk Analysis

As part of the Oregon Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Implementation Plan, ODOT implemented the NCHRP Research Report 893 methodology in 2020. This methodology uses risk factors to complete a systemic safety analysis aimed at identifying high risk locations for pedestrian and bicycle crashes along the state highway system. Systemic safety, opposed to the traditional review of crash history, allows practitioners to proactively identify high risk sites for potential safety improvements based on risk factors that often correlate to locations with low frequency but high injury crashes. For ODOT's statewide systemic safety analysis completed in 2020, the pedestrian risk factors used within rural areas included:

```
- Principal Arterial
- Number of Lanes (>=Four Lanes)}\mp@subsup{}{}{3
| Posted Speed (>=35mph)}\mp@subsup{}{}{4
- Posted Speed (>=35mph) \({ }^{4}\)
```

- Other Zoning ${ }^{5}$
- Proximity to Schools (one mile)
- Proximity to Transit Stops ( $1 / 4$ mile)

Within the UIR boundary, only one ODOT roadway segment was identified as in the highest-risk $20 \%$ of all State Highways: OR 331 north of Mission Road.
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In addition to reviewing ODOT's 2020 analysis, the project team completed the same analysis on all roadways within the UIR boundary. Figure 14 illustrates the results of the pedestrian risk analysis. The top $20 \%$ of analyzed locations for the TSP study area shown in red.

One of the high-risk segments includes OR 331 near the I-84 interchange. The one reported crash involving a pedestrian within the UIR boundary from 2016 to 2020 was located on this segment, and it resulted in a serious injury.

Because most of the roadways in the UIR are non-principal arterials with less than four lanes in "other" zoning, the main risk differentiators for this assessment are if the roadway segment has a posted speed equal to or over 35 MPH, is within one mile from the Nixyaawii Community School, and/or is within $1 / 4$ mile to a transit stop. This results in streets within the more urban portions of the Mission area showing up as higher risk due to their proximity to pedestrian activity generators (e.g., the school, transit stops).

Outside of the short segment of OR 331 with four/five lanes, the highest scoring segments within the UIR boundary include OR 331, Mission Road, and Kirkpatrick Road within 1-mile of the Nixyaawii Community School, where all three of these factors are present. Other high-risk segments are primarily located on OR 331 or within the Mission and July Grounds Hub areas, where two of three of these factors are present in varying combinations. For example, A Street is located within one mile from the Nixyaawii Community School and is within $1 / 4$ mile to a transit stop, yielding a higher risk value even through the posted speed is less than 35 MPH .

## Pedestrian System Planned Projects and Previous Feedback

Attachment $E$ contains a list of planned projects and previous feedback provided via the 2001 CTUIR TSP, MCMP, Safe Routes to School Plan, and CTUIR Capital Improvement Plan. Most of the previously planned pedestrian system projects were provided in the MCMP.

As alternatives and projects are reviewed from these documents and/or developed to address the pedestrian system gaps and deficiencies, Attachment F: Active Transportation and Transit Toolbox will be used as a resource.

## BICYCLE SYSTEM

The following section describes the bicycle system in the UIR boundary. It includes a system inventory, bicycle level of traffic stress analysis, and a systemic safety risk analysis. It also summarizes previously planned projects.

## Inventory

The bicycle system within the UIR was inventoried based on GIS data from the MCMP, as well as a review of recent aerial imagery. The inventory was supplemented by information provided in the 2001 CTUIR TSP and by information provided by the CTUIR.

The bicycle system within the UIR boundary consists of on-street bike lanes, shoulder bikeways, and unmarked shared roadways, as well as off-street multi-use paths and bicycle parking. The only marked bike lanes are on Mission Road, connecting the Mission and July Grounds hubs with residential, school, and commercial uses. Figure 15 illustrates the


Bicyclist on Mission Road Using the Wide Shoulder Lane Source: Mission Community Master Plan bicycle system within the UIR.


Risk Factor Score

- 0.00 (bottom 20\%)
- 0.01-1.45
- $1.46-1.63$
- $1.64-3.08$
- 3.09-5.81 (top 20\%)


| Bike Lane | Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary |
| :--- | :--- |
| Multi-Use Path | Mission Hub |
| Wide Shoulder | July Grounds Hub |
|  | Gateway Hub |
|  | IIII/I |

3 Miles
Mission Hub

## BIKE LANES

Mission Road between SE 56 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street and OR 331 has a striped bicycle lane on both sides of the roadway representing the only formal bicycle-only facility within the UIR boundary.

## SHOULDER BIKEWAYS

On Mission Road between OR 331 and Parr Lane, bicyclists may utilize an unmarked wide shoulder on both sides of the street, with a width varying between 7.5 to 10 feet.

## SHARED ROADWAYS

Aside from multi-use paths and facilities described above, bicycle riders must either ride in the street with motor vehicle traffic or on the sidewalk, if present, with pedestrians.

## MULTI-USE PATHS

As further described in the Pedestrian System section, there are three multi-use paths within the UIR boundary, including links between residential area between Cayuse Road and Short Mile Road, the Tamastslikt Trail, and the Timíne Way multi-use path on the north side of the roadway.

## BICYCLE PARKING

Bicycle parking is limited and generally concentrated to local businesses and the school.

## Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress

Similar to PLTS, Bicycle level of traffic stress (BLTS) is a perception-based analysis methodology that is used to evaluate the adequacy of streets to accommodate bicyclists in urban and rural environments. As applied by ODOT, this methodology classifies four levels of traffic stress that a cyclist can experience on the street, ranging from BLTS 1 (little traffic stress) to BLTS 4 (high traffic stress). A street or street segment that is rated BLTS 1 generally has low traffic volumes and travel speeds and is suitable for all cyclists, including children. A street or street segment that is rated BLTS 4 generally has high traffic volumes and travel speeds and is perceived as unsafe by most adults. Per the APM, BLTS 2 is considered a reasonable target for streets due to its acceptability with most cyclists.

The BLTS score is determined based on the speed of the street, the number of travel lanes per direction, the presence and width of an on-street bike lane and/or adjacent parking lane, and several other factors.

Figure 16 illustrates the results of the BLTS analysis for the roadways scoped for this analysis by CTUIR and ODOT. Some segments shown as BLTS 3 or 4 may have shorter segments with lower BLTS scores.

Several of the analyzed streets have segments that are rated BLTS 3 and BLTS 4. Most segments rated BLTS 3 or 4 do not have bike lanes or wide shoulders. For these segments to be rated BLTS 2, bike lanes with appropriate width and/or buffers would need to be installed. Mission Road has striped bike lanes, but is still rated as BLTS 3 or 4, depending on the location. This is because the bike lanes/shoulders west of OR 331 are not sufficient to provide a comfortable riding experience for most people given the posted speed of 40 mph . For these segments to be rated BLTS 2, the posted speed would need to be reduced and/or the bike lane/shoulders would need to be widened, potentially with a physical buffer installed.

Most segments evaluated as shared roadways that were rated BLTS 2 could still benefit from signage and/or striping to remind motorists to share the road. The signing and striping can also provide important wayfinding for cyclists to inform them of the preferred bicycle routes.


## Bicycle Systemic Safety Risk Analysis

Similar to the pedestrian risk factor screening, ODOT completed a statewide systemic safety analysis for bicycle risk factors in 2020. The risk factors used as part of the bicycle analysis for rural areas included:

- Principal Arterial - Proximity to Transit Stops ( $1 / 4$ mile)
- Posted Speed ( $>=35 \mathrm{mph}$ ) - High Population over the Age of $64^{6}$
- Proximity to Schools (one mile)

Within the UIR boundary, no ODOT roadway segments were identified as in the top $20 \%$ statewide.
The project team completed a bicycle risk factor screening analysis on all roadways within the UIR boundary using the same methodology as the ODOT screening. Figure 17 illustrates the results of the bicycle risk analysis conducted, including the top $20 \%$ locations for the TSP study area shown in red

One of the high-risk segments includes OR 331 north of Wildhorse Boulevard. The one reported crash involving a bicyclist within the UIR boundary from 2016 to 2020 was located on this segment. It resulted in a fatality.

Because the entire study area meets the high population over the age of 64 risk factor and most roadways within the UIR boundary are not classified as principal arterials, the main differentiators risk for this assessment are if the roadway segment has a posted speed equal to or over 35 MPH , is within one mile from the Nixyaawii Community School, and/or is within $1 / 4$ mile to a transit stop. Similar to the pedestrian risk factor screening, this results in roads located near activity generators in the Mission area scoring in the higher tiers. The highest scoring segments within the UIR boundary include OR 331, Mission Road, and Kirkpatrick Road within one-mile of the Nixyaawii Community School, where all three of these factors are present. Other high-risk segments are primarily located within the Mission Hub and July Grounds Hub areas, where two of three of these factors are present in varying combinations. For example, Timíne Way is located within one mile from the Nixyaawii Community School and is within $1 / 4$ mile to a transit stop, yielding a higher risk value even through the posted speed is less than 35 MPH .

## Bicycle System Planned Projects and Previous Feedback

Attachment E contains a list of planned projects and previous feedback provided via the 2001 CTUIR TSP, MCMP, Safe Routes to School Plan, and CTUIR Capital Improvement Plan.

As alternatives and projects are reviewed from these documents and/or developed to address the bicycle system gaps and deficiencies, Attachment F: Active Transportation and Transit Toolbox will be used as a resource.

## RAIL SYSTEM

The rail system within the UIR boundary was inventoried based on GIS data obtained from ODOT, as well as a review of recent aerial imagery. The inventory was supplemented by information provided in the 2001 CTUIR TSP.

## Rail Facilities

There is one rail line within the UIR boundary, connecting Pendleton and La Grande. The line runs east and west, parallel to Mission Road, Short Mile Road, Cayuse Road, and Bingham Roads before turning south along Meacham Creek Road and into the Blue Mountains. Union Pacific is the owner of the rail line, which has an ODOT rail line designation of 2 A . The line's primary purpose is for freight movement.
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## Risk Factor Score

- 1.00 (bottom 20\%)
- 1.01-2.00
- 2.01-2.03
- 2.04-2.09
- 2.10-4.12 (top 20\%)

0 $\qquad$

## Rail Crossings

Based on GIS data from ODOT, there are 29 rail crossings within the UIR, which are summarized in Table 12.
Table 12: Rail Crossings with the Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary

| Location Name | ODOT Crossing Number | Type | Crossing Surface Material |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nr Pendleton - Mission Frontage Road | 2A-218.43 | Mainline at Grade | Concrete |
| Nr Pendleton - Private Road | 2A-218.66-P | Private | Concrete |
| Nr Pendleton - Private Road | 2A-219.12-P | Private | Concrete |
| Nr Pendleton - Private Road | 2A-219.45-P | Private | Concrete |
| Mission - Private Road | 2A-219.71-P | Private | Concrete |
| Mission - Davis Lane | 2A-219.90 | Mainline at Grade | Paved |
| Mission - Umatilla-Mission Hwy | 2A-221.00 | Mainline at Grade | Paved |
| Mission - Parr Lane | 2A-221.50 | Mainline at Grade | Gravel |
| Mission - Private Road | 2A-222.25-P | Private | Concrete |
| Mission - Private Road | 2A-222.75-P | Private | Concrete |
| Minthorn - Niktyoway Road | 2A-224.10 | Mainline at Grade | Gravel |
| Minthorn - Old River Road \#918 | 2A-225.20 | Mainline at Grade | Gravel |
| Minthorn - Private Road | 2A-225.60-P | Private | Concrete |
| Minthorn - Private Road | 2A-225.88-P | Private | Concrete |
| Minthorn - Old River Road \#927 | 2A-226.20 | Mainline at Grade | Gravel |
| Cayuse - Private Road | 2A-226.68-P | Private | Concrete |
| Cayuse - Cayuse-Adams Road 925 | 2A-227.30 | Mainline at Grade | Combination |
| Cayuse - Private Road | 2A-229.34-P | Private | Concrete |
| Thorn Hollow - Thorn Hollow Road | 2A-231.10 | Mainline at Grade | Paved |
| Thorn Hollow - Private Road | 2A-232.04-P | Private | Concrete |
| Thorn Hollow - Bingham Road | 2A-232.40 | Mainline at Grade | Paved |
| Thorn Hollow - Private Road | 2A-233.44-P | Private | Concrete |
| Thorn Hollow - Private Road | 2A-233.85-P | Private | Concrete |
| Thorn Hollow - Private Road | 2A-234.36-P | Private | Concrete |
| Gibbon - Private Road | 2A-234.92-P | Private | Concrete |
| Gibbon - Private Road | 2A-235.53-P | Private | Concrete |
| Gibbon - Private Road | 2A-236.27-P | Private | Concrete |
| Gibbon - Bingham Road | 2A-236.60-C | Spur | Paved |
| Gibbon - Bingham Road | 2A-237.30 | Mainline at Grade | Paved |
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## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this memorandum is to document existing conditions, opportunities, and constraints to planning for quality development and active transportation within the study area. This memorandum is part of the 2022 CTUIR TSP update, which aims to foster cultural connectedness, deliver community-focused healthy lifestyle solutions, and prioritize safety for all modes of travel on the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Reservation).

This memorandum focuses on issues of land use, development, and property ownership in order to inform the update of transportation projects and policies. The memorandum also reviews and recommends regulatory best practices to implement the TSP update project objectives.

## STUDY AREA OVERVIEW

The study area for this analysis is the Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary, shown on Figure 1. The Reservation is located along the Umatilla River east of the City of Pendleton in Umatilla County and encompasses about 172,000 acres (about 273 square miles). The Reservation lies east of Pendleton and is primarily north of Interstate 84 (I-84) and south of OR Highway 11. A map of the study area is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Study Area Map

Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary
Mission Hub
$\square$ July Grounds Hub
$\square$ Gateway Hub

CTUIR has over 3,100 tribal members; nearly half live on or near the Reservation. The Reservation is also home to another 300 American Indians who are members of other tribes, and approximately 1,500 non-Indians also live on the Reservation.

The majority of government activity, commerce, and residential developments on the Reservation are located in the vicinity of South Market Road (OR 331) and Mission Road. This area is organized into several "Community Hubs," as shown on the inset map above and described below.

- Gateway. This area includes the Wildhorse Resort and Casino, Tamastslikt Cultural Institute, and Coyote Business Park. It is the primary entrance onto the Reservation from I-84.
- Mission. The Mission area is the center for tribal governance and includes Nixyáawii Governance Center, Community School, the Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center, and transit hub for Kayak Public Transit. The Mission Area includes some residencies, including a small apartment complex and platted subdivision for single family homes.
- July Grounds. This area located north of the Gateway Area, includes the site of the former Nixyáawii Community School, Bureau of Indian Affairs office, Wetland Community Park, the Mission Longhouse, Mission Assembly of God Church and many of CTUIR's residences.


## POLICY CONTEXT

## Governance and Land Ownership

CTUIR is governed by a Constitution and Bylaws adopted in 1949. The Constitution and Bylaws establishes membership criteria and operating procedures for the General Council, Board of Trustees, and Tribal Court meetings, and positions. The Governing body is the nine-member Board of Trustees, elected every two years by the General Council (tribal members ages 18 and older).

Land ownership on the Reservation complicates the development process and may have implications for how TSP projects are implemented. Table 1 describes the types of ownership and Figure 3 and Figure 4 show land ownership for the reservation as a whole and the Community Hubs located in the vicinity of I-84. As shown on these figures, the Community Hubs consist entirely of Tribal Trust and Tribal Fee lands.

Table 1. Land Ownership/Status Types

| Type | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Fee | Lands on which taxes are paid and in the County/State's jurisdiction. CTUIR and Umatilla County <br> have an MOU that allows for the CTUIR to administer zoning on fee lands within the Reservation <br> boundaries. |
| Allotment | Trust lands are held by the US government for the perpetual use of an individual (Allotee) or tribal <br> government (CTUIR); so while the Federal Government owns it, CTUIR owns the rights to it. |
| Tribal | Tribal Trust Lands are the trust lands that are owned by the CTUIR. This can be either in whole or <br> in part. Those that are listed as Tribal Trust on the maps are those that are owned in whole by the <br> CTUIR, but in reality many of the allotment lands also have at least a portion of the properties <br> owned by the Tribes because of right-of-first-refusal on portions where there is not a qualified <br> descendant through probate; through individuals selling portions to the Tribe of their own volition; <br> or through the Cobell Land Buy Back Program. |
| These are fee lands that are owned by the Tribe. Generally they are lands that have not yet been <br> transferred into Trust. The Fee-to-Trust transfer is a long process that requires that the property <br> not have any outstanding debts or liens; all rights-of-way, easements, and access agreements <br> need to be finalized and cleaned up, and all must be resurveyed at a level of accuracy that <br> exceeds most general surveys. Also, local jurisdictions are notified and have a response time to <br> contest or negotiate the Fee-to-Trust transfers because it impacts their tax base. For lands of <br> considerable value and lands that receive municipal or emergency services paid by tax dollars, an <br> annual payment in lieu of taxes is often made. |  |
| Fee |  |

Figure 2. Land Ownership - CTUIR (Portion)


Figure 3. Land Ownership - Community Hubs


## Zoning Designations

Land within CTUIR has one of several base zoning designations. Overlay zones include a floodplain zone and public use overlay that apply in specific areas. Zones are described briefly in this section and shown in Figure 5.

## RESIDENTIAL ZONES

- Community Residential (CR-1) - The CR-1 zone is intended to promote areas for community suburban residential development that connect to community water and sewer services where those services are available consistent with the policies of the Mission Community Plan. This zone is intended to create residential neighborhoods for public and private housing.
- Rural Residential (R-1) - The $R$-1 zone is intended to promote areas for medium density suburban residential development in close proximity to necessary public utilities (water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, telephone, etc.).
- General Rural (R-2) - The R-2 zone is intended as a transition zone from agricultural uses to rural residential uses or small farms. These lands contain many developed and undeveloped lots of record of varying acreages and uses with inadequate flood plain management and lack of planned efficient utility systems.


## EMPLOYMENT ZONES

- Commercial Development (C-D) - The C-D zone is designed to promote individual and Tribal Enterprise Development to diversify and improve the Reservation economy. This zone is established to promote efficient and appropriate locations for commercial and related service activities.
- Industrial Development (I-D) - The I-D zone is intended to provide areas for industrial development compatible with the economic resource base of the Umatilla Indian Reservation and the economic needs and wants of the people of the reservation. This zone designation is appropriate for areas in close proximity to major transportation facilities and necessary utilities, while preserving or enhancing the air, water and land resources of the area.


## AGRICULTURAL ZONES

- Exclusive Farm Use (AG-1) - The AG-1 zone is designed to maintain the agricultural economy of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. The purpose of this zone is to preserve and maintain agricultural lands for farm use. These lands are viewed as largely undeveloped, limited and irreplaceable, agricultural soils.
- Farm Pasture (AG-2) - The AG-2 zone is designed to maintain the agricultural land base taking into consideration special management practices due to steeper sloped, shallower soils and special wildlife and fish habitats. Foods, herbs and medicines traditional to the Confederated Tribes are also found in this region making it necessary for the Land Protection Planning Commission or the Board of Trustees to place further restrictions from time to time.
- Small Farm (AG-3) - The AG-3 zone is designed to maintain the agricultural lands and open space of the Reservation and yet accommodate high intensity agriculture of such as the product of fruit crops, vegetable crops, greenhouses, hay crops and certain types of animal husbandry excluding feed lots and hog farms, in areas with adequate soils and efficient irrigation systems. This zone is also designed to allow tribal members and other persons to more economically become involved in agriculture on a small scale to reduce the cost of living and/or provide additional income.
- Agri-Business (AG-4) - The AG-4 zone is designed to provide areas for certain types of agriculturally oriented businesses and services which may not otherwise need to locate in more intensive commercial or industrial areas. It may be appropriate for storage, handling or processing of agricultural products, or provide area for agriculturally oriented businesses which require larger areas.


## FOREST ZONES

- Restricted Indian Forest (F-2) - The F-2 zone is designated to the Tribal trust lands of the Johnson Creek Restoration Area which were added to the Umatilla Indian Reservation by the Johnson Creek Restoration Act of 1939. Lands within this zone are undeveloped and culturally significant. Generally, these lands are utilized and managed for range, timber and other tribal interests.
- Big Game Grazing Forest (G-1) - The G-1 zone is designated to provide critical range for big game populations. The purpose of this zone is to preserve and maintain habitat for big game and other wildlife. Lands within this zone are largely undeveloped and located at the higher elevations of the Reservation. Generally, these lands are utilized and managed for outdoor recreation, range and timber with very limited development.


## RESOURCE ZONES

- Surface Mine (SM) - The SM zone is designated for surface mining sites, an area that includes all or any part of the process of mining minerals by the removal of overburden and extraction of natural mineral deposits thereby exposed by any method by which more than 50 cubic yards of minerals are extracted.


## PUBLIC USE ZONES

- Public Use Zone (P-1) - The purpose of the P-1 zone is to set aside land for educational, recreational, homesites, subsidization for the benefit of the Tribe, or tribal religious organizations or an agency of Federal, State or local governments.
- Public Facilities Zone (P-2) - The P-2 zone provides lands for use by governmental and other non-profit organizations that provide services which are inherently intensive or unusual uses not normally associated with other zones.


## OVERLAY ZONES

- Public Use (P-1-O) Overlay - The purpose of the P-1 Overlay Zone is to support and protect the integrity of the Tamastslikt Cultural Institute of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, and within the context of supporting the Institute, to set aside land for education, recreation, subsidization for the benefit of the Tribe, tribal religious organizations or an agency of Federal, State or local governments.
- Flood Hazard Overlay (F-H-O) - The purpose of the Flood Hazard Overlay Zone is to promote and protect the public health, safety and general welfare, to protect soils, water quality, and quantity, to maintain and improve fish and wildlife habitat and minimize public and private flood losses due to floods by provisions designed to: restrict and prohibit dangerous and uses vulnerable to floods in an effort to reduce the damage of flooding.

Table 2. Summary of Zoning Designations

| Zone | Description | Acres | Percentage of <br> Study Area |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Ag-1 | Exclusive Farm Use | 53,723 | $37.9 \%$ |
| Ag-3 | Small Farm | 1,171 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Ag-4 | Agri-Business | 47 | $0.0 \%$ |
| C-D | Commercial Development | 315 | $0.2 \%$ |
| CR-1 | Community Residential | 52 | $0.0 \%$ |
| F-2 | Restricted Indian Forest | 14,202 | $10.0 \%$ |
| G-1 | Big Game Grazing Forest | 69,353 | $48.9 \%$ |
| I-D | Industrial Development | 560 | $0.4 \%$ |
| P-1 | Public Use | 246 | $0.2 \%$ |
| P-2 | Public Facilities Zone | 25 | $0.0 \%$ |
| R-1 | Rural Residential | 285 | $0.2 \%$ |
| R-2 | General Rural | 1,057 | $0.7 \%$ |
| SM | Surface Mine | 200 | $0.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| FP | Floodplain | 320 | $0.4 \%$ |
| P-1-O | Public Use Overlay | 576 |  |

Figure 4. CTUIR Zoning


Figure 5. Zoning - Community Hubs
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## RECENT PLANNING EFFORTS

CTUIR and neighboring jurisdictions have undertaken several planning efforts in recent years that are relevant to this TSP update. These plans are described below.

## Mission Community Master Plan (2018)

Figure 6. Key Elements of the Mission Community Master Plan


The Mission Community Master Plan (MCMP) is a plan to coordinate development at the heart of the Mission Community. The plan includes specific land use and transportation recommendations, as well as an implementation plan, intended to create a vibrant, engaged, and multi-modal community that fosters cultural and environmental connectedness, economic vitality, health, and well-being. During the plan's 20-year horizon there is an estimated a need for 349 dwelling units on the reservation.

The MCMP study area focused on the Central Business District and Governance Activity Center at the key intersection of Highway 331 and Mission Road, also referred to as the "Four Corners" area, shown in Figure 8.

The MCMP includes policy recommendations to improve transportation standards and design guidelines, as well as a specific transportation improvement project list. The transportation projects list includes intersection improvements at OR 331 and Mission Road, pedestrian and bicycle improvements (e.g., construction of sidewalks, bike lanes and enhanced crossings), several multi-use pathways, and transit improvements. The complete list and index maps are included in Appendix A.

Key MCMP recommendations include updates to the CTUIR Land Development Code and transportation standards to be incorporated into the TSP, as follows.

- Land Use Regulations. Recommended Land Development Code amendments include:
- New CR-2 zone. The MCMP proposed a new zoning district to enable the uses and features envisions for the Central Business District and Governance Activity Center. Rezoning land to CR-2
provides opportunity to create the mixed-use, housing, and commercial developments envisioned by the Master Plan.
- Design Guidelines. The MCMP shows examples of specific building designs and configurations that address adjacency considerations and typical user needs across a variety of land uses and development typologies that are true to the vision for the Mission Community.
- Transportation Standards. Standards related to specific transportation facilities to be incorporated into the TSP include:
- MCMP Figure 12. OR 331 + Multi Use Path Cross-Section
- MCMP Figure 13. Multi-Use Pathway Cross-Section
- MCMP Figure 14. Umatilla River Multi-Use Trail and Equestrian Trail Cross-Section
- MCMP Figure 16. Mission Road Cross-Section
- MCMP Figure 17. Potential Signalized Intersection Widening Improvements
- MCMP Figure 18. Potential Roundabout Intersection Improvements
- MCMP Figure 19. Standard Residential Street Cross-Section
- MCMP Figure 20. Minor Residential Street Cross-Section

Figure 7. Mission Community Master Plan Study Area


## CTUIR Safe Routes to School Plan (2020)

The CTUIR Safe Routes to School Plan lays the foundation for coordination between the Nixyáawi Community School, CTUIR government, Charter School Board, Yellowhawk Tribal Health, Pendleton School District, Umatilla County, ODOT Region 5, and the broader community. The overarching goal is to reduce barriers for students walking and biking to school. This plan addresses access to Nixyáawii Community School, the only school located within the CTUIR boundary.

The process of developing the plan included outreach to the community and an existing conditions assessment, and resulted in a list of recommended improvements including installation of curb ramps, high visibility crosswalks, new sidewalks, pedestrian signs, and a bike lane. The complete list and location of improvements are shown in Figure 9.

Figure 8. STRS Improvement Recommendations List and Map


## Nixyaawii Community School <br> SRTS Improvement Recommendations

Mission Road and Hwy 331: Install perpendicular curb ramps on all four corners of the intersection. Install $2^{\prime}$ wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings across each leg of the intersection. Upgrade the stormwater system and review pedestrian lighting needs at the intersection, as necessary.

Parking along Mission Road: Install bike lane symbol pavement markings and stripe a buffer within the existing bike lanes east of the Four Corners intersection about 2,100 feet along the north side of the road and about 4,200 feet along the south side of the road. Install accompanying bike lane signs.
3. Mission Road and Hwy 331: Review the community's desire to construct a multi-use path along the south side of the road as had been indicated in previous planning documents. Consider enhanced crossings across Mission Rd, such as at Alexander Ln and Ti'mine Way, based on anticipated crossing demand.

4 Mission Road and Horseshoe Lane: Install perpendicular curb ramps on each side of Mission Rd. Install $\mathbf{2}^{\prime}$ wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with associated warning signage across Mission Rd (R1-6a, W11-2 with 16-7P and W11-2 with 16-9P).

Mission Road and B St: Install 2' wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with perpendicular curb ramps and associated warning signage, across Mission Rd, on the east leg of the Parr Ln/B St and Mission Rd intersection (R1-6a, W11-2 with 16-7P and W11-2 with 16-9P).

6 Hwy 331: Install 6' sidewalks along the east side of Hwy 331 north of the existing sidewalk at the Four Corners intersection extending to Showaway Ln. Install a 12 ' multi-use path along the west side of Hwy 331 south of the Four Corners intersection extending to Ti'Mine Way.

Ti'Mine Way: Install bidirectional Pedestrian Crossing signs ( $\mathbf{S 1 - 1}$ with W16-7P, S1-1 with W16-9P) in advance of the crosswalks on Ti'Mine Way.

Mission Road between Confederated Way and Cedar Street: Install 6'sidewalks along the south side of Mission Rd / Cayuse Rd between the western intersection of Confederated Way and Cedar St (not pictured in map extent).
Install 6' sidewalks along the north side of Cayuse Rd between Short Mile Rd and Cedar St , as project budget allows (not pictured in map extent).
Upgrade the two existing marked crosswalks to ADA standards within the segment of roadway, and review additional marked crossing locations if installing only south side sidewalks (not pictured in map extent).

## Umatilla County Trail Plan Concept Plan (2021)

The Umatilla County Trail Plan Concept Plan develops a vision and plan for a multi-modal trail that interconnects the cities of Umatilla, Hermiston, Stanfield and Echo. The plan depicts conceptual trail locations and designs from Umatilla to Echo, as shown in Figure 10.

The eastern edge of the trail concept terminates at Echo High School, located on US 395. Echo is located approximately 30 miles west of the CTUIR reservation.If the trail eventually extends into the Reservation, CTUIR can chose to follow the trail design recommendations if desired.

## Blue Mountain Regional Plan (2018)

The vision for the Blue Mountain Regional Plan was to develop a community-driven and locally-supported regionwide network of bicycle and pedestrian routes and nonmotorized trails. The objective of this network is to provide outdoor recreation opportunities, mobility options, and connectivity within the Blue Mountain Region that benefit health, mobility, quality

Figure 9. Umatilla County Trail Conceptual Plan
 of life and livability, and economic development and tourism. The Regional Plan was developed with a large group of partners, including CTUIR.

CTUIR's involvement in the plan was focused on the Rainwater Wildlife Area, which is owned and operated by CTUIR and at the time did not have an updated management plan. Located in Columbia County WA, the Rainwater Wildlife Area is outside of the TSP project area. However, connections to this area from the Reservation may be considered as part of the TSP update.

Table 3. Blue Mountain Region Trails - Proposed Connections


## Walla Walla MPO 2045 Plan

The Walla Walla Valley Metropolitan and Sub-Regional Transportation Planning Organizations are responsible for transportation planning in Walla Walla Valley MPO - a region that includes the Walla Walla - College Place -Milton-Freewater urbanized area and more rural portions of Umatilla and Walla Walla counties. The 2045 Plan ensures federal, state, and local investments into pedestrian, bicycle, public transit, roadway, and freight transportation will enhance the movement of all people and goods efficiently and safely. The CTUIR Reservation is not located within the Walla Walla MPO. However, Kayak Public Transit, operated by CTUIR, provides service within the boundary of the MPO. To the extent applicable, the CTUIR TSP should be consistent with the transit recommendations in the 2045 Plan including Transportation Demand Management policies for collective marketing, trip planning, and other coordination between jurisdictions and transit agencies.

## DEVELOPMENT ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

This section outlines development issues and opportunities based on demographic trends; recent, ongoing, and future development; and focus areas visions, and how those opportunities can align with the TSP goals of accommodating quality development and active transportation.

## Demographic Trends and Housing Need

Census data from 2010 to 2020 shows marginal population growth on the Reservation (see Table 4) and a steady increase in the number and proportion of American Indian and Alaskan Native individuals. Current estimates are significantly lower than the 20-year population forecasts found in the 2001 CTUIR TSP (shown in Table 5).

Table 4. Historic Population Data (Source: ACS 5-year Community Survey Data, CTUIR Tribal Area Geography)

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Margin <br> of Error | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | Margin of <br> Error | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | Margin of <br> Error |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population <br> (Table S0101) | 2,748 | 301 | 2,842 | 209 | 2,818 | 326 |
| Population over 65 (Table <br> S0101) | $14.5 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $20.3 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| American Indian and <br> Alaska Native Population <br> /Percentage of Population <br> (Table B02001) | $917 / 33 \%$ | 219 | $1,068 / 38 \%$ | 153 | $1,144 / 40 \%$ | 179 |
| White Alone Population / <br> Percentage of Population <br> (Table B02001) | $1,520 / 55 \%$ | 202 | $1,352 / 48 \%$ | 115 | $1,284 / 45 \%$ | 171 |
| Labor Force Participation <br> Rate of Population 16+ <br> (Table S2301) | $65.4 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $57.3 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $56.6 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |

Table 5. 2001 CTUIR TSP Future Population Projection and Housing Needs (TSP Table 5-1)
FUIURE POPULATION PROJECTION AND HOUSING NEEDS

|  | Year 2000 | Year 2020 | 20-Year Increase |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population- All Indians in the Area | 3,044 | 4,125 | 1,081 |
| Additional Dwelling Units | - | 347 | 347 |
| (Scattered Sites) | - | $(100)$ | $(100)$ |
| (Mission Community) | - | $(187)$ | $(187)$ |

The MCMP estimated a need for 349 dwelling units on the reservation within the 20-year planning horizon, broken down into 151 ownership units (both Single Family Detached and Mobile Home units) and 198 rental units of various housing types. See Table 6 for additional detail.

Table 6. Projected 20-Year Need for New Housing Units (CMCP Figure 3.7)

| OWNERSHIP HOUSING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Multi-Family |  |  |  |  | Mobile home | Boat, RV, other temp | Total <br> Units | \% of Units | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cummulative } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Price Range | Single Family Detached | Single Family Attached | 2-unit | 3- or 4plex | 5+ Units MFR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals: | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 151 | \% All Units: | 43.3\% |
| Percentage: | 75.6\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 24.1\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |


| RENTAL HOUSING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Multi-Family |  |  |  |  | Mobile home | Boat, RV, other temp | Total <br> Units | \% of Units | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cummulative } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Price Range | Single Family Detached | Single Family Attached | 2-unit | $\begin{gathered} 3-\text { or 4- } \\ \text { plex } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 5+ Units <br> MFR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals: | 84 | 9 | 48 | 7 | 28 | 22 | 0 | 198 | \% All Units: | 56.7\% |
| Percentage: | 42.5\% | 4.5\% | 24.1\% | 3.7\% | 14.2\% | 11.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |


| TOTAL HOUSING UNITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Multi-Family |  |  |  |  | Mobile home | Boat, RV, other temp | Total Units | \% of Units |
|  | Single Family Detached | Single Family Attached* | 2-unit | $\begin{gathered} 3 \text { - or 4- } \\ \text { plex } \end{gathered}$ | 5+ Units MFR |  |  |  |  |
| Totals: | 198 | 9 | 48 | 7 | 28 | 58 | 0 | 349 | 100\% |
| Percentage: | 56.8\% | 2.7\% | 13.7\% | 2.1\% | 8.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  |

Sources: CTUIR, Census, Johnson Economics

* Uses Census definition, including townhomes/rowhouses and duplexes attached side-by-side, seperately metered.

CTUIR has enacted several programs to incentivize tribal members to live and/or work on the Reservation itself. Programs include housing assistance, land leasing, educational assistance programs, childcare, elder services, travel arrangements, and health services at Yellowhawk Health Center. The success of these programs could add to the growth forecast for CTUIR. As of 2017, CTUIR owned and/or managed 238 housing units.

## Buildable Land Inventory and Opportunity Sites

The 2018 MCMP included an analysis of land within the plan's study area, shown in Figure 11 and Figure 12. As discussed previously, this area contains the vast majority of land on the Reservation that is designated for uses other than agriculture, forest, or other open space.

This analysis led to identification of several "key opportunity sites" potentially suitable for new development at the heart of the Mission Area, shown in Figure 14 and discussed in the following section of this memorandum.

Figure 10. MCMP Residential BLI


Figure 11. MCMP Commercial BLI



## Community Hubs

The key opportunities for development on the Reservation lie within the Community Hubs, identified in Figure 2. Existing conditions and opportunities for each of these areas are described below.

## GATEWAY COMMUNITY HUB

The Gateway Community Hub is the primary entrance to the Reservation from I-84. It extends to both the north and south of the interstate and includes:

- Coyote Business Park. The Coyote Business Park is a 170 -acre master planned commercial and industrial park, owned and operated by CTUIR. The business park presents opportunities for commercial development. Currently, the park has an Arrowhead Travel Plaza, a truck repair stop, a Subway, and several other businesses. The proximity to I-84 and the Wildhorse Casino and Resort are notable benefits. On the South side of the park, there are more than 140 acres being marketed for distribution and shipping, logistics, light manufacturing and value-added agriculture. The area contains various tax exemption opportunities and is an IRS-certified Opportunity Zone.
- Coyote Business Park Development Standards and Design Guidelines establish the following objectives:
- Encourage office and retail uses in Coyote North.
- Encourage retail uses in Coyote East.
- Attract diversified light manufacturing and distribution warehousing to Coyote South.
- Plan for pedestrian and bicycle features, including wide sidewalks, landscaping, and retail buildings with display windows.
- Keep auto circulation compatible with pedestrian, bicycle, and transit transportation.
- Coordinate building design, signage, lighting and landscape design to provide diversity and variety in building form and type, open spaces, and site features while maintaining a sense of design continuity throughout the site.

Figure 12. Coyote Business Park Lots

(Source: https://coyotebusinesspark.com/)

- Wildhorse Resort and Casino. A key economic driver for CTUIR, this area contains a casino, golf course, movie theater, restaurants, RV park, bowling lanes, and conference/meeting facilities. The resort has been significantly expanded recently, with major construction completed in 2011 and 2020. Wildhorse employs over 800 individuals, according to the CTUIR website.
- Tamástslikt Cultural Center. The Tamástslikt Cultural Institute is located in the northeast corner of the Gateway Area at the east edge of the Wildhorse Golf Course. The Cultural Center contains a museum and education center and is the only American Indian owned and operated interpretive center on the Oregon Trail. Its permanent exhibits explore the past, present, and future of the Cayuse, Umatilla, and Walla Walla people (the Confederated Tribes) and tell the Oregon Trail story from their perspective. The Cultural Center includes spaces to rent for meetings and events. In 2018, the annual visitation totaled 28,027, including visiting school groups.


## MISSION AREA

The Mission Community Hub contains many key CTUIR institutions, including the Governance Center, Yellowhawk Health, Kayak Transit Center, the Nixyáawi Community School, and the Nixyáawi Neighborhood.

- Nixyaawii Governance Center. Tribal operations, including the Tribal Planning Office and Public Works, are housed in the governance center on Timine Way.
- Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center. Yellowhawk is a Tribally governed facility that provides outpatient primary care to CTUIR tribal members and other eligible American Indians. Services include outpatient medical, dental, mental health, alcohol / drug treatment, and aftercare programs. Yellowhawk also offers pharmacy services, medical laboratory, radiology and a DUII diversion program.
- Kayak Transit Hub and Maintenance Shop. A bus barn and maintenance shop have been on the site since 2014, and a new Transit Hub with benches and cooling/heating was built adjacent to the Transit Center in 2018.
- Nixyáawii Community School. The new school building opened in September 2019 with a 105 student capacity limit, an increase from the previous school building located in the July Grounds. ${ }^{1}$
- The Nixyáawii Neighborhood/Subdivision. The new Nixyáawii neighborhood is an opportunity for CTUIR Tribal Members to build, live, and enjoy their own homes in their own community. The 13-acre area is located southeast of the Nixyáawii Education Center and Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center. The subdivision has roughly 40 lots available to tribal members with 99 -year leases. The neighborhood is planned to include:
- A community park and walking trails
- A safe, walkable design with close proximity to CTUIR events and services at the Nixyáawii Governance Center, Nixyáawii Community School, and the Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center
- Easy access to Kayak Public Transit
- Parking access through alleyways behind each lot
- Stubbed-out utility connections
- Access to electricity through Pacific Power and fiber optic internet
- Space reserved for future neighborhood businesses and services
- Other Key Sites. The MCMP identified four key sites adjacent to the Mission Community Hub, shown in

Figure 14. These sites are either partially or fully vacant and are described below.

- Site \#1: This site is a tribal allotment property held in Trust by the BIA and, as of this writing, is held in probate and is expected to be held by a local family. It is currently zoned for industrial and low-density residential uses. Any future development and zone changes would be at the behest of the property owners.
- Site \#2: This property is a tribally owned trust property. It is 1.8 acres currently zoned for commercial uses. It currently has a well house and one of the CTUIR's community water wells located on it. Some

[^7]previous conceptual design work for this site included uses ranging from apartments to commercial development and a skate park.

- Site \#3: This is two individual parcels with the smaller, inscribed parcel containing a residence that is in trust, while the larger surrounding property is fee land owned by Tribal members. Both are zoned Commercial. Any future development or zone designation changes would be at the behest of the property owners.
- Site \#4: This is a 21-acre fee property owned by non-tribal members and is zoned Ag-1. Any future residential development would require a change of zoning designation and would be initiated at the property owner's behest in partnership with CTUIR.

Figure 13. MCMP Key Opportunity Areas


## JULY GROUNDS

The July Grounds were the site of several tribal buildings that have recently been relocated to the Mission area or elsewhere, including the Cay-Uma-Wa Education Center, the old Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center, the former Nixyaawii Community School, and the former Tribal Police station. It is still the site of the Community Center and Longhouse. The site has historical significance and is connected to the Tamástslikt Cultural Institute via off-street path. The broader July Grounds area contains residences for many tribal members.

## LAND USE UTILIZATION MAP

The following maps combine information listed previously in this memorandum into a Land Use Utilization Map. Development and redevelopment opportunities are primarily outside of resource zones. As shown on Figure 15, the study area is predominantly rural in nature, with about $97 \%$ of its acreage in either Exclusive Farm Use, Restricted Indian Forest, or Big Game Grazing Forest designations. These areas are expected to remain undeveloped for the duration of the planning period.

Figure 16 shows the CTUIR Community Hubs. There is a significant amount of land shown as vacant or partially vacant in commercial, industrial, and residential designations. There are also several parcels in CTUIR ownership with a public zoning designation. Uses in these areas vary substantially - from major employment centers such as the Wildhorse Casino and Coyote Business Park to old and new residential subdivisions.

Several other factors will contribute to development in CTUIR:

- Infrastructure availability and costs
- Floodplain regulations, particularly after significant flooding events in recent years.
- Transportation access
- Property owner interest
- CTUIR interest in developing properties it controls

Figure 14. Land Use Utilization Map - CTUIR


Figure 15. Land Use Utilization Map - Community Hubs


## OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE CTUIR TSP

This section summarizes opportunities for the CTUIR TSP to create a transportation system that achieves CTUIR's goals. Additional community conversation will refine this list of opportunities into actionable items developed later in the TSP Update process.

## Land Use and Development Code Concepts

Development on the Reservation is subject to the CTUIR Land Development Code. The following general concepts are used by communities of all sizes to implement policies that promote active transportation, create transit-supportive development, protect rural landscapes, and other community goals around health, environmental stewardship, and equity.

## Bicycle and Pedestrian Connectivity

A key goal of this TSP update is to improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. This can be achieved by:

- Identifying key projects to create/enhance bicycle and pedestrian connections among key destinations (primarily between and within Community Hubs).
- Requiring sidewalks as part of subdivisions to improve internal and cross-site connectivity.
- On-site connectivity for larger commercial and industrial development (e.g., Coyote Business Park). This can be achieved by requiring pedestrian connections from the site entrance to other on-site locations, and requiring raised sidewalks or striping to emphasize pedestrian routes within parking lots and vehicle circulation areas.


## Transit Supportive Development

In order to improve transit service and promote transit use, transit stops should host amenities for safety, comfort, and function of use, including real-time transit tracking, benches, shelters for weather protection, and lighting. Development of these features can be required through development approval on sites located along existing or planned transit routes in coordination with Kayak Public Transit. Dedication of right-of-way for bus pull-outs or turnarounds as necessary can also be required.

## Street Connectivity

Having a high level of street connectivity, with multiple options for routing for all modes of travel, can support active transportation and improve overall travel times among destinations. Establishing maximum street lengths for subdivisions, discouraging or limiting cul-de-sacs, and requiring connections to neighboring sites as part of subdivision regulations are tools to implement this.

## Trails

The rural nature of CTUIR provides opportunity for off-street transportation that provides residents and visitors the opportunity to get around on foot, bicycle, horseback, skateboard, and other means. Trail connections can be required of development and redevelopment in the land use code, along with design requirements for grade, lighting, and other design characteristics. Acquiring and maintaining the right of way for these connections is a key step, either through development or acquisition by CTUIR itself. This is particularly important along Umatilla River, which holds cultural significance to the Tribe.

## Create Inviting and Comfortable Spaces Through Building Design

Creating spaces that are pedestrian-friendly and transit supportive can be achieved in part through the design of buildings and site planning. Provisions often include:

- Ground floor windows, regulated by a minimum amount of ground floor windows and glazing provides a more inviting façade for pedestrians.
- Maximum setback standards and requiring buildings to be set closer to the street they feel more inviting to pedestrians.
- Requiring or encouraging parking in the side or rear of buildings to reduce potential conflicts between modes and create a more attractive streetscape.


## Protection of Rural Landscapes and Development Patterns

Creating tightly-knit and walkable communities in the core areas of CTUIR is a way to preserve the natural and agrarian nature of land elsewhere on the Reservation while continuing to support the Tribe's goals of housing and employing tribal members on the Reservation. The MCMP contains several recommendations to reduce regulatory barriers to developing more dense housing opportunities, including accessory dwelling units, cottage clusters, or attached housing.

## Identification of Key Projects

The TSP update will identify key improvements to meet existing and future need, which will be the basis of planned capital improvements and can also be implemented through future development approval ensuring that a robust multimodal network is built incrementally over time. The projects identified in the MCMP and listed in Attachment A are a starting point for reviewing current and future transportation needs.

## Attachment A

Mission Community Master Plan Transportation Projects and TSP Figures

Table 7. Mission Community Master Plan Preferred Transportation Improvement Projects

| Map ID | Location | Project Description | Project Benefit/Implementation Considerations | Priority/ Time Frame | Cost ${ }^{1}$ | Funding Source | Consistency with 2001 CTUIR TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | OR 331/ <br> Mission <br> Road Intersection | - Signalized the intersection <br> - Construct separate left-turn lanes on all four intersection approaches <br> - Construct a separate rightturn lane on the northbound approach | Would be needed to accommodate projected long-term local and regional traffic growth. Would require a more detailed engineering study to determine when signalization is warranted based on traffic volume growth over time. | Medium Priority <br> Long-Term <br> Time Frame | \$450k | Develop ment/ STIP | Would replace Project \#8 in existing TSP. |
|  | OR 331/ <br> Mission <br> Road Intersection | - Construct a single lane roundabout <br> - Realign the northbound and southbound approaches to avoid impacts to the Mission Market | Would be needed to accommodate projected long-term local and regional traffic growth. Would require a more detailed engineering study to determine when a roundabout would be needed based on traffic volume growth over time. | Medium Priority <br> Long-Term <br> Time Frame | \$850k | Develop ment/ STIP | Would replace Project \#8 in existing TSP. |
| Pedestrian Improvement Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P1 | Mission <br> Road (north side from grain silo to Cedar Street) | Install six-foot sidewalks along the north side of Mission Road. | Would address an existing sidewalk gap between the residential areas north of the July Grounds, the Wetland Community Park, and the Four Corners area. Implementation could be a combination of a capital improvement project and/or required as part of future development projects along the Mission Road corridor. | High Priority <br> Near-Term <br> Time Frame | \$450k | Tribal <br> Capital <br> Project / <br> Develop <br> ment | This project is not currently identified as a need in the existing TSP. |


| Map ID | Location | Project Description | Project Benefit/Implementation Considerations | Priorityl Time Frame | Cost ${ }^{1}$ | Funding Source | Consistency with 2001 CTUIR TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Portions of the corridor may require right-ofway acquisition and some utility relocation. <br> Portions of the corridor near Cedar Street may have wetland impacts. <br> A near-term/high-priority need as it would immediately benefit pedestrian access to employment areas, retail, parks and the community school. There are no other multimodal options. |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mission Road (south | Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of Mission Road from Confederated Way to Cedar | Would address an existing sidewalk gap between the July Grounds and the four corners area. Implementation could be a combination of a capital improvement project and/or required as part of future development projects along the Mission Road corridor. |  |  | Tribal |  |
| P2 | side from Confederate d Way to Cedar Street) | Street. Widen existing sidewalks near the Four Corners area to six feet and address the existing mailbox obstructions located across from Lucky Seven. | Portions of the corridor may require right-ofway acquisition and some utility relocation. <br> Portions of the corridor near Cedar Street may have wetland impacts. <br> A near-term/high-priority need as it would immediately benefit pedestrian access to employment areas, retail, parks and the community school. There are no other multimodal options. | High Priority <br> Near-Term Time Frame | \$350k | Capital <br> Project / <br> Develop ment | not currently identified as a need in the existing TSP. |
| P3 | OR 331 <br> (Mission <br> Road to <br> Umatilla <br> River) | Install sidewalks along the east and west sides of OR 331. | Sidewalks would ultimately link to a multi-use pathway along the south side of the Umatilla River (see project M5). Implementation of the sidewalks would likely be driven by the development of Project M5 and/or installed as part of future redevelopment along the OR 331 corridor. | Low Priority <br> Long-Term <br> Time Frame (tied to development of Project M5) | \$300k | Develop ment/ Grant | This project is not currently identified as a need in the existing TSP. |
|  |  |  | Redevelopment of adjacent parcels would likely address portions of this sidewalk corridor. <br> Portions of the corridor may require right-ofway acquisition. |  |  |  |  |


| Map ID | Location | Project Description | Project Benefit/Implementation Considerations | Priority/ Time Frame | Cost ${ }^{1}$ | Funding <br> Source | Consistency with 2001 CTUIR TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | A long-term need that would coincide with the development of project M5. |  |  |  |  |
| P4 | OR 331 crossing at Ti'Mine Way | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing treatment. <br> Treatment may include signalization (if warranted) or a grade separated undercrossing of OR 331. | Would provide a safer pedestrian crossing opportunity on a portion of Mission Road that has higher speeds and heavy truck volumes. Implementation of the crossing would be tied to future residential development on the east side of OR 331. | Low Priority <br> Long-Term Time Frame (tied to future residential development) | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 35 \mathrm{k}- \\ & \$ 500 \mathrm{k} \end{aligned}$ | Develop ment/ STIP | This project is not currently identified as a need in the existing TSP. |
|  |  |  | OR 331 is a high speed and high volume state highway. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Signalized crossing could be installed when warranted by a more detailed engineering study. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Grade separated undercrossings are costly and impactful during construction. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Long-term project needed if/when development occurs on the east side of OR 331. |  |  |  |  |
| P5 | Mission <br> Road crossings at July Grounds and Cedar Street | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing such as a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon. | Would facilitate pedestrian crossings of Mission Road and improve pedestrian access to tribal services and the community school on a portion of Mission Road that has higher speeds and heavy truck volumes. Implementation would be tied to a capital improvement project or Safe Routes to School improvement. | High Priority <br> Near-Term Time Frame | \$35k per location | Grant | These projects are not currently identified as a need in the existing TSP. |
|  |  |  | Would be installed when warranted by a more detailed engineering study. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Would need to be accompanied by sidewalks (see project P1 and P2). |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | A near-term/high-priority need as it would immediately benefit pedestrian access to tribal services, parks, and the community school. |  |  |  |  |
| P6 | New residential/mi | Install sidewalks along all new | Would facilitate walking to/from new development areas. Construction would | High Priority | Varies | Develop ment |  |



| Map ID | Location | Project Description | Project Benefit/Implementation Considerations | Priority/ Time Frame | Cost ${ }^{1}$ | Funding Source | Consistency with 2001 CTUIR TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | employment areas, retail, parks and the community school. |  |  |  |  |
| B3 | OR 331 <br> (Mission <br> Road to <br> Umatilla <br> River) | Install bicycle lanes along the east and west sides of OR 331. | Bicycle lanes would ultimately link to a multipurpose pathway along the south side of the Umatilla River (see project M5). <br> Implementation of the bike lanes would likely be driven by the development of Project M5 and/or installed as part of future redevelopment along the OR 331 corridor. | Low Priority <br> Long-Term Time Frame (tied to development of Project M5) | \$400k | Develop ment/ Grant | This project is not currently identified as a need in the existing TSP. |
|  |  |  | Redevelopment of adjacent parcels would likely address portions of this corridor. <br> Portions of the corridor may require right-ofway acquisition. <br> A long-term need that would coincide with the development of project M5. |  |  |  |  |
| Multi-Use Pathway Improvement Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Would provide a walking/biking route that would link Nixyáawii Governance Center and surrounding future residential development to the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino and other adjacent employment areas. Implementation would most likely be tied to grant funding or a larger capital improvement project. |  |  |  |  |
| M1 | OR 331 <br> (Mission <br> Road to Kusi <br> Road) | separated paved multi-use path along the west side of OR 331 from Mission Road to Spilya Road | Portions of the corridor have grade challenges. <br> Would require right-of-way acquisition. <br> Portions of the corridor have steep embankments which would pose some engineering and construction challenges. <br> A near-term/high-priority need as it would immediately benefit bicycle and pedestrian access between the Governance Center and the employment centers to the south. | High Priority <br> Near-Term Time Frame | \$1.0M | Grant | This project is not currently identified as a need in the existing TSP. |
| M2 | Wildhorse Boulevard (OR 331 to Tamastslikt | Construct a paved multi-use path along the north side of Wildhorse | There is currently no formal walking or biking facilities between the Wildhorse Boulevard and Tamastslikt Cultural Institute. Would link the July Grounds and adjacent residential | Medium Priority | \$95k | Grant | This project is consistent with Project |



| Map ID | Location | Project Description | Project Benefit/Implementation Considerations | Priority/ Time Frame | Cost ${ }^{1}$ | Funding Source | Consistency with 2001 CTUIR TSP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | A near-term/high-priority need as it would immediately benefit bicycle and pedestrian access between the Bowman Property/Governance Center and Four Corners area. |  |  |  |  |
| M5 | Umatilla River Trail | Construct a new multi-use trail along the south side of the Umatilla River on in parallel but offset from the river where applicable. | This path could be extended to the west over time to ultimately connect to the City of Pendleton and the existing/planned expansion their levee trail system. Project could be designed to include a hardscape pathway for walking/bicycle and a softsurface for equestrian use. Implementation would most likely be tied to grant funding or a larger capital improvement project. | Low Priority <br> Long-Term Time Frame | \$>500k | Grant / <br> Tribal <br> Capital <br> Project | This project is not currently identified as a need in the existing TSP. |
|  |  |  | Would require right-of-way. <br> May impact some private property. <br> Would require consideration of areas that have the potential to be culturally or historically significant. <br> A low priority need, but one that could provide significant regional connections. |  |  |  |  |
| Transit Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T1 | Multiple Locations | Install new transit amenities including new shelters with real-time transit tracking, benches, lighting, etc. | There is a general desire to enhance all transit stops within the Mission study area. | Medium <br> Priority <br> Near-Term <br> Time Frame | Shelters <br> \$10,000 <br> per <br> location <br> Lighting \$10-\$15k <br> per <br> location | Tribal Capital Project | These projects are not currently identified as a need in the existing TSP. |
|  |  |  | Some stops have transit shelters already. Upgrades would be limited to better lighting and transit tracking amenities. <br> A medium priority need for lower use locations. A higher priority need for higher volume locations. |  |  |  |  |
| T2 | Nixyáawii Governance Center | Designate some existing parking spaces within the Nixyáawii Governance Center for use as a park- | The ability to take transit to regional destinations such as Pendleton, MiltonFreewater, Hermiston, etc. can lead to financial savings for many Mission residents. The Nixyáawii Governance Center is a central location with a well-lit parking lot that | Medium <br> Priority <br> Long-Term <br> Time Frame | Signage: \$2 per square foot; | Tribal Capital Project | These projects are not currently identified as a |


| Map <br> ID | Location | Project Description | Project Benefit/Implementation <br> Considerations | Priority/ <br> Time Frame | Consistency <br> with 2001 <br> CTUIR TSP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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Figure A. 1 OR 331 + Multi Use Path Cross-Section


Figure A. 2 Multi-Use Pathway Cross-Section


Figure A. 3 Umatilla River Multi-Use Trail and Equestrian Trail Cross-Section


Figure A. 4 Mission Road Cross-Section
Mission Road
(OR 331 to Cedar Street)


Figure A. 5 Potential Signalized Intersection Widening Improvements


Figure A. 6 Potential Roundabout Intersection Improvements


Figure A. 7 Standard Residential Street Cross-Section


Figure A. 8 Minor Residential Street Cross-Section


Figure A. 9 Alley Cross-Section


## B. TRAFFIC OPERATIONS WORKSHEETS

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\mathbf{7}$ | a | $\mathbf{F}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 104 | 18 | 40 | 135 | 70 | 81 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 104 | 18 | 40 | 135 | 70 | 81 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 150 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| Mvmt Flow | 133 | 23 | 51 | 173 | 90 | 104 |



| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 12.3 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 23 | 128 | 36 | 64 | 114 | 25 | 35 | 105 | 102 | 8 | 98 | 30 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 23 | 128 | 36 | 64 | 114 | 25 | 35 | 105 | 102 | 8 | 98 | 30 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 28 | 158 | 44 | 79 | 141 | 31 | 43 | 130 | 126 | 10 | 121 | 37 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.1 |  |  | 12.5 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 11.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $14 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $43 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $42 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 242 | 187 | 203 | 136 |
| LT Vol | 35 | 23 | 64 | 8 |
| Through Vol | 105 | 128 | 114 | 98 |
| RT Vol | 102 | 36 | 25 | 30 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 299 | 231 | 251 | 168 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.449 | 0.366 | 0.396 | 0.272 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.41 | 5.707 | 5.685 | 5.822 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 663 | 628 | 629 | 613 |
| Service Time | 3.472 | 3.775 | 3.75 | 3.895 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.451 | 0.368 | 0.399 | 0.274 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.9 | 12.1 | 12.5 | 11.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | B | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.3 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.1 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | a | 4 | F |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 52 | 103 | 132 | 8 | 4 | 24 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 52 | 103 | 132 | 8 | 4 | 24 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 100 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 7 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 58 | 116 | 148 | 9 | 4 | 27 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | * |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 36 | 15 | 1 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 36 | 15 | 1 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 11 | 0 | 25 | 22 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 90 | 18 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 42 | 18 | 1 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | T | $\mathbf{T}$ |  | $\mathbf{-}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 38 | 68 | 24 | 204 | 186 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 38 | 68 | 24 | 204 | 186 | 12 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 160 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
| Mvmt Flow | 55 | 99 | 35 | 296 | 270 | 17 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 | 4 | 「゙ | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 60 | 60 | 168 | 41 | 63 | 191 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 60 | 60 | 168 | 41 | 63 | 191 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Stap | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | － | None | － | None | － | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 0 | － | 220 | 385 | － |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ 0 | － | 0 | － | － | 0 |
| Grade，\％ | 0 | － | 0 | － | － | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 13 | 5 | 8 | 17 | 5 | 10 |
| Mvmt Flow | 66 | 66 | 185 | 45 | 69 | 210 |







| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | $\mathbf{-}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 99 | 14 | 299 | 74 | 5 | 377 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 99 | 14 | 299 | 74 | 5 | 377 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | 260 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 10 | 23 | 5 | 10 | 24 |
| Mvmt Flow | 109 | 15 | 329 | 81 | 5 | 414 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 753 | 329 | 0 | 0 | 410 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 329 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 424 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.45 | 6.3 | - | - | 4.2 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.45 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.45 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.545 | 3.39 | - | - | 2.29 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 373 | 694 | - | - | 1107 | - |
| Stage 1 | 722 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 654 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 371 | 694 | - | - | 1107 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 371 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 722 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 650 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 18.3 |  | 0 |  | 0.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 394 | 1107 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.315 | 0.005 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 18.3 | 8.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | C | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 1.3 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | F |  |  | - |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 3 | 370 | 2 | 1 | 475 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 3 | 370 | 2 | 1 | 475 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 8 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 15 | 19 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 3 | 402 | 2 | 1 | 516 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 922 | 404 | 0 | 0 | 405 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 404 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 518 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.48 | 6.25 |  | - | 4.25 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.48 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.48 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.572 | 3.345 | - | - | 2.335 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 293 | 640 | - | - | 1087 | - |
| Stage 1 | 661 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 586 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 292 | 639 | - | - | 1086 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 292 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 660 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 585 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 12.4 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 493 | 1086 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.009 | 0.001 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 12.4 | 8.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |






| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | r |  |  | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 2 | 0 | 57 | 108 | 2 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 2 | 0 | 57 | 108 | 2 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | 160 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 | 67 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 18 | 18 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 23 |
| Mvmt Flow | 18 | 3 | 0 | 85 | 161 | 3 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\mathbf{7}$ | a | $\mathbf{F}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 112 | 21 | 45 | 152 | 81 | 89 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 112 | 21 | 45 | 152 | 81 | 89 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 150 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 7 |
| Mvmt Flow | 144 | 27 | 58 | 195 | 104 | 114 |



| Intersection |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 14.6 |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 28 | 140 | 36 | 64 | 123 | 29 | 39 | 126 | 112 | 11 | 121 | 43 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 28 | 140 | 36 | 64 | 123 | 29 | 39 | 126 | 112 | 11 | 121 | 43 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 35 | 173 | 44 | 79 | 152 | 36 | 48 | 156 | 138 | 14 | 149 | 53 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.1 |  |  | 14.5 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 13.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $45 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $40 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 277 | 204 | 216 | 175 |
| LT Vol | 39 | 28 | 64 | 11 |
| Through Vol | 126 | 140 | 123 | 121 |
| RT Vol | 112 | 36 | 29 | 43 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 342 | 252 | 267 | 216 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.555 | 0.437 | 0.46 | 0.376 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.845 | 6.253 | 6.211 | 6.261 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 616 | 574 | 579 | 575 |
| Service Time | 3.885 | 4.301 | 4.257 | 4.307 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.555 | 0.439 | 0.461 | 0.376 |
| HCM Control Delay | 16 | 14.1 | 14.5 | 13.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 3.4 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 1.7 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | T | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 57 | 118 | 136 | 9 | 5 | 26 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 57 | 118 | 136 | 9 | 5 | 26 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 100 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 7 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 64 | 133 | 153 | 10 | 6 | 29 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 39 | 24 | 1 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 39 | 24 | 1 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 85 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 11 | 0 | 25 | 22 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 90 | 18 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 46 | 28 | 1 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | T | $\mathbf{T}$ |  | $\mathbf{-}$ | $\mathbf{b}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 47 | 70 | 26 | 230 | 205 | 16 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 47 | 70 | 26 | 230 | 205 | 16 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 160 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
| Mvmt Flow | 68 | 101 | 38 | 333 | 297 | 23 |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 EBLn2 | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1229 | - | 378 | 729 | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.031 | - | 0.18 | 0.139 | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8 | 0 | 16.6 | 10.7 | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | C | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | 0.6 | 0.5 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 3 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement W | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }_{1}$ | 「 | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 69 | 69 | 187 | 48 | 74 | 201 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 69 | 69 | 187 | 48 | 74 | 201 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 0 | - | 220 | 385 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 13 | 5 | 8 | 17 | 5 | 10 |
| Mvmt Flow | 76 | 76 | 205 | 53 | 81 | 221 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | \& |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 11 | 1 | 2 | 108 | 4 | 54 | 2 | 170 | 111 | 16 | 251 | 3 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 11 | 1 | 2 | 108 | 4 | 54 | 2 | 170 | 111 | 16 | 251 | 3 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 130 | - | 200 | 1000 | - | 330 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 8 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 1 | 2 | 124 | 5 | 62 | 2 | 195 | 128 | 18 | 289 | 3 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | 个 | 「 |  | - |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 103 | 16 | 316 | 77 | 6 | 400 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 103 | 16 | 316 | 77 | 6 | 400 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | 260 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 10 | 23 | 5 | 10 | 24 |
| Mvmt Flow | 113 | 18 | 347 | 85 | 7 | 440 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 801 | 347 | 0 | 0 | 432 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 347 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 454 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.45 | 6.3 | - | - | 4.2 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.45 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.45 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.545 | 3.39 | - | - | 2.29 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 350 | 678 | - | - | 1086 | - |
| Stage 1 | 709 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 633 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 347 | 678 | - | - | 1086 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 347 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 709 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 627 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 19.9 |  | 0 |  | 0.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 371 | 1086 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.352 | 0.006 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 19.9 | 8.3 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | C | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 1.6 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | F |  |  | -1 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 3 | 390 | 2 | 1 | 502 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 3 | 390 | 2 | 1 | 502 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 8 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 15 | 19 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 3 | 424 | 2 | 1 | 546 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 974 | 426 | 0 | 0 | 427 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 426 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 548 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.48 | 6.25 |  | - | 4.25 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.48 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.48 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.572 | 3.345 | - | - | 2.335 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 272 | 622 | - | - | 1066 | - |
| Stage 1 | 646 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 567 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 271 | 621 | - | - | 1065 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 271 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 645 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 566 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 12.7 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 469 | 1065 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.009 | 0.001 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 12.7 | 8.4 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 4 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 98 | 38 | 294 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 306 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 98 | 38 | 294 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 306 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 60 | 35 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 15 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 103 | 40 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 322 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 12.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 239 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 11 | 116 | 90 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 239 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 11 | 116 | 90 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 16 | 42 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 36 | 8 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 269 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 12 | 130 | 101 | 0 |





## C. TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL DATA




## D. CRASH ANALYSIS WORKSHEETS

| General \& Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst: | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. |
| Agency/Company: | ODOT |
| Date: | $3 / 14 / 2022$ |
| Project Name: | CTUIR TSP |


| Intersection Crash Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Intersection Type | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |  |
| Mission Road/Timíne Way | Rural 3ST | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Mission Road/OR 331 | Rural 4ST | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Mission Road/Short Mile Road | Rural 3ST | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mission Road/Emigrant Road-Cayuse Road | Rural 3ST | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OR 331/Timíne Way | Rural 3ST | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OR 331/Wildhorse Boulevard | Rural 3ST | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OR 331/Kusi Road | Rural 4ST | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| OR 331/Spilya Road | Rural 4ST | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| OR 331/Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access | Rural 3ST | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| OR 331/Kash Kash Road | Rural 3ST | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I-84/OR 331 Interchange Westbound Ramps | Rural 3ST | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| I-84/OR 331 Interchange Eastbound Ramps | Rural 3ST | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| S Market Road/Tokti Road | Rural 3ST | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | Total | 6 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 24 |


| Aversection Population Type Crash Rate per intersection type |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Pop. Type | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Sum of } \\ \text { Crashes }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Sum of 5- } \\ \text { year MEV }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Avg Crash } \\ \text { Rate for Ref } \\ \text { Pop. }\end{array}$ |  |  |
| Rural 3SG | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Rural 3ST in Pop |  |  |  |  |  |$]$


| Critical Rate Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | AADT Entering Intersection | 5-year MEV | Crash Total | Intersection Population Type | Intersection Crash Rate | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Reference } \\ \text { Population Crash } \\ \text { Rate } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Critical Rate | Over Critical |
| Mission Road/Timíne Way | 4,480 | 8.2 | 1 | Rural 3ST | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.41 | Under |
| Mission Road/OR 331 | 7,680 | 14.0 | 4 | Rural 4ST | 0.29 | APM Exhibit 4-1 |  |  |
| Mission Road/Short Mile Road | 3,230 | 5.9 | 0 | Rural 3ST | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.47 | Under |
| Mission Road/Emigrant Road-Cayuse Road | 950 | 1.7 | 0 | Rural 3ST | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.88 | Under |
| OR 331/Timíne Way | 5,320 | 9.7 | 1 | Rural 3ST | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.38 | Under |
| OR 331/Wildhorse Boulevard | 5,830 | 10.6 | 1 | Rural 3ST | 0.09 | 0.13 | 0.37 | Under |
| OR 331/Kusi Road | 6,690 | 12.2 | 3 | Rural 4ST | 0.25 | APM Exhibit 4-1 |  |  |
| OR 331/Spilya Road | 7,590 | 13.9 | 4 | Rural 4ST | 0.29 | APM Exhibit 4-1 |  |  |
| OR 331/Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access | 8,680 | 15.8 | 3 | Rural 3ST | 0.19 | 0.13 | 0.32 | Under |
| OR 331/Kash Kash Road | 8,520 | 15.5 | 0 | Rural 3ST | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.32 | Under |
| I-84/OR 331 Interchange Westbound Ramps | 8,810 | 16.1 | 3 | Rural 3ST | 0.19 | 0.13 | 0.32 | Under |
| I-84/OR 331 Interchange Eastbound Ramps | 5,260 | 9.6 | 4 | Rural 3ST | 0.42 | 0.13 | 0.38 | Over |
| S Market Road/Tokti Road | 1,810 | 3.3 | 0 | Rural 3ST | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.62 | Under |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| General \& Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst: | Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. |
| Agency/Company: | ODOT |
| Date: | $3 / 14 / 2022$ |
| Project Name: | CTUIR TSP |


| Reference Population Type Crash Rates |  |  |  |  |  | Crash Rate Table II |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment Reference Population Type | Population Type Number | No. of <br> Segs in <br> Reference <br> Population | Sum of Crashes | Sum of MVMT | Avg Crash Rate for Ref Pop. | 2019 rate | 2018 rate | 2017 rate | Average |
| Rural Minor Arterial | 1 | 8 | 14 | 28.0 | 0.50 | 1.16 | 1.17 | 1.34 | 1.22 |
| Rural Major Collector | 2 | 5 | 20 | 38.5 | 0.52 | 1.25 | 1.59 | 1.51 | 1.45 |
| Rural Minor Collector | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.0 | Not enough sites | 3.24 | 0.86 | 0.93 | 1.68 |
| Rural Local | 4 | 5 | 6 | 16.7 | 0.36 | 0 | 0 | 8.43 | 2.81 |
|  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Critical Rate Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Roadway |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment | Ref. Pop. Type | Begin Milepoint | End Milepoint | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 5 \text { Year } \\ \text { Crash Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | AADT | Segment Length | Pop. Type Number | MVMT | Segment Crash Rate | Ref. Pop. Crash | Critical Rate | Over Critical |  |
| 1 | Rural Minor Arterial |  |  | 5 | 2900 | 1.48 | 1 | 7.84 | 0.64 | 0.50 | 0.98 | Under | OR 331 |
| 2 | Rural Minor Arterial |  |  | 2 | 4400 | 0.24 | 1 | 1.91 | 1.05 | 0.50 | 1.60 | Under | OR 331 |
| 3 | Rural Minor Arterial |  |  | 4 | 4800 | 0.97 | 1 | 8.54 | 0.47 | 0.50 | 0.96 | Under | OR 331 |
| 4 | Rural Minor Arterial |  |  | 1 | 4600 | 0.31 | 1 | 2.57 | 0.39 | 0.50 | 1.42 | Under | OR 331 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 0 | 6100 | 0.10 | 1 | 1.07 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 2.09 | Under | OR 331 |
| 6 | Rural Minor Arterial |  |  | 0 | 7000 | 0.11 | 1 | 1.42 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 1.83 | Under | OR 331 |
| 7 |  |  |  | 0 | 8500 | 0.20 | 1 | 3.11 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 1.32 | Under | OR 331 |
| 8 | Rural Minor Arterial Rural Minor Arterial |  |  | 2 | 5000 | 0.17 | 1 | 1.58 | 1.27 | 0.50 | 1.74 | Under | OR 331 |
| 9 | Rural Minor Collector |  |  | 2 | 1800 | 0.42 | 3 | 1.38 | 1.45 | Not enough sites |  |  | Market Rd |
| 10 | Rural Major Collector |  |  | 10 | 3300 | 2.11 | 2 | 12.70 | 0.79 | 0.52 | 0.89 | Under | Mission Rd |
| 11 |  |  |  | 0 | 3300 | 0.59 | 2 | 3.57 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 1.29 | Under | Mission Rd |
| 12 | Rural Major Collector |  |  | 1 | 3700 | 0.46 | 2 | 3.10 | 0.32 | 0.52 | 1.35 | Under | Mission Rd |
| 13 | Rural Major Collector |  |  | 7 | 4400 | 1.64 | 2 | 13.15 | 0.53 | 0.52 | 0.88 | Under | Mission Rd |
| 14 | Rural Local |  |  | 1 | 300 | 2.08 | 4 | 1.14 | 0.88 | 0.36 | 1.72 | Under | Emmigrant Rd |
| 15 | Rural Local |  |  | 1 | 2100 | 0.64 | 4 | 2.46 | 0.41 | 0.36 | 1.19 | Under | Timíne Wy |
| 16 | Rural Minor Collector |  |  | 1 | 900 | 0.97 | 3 | 1.59 | 0.63 | Not enough sites |  |  | Shortmile Rd |
| 17 | Rural Major Collector |  |  | 2 | 700 | 4.68 | 2 | 5.98 | 0.33 | 0.52 | 1.09 | Under | Cayuse Rd |
| 18 | Rural Local |  |  | 0 | 2200 | 1.38 | 4 | 5.55 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.87 | Under | Wildhorse Blvd |
| 19 | Rural Local |  |  | 4 | 4600 | 0.87 | 4 | 7.26 | 0.55 | 0.36 | 0.79 | Under | Kusi, Spilya, Kash Kash |
| 20 | Rural Local |  |  | 0 | 200 | 0.85 | 4 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 3.74 | Under | Tokti Rd |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |  | 3 | 2500 | 0.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Kusi Road |
| 27 |  |  |  | 0 | 2000 | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Spilya Road |
| 28 |  |  |  | 1 | 100 | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Kash Kash Road |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## E. PLANNED PROJECTS AND PREVIOUS FEEDBACK

The project team reviewed a list of background documents provided in the scope of work to understand projects previously planned within the Umatilla Indian Reservation (UIR). These projects will be brought to the alternatives development stage of the process to determine if they should be included in the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) update. In addition, feedback provided through community and stakeholder outreach for the projects listed below is summarized for further consideration.

## 2001 CTUIR TSP

CTUIR staff provided a list of completed projects since adoption of the 2001 CTUIR TSP. The uncompleted projects to consider further in the TSP update are listed below. The corresponding figures are provided at the end of this section.

- Roadway System
- 1: Seek Transportation Planning Funds - The BIA has stated that planning dollars are available for the CTUIR. In order to receive this money the CTUIR must identify planning to be the fust priority above all other projects listed in the priority list of transportation improvements.
- 3: East-West Connector Road (Phase I) - Construct a new urban/rural connector road from near Aspen Way to proposed North-South Connector Road. Timing for this project will be dictated by planned developments in the area (East Bench Subdivision).
- 6: River Road (Phase I) - Widen, align, shoulder, and add gravel from the railroad crossing east to White Road. Tribe to take over ownership of two at-grade railroad crossings and pave crossings with asphalt.
- 9: Kash Kash Road at Highway 331 - Close existing access to Highway 331 and reroute Kash Kash Road north to a new intersection with the highway. Add exclusive left-turn lanes on the highway approaches to new intersection. Also constuct new driveway/street access on the west side of the intersection, opposite of Kash Kash Road. Install new traffic signal when warranted.
- 10: Highway 331 Median - Construct a non-traversable landscaped median along Highway 331 from the I-84 westbound ramps to the Wildhorse Resod Entrance Road. This project also includes bicycle/pedestrian improvements.
- 13: Emigrant Road - Add shoulders and repave Emigrant Road (County Road \#937) from Mission Road to Poverly Flat 15: North Cayuse Road - Widen, align, shoulder, and pave North Cayuse Road (County Road \#925) from River Road north to Marin Road.
- 16: Mann Road - Widen, align, shoulder, and pave Mann Road (County Road \#925) from Crawford Hollow Road south to North Cayuse Road.
- 17: Motanic Road - Widen, align, shoulder, and pave Motanic Road (County Road \#1031) from Best Road south to Spring Creek Road.
- 18: Sumac Road - Widen, align, shoulder, and pave Sumac Road (County Road \#1050) from Spring Creek Road south to McKay Creek Road.
- 19: McKay Creek Road - Widen, align, shoulder, and add gravel along McKay Creek Road (County Road \#1050) from Sumac Road east to North Fork McKay Creek Road.
- 22: Wildhorse Creek Bridge - Replace County Bridge \#59C401 along Wild Horse Road (County Road \#685). This bridge is structurally deficient.
- 23: I-84 EB Ramps at Highway 331 - Construct exclusive left- and right-turn lanes on the offramp approach. Install a traffic signal when warranted.
- 24: I-84 WB Ramps at Highway 331 -Construct exclusive left- and right-turn lanes on the offramp approach and an exclusive right-turn lane on the north approach. Install a traffic signal when warranted.
- 25: Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road at Highway 331 - Add an exclusive left-turn lane on the north approach of the highway. Install a traffic signal when warranted.
- 27: North-South Connector Road - Construct a new north-south connector road from the Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road to "A" Street.
- 28: East-West Connector Road (Phase II) - Extend rural connector road from proposed NorthSouth Connector Road to Highway 331. Timing for this project will be dictated by planned developments in the area.
- 32: Highway 331 Shoulder Widening - Provide 8-foot paved shoulders along Highway 331 from Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road to proposed East-West Connector Road.
- 37: Tamastslikt Cultural Institute Connector Road - Construct a new connector road from the Tamastslikt Cultural Institute to the proposed east-west connector road, near the Cayuse Road/Emigrant Road intersection.
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Systems
- 26: Mission Road Bike/Ped Facility (Phase II) - Complete the extension of a bicycle/pedestrian facility to the City of Pendleton along Mission Road/US Highway 30.
- 31: Highway 331 Sidewalk and Bike Lanes - Provide bike lanes, curb and gutter, and sidewalks along Highway 331 from Mission Road to proposed East-West Connector Road.
- 33: Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road Path - Construct a multi-use path from Tamastslikt Cultural Institute to the Wildhorse Casino.
- 35: South Market Road Path - Construct a multi-use path along the west side of South Market Road from Tutuilla Church Road to the I-84 interchange.
- 36: Path Across Umatilla River - Construct a multi-use path in the vicinity of Pan Lane and extending across the Umatilla River to connect with Kirkpatrick Road.


## 2001 CTUIR TSP Project Maps



## MISSION COMMUNITY MASTER PLAN

The list below includes all the projects from the master plan. The project team will verify if any have been completed as part of the TSP update process. The corresponding figures are provided at the end of this section.

- Roadway System
- Intersection project alternatives at OR 331/Mission Road include signalization or a single lane roundabout. The plan calls for these improvement alternatives to the OR 331 and Mission Road intersection:
- Option 1: Signalize the intersection; Construct separate left-turn lanes on all four intersection approaches; and Construct a separate right turn lane on the northbound approach.
- Option 2: Construct a single lane roundabout; and Realign the northbound and southbound approaches to avoid impacts to the Mission Market.
- Transit System
- Based on feedback provided during the Mission Community Master Plan, there is a general desire from resident and transit riders for transit shelters at existing stops throughout the Mission study area. In addition, two projects were identified:
- T1: (For multiple locations) Install new transit amenities including new shelters with real-time transit tracking, benches, lighting, etc.
- T2: Designate some existing parking spaces within the Nixyaawii Governance Center for use as a park-and-ride for Mission community members riding Kayak to other regional locations.
- Pedestrian System
- P1: Install six-foot sidewalks along the north side of Mission Road.
- P2: Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of Mission Road from Confederated Way to Cedar Street. Widen existing sidewalks near the Four Corners area to six feet and address the existing mailbox obstructions located across from Lucky Seven.
- P3: Install sidewalks along the east and west sides of OR 331.
- P4: Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing treatment. Treatment may include signalization (if warranted) or a grade separated undercrossing of OR 331.
- P5: Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing such as a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon.
- P6: Install sidewalks along all new residential and mixed-use streets.
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Systems
- M1: Construct a separated paved multi-use path along the west side of OR 331 from Mission Road to Spilya Road.
- M2: Construct a paved multi-use path along the north side of Wildhorse Boulevard. Could be a separated path or as an extension of the existing road surface.
- M3: Construct a new multi-use path along the top of the bluff connecting OR 331 to the Tamastslikt Trail.
- M4: Construct a new multi-use path connecting the Nixyáawii Governance Center to the Four Corners Area.
- M5: Construct a new multi-use trail along the south side of the Umatilla River on in parallel but offset from the river where applicable.
- Consider the construction of a new multi-use trail connection between the Nixyaawii Governance Center and the employment areas near the Wildhorse Casino and Coyote Business Park. This
connection would likely necessitate a formal pedestrian crossing treatment along the OR 331 corridor.
- Consider the development of a new multi-use trail connection within or along the greenway that runs parallel to Mission Road. This improvement would offer a nature-based alternative to walking along Mission Road.
- Consideration enhancements to existing and new pedestrian crossings including: raised crosswalk, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs), raised median island, enhanced striping patterns, and curb extensions.
- Bicycle System
- B1: Widen Mission Road and install bicycle lanes along the north side all the way east to Cedar Street.
- B2: Widen Mission Road and install bicycle lanes along the south side from Short Mile Road to Cedar Street.
- B3: Install bicycle lanes along the east and west sides of OR 331.
- Outreach insight: key destinations include employment centers (Wildhorse Casino, Coyote Business Park, Nixyaawii Governance Center, BIA Headquarters), Nixyaawii Community School, Cultural Centers (July Grounds, Mission Tribal Longhouse), Parks (Wetland Community Park, golf course, Umatilla River), and Neighborhoods (Mission Creek Subdivision and surrounding neighborhoods, future Bowman Property neighborhood development, future Four Corners neighborhood development)


## 2018 Mission Community Master Plan Project Maps



## OR 331 ACCESS MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY AND CIRCULATION PLAN

15 proposed improvements were identified for OR 331 between Mission Road and the I-84 eastbound ramp terminals, described and shown in the map.
2006 OR 331 Access Management Implementation Strategy and Circulation Plan Preferred Option Map


## UMATILLA COUNTY TSP

The Umatilla County TSP includes a separate table (Table 7-10) that summarizes projects within the Umatilla Indian Reservation boundary. The project team will verify if any have been completed as part of the TSP update process.

- Roadway System (projects from Table 7-10)
- 1: Emigrant Road - Repave and shoulder
- 2: River Road - Widen, align, shoulder, pave
- 3: White Road - Widen, align, shoulder, pave
- 4: North Cayuse Road - Widen, align, shoulder, pave
- 5: Mann Road - Widen, align, shoulder, pave
- 6: Motanic Road - Widen, align, shoulder, pave
- 7: Sumac Road - Widen, align, shoulder, pave
- 8: McKay Creek Road - Widen, align, shoulder, pave
- 9: Kash Kash Road/St. Andrews Road - Widen, align, shoulder, pave, and repave
- 10: Gibbon/Umatilla River Bridge - Bridge Replacement/SR>55
- 11: Thornhollow Cattle Pass Bridge - Bridge Replacement (structurally deficient)
- 12: Wild Horse Creek Bridge - Bridge Replacement (structurally deficient)
- The recommended minimum shoulder width for OR 311 is 8 feet (Table 7-11)


## SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PLAN

The Safe Routes to School Plan Phase I was completed in 2020, including an initial plan document with sections to complete in Phase II. The Phase I improvement map is provided at the end of this section.

- Pedestrian and Bicycle Systems
- Complete Phase II of the plan, resulting in projects and programs to include in the updated TSP for future funding opportunities and implementation. Phase II will complete the plan document already started through Phase I. The map below summarizes the improvements proposed through Phase I.
- Outreach insights:
- Hwy 331 and Mission Rd intersection is a significant barrier for people walking and biking near the Nixyáawii Community School.
- Community members would like to be able to walk longer distances to reach the school and other destinations such as the Senior Center, Wildhorse Casino, and Pendleton


Legend

|  | Crosswalk | - | Multi-use path |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | Sidewalk Improvements | - . - | Buffered bike lane with pavement markings |
| [8] | Curb Ramp R13-7 |  | R1-6a |

W11-2 with 16-9p


1
Mission Road and Hwy 331: Install perpendicular curb ramps on all four corners of the intersection. Install $2^{\prime}$ wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings across each leg of the intersection. Upgrade the stormwater system and review pedestrian lighting needs at the intersection, as necessary.

(2)
Parking along Mission Road: Install bike lane symbol pavement markings and stripe a buffer within the existing bike lanes east of the Four Corners intersection about 2,100 feet along the north side of the road and about 4,200 feet along the south side of the road. Install accompanying bike lane signs.

Mission Road and Hwy 331: Review the community's desire to construct a multi-use path along the south side of the road as had been indicated in previous planning documents. Consider enhanced crossings across Mission Rd, such as at Alexander $\operatorname{Ln}$ and Ti'mine Way, based on anticipated crossing demand.

Mission Road and Horseshoe Lane: Install perpendicular curb ramps on each side of Mission Rd. Install 2' wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with associated warning signage across Mission Rd (R1-6a, W11-2 with 16-7P and W11-2 with 16-9P).

Mission Road and B St: Install $\mathbf{2}^{\prime}$ wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with perpendicular curb ramps and associated warning signage, across Mission Rd, on the east leg of the Parr Ln/B St and Mission Rd intersection (R1-6a, W11-2 with 16-7P and W11-2 with 16-9P).

Hwy 331: Install 6 ' sidewalks along the east side of Hwy 331 north of the existing sidewalk at the Four Corners intersection extending to Showaway Ln. Install a $12^{\prime}$ multi-use path along the west side of Hwy 331 south of the Four Corners intersection extending to Ti'Mine Way.

Ti'Mine Way: Install bidirectional Pedestrian Crossing signs (S1-1 with W16-7P, S1-1 with W16-9P) in advance of the crosswalks on Ti'Mine Way.

Mission Road between Confederated Way and Cedar Street: Install 6'sidewalks along the south side of Mission Rd / Cayuse Rd between the western intersection of Confederated Way and Cedar St (not pictured in map extent).
Install 6' sidewalks along the north side of Cayuse Rd between Short Mile Rd and Cedar St , as project budget allows (not pictured in map extent). Upgrade the two existing marked crosswalks to ADA standards within the segment of roadway, and review additional marked crossing locations if installing only south side sidewalks (not pictured in map extent).

## F. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSIT TOOLBOX

This document provides a compilation of active transportation treatments including bicycle, pedestrian and transit development features that could potentially be considered for inclusion in the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan Update (TSP). This toolbox provides illustrative examples of design elements, including text explanations of the pros and cons for use within the TSP study area, and outlines the approximate right-of-way (ROW) as well as other factors to consider in development of alternatives.

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION TREATMENTS

The treatments are organized into the following categories:

- Bicycle Facilities \& Amenities
- Pedestrian Facilities \& Amenities
- Transit Facilities \& Amenities

Headers and footers indicate the categories. Where applicable, the treatments are organized from highest level of protection to lowest level of protection. Typically, the treatments that provide the most protection will have the highest appeal to a wide variety of users. For example, bicycle treatments are commonly categorized by the level of separation they provide bicyclists from motor vehicles. Separated facilities have been found to attract more bicyclists of a variety of ages and abilities and are generally considered "lower stress" facilities. However, separated facilities must be carefully designed to allow for safe crossings and turning movements for both motor vehicles and bicyclists at intersections. As another example, treatments for pedestrian mid-block crossings range from a high-level of protection with a pedestrian signal to a lower level of protection with a high-visibility crosswalk. Intermediary levels of protection can be provided with a pedestrian hybrid beacon or rectangular rapid flashing beacon.

Each treatment page also includes a section with resources for additional guidance on that treatment. The ODOT Blueprint for Urban Design can also be used as a resource for identifying appropriate treatment types based on a performance based, context sensitive, and practical design approach to accommodate all modes of transportation.

## MULTI-USE PATH

## Cost: \$\$\$



Multi-use paths are paved, bi-directional, trails away from roadways that can serve both pedestrians and bicyclists. Multi-use paths can be used to create longer-distance links within and between communities and provide regional connections. They play an integral role in recreation, commuting, and accessibility due to their appeal to users of all ages and skill levels.

## Benefits

- Provides facility for both pedestrians and bicyclists in less space than separate facilities.
- Separation from motor vehicles can attract users of all levels.


## Constraints

- May be unsafe in areas with frequent crossings or driveways.
- When parallel to roadways, requires substantial space for buffer.
- Potential for conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians due to shared facility.
- Isolated paths may introduce personal security concerns.


## Typical Applications

- Medium- to long-distance links within and between communities that also serve as recreational facilities.
- Parallel to roads in rural areas where sidewalks and on-street facilities are not present.


## Design Considerations

- Best suited in areas where roadway crossings can be minimized (such as parallel to travel barriers such as highways, railroad tracks, rivers, shorelines, natural areas, etc.).
- Necessitate high-visibility treatments for crossings.
- A minimum width of 10 feet is recommended for low-pedestrian/bicycle-traffic contexts; 12 to 20 feet should be considered in areas with moderate to high levels of bicycle and pedestrian traffic.
- Pavement markings can be used to indicate distinct space for pedestrian and bicycle travel.


## Additional Guidance

- AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities
- ODOT Highway Design Manual


## BUFFERED BIKE LANE

Cost: \$-\$\$\$


Buffered bicycle lanes are on-street lanes that include an additional striped buffer of typically 2-3 feet between the bicycle lane and the vehicle travel lane and/or between the bicycle lane and the vehicle parking lane.

## Benefits

- A parking-edge buffer on streets with on-street parking can reduce the likelihood of "dooring."
- Increased separation from motor vehicles (over standard bicycle lanes) can increase bicyclist comfort.


## Constraints

- Does not provide physical protection and therefore may not attract bicyclists of all levels.
- The additional width provided by the buffer may invite motorists to illegally park in the lane if not adequately signed and enforced.


## Typical Applications

- Long-distance links within and between communities.
- Streets with sufficient pavement width to provide a buffer.
- Widely applicable in both urban and rural settings.
- Segments of the bicycle network with moderate vehicle speeds or volumes.


## Design Considerations

- Typical buffer width is 2-3 feet, in addition to standard bicycle lane width of 5-6 feet, but a combined width of 6 feet is acceptable.
- Green pavement markings or striping can add visibility and awareness in "conflict areas" or intersections where bicycle and vehicle travel paths cross.
- Buffer space can have markings or rumble strips to deter vehicles from traveling or parking in the space.


## Additional Guidance

- AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities
- NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
- ODOT Highway Design Manual
- ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide


## ONE-WAY SEPARATED BIKE LANE



A one-way separated bike lane (SBL), also known as a cycle track or protected bike lane, is a bicycle facility within the street right-of-way separated from motor vehicle traffic by a buffer and a physical barrier, such as planters, flexible posts, parked cars, or a mountable curb. On two-way streets, a one-way SBL would be found on each side of the street, like a standard bike lane.

## Benefits

- Provides physical separation from motor vehicle traffic, which can attract users of all levels.
- Buffer can provide opportunities for landscaping.
- Reduced risk of "dooring" when parked cars are present.


## Constraints

- Requires additional right-ofway over standard bike lane.
- Construction may be more expensive than standard bike lane.
- May introduce street maintenance considerations, depending on buffer type.


## Typical Applications

 (vehicle lane reduction) can be implemented.

- Key segments of the bicycle network where more protection is desirable, such as areas with higher traffic volumes or speeds, or routes to common destinations, like schools.
- Roadways with infrequent driveways and side street accesses.


## Design Considerations

- Intersections must be designed to ensure visibility of bicyclists using the facility. Treatments include separate signal phases for bicyclists and high visibility pavement markings.
- Buffer type can vary depending on context, presence of parking, and available right-of-way.
- Green pavement markings or striping can add visibility and awareness in "conflict areas" or intersections where bicycle and vehicle travel paths cross.


## Additional Guidance

- NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
- CROW Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic
- ODOT Highway Design Manual
- ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide
- FHWA Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide


## TWO-WAY SEPARATED BIKE LANE

## Cost: \$-\$\$\$



A two-way separated bike lane (SBL), also known as a two-way cycle track or protected bike lane, is a facility within the street right-of-way separated from motor vehicle traffic by a buffer and a physical barrier, such as planters, flexible posts, parked cars, or a mountable curb. Two-way SBLs serve bi-directional bicycle travel within the facility on one side of the street.

## Benefits

- Requires less right-of-way than a one-way SBL, due to the need for only one buffer.
- Provides physical separation from motor vehicle traffic, which can attract users of all levels.
- Reduced risk of "dooring" when parked cars are present.


## Constraints

- May be less intuitive due to apparent "wrong-way" travel on one side of street.
- Concern about crashes in areas with frequent crossings or driveways.
- Construction may be more expensive than standard bike lane.
- May introduce street maintenance considerations, depending on buffer type.


## Typical Applications

- On-street connections between off-street multi-use paths.
- Roadways with infrequent driveways and side street accesses.
- Key segments of the bicycle network where more protection is desirable, such as areas with higher traffic volumes or speeds or routes to common destinations, like schools.
- On one-way streets where two-way bicycle travel is desirable.


## Design Considerations

- Intersections must be designed to ensure visibility of bicyclists using the facility. Treatments include separate signal phases for bicyclists and high visibility pavement markings.
- Buffer type can vary depending on context, presence of parking, and available right-of-way.
- Green pavement markings or striping can add visibility and awareness in "conflict areas" or intersections where bicycle and vehicle travel paths cross.


## Additional Guidance

- Same as for one-way SBLs


## STANDARD BIKE LANE

## Cost: \$-\$\$\$



A standard bike lane is an on-street facility that provides space designated for bicyclists, separated from vehicles by pavement markings.

## Benefits

- Provides a designated
facility for bicyclists using the minimum pavement width.
- Provides increased visibility for bicyclists.
- Relatively inexpensive treatment when pavement width is available.


## Constraints

- Can position bicyclists in the "door zone" if located adjacent to parked vehicles without a buffer.
- Motorists may illegally park in the lane if not adequately signed and enforced.
- Does not provide physical protection or horizontal buffer from vehicles and therefore does not attract bicyclists of all levels.


## Typical Applications

- Arterials, collectors, and other non-local streets with speeds higher than 25 mph or over 3,000 average daily motorized traffic volumes.
- Streets without sufficient right-of-way or pavement width for buffered bike lanes or separated bike lanes (SBLs).


## Design Considerations

- Typical bike lane width is 6 feet, with 5 feet in constrained locations. A minimum 4-foot width can be used on constrained segments where on-street parking is not present.
- Green pavement markings or striping can add visibility and awareness in "conflict areas" or intersections where bicycle and vehicle travel paths cross.


## Additional Guidance

- AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities
- NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
- ODOT Highway Design Manual
- ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide


## Solutions Toolbox

## do <br> Bicycle Facilities

## PAVED SHOULDER

## Cost: \$-\$\$



A paved road shoulder can serve as a bicycle facility that provides space separated from motor vehicle traffic in rural areas.

## Benefits

- Provides a space separated from motorists.
- Requires less right-of-way than a separated multiuse path.


## Constraints

- Does not provide physical protection from vehicles and may not attract bicyclists of all levels.
- Shoulders serving other uses, such as broken-down vehicles, may force bicyclists into travel lanes.


## Typical Applications

- Typically applied on rural roadways.
- Also used as an interim treatment in urbanizing areas.


## Design Considerations

- A 6-foot width is preferred to accommodate bicycle travel, with a 4 -foot minimum in constrained areas. Greater widths can be used in higher-speed locations.
- Rumble strips or profiled striping can be used to enhance safety and minimize motorists encroaching on the shoulder.


## Additional Guidance

- AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities
- ODOT Highway Design Manual
- ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide


## SHARED LANE ROADWAYS



Shared lane roadways include roadways without separate bicycle facilities on which bicycle travel is not prohibited. Most roadways, with the exception of some limited access freeways, are "shared lane roadways" if they do not have a different type of bicycle facility. Shared lane roadways that are part of a designated bicycle network may include shared lane markings ("sharrows") or signage to indicate the legal presence of bicyclists in the travel lane.

## Benefits

- Allows for bicycle travel when other treatments are not feasible.
- Low- to no-cost.


## Typical Applications

- Rural roadways without shoulders often use "share the road" signage to indicate to road users that bicyclists may be present.
- Sharrows are typically used in urban or suburban locations on bicycle network links where other facilities are not present.


## Design Considerations

- Sharrows should be placed at least 4 feet from the edge of the curb or on-street parking.


## Additional Guidance

- ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide
- ODOT Highway Design Manual
- Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)


# do Bicycle Facilities 

## BICYCLE PARKING



Devices and/or areas that allow secure bicycle parking, often located at areas of high bicycle and pedestrian traffic such as bus stations, shopping centers, schools, and multi-use trails.

## Benefits

- Provides a secure location to store and lock bicycles.
- Relatively inexpensive and easy installation.
- Encourages community bicycle use and makes local attractions/businesses more accessible to bicyclists.


## Typical Applications

- Typically provided at areas of high bicycle and pedestrian traffic such as bus stations, shopping centers, schools, and multi-use trails.


## Design Considerations

- The size and design of the bicycle rack can vary based on the estimated number of users and available space.
- Covered bicycle parking can provide protection from the weather for parked bicycles and people as they lock and unlock bikes. Bike lockers can provide additional security.
- If possible, bicycle racks should be placed immediately adjacent to the entrance/location they serve.
- Rack should not be placed to block the entrance of a building or inhibit pedestrian flow.
- Racks should be easy to find, convenient, and secure.


## Additional Guidance

- APBP Bicycle Parking Guidelines


## Solutions Toolbox

## 人 Pedestrian Facilities

## PEDESTRIAN PATH (SIDEPATH)



A pedestrian path is a hard-surface path adjacent to the roadway in lieu of a sidewalk in areas where other bicycle facilities exist. Similar to a multi-use path, pedestrian paths are narrower in width and generally do not invite bicycle travel.

## Benefits

- Provides a hard surface for pedestrians buffered from the roadway.
- Requires less right-of-way than a multi-use path.
- Lower cost than construction of a full sidewalk with curb and gutter.


## Typical Applications

- In constrained rural areas where sidewalks are not present and multi-use paths cannot be accommodated.
- As an interim treatment in urbanizing areas to make connections between sidewalk facilities.


## Design Considerations

- Typically 5- to 8-foot wide asphalt surface.
- Pedestrian paths are typically separated from the roadway by a gravel or vegetated buffer instead of a curb and gutter.
- Should follow ADA standards to allow for universal access.
- Though not intended for bicyclists, pedestrian paths may attract bicyclists if a separate bicycle facility is not provided.


## Additional Guidance

- FHWA Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access
- ODOT Highway Design Manual


# Solutions Toolbox 

## Pedestrian Facilities

## SIDEWALK

Cost: \$\$\$


A sidewalk is a dedicated pedestrian facility adjacent to the roadway and separated from traffic by a curb.

## Benefits

- Provides pedestrians with a dedicated physicallyseparated space.
- Provides means of mobility for people using wheelchairs, people with strollers, or others who may not be able to travel on an unpaved surface.


## Constraints

- Adding a concrete curb and sidewalk to streets adds a substantial expense to the overall construction cost.
- Stormwater drainage needs to be considered when retrofitting existing streets.


## Typical Applications

- Typically provided on urban (non-rural) and residential streets, with the exception of limited access freeways.
- Typically added to streets in urbanizing areas as development occurs.


## Design Considerations

- Typically 6 to 8 feet wide. Sidewalks should be constructed at least 5 feet wide, with a minimum of 4 feet of clear width, excluding a shy distance of 1.5 feet from the curb and any adjacent obstructions.
- A landscaped buffer is preferable in residential areas and in locations with higher traffic speeds and volumes.
- Wider sidewalks of 12 to 20 feet can be beneficial in commercial or "town center" areas in order to accommodate higher pedestrian volumes, street furniture, pedestrian scale lighting, business signage, bike parking, transit stops, and other amenities.


## Additional Guidance

- ODOT Highway Design Manual.
- ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide
- AASHTO Green Book
- NACTO Urban Streets Design Guide


## Solutions Toolbox

## Pedestrian Facilities

## SHOULDER PEDESTRIAN FACILITY

Cost: \$-\$\$


A paved shoulder facility provides access for pedestrians on a hard surface in rural areas where sidewalks are not present.

## Benefits

- Provides a hard surface space separated from motorists.
- Requires less right-ofway than a separated multi-use path.
- More cost-effective than installing sidewalks.


## Constraints

- Does not provide physical protection of a curb and may not be comfortable for all users.
- Shoulders serving other uses, such as broken-down vehicles, may force pedestrians into travel lanes.


## Typical Applications

- Typically applied on rural roadways.
- Also used as an interim treatment in urbanizing areas.


## Design Considerations

- A 6-foot width is preferred to accommodate pedestrian travel, with a 4-foot minimum of paved surface in constrained areas. Greater widths can be used in higher-speed locations.
- Rumble strips or profiled striping can be used to enhance safety and minimize motorists encroaching on the shoulder.


## Additional Guidance

- ODOT Highway Design Manual
- AASHTO Green Book


# Solutions Toolbox 

## 人 Pedestrian Facilities

## PEDESTRIAN HYBRID BEACON

## Cost: \$\$\$-\$\$\$\$



A pedestrian hybrid beacon (sometimes called a HAWK signal) is a pedestrian activated signal that is unlit when not in use. It begins with a yellow light alerting drivers to slow, and then displays a solid red light requiring drivers to remain stopped while pedestrians cross the street. Finally, the beacon shifts to flashing red lights to signal that motorists may proceed after pedestrians have completed their crossing.

## Benefits

- Has nearly 100 percent rate of motorist yielding behavior at crossing locations.
- Improves pedestrian safety and reduces pedestrianinvolved crashes.
- Less delay to motor vehicle drivers than a signal.


## Typical Applications

- Midblock crossings with high pedestrian or bicycle demand and/or high traffic volumes.
- At locations where multi-use paths intersect with roadways.


## Design Considerations

- The push button to activate the pedestrian hybrid beacon should be easily accessible by pedestrians, wheelchair users, and bicyclists (if applicable).


## Additional Guidance

- Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)
- NACTO Urban Street Design Guide
- NCHRP Report 562 Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Crossings
http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/


# Solutions Toolbox 

## 人 Pedestrian Facilities

## RECTANGULAR RAPID FLASHING BEACON (RRFB)

Cost: \$\$-\$\$\$


These crossing treatments include signs that have a pedestrian-activated "strobe-light" flashing pattern to attract motorists' attention and provide awareness of pedestrians and/or bicyclists that are intending to cross the roadway.

## Benefits

- Provides a visible warning to motorists at eye level.
- Increases motorists yielding behavior at crossing locations over round yellow flashing beacons ( 80 to 100 percent compliance).
- Allows motorists to proceed after yielding to pedestrians and bicyclists.


## Typical Applications

- Midblock crossings with medium to high pedestrian or bicycle demand and/or medium to high traffic volumes.
- Locations where multi-use paths intersect with roadways.


## Design Considerations

- The push button to activate the RRFB should be easily accessible by pedestrians, wheelchair users, and bicyclists (if applicable).
- Consider adding a push button in the median island for crossings of multi-lane facilities.


## Additional Guidance

- Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)
- NACTO Urban Street Design Guide
- NCHRP Report 562 Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Crossings
- ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide


# Solutions Toolbox 

## 人 Pedestrian Facilities

## CROSSING ISLAND (PEDESTRIAN REFUGE)

## Cost: \$-\$\$



A crossing island in the median provides a protected area in the middle of a crosswalk for pedestrians to stop while crossing the street. Also called pedestrian refuge islands or median refuges, they can be used at intersections or midblock crossings.

Benefits

- Reduces pedestrian exposure at marked and unmarked crosswalks.
- Requires shorter gaps in traffic to cross the street.
- Allows pedestrians to cross in two phases.
- Proven safety countermeasure.


## Typical Applications

- Preferred treatment for crossings of multi-lane streets.
- Often used in areas with high levels of vulnerable pedestrian users, such as near schools or senior centers/housing.
- Often applied in areas with high traffic volumes or with a pedestrian crash history.


## Design Considerations

- Must have at least 6 feet of clear width to accommodate people using wheelchairs.
- At crossing locations where bicyclists are anticipated, a width of 10 feet or greater is desirable to accommodate bicycles with trailers or groups of bicyclists.
- Can be applied in conjunction with other traffic control treatments.


## Additional Guidance

- ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide
- NACTO Urban Streets Design Guide
- NCHRP Report 562 Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Crossings
- http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/


## Solutions Toolbox

## 人 Pedestrian Facilities

## BULB-OUT/CURB EXTENSIONS

Cost: \$\$


An extension of the curb or the sidewalk into the street (in the form of a bulb), usually at an intersection, that narrows the vehicle path, inhibits fast turns, and shortens the crossing distance for pedestrians.

## Benefits

- Shortens crossing distances for pedestrians.
- Reduces motorist turning speeds.
- Increases visibility between motorists and pedestrians.
- Enables permanent parking
- Enables tree and landscape planting and water runoff treatment.


## Typical Applications

- Mid-block or intersection pedestrian crossings on streets with unrestricted on-street parking.
- Streets with on-street parking where pedestrian volumes $\geq 20$ pedestrians per hour, ADT $\geq 1,500$ vehicles per day, and average right-turn speeds $\geq 15 \mathrm{mph}$.


## Design Considerations

- Include a narrow passage for bicyclists to prevent conflict with vehicles.
- Provide accessible curb ramps and detectible warnings.
- Include landscaping on the curb extension to differentiate path for pedestrian travel, especially for pedestrians with vision impairments.


## Additional Guidance

- ITE/FHWA Report Traffic Calming: State of the Practice
- FHWA Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access Part II of II: Best Practices Design Guide


## Solutions Toolbox

## 人 <br> Pedestrian Facilities

## RAISED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Cost: \$\$


Raised pedestrian crossings bring the level of the roadway even with the sidewalk, providing a level pedestrian path and requiring vehicles to slow. Raised crossings can be used at midblock crosswalks or intersections.

## Benefits

- Provides a better view for pedestrians and motorists
- Slows down motorists.


## Constraints

- Can be difficult to navigate for busses, large trucks, snow plows, and low ground clearance vehicles.
- Relatively expensive.
- Forces emergency vehicles to slow down


## Typical Applications

- Raised crosswalks are typically provided at midblock crossings on two-lane roads where pedestrian volumes $\geq 50$ pedestrians per hour and speed control is needed.
- Raised crosswalks may be provided at intersections where low-volume streets intersect with high-volume streets or where a roadway changes character (such as from commercial to residential).
- Raised crosswalks should not be used on transit routes or where there are steep grades or curves.


## Design Considerations

- Raised crosswalks should be even with the sidewalk in height and at least as wide as the crossing or intersection.
- Provide detectable warnings for pedestrians where they cross from the sidewalk in to the crossing area.
- Consider drainage needs and provide appropriate treatments.
- Use colored asphalt as opposed to brick or decorative surface materials to make the crossing smoother for those with mobility impairments.


## Additional Guidance

- ITE/FHWA Report Traffic Calming: State of the Practice
- FHWA Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access Part II of II: Best Practices Design Guide


# Solutions Toolbox 

## 人 Pedestrian Facilities

## HIGH VISIBILITY CROSSWALK

Cost: \$


High visibility crosswalks consist of reflective roadway markings and accompanying signage at intersections and priority pedestrian crossing locations.

## Benefits

- Communicates potential for pedestrian crossings to motorists.
- Designates a preferred crossing location for pedestrians.
- Motorists are required to stop for pedestrians entering crosswalks.
- Low cost.


## Typical Applications

- High visibility crosswalks are typically applied at intersections of arterials, collectors, and/or other facilities with moderate to high vehicle volumes and speeds.
- Can be applied at mid-block locations, especially in conjunction with other treatments.


## Design Considerations

- Crosswalk striping can vary, and may include continental striping (top photo), ladder striping, zebra striping (middle photo), etc.
- Can be constructed with paint or thermoplastic material.
- Minimum width is 6 feet, but wider crossings are preferred in areas with high number of pedestrians.


## Additional Guidance

- NCHRP Report 562 Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Crossings
- ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide


## Solutions Toolbox

## 人 Pedestrian Facilities

## STREET FURNITURE AND LIGHTING

Cost: \$-\$\$\$


Street furniture includes pedestrian seating, information/ wayfinding structures, and trash cans. Street furniture and lighting can be used to enhance the pedestrian experience and encourage pedestrian activity on a street.

## Benefits

- Encourages walking and sense of comfort and security for pedestrians.
- Street furniture can be relatively inexpensive and easy installation.
- Encourages foot traffic and can make local attractions/ businesses inviting.


## Constraints

- Requires space in potentially busy areas, such as sidewalks.
- Can reduce the pedestrian travel spaces on narrower sections.


## Typical Applications

- Typically provided at areas of high bicycle and pedestrian traffic such as bus stations, shopping centers, schools, and multi-use trails.
- Street furniture and pedestrian-scale lighting is usually provided on corridors with commercial activity and anticipated high-pedestrian use.


## Design Considerations

- Street furniture should not be placed to block the entrance of a building or inhibit pedestrian flow.
- The type and size of street furniture should be based on the available space and anticipated demand.
- Street furniture should be accessible to all users.


## Additional Guidance

- AASHTO Roadway Lighting Design Guide


## Solutions Toolbox

## Transit Facilities/Service Types

## BUS STOP

Cost: \$\$\$


Molalla, OR


Transit stop shelters help protect passengers waiting to load the bus from the elements and provides a great level of comfort. They also increase the visibility of transit stops and attractiveness for riders.

## Benefits

- Provides protection from the elements and a place to sit for people waiting for transit.
- Provides a prominent visual cue about where the transit stop is located.


## Constraints

- Require sufficient space along the street for bus to safely pull over and stop.
- Sign poles and stop amenities require maintenance


## Typical Applications

- Install bus stops at locations with potential or existing transit demand
- Inclusion of amenities, such as shelters and seating, can be determined based upon daily boardings or market served (e.g. bus stop at senior center probably needs seating)


## Design Considerations

- The style of the transit stop shelter can depend on the preferences of the local jurisdiction.
- At stops with a high number of daily boardings (i.e. over 100), a larger shelter or multiple shelters should be considered.
- Shelters should be cleaned and maintained regularly.
- Shelters should have transparent sides for greater visibility and panels should be resistant to fading or clouding.


## Additional Guidance

- TCRP Report 19: Guidelines for the Location and Design of Bus Stops
- Transit in Small Cities: A Primer for Planning, Siting and Designing Transit Facilities in Oregon


# Transit Facilities/Service Types 

## PARK-AND-POOL OR PARK-AND-RIDE

Cost: \$


## Application to Ontario

Park-and-pool may be a low-cost option for organizing rides between Ontario and common work, shopping, and service destinations such as Caldwell, Nampa, Meridian, and Boise. Park-and-pool locations could be upgraded to transit stops depending on future demand.

Park-and-pool or park-and-ride facilities allow travelers to drive to a parking facility, park, and use transit or carpool to their eventual destination. Park-and-ride or park-and-pool lots may be owned by a city, transit agency, or by a business that has excess parking during typical work hours.

Benefits

- Reduces the need for parking in downtown areas and activity centers
- Reduces single-occupant vehicle travel, which supports environmental goals
- Saves money by reducing gas costs for individual commuters


## Typical Applications

- These programs work well in rural or suburban areas where fixed-route transit is limited, and in communities with long commutes and common work destinations.
- They may be located in a downtown area, at the edge of a downtown, or within a neighborhood.


## Design Considerations

- Integrate park-and-ride/park-and-pool lots into existing downtowns to provide a central meeting point for people to meet and pool or take transit
- Add aesthetic treatments such as landscaping to integrate the parking area into the surrounding neighborhood.
- Provide adequate signage visible from the street indicating that parking is available, at what times, and at what (if any) cost. Ensure signage clearly states that park-and-ride/park-and-pool users are allowed to park


## Additional Guidance

- TCRP Report 19: Guidelines for the Location and Design of Bus Stops
- Transit in Small Cities: A Primer for Planning, Siting and Designing Transit Facilities in Oregon


## Solutions Toolbox

## Transit Facilities/Service Types

## DEMAND-RESPONSE SERVICE

Cost: \$\$\$


Cherriots RED Line is an example of both a shopper shuttle and zone service

Demand-response services pick-up and drop-off passengers at their door or at the curb. Transit vehicles providing demandresponse service do not follow a fixed route, but travel throughout the community transporting passengers according to their specific requests. Passengers must call ahead to book a trip.

## Benefits

- High level of service for those with mobility challenges


## Constraints

- Demand-response typically has low productivity, carrying 2-3 passengers per hour compared to other transit services
- Passengers must schedule service in advance


## Typical Applications

- Works well in low-density areas without a strong market for fixedroute transit
- Often used to serve markets that have mobility challenges


## Service Variations

- Shopper Shuttle - A shopper shuttle caters to shopping trips. Shopper shuttles may be provided daily or periodically, connecting passengers from their home to a major shopping destination.
- Zone Service - In rural or suburban communities, transit agencies may provide service in a particular neighborhood or zone during days of the week
- Taxi Vouchers - Public agencies may subsidize taxi fares as a way of providing demand-response service using existing general public taxi services. Passengers may either buy vouchers in advance at a discounted rate or pay the fare and submit for reimbursement.
- Volunteer Programs - Volunteers may subsidize taxi fares as a way of providing demand-response service using existing general public taxi services. Passengers may either buy vouchers in advance at a discounted rate or pay the fare and submit for reimbursement.
- Vanpools - Vanpools are a prearranged ridesharing service in which a number of people travel together on a regular basis in a van. Vanpools may be publicly operated, employer operated, individually owned, or leased.


## Solutions Toolbox

## Transit Facilities/Service Types

## FLEX SERVICE

Cost: \$\$


CC Rider's Route 3 provides flex service between Scappoose and St. Helen's. Riders can call in advance to schedule a pick-up no more than $1 / 2$ mile from the published route.

Flex service is a hybrid service type that combines the structure of a fixed-route with the flexibility of demand-response service. There are many models of flex service, ranging from those that are primarily fixed routes but offer limited deviations upon request, to those that are primarily demand-response zones but offer fixed time points.

## Benefits

- In lower demand areas where deviations can be accommodated, both fixed-route and ADA paratransit service can be provided with one vehicle
- Meets ADA paratransit requirements as long as schedule builds in additional time for deviations and service is open to the general public


## Typical Applications

- Flex service works in areas with low to medium densities where deviations to pick-up passengers can be supported while maintaining service along advertised routes.


## Service Variations

- Point-Deviated Service - Point deviated routes have several fixed timepoints, and passengers who live between the time points may call to request a curbside pick-up. The driver takes the most direct route between time points to pick-up each passenger.
- Deviated Service - Deviated service operates via a set route. Passengers may call ahead to request a deviation from that route, and as long as the pickup allows the bus to stay on schedule, the driver will deviate from the route to pick-up a passenger in front of their destination. Deviations are "out-and-back," meaning the bus returns back to the same point at which it started the deviation.


## Solutions Toolbox

## Transit Facilities/Service Types

## FIXED-ROUTE

Cost: \$\$


## Service Variations



Transit Service that involves frequent stops that circulate passengers within a community

## Intercity



Intercity transit routes provide direct service along major travel corridors with limited stops. These routes typically service longer distances than local fixed-routes. Between destinations, intercity services typically operate on arterials or interstate roadways.

## Commuter

Commuter service is specifically designed to bring people from residential areas to employment centers. These routes may look similar to intercity routes, but only operate during employment peak hours.


[^8]Fixed-route service means that transit vehicles run along a set route during a set schedule. Typically, fixed-route service is characterized by designated bus stops where passengers board and alight, and is supported with service information (maps and timetables).

## Benefits

- Predictable service that riders can access by following the schedule and map
- Cost effective (cost per rider) when serving high ridership corridors
- Can provide fairly direct travel times competitive with driving, making service more attractive to choice riders


## Typical Applications

- Connects origins and destinations within a community or between communities


## Service Variations

- Point-Deviated Service - Point deviated routes have several fixed timepoints, and passengers who live between the time points may call to request a curbside pick-up. The driver takes the most direct route between time points to pick-up each passenger.
- Deviated Service - Deviated service operates via a set route. Passengers may call ahead to request a deviation from that route, and as long as the pickup allows the bus to stay on schedule, the driver will deviate from the route to pick-up a passenger in front of their destination. Deviations are "out-and-back," meaning the bus returns back to the same point at which it started the deviation.
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## INTRODUCTION

This memorandum presents the proposed vision statement, goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria that will be used to guide the development of the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update. The goals and objectives will help ensure key issues are addressed throughout the planning process, while the evaluation criteria will be used to select and prioritize preferred projects. The goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria will also inform recommendations for policy language that will serve as guidance for future land use decision making, such as approval criteria related to zone change and comprehensive plan amendments.

To ensure a consistent understanding of the items included in this memorandum, the following definitions have been provided:

- Vision Statement - Provides overarching long-term outlook to be achieved by the plan.
- Goal - Provides direction for where the community's vision is leading the plan.
- Objective - Provides a more detailed breakdown of the goal with specific language on how the goal can be achieved.
- Evaluation Criteria - Provides a quantitative or qualitative tool to help prioritize projects or evaluate project alternatives. They can help measure the extent to which a project is in line with the community's vision, goals, or objectives.


## BACKGROUND

The existing CTUIR TSP was adopted in 2001 and includes one goal and 11 corresponding objectives, as listed below. A review of the goal and objectives highlights a focus on equity, community engagement, financial stability, and coordination between CTUIR and other regional and local partners.

## 2001 TSP Goal

To provide an effective and economical transportation system on the Umatilla Indian Reservation.

## 2001 TSP Objectives

A. Consider the needs of all segments of the Tribal community and all modes transportation in the transportation planning process.
B. Ensure that projects involving land use, economic development, and transportation issues are coordinated at conception.
C. Develop an effective relationship and process for working with the BIA, County, and State to identify, fund, and implement transportation projects.
D. Develop and maintain effective lobbying efforts with Tribal organizations to assure adequate funding and political clout on transportation issues.
E. Provide Tribal input into transportation improvements programs that will affect the Reservation road system.
F. Adopt and maintain the Umatilla Indian Reservation Transportation Plan.
G. Coordinate the location of public and private

CTUIR Comprehensive Plan
The 2010 Comprehensive Plan (updated in 2018) has the same goal as the CTUIR TSP, but the objectives are different.

1. Develop and maintain a transportation asset system that is safe, environmentally sensitive and economically sound and promotes the public health with future transportation in mind.
2. Ensure public or personal transportation to meet cultural, economic, personal employment, health and other needs for all residents, particularly at-risk populations.
3. Ensure required road transportation and transit planning documents are completed accurately in a timely manner and implemented as appropriate.
4. Work toward providing access throughout the ceded and traditional use areas through transportation infrastructure and transit options. utilities with development planning for new roads and assure adequate right-of-ways and easements are secured at the time of development approval.
H. Minimize the number and improve safety at railroad crossings by working closely with Umatilla County and the Union Pacific Railroad.
I. Improve the intersection of stream channel crossings with the current transportation system of railroads, highways and utilities which will decrease damage caused by periodic flooding.
J. Develop and adopt public and private road standards for new and unimproved roads on the Reservation acceptable to those responsible for maintenance and safety.
K. Develop and maintain a public transportation system for the benefit of Tribal members and the reservation residents.

## PROPOSED VISION STATEMENT

The proposed vision statement was based on conversations with CTUIR staff and a review of the 2001 TSP, CTUIR's Comprehensive Plan, and the scope of work for this project.

The transportation system on the Umatilla Indian Reservation provides safe, equitable, and sustainable travel choices that fulfill the needs of those living, working, and recreating in the reservation community, while also fostering cultural connections and preserving the rural character.

## PROPOSED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The proposed goals and objectives for the CTUIR TSP update are described below. The proposed TSP goals and objectives are based on the proposed vision statement, a review of the existing TSP goal and objectives, information from the ODOT TSP guidelines, and discussions with Tribal staff about the important issues prevalent in the community and transportation system.

## Goal 1 - Safety

Provide a safe multimodal transportation system for all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.
Objective 1A: Improve locations with a history of fatal and/or severe injury crashes
Objective 1B: Implement strategies that systemically reduce the potential for crashes

## Goal 2 - Environment and Cultural Heritage

Preserve existing cultural connections and the rural landscape.
Objective 2A: Develop projects that respect the rural landscape and cultural context
Objective 2B: Develop projects that help the community achieve its economic potential
Objective 2C: Establish land-use strategies and policies that support desired development that is culturally sensitive

## Goal 3 - Health

Develop a transportation system that supports active transportation and encourages healthy and active choices for the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.

Objective 3A: Increase the user-friendliness and comfort of active transportation options available to all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community
Objective 3B: Provide connections to community health centers, schools, and parks

## Goal 4 - Equity and Accessibility

Provide a multimodal transportation system that is accessible to all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.

Objective 4A: Provide access to essential destinations for all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community
Objective 4B: Develop a plan that responds to the range of needs within the community

## Goal 5 - Connectivity

Provide a multimodal transportation system that increases connections to the key hubs within the reservation and works to overcome existing barriers to regional connectivity.

Objective 5A: Improve existing, and/or create new multimodal connections between the Mission, July Grounds, and Gateway hubs
Objective 5B: Improve existing, or create new, regional multimodal connections

## Goal 6 - Coordination

Develop a transportation system that works together with Federal, State, regional, and local partners.
Objective 6A: Ensure consistency with Federal, State, regional, and local planning rules and regulations
Objective 6B: Coordinate with partners to gain consensus on the planned system for the region

## Goal 7 - Financial Stability

Develop attainable funding solutions for transportation system improvements.
Objective 7A: Prioritize investments and maximize partnerships to provide maximum benefit and return on investment for the associated cost.
Objective 7B: Develop projects that can be realistically achieved given the Tribe's existing, and potential, funding sources, including developing projects that will be compatible with Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) requirements and position CTUIR for future grant sources.

## PROPOSED EVALUATION CRITERIA

The proposed evaluation criteria are based on the identified goals and objectives. The project team will use the evaluation criteria to compare alternatives, as applicable, and to help prioritize the projects identified through the TSP update process. The evaluation process will score applicable projects, which may include capital projects (e.g., constructing a buffered bike lane, adding a turn lane), service enhancements (e.g., adding additional weekend transit service, providing real-time transit information), and programmatic solutions (e.g., yearly signage maintenance). The rating method used to evaluate the alternatives is described below.

Most Desirable: The concept makes substantial improvements in the criteria category. (+2)
Desirable: The concept makes some improvements in the criteria category. (+1)
No Effect: The criterion does not apply to the concept or the concept has no influence on the criteria. (0)
Less Desirable: The concept somewhat negatively impacts the criteria category. (-1)
Least Desirable: The concept substantially negatively impacts the criteria category. (-2)
At this level of screening, the criteria will not be weighted. The ratings will be used to inform discussions about the benefits and tradeoffs of each alternative. Each alternative or project will be reviewed against the objectives described in the preceding section on a ( -2 to 2 ) score rating.

In addition to assessments based on the objectives, the following implementation-focused evaluation criteria will also be reviewed on a (-2 to 2 ) score rating:

- Right-of-way constraints
- Physical barriers constraints
- Environmental impacts


## Appendix H . Technical Memorandum \#4: Preliminary Concept Design and Transportation Solutions

## DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM \#4: PRELIMINARY CONCEPT DESIGN

Date: September 16, 2022
Dani Schulte, CTUIR
To: Cheryl-Jarvis Smith, ODOT Region 5
Molly McCormick, Nick Foster AICP, RSP ${ }_{1}$, and Matt Hughart, AICP, Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. Colin Roberts, SERA, Andy Lindsey, Anderson-Perry \& Associates, Inc.

Project: Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation Transportation System Plan Update

Subject: Tech Memo \#4: Preliminary Concept Design

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents ..... 1
Introduction ..... 1
Project Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria ..... 2
Proposed Transportation Policies ..... 2
Roadway System ..... 2
Pedestrian System - Walking and Rolling ..... 23
Bicycle System ..... 29
Transit System ..... 31
Rail System ..... 33
Pipeline System ..... 33
Modification of Previous Planning Documents ..... 34

## INTRODUCTION

This memorandum summarizes and evaluates projects that address identified deficiencies and needs within the Umatilla Indian Reservation (UIR). The information provided in this memorandum will serve as the foundation for projects for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) update. By developing projects that promote connectivity, safety, and comfort for all people using the transportation system, CTUIR can support equitable access, active transportation, increased connectivity, and reduced environmental and climate impacts.

In addition to transportation projects, this memorandum also includes draft roadway cross-section standards and detailed concept design graphics for two areas within the UIR.

# PROJECT GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND EVALUATION CRITERIA 

Project goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria were developed early in the planning process to guide the development of the TSP update. They reflect the vision of celebrating community history and emphasize the desire to increase options for people walking and biking. The project goals and objectives were used to develop projects, while the evaluation criteria were used to complete a preliminary prioritization.

The goals of the TSP update are documented in Technical Memorandum \#3: Vision Statement and Guiding Principles and summarized below.

- Goal 1: Safety - Provide a safe multimodal transportation system for all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.
- Goal 2: Environment and Cultural Heritage - Preserve existing cultural connections and the rural landscape.
- Goal 3: Health - Develop a transportation system that supports active transportation and encourages healthy and active choices for the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.
- Goal 4: Equity and Accessibility - Provide a multimodal transportation system that is accessible to all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.
- Goal 5: Connectivity - Provide a multimodal transportation system that increases connections to the key hubs within the reservation and works to overcome existing barriers to regional connectivity.
- Goal 6: Coordination - Develop a transportation system that works together with Federal, State, regional, and local partners.
- Goal 7: Financial Stability - Develop attainable funding solutions for transportation system improvements. The projects were evaluated based on the project evaluation criteria to identify preliminary priorities. The projects were identified as high, medium, and low priority based on how well they meet the evaluation criteria and by extension, the goals of the TSP update. Attachment A includes the evaluation criteria and indicates how the evaluation criteria were used to evaluate and prioritize the projects.


## PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

Through review of previous planning efforts and CTUIR staff input, this memorandum identifies policies to be considered for the transportation system in within the UIR:

- Institute policies that encourage right-sizing, and adopting appropriate technology for, fleet vehicles and equipment, and encourage the adoption of alternative fuel vehicles through policy, infrastructure, etc.
- Adopt the cross-sectional standards provided in this memorandum into necessary code and guidelines.


## ROADWAY SYSTEM

Streets serve most trips within the UIR across all travel modes. This section identifies alternatives to address gaps and deficiencies in the street system as well as alternatives that will facilitate improvements to the pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit systems.

The projects developed for the roadway system include realignments, repaving and updates to existing roadways, traffic calming, intersection reconfiguration, and more. Table 1 describes the projects for the roadway system. The priority levels shown in Table 1 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the project team. Prioritization will be updated based on input from the advisory committees and the community. Figure 1 illustrates the location of the projects.

Table 1: Motor Vehicle System Projects

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Project } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Location/Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R01 | Kash Kash <br> Road | Kusi Road to east of OR 331 | Close existing access to OR 331 and reroute Kash Kash Road north to a new intersection with Kusi Road. | County | Medium |
| R02 | Spilya Road | Eastern end of roadway to Kash Kash Road realignment | Extend Spilya Road east to Kash Kash Road realignment. | CTUIR | Low |
| R03 | Emigrant Road | Cayuse Road to Poverty Flat Road | Widen to add shoulders and repave Emigrant Road (County Road \#937) from Cayuse Road to Poverty Flat Road. | County | Low |
| R04 | 56th Street- <br> Theater Road | Mission Road to US 30 | Widen, align, add shoulders, and pave/repave 56th Street-Theater Road to help support rerouting of trucks and other regional/state traffic during I-84 closures. | County | Low |
| R05 | North Cayuse Road | River Road to Mann Road | Widen, align, add shoulders, and pave North Cayuse Road (County Road \#925) from River Road north to Mann Road. | County | Low |
| R06 | Mann Road | Crawford Hollow Road to North Cayuse Road | Widen, align, add shoulders, and pave Mann Road (County Road \#925) from Crawford Hollow Road south to North Cayuse Road. | County | Low |
| R07 | Motanic Road | Best Road to Spring Creek Road | Widen, align, add shoulders, and pave Motanic Road (County Road \#1031) from Best Road south to Spring Creek Road. | County | Low |
| R08 | Sumac Road | Spring Creek Road to McKay Creek Road | Widen, align, add shoulders, and pave Sumac Road (County Road \#1050) from Spring Creek Road south to McKay Creek Road. | County | Low |
| R09 | McKay Creek Road | Sumac Road to North Fork McKay Creek Road | Widen, align, add shoulders, and add gravel along McKay Creek Road (County Road \#1050) from Sumac Road east to North Fork McKay Creek Road. | County | Low |
| R10 | Cayuse River Road | River Road to Cayuse Road | Widen, align, add shoulders, and pave Cayuse River Road from River Road north to Cayuse Road. | County | Low |
| R11 | OR 331 Speed Study | UIR northern boundary to I-84 | Perform a speed study along the OR 331 corridor to determine the potential for speed zone modifications. | ODOT | High |
| R12 | Mission Road Traffic Calming | From just west of Timíne Way to Parr Lane | Install speed feedback signage and other traffic calming measures. | County | High |
| R13 | Cayuse Road Bridge Traffic Calming | Intersection extents | Install speed feedback signage and other traffic calming measures. | County | Medium |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { Project } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Location/Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R14 | Kirkpatrick Road, vertical curve east of McKinley Lane | Intersection extents | Evaluate sight distance and install advisory signage if warranted. | County | Low |
| R15 | Cayuse <br> Road/Cayuse <br> River Road <br> intersection | Intersection extents | Reconstruct northern leg to connect at a more perpendicular angle. | County | Low |
| R16 | Wildhorse Creek Bridge | Bridge extents | Replace County Bridge \#59C401 along Wild Horse Road (County Road \#685). | County | Low |
| R17 | Confederated Way | B Street to Cayuse Road | Construct flood remediation projects on Confederated Way from B Street to Cayuse Road. Mitigations may include building a levy, raising the roadway, creating water retention areas, and rerouting the roadway. | BIA | Medium |

## Roadway Programs and Plans

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential programs and plans to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff. Through the TSP update process, the following programs and plans were identified:

- Maintenance program for intersections in the northern UIR where crops limit sight distance during certain times of the year
$\square$ Work with property owners adjacent to roads with limited sight distance to establish formal sight triangle boundaries. One example is Duff Road at Mann Road.
$\square \quad$ Where sight triangles cannot be established, add warning signage.
- Maintenance programs for striping
$\square$ Complete annual striping projects to update worn striping and to add/restripe fog lines on collectors and arterials.
- Coordinate with the County and ODOT on how to address truck parking and routing when I-84 is closed.
- Coordinate with ODOT and Umatilla County on regional connecting roadways.
- Create walkable neighborhoods. Monitor the need for traffic calming measures in neighborhoods and near pedestrian and bicycle activity centers, such as the school, Mission Senior Center, July Grounds residential area, and Nixyáawii Governance Center. Potential mitigations include raised crosswalks, "Children at Play" signage, 20 MPH speed limits, and additional marked crossings.
- Update and maintain CTUIR's parking policy based on current national guidance and local trends.
- Maintain the Tribal Transportation Program (TTP) National Tribal Transportation Facility Inventory (NTTFI) and update with routes that CTUIR may wish to include as projects move forward. Coordinate with the BIA as needed. Attachment B includes the existing NTTFI as of September 2022.



## Development Driven Capacity and Intersection Projects on OR 331

Although the operations analysis presented in Technical Memorandum \#2: Context and Site Analysis did not highlight intersection capacity deficiencies based on generalized growth projections, previous planning efforts have identified potential intersection and roadway projects that may be needed to accommodate localized development or expansions of existing businesses and destinations.

These growth opportunities, such as expansion of the Coyote Business Park, further expansion of the Wildhorse Resort and Casino, and expansion of Arrowhead Travel Plaza, are not imminent, but could have local and regional impacts to the transportation system. If and when projects like this were to occur, the potential impacts and mitigation measures would have to be determined based on detailed traffic studies for the specific development scenario. Intersection solutions that have been identified through previous planning studies and preliminary traffic impact studies are summarized in Table 2. The identified solutions have historically included constructing roundabouts or installing traffic signals. Cost and benefit considerations for these two intersection control types are discussed below:

- Construct a roundabout
$\square \quad$ Cost considerations: Potentially higher construction cost and lower long-term maintenance cost.
$\square \quad$ Benefit considerations: Improved safety, including reducing the potential for fatal and serious injury crashes and lowering speeds near the intersection. Adds capacity and reduces delay.
- Install a traffic signal
$\square$ Cost considerations: Potentially lower construction cost (depending on turn lane impacts) and higher long-term maintenance cost.
$\square$ Benefit considerations: Adds capacity and reduces delay. May also reduce crash potential, but not to the same extent as a roundabout.
Table 2: Potential Development Driven Intersection Projects on OR 331

| Location | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| OR 331/ Mission Road | Construct a single lane roundabout. Realign the northbound and southbound approaches to avoid impacts to the Mission Market. <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. Construct separate left-turn lanes on all four intersection approaches. Construct a separate right turn lane on the northbound approach. |
| OR 331/ <br> Wildhorse <br> Boulevard | Construct a single lane roundabout. <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. |
| OR 331/ Spilya Road | Construct a single lane roundabout. Modify access to right-in, right-out only at Kusi Road and Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway. <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. Modify access to right-in, right-out only at Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway. |
| OR 331/ <br> I-84 EB Ramps | Construct a single lane roundabout. <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. Construct exclusive left- and right-turn lanes on the off-ramp approach. |
| OR 331/ <br> I-84 WB Ramps | Install a traffic signal when warranted. Construct exclusive left- and right-turn lanes on the off-ramp approach and an exclusive right-turn lane on the north approach. |

Due to the potential for development-related growth to influence traffic conditions along OR 331 from Mission Road to the I-84 interchange, it is recommended that CTUIR and ODOT require traffic impact studies for all new development projects requiring access along the corridor and that are expected to generate more than 500 daily trips.

## Local Road Connectivity

Several local road connections were identified for the TSP update. Figure 2 illustrates the location and general orientation of the connections. Exact roadway alignments are not provided as these connections are anticipated to occur as a result of future development. Any local road connections that are desired to be CTUIR-initiated projects should be identified as a high priority and included in the cost-constrained plan. CTUIR will refer to the local road connectivity plan shown in Figure 2 during development review to ensure future local roads are consistent with the vision for overall access and connectivity within UIR.

## Access Management

As noted in the 2001 TSP, CTUIR supports the access spacing standards for County roads within the UIR. CTUIR also elects to apply these standards to the roads maintained and/or owned by CTUIR or BIA. To handle any discrepancies between functional classifications, the County standards for major and minor collectors should apply to all CTUIR rural and urban collectors. The County standards for local roads should apply to all CTUIR rural and urban local roads.

## Roadway Cross-sections and Design Standards

The 2001 TSP does not include roadway cross-sections or standards within the UIR. Figures 3 to 15 provide proposed cross-sections for inclusion in the TSP update. Figures 16 to 19 provide proposed roadway design standards for inclusion in the TSP update.

## OR 331 Detailed Concept Design Graphic

The project team created a detailed concept design graphic for OR 331 from Wildhorse Boulevard to the I-84 interchange shown in Figure 20. This graphic incorporates the projects identified throughout this memorandum, including projects that were originally identified in the 2006 OR 331 Access Management Implementation Strategy and Circulation Plan. The project team and CTUIR staff selected this location for one of the two detailed concept design graphics because it is important for the economy and cultural heritage of CTUIR. Many of the area's key destinations for both residents and visitors are located along this corridor, creating conflicts between modes and safety concerns.


Figure 3: Cross-section for Arterial Roadway (i.e., OR 331 or Mission Road) - Multi-use Path Option


Figure 4: Cross-section for Arterial Roadway (i.e., OR 331 or Mission Road) - Curb and Gutter Option


Exhibit \#3 - Pagge 236 of 532

Figure 5: Cross-section for Rural Collector - Shoulder Option


Figure 6: Cross-section for Rural Collector - Multi-use Path Option


Figure 7: Cross-section for Rural Collector - Gravel Option


Figure 8: Cross-section for Urban Collector


Figure 9: Cross-section for Rural Local Street


Figure 10: Cross-section for Rural Local Street - Gravel Option



Figure 12: Cross-section for Urban Local Street - Minor Residential Street


Figure 13: Cross-section for Alley


Figure 14: Cross-section for Multi-use Path


Figure 15: Cross-section for Umatilla River Multi-use Path and Horse Trail



TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTION - ASPHALT RURAL COLLECTOR


TYPICAL ROADWAY SECTION - GRAVEL RURAL COLLECTOR




TYPICAL SECTION
MULTI-USE PATHWAY

Figure 20: Detailed Concept OR 331 from Wildhorse Boulevard to the I-84 Interchange
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## PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM - WALKING AND ROLLING

The projects developed for the pedestrian system include sidewalk infill and reconstruction, new multi-use path connections, pedestrian crossing treatments, and more. Table 3 describes the projects for the pedestrian system. The priority levels shown in Table 3 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the project team. Prioritization will be updated based on input from the advisory committees and the community. Table 3 also shows if a project is eligible for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) funding based on a 2-mile radius from the Nixyáawii Community School. If it was, the priority was bumped up the next level. Figure 21 illustrates the location of the projects.

Table 3: Pedestrian System Projects

| Project ID | Location/Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Eligible for SRTS Funding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P01 | Mission Road | East of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street | Install six-foot sidewalks along the north side of Mission Road from east of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street. | County | High | X |
| P02 | Mission Road | Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection) | Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of Mission Road from Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection). | County | High | X |
| P03 | Mission Road | OR 331 to <br> Confederated <br> Way <br> (western intersection) | Widen sidewalks to six feet on the south side of Mission Road from OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) and address the existing mailbox obstructions. | County | High | X |
| P04 | Confederated Way | East of Whirlwind Drive to Cayuse Road | Complete the sidewalk network along the north side of Confederated Way from east of Whirlwind Drive to Cayuse Road. | BIA | High | X |
| P05 | Cedar Street | Short Mile <br> Road to Cayuse Road | Widen sidewalks to five feet wide on both sides of Cedar Street from Short Mile Road to Cayuse Road. | BIA | Medium | X |
| P06 | Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase I) | Purchase <br> Lane to OR <br> 331 | Construct a multi-use path on the south side of Mission Road from Purchase Lane to OR 331. This project is the first phase of a larger multi-use path connection to the City of Pendleton. Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. | CTUIR | High | X |
| P07 | Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase II) | UIR western boundary to Purchase Lane | Construct the second phase of the multi-use path to Pendleton, connecting at Purchase Lane. West of Purchase Lane, the alignment of the multi-use path connection may follow two potential alignments: | CTUIR | High | X |


| Project ID | Location/Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Eligible for SRTS Funding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1) Along the south side of the Umatilla River in parallel but offset from the river where applicable. If able, connect to Pendleton Riverwalk. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | OR |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2) Along the north or south side of Mission Road. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. |  |  |  |
| P08 | Short Mile Road Multi-use Path | Mission Road to Cayuse Bridge | Construct a multi-use path along Short Mile Road to Sampson Lane to the Union Pacific Railroad maintenance road to River Road to North Cayuse Road Bridge. | CTUIR | Medium |  |
| P09 | OR 331 Multiuse Path (Phase I) | Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway | Construct a multi-use path along the west side of OR 331 from Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway. | CTUIR | High |  |
| P10 | OR 331 Multiuse Path (Phase II) | Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road, depending on feasible options for crossing the Umatilla Bridge. River access could be included as part of this project. | CTUIR | High | X |
| P11 | South Market Road Multi-use Path | Arrowhead <br> Travel Plaza driveway to Tutuilla Church Road | Construct a multi-use path along the west side of OR 331-South Market Road from Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway to Tutuilla Church Road. | CTUIR | Medium |  |
| P12 | Wildhorse <br> Boulevard <br> Multi-use Path | OR 331 to the <br> Tamástslikt <br> Trail | Construct a multi-use path along Wildhorse Boulevard, along the north side of the median or within the median. | CTUIR | Medium |  |
| P13 | Parr Lane Multiuse Path | Umatilla River to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path in the vicinity of Parr Lane and extending to the Umatilla River. | CTUIR | Low |  |
| P14 | East-West <br> Multi-use Path | OR 331 to Cayuse Road | Construct a multi-use path along the top of the bluff connecting OR 331 to Cayuse Road, intersecting the Tamástslikt Trail. Coordinate with Project P18 - OR 331/Timíne Way pedestrian crossing and Project P22 Cayuse Road/Cedar Street pedestrian crossing. | CTUIR | High | X |


| Project ID | Location/Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Eligible for SRTS Funding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P15 | Tamástslikt Trail Lighting | Confederated Way to Tamástslikt Cultural Institute | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | High |  |
| P16 | Timíne Way Multi-use Path Lighting | Mission Road to OR 331 | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | Medium | X |
| P17 | July Ground Multi-use Path System Lighting | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | Medium | X |
| P18 | Cayuse Road Lighting | Short Mile Road to Cedar Street | Install pedestrian-scale lighting. | County | High |  |
| P19 | OR 331/ <br> Timíne Way | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include signalization (if warranted) or a grade separated undercrossing of OR 331. Coordinate with Project P14 - EastWest Multi-use Path. | ODOT | High | X |
| P20 | Cayuse Road Mid-block Crossing | n/a | Install enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments at the existing mid-block crossing on Cayuse Road east of Short Mile Road. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs), enhanced striping patterns, and/or curb extensions. | County | High | X |
| P21 | OR 331/ Kusi Road | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs), raised median island, enhanced striping patterns, and curb extensions. | ODOT | High |  |
| P22 | Cayuse Road/ <br> Confederated Way | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs), enhanced striping patterns, and curb extensions. | County | High | X |
| P23 | Cayuse Road/ Cedar Street | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs), enhanced striping patterns, and curb extensions. Coordinate with Project P14 - EastWest Multi-use Path. | County | High | X |

## Pedestrian Programs and Plans

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential programs and plans to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff. Through the TSP update process, the following programs and plans were identified:

- Parks and Transportation Coordinator
$\square$ Create a new CTUIR staff position to oversee and coordinate multi-use path maintenance and construction, park and river access, and park maintenance.
- Parks and River Access Plan
$\square$ CTUIR is acquiring land impacted by the 2020 flooding, including area near Cayuse River Road, Cayuse Road, and Sampson Lane. The plan will determine a vision for creating a park(s) with potential river access. Work with property owners adjacent to the river to gain access. Explore other river access locations including previous informal access points, such as Parr Lane and the swimming hole near the railroad bridge.


## July Grounds Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing Detailed Concept Design Graphic

The project team created a detailed concept design graphic for the July Grounds enhanced pedestrian crossing shown in Figure 22. This graphic incorporates the projects identified throughout this memorandum. The project team and CTUIR staff selected this location for one of the two detailed concept design graphics because it provides an example of what an enhanced crossing could look like within the UIR. This mid-block crossing is also a current barrier to the connectivity of the pedestrian and bicycle networks.


| Existing Sidewalk | Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary |
| :---: | :---: |
| Existing Multi-use Path | Mission Hub |
| Sidewalk Project | July Grounds Hub |
| Multi-use Path Project | Gateway Hub |
| Lighting Project | IMI/I/ Pendleton UGB |
| Pedestrian Crossing Project |  |

Figure 22: Detailed Concept for July Grounds Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing
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## BICYCLE SYSTEM

The projects developed for the bicycle system include buffered bike lanes, shoulder bikeways, and shared roadways. Table 4 describes the projects for the bicycle system. The priority levels shown in Table 4 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the project team. Prioritization will be updated based on input from the advisory committees and the community. Table 4 also shows if a project is eligible for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) funding based on a 2 -mile radius from the Nixyáawii Community School. If it was, the priority was bumped up the next level. Figure 23 illustrates the location of the projects. The figure also includes the multiuse path projects previously shown in the Pedestrian System section.
Table 4: Bicycle System Projects

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Project } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Location/Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B01 | Mission Road | OR 331 to Cayuse Road | Widen Mission Road and install buffered or separated/raised bicycle lanes along both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to Cayuse Road. | County | High | X |
| B02 | Kirkpatrick <br> Road | OR 331 to <br> McKinley <br> Lane | Widen Kirkpatrick Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to McKinley Lane. | County | Medium | X |
| B03 | Cayuse Road | Emigrant <br> Road to <br> River Road | Widen Cayuse Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from Emigrant Road to River Road. | County | Medium |  |
| B04 | Confederated Way | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X |
| B05 | Whirlwind Drive | Mission Road to Confederated Way | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X |
| B06 | Cedar Street | Short Mile Road to Cayuse Road | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X |
| B07 | Kusi Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  |
| B08 | Spilya Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  |
| B09 | Coyote Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  |
| B10 | Arrowhead Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  |
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## TRANSIT SYSTEM

The projects developed for the transit system include bus stop enhancements, modified service, and new service. Table 5 describes the projects for the transit system. The priority levels shown in Table 5 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the project team. Prioritization will be updated based on input from the advisory committees and the community. Figure 24 illustrates the location of the projects.

As CTUIR explores the transit system projects, coordination with other transit providers on or near the reservation will be needed. These other providers include Kayak, SafeT Transportation, Elite Taxi, WRC Shuttle, Greyhound, and YTHC CHR transportation.

Table 5: Transit System Projects

| Project <br> ID | Location/Name | Description | Priority |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| T01 | Park-and-ride <br> Locations | Coordinate with regional transit providers for park-and-ride locations <br> that help facilitate the use of transit by community members and <br> maximize regional connectivity. | High |
| T02 | Bus Stop <br> Enhancments | Evaluate transit stops for additional amenity needs, such as shelters <br> and signage. | Medium |
| T03 | OR 331 Transit Hub | Consolidate bus stops at Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, <br> and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus into one transit hub near <br> OR 331 north of Spilya Road, reducing need for transit vehicles to <br> turn to and from OR 331. Coordinate with Project T13 - Wildhorse <br> Campus Shuttle. | High |
| T04 | wildhorse Campus <br> Shuttle | Partner with adjacent businesses to provide a shuttle to transport <br> people from Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the <br> Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus to the OR 331 Transit Hub. <br> Coordinate with Project T12 - OR 331 Transit Hub. | High |
| T05 | Kayak Transit Hub <br> Expansion | Install public restrooms for passengers at the Kayak Transit Hub. | Low |
| T06 | Electric Vehicle and <br> Shuttle Pilot | Acquire vehicles, install charging facilities, and begin electric vehicle <br> service for the Metro and campus shuttle routes. | Medium |
| T07 | More frequent transit <br> service | Explore adding more trips per day on the highest ridership routes <br> including Hopper, Whistler, and Metro. | Low |
| T08 | Extended hours of <br> service | Explore additional hours of service to serve the morning and evening <br> shifts at Wildhorse Resort \& Casino. | Medium |
| T09 | Extended coverage | Explore extended coverage for transit services to reach residential <br> area near Riverside Avenue, Pendleton Airport, and Walla Walla <br> Airport. Coordinate with surrounding jurisdictions and transit agencies <br> who already provide services to these areas. | Medium |

## Transit Programs and Plans

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential programs and plans to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff. Through the TSP update process, the following programs and plans were identified:

- Work with adjacent businesses to sponsor transit shelters at bus stops.


Existing Kayak Bus Routes $\bigcirc$ Bus Stop Enhancement

- Hopper
- Arrow
- Metro
- Rocket
- Tripper

Whistler

## 图 Park-and-ride <br> (4) Transit Hub <br> Shuttle Service Area

Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary Mission Hub
July Grounds Hub
Gateway Hub
Pendleton UGB

## RAIL SYSTEM

There is one rail line within the UIR boundary, connecting Pendleton and La Grande. The line runs east and west, parallel to Mission Road, Short Mile Road, Cayuse Road, and Bingham Roads before turning south along Meacham Creek Road and into the Blue Mountains. Although no projects were identified to support the rail system, the following plan was identified:

- Safe Rail Crossing Plan
$\square$ Conduct a planning effort to establish a Quiet Zone Agreement for the Union Pacific railroad adjacent to the Mission area. The plan area would extend from the eastern boundary of the Community Water Sewer System service area to the UIR western boundary near Memory Lane.
$\square$ The plan would also include rail crossing safety upgrades for all crossings, which may result in the closure of some crossings.


## PIPELINE SYSTEM

There are liquid and natural gas pipelines within the UIR boundary. Figure 25 shows the existing pipeline system, in addition to other utility lines within the UIR. No future projects, programs, or plans were identified to support the pipeline system.
Figure 25: Pipeline System (Image provided by CTUIR)


## MODIFICATION OF PREVIOUS PLANNING DOCUMENTS

The proposed projects described in this memorandum will result in modifications or elimination of the following projects from the 2001 TSP, Mission Community Master Plan (MCMP), and the OR 331 Access Management Plan, described in Table 6. Table 6 only includes previously planned projects that have not been completed.

Table 6: Modifications to Previous Planning Documents

| Planning Document(s) | Previous Project ID(s) | Location/Name | Description | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway System |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 TSP | 6 | River Road | Widen, align, and add gravel from the railroad crossing east to White Road. CTUIR to take over ownership of two atgrade railroad crossings and pave crossings with asphalt. | CTUIR requested removal. |
| 2001 TSP and OR 331 <br> Access Man. | 9 and 14 | Kash Kash <br> Road | Kash Kash Road at Highway 331 - Close existing access to Highway 331 and reroute Kash Kash Road north to a new intersection with the highway. Add exclusive left-turn lanes on the highway approaches to new intersection. Also construct new driveway/street access on the west side of the intersection, opposite of Kash Kash Road. Install new traffic signal when warranted. | Edited project to focus only on Kash Kash Road realignment, since the other elements have mostly been completed |
| 2001 TSP and OR 331 <br> Access Man. | 10 and 8 | OR 331 | Highway 331 Median - Construct a nontraversable landscaped median along Highway 331 from the l-84 westbound ramps to the Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road. This project also includes bicycle/pedestrian improvements. | No longer desired for this roadway. |
| 2001 TSP | 27 | North-South <br> Connector <br> Road | North-South Connector Road - Construct a new north-south connector road from the Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road to "A" Street. | No longer desired by CTUIR. This area is difficult to develop because of cultural sites and topography. |
| 2001 TSP | 28 | East-West <br> Connector <br> Road (Phase II) | East-West Connector Road (Phase II) Extend rural connector road from proposed North-South Connector Road to Highway 331. Timing for this project will be dictated by planned developments in the area. | No longer desired by CTUIR. This area is difficult to develop because of cultural sites and topography. |
| 2001 TSP | 3 | East-West Connector Road (Phase I) | East-West Connector Road (Phase I) Construct a new urban/rural connector road from near Aspen Way to proposed North-South Connector Road. Timing for this project will be dictated by planned developments in the area (East Bench Subdivision). | No longer desired by CTUIR. This area is difficult to develop because of cultural sites and topography. MCMP shows a multi-use path instead |
| 2001 TSP | 37 | Tamástslikt Cultural Institute | Tamástslikt Cultural Institute Connector Road - Construct a new connector road from the Tamástslikt Cultural Institute to the proposed east-west connector road, | No longer desired by CTUIR. This area is difficult to develop |


| Planning Document(s) | Previous Project ID(s) | Location/Name | Description | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Connector Road | near the Cayuse Road/Emigrant Road intersection. | because of cultural sites and topography. |
| OR 331 <br> Access Man. | 10 | OR 331 | Widen OR 331 to a five-lane cross-section in the vicinity of Spilya Road. | New cross-sections established in MCMP and through this TSP update process. |
| OR 331 <br> Access Man. | 13 | Kusi Road | Extend Kusi Road and construct northsouth local road for local circulation. | Edited to Spilya Road and without the additional north-south connection based on development that has occurred. |
| Pedestrian System |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 TSP | 26 | Mission Road <br> Bike/Ped <br> Facility (Phase <br> II) | Mission Road Bike/Ped Facility (Phase II) <br> - Complete the extension of a bicycle/pedestrian facility to the City of Pendleton along Mission Road/US Highway 30. | Revised to have first phase along Mission Road and then two options to Pendleton: along Mission Road or along Umatilla River. |
| 2001 TSP | 31 | Highway 331 Sidewalk and Bike Lanes | Highway 331 Sidewalk and Bike Lanes Provide bike lanes, curb and gutter, and sidewalks along Highway 331 from Mission Road to proposed East-West Connector Road. | Replaced by a multi-use path. |
| 2001 TSP | 36 | Path Across Umatilla River | Path Across Umatilla River - Construct a multi-use path in the vicinity of Parr Lane and extending across the Umatilla River to connect with Kirkpatrick Road. | Edited to remove bridge and only connect Parr Lane to the river based on input from CTUIR staff. |
| MCMP, TAC1 | P2 | Mission Road | Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of Mission Road from Confederated Way to Cedar Street. Widen existing sidewalks near the Four Corners area to six feet and address the existing mailbox obstructions located across from Lucky Seven. | Removed because the pedestrian crossing was moved north to Confederated Way, removing the need for sidewalks on both sides of the street to Cedar Street. |
| MCMP | P3 | OR 331 | Install sidewalks along the east and west sides of OR 331. | Replaced by a multi-use path. |
| MCMP | M5 | Umatilla River Multi-use Path | Construct a new multi-use trail along the south side of the Umatilla River on in parallel but offset from the river where applicable. Connect to Pendleton Riverwalk. | Revised to have first phase along Mission Road and then two options to Pendleton: along Mission Road or along Umatilla River. |
| Bicycle System |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 TSP | 32 | OR 331 | Highway 331 Shoulder Widening - Provide 8-foot paved shoulders along Highway 331 from Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road to proposed East-West Connector Road. | Replaced by a multi-use path. |


| Planning <br> Document(s) | Previous <br> Project ID(s) | Location/Name | Description | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| MCMP | B3 | OR 331 | Install bicycle lanes along the east and <br> west sides of OR 331. | Replaced by a multi-use <br> path. |
| MCMP | T1 | Multiple <br> Locations | (For multiple locations) Install new transit <br> amenities including new shelters with real- <br> time transit tracking, benches, lighting, etc. | Replaced by more <br> specific suggestions for <br> the bus stop locations. |

## Attachment A

## Description of Evaluation Process and Evaluation Criteria

A qualitative process using the evaluation criteria will be used to evaluate potential modal solutions and prioritize projects developed through the TSP update. The rating method used to evaluate the alternatives is described below.

Most Desirable: The concept addresses the criterion and/or makes substantial improvements in the criteria category. (+2)
Desirable: The concept addresses the criterion and/or makes improvements in the criteria category. ( +1 )
No Effect: The criterion does not apply to the concept or the concept has no influence on the criteria. (0)
Less Desirable: The concept does not support the intent of and/or negatively impacts the criteria category. (-1)
Least Desirable: The concept does not support the intent of and/or substantially negatively impacts the criteria category. (-2)

| Objective | Evaluation Criteria | Evaluation Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Goal 1: Safety |  |  |
| Objective 1A: Hisfory of Crashes | Improve locations with a history of fatal and/or severe injury crashes | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 1B: Reduce crash potential | Implement strategies that systemically reduce the potential for crashes | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Goal 2: Environment and Cultural Heritage |  |  |
| Objective 2A: Respect rural and cultural context | Develop projects that respect the rural landscape and cultural context | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 2B: Achieve economic potential | Develop projects that help the community achieve its economic potential | (-2 to +2) |
| Objective 2C: Culturally sensitive | Establish land-use strategies and policies that support desired development that is culturally sensitive | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Goal 3: Health |  |  |
| Objective 3A: Increase active transportation options | Increase the user-friendliness and comfort of active transportation options available to all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 3B: <br> Connections to health centers, schools, parks | Provide connections to community health centers, schools, and parks | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Goal 4: Equity and Accessibility |  |  |
| Objective 4A: Access to essential destinations | Provide access to essential destinations for all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 4B: Responds to range of community needs | Develop a plan that responds to the range of needs within the community | $(-2$ to +2) |
| Goal 5: Connectivity |  |  |
| Objective 5A: Improve multimodal connections between hubs | Improve existing, and/or create new multimodal connections between the Mission, July Grounds, and Gateway hubs | (-2 to +2) |
| Objective 5B: Improve regional multimodal connections | Improve existing, or create new, regional multimodal connections | (-2 to +2) |
| Goal 6: Coordination |  |  |
| Objective 6A: <br> Consistency with partners | Ensure consistency with Federal, State, regional, and local planning rules and regulations | (-2 to +2) |
| Objective 6B: Partner consensus on planned system for reaion | Coordinate with partners to gain consensus on the planned system for the region | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Goal 7: Financial Stability |  |  |
| Objective 7A: Maximize benefit and return on investment | Prioritize investments and maximize partnerships to provide maximum benefit and return on investment for the associated cost. | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 7B: Realistic, compatible with BIA, and/or positioning for grants | Develop projects that can be realistically achieved given the Tribe's existing, and potential, funding sources, including developing projects that will be compatible with Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) requirements and position CTUIR for future grant sources. | (-2 to +2) |





| Project ID | Location/Name | Extents | Description | Evaluation Criteria (-2 to +2 scoring) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Evaluat } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Priority |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Goal 1: } \\ & \text { Safety } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Goal 2: Environment and Cultura Heritage |  |  | Goal 3: Health |  | Goal 4: Equity and Accessibility |  | Goal 5: Connectivity |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Goal 6: } \\ & \text { Coordination } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Goal 7: Financial Stability |  | Other Criteria |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P22 | Cayuse Road/Confederated Way | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs), enhanced striping patterns, and curb extensions. | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | High | Yes |
| P23 | Cayuse Road/Cedar Street | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. <br> Treatment may include raised crosswalk, <br> Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBS), <br> enhanced striping patterns, and curb <br> extensions. Coordinate with Project P14 - East- <br> West Multi-use Path. | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | High | Yes |
| Bicycle System |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| в01 | Mission Road | OR 331 to Cayuse Road | Widen Mission Road and install buffered or raised bicycle lanes along both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to Cayuse Road. | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 15 | High | Yes |
| в02 | Kirkpatrick Road | OR 331 to MCKinley Lane | Widen Kirkpatrick Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to Mckinley Lane. | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 13 | Medium | Yes |
| во3 | Cayuse Road | Emigrant Road to River Road | Widen Cayuse Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from Emigrant Road to River Road. | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 13 | Medium | No |
| B04 | Confederated Way | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Medium | Yes |
| в05 | Whirlwind Drive | Mission Road to Confederated Way | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Medium | Yes |
| B06 | Cedar Street | Short Mile Road to Cayuse Road | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Medium | Yes |
| в07 | Kusi Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | Low | No |
| в08 | Spilya Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | Low | No |
| воя | Coyote Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Low | No |
| ${ }^{\text {B10 }}$ <br> Transit System | Arrowhead Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Low | No |


| Project ID | Location/Name | Extents | Description | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Goal 1: } \\ & \text { Safety } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Goal 2: Environment and Cultural <br> Heritage |  |  | Goal 3: Heath |  | Evaluation Criteria (-2 to +2 scoring)Goal 4 : Eauitr andGooil 5 : |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Goal 6: } \\ \text { Coordination } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Goal 7: Financial Stability |  | Other Criteria |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Evaluation } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Priority |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 墻 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gig } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T01 | Park-and-ride Locations | n/a | Coordinate with regional transit providers for park-and-ride locations that help facilitate the use of transit by community members and maximize regional connectivity. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | High | No |
| T02 | Bus Stop Enhancments | n/a | Evaluate transit stops for additional amenity needs, such as shelters and signage. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | Medium | No |
| тоз | OR 331 Transit Hub | n/a | Consolidate bus stops at Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus into one transit hub near OR 331 north of Spilya Road, reducing need for transit vehicles to turn to and from OR 331. Coordinate with Project T13 Wildhorse Campus Shuttle. | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | High | No |
| T04 | wildhorse Campus Shuttle | n/a | Partner with adjacent businesses to provide a shuttle to transport people from Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus to the OR 331 Transit Hub. Coordinate with Project T12 OR 331 Transit Hub. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | High | No |
| T05 | Kayak Transit Hub Expansion | n/a | Install public restrooms for passengers at the Kayak Transit Hub. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | Low | No |
| т06 | Electric Vehicle and Shuttle Pilot | n/a | Acquire vehicles, install charging facilities, and begin electric vehicle service for the Metro and campus shuttle routes. | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | Medium | No |
| T07 | More frequent transit service | n/a | Explore adding more trips per day on the highest ridership routes including Hopper, Whistler, and Metro. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | Low | No |
| T08 | Extended hours of service | n/a | Explore additional hours of service to serve the morning and evening shifts at Wildhorse Resort \& Casino. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | Medium | No |
| то9 | Extended coverage | n/a | Explore extended coverage for transit services to reach residential area near Riverside Avenue, Pendleton Airport, and Walla Walla Airport. Coordinate with surrounding jurisdictions and transit agencies who already provide services to these areas. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | Medium | No |

## Attachment B

## Indian Reservation Roads Program

 Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)| Filter Criteria |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P | 2022 | 07 | 143 |  |



## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Indian L | P07143 Northwes Umatille Umatilla Indian L | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Indian L | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Indian L | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatille Indian L | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatill Umatille Indian L | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Indian L | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Indian L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0006 | 0006 | 0006 | 0006 | 0006 | 0006 | 0006 | 0006 |
| 5 -Section Number | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.3 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridae Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 30 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-Surface Width | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 24 | 15 | 10 | 10 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 24 | 15 | 10 | 10 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X ING/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 042 | 42 | 42 | 42 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe |  |  |  |  | 00 |  |  |  |
| 51-Road Category |  | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |  |
| Update Year | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea <br> 0007 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea <br> 0007 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea <br> 0007 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> B Street <br> 0008 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> "B" Stre <br> 0008 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatille "A" Stre 0009 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> "A" Stre <br> 0009 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> "A" Stre <br> 0009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | - 10 | - 20 | - 30 | 10 | 20 | - 10 | 20 | - 30 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 3.7 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 60 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 58 | 64 | 57 | 90 |
| 16-Surface Width | 20 | 20 | 20 | 17 | 27 | 22 | 22 | 16 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT | 62 | 77 | 51 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 14 | 9 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | F006 | F006 | F006 | 08 |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 30 | 30 | 30 | 19 | 29 | 24 | 24 | 16 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 92 | 114 | 76 | 37 | 37 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 12 | 12 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | E | E | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  | 45.66800000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66600000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66600000 | 45.66400000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  | -118.67400000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  | -118.67200000 | -118.67000000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 33 | 33 | 33 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75003 | 0 | 0 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | J | $\checkmark$ | $R$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1960 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| $\left.\begin{array}{r}\text { Location ID } \\ \text { Region } \\ \text { Agency }\end{array}\right\}$Reservation <br> Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> "A" Stre <br> 0009 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Alder Dr <br> 0010 | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Oreaon W 0011 | P07143 Northwes Umatille Umatille Oregon W 0011 | P07143 Northwes Umatille Umatille Oregon W 0011 | P07143 Northwes Umatille Umatille Oregon W 0011 | $\begin{gathered} \text { P07143 } \\ \text { Northwes } \\ \text { Umatilla } \\ \text { Umatilla } \\ \text { Oregon W } \\ 0011 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { P07143 } \\ \text { Northwes } \\ \text { Umatilla } \\ \text { Umatill } \\ \text { Oregon W } \\ 0011 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | 40 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |  | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Lenath |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 04697 \mathrm{~A} 00800018 \\ 9 \\ 308 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 2 | 7 | 4 |  | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 90 | 66 | 60 |  | 80 | 80 | 80 | 100 |
| 16-Surface Width | 12 | 28 | 24 |  | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 20 | 66 | 120 |  | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 1 | 4 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 4 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  | 8600 |  | 8600 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  | 2004 |  | 2004 | 2004 | 2004 | 2004 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  | 11 |  | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 10 | 0008 |  | 0008 | 0008 | 08 | 08 |
| Roadway Width | 12 | 30 | 32 |  | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 37 | 12771 |  | 12771 | 5940 | 5940 | 5940 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 14 | 18 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | E | P |  | P | P | P | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 0 | 1 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 1 | 3 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.66400000 | 45.66800000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.66400000 | 45.66700000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.67200000 | -118.66100000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.67200000 | -118.66000000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  | 64 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 75000 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | $R$ | $V$ | A |  | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2016 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Cayuse D | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> New Road | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> New Road | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0011 | 0011 | 0011 | 0011 | 0012 | 0013 | 0013 | 0014 |
| 5-Section Number | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 15-Length of Section | 14.3 |  | 4.3 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.2 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  | 01064A008 01240 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-Bridge Length 32-County | 059 | 71 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 |  | 80 | 100 | 49 | 72 | 0 | 58 |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 |  | 24 | 36 | 25 | 12 | 10 | 26 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 120 |  | 120 | 120 | 66 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 6 |  | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |  | 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT | 5300 |  | 5100 | 4900 |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2004 |  | 2004 | 2004 |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 11 |  | 11 | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 8 |  | 0008 | 8 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| Roadway Width | 36 |  | 40 | 52 | 27 | 12 | 10 | 28 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 7871 |  | 7574 | 7277 | 37 | 74 | 74 | 37 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 18 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | P |  | P | P | E | G | G | E |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  | 45.66700000 | 45.64600000 | 45.64600000 | 45.66700000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  | 45.66600000 | 45.64600000 | 45.64600000 | 45.66700000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  |  | -118.66700000 | -118.64100000 | -118.62200000 | -118.67000000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  | -118.66600000 | -118.60500000 | -118.60500000 | -118.67000000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 27 | 24 | 21 | 22 | 750064 | 7502 | - 27 | 64 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 75000 | 7500 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | $A$ |  | A | A | $V$ | 7 | $T$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |


| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Senior C | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Walla Wa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Whirlwin | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Willow D | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Cottonwo | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Aspen Wa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0014 | 0015 | 0015 | 0016 | 0017 | 0018 | 0019 | 0020 |
| 5-Section Number | 15 | 810 | 810 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 9 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County <br> 33-Congressional District | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
|  | 02 |  |  | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  |  |  | 64 | 66 | 49 | 63 | 91 |
| 16-Surface Width | 21 |  |  | 24 | 36 | 36 | 28 | 22 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 |  |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  |  | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| Roadway Width | 21 |  |  | 26 | 38 | 38 | 30 | 24 |
| TTAM Future ADTTTAM ADS Number |  |  |  | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
|  | 20 |  |  | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  |  |  | E | E | E | E | E |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  | 45.66600000 | 45.66500000 | 45.66800000 | 45.66800000 | 45.66400000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  | 45.66600000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66600000 | 45.66600000 | 45.66500000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  | -118.66800000 | -118.66500000 | -118.66300000 | -118.66000000 | -118.65800000 |
| 44-End Lonaitude |  |  |  | -118.66600000 | -118.66500000 | -118.66100000 | -118.65800000 | -118.65700000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  |  |  | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | $\square-$ |  |  | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | $Z$ |  |  | $V$ | $V$ | $V$ | $V$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1970 | 1959 | 1959 | 1996 |
| Update Year Status | 2016 | 1974 | 1974 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
|  | 2ETURNED-TO-FIE | D-AT-REG | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Juniper | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Lodgepol | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Tamarack | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Easy Str | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Reservoi | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Wildhors | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Wildhors | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Dogwood |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0027 | 0028 | 0029 | 0030 | 0031 | 0032 | 0032 | 0033 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County33-Congressional District | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
|  | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | , | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition 7 |  | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index 87 |  | 82 | 87 | 63 | 40 | 64 | 67 | 91 |
| 16-Surface Width |  | 18 | 18 | 24 | 15 | 48 | 24 | 18 |
| 13-Surface Type |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share 100 |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 14-Shoulder Type 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  | 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number 27 |  | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 |  | 33 |
| Roadway Width 24 |  | 20 | 20 | 26 | 15 | 48 | 24 | 20 |
| TTAM Future ADT 3 |  | 37 | 37 | 37 | 74 | 149 | 149 | 37 |
| TTAM ADS Number 1 |  | 18 | 18 | 18 | 14 | 7 | 8 | 18 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  | E | E | E | G | P | P | E |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude 45.66500000 |  | 45.66500000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66800000 |  | 45.65000000 | 45.65000000 | 45.66400000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.66600000 | 45.66500000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 |  | 45.65000000 | 45.65000000 | 45.66500000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.65700000 | -118.65600000 | -118.65500000 | -118.65800000 |  | -118.68400000 | -118.67300000 | -118.65500000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.65600000 | -118.65500000 | -118.65600000 | -118.65800000 |  | -118.67300000 | -118.67300000 | -118.65500000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | -27 | 27 | 64 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 7500 | 7500 | 75000 | 2 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | $V$ | $V$ | $V$ | $V$ | $K$ | E | $E$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1995 | 1995 | 1995 | 1959 | 1959 | 1995 | 1997 | 2013 |
| Update Year Status | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2007 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
|  | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Showaway | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Johnson | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Johnson | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Sheoship | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Umbarger | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Fowler L | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Fenton L | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Fenton L |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0034 | 0035 | 0035 | 0036 | 0037 | 0038 | 0039 | 0039 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.4 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 20 | 20 | 0 | 64 | 44 | 68 | 76 | 76 |
| 16-Surface Width | 16 | 12 | 8 | 13 | 22 | 18 | 15 | 15 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 30 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 34 | 35 |  | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 39 |
| Roadway Width | 16 | 12 | 8 | 13 | 22 | 18 | 15 | 15 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 14 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.67100000 |  |  | 45.68500000 | 45.63100000 | 45.66000000 | 45.58800000 | 45.59000000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.67200000 |  |  | 45.68300000 | 45.64200000 | 45.64600000 | 45.59000000 | 45.59100000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68400000 |  |  | -118.49100000 | -118.72600000 | -118.59400000 | -118.46200000 | -118.45800000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.69300000 |  |  | -118.49100000 | -118.72600000 | -118.58800000 | -118.45800000 | -118.45800000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 64 | 42 | 42 | - 28 | 27 | 27 | 33 | 33 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 |  |  | 7500 | 7500 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | $B$ | $B$ | A | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 2011 | 2009 | 2009 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2006 | 2006 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)
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## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Minthorn | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Minthorn | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatill <br> Umatill <br> Weedy La | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Brahman | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Charolai | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Durham P | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> 54th Str | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> 54th Str |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0049 | 0049 | 0050 | 0051 | 0052 | 0053 | 0054 | 0054 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 84 | 84 | 60 | 53 | 53 | 49 | 68 | 66 |
| 16-Surface Width | 20 | 14 | 18 | 22 | 22 | 20 | 18 | 17 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 30 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 49 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 54 |
| Roadway Width | 20 | 14 | 18 | 22 | 22 | 20 | 18 | 17 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 13 | 13 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | E | E | E | E | E |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.62700000 | 45.62600000 | 45.61700000 | 45.61700000 | 45.61700000 | 45.61900000 | 45.67100000 | 45.66900000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.62600000 | 45.62600000 | 45.62300000 | 45.62000000 | 45.61900000 | 45.62000000 | 45.66900000 | 45.66800000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude | -118.71000000 | -118.70500000 | -118.70500000 | -118.69300000 | -118.69300000 | -118.69300000 | -118.72800000 | -118.72800000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.70500000 | -118.70100000 | -118.70500000 | -118.69000000 | -118.69300000 | -118.69200000 | -118.72800000 | -118.72800000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 63 | 63 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 2010 | 2010 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 2011 | 2011 |
| Update Year | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Meac <br> 0062 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Spilya R 0063 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Spilya R 0063 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Spilya R 0063 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Spilya R 0063 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Coyote R 0064 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Coyote R <br> 0064 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Arrowhea 0065 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | - 10 | - 20 | - 20 | - 30 | - 30 | - 10 | - 20 | - 10 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 44 |  |  |  |  | 92 | 90 | 91 |
| 16-Surface Width | 10 |  |  |  |  | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1 4 | 1 4 | 2 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 10 |  |  |  |  | 26 | 26 | 28 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 15 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.70300000 |  |  |  |  | 45.64400000 | 45.64400000 | 45.64400000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.69700000 |  |  |  |  | 45.64300000 | 45.64600000 | 45.64600000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude | -118.35400000 |  |  |  |  | -118.68600000 | -118.68600000 | -118.68200000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.35100000 |  |  |  |  | -118.68600000 | -118.68600000 | -118.68200000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 25 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 |  |  |  |  | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A |  |  |  |  | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  |  |  |  | 2007 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2007 | 2007 | 2007 | 2007 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | -AT-REG | OFFICIALC | -AT-REG | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Arrowhea | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Tsimti F | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pendleto | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pendleto | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Pendleto | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatilla Pendleto | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Tela-Quo | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Ti'Mine |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0065 | 0066 | 0067 | 0067 | 0067 | 0067 | 0068 | 0069 |
| 5-Section Number | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.7 |  | 0.3 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridae Lenath |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 242 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 7 |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 4 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 91 |  | 60 |  | 80 | 80 |  | 98 |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 |  | 24 |  | 36 | 36 |  | 32 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 0 | 250 |  | 250 | 250 | 0 | 85 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 2 |  | 6 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 4 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  | 5300 |  | 1600 | 1600 |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  | 2004 |  | 2004 | 2004 |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  | 10 |  | 10 | 10 |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  | 67 |  | 67 | 67 |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 28 |  | 36 |  | 48 | 48 |  | 40 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 7871 |  | 2376 | 2376 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 13 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 13 | 13 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | P |  | P | P | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 |  | 2 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 |  | 2 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 |  | 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.64600000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.66400000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.64700000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.66400000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68200000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -118.68400000 |
| 44-End Lonaitude | -118.68200000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -118.68500000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | $7500{ }^{27}$ | 27 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 64 | 564 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 75000 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A |  | A |  | A | A |  | $C$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 2009 |  | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 |  | 2009 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2007 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | $2006$ | 2007 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Nac Park <br> 0069 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Ti"Mine 0069 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Ti'Mine 0069 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Pond Cem <br> 0070 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Red Elk 0071 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Awi'Aw R 0072 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Minthorn <br> 0073 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Agen 0074 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0069 | 0069 | 0069 | 0070 | 0071 | 0072 | 0073 | 0074 |
| 5-Section Number | 15 | 20 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridae Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  | 96 | 98 | 85 |  |  |  | 78 |
| 16-Surface Width | 274 | 24 | 37 | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 29-Right of Way Width |  | 69 | 69 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 99 | 28 | 41 | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 20 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  | 45.66400000 | 45.66700000 | 45.57700000 |  |  |  | 45.66800000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  | 45.66700000 | 45.66800000 | 45.57700000 |  |  |  | 45.66800000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  | -118.68500000 | -118.69300000 | -118.78200000 |  |  |  | -118.69800000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  | -118.69300000 | -118.69300000 | -118.78400000 |  |  |  | -118.70000000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  | 64 |  | 67 | 28 | 37 | 27 | 63 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |  |  |  | 75008 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | $\gamma$ | C | $C$ | $R$ |  |  |  | $R$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 2009 | 2009 | 1959 |  |  |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2016 | $2016$ | $2016$ | 2007 | 2007 | 2007 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Retail C | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Old Orea | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Old Orea |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0083 | 0084 | 0084 | 0084 | 0084 | 0084 | 0084 | 0084 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 70 | 80 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 1.6 | 0.5 |  |  | 3.0 | 2.3 | 6.3 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  |  | 0952500621304 | 09525A006 21306 |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridae Condition |  |  |  |  | - 93 |  |  |  |
| 20-Bridae Lenath 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 202 059 | 230 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 99 | 100 | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 | 48 | 48 |  |  | 48 | 48 | 60 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 | 6 | 6 |  |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 305 | 305 |  |  | 305 | 305 | 305 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  | 14 | 14 |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 10900 | 10900 |  |  | 12400 | 10000 | 10000 |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2004 | 2004 |  |  | 2004 | 2004 | 2004 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 40 | 40 |  |  | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 0006 | 184 |  |  | 3 | 0006 | 0006 |
| Roadway Width | 24 | 76 | 76 |  |  | 76 | 76 | 88 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 16187 | 16187 |  |  | 18414 | 14850 | 14850 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | P | P |  |  | P | P | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 5 | 5 |  |  | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.64600000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.64400000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.68500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  | $0^{14}$ | 07 | 27 | 27 | $0^{27}$ | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A |  |  | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 2001 | 2001 |  |  | 2001 | 2001 | 1989 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

4-IRR Route Number
5-Section Number
10-Class
15-Length of Section 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridqe Condition 20-Bridge Lenath
32-County
33-Congressional District 7-State
8-Ownership
12-Construction Need 11-Terrain
25-Roadbed Condition 24-Surface Condition Index 16-Surface Width
13-Surface Type
9-Federal Aid Category 28-Right of Way Status 29-Right of Way Width TTAM BIA Share
30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type 22-Existing ADT
21-ADT Year
23-Percent Trucks
34-Owner Route Number
Roadway Width
TTAM Future ADT
TTAM ADS Number TTAM Future Surface Type 35-Drainaqe Condition 36-Shoulder Condition 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE 39-Right of Way Utility 40-Right of Way Cost 26-Level of Maintenance 27-Snow \& Ice Control 41-Begin Latitude 42-End Latitude 43-Begin Longitude 44-End Longitude 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory
52-Year of Construction Chanae Update Year

Status

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory



| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Bell Roa | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Wildhors | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Mclean R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mclean R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mclean R | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Wildhors | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Wildhors | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Wildhors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0666 | 0675 | 0675 | 0675 | 0675 | 0685 | 0685 | 0685 |
| 5 -Section Number | 20 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 10 | 20 | 30 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 3.8 | 1.1 |  | 1.9 | 1.3 | 0.8 |  | 0.5 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  | 59C408067500465 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridqe Lenath |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 39 \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 26 \end{array}$ |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 2 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 0 | 80 |  | 80 | 80 | 60 |  | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 8 | 22 |  | 22 | 22 | 20 |  | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type | 1 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 60 |  | 60 | 40 | 60 |  | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 66 |  | 80 | 191 | 171 |  | 106 |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2005 |  | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |  | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 15 |  | 13 | 15 | 20 |  | 20 |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 0666 | 675 |  | 675 | 675 | 685 |  | 685 |
| Roadway Width | 8 | 24 |  | 26 | 26 | 24 |  | 24 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 98 |  | 119 | 284 | 254 |  | 157 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 14 | 11 |  | 12 | 11 | 10 |  | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G |  | G | P | P |  | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 |  | 0 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 2 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 1 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.73500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.74500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.39500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.32500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | - 25 | 25 | 25 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | - | 3 |  | 4 | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| 51-Road Category | A | A |  | A | A | A |  | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2005 | 2006 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Status | ZETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Wildhors <br> 0685 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Eagle Cr 0685 | $\begin{gathered} \text { P07143 } \\ \text { Northwes } \\ \text { Umatilla } \\ \text { Umatilla } \\ \text { Eagle Cr } \\ 0685 \end{gathered}$ | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Rainvill 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatilla Rainvill 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Rainvill 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> M.Johns <br> 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> M.Johns <br> 0692 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | - 40 | - 50 | - 60 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 2.1 | 1.6 | 2.7 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.1 |  |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1810200059 \mathrm{C} 403$ |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |  |
| 16-Surface Width | 20 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 |  |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width <br> 14-Shoulder Type | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 685 | 685 | 685 | 692 | 692 | 692 | 692 |  |
| Roadway Width | 24 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 |  |
| TTAM Future ADT | 149 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |  |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 |  |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |  |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |  |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 22 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 3 | 0 | 4 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | A | A | $T$ | $A$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2005 | $2005$ |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region <br> Agency <br> Reservation <br> Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> M. Johns <br> 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille M. Johns | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatille Wamishta | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Wamishta | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Wamishta | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Wamishta <br> 0732 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Wamishta <br> 0732 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil 0735 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0692 | 0692 | 0732 | 0732 | 0732 | 0732 | 0732 | 0735 |
| 5-Section Number | 60 | 70 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.2 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 60 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 15 | 15 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 10 | 12 | 14 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 40 | 0 | 50 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 692 | 692 | 732 | 732 | 732 | 732 | 732 | 735 |
| Roadway Width | 15 | 15 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 10 | 12 | 14 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  | 45.74600000 |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  | 45.74600000 |  |  |
| 43-Beqin Longitude |  |  |  |  |  | -118.47800000 |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  | -118.45200000 |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 4 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 75009 | 9 | 0 |
| 51-Road Category | A | $T$ | A | A | A | $T$ | $T$ | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2016 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | IN-PROCESS | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| $\left.\begin{array}{r}\text { Location ID } \\ \text { Region } \\ \text { Agency }\end{array}\right\}$Reservation <br> Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil <br> 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Ross Hil 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Curl Roa 0736 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Curl Roa 0736 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille Curl Roa 0736 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 20 | 30 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 60 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 12 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 10 | 16 | 16 | 22 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Riaht of Wav Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 50 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 735 | 735 | 735 | 735 | 735 | 736 | 736 | 736 |
| Roadway Width | 12 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 10 | 16 | 16 | 22 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 13 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 25 | 22 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | $T$ | $T$ | $T$ | $T$ | $T$ | A | $T$ | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year Status | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Spring H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0745 |
| 5 -Section Number | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.0 | 2.2 |  | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  | 1958473700082 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridae Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 60 | 80 |  | 80 | 80 | 60 | 0 | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 22 | 24 |  | 24 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 24 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 |  | 60 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 22-Existing ADT | 178 | 138 |  | 100 |  |  |  | 82 |
| 21-ADT Year | 2004 | 2005 |  | 2004 |  |  |  | 2004 |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 20 | 19 |  | 12 |  |  |  | 35 |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 737 | 737 |  | 737 | 737 | 737 | 737 | 745 |
| Roadway Width | 26 | 28 |  | 28 | 24 | 20 | 10 | 28 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 264 | 205 |  | 149 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 122 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 |  | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | P | G |  | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 21 | 21 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 4 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51-Road Category | A | A |  | A | A | A | $T$ | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


4-IRR Route Number 5-Section Number 10-Class
15-Length of Section 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridae Condition 20-Bridge Lenath 32-County
33-Congressional District 7-State
8-Ownership
12-Construction Need 11-Terrain
25-Roadbed Condition 24-Surface Condition Index 16-Surface Width
13-Surface Type
9-Federal Aid Category 28-Right of Way Status 29-Right of Way Width TTAM BIA Share
30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type 22-Existing ADT
21-ADT Year
23-Percent Trucks 34-Owner Route Number Roadway Width
TTAM Future ADT TTAM ADS Number TTAM Future Surface Type 35-Drainage Condition 36-Shoulder Condition 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE 39-Right of Way Utility 40-Right of Way Cost 26-Level of Maintenance 27-Snow \& Ice Control 41-Begin Latitude 42-End Latitude 43-Beain Lonaitude 44-End Longitude 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region <br> Agency <br> Reservation <br> Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatilla Thorn Ho 0745 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Thorn Ho | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Thorn Ho 0745 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Homly Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Homly Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Homly Ro 0747 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Homly Ro <br> 0747 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Crawford 0751 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0745 | 0745 | 0745 | 0747 | 0747 | 0747 | 0747 | 0751 |
| 5-Section Number | 100 | 110 | 120 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 |  | 0.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.7 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  | $59 \mathrm{C738}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 |  | 80 | 60 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 22 |  | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 22 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 |  | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 |  | 60 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 2 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 2 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22-Existing ADT | 135 |  | 137 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2005 |  | 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 13 |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 745 |  | 745 | 747 | 747 | 747 | 747 | 0751 |
| Roadway Width | 26 |  | 24 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 22 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 200 |  | 203 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 10 |  | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G |  | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 3 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  | 25 | 325 | $0^{24}$ | 024 | 024 | 724 | $3^{24}$ |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory | 0 A |  | 3 A | 0 | 0 T | $\bigcirc$ A | 1 A |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Johnley 0751 | $\begin{gathered} \text { P07143 } \\ \text { Northwes } \\ \text { Umatilla } \\ \text { Umatilla } \\ \text { Johnley } \\ 0751 \end{gathered}$ | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatilla Lafave R 0784 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Lafave R 0784 | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatille Tubbs Ra 0788 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Tubbs Ra 0788 | P07143 Northwes Umatille Umatille Tubbs Ra 0788 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Tubbs Ra 0788 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | 20 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 2.2 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 40 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 80 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 22 | 22 | 7 | 12 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Riaht of Wav Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 50 | 50 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  | 162 |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  | 21 | 34 |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 0751 | 0751 | 784 | 784 | 788 | 788 | 788 | 788 |
| Roadway Width | 22 | 22 | 7 | 12 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 20 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 241 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 724 | 024 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 024 | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | $T$ | $T$ | A | A | A | $T$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory
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## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Bingham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mission | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Bingham | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Bingham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Bingham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Bingham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Bingham |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 |
| 5-Section Number | 120 | 120 | 130 | 130 | 140 | 140 | 150 | 150 |
| 10-Class | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15-Length of Section |  |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |  | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| 18-Bridge Number | P72500000000000 | P725 |  |  | P72600000000000 | P726 |  |  |
| 19-Bridae Condition | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 20-Bridge Length | 370 | 60 |  |  | 160 | 60 |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  |  | 52 | 80 |  |  | 52 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width |  |  | 22 | 22 |  |  | 21 | 21 |
| 13-Surface Type |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width |  |  | 60 | 60 |  | 0 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 10.27 | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 2 | 3 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  | 261 | 261 |  |  | 203 | 203 |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  | 29 | 29 |  |  | 30 | 30 |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  | 900 | 900 |  |  | 900 | 900 |
| Roadway Width |  |  | 24 | 24 |  |  | 23 | 23 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  |  | 388 | 388 |  |  | 301 | 301 |
| TTAM ADS Number |  |  | 9 | 9 |  | 7 | 9 | 9 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  |  | P | P |  |  | P | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.69800000 |  | 45.69800000 |  | 45.70200000 |  | 45.70300000 |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.69800000 |  | 45.70200000 |  | 45.70300000 |  | 45.71200000 |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.39400000 |  | -118.39400000 |  | -118.35600000 |  | -118.35500000 |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.39400000 |  | -118.35600000 |  | -118.35500000 |  | -118.34300000 |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |  |  | - 25 | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe |  |  | 75000 |  |  |  | 75000 |  |
| 51-Road Category |  |  | A | A |  |  | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  |  | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2006 | 2016 | 2006 | 2016 | 2002 | 2016 | 2006 |
| Status | ZETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIALR | ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL |



## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Jackson | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Marlowe | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Mytinger | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mckay La | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Short Mi | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Short Mi | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Meacham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0902 | 0903 | 0904 | 0904 | 0908 | 0908 | 0911 | 0911 |
| 5 -Section Number | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | P75000000000000 |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 147 |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 0 | 40 | 100 | 100 | 60 | 60 | 40 |  |
| 16-Surface Width | 8 | 16 | 24 | 24 | 33 | 33 | 16 |  |
| 13-Surface Type | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |  |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 28-Riaht of Wav Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 0 |  |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width <br> 14-Shoulder Type | 0 | 0 | 3 3 | 3 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  | 655 | 655 |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  | 13 | 13 |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 902 | 903 | 904 | 904 | 908 | 908 | 911 |  |
| Roadway Width | 8 | 16 | 30 | 30 | 37 | 37 | 16 |  |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 973 | 973 | 74 |  |
| TTAM ADS Number | 15 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 |  |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | P | P | G |  |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.70200000 | 45.68900000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.68900000 | 45.68900000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  | -118.35600000 | -118.35800000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  | -118.35800000 | -118.35800000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 27 | $4^{64}$ | 063 | $0^{63}$ | $3^{64}$ | $64$ | $25$ | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory | $T$ | 4 A | 0 A | 0 A | 3 A | $3$ | A |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  | 1959 | 2005 | 2005 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |
| Update Year | 2006 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIALC | -AT-REG | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham <br> 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham <br> 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham <br> 0911 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 |
| 5 -Section Number | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.4 |  | 2.7 |  | 0.2 | 0.7 |  | 4.7 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  | P75100000000000 |  | P75200000000000 |  |  | P75300000000000 |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  | 7 |  | 7 |  |  | 7 |  |
| 20-Bridge Length |  | 67 |  | 45 |  |  | 33 |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 40 |  | 40 |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 |
| 16-Surface Width | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 |  | 74 |  | 74 | 74 |  | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G |  | G |  | G | G |  | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.68900000 | 45.68400000 | 45.68400000 | 45.64700000 | 45.64700000 | 45.64500000 | 45.63600000 | 45.63600000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.68400000 | 45.68400000 | 45.64700000 | 45.64700000 | 45.64500000 | 45.63600000 | 45.63500000 | 45.57400000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.35800000 | -118.36400000 | -118.36400000 | -118.35900000 | -118.35900000 | -118.35800000 | -118.35500000 | -118.35500000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.36400000 | -118.36400000 | -118.35900000 | -118.35900000 | -118.35800000 | -118.35500000 | -118.35500000 | -118.32500000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | - 25 | 28 | - 28 | 28 | $28$ | $28$ | 28 | $28$ |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory | $A$ |  | A |  | $A$ | A |  | $A$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 |
| 5-Section Number | 110 | 120 | 130 | 140 | 150 | 160 | 170 | 180 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section |  | 0.6 |  | 1.6 |  | 1.8 |  | 1.3 |
| 18-Bridge Number | P75400000000000 |  | P75500000000000 |  | P75600000000000 |  | P75700000000000 |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition | 7 |  | 7 |  | 7 |  | 7 |  |
| 20-Bridge Lenath | 161 |  | 66 |  | 36 |  | 163 |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  | 40 |  | 40 |  | 40 |  | 20 |
| 16-Surface Width |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |
| 13-Surface Type |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  | 74 |  | 74 |  | 74 |  | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  | G |  | G |  | G |  | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.57400000 | 45.57400000 | 45.56800000 | 45.56700000 | 45.54600000 | 45.54600000 | 45.52500000 | 45.52500000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.57400000 | 45.56800000 | 45.56700000 | 45.54600000 | 45.54600000 | 45.52500000 | 45.52500000 | 45.50900000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude | -118.32500000 | -118.32500000 | -118.31900000 | -118.31900000 | -118.31000000 | -118.31000000 | -118.29000000 | -118.29000000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.32500000 | -118.31900000 | -118.31900000 | -118.31000000 | -118.31000000 | -118.29000000 | -118.29000000 | -118.28000000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 33 | - 33 | 33 | - 33 | 33 | - 33 | 33 | 33 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe |  | - |  | $-\square$ |  |  |  | $\square$ |
| 51-Road Category |  | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  | 1959 |  | 1959 |  | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year Status | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ |



## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)
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## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> North Ca | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> River Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> River Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> River Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Wilson R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pond Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Pond Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Pond Roa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0925 | 0927 | 0927 | 0927 | 0927 | 0929 | 0929 | 0929 |
| 5-Section Number | 90 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 40 | 67 | 67 | 40 | 48 | 40 | 0 |
| 16-Surface Width | 30 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 15 | 8 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 60 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 925 | 927 | 927 |  | 927 | 929 | 929 | 929 |
| Roadway Width | 30 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 15 | 8 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  | 45.66000000 | 45.67600000 |  | 45.63100000 | 45.62800000 | 45.62400000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  | 45.67200000 | 45.67500000 |  | 45.62800000 | 45.62400000 | 45.61700000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  | -118.60500000 | -118.57900000 |  | -118.72600000 | -118.72600000 | -118.72600000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  | -118.60000000 | -118.55600000 |  | -118.72600000 | -118.72600000 | -118.72600000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 27 | 27 | 27 |  | 27 | $00^{27}$ | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 4 | 3 | 75008 | 75000 | 0 | 75000 | 75000 | 75009 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | $T$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |
| Update Year Status | $\begin{array}{r} 2005 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2005 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { IN-PROCESS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { IN-PROCESS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2005 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ |
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## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)
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## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Thompson | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Patawa R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Kash Kas | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatill Umatilla Kash Kas | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Kash Kas | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Kash Kas | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Hobby Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Hobby Ro |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0932 | 0933 | 0934 | 0934 | 0934 | 0934 | 0934 | 0934 |
| 5 -Section Number | 40 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 3.1 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 40 | 60 |  |  | 80 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 16 | 18 |  |  | 24 | 16 | 20 | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 244 |  |  | 127 | 121 |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2005 |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 19 |  |  | 12 | 12 |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 933 |  |  | 934 | 934 | 934 | 934 |
| Roadway Width | 16 | 22 |  |  | 24 | 16 | 20 | 20 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 362 | 74 | 74 | 189 | 180 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 10 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 14 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | P | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Lonaitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | $27$ | $0^{27}$ | 27 | 27 | $3^{27}$ | $3^{27}$ | $0^{27}$ | $0^{27}$ |
| 51-Road Cateqory | L | A |  |  | , A | - $A$ | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2007 | 2007 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Lloyd Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Lloyd Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Emigrant | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Emigrant | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Emigrant | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Theater | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Best Roa |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0936 | 0936 | 0937 | 0937 | 0937 | 0937 | 0939 | 0950 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 6.5 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridge Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 80 | 60 | 60 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 18 | 22 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 18 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 80 | 80 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 408 | 177 | 218 | 135 | 68 |  | 198 |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |  | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 13 | 14 | 30 | 48 | 12 |  | 16 |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 936 | 936 | 937 | 937 | 937 | 937 | 939 | 950 |
| Roadway Width | 18 | 24 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 22 | 30 | 18 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 606 | 263 | 324 | 200 | 101 | 74 | 294 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | P | P | P | G | G | G | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 127 | 027 | $0^{27}$ | $0^{32}$ | $3^{33}$ | $3^{32}$ | $3^{27}$ | 127 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | A | A | $A$ | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

4-IRR Route Number 5-Section Number
10-Class
15-Length of Section
18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length 32-County
33-Congressional District 7-State
8-Ownership
12-Construction Need
11-Terrain
25-Roadbed Condition 24-Surface Condition Index 16-Surface Width
13-Surface Type
9-Federal Aid Category 28-Right of Way Status 29-Right of Way Width TTAM BIA Share
30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type 22-Existing ADT
21-ADT Year
23-Percent Trucks
34-Owner Route Number
Roadway Width
TTAM Future ADT
TTAM ADS Number TTAM Future Surface Type 35-Drainage Condition 36-Shoulder Condition 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE 39-Right of Way Utility 40-Right of Way Cost 26-Level of Maintenance 27-Snow \& Ice Control 41-Begin Latitude 42-End Latitude 43-Beain Lonaitude 44-End Lonaitude
45-Atlas Map Number 1991 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory
52-Year of Construction Change Update Year


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Baldwin | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Baldwin | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Poverty <br> 1021 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Poverty <br> 1021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 | 1019 | 1019 | 1021 | 1021 |
| 5-Section Number | 100 | 110 | 120 | 130 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.5 |  | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |  |
| 18-Bridge Number |  | 59C330 |  |  |  |  |  | 09648 006F22471 |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 20-Bridge Length |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  | 172 |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 |  | 80 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 60 |  |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 |  | 24 | 24 | 10 | 10 | 20 |  |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 |  | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 |  | 60 | 60 | 60 | 30 | 60 |  |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 10.27 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width <br> 14-Shoulder Type | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT | 61 |  |  | 58 |  |  | 94 |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2004 |  |  | 2004 |  |  | 2005 |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 29 |  |  | 23 |  |  | 20 |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 987 |  | 987 | 987 | 1019 | 1019 | 1021 |  |
| Roadway Width | 24 |  | 24 | 24 | 10 | 10 | 24 |  |
| TTAM Future ADT | 91 |  | 74 | 86 | 74 | 74 | 140 |  |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 |  | 11 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 11 |  |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G |  | G | G | G | G | G |  |
| $35-$ Drainage Condition | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 |  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  | 45.55500000 | 45.55500000 |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  | 45.55500000 | 45.55500000 |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  | -118.60000000 | -118.60000000 |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  | -118.59900000 | -118.59900000 |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | $32$ | 32 | $032$ |  |  |  | $32$ | 32 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Category | 0 A |  | 0 A | 6 A | - 9 A | - 9 A | $3$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 |  | A | 1959 |  |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2016 | 2007 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | URNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Poverty | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Poverty | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Poverty | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Poverty | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> East Pov | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> East Pov | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Palmer R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> South Ma |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1022 | 1022 | 1023 | 1025 |
| 5-Section Number | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 2.4 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 60 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 21 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 10.27 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 84 | 84 |  |  |  |  | 1259 |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |  |  | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 14 | 16 |  |  |  |  | 18 |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1022 | 1022 | 1023 | 1025 |
| Roadway Width | 25 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 28 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 125 | 125 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 1870 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.57900000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.57800000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.58900000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.58900000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | A | A | B | $B$ | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Conner R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Tias Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Fisher R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Fisher R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Fisher R | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla South Ma | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> South Ma | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Red Hawk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 1026 | 1026 | 1026 | 1026 | 1026 | 1027 | 1027 | 1027 |
| 5 -Section Number | 10 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 20 | 30 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.0 | 1.1 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 60 | 0 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 60 | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 18 | 24 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 24 | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 50 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT | 100 |  |  |  |  | 248 | 125 |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2005 |  |  |  |  | 2004 | 2004 |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 17 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 25 |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 1026 | 1026 | 1026 | 1026 | 1026 | 1027 | 1027 | 1027 |
| Roadway Width | 18 | 24 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 28 | 24 | 20 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 149 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 368 | 186 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 10 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | P | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Lonaitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | $\begin{array}{r} 32 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $0^{32}$ | $9^{32}$ | 32 | 32 | $0^{32}$ | 32 | 32 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | - $A$ | $T$ | $T$ | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Cabbage | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatille Cabbage | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Cabbage | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Cabbage | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Motanic | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Motanic | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Holmes R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Holmes R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 1028 | 1028 | 1028 | 1028 | 1031 | 1031 | 1032 | 1032 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 2.0 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District7-State | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
|  | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 75 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 15 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 18 | 20 | 24 | 18 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  | 104 | 137 |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  | 13 | 21 |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 1028 | 1028 | 1028 | 1028 | 1031 | 1031 | 1032 | 1032 |
| Roadway Width | 15 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 18 | 20 | 24 | 18 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 154 | 203 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility 3 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.56900000 |  |  | 56600000 |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.56600000 |  |  | 56600000 |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.59000000 |  |  | 57500000 |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.57500000 |  |  | 57000000 |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 27 | 32 | 31 | 32 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 7 | 9 | 0 |  | 1 | 7 | 7 |
| 51-Road Category | A | A | $B$ | $B$ | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year Status | 2016 | 2005 | 2005 | 2016 | 2005 | 2005 | 2007 | 2007 |
|  | 3ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | D-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mckay Cr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 1050 | 1050 | 1050 | 1052 | 1052 | 1052 | 1052 | 1052 |
| 5-Section Number | 90 | 100 | 110 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section |  | 0.5 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 2.9 |  | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length | 59C034105001067 ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 59 \mathrm{C} 025105200345 \\ 9 \\ 65 \end{array}$ |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  | 80 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |  | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width |  | 20 | 16 | 20 | 20 | 20 |  | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width |  | 60 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 50 |  | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  | 75 | 69 | 58 |  | 65 |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |  | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  | 22 | 25 | 28 |  | 22 |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 1050 | 1050 | 1052 | 1052 | 1052 |  | 1052 |
| Roadway Width |  | 20 | 16 | 20 | 20 | 20 |  | 20 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  | 74 | 74 | 111 | 102 | 86 |  | 97 |
| TTAM ADS Number |  | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |  | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  | G | G | G | G | G |  | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Lonaitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 37 | 37 | 37 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe |  |  | 7 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |
| 51-Road Cateqory |  | A | A | A | A | A |  | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


4-IRR Route Number 5-Section Number
10-Class
15-Length of Section 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridae Condition 20-Bridge Length 32-County
33-Congressional District 7-State
8-Ownership
12-Construction Need
11-Terrain
25-Roadbed Condition 24-Surface Condition Index 16-Surface Width
13-Surface Type
9-Federal Aid Category 28-Right of Way Status 29-Right of Way Width TTAM BIA Share
30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type 22-Existing ADT
21-ADT Year
23-Percent Trucks
34-Owner Route Number
Roadway Width
TTAM Future ADT
TTAM ADS Number TTAM Future Surface Type 35-Drainage Condition 36-Shoulder Condition 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE 39-Right of Way Utility 40-Right of Way Cost 26-Level of Maintenance 27-Snow \& Ice Control 41-Begin Latitude 42-End Latitude 43-Begin Lonaitude 44-End Lonaitude
45-Atlas Map Number 1991
46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Category
52-Year of Construction Change Update Year



## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Usfs 303 | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Usfs 310 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Redford | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Redford | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Indian G | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Purchase | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Purchase | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Kusi Roa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 3030 | 3100 | 3142 | 3142 | 3147 | 3172 | 3172 | 3177 |
| 5-Section Number | 50 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 6.7 | 38.8 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County33-Congressional District |  |  | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
|  |  |  | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership |  | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  | 70 | 72 | 60 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 96 |
| 16-Surface Width 1 |  | 24 | 24 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 24 |
| 13-Surface Type |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status <br> 29-Right of Way Width |  |  | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  | 3142 | 3142 | 3147 | 3172 | 3172 | 3177 |
| Roadway Width | 15 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 26 |
| TTAM Future ADTTTAM ADS Number |  |  | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
|  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13 |
| TTAM ADS Number <br> TTAM Future Surface Type |  |  | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  | 45.76100000 |  | 45.74600000 | 45.67000000 |  | 45.64600000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  | 45.75800000 |  | 45.73700000 | 45.66000000 |  | 45.64600000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  | -118.49800000 |  | -118.38100000 | -118.71000000 |  | -118.68400000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  | -118.52200000 |  | -118.35200000 | -118.70800000 |  | -118.68200000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  |  | - 24 | 24 | 25 | 63 | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | - | - | 75000 | 7 | 75000 | 75000 |  | 7500 |
| 51-Road Cateqory |  |  | A | A | $B$ | $T$ | $T$ | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  |  | 2011 | 1959 |  | 1959 |  | 2008 |
| Update Year Status | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { IN-PROCESS } \end{array}$ | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2006 | 2016 |
|  |  | IN-PROCES | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Kusi Roa 3177 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Price La <br> 3180 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Shippent <br> 3182 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Johnley <br> 3270 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Johnley <br> 3270 | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Johnley 3270 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Usfs 542 <br> 5427 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Usfs 542 <br> 5427 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 1.4 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 86 | 68 | 68 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 40 |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 | 15 | 14 | 24 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 0 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 3180 | 3182 | 3270 | 3270 | 3270 | 5427 | 5427 |
| Roadway Width | 26 | 15 | 14 | 24 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.64600000 | 45.66500000 | 45.67700000 | 45.71700000 | 45.73200000 | 45.74600000 |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.64600000 | 45.65800000 | 45.67700000 | 45.73200000 | 45.74600000 | 45.74600000 |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68400000 | -118.55800000 | -118.55600000 | -118.53900000 | -118.53900000 | -118.53900000 |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.68600000 | -118.54900000 | -118.56100000 | -118.53900000 | -118.53900000 | -118.53900000 |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 27 | 27 | 27 |  | 24 | 24 | 42 | 42 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |  |  |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | $T$ | $T$ | $T$ | $B$ | $B$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 2008 | 1959 | 1999 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | -TO-FIER | D-TO-FIE |



## Indian Reservation Roads Program <br> Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ti'Mine |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 7001 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 |
| 10-Class | 8 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.8 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  |
| 20-Bridge Length |  |
| 32-County | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 |
| 7-State | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  |
| 16-Surface Width | 8 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |
| Roadway Width | 8 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 30 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 19 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.66400000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.66800000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68400000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.69300000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | $E$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 2010 |
| Update Year | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL |
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## INTRODUCTION

This memorandum updates Technical Memorandum \#4: Preliminary Concept Design, incorporating feedback from Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members and the general public. It summarizes and evaluates projects that address identified deficiencies and needs within the Umatilla Indian Reservation (UIR). The information provided in this memorandum will serve as the foundation for projects for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) update. By developing projects that promote connectivity, safety, and comfort for all people using the transportation system, CTUIR can support equitable access, active transportation, increased connectivity, and reduced environmental and climate impacts.

In addition to transportation projects, this memorandum also includes revised roadway cross-section standards and detailed concept design graphics for two areas within the UIR.

# PROJECT GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND EVALUATION CRITERIA 

Project goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria were developed early in the planning process to guide the development of the TSP update. They reflect the vision of celebrating community history and emphasize the desire to increase options for people walking and biking. The project goals and objectives were used to develop projects, while the evaluation criteria were used to complete a preliminary prioritization.

The goals of the TSP update are documented in Technical Memorandum \#3: Vision Statement and Guiding Principles and summarized below.

- Goal 1: Safety - Provide a safe multimodal transportation system for all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.
- Goal 2: Environment and Cultural Heritage - Preserve existing cultural connections and the rural landscape.
- Goal 3: Health - Develop a transportation system that supports active transportation and encourages healthy and active choices for the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.
- Goal 4: Equity and Accessibility - Provide a multimodal transportation system that is accessible to all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community.
- Goal 5: Connectivity - Provide a multimodal transportation system that increases connections to the key hubs within the reservation and works to overcome existing barriers to regional connectivity.
- Goal 6: Coordination - Develop a transportation system that works together with Federal, State, regional, and local partners.
- Goal 7: Financial Stability - Develop attainable funding solutions for transportation system improvements. The projects were evaluated based on the project evaluation criteria to identify preliminary priorities. The projects were identified as high, medium, and low priority based on how well they meet the evaluation criteria and by extension, the goals of the TSP update. Attachment A includes the evaluation criteria and indicates how the evaluation criteria were used to evaluate and prioritize the projects.


## PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

Through review of previous planning efforts and CTUIR staff input, this memorandum identifies policies to be considered for the transportation system in within the UIR:

- Institute policies that encourage right-sizing, and adopting appropriate technology for, fleet vehicles and equipment, and encourage the adoption of alternative fuel vehicles through policy, infrastructure, etc.
- Adopt the cross-sectional standards provided in this memorandum into necessary code and guidelines.


## ROADWAY SYSTEM

Streets serve most trips within the UIR across all travel modes. This section identifies alternatives to address gaps and deficiencies in the street system as well as alternatives that will facilitate improvements to the pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit systems.

The projects developed for the roadway system include realignments, repaving and updates to existing roadways, traffic calming, intersection reconfiguration, and more. Table 1 describes the projects for the roadway system. The priority levels shown in Table 1 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the project team. Prioritization has been updated based on input from the advisory committees and the community. Figure 1 illustrates the location of the projects. Attachment B includes assumptions used to develop the planning-level cost estimates shown in Table 1. Attachment C includes summary sheets for each of the high priority projects.

Table 1: Roadway System Projects

| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R01 | Kash Kash Road | Kusi Road to east of OR 331 | Close existing access to OR 331 and reroute Kash Kash Road north to a new intersection with Kusi Road. | County | Medium | \$1,900,000 |
| R02 | Spilya Road | Eastern end of roadway to Kash Kash Road realignment | Extend Spilya Road east to Kash Kash Road realignment. | CTUIR | Low | \$385,000 |
| R03 | Emigrant <br> Road | Cayuse <br> Road to Poverty Flat Road | Widen, add shoulders, and repave Emigrant Road (County Road \#937) from Cayuse Road to Poverty Flat Road. | County | Medium | \$21,800,000 |
| R04 | 56th Street- <br> Theater Road | Mission <br> Road to US <br> 30 | Widen, add shoulders, and pave/repave 56th StreetTheater Road to help support rerouting of trucks and other regional/state traffic during I-84 closures. | County/BIA | Low | \$3,900,000 |
| R05 | North Cayuse Road | River Road <br> to Mann <br> Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave North Cayuse Road (County Road \#925) from River Road north to Mann Road. | County | Low | \$2,400,000 |
| R06 | Mann Road | Crawford <br> Hollow Road <br> to North <br> Cayuse <br> Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave Mann Road (County Road \#925) from Crawford Hollow Road south to North Cayuse Road. | County | Medium | \$7,000,000 |
| R07 | Motanic Road | Best Road to Spring Creek Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave Motanic Road (County Road \#1031) from Best Road south to Spring Creek Road. | County | Medium | \$10,000,000 |
| R08 | Sumac Road | Spring Creek Road to McKay Creek Road | Widen, add shoulders, and pave Sumac Road (County Road \#1050) from Spring Creek Road south to McKay Creek Road. | County | Low | \$6,000,000 |
| R09 | McKay Creek Road | Sumac Road to North Fork McKay Creek Road | Widen, add shoulders, and add gravel along McKay Creek Road (County Road \#1050) from Sumac Road east to North Fork McKay Creek Road. | County | Medium | \$4,700,000 |
| R10 | Exit 2016 <br> Truck <br> Overflow <br> Parking | South of I-84 <br> Exit 216 | Parking lot for overflow truck parking from I-84 winter closures. Could include a shuttle service from parking lot to Arrowhead during events. | ODOT | High | \$3,200,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ <br> Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R11 | OR 331 <br> Speed Study | UIR northern boundary to I-84 | Perform a speed study along the OR 331 corridor and determine whether to modify any speed zones. | ODOT | High | \$20,000 |
| R12 | Mission Road Traffic Calming | From <br> Mustanger <br> Lane to Parr <br> Lane | Install speed feedback signage and other traffic calming measures. | CTUIR/ County | High | \$30,000 |
| R13 | County Road \#900 <br> (Cayuse <br> Road and <br> Bingham <br> Road) | Emigrant <br> Road to UIR <br> eastern <br> boundary | Perform a speed study at key intersections on the County Road \#900 corridor to determine potential traffic calming or intersection safety treatments. | County | Medium | \$20,000 |
| R14 | Kirkpatrick Road, vertical curve east of McKinley Lane | Intersection extents | Evaluate sight distance and install advisory signage if warranted. | County | Low | \$25,000 |
| R15 | Cayuse <br> Road/ <br> Cayuse River <br> Road <br> intersection | Intersection extents | Reconstruct northern leg to connect at a more perpendicular angle. | County | Low | \$1,200,000 |
| R16 | River <br> Road/White <br> Road <br> intersection | Intersection extents | Reconstruct southern leg to connect at a more perpendicular angle. | County | Low | \$1,200,000 |
| R17 | Confederated Way | B Street to Mission Road (east intersection) | Construct flood remediation projects on Confederated Way from B Street to Mission Road (east intersection). Mitigations may include building a levy, raising the roadway, creating water retention areas, and rerouting the roadway. | BIA | High | To be determined by ongoing study |
| R18 | OR 331/ <br> Mission Road | Intersection extents | Construct a single lane roundabout. Realign the northbound and southbound approaches to avoid impacts to the Mission Market. ${ }^{1}$ <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. Construct separate left-turn lanes on all four intersection approaches. Construct a separate right turn lane on the northbound approach. ${ }^{1}$ | ODOT/ <br> County/ CTUIR | Deve | nent-Driven |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R19 | Mission <br> Road/Timíne Way | Intersection extents | Construct a single lane roundabout. <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ODOT/ } \\ & \text { CTUIR } \end{aligned}$ | Development-Driven |  |
| R20 | OR 331/ <br> Wildhorse <br> Boulevard | Intersection extents | Construct a single lane roundabout. <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. | ODOT/ CTUIR | Development-Driven |  |
| R21 | OR 331/ <br> Spilya Road | Intersection extents | Construct a single lane roundabout. Modify access to right-in, right-out only at Kusi Road and Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway. ${ }^{1}$ <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. Modify access to right-in, right-out only at Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway. ${ }^{1}$ | ODOT/ CTUIR | Development-Driven |  |
| R22 | OR 331/I-84 <br> Eastbound <br> Ramps | Intersection extents | Construct a single lane roundabout. ${ }^{2}$ <br> OR <br> Install a traffic signal when warranted. Construct exclusive left- and right-turn lanes on the off-ramp approach. ${ }^{2}$ | ODOT | Deve | Driven |
| R23 | OR 331/I-84 <br> Westbound Ramps | Intersection extents | Install a traffic signal when warranted. Construct exclusive left- and right-turn lanes on the off-ramp approach and an exclusive right-turn lane on the north approach. ${ }^{2}$ | ODOT | Development-Driven |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total High Priority Cost |  | \$3,250,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Medium Priority Cost |  | \$45,420,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Low | iority Cos | \$15,110,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total Cos | \$63,780,000 |

[^9]

## Development Driven Capacity and Intersection Projects on OR 331

Although the operations analysis presented in Technical Memorandum \#2: Context and Site Analysis did not highlight intersection capacity deficiencies based on generalized growth projections, previous planning efforts have identified potential intersection and roadway projects that may be needed to accommodate localized development or expansions of existing businesses and destinations.

These growth opportunities, such as expansion of the Coyote Business Park, further expansion of the Wildhorse Resort and Casino, and expansion of Arrowhead Travel Plaza, are not imminent, but could have local and regional impacts to the transportation system. If and when projects like this were to occur, the potential impacts and mitigation measures would have to be determined based on detailed traffic studies for the specific development scenario. Intersection solutions that have been identified through previous planning studies and preliminary traffic impact studies are included in Table 1. The identified solutions have historically included constructing roundabouts or installing traffic signals. Cost and benefit considerations for these two intersection control types are discussed below:

- Construct a roundabout
$\square$ Cost considerations: Potentially higher construction cost and lower long-term maintenance cost.
$\square$ Benefit considerations: Improved safety, including reducing the potential for fatal and serious injury crashes and lowering speeds near the intersection. Adds capacity and reduces delay.
- Install a traffic signal
$\square$ Cost considerations: Potentially lower construction cost (depending on turn lane impacts) and higher long-term maintenance cost.
$\square$ Benefit considerations: Adds capacity and reduces delay. May also reduce crash potential, but not to the same extent as a roundabout.
Due to the potential for development-related growth to influence traffic conditions along OR 331 from Mission Road to the I-84 interchange, it is recommended that CTUIR and ODOT require traffic impact studies for all new development projects requiring access along the corridor and that are expected to generate more than 500 daily trips.


## Roadway Programs and Plans

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential roadway-related policy and programmatic direction to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff. Through the TSP update process, the following items were identified for incorporation into CTUIR programs and plans:

- Maintenance program for intersections in the northern UIR where crops limit sight distance during certain times of the year
$\square$ Work with property owners adjacent to roads with limited sight distance to establish formal sight triangle boundaries. One example is Duff Road at Mann Road.
$\square \quad$ Where sight triangles cannot be established, add warning signage.
- Maintenance programs for striping
$\square$ Complete annual striping projects to update worn striping and to add/restripe fog lines on collectors and arterials.
- Coordinate with the County and ODOT on how to address truck parking and routing when I-84 is closed.
- Coordinate with ODOT and Umatilla County on regional connecting roadways.
- Create walkable neighborhoods. Monitor the need for traffic calming measures in neighborhoods and near pedestrian and bicycle activity centers, such as the school, Mission Senior Center, July Grounds residential area, and Nixyáawii Governance Center. Potential mitigations include raised crosswalks, "Children at Play" signage, 20 MPH speed limits, and additional marked crossings.
- Update and maintain CTUIR's parking policy based on current national guidance and local trends.
- Maintain the Tribal Transportation Program (TTP) National Tribal Transportation Facility Inventory (NTTFI) and update with routes that CTUIR may wish to include as projects move forward. Coordinate with the BIA as needed. Attachment D includes the existing NTTFI as of September 2022.
- As new development occurs, create a local street network that provides a high level of connectivity, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and multiple alternative routes.
Figure 2: Street Grid Template



## Access Management

As noted in the 2001 CTUIR TSP, CTUIR supports the access spacing standards for County roads within the UIR. CTUIR also elects to apply these standards to the roads maintained and/or owned by CTUIR or BIA. To handle any discrepancies between functional classifications, the County standards for major and minor collectors should apply to all CTUIR rural and urban collectors. The County standards for local roads should apply to all CTUIR rural and urban local roads.

The OR 331 Access Management Plan was referenced in developing the roadway projects described in Table 1 and Figure 1. Once adopted, the standards in the updated CTUIR TSP will supersede this document.

## Roadway Cross-sections and Design Standards

The 2001 CTUIR TSP does not include roadway cross-sections or standards within the UIR. Figures 3 to 15 provide proposed cross-sections for inclusion in the TSP update. Figures 16 to 19 provide proposed roadway design standards for inclusion in the TSP update.

## OR 331 Detailed Concept Design Graphic

The project team created a detailed concept design graphic for OR 331 from Wildhorse Boulevard to the I-84 interchange shown in Figure 20. This graphic incorporates the projects identified throughout this memorandum, including projects that were originally identified in the 2006 OR 331 Access Management Implementation Strategy and Circulation Plan. The project team and CTUIR staff selected this location for one of the two detailed concept design graphics because it is important for the economy and cultural heritage of CTUIR. Many of the area's key destinations for both residents and visitors are located along this corridor, creating conflicts between modes and safety concerns.

Figure 3：Cross－section for Arterial Roadway（i．e．，OR 331 or Mission Road）－Multi－use Path Option


Figure 4：Cross－section for Arterial Roadway（i．e．，OR 331 or Mission Road）－Curb and Gutter Option
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Figure 5: Cross-section for Rural Collector - Shoulder Option


Figure 6: Cross-section for Rural Collector - Multi-use Path Option


Figure 7: Cross-section for Rural Collector - Gravel Option


Figure 8: Cross-section for Urban Collector


Figure 9: Cross-section for Rural Local Street


Figure 10: Cross-section for Rural Local Street - Gravel Option



Figure 12: Cross-section for Urban Local Street - Minor Residential Street


Figure 13: Cross-section for Alley


Figure 14: Cross-section for Multi-use Path


Figure 15: Cross-section for Umatilla River Multi-use Path and Horse Trail
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Figure 20: Detailed Concept OR 331 from Wildhorse Boulevard to the I-84 Interchange


## PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM - WALKING AND ROLLING

The projects developed for the pedestrian system include sidewalk infill and reconstruction, new multi-use path connections, pedestrian crossing treatments, and more. Table 2 describes the projects for the pedestrian system. The priority levels shown in Table 2 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the project team. Prioritization has been updated based on input from the advisory committees and the community. Table 2 also shows if a project is within a 2 -mile radius of the Nixyáawii Community School. If it was, the priority was increased one level, if possible. Attachment E includes the CTUIR Safe Route to School Plan, which has been used to develop the projects shown in Table 2. Figure 21 illustrates the location of the projects. Attachment $B$ includes assumptions used to develop the planning-level cost estimates shown in Table 2. Attachment $C$ includes summary sheets for each of the high priority projects.

Table 2: Pedestrian System Projects

| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P01 | Mission Road | East of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street | Install six-foot sidewalks along the north side of Mission Road from east of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$1,500,000 |
| P02 | Mission Road | Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection) | Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of Mission Road from Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection). Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$680,000 |
| P03 | Mission Road | OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) | Widen sidewalks to six feet on the south side of Mission Road from OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) and address the existing mailbox obstructions. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$490,000 |
| P04 | Confederated Way | East of <br> Whirlwind <br> Drive to <br> Mission Road <br> (east <br> intersection) | Complete the sidewalk network along the north side of Confederated Way from east of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection). | BIA | High | X | \$435,000 |
| P05 | Cedar Street | Short Mile <br> Road to <br> Mission Road | Widen sidewalks to six feet wide on both sides of Cedar Street from Short Mile Road to Mission Road. | BIA | Medium | X | \$580,000 |
| P06 | Multi-use <br> Path to | Purchase Lane to OR 331 | Construct a multi-use path on the south side of Mission Road from Purchase Lane to OR | CTUIR | High | X | \$775,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pendleton (Phase I) |  | 331. This project is the first phase of a larger multi-use path connection to the City of Pendleton. Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. |  |  |  |  |
| P07 | Multi-use <br> Path to <br> Pendleton <br> (Phase II) | UIR western boundary to Purchase Lane | Construct the second phase of the multi-use path to Pendleton, connecting at Purchase Lane. West of Purchase Lane, the alignment of the multi-use path connection may follow two potential alignments: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1) Along the south side of the Umatilla River in parallel but offset from the river where applicable. If able, connect to Pendleton Riverwalk. <br> OR | CTUIR/ <br> County/ Pendleton | High | X | \$3,500,000 |
|  |  |  | 2) Along the north or south side of Mission Road. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. Include benches, lighting, and safety amenities (such as emergency call boxes and security cameras). |  |  |  |  |
| P08 | Short Mile Road Multiuse Path | Mission Road to Cayuse Bridge | Construct a multi-use path along Short Mile Road to Sampson Lane adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad maintenance road to River Road to North Cayuse Road Bridge. | CTUIR | Medium |  | \$3,900,000 |
| P09 | OR 331 <br> Multi-use <br> Path (Phase <br> I) | Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway. | CTUIR | High |  | \$1,900,000 |
| P10 | OR 331 <br> Multi-use <br> Path (Phase <br> II) | Kirkpatrick <br> Road to <br> Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road, depending on feasible options for crossing the Umatilla River Bridge. <br> River access could potentially | CTUIR | High | X | \$2,900,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | be included as part of this project. |  |  |  |  |
| P11 | South Market Road Multiuse Path | Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway to Tutuilla Church Road | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331-South Market Road from Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway to Tutuilla Church Road. The Exit 216 overpass may need to be replaced to fit the desired facilities. | CTUIR | Medium |  | \$3,900,000 |
| P12 | Wildhorse <br> Boulevard <br> Multi-use <br> Path | OR 331 to the Tamástslikt Trail | Construct a multi-use path along Wildhorse Boulevard, along the north side of the median or within the median. | CTUIR | Medium |  | \$675,000 |
| P13 | Parr Lane <br> Multi-use <br> Path | Umatilla River to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path in the vicinity of Parr Lane and extending to the Umatilla River. | CTUIR | Low |  | \$305,000 |
| P14 | East-West <br> Multi-use <br> Path | OR 331 to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path along the top of the bluff connecting OR 331 to Mission Road, intersecting the Tamástslikt Trail. Coordinate with Project P19 - OR 331/Timíne Way pedestrian crossing and Project P23 Mission Road/Cedar Street pedestrian crossing. | CTUIR | High | X | \$820,000 |
| P15 | Tamástslikt Trail Lighting | Confederated <br> Way to <br> Tamástslikt <br> Cultural <br> Institute | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | High |  | \$530,000 |
| P16 | Timíne Way <br> Multi-use <br> Path Lighting | Mission Road to OR 331 | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | Medium | X | \$320,000 |
| P17 | July Ground Multi-use Path System Lighting | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUIR | Medium | X | \$480,000 |
| P18 | Mission Road Lighting | Short Mile <br> Road to Cedar Street | Install pedestrian-scale lighting. | County | High |  | \$195,000 |
| P19 | OR 331/ <br> Timíne Way | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include signalization or a pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), or a grade separated | ODOT | High | X | \$2,000,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | undercrossing of OR 331. <br> Coordinate with Project P14 -East-West Multi-use Path. |  |  |  |  |
| P20 | Mission Road Mid-block Crossing | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | Install enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments at the existing mid-block crossing on Mission Road east of Short Mile Road. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and/or curb extensions. | County | High | X | \$105,000 |
| P21 | OR 331/ <br> Kusi Road | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), raised median island, high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. | ODOT | High |  | \$105,000 |
| P22 | Mission <br> Road/ <br> Confederated <br> Way (east intersection) | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. | County | High | X | \$105,000 |
| P23 | Mission <br> Road/ <br> Cedar Street | n/a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. Coordinate with Project P14 -East-West Multi-use Path. | County | High | X | \$105,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total High Priority Cost |  |  | \$16,145,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Medium Priority Cost |  |  | \$9,855,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Low Priority Cost |  |  | \$305,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost |  |  | \$26,305,000 |

## Pedestrian Programs and Plans

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential pedestrian-related policy and programmatic direction to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff. Through the TSP update process, the following items were identified for incorporation into CTUIR programs and plans:

- New development within the Mission Hub should be required to include off-street multi-use paths to create a connected pathway system within the area.
- Parks and Transportation Coordinator
$\square \quad$ Create a new CTUIR staff position to oversee and coordinate multi-use path maintenance and construction, park and river access, and park maintenance.
$\square$ Develop an Invasive Plant Management Plan for roads and multi-us paths in coordination with other CTUIR departments.
- Parks and River Access Plan
$\square$ CTUIR is acquiring land impacted by the 2020 flooding, including areas near Cayuse River Road, Cayuse Road, and Sampson Lane. The plan will determine a vision for creating a park(s) with potential river access. Work with property owners adjacent to the river to gain access. Explore other river access locations including previous informal access points, such as Parr Lane and the swimming hole near the railroad bridge.


## July Grounds Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing Detailed Concept Design Graphic

The project team created a detailed concept design graphic for the July Grounds enhanced pedestrian crossing shown in Figure 22. This graphic incorporates the projects identified throughout this memorandum, not just pedestrian-related projects. The project team and CTUIR staff selected this location for one of the two detailed concept design graphics because it provides an example of what an enhanced crossing could look like within the UIR. This mid-block crossing is also a current barrier to the connectivity of the pedestrian and bicycle networks.



Figure 22: Detailed Concept for July Grounds Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing
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## BICYCLE SYSTEM

The projects developed for the bicycle system include buffered bike lanes, shoulder bikeways, and shared roadways. Table 3 describes the projects for the bicycle system. The priority levels shown in Table 3 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the project team. Prioritization has been updated based on input from the advisory committees and the community. Table 3 also shows if a project is within a 2 -mile radius of the Nixyáawii Community School. If it was, the priority was increased one level, if possible. Attachment E includes the CTUIR Safe Route to School Plan, which has been used to develop the projects shown in Table 3. Figure 23 illustrates the location of the projects. The figure also includes the multi-use path projects previously shown in the Pedestrian System section. Attachment B includes assumptions used to develop the planning-level cost estimates shown in Table 3. Attachment C includes summary sheets for each of the high priority projects.

Table 3: Bicycle System Projects

| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B01 | Mission Road | OR 331 to Cayuse Road | Widen Mission Road and install buffered or separated/ raised bicycle lanes along both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to Cayuse Road. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | High | X | \$4,200,000 |
| B02 | Kirkpatrick <br> Road | OR 331 to McKinley Lane | Widen Kirkpatrick Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to McKinley Lane. | County | Medium | X | \$2,400,000 |
| B03 | Cayuse Road | Emigrant Road to River Road | Widen Cayuse Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from Emigrant Road to River Road. | County | Medium |  | \$6,800,000 |
| B04 | Confederated Way | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X | \$30,000 |
| B05 | Whirlwind Drive | Mission Road to Confederated Way | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X | \$5,000 |
| B06 | Cedar Street | Short Mile Road to Mission Road | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | BIA | Medium | X | \$35,000 |
| B07 | Kusi Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$25,000 |
| B08 | Spilya Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$30,000 |
| B09 | Coyote Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$20,000 |
| B10 | Arrowhead <br> Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and/or striping (sharrows). | CTUIR | Low |  | \$15,000 |


| Project ID | Location/ Name | Extents | Description | Roadway Jurisdiction | Priority | Near a School | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B11 ${ }^{1}$ | Bicycle Fix-it Stations | Within UIR boundaries | Evaluate where bicycle fix-it stations would be beneficial to install within the UIR, such as trailheads, community hubs, or the school. | CTUIR | High |  | \$10,000 per station |
|  |  |  |  | Total High Priority Cost |  |  | \$4,200,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Medium Priority Cost |  |  | \$9,270,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Low Priority Cost |  |  | \$90,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost |  |  | \$13,560,000 |

1 Project not shown on the project map.

## Bicycle Programs and Plans

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified the following potential bicycle-related item for incorporation into CTUIR programs and plans:

- Coordinate installation of future bicycle fix-it stations as part of construction of projects that will attract bicycle activity, such as commercial development, parks, civic centers, transit hubs, multi-use paths, and bike lanes.


3Miles
==== Shoulder Bikeway (both sides of the roadway)
==== Shared Roadway
=-=- Widen and add buffered bike lanes
Figure 23
--- Multi-use Path Project

## TRANSIT SYSTEM

The projects developed for the transit system include bus stop enhancements, modified service, and new service. Table 4 describes the projects for the transit system. The priority levels shown in Table 4 are based on the project evaluation criteria as well as input from the project team. Prioritization was updated based on input from the advisory committees and the community. Figure 24 illustrates the location of the projects. Attachment $B$ includes assumptions used to develop the planning-level cost estimates shown in Table 4. Attachment $C$ includes summary sheets for each of the high priority projects.

As CTUIR explores the transit system projects, coordination with other transit providers that serve the reservation and nearby areas will be needed. These other providers include Kayak, SafeT Transportation, Elite Taxi, Wildhorse Resort \& Casino Shuttle, Greyhound, and Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center transportation through the Allied Health Service Department.

Table 4: Transit System Projects

| Project ID | Location/Name | Description | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T01 ${ }^{1}$ | Park-and-ride Locations | Coordinate with regional transit providers for park-andride locations that help facilitate the use of transit by community members and maximize regional connectivity. | High | TBD, depends on partnerships available |
| T02 | Bus Stop Enhancements | Evaluate transit stops for additional amenity needs, such as shelters, lighting, and signage. | High | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 324,000 \\ \text { (\$18,000/stop } \\ \text { for } 18 \text { bus } \\ \text { stops) } \end{array}$ |
| T03 | OR 331 Transit Hub | Consolidate bus stops at Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus into one pair of transit hubs on OR 331 north of Spilya Road, reducing need for transit vehicles to turn to and from OR 331. Coordinate with Project T04Wildhorse Campus Shuttle. If a roundabout is constructed on OR 331 based on development-driven projects, a single transit hub on one side of OR 331 may be appropriate. | High | \$200,000 |
| T04 | Wildhorse Campus Shuttle | Partner with adjacent businesses to provide a shuttle to transport people from Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus to the OR 331 Transit Hub. Coordinate with Project T03 - OR 331 Transit Hub. | High | To be determined in conjunction with Kayak |
| T05 | Kayak Transit Hub Expansion | Install public restrooms for passengers at the Kayak Transit Hub. | Low | To be determined in conjunction with Kayak |
| T06 ${ }^{1}$ | Electric Vehicle and Shuttle Pilot | Acquire vehicles, install charging facilities, and begin electric vehicle service for the Metro and campus shuttle routes. | Medium | To be determined in conjunction with Kayak |
| T07 ${ }^{1}$ | More frequent transit service | Explore adding more trips per day on the highest ridership routes including Hopper, Whistler, and Metro. | Low | To be determined in conjunction with Kayak |


| Project ID | Location/Name | Description | Priority | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T08 ${ }^{1}$ | Extended hours of service | Explore additional hours of service to serve the morning and evening shifts at Wildhorse Resort \& Casino. | Medium | To be determined in conjunction with Kayak |
| T09 ${ }^{1}$ | Extended coverage | Explore extended coverage for transit services to reach residential area near Riverside Avenue, Pendleton Airport, and Walla Walla Airport. Coordinate with surrounding jurisdictions and transit agencies who already provide services to these areas. Coordinate with local health and fitness facilities when locating new bus stops. | Medium | To be determined in conjunction with Kayak |
| Total High Priority Cost |  |  |  | \$524,000 |
| Total Medium Priority Cost |  |  |  | \$TBD |
| Total Low Priority Cost |  |  |  | \$TBD |
| Total Cost |  |  |  | \$TBD |

1 Project not shown on the project map.

## Transit Programs and Plans

In addition to identifying potential projects, the project team also identified potential transit-related policy and programmatic direction to support the transportation system based on input from CTUIR staff. Through the TSP update process, the following items were identified for incorporation into CTUIR programs and plans:

- Work with businesses adjacent to existing or planned transit stops to sponsor transit shelters at bus stops. Coordinate with businesses and the proposed Parks and Transportation Coordinator position to determine responsibility for maintenance of transit shelters.
- Work with partner jurisdictions and agencies to ensure that Kayak is part of the development review process where there may be opportunities for new transit facilities or impacts to existing transit service.


Figure 24

## RAIL SYSTEM

There is one Union Pacific rail line within the UIR boundary, connecting Pendleton and La Grande. The line runs east and west, parallel to Mission Road, Short Mile Road, Cayuse Road, and Bingham Roads before turning south along Meacham Creek Road and into the Blue Mountains. Although no projects were identified to support the rail system, the following plan was identified:

- Safe Rail Crossing Plan
$\square$ Conduct a planning effort to establish a Quiet Zone Agreement for the Union Pacific railroad adjacent to the Mission area. The plan area would extend from the eastern boundary of the Community Water Sewer System service area to the UIR western boundary near Memory Lane.
$\square$ The plan would include recommended safety upgrades for crossings in the plan area, including any recommended closures of specific crossings to enhance safety in the area.


## PIPELINE SYSTEM

There are liquid and natural gas pipelines within the UIR boundary. Figure 25 shows the existing pipeline system, in addition to other utility lines within the UIR. No future projects, programs, or plans were identified to support the pipeline system.
Figure 25: Pipeline System (Image provided by CTUIR)


## MODIFICATION OF PREVIOUS PLANNING DOCUMENTS

The proposed projects described in this memorandum represent modifications or elimination of the following projects currently found in the adopted 2001 CTUIR TSP, Mission Community Master Plan (MCMP), and the OR 331 Access Management Plan (AMP), described in Table 5. Table 5 does not include completed projects from these planning documents.

Table 5: Modifications to Previous Planning Documents

| Planning Document(s) | Previous Project ID(s) | Location/Name | Description | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway System |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2001 \text { CTUIR } \\ & \text { TSP } \end{aligned}$ | 6 | River Road | Widen, align, and add gravel from the railroad crossing east to White Road. CTUIR to take over ownership of two atgrade railroad crossings and pave crossings with asphalt. | CTUIR requested removal. |
| ```2001 CTUIR TSP and OR 331 AMP``` | 9 and 14 | Kash Kash Road | Kash Kash Road at Highway 331 - Close existing access to Highway 331 and reroute Kash Kash Road north to a new intersection with the highway. Add exclusive left-turn lanes on the highway approaches to new intersection. Also construct new driveway/street access on the west side of the intersection, opposite of Kash Kash Road. Install new traffic signal when warranted. | Edited project to focus only on Kash Kash Road realignment, since the other elements have mostly been completed |
| ```2001 CTUIR TSP and OR 331 AMP``` | 10 and 8 | OR 331 | Highway 331 Median - Construct a nontraversable landscaped median along Highway 331 from the I-84 westbound ramps to the Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road. This project also includes bicycle/pedestrian improvements. | No longer desired for this roadway. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2001 \text { CTUIR } \\ & \text { TSP } \end{aligned}$ | 27 | North-South <br> Connector <br> Road | North-South Connector Road - Construct a new north-south connector road from the Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road to "A" Street. | No longer desired by CTUIR. This area is difficult to develop because of cultural sites and topography. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2001 \text { CTUIR } \\ & \text { TSP } \end{aligned}$ | 28 | East-West Connector Road (Phase II) | East-West Connector Road (Phase II) Extend rural connector road from proposed North-South Connector Road to Highway 331. Timing for this project will be dictated by planned developments in the area. | No longer desired by CTUIR. This area is difficult to develop because of cultural sites and topography. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2001 \text { CTUIR } \\ & \text { TSP } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | East-West <br> Connector Road (Phase I) | East-West Connector Road (Phase I) Construct a new urban/rural connector road from near Aspen Way to proposed North-South Connector Road. Timing for this project will be dictated by planned developments in the area (East Bench Subdivision). | No longer desired by CTUIR. This area is difficult to develop because of cultural sites and topography. MCMP shows a multi-use path instead |
| $\begin{gathered} 2001 \text { CTUIR } \\ \text { TSP } \end{gathered}$ | 22 | Wildhorse Creek Bridge | Replace County Bridge \#59C401 along Wild Horse Road (County Road \#685). | Not under CTUIR jurisdiction. CTUIR staff |


| Planning <br> Document(s) | Previous <br> Project ID(s) | Location/Name |  | Description |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Planning <br> Document(s) | Previous <br> Project ID(s) | Location/Name | Description | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Bicycle System |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 CTUIR <br> TSP | 32 | OR 331 | Highway 331 Shoulder Widening - Provide <br> 8-foot paved shoulders along Highway 331 <br> from Wildhorse Resort Entrance Road to <br> proposed East-West Connector Road. | Replaced by a multi-use <br> path. |
| MCMP | B3 | OR 331 | Install bicycle lanes along the east and <br> west sides of OR 331. | Replaced by a multi-use <br> path. |
| MCMP | T1 | Multiple <br> Locations | (For multiple locations) Install new transit <br> amenities including new shelters with real- <br> time transit tracking, benches, lighting, etc. | Replaced by more <br> specific suggestions for <br> the bus stop locations. |

## Attachment A

## Description of Evaluation Process and Evaluation Criteria

A qualitative process using the evaluation criteria will be used to evaluate potential modal solutions and prioritize projects developed through the TSP update. The rating method used to evaluate the alternatives is described below.

Most Desirable: The concept addresses the criterion and/or makes substantial improvements in the criteria category. (+2)
Desirable: The concept addresses the criterion and/or makes improvements in the criteria category. ( +1 )
No Effect: The criterion does not apply to the concept or the concept has no influence on the criteria. (0)
Less Desirable: The concept does not support the intent of and/or negatively impacts the criteria category. (-1)
Least Desirable: The concept does not support the intent of and/or substantially negatively impacts the criteria category. (-2)

| Objective | Evaluation Criteria | Evaluation Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Goal 1: Safety |  |  |
| Objective 1A: Hisfory of Crashes | Improve locations with a history of fatal and/or severe injury crashes | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 1B: Reduce crash potential | Implement strategies that systemically reduce the potential for crashes | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Goal 2: Environment and Cultural Heritage |  |  |
| Objective 2A: Respect rural and cultural context | Develop projects that respect the rural landscape and cultural context | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 2B: Achieve economic potential | Develop projects that help the community achieve its economic potential | (-2 to +2) |
| Objective 2C: Culturally sensitive | Establish land-use strategies and policies that support desired development that is culturally sensitive | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Goal 3: Health |  |  |
| Objective 3A: Increase active transportation options | Increase the user-friendliness and comfort of active transportation options available to all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 3B: <br> Connections to health centers, schools, parks | Provide connections to community health centers, schools, and parks | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Goal 4: Equity and Accessibility |  |  |
| Objective 4A: Access to essential destinations | Provide access to essential destinations for all members of the Umatilla Indian Reservation community | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 4B: Responds to range of community needs | Develop a plan that responds to the range of needs within the community | $(-2$ to +2) |
| Goal 5: Connectivity |  |  |
| Objective 5A: Improve multimodal connections between hubs | Improve existing, and/or create new multimodal connections between the Mission, July Grounds, and Gateway hubs | (-2 to +2) |
| Objective 5B: Improve regional multimodal connections | Improve existing, or create new, regional multimodal connections | (-2 to +2) |
| Goal 6: Coordination |  |  |
| Objective 6A: <br> Consistency with partners | Ensure consistency with Federal, State, regional, and local planning rules and regulations | (-2 to +2) |
| Objective 6B: Partner consensus on planned system for reaion | Coordinate with partners to gain consensus on the planned system for the region | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Goal 7: Financial Stability |  |  |
| Objective 7A: Maximize benefit and return on investment | Prioritize investments and maximize partnerships to provide maximum benefit and return on investment for the associated cost. | $(-2$ to +2$)$ |
| Objective 7B: Realistic, compatible with BIA, and/or positioning for grants | Develop projects that can be realistically achieved given the Tribe's existing, and potential, funding sources, including developing projects that will be compatible with Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) requirements and position CTUIR for future grant sources. | (-2 to +2) |




| Proiect 10 | Location/Name | Extents | Description | Responsible Jurisdiction | Evaluation Criteria (-2 to +2 coring) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Evaluation } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Priority |  | cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Goal 1: } \\ & \text { Safiety } \end{aligned}$ |  | Goal 2: Environment and Cultural Heritage |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Goal 3: } \\ & \text { Health } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Goal 4: Equity and } \\ \text { Accessibility } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Goal 5: } \\ \text { Connectivity } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Goal 6: } \\ \text { Coordination } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Goal 7: Financial Stability |  | Other Criteria |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P01 | Mission Road | East of Huckleberry Street to Cedar |  | County | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 16 | High | Yes | \$ 1,500,000 |
| P02 | Mission Road | Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection) | Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of Mission Road from Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection). Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 16 | High | yes | \$ 680,000 |
| P03 | Mission Road | OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) | Widen sidewalks to six feet on the south side of Mission Road from OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) and address the existing mailbox obstructions. Conside incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design. | County | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | -2 | -1 | -1 | 10 | High | Yes | \$ 490,000 |
| P04 | Confederated Way | East of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection) | Complete the sidewalk network long the north side of Confederated Way from east of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection). | BIA | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 10 | High | Yes | \$ 435,000 |
| P05 | Cedar Street | Short Mile Road to Mission Road | Widen sidewalks to six feet wide on both sides of Cedar Street from Short Mile Road to Mission Road. | BIA | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -2 | 0 | -1 | 6 | Medium | Yes | \$ 580,000 |
| P06 | Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase I) | Purchase Lane to OR 331 | Construct a multi-use path on the south side of Mission Road from Purchase Lane to OR 331. This project is the first phase of a larger multi-use path connection to the City of Pendleton. Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. | CTUR | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 0 | -1 | 19 | High | Yes | \$ 775,000 |
| P07 | Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase <br> II) | e UIR western boundary to Purchase Lane | Construct the second phase of the multi-use path to Pendleton, connecting at Purchase Lane. West of Purchase Lane, the alignment of the multi-use path connection may follow two potential alignments: 1) Along the south side of the Umatilla River in parallel but offset from the river where applicable. If able, connect to Pendleton Riverwalk. <br> or <br> 2) Along the north or south side of Mission Road. <br> Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. Include benches, lighting, and safety amenities (such as emergency call boxes and security cameras). | IR/Count/Pendle | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | -2 | -1 | -1 | 14 | High | yes | \$ 3,50,000 |
| p08 | Short Mile Road Multi-use Path | Mission Road to Cayuse Bridge | Construct a multi-use path along Short Mile <br> Road to Sampson Lane adjacent to the Union <br> Pacifif Rairioad maintenance raod to River <br> Road to North Cayuse Road Bridge. | CTUR | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | -2 | -1 | -1 | 11 | Medium | No | \$ 3,900,000 |


| Project ID | Location/Name | Extents | Descripition | Responsible Jurisdiction | Evaluation Criteria (-2 to +2 scoring) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Priority |  | cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Coal 1: } \\ \text { Safect } \end{gathered}$ |  | Goal 2: Environment and Cultural Heritage |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Goal 3: } \\ & \text { Health } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Goal 4: Equity and } \\ \text { Accessibility } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Goal 5: } \\ \text { Connectivity } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | coordination |  | Goal 7: Financial Stability |  | Other Criteria |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $3 \frac{n}{6}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Evaluation Total |  |  |  |
| p09 | OR 331 Muti-use Path (Phase 1) | Mission Road to Arrowhead Trave Plaza driveway | Construct a multi-use path along one or both <br> sides of OR 331 from Mission Road to <br> Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway. Include <br> benches, lighting, and safety amenities (such <br> as emergency call boxes and security <br> cameras). | CTUR | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | $\begin{array}{r}1 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | -2 | 0 | -1 | 20 | High | No | \$ 1,900,000 |
| P10 | OR 331 Multi-use Path (Phase II) | Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road, depending on feasible options for crossing the Umatilla River Bridge. River access could potentially be included as part of this project. | CTUR | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | -2 | -2 | -1 | 12 | High | yes | \$ 2,900,000 |
| P11 | South Market Road Multi-use Path | Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway to Tutuilla Church Road | Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331-South Market Road from Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway to Tutuilla Church Road. The Exit 216 overpass may need to be replaced to fit the desired facilities. | CTUIR | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | -2 | -2 | -1 | 11 | Medium | No | \$ 3,900,000 |
| P12 | Wildhorse Boulevard Multi-use Path | OR 331 to the Tamástslikt Trail | Construct a multi-use path along Wildhorse Boulevard, along the north side of the median or within the median | CTUR | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | -2 | 0 | -1 | 12 | Medium | No | \$ 675,000 |
| P13 | Part Lane Multi-us Path | Umatilla River to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path in the vicinity of Parr Lane and extending to the Umatilla River. | CTUR | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -2 | 0 | -1 | 10 | Low | No | \$ 305,000 |
| P14 | East-West Multi-use Path | OR 331 to Mission Road | Construct a multi-use path along the top of the bluff connecting OR 331 to Mission Road, intersecting the Tamástslikt Trail. Coordinate with Project P19 - OR 331/Timíne Way pedestrian crossing and Project P23 - Mission Road/Cedar Street pedestrian crossing. | CTUIR | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 。 | -2 | -2 | -1 | 10 | High | yes | \$ 820,000 |
| P15 | Tamástsilk Trail Lighting | Confederated Way to Tamástsikt Cutural unstitue | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUR | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 。 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | High | No | \$ 530,000 |
| P16 | Timíne Way Multi-use Path Lighting | Mission Road to OR 331 | Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use path system. | CTUR | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | Medium | Yes | \$ 320,000 |
| P17 | July Ground Multi-use Path System Lighting | n/a | Install lighting and security cameras to existing <br> multi-use path system. | CTUIR | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | Medium | Yes | \$ 480,000 |
| P18 | Mission Road Lighting | short Mile Road to Cedar Street | Install pedestrian-scale lighting. | County | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | High | No | \$ 195,000 |
| P19 | OR 331/Timine Way | n/a |  | ооот | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | - | 0 | 23 | High | Yes | \$ 2,000,000 |
| P20 | Mission Road Mid-block Crosing | n/a | Install enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments at the existing mid-llock crossing on Misssion Rooad east of fhort tile Road. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular araid flashing beacons RRFBS), high visibility crosswalk markings, and/or curb extensions. | County | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | 0 | - | 18 | High | Yes | \$ 105,000 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Crite | $2 \mathrm{to}+$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Goal 2: | nment | cutura |  | al | Goal 4 Acces | tivand lity |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {coil }}^{\text {Goal }}$ Stid | Financial <br> ility |  | Other $\mathrm{C}_{\text {r }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proiect ID | Location／Name | Extents | Description | Responsible Jurisdiction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Evaluation } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Priority |  |  | cost |
| P 21 | OR 331／Kus Road | n／a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing Treatment may include pedestrian hybrid beacon（if warranted），rectangular rapid flashing beacons（RRFBs），raised median island，high visibility crosswalk markings，and curb extensions． | ооот | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | High | No |  | 105，000 |
| P22 | Mission Road／Confederated Way | n／a |  | County | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 。 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | － | 。 | 18 | High | ves |  | 105，000 |
| P23 | Mission Road／Cedar Street | n／a | Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing． Treatment may include raised crosswalk， rectangular rapid flashing beacons（RRFBs）， high visibility crosswalk markings，and curb extensions．Coordinate with Project P14－East West Multi－use Path． | County | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | High | Yes |  | 105，000 |
| Bicycle System |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| в01 | Mission Road | OR 331 to Cayuse Road | Widen Mission Road and install buffered or raised bicycle lanes along both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to Cayuse Road． Consider incorporating bus pull－outs into the project design． | County | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | －1 | 0 | －1 | 15 | High | ves |  | 4，200，000 |
| в02 | Kirkpatrick Road | OR 331 to Mckinley Lane | Widen Kirkpatrick Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to McKinley Lane | County | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | －1 | 0 | －1 | 13 | Medium | yes |  | 2，400，000 |
| в03 | Cayuse Road | Emigrant Road to River Road | Widen Cayuse Road and install shoulder bikeways on both sides of the roadway from Emigrant Road to River Road | County | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | －1 | 0 | －1 | 13 | Medium | No |  | 6，800，000 |
| в04 | Confederated Way | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and／or striping （sharrows） | BIA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 。 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Medium | Yes | s | 30，000 |
| в05 | Whirwind Drive | Mission Road to Confederated Way | Install shared roadway signage and／or striping （sharrows）． | BIA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Medium | Yes | s | 5，000 |
| в06 | Cedar Street | Short Mile Road to Mission Road | Install shared roadway signage and／or striping （sharrows）． | BIA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Medium | yes | s | 35，000 |
| во7 | Kusi Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and／or striping （sharrows）． | CTUR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | Low | No | s | 25，000 |
| в08 | Spily Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and／or striping （sharrows）． | CTUR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | Low | No | s | 30，000 |
| во9 | Coyote Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and／or striping （sharrows）． | CTUR | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Low | No | s | 20，000 |
| ${ }^{810}$ | Arrowhead Road | Full roadway extents | Install shared roadway signage and／or striping （sharrows）． | CTUR | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | Low | No | s | 15，000 |
| ${ }^{811}$ | Bicycle fixititstations | Within UIR boundaries | Evaluate where bicycle fix－it stations would be beneficial to install within the UIR，such as trailheads，community hubs，or the school． | CTUR | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | High | No | s |  |
| Transit System |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Memo

| To: | Nick Foster, Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Andy Lindsey, P.E. |
| Subject: | Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation <br>  <br> System Plan (TSP) Update - Roadway System Projects Cost Estimate Assumptions |
| Date: | December 9, 2022 |
| Job/File No. | $152-200-36$ |
| cc: | Grant Banister, E.I., Anderson Perry \& Associates, Inc. |

This memo outlines the assumptions used in estimating costs for the proposed roadway system projects for the CTUIR TSP. Unit costs for specific project elements shown below are construction costs only. Total project costs include a 30 percent contingency and 30 percent for engineering, environmental, and administration. Costs shown are in 2022 dollars.

## Project Elements

Roadway Construction/Reconstruction - Rural Collector Asphalt Concrete Pavement (ACP) \$320 per linear foot (LF) (Standard Construction)

- Full construction to current CTUIR rural collector standard
- 12-foot ACP travel lane, 6-foot ACP shoulder, 3-foot gravel shoulder
- 4-inch ACP over 10-inch aggregate

Roadway Construction/Reconstruction - Rural Collector - ACP \$360 per LF
(Complex Construction)

- Extensive cut/fill requirements
- Steep grades
- Intersection realignments
- Other complex issues

Widen and Resurface Roadway - Rural Collector - ACP
\$250 per LF

- Assumes existing 20-foot roadway
- Widen 11 feet on each side
- Resurface ACP full width
- Per CTUIR standards

Widen and Resurface Roadway - Rural Collector - Gravel
\$150 per LF

- Assumes existing 20-foot roadway
- Widen 11 feet on each side
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- Resurface aggregate full width
- Per CTUIR standards


## Single Lane Roundabout (RAB)

\$2,250,000 Each

- Assumes approximately 180-foot diameter RAB
- Approximately 600 LF roadway each leg
- Per Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) standards


## Signalized Intersection

\$1,750,000 Each

- Full roadway reconstruction
- Approximately 600 LF roadway each leg
- Per ODOT standards

Traffic Calming
\$18,000 Each

- Assumes two radar speed signs
- Enhanced striping/signage

Speed Study
\$12,000 Each

## Proposed Pedestrian System Projects

R01 - Kash Kash Road

- Full Reconstruction - Rural Collector - ACP: 3,700 LF

RO2 - Spilya Road

- Full Reconstruction - Rural Collector - ACP: 750 LF

R03 - Emigrant Road

- Widen and Resurface - Rural Collector - ACP: 22,500 LF
- Relatively flat sections on valley floor and top of hill
- Full Reconstruction - Rural Collector - ACP: 25,000 LF
- Steep, winding section going up the hill

R04-56th Street - Theater Road

- Full Reconstruction - Rural Collector - ACP: 7,500 LF

R05 - North Cayuse Road

- Widen and Resurface - Rural Collector - ACP: 6,000 LF

R06 - Mann Road

- Widen and Resurface - Rural Collector - ACP: 17,500 LF R07 - Motanic Road
- Widen and Resurface - Rural Collector - ACP: 25,000 LF R08 - Sumac Road
- Widen and Resurface - Rural Collector - ACP: 15,000 LF R09 - McKay Creek Road
- Widen and Resurface - Rural Collector - ACP: 19,500 LF R10 - Exit 216 Truck Overflow Parking
- Design options currently in progress as separate CTUIR project
- Costs based on 5.7-acre improvement area
- Approximately 55 truck parking spaces and ancillary facilities
- Conduct speed study

R12 - Mission Road Traffic Calming

- Two radar speed signs
- Enhanced signing/striping

R13 - Cayuse Road and Bingham Road Speed Study

- Conduct speed study

R14 - Kirkpatrick Road/McKinley Lane Sight Distance

- Some topographic survey required to facilitate geometric analysis

R15 - Cayuse Road/Cayuse River Road Intersection

- Intersection realignment
- Full Reconstruction - Rural Collector - ACP (Complex): 2,000 LF
- 750 LF east and west of intersection on Cayuse Road - 500 LF for Cayuse River Road and N. Cayuse Road
- Higher unit cost for more complex construction, cut/fill earthwork, etc.

R16 - River Road/White Road Intersection

- Intersection realignment
- Full Reconstruction - Rural Collector - ACP (Complex): 2,000 LF
- 750 LF east and south of intersection
- 500 LF north of intersection
- Higher unit cost for more complex construction, cut/fill earthwork, etc.

R17-Confederated Way Flood Remediation

- Current standalone CTUIR project in planning phase
- Revisit cost after initial hydraulic analysis


## AL/ct
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## Memo

To: Nick Foster, Kittelson \& Associates, Inc.
From: Andy Lindsey, P.E. for
Subject: $\quad$ Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update - Roadway System Projects Cost Estimate Assumptions Development Driven Projects

Date: December 9, 2022
Job/File No. 152-200-36
cc: Grant Banister, E.I., Anderson Perry \& Associates, Inc.

This memo outlines the assumptions used in estimating costs for the proposed development driven roadway system projects for the CTUIR TSP. Unit costs for specific project elements shown below are construction costs only. Total project costs include a 30 percent contingency and 30 percent for engineering, environmental, and administration. Costs shown are in 2022 dollars.

## Project Elements

Roadway Construction/Reconstruction - Rural Collector -
Asphalt Concrete Pavement (ACP)
\$320 per linear foot (LF)
(Standard Construction)

- Full construction to current CTUIR rural collector standard
- 12 -foot ACP travel lane, 6-foot ACP shoulder, 3 -foot gravel shoulder
- 4-inch ACP over 10 -inch aggregate

Roadway Construction/Reconstruction - Rural Collector - ACP \$360 per LF
(Complex Construction)

- Extensive cut/fill requirements
- Steep grades
- Intersection realignments
- Other complex issues

Widen and Resurface Roadway - Rural Collector - ACP
\$250 per LF

- Assumes existing 20 -foot roadway
- Widen 11 feet on each side
- Resurface ACP full width
- Per CTUIR standards
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Widen and Resurface Roadway - Rural Collector - Gravel
\$150 per LF

- Assumes existing 20-foot roadway
- Widen 11 feet on each side
- Resurface aggregate full width
- Per CTUIR standards


## Single Lane Roundabout (RAB)

\$2,250,000 Each

- Assumes approximately 180-foot diameter RAB
- Approximately 600 LF roadway each leg
- Per Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) standards


## Signalized Intersection

\$1,750,000 Each

- Full roadway reconstruction
- Approximately 600 LF roadway each leg
- Per ODOT standards

Traffic Calming
\$18,000 Each

- Assumes two radar speed signs
- Enhanced striping/signage


## Speed Study

\$12,000 Each

## Proposed Roadway System Projects - Development Driven

R18-OR 331/Mission Road

- Single lane RAB

OR

- Traffic signal with intersection reconstruction

R19-Mission Road/Timine Way

- Single Lane RAB

OR

- Traffic signal with intersection reconstruction

R20-OR 331/Wildhorse Boulevard

- Single Lane RAB

OR

- Traffic signal with intersection reconstruction

R21-OR 331/Spilya Road

- Single Lane RAB

OR

- Traffic signal with intersection reconstruction

R22-OR 331/I-84 Eastbound Ramps

- Single Lane RAB

OR

- Traffic signal with intersection reconstruction

R23 - OR 331/I-84 Westbound Ramps

- Traffic signal installation

AL/ct
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## Memo

| To: | Nick Foster, Kittelson \& Associates, Inc |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Andy Lindsey, P.E. Sf |
| Subject: | Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation <br> System Plan (TSP) Update - Pedestrian System Projects Cost Estimate Assumptions |
| Date: | December 9, 2022 |
| Job/File No. | $152-200-36$ |
| cc: | Grant Banister, E.l., Anderson Perry \& Associates, Inc. |

This memo outlines the assumptions used in estimating costs for the proposed pedestrian system projects for the CTUIR TSP. Unit costs for specific project elements shown below are construction costs only. Total project costs include a 30 percent contingency and 30 percent for engineering, environmental, and administration. Costs shown are in 2022 dollars.

## Project Elements

## Construct 6-foot Concrete Sidewalk

\$150 per linear foot (LF)

- Concrete curb and gutter
- 6-foot concrete sidewalk
- Per CTUIR standards


## Widen Existing Sidewalk

\$60 per LF

- Assumes 2-foot widening

Construct Multiuse Path \$70 per LF

- 10-foot asphalt path
- 2-foot gravel shoulder
- Per CTUIR standards

Multiuse Path Railroad Crossing
\$15,000 Each

- Two concrete Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramps
- Two signs per crossing


## Multiuse Trail Amenities

\$60 per LF

- Benches at 1,250-foot spacing
- Pedestrian lighting at 100-foot spacing
- Security cameras/call boxes at 200-foot spacing
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## Construct Bus Pullout

$\$ 35,000$ Each

- Per Oregon Department of Transportation typical detail
- Accommodates 60-foot bus length


## Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing

$\$ 65,000$ Each

- Assumes new curb, gutter, and sidewalk, both sides of roadway
- ADA-compliant curb ramps
- Rectangular rapid flashing beacon
- Two signs per crossing
- Enhanced crosswalk striping


## Pedestrian Bridge

\$5,000 per LF

- Assumes 12-foot bridge


## Proposed Pedestrian System Projects

P01 - Mission Road: Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street

- Construct 6-foot sidewalk with concrete curb and gutter: 5,900 LF
- Construct one bus pullout

P02 - Mission Road: Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection)

- Construct 6-foot sidewalk with concrete curb and gutter: 2,600 LF
- Construct one bus pullout

PO3 - Mission Road: OR 331 to Confederated Way

- Widen existing sidewalk to 6 feet: 4,500 LF
- Construct one bus pullout

PO4 - Confederated Way

- Construct 6-foot sidewalk with concrete curb and gutter: 1,800 LF

P05 - Cedar Street

- Construct 6-foot sidewalk: 1,800 LF
- Widen existing sidewalk to 6 feet: 1,500 LF

P06 - Multiuse Path to Pendleton (Phase I)

- Construct multiuse path: 6,900 LF

P07 - Multiuse Path to Pendleton (Phase II)

- Alignment Option 1 - parallel Umatilla River
- Construct multiuse path: 16,600 LF
- Multiuse path railroad crossing: one
o Install multiuse path amenities: 16,600 LF
OR
- Alignment Option 2 - parallel Mission Road
- Construct multiuse path: 14,200 LF
- Install multiuse path amenities: 14,200 LF

P08 - Short Mile Road Multiuse Path

- Construct multiuse path: 30,000 LF
- Multiuse path railroad crossing: two
- Pedestrian bridge: 50 LF
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- Two small streams

P09- OR 331 Multiuse Path (Phase I)

- Construct multiuse path: 9,000 LF
- Install multiuse path amenities: 9,000 LF P10 - OR 331 Multiuse Path (Phase II)
- Construct multiuse path: 3,700 LF
- Multiuse path railroad crossing: one
- Pedestrian bridge: 300 LF
- Over Umatilla River

P11 - South Market Road Multiuse Path

- Construct multiuse path: 4,200 LF
- Pedestrian bridge: 425 LF
- Over I-84

P12 - Wildhorse Boulevard Multiuse Path

- Construct multiuse path: 6,000 LF

P13 - Parr Lane Multiuse Path

- Construct multiuse path: 2,500 LF
- Multiuse path railroad crossing: one

P14 - East-West Multiuse Path

- Construct multiuse path: 7,300 LF

P15 - Tamástslikt Trail Lighting

- Install multiuse path amenities: 5,500 LF

P16 - Timine Way Multiuse Path Lighting

- Install multiuse path amenities: 3,300 LF P17 - July Grounds Multiuse Path Lighting
- Install multiuse path amenities: 5,000 LF P18-Mission Road Lighting
- Install multiuse path amenities: 2,000 LF P19- OR 331/Timine Way
- Pedestrian bridge: 250 LF P20 - Mission Road Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossing
- Install enhanced pedestrian crossing: one P21 - OR 331/Kusi Road
- Install enhanced pedestrian crossing: one P22 - Mission Road/Confederated Way
- Install enhanced pedestrian crossing: one P23 - Mission Road/Cedar Street
- Install enhanced pedestrian crossing: one


## AL/ct

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| \$ 920,000 | s | 276,000 | s | 27,000 | s | 1,42,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ 425,000 | s | 127,500 | s | 127,50 | s | 680,000 |
| \$ 305,000 | s | ${ }^{91,500}$ | s | 91,500 | s | 488,000 |
| s 270,000 | s | 81,000 | s | 81,00 | s | 432,000 |
| \$ 360,000 | s | 108,000 | s | 108,000 | s | 57,000 |
| \$ 483,000 | s | 144,900 | s | 144,900 | s | 722,800 |
| \$ 2,173,000 | s | 651,900 | s | 651,900 | s | 3,47,800 |
| \$ 1,866,000 | s | 553,80 | s | 55,800 | s | 2,95, 000 |
| \$ 2,380,000 | s | 714,00 | s | 714,000 | s | 3,80,000 |
| \$ 1,170,000 | s | 351,000 | s | 351,000 | s | 1.872,000 |
| \$ 1,774,000 | s | ${ }^{532,200}$ | s | 532,200 | s | 2,888.400 |
| \$ 2,419,000 | s | 725,700 | s | 725,700 |  | 3,87,400 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |




## Memo

| To: | Nick Foster, Kittelson \& Associates, Inc |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Andy Lindsey, P.E. |

This memo outlines the assumptions used in estimating costs for the proposed bicycle system projects for the CTUIR TSP. Unit costs for specific project elements shown below are construction costs only. Total project costs include a 30 percent contingency and 30 percent for engineering, environmental, and administration. Costs shown are in 2022 dollars.

## Project Elements

Construct Raised Bike Lane
\$250 per linear foot (LF)

- 2-foot concrete ribbon curb
- 6-foot asphalt bike lane
- Concrete curb and gutter
- 6-foot concrete sidewalk
- Sidewalk component may overlap with some proposed TSP pedestrian projects


## Construct Shoulder Bike Way

\$140 per LF

- Widen existing road on both sides
- 6-foot asphalt bike lane
- 3-foot gravel shoulder

Install Shared Roadway Striping
\$1,500 Each

- Install two "Sharrow" legends per intersection

Construct Bus Pullout
\$35,000 Each

- Per Oregon Department of Transportation typical detail
- Accommodates 60-foot bus length

Evaluate Bicycle Fix-It Stations
\$8,000 Each

- Evaluate where Fix-It Stations would be beneficial
- Fix-It Stations could include benches, tools, etc., for minor bicycle repair
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## Proposed Bicycle System Projects

B01-Mission Road

- Construct raised bike lane: 10,200 LF
- Install bus pullout: one

BO2 - Kirkpatrick Road

- Construct shoulder bikeways: 10,700 LF

BO3-Cayuse Road

- Construct shoulder bikeways: 30,000

B04 - Confederated Way

- Install shared roadway striping: 12

B05 - Whirlwind Drive

- Install shared roadway striping: two

B06-Cedar Street

- Install shared roadway striping: 14

B07-Kusi Road

- Install shared roadway striping: 10

B08 - Spilya Road

- Install shared roadway striping: 12

B09-Coyote Road

- Install shared roadway striping: eight

B10 - Arrowhead Road

- Install shared roadway striping: six

B11 - Bicycle Fix-It Stations

- Study to evaluate locations for potential bicycle Fix-lt Stations


## AL/ct
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Base } \\ \text { Construction } \\ \text { Cost (2022) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Contingency | 30\% | PE/CE/Env/Etc | 30\% | ${ }_{\text {Project }}^{\text {Total }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { imated } \\ & \text { ost (2022) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ 2,620,000 | 786,000 |  | 786,000 |  |  | 4,192,000 |
| \$ 1,498,000 | 449,400 |  | 499,400 |  |  | 2,396,800 |
| \$ 4,200,000 | 1. | 1,260,000 |  | 1,260,000 | s | 6,720,000 |
| \$ 18,000 | \$ | 5,400 | \$ | 5,400 | s | 28,800 |
| \$ 3,000 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 900 | \$ | 4,800 |
| \$ 21,000 | \$ | 6,300 | \$ | 6,300 | \$ | 33,600 |
| \$ 15,000 | s | 4,500 | s | 4,500 | s | 24,000 |
| \$ 18,000 | s | 5,400 | \$ | 5,400 | \$ | 28,800 |
| \$ 12,000 | \$ | 3,600 | \$ | 3,600 | \$ | 19,200 |
| \$ 9,000 | \$ | 2,700 | s | 2,700 | \$ | 14,400 |
| \$ 5,000 | \$ | 1,500 | s | 1,500 | \$ | 8,000 |

## Project ID R10

## Exit 216 Truck Overflow Parking

## Description:

Parking lot for overflow truck parking from I-84 winter closures. Could include a shuttle service from parking lot to Arrowhead during events.

Project Type: Roadway

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$3,200,000

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: ODOT

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Kayak, Umatilla County, Trucking Companies, Arrowhead Travel Plaza

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns. Other - ODOT is currently designing the parking lot.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?


## Project Location/Images



## Project ID R11

## OR 331 Speed Study

## Description:

Perform a speed study along the OR 331 corridor and determine whether to modify any speed zones.

Project Type: Roadway

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$20,000

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: ODOT

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Umatilla County, Local Businesses/Property Owners along OR 331

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - OR 331 is the primary walking and biking route to the Wildhorse complex and other surrounding commercial development.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
Safety
Environment and
Cultural Heritage
Health

Equity and
Accessibility
Connectivity Coordination

## Project Location/Images



## Project ID R12

## Mission Road Traffic Calming

## Description:

Install speed feedback signage and other traffic calming measures.

Project Type: Roadway

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$30,000
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: Local Businesses/Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Other planned improvements (P01, P03, and B01) along Mission Road may help with traffic calming.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID R17

## Confederated Way Flood Remediation

## Description:

Construct flood remediation projects on Confederated Way from B Street to Mission Road (east intersection). Mitigations may include building a levy, raising the roadway, creating water retention areas, and rerouting the roadway.

Project Type: Roadway

Project Priority: High

Cost: To be determined by ongoing study

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: BIA

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Local
Businesses/Property Owners along Confederated Way

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential for significant impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - Project is highly linked to environmental outcomes.
Other - The study to determine which projects would be needed is currently ongoing.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID <br> P01 <br> Mission Road Sidewalks - East of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street

## Description:

Install six-foot sidewalks along the north side of Mission Road from east of Huckleberry Street to Cedar Street. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$1,500,000

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, ODOT, Local
Businesses/Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - Potential impacts to culverts.
Environmental impacts - Potential impacts to wetlands.

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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# Project ID <br> P02 <br> Mission Road Sidewalk Infill - Between Confederated Way Intersections 

Description:<br>Complete the sidewalk network along the south side of Mission Road from Confederated Way (western intersection) to Confederated Way (eastern intersection). Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design.<br>Project Type: Pedestrian<br>Project Priority: High<br>Cost: \$680,000<br>Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?


## Project Location/Images



## Project ID Mission Road Sidewalk Widening - OR 331 to P03 Confederated Way (Western Intersection)

## Description:

Widen sidewalks to six feet on the south side of Mission Road from OR 331 to Confederated Way (western intersection) and address the existing mailbox obstructions. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$490,000

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Local Businesses/Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - Potential utility impacts. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID <br> P04 <br> Confederated Way Sidewalk Infill - East of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection)

## Description:

Complete the sidewalk network along the north side of Confederated Way from east of Whirlwind Drive to Mission Road (east intersection).

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$435,000

Responsible Jurisdiction: BIA

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Property Owners along Confederated Way

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - Potential impacts.

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

## Project ID

## P06

## Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase I)

## Description:

Construct a multi-use path on the south side of Mission Road from Purchase Lane to OR 331. This project is the first phase of a larger multi-use path connection to the City of Pendleton. Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$775,000
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR

Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

## Project ID

## P07

## Multi-use Path to Pendleton (Phase II)

## Description:

Construct the second phase of the multi-use path to Pendleton, connecting at Purchase Lane. West of Purchase Lane, the alignment of the multi-use path connection may follow two potential alignments:

1) Along the south side of the Umatilla River in parallel but offset from the river where applicable. If able, connect to Pendleton Riverwalk.

## OR

2) Along the north or south side of Mission Road.

Further study is needed to determine the ultimate alignment. Include benches, lighting, and safety amenities (such as emergency call boxes and security cameras).

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High
Cost: 1) \$3,500,000
2) $\$ 3,000,000$

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Umatilla County, City of Pendleton

Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - Potential constraints like bridge structures or water management facilities depending on the alignment.
Environmental impacts - Likely impacts.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?

| Safety | Environment and <br> Cultural Heritage | Health | Equity and <br> Accessibility | Connectivity Coordination |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | | Financial |
| :---: |
| Stability | | Project Outcomes |
| :---: |
| Positive |

## Project Location/Images



## Project ID

## P09

## OR 331 Multi-use Path (Phase I)

## Description:

Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Mission Road to Arrowhead Travel Plaza driveway.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$1,900,000
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR
Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

## P10

## OR 331 Multi-use Path (Phase II)

## Description:

Construct a multi-use path along one or both sides of OR 331 from Kirkpatrick Road to Mission Road, depending on feasible options for crossing the Umatilla River Bridge. River access could potentially be included as part of this project.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$2,900,000
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR

Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - Likely impacts along Umatilla River Bridge.
Environmental impacts - Potential impacts.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

## Project ID

## P14

## East-West Multi-use Path

## Description:

Construct a multi-use path along the top of the bluff connecting OR 331 to Mission Road, intersecting the Tamástslikt Trail. Coordinate with Project P19 - OR 331/Timíne Way pedestrian crossing and Project P23 Mission Road/Cedar Street pedestrian crossing.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: $\$ 820,000$
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR
Potential Project Partners: Local Property Owners within Alignment

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Likely impacts. Project may require purchasing R/W for the path or coordination with adjacent property owners for easements or R/W dedication.
Physical barrier constraints - Likely impacts, depending on alignment. Barriers include significant topography changes and historical sites.
Environmental impacts - Potential impacts.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

P15

## Tamástslikt Trail Lighting

| Description: |
| :--- |
| Install lighting and security cameras to existing multi-use |
| path system. |
| Project Type: Pedestrian |
| Project Priority: High |
| Cost: \$530,000 |
| Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 <br> of TSP Update project. |

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR<br>Potential Project Partners: None

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - A power source will be needed for this project.
Solar may be an option in areas with adequate year-round sun exposure, but not in all areas.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID <br> P18

## Mission Road Lighting

## Description:

Install pedestrian-scale lighting.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$195,000

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P01, P02, P20, P22, P23, and B01).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

## P19

## OR 331/Timíne Way Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing

## Description:

Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include signalization or a pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), or a grade separated undercrossing of OR 331.
Coordinate with Project P14 - East-West Multi-use Path.
Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$2,000,000

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: ODOT

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P09).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID

## P20

## Mission Road Mid-block Crossing

## Description:

Install enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments at the existing mid-block crossing on Mission Road east of Short Mile Road. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and/or curb extensions.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$105,000
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P01, P02, P18, P22, P23, and B01).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?

| Safety | Environment and <br> Cultural Heritage | Health | Equity and <br> Accessibility Connectivity Coordination | Financial <br> Stability | Project Outcomes <br> Positive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Project Location/Images



## Project ID

## P21

## OR 331/Kusi Road Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing

## Description:

Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include pedestrian hybrid beacon (if warranted), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), raised median island, high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$105,000

Responsible Jurisdiction: ODOT

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

## Project ID <br> P22 <br> <br> Mission Road/Confederated Way Enhanced <br> <br> Mission Road/Confederated Way Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing

 Pedestrian Crossing}
## Description:

Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$105,000

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P01, P02, P18, P20, P23, and B01).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID Mission Road/Cedar Street Enhanced Pedestrian P23 Crossing

## Description:

Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing. Treatment may include raised crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs), high visibility crosswalk markings, and curb extensions. Coordinate with Project P14 - East-West Multi-use Path.

Project Type: Pedestrian

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$105,000
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.
Other - Potential to coordinate this project with other projects in the area (P01, P02, P18, P20, P22, and B01).

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID B01 <br> Mission Road Bicycle Lane Separation - OR 331 to Cayuse Road

## Description:

Widen Mission Road and install buffered or separated/raised bicycle lanes along both sides of the roadway from OR 331 to Cayuse Road. Consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design.

Project Type: Bicycle

Project Priority: High

Cost: \$4,200,000

Responsible Jurisdiction: Umatilla County

Potential Project Partners: CTUIR, Property Owners along Mission Road

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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## Project ID B11 <br> Bicycle Fix-it Stations

## Description:

Evaluate where bicycle fix-it stations would be beneficial to install within the UIR, such as trailheads, community hubs, or the school.

Project Type: Bicycle

Project Priority: High

Cost: $\$ 10,000$ per station

Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?


## Project ID

T01

## Park-and-ride Locations

## Description:

Coordinate with regional transit providers for park-andride locations that help facilitate the use of transit by community members and maximize regional connectivity.

## Project Type: Transit

Project Priority: High

Cost: TBD, depends on partnerships available
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Kayak

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - Potential impacts. Implementation of specific locations may require partnering with private property owners or purchasing lots. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?


## Project ID

T02

## Bus Stop Enhancements

## Description:

Evaluate transit stops for additional amenity needs, such as shelters, lighting, and signage.

Project Type: Transit

Project Priority: High

Cost: $\$ 324,000$ ( $\$ 18,000 /$ stop for 18 bus stops)
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Kayak

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns. Environmental impacts - No known concerns. Other - A power source will be needed for any enhancements requiring electricity. Solar may be an option if hardwiring is not, especially in areas with adequate year-round sun exposure.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?


## Project ID

## T03

## OR 331 Transit Hub

## Description:

Consolidate bus stops at Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus into one pair of transit hubs on OR 331 north of Spilya Road, reducing need for transit vehicles to turn to and from OR 331. Coordinate with Project T04Wildhorse Campus Shuttle. If a roundabout is constructed on OR 331 based on development-driven projects, a single transit hub on one side of OR 331 may be appropriate.

Project Type: Transit

Project Priority: High

Cost: $\$ 200,000$
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Kayak

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns. Assumes project is able to be constructed within CTUIR and/or ODOT right-of-way.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

## HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?

Safety \begin{tabular}{llll}
Environment and <br>
Cultural Heritage

 Health 

Equity and <br>
Accessibility

 Connectivity Coordination 

Financial <br>
Stability

 

Project Outcomes <br>
Positive
\end{tabular}
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## Project ID

## T04

## Wildhorse Campus Shuttle

## Description:

Partner with adjacent businesses to provide a shuttle to transport people from Arrowhead Travel Plaza, Cayuse Holdings, and the Wildhorse Resort \& Casino campus to the OR 331 Transit Hub. Coordinate with Project T03OR 331 Transit Hub.

Project Type: Transit

Project Priority: High

Cost: To be determined in conjunction with Kayak.
Potential Funding Sources: To be added during Task 5 of TSP Update project.

Responsible Jurisdiction: CTUIR, Kayak

Potential Project Partners: Adjacent Property Owners, Adjacent Transit Providers

## Considerations:

Right-of-way constraints - No known concerns.
Physical barrier constraints - No known concerns.
Environmental impacts - No known concerns.

HOW DOES THE PROJECT RANK AGAINST TRANSPORTATION GOALS?
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Attachment D

## Indian Reservation Roads Program

 Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


4-IRR Route Number 5-Section Number
10-Class
15-Length of Section 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Lenath 32-County
33-Congressional District 7-State
8-Ownership
12-Construction Need
11-Terrain
25-Roadbed Condition 24-Surface Condition Index 16-Surface Width
13-Surface Type
9-Federal Aid Category 28-Right of Way Status 29-Right of Way Width TTAM BIA Share
30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type 22-Existing ADT
21-ADT Year
23-Percent Trucks 34-Owner Route Number Roadway Width TTAM Future ADT TTAM ADS Number TTAM Future Surface Type 35-Drainage Condition 36-Shoulder Condition 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE 39-Right of Way Utility 40-Right of Way Cost 26-Level of Maintenance 27-Snow \& Ice Control 41-Begin Latitude 42-End Latitude 43-Beain Lonaitude 44-End Lonaitude 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Category
52-Year of Construction Change Update Year

Status

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea <br> 0007 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea <br> 0007 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea <br> 0007 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> B Street <br> 0008 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> "B" Stre <br> 0008 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatille "A" Stre 0009 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> "A" Stre <br> 0009 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> "A" Stre <br> 0009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | - 10 | - 20 | - 30 | 10 | 20 | - 10 | 20 | - 30 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 3.7 | 3.6 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 60 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 58 | 64 | 57 | 90 |
| 16-Surface Width | 20 | 20 | 20 | 17 | 27 | 22 | 22 | 16 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT | 62 | 77 | 51 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 14 | 9 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | F006 | F006 | F006 | 08 |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 30 | 30 | 30 | 19 | 29 | 24 | 24 | 16 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 92 | 114 | 76 | 37 | 37 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 12 | 12 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | E | E | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  | 45.66800000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66600000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66600000 | 45.66400000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  | -118.67400000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  | -118.67200000 | -118.67000000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 | -118.67200000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 33 | 33 | 33 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75003 | 0 | 0 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | J | $\checkmark$ | $R$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1960 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> "A" Stre | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Alder Dr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0009 | 0010 | 0011 | 0011 | 0011 | 0011 | 0011 | 0011 |
| 5-Section Number | 40 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |  | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridae Lenath |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 04697 A 00800018 \\ 9 \\ 308 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 2 | 7 | 4 |  | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 90 | 66 | 60 |  | 80 | 80 | 80 | 100 |
| 16-Surface Width | 12 | 28 | 24 |  | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 20 | 66 | 120 |  | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 1 | 4 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 4 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  | 8600 |  | 8600 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  | 2004 |  | 2004 | 2004 | 2004 | 2004 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  | 11 |  | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 10 | 0008 |  | 0008 | 0008 | 08 | 08 |
| Roadway Width | 12 | 30 | 32 |  | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 37 | 12771 |  | 12771 | 5940 | 5940 | 5940 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 14 | 18 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | E | P |  | P | P | P | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 0 | 1 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 1 | 3 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.66400000 | 45.66800000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.66400000 | 45.66700000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.67200000 | -118.66100000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.67200000 | -118.66000000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  | 750064 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 75000 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | $R$ | $V$ | A |  | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2016 | 2006 | 2006 | $2006$ | $2006$ | $2006$ | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Oregon W | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Cayuse D | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> New Road | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> New Road | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0011 | 0011 | 0011 | 0011 | 0012 | 0013 | 0013 | 0014 |
| 5-Section Number | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 15-Length of Section | 14.3 |  | 4.3 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.2 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  | 01064A008 01240 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-Bridge Length 32-County | 059 | 71 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 |  | 80 | 100 | 49 | 72 | 0 | 58 |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 |  | 24 | 36 | 25 | 12 | 10 | 26 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 120 |  | 120 | 120 | 66 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 6 |  | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |  | 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT | 5300 |  | 5100 | 4900 |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2004 |  | 2004 | 2004 |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 11 |  | 11 | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 8 |  | 0008 | 8 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 14 |
| Roadway Width | 36 |  | 40 | 52 | 27 | 12 | 10 | 28 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 7871 |  | 7574 | 7277 | 37 | 74 | 74 | 37 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 18 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | P |  | P | P | E | G | G | E |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  | 45.66700000 | 45.64600000 | 45.64600000 | 45.66700000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  | 45.66600000 | 45.64600000 | 45.64600000 | 45.66700000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  |  | -118.66700000 | -118.64100000 | -118.62200000 | -118.67000000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  | -118.66600000 | -118.60500000 | -118.60500000 | -118.67000000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 27 | 24 | 21 | 22 | 750064 | 7502 | - 27 | 64 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 75000 | 7500 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | $A$ |  | A | A | $V$ | 7 | $T$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |


| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Senior C | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Walla Wa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Whirlwin | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Willow D | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Cottonwo | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Aspen Wa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0014 | 0015 | 0015 | 0016 | 0017 | 0018 | 0019 | 0020 |
| 5-Section Number | 15 | 810 | 810 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 9 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 |  |  | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  |  |  | 64 | 66 | 49 | 63 | 91 |
| 16-Surface Width | 21 |  |  | 24 | 36 | 36 | 28 | 22 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 |  |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  |  | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| Roadway Width | 21 |  |  | 26 | 38 | 38 | 30 | 24 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  |  |  | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 20 |  |  | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  |  |  | E | E | E | E | E |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  | 45.66600000 | 45.66500000 | 45.66800000 | 45.66800000 | 45.66400000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  | 45.66600000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66600000 | 45.66600000 | 45.66500000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  | -118.66800000 | -118.66500000 | -118.66300000 | -118.66000000 | -118.65800000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  | -118.66600000 | -118.66500000 | -118.66100000 | -118.65800000 | -118.65700000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  |  |  | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | $\square-$ |  |  | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | $Z$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $V$ | $V$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1970 | 1959 | 1959 | 1996 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 1974 | 1974 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | 3ETURNED-TO-FIEC | D-AT-REG | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Juniper | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Lodgepol | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Tamarack | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Easy Str | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Reservoi | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Wildhors | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Wildhors | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Dogwood |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0027 | 0028 | 0029 | 0030 | 0031 | 0032 | 0032 | 0033 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County33-Congressional District | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
|  | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | , | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition 7 |  | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index 87 |  | 82 | 87 | 63 | 40 | 64 | 67 | 91 |
| 16-Surface Width |  | 18 | 18 | 24 | 15 | 48 | 24 | 18 |
| 13-Surface Type |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share 100 |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 14-Shoulder Type 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  | 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number 27 |  | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 |  | 33 |
| Roadway Width 24 |  | 20 | 20 | 26 | 15 | 48 | 24 | 20 |
| TTAM Future ADT 3 |  | 37 | 37 | 37 | 74 | 149 | 149 | 37 |
| TTAM ADS Number 1 |  | 18 | 18 | 18 | 14 | 7 | 8 | 18 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  | E | E | E | G | P | P | E |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude 45.66500000 |  | 45.66500000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66800000 |  | 45.65000000 | 45.65000000 | 45.66400000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.66600000 | 45.66500000 | 45.66700000 | 45.66700000 |  | 45.65000000 | 45.65000000 | 45.66500000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.65700000 | -118.65600000 | -118.65500000 | -118.65800000 |  | -118.68400000 | -118.67300000 | -118.65500000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.65600000 | -118.65500000 | -118.65600000 | -118.65800000 |  | -118.67300000 | -118.67300000 | -118.65500000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | -27 | 27 | 64 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 7500 | 7500 | 75000 | 2 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | $V$ | $V$ | $V$ | $V$ | $K$ | E | $E$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1995 | 1995 | 1995 | 1959 | 1959 | 1995 | 1997 | 2013 |
| Update Year Status | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2007 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
|  | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Showaway 0034 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Johnson 0035 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Johnson 0035 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Sheoship <br> 0036 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Umbarger 0037 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Fowler L 0038 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Fenton L 0039 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Fenton L 0039 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0034 | 0035 | 0035 | 0036 | 0037 | 0038 | 0039 |  |
| 5 -Section Number | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.4 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 20 | 20 | 0 | 64 | 44 | 68 | 76 | 76 |
| 16-Surface Width | 16 | 12 | 8 | 13 | 22 | 18 | 15 | 15 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | , |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 30 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 34 | 35 |  | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 39 |
| Roadway Width | 16 | 12 | 8 | 13 | 22 | 18 | 15 | 15 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 14 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.67100000 |  |  | 45.68500000 | 45.63100000 | 45.66000000 | 45.58800000 | 45.59000000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.67200000 |  |  | 45.68300000 | 45.64200000 | 45.64600000 | 45.59000000 | 45.59100000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68400000 |  |  | -118.49100000 | -118.72600000 | -118.59400000 | -118.46200000 | -118.45800000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.69300000 |  |  | -118.49100000 | -118.72600000 | -118.58800000 | -118.45800000 | -118.45800000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 64 | 42 | 42 | 28 | 27 | 27 | 33 | 33 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 |  |  | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | $B$ | $B$ | A | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 2011 | 2009 | 2009 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2006 | 2006 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Minthorn | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Minthorn | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatill <br> Umatill <br> Weedy La | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Brahman | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Charolai | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Durham P | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> 54th Str | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> 54th Str |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0049 | 0049 | 0050 | 0051 | 0052 | 0053 | 0054 | 0054 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 84 | 84 | 60 | 53 | 53 | 49 | 68 | 66 |
| 16-Surface Width | 20 | 14 | 18 | 22 | 22 | 20 | 18 | 17 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 30 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 49 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 54 |
| Roadway Width | 20 | 14 | 18 | 22 | 22 | 20 | 18 | 17 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 13 | 13 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | E | E | E | E | E |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.62700000 | 45.62600000 | 45.61700000 | 45.61700000 | 45.61700000 | 45.61900000 | 45.67100000 | 45.66900000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.62600000 | 45.62600000 | 45.62300000 | 45.62000000 | 45.61900000 | 45.62000000 | 45.66900000 | 45.66800000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude | -118.71000000 | -118.70500000 | -118.70500000 | -118.69300000 | -118.69300000 | -118.69300000 | -118.72800000 | -118.72800000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.70500000 | -118.70100000 | -118.70500000 | -118.69000000 | -118.69300000 | -118.69200000 | -118.72800000 | -118.72800000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 63 | 63 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 2010 | 2010 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 2011 | 2011 |
| Update Year | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ | $2016$ |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Meac 0062 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Spilya R 0063 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Spilya R 0063 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Spilya R 0063 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Spilya R 0063 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Coyote R <br> 0064 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Coyote R <br> 0064 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Arrowhea 0065 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0062 | 0063 | 0063 | 0063 | 0063 | 0064 | 0064 | 0065 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 44 |  |  |  |  | 92 | 90 | 91 |
| 16-Surface Width | 10 |  |  |  |  | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 10 |  |  |  |  | 26 | 26 | 28 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 15 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.70300000 |  |  |  |  | 45.64400000 | 45.64400000 | 45.64400000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.69700000 |  |  |  |  | 45.64300000 | 45.64600000 | 45.64600000 |
| 43-Beqin Longitude | -118.35400000 |  |  |  |  | -118.68600000 | -118.68600000 | -118.68200000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.35100000 |  |  |  |  | -118.68600000 | -118.68600000 | -118.68200000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 25 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 |  |  |  |  | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | A |  |  |  |  | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  |  |  |  | 2007 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2007 | 2007 | 2007 | 2007 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | -AT-REG | OFFICIAL | -AT-REG | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Arrowhea | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Tsimti F | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pendleto | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pendleto | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Pendleto | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatilla Pendleto | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Tela-Quo | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Ti'Mine |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0065 | 0066 | 0067 | 0067 | 0067 | 0067 | 0068 | 0069 |
| 5-Section Number | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.7 |  | 0.3 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridae Lenath |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 242 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 7 |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 4 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 91 |  | 60 |  | 80 | 80 |  | 98 |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 |  | 24 |  | 36 | 36 |  | 32 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 0 | 250 |  | 250 | 250 | 0 | 85 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 2 |  | 6 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 4 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 4 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  | 5300 |  | 1600 | 1600 |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  | 2004 |  | 2004 | 2004 |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  | 10 |  | 10 | 10 |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  | 67 |  | 67 | 67 |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 28 |  | 36 |  | 48 | 48 |  | 40 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 7871 |  | 2376 | 2376 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 13 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 13 | 13 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | P |  | P | P | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 |  | 2 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 |  | 2 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 |  | 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.64600000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.66400000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.64700000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.66400000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68200000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -118.68400000 |
| 44-End Lonaitude | -118.68200000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -118.68500000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | $7500{ }^{27}$ | 27 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 64 | 564 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 75000 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A |  | A |  | A | A |  | $C$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 2009 |  | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 |  | 2009 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2007 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | $2006$ | 2007 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Nac Park <br> 0069 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Ti"Mine 0069 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Ti'Mine 0069 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Pond Cem <br> 0070 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Red Elk 0071 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Awi'Aw R 0072 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Minthorn <br> 0073 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Agen 0074 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0069 | 0069 | 0069 | 0070 | 0071 | 0072 | 0073 | 0074 |
| 5-Section Number | 15 | 20 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridae Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  | 96 | 98 | 85 |  |  |  | 78 |
| 16-Surface Width | 274 | 24 | 37 | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 29-Right of Way Width |  | 69 | 69 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 99 | 28 | 41 | 12 |  |  |  | 12 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 20 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  | 45.66400000 | 45.66700000 | 45.57700000 |  |  |  | 45.66800000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  | 45.66700000 | 45.66800000 | 45.57700000 |  |  |  | 45.66800000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  | -118.68500000 | -118.69300000 | -118.78200000 |  |  |  | -118.69800000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  | -118.69300000 | -118.69300000 | -118.78400000 |  |  |  | -118.70000000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  | 64 |  | 67 | 28 | 37 | 27 | 63 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |  |  |  | 75008 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | $\gamma$ | C | $C$ | $R$ |  |  |  | $R$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 2009 | 2009 | 1959 |  |  |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2016 | $2016$ | $2016$ | 2007 | 2007 | 2007 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Retail C 0083 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Old Orea 0084 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Old Orea 0084 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea 0084 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea 0084 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea <br> 0084 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Old Orea 0084 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatille Old Orea 0084 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | r 10 | r 10 | - 20 | - 30 | 40 40 | - 50 | 70 | - 80 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 1.6 | 0.5 |  |  | 3.0 | 2.3 | 6.3 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 0952500621304 \\ 9 \\ 202 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 09525 \text { A006 } 21306 \\ 9 \\ 230 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 99 | 100 | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 | 48 | 48 |  |  | 48 | 48 | 60 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 | 6 | 6 |  |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 305 | 305 |  |  | 305 | 305 | 305 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  | 14 | 14 |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 10900 | 10900 |  |  | 12400 | 10000 | 10000 |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2004 | 2004 |  |  | 2004 | 2004 | 2004 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 40 | 40 |  |  | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 0006 | 184 |  |  | 3 | 0006 | 0006 |
| Roadway Width | 24 | 76 | 76 |  |  | 76 | 76 | 88 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 16187 | 16187 |  |  | 18414 | 14850 | 14850 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | P | P |  |  | P | P | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 5 | 5 |  |  | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.64600000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.64400000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.68500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [991 |  | 14 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51-Road Category | A | A | A |  |  | A | A | $A$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 2001 | 2001 |  |  | 2001 | 2001 | 1989 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | $2006$ | $2006$ | $2006$ |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

4-IRR Route Number
5-Section Number
10-Class
15-Length of Section 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridqe Condition 20-Bridge Lenath
32-County
33-Congressional District 7-State
8-Ownership
12-Construction Need 11-Terrain
25-Roadbed Condition 24-Surface Condition Index 16-Surface Width
13-Surface Type
9-Federal Aid Category 28-Right of Way Status 29-Right of Way Width TTAM BIA Share
30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type 22-Existing ADT
21-ADT Year
23-Percent Trucks
34-Owner Route Number
Roadway Width
TTAM Future ADT
TTAM ADS Number TTAM Future Surface Type 35-Drainaqe Condition 36-Shoulder Condition 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE 39-Right of Way Utility 40-Right of Way Cost 26-Level of Maintenance 27-Snow \& Ice Control 41-Begin Latitude 42-End Latitude 43-Begin Longitude 44-End Longitude 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory
52-Year of Construction Chanae Update Year

Status

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Veterans | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Cay-Uma- |  |  | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Daycare |  | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Public S | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Usfs 212 | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatille Iskuulpa | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatille Iskuulpa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Usfs 210 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0096 | 0097 |  |  | 0097 |  | 0098 | 0110 | 0121 | 0121 | 0275 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 | 10 |  |  | 15 |  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 |  |  | 9 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  | 0.1 |  | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 0.3 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County33-Congressional District | 059 | 059 |  |  | 059 |  | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
|  | 02 | 02 |  |  | 02 |  | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 33-Congressional District 7-State | OR | OR |  |  | OR |  | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 84 | 69 |  |  |  |  | 76 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-Surface Width | 30 | 20 |  |  | 166 |  | 24 | 10 | 16 | 10 | 12 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 4 |  |  | 5 |  | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 40 |  |  | 40 |  | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 |  |  | 0 |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type 2 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 110 |  |  | 275 |
| Roadway WidthTTAM Future ADT | 32 | 22 |  |  | 99 |  | 24 | 10 | 16 | 10 | 12 |
|  | 74 | 74 |  |  |  |  | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM Future ADT TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 13 |  |  | 20 |  | 13 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 14 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G |  |  |  |  | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.66600000 | 45.66500000 |  |  |  |  | 5.66400000 |  | 45.69800000 | 45.68600000 |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.66600000 | 45.66500000 |  |  |  |  | 5.66400000 |  | 45.68600000 | 45.65300000 |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.66200000 | -118.66500000 |  |  |  |  | 8.68700000 |  | -118.39200000 | -118.39300000 |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.66200000 | -118.66500000 |  |  |  |  | 8.68600000 |  | -118.39300000 | -118.40100000 |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [991 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42 |  |  | $\square 43$ |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 75000 | 75 |  | 0 | 75 | 000 |  | 75007 | 75007 | - |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A |  |  | $Z$ |  | C | $B$ | $B$ | $B$ | $B$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 |  | 1959 |  | 1959 |  |  |
| Update Year Status | 2016 | 2016 |  |  | 2016 |  | 2016 | 2006 | 2016 | 2016 | 2007 |
|  | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |  |  | OFFICIAL |  | OFFICIALR | ED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | IN-PROCESS |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Usfs 210 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Umatilla | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Flat Lak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0275 | 0331 | 0331 | 0331 | 0331 | 0331 | 0331 | 0400 |
| 5-Section Number | 20 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 |  | 2.0 | 0.5 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  | $0956733100451$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridae Lenath |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 416 \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 294 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 061 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 2 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 0 |  | 100 | 100 |  | 100 | 100 | 40 |
| 16-Surface Width | 12 |  | 24 | 24 |  | 24 | 24 | 15 |
| 13-Surface Type | 1 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 0 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 0 |  | 80 | 80 |  | 80 | 80 | 0 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 0 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  | 4400 | 2500 |  | 2300 | 1900 |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  | 2004 | 2004 |  | 2004 | 2004 |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  | 13 | 13 |  | 13 | 13 |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 275 |  | 331 | 331 |  | 331 | 331 | 400 |
| Roadway Width | 12 |  | 30 | 30 |  | 30 | 30 | 15 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 |  | 6534 | 3713 |  | 3416 | 2822 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 |  | 5 | 4 |  | 5 | 5 | 12 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G |  | P | P |  | P | P | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 0 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 0 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] <br> 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | $\square \quad 43$ | 27 | $0^{27}$ | $0^{27}$ | 27 | $3^{27}$ | $3^{24}$ | 42 |
| 51-Road Category | $B$ |  | A | A |  | A | A | $B$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  |  | 2004 | 2004 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2007 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Status | IN-PROCESS | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIALR | ED-TO-FIE |



| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Bell Roa <br> 0666 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Wildhors 0675 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mclean R <br> 0675 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mclean R <br> 0675 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mclean R <br> 0675 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Wildhors <br> 0685 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Wildhors <br> 0685 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Wildhors 0685 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0666 | 0675 | 0675 | 0675 | 0675 | 0685 | 0685 | 0685 |
| 5-Section Number | 20 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 10 | 20 | 30 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 3.8 | 1.1 |  | 1.9 | 1.3 | 0.8 |  | 0.5 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  | 59C408067500465 |  |  |  | 59C39867500119 |  |
| 19-Bridae Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 39 \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 26 \end{array}$ |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 2 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 0 | 80 |  | 80 | 80 | 60 |  | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 8 | 22 |  | 22 | 22 | 20 |  | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type | 1 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 60 |  | 60 | 40 | 60 |  | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 66 |  | 80 | 191 | 171 |  | 106 |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2005 |  | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |  | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 15 |  | 13 | 15 | 20 |  | 20 |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 0666 | 675 |  | 675 | 675 | 685 |  | 685 |
| Roadway Width | 8 | 24 |  | 26 | 26 | 24 |  | 24 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 98 |  | 119 | 284 | 254 |  | 157 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 14 | 11 |  | 12 | 11 | 10 |  | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G |  | G | P | P |  | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 |  | 0 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 2 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 1 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.73500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.74500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Begin Longitude | -118.39500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.32500000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 25 | 25 | 25 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | - | 3 |  | 4 | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| 51-Road Category | A | A |  | A | A | A |  | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2005 | 2006 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Status | 3ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Wildhors <br> 0685 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Eagle Cr 0685 | $\begin{gathered} \text { P07143 } \\ \text { Northwes } \\ \text { Umatilla } \\ \text { Umatilla } \\ \text { Eagle Cr } \\ 0685 \end{gathered}$ | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Rainvill 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatilla Rainvill 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Rainvill 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> M.Johns <br> 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> M.Johns <br> 0692 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | - 40 | - 50 | - 60 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 2.1 | 1.6 | 2.7 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.1 |  |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1810200059 \mathrm{C} 403$ |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |  |
| 16-Surface Width | 20 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 |  |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |  |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width <br> 14-Shoulder Type | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 685 | 685 | 685 | 692 | 692 | 692 | 692 |  |
| Roadway Width | 24 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 15 |  |
| TTAM Future ADT | 149 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |  |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 |  |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |  |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |  |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 22 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 3 | 0 | 4 |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | A | A | $T$ | $A$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2005 | $2005$ |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region <br> Agency <br> Reservation <br> Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> M. Johns <br> 0692 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille M. Johns | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatille Umatille Wamishta | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Wamishta | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Wamishta | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Wamishta <br> 0732 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Wamishta <br> 0732 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil 0735 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0692 | 0692 | 0732 | 0732 | 0732 | 0732 | 0732 | 0735 |
| 5-Section Number | 60 | 70 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.2 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 60 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 15 | 15 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 10 | 12 | 14 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 40 | 0 | 50 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 692 | 692 | 732 | 732 | 732 | 732 | 732 | 735 |
| Roadway Width | 15 | 15 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 10 | 12 | 14 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  | 45.74600000 |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  | 45.74600000 |  |  |
| 43-Beqin Longitude |  |  |  |  |  | -118.47800000 |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  | -118.45200000 |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 4 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 75009 | 9 | 0 |
| 51-Road Category | A | $T$ | A | A | A | $T$ | $T$ | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2016 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | IN-PROCESS | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| $\left.\begin{array}{r}\text { Location ID } \\ \text { Region } \\ \text { Agency }\end{array}\right\}$Reservation <br> Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil <br> 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ross Hil 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Ross Hil 0735 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Curl Roa 0736 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Curl Roa 0736 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille Curl Roa 0736 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 10 | 20 | 30 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 60 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 12 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 10 | 16 | 16 | 22 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Riaht of Wav Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 50 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 735 | 735 | 735 | 735 | 735 | 736 | 736 | 736 |
| Roadway Width | 12 | 12 | 22 | 8 | 10 | 16 | 16 | 22 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 13 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 25 | 22 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | $T$ | $T$ | $T$ | $T$ | $T$ | A | $T$ | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year Status | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pambrun | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Spring H |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0737 | 0745 |
| 5 -Section Number | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.0 | 2.2 |  | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  | 1958473700082 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridae Lenath |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 60 | 80 |  | 80 | 80 | 60 | 0 | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 22 | 24 |  | 24 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 24 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 |  | 60 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 22-Existing ADT | 178 | 138 |  | 100 |  |  |  | 82 |
| 21-ADT Year | 2004 | 2005 |  | 2004 |  |  |  | 2004 |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 20 | 19 |  | 12 |  |  |  | 35 |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 737 | 737 |  | 737 | 737 | 737 | 737 | 745 |
| Roadway Width | 26 | 28 |  | 28 | 24 | 20 | 10 | 28 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 264 | 205 |  | 149 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 122 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 |  | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | P | G |  | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 21 | 21 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 4 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51-Road Category | A | A |  | A | A | A | $T$ | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | $2005$ | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


4-IRR Route Number 5-Section Number 10-Class
15-Length of Section 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridae Condition 20-Bridge Lenath 32-County
33-Congressional District 7-State
8-Ownership
12-Construction Need 11-Terrain
25-Roadbed Condition 24-Surface Condition Index 16-Surface Width
13-Surface Type
9-Federal Aid Category 28-Right of Way Status 29-Right of Way Width TTAM BIA Share
30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type 22-Existing ADT
21-ADT Year
23-Percent Trucks 34-Owner Route Number Roadway Width
TTAM Future ADT TTAM ADS Number TTAM Future Surface Type 35-Drainage Condition 36-Shoulder Condition 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE 39-Right of Way Utility 40-Right of Way Cost 26-Level of Maintenance 27-Snow \& Ice Control 41-Begin Latitude 42-End Latitude 43-Beain Lonaitude 44-End Longitude 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Johnley 0751 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Johnley 0751 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Lafave R 0784 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Lafave R 0784 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Tubbs Ra 0788 | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatille Tubbs Ra 0788 | $\begin{gathered} \text { P07143 } \\ \text { Northwes } \\ \text { Umatille } \\ \text { Umatille } \\ \text { Tubbs Ra } \\ 0788 \end{gathered}$ | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Tubbs Ra 0788 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | 20 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 2.2 |
| 18-Bridge Number <br> 19-Bridge Condition <br> 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 40 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 80 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 22 | 22 | 7 | 12 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 50 | 50 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  | 162 |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  | 21 | 34 |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 0751 | 0751 | 784 | 784 | 788 | 788 | 788 | 788 |
| Roadway Width | 22 | 22 | 7 | 12 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 20 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 241 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beqin Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 51-Road Category | A | A | $T$ | $T$ | A | A | A | $T$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| 4-IRR Route Number | 0858 | 0858 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | $0900$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 -Section Number | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 40 | 88 | 40 | 83 | 40 | 78 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 18 | 15 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 24 | 24 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  | 3580 | 3580 | 3432 | 3432 | 2553 | 2553 |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 13 |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 858 | 858 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 | 900 |
| Roadway Width | 18 | 15 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 34 | 34 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 5316 | 5316 | 5097 | 5097 | 3791 | 3791 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 14 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  | 45.67200000 |  | 45.66900000 |  | 45.66800000 |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  | 45.66900000 |  | 45.66800000 |  | 45.66800000 |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  | -118.75300000 |  | -118.74700000 |  | -118.69700000 |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  | -118.74700000 |  | -118.69700000 |  | -118.68400000 |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 24 | 24 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 0 | 3 | 75000 |  | 75000 | 65408 | 75000 |  |
| 51-Road Cateqory | $T$ | $T$ | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1992 | 1992 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2016 | 2006 | 2016 | 2006 | 2016 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | TURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIALR | ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Bingham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mission | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Bingham | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Bingham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Bingham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Bingham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Bingham |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 | 0900 |
| 5-Section Number | 120 | 120 | 130 | 130 | 140 | 140 | 150 | 150 |
| 10-Class | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15-Length of Section |  |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |  | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| 18-Bridge Number | P72500000000000 | P725 |  |  | P72600000000000 | P726 |  |  |
| 19-Bridae Condition | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 20-Bridge Length | 370 | 60 |  |  | 160 | 60 |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  |  | 52 | 80 |  |  | 52 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width |  |  | 22 | 22 |  |  | 21 | 21 |
| 13-Surface Type |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width |  |  | 60 | 60 |  | 0 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 10.27 | 100 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 10.27 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 2 | 3 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  | 261 | 261 |  |  | 203 | 203 |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  | 29 | 29 |  |  | 30 | 30 |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  | 900 | 900 |  |  | 900 | 900 |
| Roadway Width |  |  | 24 | 24 |  |  | 23 | 23 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  |  | 388 | 388 |  |  | 301 | 301 |
| TTAM ADS Number |  |  | 9 | 9 |  | 7 | 9 | 9 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  |  | P | P |  |  | P | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.69800000 |  | 45.69800000 |  | 45.70200000 |  | 45.70300000 |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.69800000 |  | 45.70200000 |  | 45.70300000 |  | 45.71200000 |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.39400000 |  | -118.39400000 |  | -118.35600000 |  | -118.35500000 |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.39400000 |  | -118.35600000 |  | -118.35500000 |  | -118.34300000 |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |  |  | - 25 | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe |  |  | 75000 |  |  |  | 75000 |  |
| 51-Road Category |  |  | A | A |  |  | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  |  | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2006 | 2016 | 2006 | 2016 | 2002 | 2016 | 2006 |
| Status | ZETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIALR | ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | ETURNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL |



## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Jackson | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Marlowe | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Mytinger | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mckay La | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Short Mi | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Short Mi | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Meacham | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0902 | 0903 | 0904 | 0904 | 0908 | 0908 | 0911 | 0911 |
| 5 -Section Number | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | P75000000000000 |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 147 |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 0 | 40 | 100 | 100 | 60 | 60 | 40 |  |
| 16-Surface Width | 8 | 16 | 24 | 24 | 33 | 33 | 16 |  |
| 13-Surface Type | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |  |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 28-Riaht of Wav Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 0 |  |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width <br> 14-Shoulder Type | 0 | 0 | 3 3 | 3 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  | 655 | 655 |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  | 13 | 13 |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 902 | 903 | 904 | 904 | 908 | 908 | 911 |  |
| Roadway Width | 8 | 16 | 30 | 30 | 37 | 37 | 16 |  |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 973 | 973 | 74 |  |
| TTAM ADS Number | 15 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 |  |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | P | P | G |  |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.70200000 | 45.68900000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.68900000 | 45.68900000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  | -118.35600000 | -118.35800000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  | -118.35800000 | -118.35800000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 27 | $4^{64}$ | 063 | $0^{63}$ | $3^{64}$ | $64$ | $25$ | 25 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory | $T$ | 4 A | 0 A | 0 A | 3 A | $3$ | A |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  | 1959 | 2005 | 2005 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |
| Update Year | 2006 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIALC | -AT-REG | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham <br> 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham <br> 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham 0911 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Meacham <br> 0911 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 | 0911 |
| 5 -Section Number | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.4 |  | 2.7 |  | 0.2 | 0.7 |  | 4.7 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  | P75100000000000 |  | P75200000000000 |  |  | P75300000000000 |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  | 7 |  | 7 |  |  | 7 |  |
| 20-Bridge Length |  | 67 |  | 45 |  |  | 33 |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 40 |  | 40 |  | 40 | 40 |  | 40 |
| 16-Surface Width | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roadway Width | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 |  | 74 |  | 74 | 74 |  | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 | 12 |  | 12 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G |  | G |  | G | G |  | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.68900000 | 45.68400000 | 45.68400000 | 45.64700000 | 45.64700000 | 45.64500000 | 45.63600000 | 45.63600000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.68400000 | 45.68400000 | 45.64700000 | 45.64700000 | 45.64500000 | 45.63600000 | 45.63500000 | 45.57400000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.35800000 | -118.36400000 | -118.36400000 | -118.35900000 | -118.35900000 | -118.35800000 | -118.35500000 | -118.35500000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.36400000 | -118.36400000 | -118.35900000 | -118.35900000 | -118.35800000 | -118.35500000 | -118.35500000 | -118.32500000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | - 25 | 28 | - 28 | 28 | $28$ | $28$ | 28 | $28$ |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Cateqory | $A$ |  | A |  | $A$ | A |  | $A$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |




## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> North Ca | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> River Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> River Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> River Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Wilson R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Pond Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Pond Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Pond Roa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0925 | 0927 | 0927 | 0927 | 0927 | 0929 | 0929 | 0929 |
| 5-Section Number | 90 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 40 | 67 | 67 | 40 | 48 | 40 | 0 |
| 16-Surface Width | 30 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 15 | 8 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 60 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 925 | 927 | 927 |  | 927 | 929 | 929 | 929 |
| Roadway Width | 30 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 16 | 15 | 8 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  | 45.66000000 | 45.67600000 |  | 45.63100000 | 45.62800000 | 45.62400000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  | 45.67200000 | 45.67500000 |  | 45.62800000 | 45.62400000 | 45.61700000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  | -118.60500000 | -118.57900000 |  | -118.72600000 | -118.72600000 | -118.72600000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  | -118.60000000 | -118.55600000 |  | -118.72600000 | -118.72600000 | -118.72600000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 27 | 27 | 27 |  | 27 | $00^{27}$ | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 4 | 3 | 75008 | 75000 | 0 | 75000 | 75000 | 75009 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | $T$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |
| Update Year Status | $\begin{array}{r} 2005 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2005 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { IN-PROCESS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { IN-PROCESS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2005 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2016 \\ \text { OFFICIAL } \end{array}$ |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Thompson | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Patawa R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Kash Kas | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatill Umatilla Kash Kas | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Kash Kas | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Kash Kas | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Hobby Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Hobby Ro |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0932 | 0933 | 0934 | 0934 | 0934 | 0934 | 0934 | 0934 |
| 5 -Section Number | 40 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 3.1 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 40 | 60 |  |  | 80 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 16 | 18 |  |  | 24 | 16 | 20 | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 244 |  |  | 127 | 121 |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2005 |  |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 19 |  |  | 12 | 12 |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 933 |  |  | 934 | 934 | 934 | 934 |
| Roadway Width | 16 | 22 |  |  | 24 | 16 | 20 | 20 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 362 | 74 | 74 | 189 | 180 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 10 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 14 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | P | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 4 |  |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Lonaitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | $27$ | $0^{27}$ | 27 | 27 | $3^{27}$ | $3^{27}$ | $0^{27}$ | $0^{27}$ |
| 51-Road Cateqory | L | A |  |  | , A | - $A$ | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2007 | 2007 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Lloyd Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Lloyd Ro | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Emigrant | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Emigrant | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatille Emiagrant | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Old Orea | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Theater | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Best Roa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0936 | 0936 | 0937 | 0937 | 0937 | 0937 | 0939 | 0950 |
| 5 -Section Number | 10 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 6.5 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 80 | 60 | 60 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 80 |
| 16-Surface Width | 18 | 22 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 18 |
| 13-Surface Type | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 80 | 80 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 408 | 177 | 218 | 135 | 68 |  | 198 |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |  | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 13 | 14 | 30 | 48 | 12 |  | 16 |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 936 | 936 | 937 | 937 | 937 | 937 | 939 | 950 |
| Roadway Width | 18 | 24 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 22 | 30 | 18 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 606 | 263 | 324 | 200 | 101 | 74 | 294 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | P | P | P | G | G | G | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Lonaitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 27 | 27 | 27 | 32 | 33 | 32 | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | $A$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

4-IRR Route Number 5-Section Number
10-Class
15-Length of Section
18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length 32-County
33-Congressional District 7-State
8-Ownership
12-Construction Need
11-Terrain
25-Roadbed Condition 24-Surface Condition Index 16-Surface Width
13-Surface Type
9-Federal Aid Category 28-Right of Way Status 29-Right of Way Width TTAM BIA Share
30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type 22-Existing ADT
21-ADT Year
23-Percent Trucks
34-Owner Route Number
Roadway Width
TTAM Future ADT
TTAM ADS Number TTAM Future Surface Type 35-Drainage Condition 36-Shoulder Condition 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE 39-Right of Way Utility 40-Right of Way Cost 26-Level of Maintenance 27-Snow \& Ice Control 41-Begin Latitude 42-End Latitude 43-Begin Lonaitude 44-End Lonaitude
45-Atlas Map Number 1991 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Category
52-Year of Construction Change Update Year

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 |
| 5 -Section Number | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section |  | 1.2 | 0.1 |  | 3.1 |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 18-Bridge Number | 0952400621206 |  |  | 18512098700196 |  | 59C329 |  |  |
| 19-Bridae Condition | 7 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 20-Bridge Length | 268 |  |  | 52 |  | 20 |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  | 3 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  | 80 | 80 |  | 80 |  | 60 | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width |  | 24 | 24 |  | 24 |  | 24 | 15 |
| 13-Surface Type |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width |  | 40 | 60 |  | 60 |  | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 10.27 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width <br> 14-Shoulder Type |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 76 | 68 |  | 58 |  | 60 | 69 |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2004 | 2004 |  | 2005 |  | 2005 | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 31 | 34 |  | 30 |  | 33 | 37 |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 987 | 987 |  | 987 |  | 987 | 987 |
| Roadway Width |  | 24 | 24 |  | 24 |  | 24 | 15 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  | 113 | 101 |  | 86 |  | 89 | 102 |
| TTAM ADS Number |  | 12 | 11 |  | 11 |  | 11 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  | G | G |  | G |  | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Lonaitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [991 | 14 | 14 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 32 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe |  | 7 | 0 |  | 7 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 51-Road Cateqory |  | A | A |  | A |  | A | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2008 | 2005 | 2005 | 2006 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Goad Roa | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Baldwin | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Baldwin | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> Poverty <br> 1021 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Poverty <br> 1021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 | 0987 | 1019 | 1019 | 1021 | 1021 |
| 5-Section Number | 100 | 110 | 120 | 130 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.5 |  | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |  |
| 18-Bridge Number |  | 59C330 |  |  |  |  |  | 09648 006F22471 |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 20-Bridge Length |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  | 172 |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 |  | 80 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 60 |  |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 |  | 24 | 24 | 10 | 10 | 20 |  |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 |  | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 |  | 60 | 60 | 60 | 30 | 60 |  |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 10.27 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width <br> 14-Shoulder Type | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 22-Existing ADT | 61 |  |  | 58 |  |  | 94 |  |
| 21-ADT Year | 2004 |  |  | 2004 |  |  | 2005 |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks | 29 |  |  | 23 |  |  | 20 |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 987 |  | 987 | 987 | 1019 | 1019 | 1021 |  |
| Roadway Width | 24 |  | 24 | 24 | 10 | 10 | 24 |  |
| TTAM Future ADT | 91 |  | 74 | 86 | 74 | 74 | 140 |  |
| TTAM ADS Number | 11 |  | 11 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 11 |  |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G |  | G | G | G | G | G |  |
| $35-$ Drainage Condition | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 4 |  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  | 45.55500000 | 45.55500000 |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  | 45.55500000 | 45.55500000 |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude |  |  |  |  | -118.60000000 | -118.60000000 |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  |  |  | -118.59900000 | -118.59900000 |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | $32$ | 32 | $032$ |  |  |  | $32$ | 32 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Category | 0 A |  | 0 A | 6 A | - 9 A | - 9 A | $3$ |  |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 |  | 1959 | 1959 |  | A | 1959 |  |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2016 | 2007 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | URNED-TO-FIE | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> Poverty | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Poverty | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Poverty | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Poverty | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> East Pov | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatilla <br> East Pov | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Palmer R | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatille <br> Umatille <br> South Ma |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1022 | 1022 | 1023 | 1025 |
| 5-Section Number | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 2.4 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 80 | 60 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width | 21 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 60 | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 10.27 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  | 84 | 84 |  |  |  |  | 1259 |
| 21-ADT Year |  | 2005 | 2005 |  |  |  |  | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  | 14 | 16 |  |  |  |  | 18 |
| 34-Owner Route Number | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1021 | 1022 | 1022 | 1023 | 1025 |
| Roadway Width | 25 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 28 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 125 | 125 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 1870 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | P |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.57900000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.57800000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.58900000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.58900000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 0 |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | A | A | B | $B$ | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

## 4-IRR Route Number

 5-Section Number10-Class
15-Length of Section
18-Bridge Number 19-Bridae Condition 20-Bridge Length 32-County
33-Congressional District 7-State
8-Ownership
12-Construction Need
11-Terrain
25-Roadbed Condition 24-Surface Condition Index 16-Surface Width
13-Surface Type
9-Federal Aid Category 28-Right of Way Status 29-Right of Way Width TTAM BIA Share
30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width 14-Shoulder Type 22-Existing ADT
21-ADT Year
23-Percent Trucks
34-Owner Route Number
Roadway Width
TTAM Future ADT
TTAM ADS Number TTAM Future Surface Type 35-Drainage Condition 36-Shoulder Condition 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE 39-Right of Way Utility 40-Right of Way Cost 26-Level of Maintenance 27-Snow \& Ice Control 41-Begin Latitude 42-End Latitude 43-Begin Lonaitude 44-End Longitude
45-Atlas Map Number 1991 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe 51-Road Category
52-Year of Construction Change Update Year

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Mckay Cr | P07143 <br> Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Mckay Cr |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 1050 | 1050 | 1050 | 1052 | 1052 | 1052 | 1052 | 1052 |
| 5-Section Number | 90 | 100 | 110 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 |
| 10-Class | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section |  | 0.5 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 2.9 |  | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number | 59C034105001067 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition | [ 1 |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 9 \\ 65 \end{array}$ |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  | 80 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |  | 60 |
| 16-Surface Width |  | 20 | 16 | 20 | 20 | 20 |  | 20 |
| 13-Surface Type |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 29-Right of Way Width |  | 60 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 50 |  | 60 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent 17-Shoulder Width |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  | 75 | 69 | 58 |  | 65 |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |  | 2005 |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  | 22 | 25 | 28 |  | 22 |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 1050 | 1050 | 1052 | 1052 | 1052 |  | 1052 |
| Roadway Width |  | 20 | 16 | 20 | 20 | 20 |  | 20 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  | 74 | 74 | 111 | 102 | 86 |  | 97 |
| TTAM ADS Number |  | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |  | 10 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  | G | G | G | G | G |  | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44-End Lonaitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] | 37 | 37 | 37 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe |  |  | 7 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |
| 51-Road Category |  | A | A | A | A | A |  | A |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 | 1959 |  | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory





## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Usfs 303 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Usfs 310 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Redford | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Redford | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Indian G | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Purchase | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Purchase | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Kusi Roa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 3030 | 3100 | 3142 | 3142 | 3147 | 3172 | 3172 | 3177 |
| 5-Section Number | 50 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15-Length of Section | 6.7 | 38.8 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.1 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County |  |  | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District |  |  | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 11-Terrain | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 0 | 70 | 72 | 60 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 96 |
| 16-Surface Width | 15 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 24 |
| 13-Surface Type | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 29-Right of Way Width |  |  | 40 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |  | 3142 | 3142 | 3147 | 3172 | 3172 | 3177 |
| Roadway Width | 15 | 24 | 24 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 26 |
| TTAM Future ADT |  |  | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number |  |  | 14 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  |  | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control |  |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude |  |  | 45.76100000 |  | 45.74600000 | 45.67000000 |  | 45.64600000 |
| 42-End Latitude |  |  | 45.75800000 |  | 45.73700000 | 45.66000000 |  | 45.64600000 |
| 43-Begin Longitude |  |  | -118.49800000 |  | -118.38100000 | -118.71000000 |  | -118.68400000 |
| 44-End Longitude |  |  | -118.52200000 |  | -118.35200000 | -118.70800000 |  | -118.68200000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 |  |  | - 24 | 24 | 25 | 63 | 27 | 27 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | - | T | 75000 | 7 | 75000 | 75000 |  | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category |  |  | A | A | $B$ |  | $T$ | $A$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change |  |  | 2011 | 1959 |  | 1959 |  | 2008 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2006 | 2016 |
| Status | IN-PROCES | IN-PROCES | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL |

## Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

FY 2022 Inventory

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Kusi Roa 3177 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Price La <br> 3180 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Shippent <br> 3182 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Johnley <br> 3270 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Johnley <br> 3270 | P07143 Northwes Umatilla Umatilla Johnley 3270 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Usfs 542 <br> 5427 | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatille <br> Usfs 542 <br> 5427 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-Section Number | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 10 | 20 |
| 10-Class | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 1.4 |
| 18-Bridge Number 19-Bridge Condition 20-Bridge Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32-County | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 | 02 |
| 7-State | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 11-Terrain | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25-Roadbed Condition | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 24-Surface Condition Index | 86 | 68 | 68 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 40 |
| 16-Surface Width | 24 | 15 | 14 | 24 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 28-Right of Way Status | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 0 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Shoulder Type | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  | 3180 | 3182 | 3270 | 3270 | 3270 | 5427 | 5427 |
| Roadway Width | 26 | 15 | 14 | 24 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 13 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 11 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type | G | G | G | G | G | G | G | G |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.64600000 | 45.66500000 | 45.67700000 | 45.71700000 | 45.73200000 | 45.74600000 |  |  |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.64600000 | 45.65800000 | 45.67700000 | 45.73200000 | 45.74600000 | 45.74600000 |  |  |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68400000 | -118.55800000 | -118.55600000 | -118.53900000 | -118.53900000 | -118.53900000 |  |  |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.68600000 | -118.54900000 | -118.56100000 | -118.53900000 | -118.53900000 | -118.53900000 |  |  |
| 45-Atlas Map Number 1991 | 27 | 27 | 27 |  | 24 | 24 | 42 | 42 |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 | 75000 |  |  |
| 51-Road Cateqory | A | A | A | $T$ | $T$ | $T$ | $B$ | $B$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 2008 | 1959 | 1999 | 1959 |  |  | 1959 | 1959 |
| Update Year | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2016 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Status | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | OFFICIAL | -TO-FIER | D-TO-FIE |



Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (ver2)

| Location ID Region Agency Reservation Road Name | P07143 <br> Northwes <br> Umatilla <br> Umatilla <br> Ti'Mine |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4-IRR Route Number | 7001 |
| 5-Section Number | 10 |
| 10-Class | 8 |
| 15-Length of Section | 0.8 |
| 18-Bridge Number |  |
| 19-Bridge Condition |  |
| 20-Bridge Length |  |
| 32-County | 059 |
| 33-Congressional District | 02 |
| 7-State | OR |
| 8-Ownership | 2 |
| 12-Construction Need | 2 |
| 11-Terrain |  |
| 25-Roadbed Condition |  |
| 24-Surface Condition Index |  |
| 16-Surface Width | 8 |
| 13-Surface Type | 5 |
| 9-Federal Aid Category |  |
| 28-Right of Way Status |  |
| 29-Right of Way Width | 40 |
| TTAM BIA Share | 100 |
| 30-Additional Incidental Percent |  |
| 17-Shoulder Width |  |
| 14-Shoulder Type |  |
| 22-Existing ADT |  |
| 21-ADT Year |  |
| 23-Percent Trucks |  |
| 34-Owner Route Number |  |
| Roadway Width | 8 |
| TTAM Future ADT | 30 |
| TTAM ADS Number | 19 |
| TTAM Future Surface Type |  |
| 35-Drainage Condition | 2 |
| 36-Shoulder Condition | 0 |
| 37/38 \# RR X I NG/RR XING TYPE | 0 |
| 39-Right of Way Utility | 3 |
| 40-Right of Way Cost |  |
| 26-Level of Maintenance | 3 |
| 27-Snow \& Ice Control | 3 |
| 41-Begin Latitude | 45.66400000 |
| 42-End Latitude | 45.66800000 |
| 43-Beain Longitude | -118.68400000 |
| 44-End Longitude | -118.69300000 |
| 45-Atlas Map Number [99] |  |
| 46-50 Grade/Sight/Curve/Stop / Safe | 75000 |
| 51-Road Category | $E$ |
| 52-Year of Construction Change | 2010 |
| Update Year | 2016 |
| Status | OFFICIAL |

## Attachment E

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation Safe Routes to School Plan
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ii Oregon Safe Routes to School Project Identification Program

## Exhibit \#3 - Page 487 of 532

## Chapter 1. Introduction

The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plan lays the foundation for school, CTUIR government, Charter School Board, Yellowhawk Tribal Health, Pendleton School District, Umatilla County, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 5, and wider community to work together on reducing barriers for students walking and biking to school. The CTUIR SRTS Plan addresses Nixyáawii Community School, the only school located within the CTUIR boundary.

This Plan is the first deliverable in a phased approach to the planning process, in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic and the need for social distancing and school closures. The Plan documents the process that took place remotely to identify and prioritize construction projects for the ODOT SRTS Competitive Infrastructure Grant Program.

## Oregon Department of Transportation's Project Identification Program

This SRTS Plan supports Oregon's state-wide SRTS construction (infrastructure) and education/engagement (noninfrastructure) efforts. The Project Identification Program (PIP) Process is an ODOT technical grant program that connects communities in Oregon with planning assistance to identify needs and opportunities near one or more Schools, focusing on streets within a quarter-mile of the School, as well as critical issues within a mile of the School.

The goals of the PIP process are:

- To engage school stakeholders around identifying and prioritizing projects that will improve walking and bicycling routes to Schools.
- To identify and refine specific projects that are eligible for the ODOT SRTS Infrastructure Grants and prepare jurisdictions to apply for the funding.

CTUIR transportation planning staff, Charter School Board members, Yellowhawk Tribal Health staff, ODOT Region 5 staff, and Umatilla County staff worked with a consultant team from Alta Planning + Design to complete the Phase 1 SRTS Plan.

For more information on the program, visit: https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS-Project-Identification-Program.aspx.

## What is Safe Routes to School (SRTS)?

SRTS is a comprehensive program to make School communities safer by combining engineering tools and enforcement with education about safety and activities to enable and encourage students to walk and bicycle to School. SRTS programs typically involve partnerships among municipalities, school districts, community members, parent volunteers, and law enforcement.

The benefits of implementing a SRTS plan are far-reaching and include improving safety, encouraging physical activity, increasing access to school, and reducing traffic congestion and motor vehicle emissions near schools. Implementing SRTS programs and projects benefit adjacent neighborhoods, as well as students and their families, by reducing traffic conflicts and enabling walking and biking trips for all purposes.

## Why Safe Routes to School?

## THE PROBLEM

Within the span of one generation, the percentage of children walking or blcycling to school has decreased $73 \%$.


Children and adolescents should have 60 minutes ( 1 hour) or more of physical activity dally.


Roads near schools are congested, decreasing safety and air quallty for children.


This movement away from active transportation Is a self-perpetuating cycle.


## THE SOLUTION

Safe Routes to School programs and activitles help overcome obstacles to walking, blking, and skating by Improving safety and making It fun and convenlent for everyone.


SRTS education and encouragement programs can result in a $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ Increase in walking and biking over five years.


When education and encouragement programs are combined with Infrastructure improvements, such as sidewalks and safe crossings, SRTS can
 result in a 45\% Increase In walking and blking.

1 mille of walking each way to school equals $2 / 3$ of the dally recommended 60 minutes of physical activity.


[^10]
## Nixyáawii Community School Overview

| Nixyáawii Community School |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Principal: | Ryan Heinrich | Address: | 46250 Timíne Way, |
|  |  | \% students eligible for | Pendleton, OR 97801 |

Table 1: School Demographics
$\left.\begin{array}{lcccccccc}\hline & \text { AMERICAN } & & \text { NATIVE } & & & & \\ & \text { INDIAN/ } & & \text { HAWAIIAN/ } & \text { BLACK/ } & & \text { WHITE, NON- } & \\ & \text { ALASKA } & & \text { PACIFIC } & \text { AFRICAN }\end{array}\right)$

Source: Oregon Department of Education 2019-2020 School year.

Table 2: Pendleton School District Languages

| TOP 5 LANGUAGES SPOKEN (BY SCHOOL DISTRICT) | \#STUDENTS |
| :--- | :--- |
| English | 3213 |
| Spanish | 132 |
| Chinese | 5 |
| Other | 17 |

Total Languages Spoken: 15
Source: Oregon Department of Education 2019-2020 School year.

## PIP Outreach Process

In response to the COVID-19 global pandemic and the need for social distancing and school closures, the outreach process for this Plan took place virtually. The outreach process consisted of two components, a Virtual School Safety Assessment and an Online Public Input Tool.

The Virtual School Safety Assessment took place on June 25, 2020 and included representatives from CTUIR Transportation Planning, Nixyáawii School Board, Umatilla County, and ODOT Region 5.

In June and July 2020, community members were invited to provide feedback via an Online Public Input Tool that asked about the best routes to school and challenging locations to walk and bike. CTUIR Transportation Planning, Nixyáawii School Board, and Yellowhawk Tribal Health coordinated to spread the word about the Online Public Input Tool and posted information about the project and online tool, using the following methods to encourage participation:

- CTUIR and YellowHawk Tribal Health website and social media channels
- CTUIR June and July monthly newsletter
- Flyers sent home with school meal pick-up promoting the public input map

A total of 5 comments were provided on the online map, and 6 "likes" of existing comments to indicate support for the comment. These comments informed the construction recommendations on page 24.

## Chapter 2. Vision and Goals for Safe Routes to Schools

Chapter will be completed during Phase 2, when public health circumstances allow for a site visit and community meeting to establish shared community goals for SRTS.

## Chapter 3. Existing Conditions

## Background Data

In advance of the School Safety Assessment, the consultant team collected and compiled existing conditions data and local context information, as well as information about documented community concerns, demographics, travel routes, existing facilities, traffic patterns, school environment, and other relevant details. After the Virtual School Safety Assessment and Online Public Input Tool comment period, the consultant team added contextual details learned from the participants.

## Plan Review

## CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE UMATILLA INDIAN RESERVATION TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN

The Transportation System Plan (TSP) addresses the transportation needs of the Umatilla Indian Reservation over the next 20 years, and considers key modes of travel including roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and rail. It is used to guide decisions related to the classification of existing and future roadways on the Reservation, the implementation of roadway design standards when new roads are built or existing ones are improved, the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians and public transit, and the enforcement of access management policies.

Although the Transportation System Plan was adopted in 2001, its prioritized list of transportation improvements remains relevant to SRTS planning efforts today. Notable guidance related to the pedestrian and bicycle systems in particular are highlighted below:

- Provide bicycle/pedestrian facility along Mission Road (County Road \#900) from Highway 331 to the west Reservation boundary near Hal's Trailer Park. Construct a multi-use path along the south side of Mission Road.
- When roadway improvements are made to Highway 331, the East-West Connector Road and Mission Road shall consist of two 12-foot travel lanes, with 6-foot bike lanes, 6-foot sidewalks, and underground storm water drainage.
- Full implementation of all improvement projects would result in a safe and continuous pedestrian route along Highway 331 from Mission Road to South Market Road consisting of a combination of paved shoulders, sidewalks, and a multi-use path.
- Sidewalks should be present along all roads located in the urban or urbanizeable areas of the Reservation.
- In cases where bike lanes are proposed, five to six feet of roadway pavement should be provided between the curb and vehicle travel lane. Striping should also be provided to distinguish the bike lane from the travel lane.
- Multi-use paths should be paved and have a minimum width of eight feet.


## MISSION COMMUNITY MASTER PLAN

The purpose of the Mission Community Master Plan is to plan and coordinate the future of the Mission Community, the tribal commercial and emerging tribal services center of the reservation, with a focus on the Central Business District and Governance Activity Center Subarea. The Master Plan grew from an analysis of three alternative ways to meet the need for improved connectivity and additional housing for tribal members, and was adopted in

March 2018. It contains recommendations that serve as a technical memo advising recommended changes to the Transportation System Plan (2001) as well as the Mission Community Plan (1998).
The Mission Community Master Plan focuses on the area adjacent to the intersection of Highway 331 and Mission Road, also referred to as the "Four Corners" area. Among its many land use and transportation recommendations, the plan assesses that there is a lack of improved trails and safe pedestrian and bicycle routes to connect areas within the Four Corners, and that the future of the Mission Community's active transportation network is an expanded and interconnected system of multi-use pathways. Some of the plan's transportation goals are to:

- Promote a Connected and Healthy Community. Create a more physically connected community that provides viable multi-modal transportation opportunities; strengthens access to natural and cultural assets and other important destinations throughout the community; and improves transportation choices and health outcomes.
- Include pedestrian, bicycle, rolling, horse, and transit facilities while developing street and on-site circulation designs.
- Support the development of a community-wide multi-use path system, which connects residential, commercial/employment, public use/service, and open space areas, specifically those that highlight significant natural and cultural elements.

A few specific proposed improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle transportation networks are detailed below, which help inform the SRTS planning effort:

- P-1: Install six-foot sidewalks along the north side of Mission Road.
- M-4: Construct a new multi-use path connecting the Nixyáawii Governance Center to the Four Corners Area.
- B-1; B-2: Widen Mission Road and install bicycle lanes along the north side all the way east to Cedar Street; Widen Mission Road and install bicycle lanes along the south side from Short Mile Road to Cedar Street.



The Mission Community Master Plan also identifies the intersection of OR 331 and Mission Rd as a key intersection, which has been similarly identified in planning for safe routes to Nixyáawii Community School (Figure 3).

The plan calls for these improvement alternatives to the OR 331 and Mission Rd intersection:

1. Signalize the intersection
2. Construct separate left-turn lanes on all four intersection approaches
3. Construct a separate right turn lane on the northbound approach.

OR

1. Construct a single lane roundabout (Figure 4)
2. Realign the northbound and southbound approaches to avoid impacts to the Mission Market.



For a complete list of existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities, as well as engineering design standards see pages 24-35 of the Mission Community Master Plan.

## HIGHWAY 331 CORRIDOR PLAN - OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

In 1995, there was a surge in economic and transportation activity along Highway 331 tied to the development of the Wildhorse Gaming Resort, located along the east side of Highway 331 approximately three-quarters of a mile north of Interstate 84. The Highway 331 Corridor Plan was subsequently developed to address the existing and emerging transportation needs of the highway corridor for the following 20 years since its adoption in 2002 and constitutes a public facility plan for ODOT.

The following projects in the prioritized implementation plan set forth in this document are especially relevant to the SRTS planning effort:

- Mission Road at Highway 331 - Modify intersection to include stop control at all four approaches, construct sidewalks and curbing with handicap ramps on all four corners, and provide striping for crosswalks. Must be reviewed by state traffic engineer. (Note that this project has been partially implemented, with sidewalks and curbing with handicap ramps on all four corners and crosswalk striping not done).
- East-West Connector Road - Extend urban connector road from the new intersection at Highway 331 to the west and then north to a new intersection with Mission Road. (Note this project has been implemented.)
- Mission Road Bike/Ped Facility - Provide bicycle/pedestrian facility along Mission Road (County Road \#900) from Highway 331 to the west Reservation boundary near Hal's Trailer Park (Option 1: Construct a multi-use path along the south side of Mission Road. Option 2: Widen roadway to include paved shoulders.)
- Highway 331 Sidewalks and Bike Lanes - Provide bike lanes, curb and gutter, and sidewalks along Highway 331 from Mission Road to proposed East-West Connector Road.

For a complete list and map of the prioritized projects, see page 9 of the Highway 331 Corridor Plan.

## CTUIR VISIONING AND BEAUTIFICATION MASTER PLAN

Adopted in July 2009, the CTUIR Visioning and Beautification Master Plan was a conceptual study that sought to:

- Create and further enhance non-motorized connectivity of the land uses in the study area;
- Incorporate safety, exercise and health
- Create and enhance visual and aesthetic continuity between and within the diverse uses currently located on and planned for the most developed reservation lands.

The plan identifies three diverse general areas of current and planned development:

- Mission: the tribal commercial and emerging tribal services center of the reservation.
- July Grounds: the cultural, educational, wellness and housing center.
- Gateway: the economic engine, featuring most of the visitor draws, development and employment opportunities.

The plan notes in its conclusion that there is a unique and valuable opportunity for non-motorized connectivity, aesthetic continuity, entrance definition, recreation/exercise and education/interpretation on the most developed lands of the CTUIR. The plan conceptually indicates a pathway system, as a loop system and otherwise, connecting all three major developed "communities" listed above, which has implications for SRTS planning.

## THE PATHWAY SYSTEM



## CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE UMATILLA INDIAN RESERVATION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Adopted in September 2010 and updated in November 2018, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Comprehensive Plan (Plan) articulates a vision for the future of the CTUIR community that sustains the values of the people and establishes a flexible policy framework to guide decisions on a continuing basis.

The Plan directs the creation of Tribal statutes and plans; the implementation of actions and services that support the vision. The Plan reflects the long-term values and aspirations of the CTUIR community as a whole and shows how various elements, such as economy, land base restoration, housing, transportation, community facilities, natural resources, health, education and culture can work together to achieve a desired vision.

The objectives within the transportation chapter that are especially relevant to the SRTS planning and implementation effort are highlighted below:

- Develop and maintain a transportation asset system that is safe, environmentally sensitive and economically sound and promotes the public health with future transportation in mind.
- Ensure public or personal transportation to meet cultural, economic, personal employment, health and other needs for all residents, particularly at-risk populations.

Finally, the Comprehensive Plan notes that the transportation safety, safety education and law enforcement, public transportation, new or reconstructed roads, and other transportation methods such as sidewalks, and multi-use paths are all needed for modern day transportation systems.

## CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE UMATILLA INDIAN RESERVATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM 2013-2030

The CTUIR Capital Improvement Plan is a financial tool for scheduling projects needed to accomplish the goals of the Tribes' Comprehensive Plan over time. It identifies projects, establishes and schedules priorities and commits needed funds.

While the plan outlays funding options for a range of transportation projects, there are some that are specifically related to active transportation both in the short term (2012-2015) and mid-term (2016-2020):
1.) $\mathrm{M}-5$ : A trail connecting the CTUIR Governance Center with Mission Market. The trail is envisioned as one piece of a larger trail system connecting the Mission, July Grounds and Gateway neighborhoods.
2.) $\mathrm{C}-3$ : A bridge is envisioned across Hwy 331 as part of a larger trail system connecting neighborhoods within the reservation. There is a natural place for the bridge where the topography on each side of the road rises south of the Governance Center.
3.) C-4: A connecting network of trails is envisioned for pedestrians to safely move from the July Grounds and Mission neighborhoods to the Gateway commercial area. Paved and bark components of the trail would allow for ADA access as well as horse travel. The early phase would be an east-west connector between Yellowhawk clinic/ July grounds housing and the Mission Road intersection with Hwy 331; A later phase would be a north south link adjacent to Hwy331 between Mission Road and Coyote Business Park/ Wildhorse.

For a complete list of projects in the Capital Improvements Program, see page 20 of the report.

## Crash History

Figure 6 and Figure 7 document all crashes near Nixyáawii Community School from 2012 to 2018. (Note that the most recent vehicle-only collision data is only through 2016). There was a fatal crash with a person biking in June of 2018. While this occurred more than a mile away from the school, the severity of the crash warranted acknowledgement in this report. Also, it is important to note that crash data do not record near misses and unreported incidents.


Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions (2012-2018)
(2) Bicycle: Fatal Injury
(1) Bicycle: Non-Fatal Injury

* Pedestrian: Fatal Injury

Primary Affected School
SafeRoutes alta
(2) Bicycle: No Injury
( Pedestrian: Non-Fatal Injury

* Pedestrian: No Injury

Other School

Figure 7. Vehicle-Only Collisions near Nixyáawii Community School


Source: Crash Analysis and Reporting Unit, ODOT (2012-2016)

## School Attendance Area and Transportation Policies

Nixyáawii Community School is a charter school located in the Pendleton School District. Currently, Nixyáawii Community School or Pendleton School District do not have any specific transportation policies in place to address walking and biking to school.

## Previous SRTS Efforts or Walking/Biking Engagement Activities

Nixyáawii Community School does not have any existing SRTS efforts. However, Yellowhawk Tribal Health was recently awarded a Federal CDC grant that will fund some SRTS engagement at the school including walk + roll events, pedestrian education, and family outreach.

## Nixyáawii Community School Virtual School Safety Assessment

The School Safety Assessment consisted of a Zoom Conference call among project partners, due to social distancing guidelines and School closures in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic. During the Virtual School Safety Assessment, the team discussed potential solutions to identified challenges with a particular focus on construction projects eligible for the ODOT SRTS Competitive Infrastructure Grant.

Date: June 25, 2020
Attendees:

- Dani Schulte, CTUIR
- Randall Melton, Nixyáawii Community School Board
- Kenneth Patterson, ODOT Region 5
- Paul Howland, ODOT Region 5
- Tom Fellows, Umatilla County

Meeting Time: 10-11:30am
Facilitators

- Katie Selin, Alta Planning + Design
- Kirk Paulsen, Alta Planning + Design
- Philip Longenecker, Alta Planning + Design


## Key Themes from Outreach Process

Community members were invited to provide feedback via an Online Public Input Tool that asked about the best routes to school and challenging locations to walk and bike. A total of 5 comments were provided on the online map, and 6 "likes" of existing comments to indicate support for the comment. These comments informed the construction recommendations on page 24.

## KEY THEMES FROM OUTREACH PROCESS

- Hwy 331 and Mission Rd intersection is a significant barrier for people walking and biking near the Nixyáawii Community School.
- Community members would like to be able to walk longer distances to reach the school and other destinations such as the Senior Center, Wildhorse Casino, and Pendleton.


## Nixyáawii Community School Photos (Provided by CTUIR or Google Maps)



Hwy 331 and Mission Rd is the most significant barrier for students walking and biking to school.


Community members report speeding traffic and lack of visibility for pedestrians and people biking through the Mission Rd curves approaching the school road at Timine Way.


Students cross from a bus stop on the south side of Mission Rd at Parr Ln without a marked crossing.


Facing south from Timine Way Trail on campus, new curb ramps and crosswalks provide safe, comfortable crossings for students.

## Bike and Pedestrian Facility Inventory

The bike and pedestrian facility inventory confirmed existing infrastructure conditions, and filled gaps in ODOT and CTUIR data focusing on all streets within a quarter mile of the School. In response to the COVID-19 global pandemic and the need for social distancing and School closures, the bike and pedestrian facility inventory was completed virtually to the best of the consultant's ability. An on-site inventory will be completed when circumstances allow for a site visit. As part of the online bike and pedestrian facility inventory, the consultant team collected the following information about general infrastructure deficiencies and needs:

- Sidewalk deficiencies - lack of continuity, insufficient width, poor surface condition, non-compliant crossslopes and driveways, lack of separation from the travel lane, and obstacles (utility/light poles, signs, and vegetation)
- School area signs and pavement markings - presence, placement, and condition
- Paths - formal or informal, surface material
- Bike lanes - lack of continuity, insufficient width or markings, presence of on-street parking, speed and volume of traffic, poor pavement condition
- Bicycle, scooter, and/or skateboard parking - presence, location, visibility, degree of security, and utilization
- Drop-off/pick-up areas - designated areas, curb paint, and signs
- Visibility - insufficient pedestrian lighting, line of sight obstacles (parked cars, vegetation, signs, and poles)

The following types of information about street crossings were collected virtually by the consultant during the bike and pedestrian facility inventory:

- Traffic signals - pedestrian signals, push-button location and reach distance, signing, countdown feature, accessible pedestrian signal feature, and sufficient crossing time.
- Marked crosswalks - condition, type, signs, visibility, and whether ramp is contained within crosswalk markings.
- Curb ramps - presence at corners, ADA-compliant design (tactile domes, ramp and flare slope, level landing).
- Connections with neighborhood trails or paths and transit - signage, bike parking, ease of connection to transit hubs, parks, or schools.

Deficiencies and needs identified in the bike and pedestrian facility inventory inform the construction recommendations described in Table 3. Note: All facilities listed above may not be present in every community, but serve as a general list.

## Chapter 4. Needs \& Recommendations

## Construction Recommendations

In response to the COVID-19 global pandemic and the need for social distancing and school closures, the recommendations included below are based on a virtual assessment of the site and are focused on short-term construction recommendations that are eligible for ODOT SRTS Competitive Infrastructure Grant Funding. When circumstances allow for an in-person site assessment and community meeting additional recommendations will be provided, including longer-term construction recommendations, construction recommendations on School grounds, and education and encouragement recommendations that complement infrastructure improvements and promote safe walking and bicycling to and from the School and in the community.

The construction recommendations identified below are based on:

- Existing conditions data
- Community feedback from the Online Public Input Tool
- Jurisdiction input

Table 3 lists the needs identified at each location and ensuing infrastructure recommendations, as well as the relative priority of the recommendation, a high-level cost, the agency responsible for implementing the recommendation, and the potential funding source for construction.

Table 3. Nixyáawii Community School Construction Needs and Recommendations

| ISSUE/ CHALLENGE | RECOMMENDATION | PRIORITY LEVEL | PLANNING <br> LEVEL COST | RESPONSIBLE <br> AGENCY | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mission Road |  |  |  |  |  |
| The intersection of Mission Rd and Hwy 331 (also known as the Four Corners intersection) lacks crossing infrastructure, raising safety concerns for students walking and biking in the area. | Install perpendicular curb ramps on all four corners of the intersection. Install 2' wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings across each leg of the intersection. Upgrade the stormwater system and review pedestrian lighting needs at the intersection, as necessary. | High priority <br> Near-term | \$\$\$ | ODOT, CTUIR, <br> Umatilla <br> County | ODOT SRTS <br> Construction <br> Grant |
|  | Obtain and review speed data east of Four Corners along Mission Rd to determine feasibility of a speed reduction request. | Long-term | \$ | ODOT, CTUIR, <br> Umatilla <br> County | $N A$ |
| Cars and trucks illegally park along Mission Rd in the bike lane, for example to access Mission Market. The existing bike lanes are relatively wide, similar in size to a typical parking lane, and lack signs and markings identifying the intended use of the facility. | Install bike lane symbol pavement markings and stripe a buffer within the existing bike lanes east of the Four Corners intersection about 2,100 feet along the north side of the road and about 4,200 feet along the south side of the road. Install accompanying bike lane signs. | Near-term | \$ | Umatilla County |  |
| Students living north of Mission Rd and west of the Four Corners intersection do not have a designated crossing of Mission Rd west of the intersection, despite bus pick up and drop off occurring along this stretch. | Review the community's desire to construct a multi-use path along the south side of the road as had been indicated in previous planning documents. Consider enhanced crossings across Mission Rd, such as at Alexander Ln and Timine Way, based on anticipated crossing demand. <br> At Mission Rd and Timíne Way, review existing pedestrian crossing demand to determine applicability of installing a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) including 2' wide high | Long-term | \$\$-\$\$\$ | CTUIR |  |
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| ISSUE/ CHALLENGE | RECOMMENDATION | PRIORITY LEVEL | PLANNING <br> LEVEL COST | RESPONSIBLE <br> AGENCY | POTENTIAL <br> FUNDING <br> SOURCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with associated school crossing warning signage and perpendicular curb ramps. <br> If existing pedestrian crossing demand is currently deemed insufficient for the suggested improvements, consider requiring future housing development to construct crossing enhancements. |  |  |  |  |
| Students living along and adjacent to Horseshoe Lane are dropped off by bus on the south side of Mission Rd, and are likely to dash directly across Mission Rd rather than walking to the Four Corners intersection to cross. | At Mission Rd and Horseshoe Lane, install perpendicular curb ramps on each side of Mission Rd. Install 2' wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with associated warning signage across Mission Rd. | Medium-term | \$-\$\$ | Umatilla County | ODOT SRTS <br> Construction <br> Grant |
| Students living along and adjacent to Parr Ln and B St are picked up and dropped off at bus stops along Mission Rd and lack crossing infrastructure at this location, raising safety concerns for students walking in the area. | At Mission Rd and B St, install $2^{\prime}$ wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with perpendicular curb ramps and associated warning signage, across Mission Rd, on the east leg of the Parr Ln/B St and Mission Rd intersection. Review the feasibility of and need for enhancing the crossing with a RRFB for safety reasons. Designate a formal school bus stop on the south side of Mission Rd at this location. | Near-term; <br> High priority | \$-\$\$ | Umatilla County | ODOT SRTS <br> Construction <br> Grant |
| Community input indicated that sidewalk gaps along Mission Road between Confederated Way | Install 6'sidewalks along the south side of Mission Rd / Cayuse Rd between the western intersection of Confederated Way and Cedar St. | Long-term | \$\$-\$\$\$ | Umatilla County |  |


| ISSUE/ CHALLENGE | RECOMMENDATION | PRIORITY LEVEL | PLANNING LEVEL COST | RESPONSIBLE AGENCY | POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| and Cedar St are a barrier for students walking and biking to school. | Install 6' sidewalks along the north side of Cayuse Rd between Short Mile Rd and Cedar St, as project budget allows. <br> Upgrade the two existing marked crosswalks to ADA standards within the segment of roadway, and review additional marked crossing locations if installing only south side sidewalks. |  |  |  |  |
| Hwy 331 |  |  |  |  |  |
| There are currently no sidewalks south of the Four Corners intersection, and approximately 175' of sidewalk north of the intersection. There is a | Install 6' sidewalks along the east side of Hwy 331 north of the existing sidewalk at the Four Corners intersection extending to Showaway Ln. | Near-term | \$\$\$ | ODOT | ODOT SRTS <br> Construction <br> Grant |
| history of train-pedestrian crashes at the railroad crossing north of Four Corners. | Install a 12' multi-use path along the west side of Hwy 331 south of the Four Corners intersection extending to Timíne Way. | Near-term; <br> High priority | \$\$-\$\$\$ | ODOT | ODOT SRTS <br> Construction <br> Grant |
| Timine Way |  |  |  |  |  |
| Timine Way is the main road that students utilize to access school, and the current pedestrian crossing signage around the school should be updated. | Install bidirectional Pedestrian Crossing signs (S1-1 and W16-7P, S1-1 and W16-9P) in advance of the crosswalks on Timíne Way. | Near-term; <br> High priority | \$ | CTUIR | ODOT SRTS <br> Construction <br> Grant |

Figure 8. Nixyáawii SRTS Construction Improvements Map
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Ti'Mine Way: Install bidirectional Pedestrian Crossing signs (S1-1 with W16-7P, S1-1 with W16-9P) in advance of the crosswalks on Ti'Mine Way.

Mission Road between Confederated Way and Cedar Street: Install 6'sidewalks along the south side of Mission Rd / Cayuse Rd between the extent).
install 6' sidewalks along the north side of Cayuse Rd between Short Mile Rd and Cedar St , as project budget allows (not pictured in map extent).
Upgrade the two existing marked crosswalks to ADA standards within the segment of roadway, and review additional marked crossing locations if installing only south side sidewalks (not pictured in map extent).

## Nixyaawii Community School SRTS Improvement Recommendations <br> SafeRoutes初 85

Mission Road and Hwy 331: Install perpendicular curb ramps on all four corners of the intersection. Install 2' wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings across each leg of the intersection. Upgrade the stormwater system and review pedestrian lighting needs at the intersection, as necessary.
tripe along Mission Road: Install bike lane symbol pavement markings and intersection about 2,100 feet along the north side of the road and about $\mathbf{4 , 2 0 0}$ feet along the south side of the road. Install accompanying bike lane signs.

3 Mission Road and Hwy 331: Review the community's desire to construct a multi-use path along the south side of the road as had been indicated in previous planning documents. Consider enhanced crossings across Mission Rd , such as at Alexander Ln and Ti'mine Way, based on anticipated crossing
demand. demand.

©
Mission Road and Horseshoe Lane: Install perpendicular curb ramps on each side of Mission Rd. Install 2' wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with associated warning signage across Mission Rd (R1-6a, W11-2 with 16-7P and W11-2 with 16-9P).Mission Road and BSt: Install $\mathbf{2}^{\prime}$ wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with perpendicular curb ramps and associated warning signage, across Mission Rd, on the east leg of the Parr Ln/B St and Mission Rd intersection (R1-6a, W11-2 with 16-7P and W11-2 with 16-9P)

Hwy 331: Install 6' sidewalks along the east side of Hwy 331 north of the existing sidewalk at the Four Corners intersection extending to Showaway Ln. Install a 12' multi-use path along the west side of Hwy 331 south of the Four Corners intersection extending to Ti'Mine Way.

## High Priority Improvements for the ODOT Infrastructure Grant Application

The following are top priority improvements recommended for the Competitive ODOT SRTS Construction Grant Application:

| ISSUE/ CHALLENGE | RECOMMENDATION |
| :--- | :--- |
| The intersection of Mission Rd and Hwy 331 (also | Install perpendicular curb ramps on all four cor- |
| known as the Four Corners intersection) lacks crossing | ners of the intersection. Install 2' wide high visibil- |
| infrastructure, raising safety concerns for students | ity white thermoplastic continental crosswalk <br> walking and biking in the area. |
|  | markings across each leg of the intersection. Up- <br> grade the stormwater system and review pedes- <br> trian lighting needs at the intersection, as neces- <br> sary. |

There are currently no sidewalks south of the Four Corners intersection, and approximately 175' of sidewalk north of the intersection. There is a history of train-pedestrian crashes at the railroad crossing north of Four Corners.

Install a 12' multi-use path along the west side of Hwy 331 south of the Four Corners intersection extending to Timíne Way. ${ }^{1}$

Students living along and adjacent to Parr Ln and B St are picked up and dropped off at bus stops along Mission Rd and lack crossing infrastructure at this location, raising safety concerns for students walking in the area.

At Mission Rd and B St, install 2' wide high visibility white thermoplastic continental crosswalk markings with perpendicular curb ramps and associated warning signage, across Mission Rd, on the east leg of the Parr Ln/B St and Mission Rd intersection. Review the feasibility and need to enhance the crossing with a RRFB for safety reasons. Designate a formal bus stop on the south side of Mission Rd at this location.

Timine Way is the main road that students utilize to access school, and the current pedestrian crossing signage around the school should be updated.

Install bidirectional Pedestrian Crossing signs (S1-1 and W16-7P, S1-1 and W16-9P) in advance of the crosswalks on Timíne Way.

Additional details that will be needed to complete the application are provided in Table 4.

[^12]Table 4. Project Details for ODOT Competitive Infrastructure Grant

| GRANT CRITERIA/QUESTION | RESPONSE FOR CTUIR |
| :--- | :--- |
| Relevant Right of Way <br> ownership | CTUIR transferring right-of-way ownership to ODOT for proposed multi-use path <br> (MUP) adjacent to Hwy 331. No ot |
| Utility implications and <br> opportunities to mitigate | Location of the proposed multi-use path (MUP) may conflict with the location of <br> existing utility poles. Opportunity to design the MUP to avoid conflict with <br> existing utility poles, dependent on available ROW and/or easements. |
| Environmental resource <br> implications | Revisions to existing ditches may trigger wetland mitigation requirements <br> because open ditches may be considered as surface water habitat. Proposed <br> improvements have the potential to require archaeological evaluations and <br> determinations. |
| Stormwater management <br> implications | Revisions to existing ditches may trigger wetland mitigation requirements. |
| Near a rail road? Or bridge, <br> tunnel, retaining wall <br> affected? | No |
| AADT | Hwy 331 = 3,400, Mission Rd = 6,500, Timine Way = unknown |
| Priority Safety Corridor | Yes |

Table 5. Competitive Grant Cost Estimates: Four Corners Intersection Upgrades

| ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT ${ }^{2}$ | UNIT | COST | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EST } \\ & \text { QTY } \end{aligned}$ | EST | COSTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demo existing sidewalk/ramps | SF | \$ | 6 | 600 | \$ | 3,600 |
| Demo existing curb and gutter | LF | \$ | 15 | 100 | \$ | 1,500 |
| Remove pavement markings | LF | \$ | 3 | 72 | \$ | 216 |
| Install perpendicular curb ramp | EA | \$ | 10,000 | 8 | \$ | 80,000 |
| Install curb and gutter | LF | \$ | 25 | 250 | \$ | 6,250 |
| Install 6' wide sidewalk | SF | \$ | 25 | 1500 | \$ | 37,500 |
| Install 4 marked crosswalks with thermoplastic continental markings | SF | \$ | 8 | 432 | \$ | 3,456 |
| Install 4 stop bars | SF | \$ | 8 | 120 | \$ | 960 |
| Remove existing catch basin | EA | \$ | 500 | 2 | \$ | 1,000 |
| Install catch basin | EA | \$ | 3,000 | 2 | \$ | 6,000 |
| Install 3 luminaires | LS | \$ | 37,500 | 1 | \$ | 37,500 |
| Relocate street signs | LS | \$ | 1,000 | 1 | \$ | 1,000 |
| Traffic Mobilization (10\%) | EA | \$ | 17,367 | 1 | \$ | 17,367 |
| Traffic Control (15\%) | EA | \$ | 26,050 | 1 | \$ | 26,050 |
| Erosion Control (2\%) | EA | \$ | 3,473 | 1 | \$ | 3,473 |

[^13]|  |  | Sub- <br> total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Contingency | \$225,872 |  |
| CA/CEI | $\%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Total Estimated Construction Costs | $\%$ | $15 \%$ |
|  | $\$ 90,349$ |  |
| Preliminary Engineering/Design Costs (12\%) | $\$ 47,433$ |  |
| ODOT Oversight (6\%) | $\$ 363,654$ |  |
| Inflation Risks per year (5\%)* | $\$ 43,638$ |  |
| Easements | $\$ 21,819$ |  |
| Right of Way Acquisition | $\$ 36,365$ |  |
| Utility Relocation | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Other Costs | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Total Estimated Soft Costs | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Total Estimated Project Cost: | $\$ 0$ |  |
| Assumes construction by 2022. Additional inflation | $\$ 101,823$ |  |
| costs apply if constructed in 2023 or later |  |  |

Table 6. Competitive Grant Cost Estimates: Highway 331 Path from Four Corners to Timíne Way

| ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | UNIT COST |  | EST QTY | EST COSTS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clearing and grubbing | LS | \$ | 2,000 | 1 | \$ | 2,000 |
| Install 1200 LF 12' wide asphalt path | SF | \$ | 10 | 14400 | \$ | 144,000 |
| Install trail lighting (150' OC ) | EA | \$ | 3,000 | 8 | \$ | 24,000 |
| Install 12x20' bike/ped bridge | SF | \$ | 150 | 240 | \$ | 36,000 |
| Install trail signs | EA | \$ | 300 | 2 | \$ | 600 |
| Traffic Mobilization (10\%) | EA | \$ | 20,660 | 1 | \$ | 20,660 |
| Traffic Control (15\%) | EA | \$ | 30,990 | 1 | \$ | 30,990 |
| Erosion Control (2\%) | EA | \$ | 4,132 | 1 | \$ | 4,132 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  | \$262,382 |
| Contingency | \% |  | 40\% |  |  | \$104,953 |
| CA/CEI | \% |  | 15\% |  |  | \$55,100 |
| Total Estimated Construction Costs |  |  |  |  |  | \$422,435 |
| Preliminary Engineering/Design Costs (12\%) |  |  |  |  |  | \$50,692 |
| ODOT Oversight (6\%) |  |  |  |  |  | \$25,346 |Inflation Risks per year (5\%)*

* Assumes construction by 2022. Additional inflation costs apply if constructed in 2023 or later
** Cost of easement based on an assumed size of $10^{\prime}$ wide $\times 1,185^{\prime}$ long, valued at $\$ 2.15 / S F$. Land valuation based on the average 2019 real market value of land for two properties adjacent to the properties that would be impacted by the proposed path.\$42,244
Easements** ..... \$25,478
Right of Way Acquisition ..... \$0
Utility Relocation ..... \$0
Other Costs ..... \$0
Total Estimated Soft Costs ..... \$143,759
Total Estimated Project Cost: ..... \$566,194*

Table 7. Competitive Grant Cost Estimates: School Zone Signage

| ITEM DESCRIPTION | MEASUREMENT | COST/UNIT |  | UNITS | ESTIMATE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Install marked crosswalk warning sign assemblies | EA | \$ | 1,000 | 8 | \$ | 8,000 |
| Traffic Mobilization (10\%) | EA | \$ | 800 | 1 | \$ | 800 |
| Traffic Control (15\%) | EA | \$ | 1,200 | 1 | \$ | 1,200 |
| Erosion Control (2\%) | EA | \$ | 160 | 0 | \$ | - |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal | \$10,000 |  |
| Total Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary Engineering/Design Costs (12\%) <br> Construction Costs (Subtotal + 40\% Contingency + 15\% CE) |  |  |  |  | \$15,500 |  |
| Right of Way Costs |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |
| Utility Costs |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |
| Other Costs |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |
| Total Project Cost: |  |  |  |  | \$16,700 |  |

Table 8. Summary of Competitive Grant Cost Estimates

| PROJECT | ESTIMATED COSTS (SAME AS ABOVE) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Four Corners Intersection Upgrades | $\$ 465,477$ |
| Highway 331 Path | $\$ 1 \$ 566,194$ |
| School Zone Signage | $\$ 16,700$ |
| TOTAL ESTIMATED COMPETITIVE GRANT COSTS: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 4 8 , 3 7 1}$ |

## Additional Cost Estimates for Near-Term Projects not Included in Competitive Grant Application

Table 9. Highway 331 Sidewalk Mission Road to Showaway Lane

| ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | UNIT COST |  | EST QTY | EST COSTS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clearing and grubbing | LS | \$ | 2,000 | 1 | \$ | 2,000 |
| Construct embankment to widen highway by $6^{\prime}$ Implement stormwater improvements associated with sidewalk | CUYD LF | \$ | 30 80 | 427 1050 | \$ | 12,810 84,000 |
| Install 1050 LF of 6' wide sidewalk | SF | \$ | 25 | 6300 | \$ | 157,500 |
| Install curb and gutter | LF | \$ | 25 | 1050 | \$ | 26,250 |
| Install bike lane symbol pavement markings | EA | \$ | 250 | 3 | \$ | 750 |
| Reconstruct 11 driveway access points | SY | \$ | 160 | 123 | \$ | 19,680 |
| Install UPRR-approved crossing | LS | \$ | 200,000 | 1 | \$ | 200,000 |
| Install perpendicular curb ramp | EA | \$ | 10,000 | 6 | \$ | 60,000 |
| Install 70 LF of 6' wide sidewalk | SF | \$ | 25 | 420 | \$ | 10,500 |
| Install curb and gutter | LF | \$ | 25 | 70 | \$ | 1,750 |
| Traffic Mobilization (10\%) | EA | \$ | 57,524 | 1 | \$ | 57,524 |
| Traffic Control (15\%) | EA | \$ | 86,286 | 1 | \$ | 86,286 |
| Erosion Control (2\%) | EA | \$ | 11,505 | 1 | \$ | 11,505 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal |  | ,555 |
| Contingency | \% | 40\% |  |  |  | 2,222 |
| CA/CEI | \% | 15\% |  |  | \$15 | 3,417 |
| Total Estimated Construction Costs |  |  |  |  |  | 76,193 |
| Preliminary Engineering/Design Costs (12\%) |  |  |  |  | \$14 | 1,143 |
| ODOT Oversight (6\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 572 |
| Inflation Risks per year (5\%)* |  |  |  |  |  | 7,619 |


| Easements |  | \$0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right of Way Acquisition |  |  |
| Utility Relocation |  |  |
| Other Costs |  |  |
| Total Estimated Soft Costs |  |  |

## Chapter 5. Potential Funding \& Implementation

This chapter lists a variety of funding sources that could be used to implement the recommendations outlined in Chapter 4. These funding sources are accurate as of February 2020, but may change over time. Please refer to ODOT or other funding jurisdictions' websites for the most up to date information.

## Statewide Funding Opportunities

## ODOT SRTS Infrastructure Grants:

ODOT currently offers specific Safe Routes to School funding pools for local jurisdictions interested in improving walking and biking conditions near schools, including a competitive infrastructure grant program and a rapid response infrastructure grant.

## COMPETITIVE INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT

ODOT's SRTS Competitive Infrastructure Grant program funds roadway safety projects located within a one-mile radius of an educational facility that improves walking and biking conditions for children on their way to school. Funding requests may range between $\$ 60,000$ and $\$ 2$ million, with a $40 \%$ local match (special circumstances may allow a $20 \%$ reduction in match requirements). These funds are awarded on a competitive application basis to cities, counties, transit districts, ODOT, any other roadway authority, and tribes are in compliance with existing jurisdictional plans and receive school or school district support. Learn more about the 2021-2022 grant cycle at https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx.

## RAPID RESPONSE INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT

Up to $10 \%$ of state SRTS funding will be reserved for projects that can demonstrate serious and immediate need for safety improvements within a one-mile radius of schools. This funding would be awarded outside of the Competitive Infrastructure Grant cycle as a Rapid Response Infrastructure Grant. Eligibility requirements for Rapid Response Infrastructure grants can be found at https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx.

## ODOT STIP Program

Outside of Safe Routes to School programs, ODOT offers general funding opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects through the development of ODOT's State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which programs funding for three years. Proposed projects should be nominated in coordination with ODOT's Region 2 office. To be eligible for STIP funding, CTUIR projects must be included an adopted Transportation System

Plan. The draft 2021-2024 STIP includes roughly $\$ 115$ million for walking and biking projects. Programs include Active Transportation Leverage, which adds walking or biking features to Fix-It projects, and ADA Curb Ramps, to boost accessibility of pedestrian infrastructure.

Learn more: http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/STIP/ and find contact info for your ODOT region at www.oregon.gov/ODOT/STIP/Pages/Contacts.aspx

## ODOT All Roads Transportation Safety Program (ARTS)

ODOT's STIP process also funds safety improvement projects that reduce traffic related deaths and injuries through the All Roads Transportation Safety Program, which utilizes data collection and analysis to select projects that will maximize traffic safety benefits per investment dollar. For more information on ARTS, visit:
https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Engineering/Pages/ARTS.aspx.

## Oregon Parks and Recreation Grants

Oregon Parks and Recreation manage a number of grants that may help in completing a Safe Routes to School offroad project like the Local Government Grant Program, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and the Recreational Trails Program. For more information visit:
https://www.oregon.gov/OPRD/GRANTS/pages/index.aspx

## Oregon Community Paths Program (OCPP)

In 2020, ODOT will open solicitation for an off-system path grant program called the Oregon Community Paths Program (OCPP) and will fund awarded projects (in 2021) with either the state Multimodal Active Transportation fund or the federal Transportation Alternatives Program funds. Through the OCPP, ODOT strives to fund projects for pedestrian and bicycle transportation projects including the development, construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, or other capital improvement of multiuse paths, bicycle paths, and footpaths that improve access and safety for people walking and bicycling. https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Programs/Pages/OCP.aspx

## Oregon Transportation Infrastructure Bank (OTIB)

Oregon Transportation Infrastructure Bank (OTIB) provides low cost loans for transportation related projects by: reducing total up-front costs; reducing overall interest costs; no prepayment penalties; draw funds only as needed. OTIB loans are processed quickly and a decision is typically received within 60 days, with loan closing between 90120 days. www.oregon.gov/odot/cs/fs/pages/otib.aspx

## State Highway Trust Fund/Bicycle Bill

When roads are constructed or reconstructed, Oregon law requires walkways and bikeways be provided. Additionally, all agencies receiving State Highway Funds are required to spend at least 1\% of those funds on bicycle and/or pedestrian infrastructure improvements (ORS 366.514). Currently, cities and counties receive $20 \%$ and $30 \%$ of the state's highway trust funds, respectively, which can be used for walking and biking projects along roads. For more information contact Jessica Horning, (503) 986-3555.

## Sidewalk Improvement Program (SWIP)

ODOT's SWIP builds pedestrian and bicycle facilities on state roads and local roads that help people moving across or around the state system. For more information contact Jessica Horning, (503) 986-3555.

## Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) Funds

TGM offers grants for improving transportation system plans and planning efforts that integrate land use and transportation. TGM also offers Quick Response grants when pending development will impact the city's goals, Code Assistance to help with specific code questions, Transportation System Plan (TSP) Assessments to look at city TSPs, and Education and Outreach projects to move community conversations forward. www.oregon.gov/lcd/tgm/

## State Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF)

Walking and biking connections to transit are eligible under ODOT's STIF Discretionary and Statewide Network Program, a new fund for transit started in 2018.
https://www.oregon.gov/odot/RPTD/Pages/Funding-Opportunities.aspx

## Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program

The CMAQ program is jointly administered by the FHWA and FTA, with projects selected by local jurisdictions in high pollution areas. Bike/pedestrian projects make up a significant portion of the funded projects, which must focus on air quality improvement. www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air quality/cmaq/

## Federal Funds

Some federal funding sources may be available to certain communities and can be used for Safe Routes to School projects. Such as:

- Community Development Block Grant Program, https://www.orinfrastructure.org/InfrastructurePrograms/CDBG/
- Rural Development Grant Assistance Program, https://www.usda.gov/topics/farming/grants-and-loans
- FHWA Tribal Transportation Program, https://highways.dot.gov/federal-lands/programs-tribal\#:~:text=of\ transportation\ programs.-
Tribal\%20Transportation\%20Program,Established\%20in\%2023\%20U.S.C.\&text=The\%20purpose\%20of\%2 Othe\%20TTP,and\%20Alaska\%20Native\%20Village\%20communities
- FHWA Tribal Transportation Bridge Program, https://highways.dot.gov/federal-lands/programstribal/bridge
- FHWA Tribal Transportation Safety Fund, https://highways.dot.gov/federal-lands/programs-tribal/safety


## Local Funding Opportunities

## Potential School Bond Opportunities

Localities can leverage school bonds to collect funding for transportation educational programing and School-zone pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure improvements. School bonds may be sufficient to cover the cost of low to mid cost projects or could be utilized to collect local match dollars for state awarded grants.

## SRTS Projects \& the TSP

Cities and counties undergoing transportation system plan updates should consider including a section on their plans and priorities for Safe Routes to School infrastructure upgrades and programming to identify project expenses well in advance and allow ample time to gather project funding.

## Demonstration Projects

Demonstration projects are temporary roadway improvement installments that utilize temporary barriers (such as traffic cones, planters, hay barrels, etc.) to test and demonstrate how a street would operate with bicycle and/or pedestrian infrastructure improvements. These low-cost projects can serve as an immediate term temporary solution to traffic issues while local jurisdictions build support and funding for permanent infrastructure improvements. Depending on specific site conditions and the nature of materials used, demonstration projects can last for several hours to several months.

## Non-Infrastructure Programs Funding Opportunities

## ODOT SRTS Non-Infrastructure Grant

In addition to funding infrastructure improvements for Safe Routes to School programs, ODOT reserves \$300,000 annually for funding of non-infrastructure SRTS projects that encourage children in grades K-8 to walk and bike to school. This competitive grant program distributes funding to a project over the course of three years (to allow for advanced planning) with a maximum award of $\$ 50,000$ per year with a $12 \%$ match requirement. For more information, visit https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx

# Appendix J. <br> Transportation Technical Standards Coordination Memorandum 

## Technical Memorandum

```
To: Cheryl-Jarvis Smith, ODOT Region 5
From: Molly McCormick and Nick Foster AICP, RSP1
CC: Dani Schulte, CTUIR
RE: Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation Transportation System Plan Update
```

This memorandum documents the methodologies and assumptions to be used in preparation of analyses for the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) update. The methodologies and assumptions included in this memorandum are based on guidance provided in the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Transportation System Plan Guidelines (Reference 1), the ODOT Analysis Procedures Manual (APM - Reference 2), and direction provided by CTUIR and ODOT staff. The methodologies and assumptions described in this memorandum will help identify potential deficiencies in the transportation system, including:

- Traffic operations at the study intersections under existing and future traffic conditions,
- Traffic safety at the study intersections and along study area roadways,
- Gaps and deficiencies in bicycle and pedestrian facilities,
- Gaps and deficiencies in transit facilities and services, and
- Gaps and deficiencies in other travel modes.

This information will serve as a baseline for identifying a comprehensive list of multi-modal transportation system needs to be addressed as part of the TSP update. It will also serve as a baseline for identifying and evaluating potential solutions and developing a prioritized list of improvements for the TSP update.

## STUDY AREA

The study area for the CTUIR TSP update encompasses all lands within the boundaries of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (UIR), including several roads on off-reservation Trust lands. The primary focus of the project will be on areas within the UIR. The project will describe the location and access management conditions for off-reservation Trust lands. Figure 1 illustrates the primary study area.

## FREIGHT MOBILITY ROUTES AND LOCAL TRUCK ROUTES

A summary map and description will be provided for the freight mobility routes, local truck routes, and snowplow routes in the study area. This information will be obtained from CTUIR documents and GIS files and ODOT's TransGIS database.


- Study Intersections


## STUDY INTERSECTIONS

The study intersections for the TSP update were determined by CTUIR in coordination with ODOT. There is a total of 13 study intersections located along tribal, County, and ODOT facilities, all of which are unsignalized. Figure 1 illustrates the location of the study intersections, which include:

1. Mission Road/Timíne Way
2. Mission Road/OR 331
3. Mission Road/Short Mile Road
4. Mission Road/Emigrant Road-Cayuse Road
5. OR 331/Timíne Way
6. OR 331/Wildhorse Boulevard
7. OR 331/Kusi Road
8. OR 331/Spilya Road
9. OR 331/Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access
10. OR 331/Kash Kash Road
11. I-84/OR 331 Interchange Westbound Ramps
12. I-84/OR 331 Interchange Eastbound Ramps
13. S Market Road/Tokti Road

## VOLUME DEVELOPMENT

## Traffic Counts

Turning movement counts were conducted by ODOT at the study intersections on March $24^{\text {th }}$, March 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$, April $1^{\text {st }}$, and April $13^{\text {th }}, 2021$. The counts were conducted on mid-weekdays. All counts were conducted over a 16-hour period (6:00 AM to 10:00 PM) and include the total number of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicles that entered the study intersections in 15 -minute intervals.

## Peak Hour Development

The counts will be post-processed to determine system-wide PM peak hour. A system-wide peak hour will be utilized since the study intersections are generally closely spaced with limited access in between. The PM peak hour counts will be adjusted to develop analysis volumes as discussed below.

## SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT FACTORS

$30^{\text {th }}$ Hour Volumes ( 30 HV ) for the project will be developed based on the traffic counts collected at the study intersections and the application of seasonal adjustment factors consistent with the methodology identified in the APM. The APM provides three methods for identifying seasonal adjustment factors for highway traffic volumes. All three methods utilize information provided by Automatic Traffic Recorders (ATRs) positioned in select locations throughout the State Highway System that collect traffic data 24-hours a day, 365 days a year. Each method was evaluated to determine the most appropriate method for the study intersections. As discussed below, the seasonal adjustment factor shown in Table 1 will be used to
derive 30 HV volumes at the I-84 Ramp Terminals, while the average seasonal adjustment factors for Commuter and Summer facilities from Table 2 will be used to derive 30 HV at all other ODOT study intersections.

## I-84

For I-84, ATR \#30-026 was reviewed to see if it was able to be applied for this project. The project team does not recommend moving forward with using this ATR because it has had equipment failures and incomplete data for several of the most recent count years and would suggest a seasonal factor greater than $30 \%$ if the estimated data is utilized. There is another ATR available west of the study area that was reviewed for determining a seasonal adjustment factor for I-84 ramps in the study area. ATR 30-004 is an interstate non-urbanized ATR location on I-84 approximately 12.7 miles northwest of the OR 311 interchange. Because this ATR is west of the Pendleton interchange but is within the ten percent volume limitation, ODOT suggested its use for the west leg of the interchange only. The ODOT ATR Characteristic Table indicates this location has a weekend traffic trend, therefore the average daily traffic based on days of the week was used. Table 1 shows the calculated seasonal factor.

Table 1: Seasonal Adjustment Factor for ATR \#30-004 (Pendleton)

|  | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Month <br> (July) | $119^{*}$ | $123^{*}$ | 119 | 121 | 123 | 121 |
| Count Month <br> (March) | $97^{*}$ | 96 | 96 | 96 | $88^{*}$ | 96 |

*Indicates values that were discarded from the average as indicated in the APM.
For the east leg of the interchange, the Seasonal Trend Table Method was used to calculate the seasonal adjustment factor. The Seasonal Trend Table Method is used when there is not an ATR nearby or nearby ATRs do not meet the requirements outlined in the APM, and when there are no ATRs with similar characteristics to the study road segment. The corresponding factors were calculated using the 2019 Seasonal Trend Table ${ }^{1}$ for the late March and early April 2021 counts. Table 2 shows the values for the count month, peak period seasonal factor, and the calculated seasonal factors that will be used for l-84 based on the interstate non-urbanized trend.

Table 2: Seasonal Adjustment Factors for I-84 Counts East of OR 331

| Late March/Early April 2021 <br> Trend <br> Count Date Season Factor | Peak Period Seasonal Factor | Seasonal Adjustment |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interstate Non- <br> urbanized | 1.0382 | 0.8139 | $1.0382 / 0.8139=1.28$ |

[^14]
## OR 331

The Seasonal Trend Table Method was used to calculate the seasonal adjustment factor along OR 331. The Seasonal Trend Table Method is used when there is not an ATR nearby or nearby ATRs do not meet the requirements outlined in the APM, and when there are no ATRs with similar characteristics to the study road segment. The recently completed CTUIR Mission Community Master Plan was conducted in coordination with ODOT and reviewed some of this project's study intersections. The Mission Community Master Plan used an average of the Commuter and Summer seasonal trends for this segment of OR 331.

This project proposes to use a similar method. The corresponding factors were calculated using the 2019 Seasonal Trend Table ${ }^{2}$ for the late March and early April 2021 counts. Table 3 shows the values for the count month, peak period seasonal factor, and the calculated seasonal factors that will be used for OR 331.

Table 3: Seasonal Adjustment Factors for OR 331 Counts

| Trend | OR 331 Counts Conducted in Late March/Early April 2021 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | March 2021 Count Date Season Factor | Peak Period Seasonal Factor | Seasonal Adjustment | Average of Commuter and Summer Seasonal Factors |
| Commuter | 1.0014 | 0.9355 | 1.0014/0.9355=1.07 | 17 |
| Summer | 1.0620 | 0.8299 | 1.0620/0.8299=1.28 | . |
| OR 331 Counts Conducted in Mid April 2021 |  |  |  |  |
| Trend | April 2021 Count Date Season Factor | Peak Period Seasonal Factor | Seasonal Adjustment | Average of Commuter and Summer Seasonal Factors |
| Commuter | 0.9759 | 0.9355 | 0.9759/0.9355=1.04 | 13 |
| Summer | 1.0100 | 0.8299 | 1.0100/0.8299=1.22 | 1.13 |

## FORECAST TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Forecast traffic volumes for the study intersections will be developed based on the methodology identified in the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 255 Highway Traffic Data for Urbanized Area Project Planning and Design. The methodology combines the year 202130 HV developed at the study intersections with the base year and future year traffic volume forecasts from the current Pendleton travel demand model, which covers the study area.

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

Per the project scope, volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ ) ratio will be used to review performance thresholds/targets for the study intersections. This information will be provided in tables, figures, and/or technical appendices,

[^15]but where possible will be provided in figures to give the general public a more clear and relatable understanding of the analysis results.

Table 6 of the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) provides volume-to-capacity targets for facilities outside the Metro area. The OHP ratios are used to evaluate existing and future no-build conditions, while Table 10-2 of the ODOT 2012 Highway Design Manual (HDM) provides V/C ratios used to assist in evaluating future alternatives on State highways. Table 4 summarizes the classifications and applicable performance thresholds for study intersection roadways.

Table 4: Roadway Classification and Mobility Targets

| Roadway | Existing Roadway Ownership | Functional Classification | Mobility <br> Target/ <br> Standard | HDM 20-year Design Mobility Target |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-84 | ODOT | Interstate | 0.70 | 0.60 |
| OR 331 | ODOT | District Highway | $0.75{ }^{1}$ | 0.70 |
| Mission Road east of OR 331 | Umatilla County | Major Collector | LOS E | N/A |
| Cayuse Road | Umatilla County | Major Collector | LOS E | N/A |
| Short Mile Road | Umatilla County | Minor Collector | LOS E | N/A |
| Emigrant Road | Umatilla County | Minor Collector | LOS E | N/A |
| Market Road | Umatilla County | Minor Collector | LOS E | N/A |
| Mission Road west of OR 331 | CTUIR | - | - ${ }^{2}$ | N/A |
| Timíne Way | CTUIR | - | -2 | N/A |
| Wildhorse Boulevard | CTUIR | - | - ${ }^{2}$ | N/A |
| Kusi Road | CTUIR | - | - ${ }^{2}$ | N/A |
| Spilya Road | CTUIR | - | -2 | N/A |
| Arrowhead Travel Plaza Access | Private Driveway | - | -2 | N/A |
| Kash Kash Road | Public Use Road | - | - ${ }^{2}$ | N/A |
| Tokti Road | CTUIR | - | -2 | N/A |

${ }^{1}$ ODOT assesses intersection operations based on volume-to-capacity ratios. Table 6 of the Oregon Highway Plan identifies maximum volume-to-capacity targets for all intersections outside the Portland Metro area. Based on the OHP, OR 331 is classified as a District Highway and designated Freight Route. The resulting volume-to-capacity target for all intersections along OR 331 is a maximum volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.75 .
${ }^{2}$ For intersection operations, the major road standard will apply.

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS PARAMETERS

The bullets below identify the specific sources of data and methodologies proposed to conduct the operational analyses. Analyses of all state facilities will be conducted according to the APM, unless otherwise agreed upon by CTUIR and ODOT.

1. Intersection/Roadway Geometry (lane numbers and arrangements, cross-section elements, signal phasing, etc.) will be collected through aerial photography and confirmed through a site visit. Available as-built data may also be used to verify existing roadway geometry. The analysis models will be built on scaled roadway line work from GIS or aerial photography.
2. Operational Data (such as posted speeds, intersection control, parking, transit stops, rail crossings, right-turn on red, etc.) will be collected through a site visit.
3. Peak Hour Factors (PHF) will be calculated for each intersection and applied to the existing conditions analyses. Per the APM, PHFs of 0.95 will be used for the year 2040 analysis for highorder facilities (arterials), with 0.90 applied to medium-order facilities (collectors) and 0.85 applied to local roads. If the existing PHF is greater than these default future values, the existing PHF will be applied.
4. Traffic Operations
a. The methodologies identified in the Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition (HCM Reference 4) will be used to analyze traffic operations at the study intersections.
b. Synchro 11 will be used to conduct the traffic operations analyses. Synchro 11 is a software tool designed to assist with operations analyses in accordance with HCM $6^{\text {th }}$ methodologies. The analysis results will be reported for the overall intersection at signalized intersections and the critical movement at unsignalized intersections overall intersection $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios will be developed for the signalized intersections in accordance with the methodologies identified in the APM.

## Traffic Analysis Software and Input Assumptions

Synchro 11 software will be used for the intersection analysis. The reported results will be the level of service and intersection delay generated by the HCM report. Analysis assumptions are listed in Table 5.

Table 5: Synchro Operations Parameters/Assumptions

| Arterial Intersection Parameters | Existing Conditions |
| :--- | :--- |
| Peak Hour Factor | From traffic counts |
| Conflicting Bikes and Pedestrian per Hour | From traffic counts, as available |
| Area Type | Other |
| Ideal Saturation Flow Rate (for all movements) | 1,750 passenger cars per hour green per lane |
| Lane Width | 12 feet unless field observations suggest otherwise |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | From traffic counts by movement, as available |
| Percent Grade | Estimated based on field observations |
| Parking Maneuvers per Hour | Estimated based on field observations |
| Bus Blockages | Estimated based on frequency of service |
| 95th percentile vehicle queues | Synchro 11 summary output |

## SAFETY ANALYSIS

Safety analyses will include reviewing historical crash data and examining roadway crossings, as described in the following sections.

## Crash Analyses

The five most recent years of crash data will be obtained from ODOT's crash database and reviewed at the study intersections and along the study roadway segments, consistent with the methodologies outlined in the APM. In addition, the five most recent years of bicyclist and pedestrian-related crash data will be obtained from ODOT's crash database and reviewed.

The crash data will be analyzed to identify potential crash patterns (such as crash types and locations). Crash rates and critical crash rates will be developed as applicable at study intersections. Intersection crash rates will be compared to the published $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile crash rates in Exhibit 4.1 of the APM, and segment crash rates will be compared to Table II in the current ODOT Crash Rate Tables. In addition, ODOT's Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) sites will be reviewed, as appropriate. At intersections or segments where the critical threshold is exceeded, a crash diagram will be prepared, and crash trends will be reviewed to identify contributing factors and potential countermeasures. Particular attention will be paid to the details of crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists.

The risk factor screening methodology from ODOT’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Implementation Plan (2020) will be applied to the Project Area roadway network (to the extent sufficient data is available to apply the risk factors). This analysis will be used to identify areas with the greatest potential for bicycle and pedestrian crashes.

Identified potential countermeasures (and resulting crash percentage reduction) will be taken from the All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS) Crash Reduction Factors (CRF) listing or the CRF Appendix when available. If no CRF is available from the ARTS database, then the FHWA CMF Clearinghouse may be reviewed to identify a suitable CRF. Only CMFs with a quality rating of three stars or greater and within 10\% of the study roadway's/intersection's volume will be used.

## Pedestrian Crossing Review

Key pedestrian crossings identified through the public involvement process, past work in the area, or the project team's review of the system will be evaluated to determine whether the type of crossing currently presented may warrant an enhancement. This review will include assessing the crossing using National Cooperative Highway Research Board (NCHRP) Report 562 procedures. If the crossing is not currently marked and is located on an ODOT Highway, it will be reviewed against ODOT's Criteria for Establishing Marked Crosswalks on State Highways (Section 6.6.2 of the ODOT Traffic Manual).

## LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS

The existing pedestrian, bicycle, and trail network will be reviewed to identify gaps and deficiencies. A gap is defined as a missing link in the network, such as a missing sidewalk on a collector or arterial roadway. A deficiency, or obstacle, is defined as a bicycle or pedestrian facility that is not up to standards or sufficient to meet users' needs. Examples of deficiencies include:

- On-street connection on a collector or arterial roadway that has a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress rating greater than 2 (to support the Interested but Concerned bicyclists)
- Arterial or collector roadway crossing where enhancement may be warranted according to the Pedestrian Crossing Review analysis described previously
- Sidewalks that are too narrow to meet ADA standards or crossings without a curb ramp

Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress (PLTS) and Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) analyses will be performed on significant roadways within the CTUIR water/sewer service area. Roadways to be studied include

Mission/Cayuse Road, Cedar Street, Confederated Way, Short Mile Road, Ti'mine Way, Wildhorse Blvd, A Street, B Street, Whirlwind Drive, Kusi Road, Spilya Road, Coyote Road, Kirkpatrick Road, and OR 331 between Showaway Lane and the I-84 Interchange. The analyses will be conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in Chapter 14 of the ODOT APM.

The target level of traffic stress for the bicycle system will be LTS 2, as this target most closely appeals to most of the potential bicycle riding population and maximizes the available bicycle mode share. The target level of traffic stress for the pedestrian system will also be LTS 2, as this target will generally be acceptable to the majority of users; however, the project team may also review areas within a quarter mile of schools, and other routes heavily used by children, to determine what improvements may be necessary to achieve LTS 1 on these routes.

## QUALITATIVE MULTIMODAL ASSESSMENT

A Qualitative Multimodal Assessment (QMA) will be used to evaluate the transit facilities and services within the study area to identify potential issues in transit connectivity that can be addressed as part of the Active Transportation Update. The QMA uses context-based subjective ratings of Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor.

As outlined in the ODOT APM, the following factors are considered within the QMA:

- Frequency and on-time reliability
- Schedule speed/travel times
- Transit stop amenities
- Connecting pedestrian/bike network

Table 6 outlines the methodology that will be used for determining transit QMA within the study area.
Table 6: QMA Methodology

| Category | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frequency and ontime reliability | <15-minute headways | 15 to 30-minute headways | 30 to 60-minute headways | 60+ minute headways |
| Schedule speed/travel times | <20\% slower than driving | $20 \%$ to $40 \%$ slower than driving | $40 \%$ to $60 \%$ slower than driving | >60\% slower than driving |
| Transit stop amenities | Shelter | Bench | Sign with waiting area | No waiting area and/or no sign |
| Connecting pedestrian/bike network | BLTS and PLTS 2 or better and crossing | BLTS and PLTS 2 or better with no crossing | BLTS or PLTS >2 and no crossing | BLTS and PLTS >2 and no crossing |

## REFERENCES

1. Oregon Department of Transportation. Analysis Procedures Manual, 2020.
2. Oregon Department of Transportation. Oregon Highway Plan, 2015.
3. Oregon Department of Transportation. Highway Design Manual, 2012.
4. Transportation Research Board. Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition, 2016.
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## INTRODUCTION

The project team recently completed outreach efforts to guide the development of the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update, with the support of CTUIR and ODOT staff. These efforts included:

- Senior Center Outreach
- Mission Market Outreach
- Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center Tabling
- General Council Meeting Tabling
- Nixyaawii Gym Outreach
- Tribal Youth Council Meeting
- Treaty Day Outreach
- Online Input


## Spring 2022 Outreach

Overall, a total of approximately 75 people were reached in person during the Spring 2022 outreach events, with 54 providing comments.

This memorandum summarizes the feedback received from these events as of June 14, 2022. Key and recurring themes from the feedback included:

- Road maintenance and condition are a concern, especially when I-84 is closed and trucks and other traffic try to reroute onto local roads.
- Additional lighting is desired on Mission Road, in the July Grounds Hub, and on multi-use paths.
- There was concern about cougars along the TCI trail.
- People would like dedicated space for walking and biking along OR 331 and on Mission Road.
- Focus on safety improvements and connections near schools and other essential destinations (e.g., Nixyawii Government Center, Wildhorse Resort \& Casino).
- Desire for additional river access.
- People would like more frequent transit service and extended coverage.
- Many people get rides from relatives when transit service is not an option.
- There is interest in a walking and biking connection to Pendleton.


## SENIOR CENTER OUTREACH

Members of the project team and CTUIR staff visited the Senior Center during lunch on May 18, 2022 from 11:30 AM to 12:30 PM. This provided the opportunity to introduce the project to attendees, answer questions related to the vision and goals, and solicit input via a handout. There were approximately 20 people present, with about 4 people providing comments.

Comments included:

- Bus system is not close enough to housing and only comes twice a day.
- Roads in Tutuilla need to be paved or maintained more efficiently. Very hard on vehicles and floods often. It is a County road but a lot of tribal members use it.
- Need safe places for kids to go to school.
- Thorn Hollow Road bridge washed away, still being replaced.
- Kanine Ridge Road not actually open to public travel.
- N Cayuse Road - shoulders need to be wider, and road is eroding.
- Bike trails from housing areas to Nixyaawii Governance Center, school, and clinic that are not along the main road.
- Transit needs - more frequent routes, express lines so you can go to Safeway/Walmart directly, dial-a-ride, and student routes.
- Top destinations include TCI, Yellowhawk, Wildhorse Casino, Pendleton, housing, clinic, Walmart, Safeway, Walla Walla.
- County roads need more attention.
- People still ride horses sometimes. Mostly through fields and sometimes you'll see them near Nixyaawii Governance Center. One thing that prevents people from riding more is the lack of places to hitch their horses at their destinations.
- Like the greenery in the area and the care CTUIR puts into things.
- Kids need more things to do. Traditions are fading.
- Services for homeless kids would be good. They often walk places.
- Transportation is generally good. Roads need to be repaired upriver.
- They no longer give out tokens for the bus. Miss this. Taxi rides are expensive and so is gas.
- There was interest in a new road connecting Burke Road to Kanine Ridge Road near I-84. There is less snow there than on I-84.


## MISSION MARKET OUTREACH

The project team and CTUIR staff solicitated public input at Mission Market during two time periods: 3:00 to 5:00 PM on May 18, 2022 and 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM on May 19, 2022. Community members were able to provide verbal comments or mark comments on a poster board of the study area. Six people provided input to the project team on May $18^{\text {th }}$ and nine provided input on May $19^{\text {th }}$.

Comments included:

- Food pantry on Tokti Road. Public transport to here or delivery services.
- Parked cars occur on Kash Kash Road.
- Need transit to airport/hotels from Wildhorse.
- Tourists ride e-bikes around Wildhorse.
- Need lighting in July Grounds.
- Bears and cougars are present in July Grounds.
- Need walking/biking access along OR 331.
- Mission Road/OR 331 intersection can get busy.
- E-scooters on Rothrock Road.
- Near Kusi Road and Spilya Road east of OR 331, expanded parking would be safer than on street with casino shuttle.
- Trail in July Ground needs maintenance (cracks).
- Used to have access to river from Parr Lane. Would be good to have a park on river.
- East-west off-road path connecting Mission and July Grounds.
- Wildlife was a common theme for July Grounds.
- Fill sidewalk gaps in July Grounds.
- Biking on Mission is tough, especially on way to Pendleton and by Cayuse.
- On Mission Road, stopping downhill is a challenge in the winter (approaching OR 331).

- Trail to Pendleton along Mission Road. Trails to walk in Riverside.
- Mountain bike trails on undeveloped CTUIR land.
- Public transportation to Wildhorse on holidays.
- Kayak - more frequent trips; stops throughout UIR (especially for Mission service and new transitional housing by BIA building on B street)); service to Riverside area.
- Kayak coverage is generally excellent.
- Lots of people get rides from relatives when other options aren't available.


## JULY GROUNDS GYM OUTREACH

```
Member of the project team and CTUIR staff were available at the July Grounds Gym during afterschool
programs on May 18, 2022 from 3:00 to 5:00 PM, soliciting feedback via a handout. Six people provided input to
the project team.
Comments included:
- Johnson Creek area.
- Horse trailers hard on roundabouts.
- How to deal with truck traffic and parking during snow events? Unsafe driving/walking conditions during snow events currently.
- Need to run buses more often for those that can't drive.
- Stop sign at Mission/Short Miles bus stop would be nice.
- Mission Road sidewalks from July Grounds to Yellowhawk are heavily used.
- Trails in July Ground are not safe at night.
- GIS plant trail connection to community garden in July Grounds.
- Sidewalks on Mission Road/Emigrant Road.
- Sidewalk needed along OR 331.
- Better bike/pedestrian connection to casino from Mission area.
- Horses need to cross I-84 just east of OR 331.
```


## GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING TABLING

CTUIR staff manned a table in the rotunda outside the General Council meeting at the Nixyaawii Governance Center on May 19, 2022 from 1:00 to 3:00 PM. This provided the opportunity to introduce the project to attendees, answer questions related to the vision and goals, discuss the transportation system history in the area, and solicit input via a handout and larger maps. Approximately 18 people provided input.

Comments included:

- Connect to Levy Trail to the west.
- Steep on Mytinger Lane. Need help at assisted living.
- Need better bike lane eastbound on Mission Road at west CTUIR boundary.
- Bike lane on Mission Road east of $56^{\text {th }}$ Street is dirty and feels unsafe.
- River near OR 331 - pull out for river, ADA platform for fishing.
- Distance markers on walking path in Mission.
- Walk path and bike lanes along OR 331 - very scary with pedestrians, especially just south of Timíne Way where there is a narrow shoulder.
- Nixyaawii Governance Center labeled incorrectly on map.
- Trails feel unsafe. Too dark at night and need lighting.
- Trail access on river.
- Transportation needs for young people near Short Mile Road and railroad area.
- Walkability over I-84.
- Truck left turns from Kusi Road.
- Truck parking north of Kash Kash Road.
- Kayak has improved.
- Expand transit routes and service hours for WRC staff. Coordinate service with WRC.
- Need notifications for cancelled transit pickups.
- UPRR drivers can cause issues and drive dangerously.
- Lack of school bus signs and follow-up with Umatilla County Roads staff.
- Fix roads in the southern area of the reservation boundary (south of E Birch Creek Road).
- Guard rails on Sumac Road.
- Frequently washed out on Spring Creek Road.
- Emigrant Road - signage to turn around sooner, sinking of road surface and bad road conditions.
- Maintenance issues on Kash Kash Road.
- Thornhollow Road Bridge.
- Snow and ice south of railroad near Butcher Creek Road and Weather Road.
- Need Kayak routes to St. Anthony and Les Schwab.
- Info hub for regional transit, other agencies, transfers (Arrowhead, senior center).
- Links at bottom of page.
- Mile point 12.2 - raise road grade.
- Mile point 16 - add guard rail.
- Paint fog stripe on all paved roads.
- Do D.E.M. analysis and add guard rails wherever needed.
- People walking along OR 331.
- Transit for outlying residences.
- Google maps aren't accurate.
- School trail near Mission.
- Add bus stop signs on Mission Road and Short Mile Road.
- Truck traffic on Mission Road/Emigrant Road when I-84 closes is dangerous, and noise is irritating to residents.
- Kanine Ridge Road is gated and not open to the public.
- Like walking paths in housing projects.
- Security cameras on trails with lighting.
- More signs where kids may be near roads (slow, kids at play, etc.). Traffic calming too.
- Improvements nears schools/places kids go, especially 4 Corners.
- Vision and Goals
$\square \quad$ Coordinate with other transit agencies in the region.
$\square \quad 70 \%$ of CTUIR energy costs are transport fuel.
$\square$ Awareness of drivers/other roadway users.
$\square$ Awareness of cyclist rights and needs.


## YELLOWHAWK TRIBAL HEALTH CENTER TABLING

During May 19, 2022 from 2:00 to 4:00 PM, members of the project team and CTUIR staff manned a table with handouts and larger maps in the lobby of the Yellowhawk Tribal Health Center to solicit public comment on the existing transportation system and future needs. Seven members of the public provided input.

Comments included:

- Improvements to roads and sidewalks for biking in July Grounds.
- Need sidewalks where you turn into housing/Whirlwind.
- Sidewalks on Short Mile.
- Need more parking near Arrowhead for when I-84 closes. Could provide shuttle to enjoy amenities whiles waiting for road.


## TRIBAL YOUTH COUNCIL MEETING

CTUIR staff attended an engagement session with the Tribal Youth Council on May 22, 2022 from 1:15 to 2:00 PM. Staff led a conversation with the seven youth council members in attendance and solicited additional feedback via a handout.

Discussion around what projects the students think of when envision meeting each of the Technical Memo \#3 goals:

- Safety
- More lighting.
- New crosswalks and sidewalks.
- More space to ride bikes and keep away from vehicular traffic.
- Repaint speed bumps or have "speed bumps ahead" signs for Whirlwind Drive and Confederated Way.
- Safety of railroad crossings has improved greatly. Need more pedestrian access, and all of the crossings should have traffic-blocking arms.
- CTUIR prompted discussion of new funding for reduction of at-grade rail crossings. Potential useful for the heavier traffic roads, such as OR 331 and Memory Lane.
- Environment and Cultural Heritage
- There used to be a path down to the river by Parr Lane. It might have been shut down prior to the 2020 flood by the property owner, but the flood washed it out. It would be nice to have trails that are official and maintained to access the river for fishing and swimming. Interested in public access and potentially some locations with gravel parking areas.
- Extension of the levy trail.
- Can there be walkways along the river? Potential negative impact on environmental protection; might be better to have access points and with a multi-use trail along the Mission Road.
- River access off of Parr Lane and Short Mile Road (near housing).
- Health
- Cross country team runs near Nixyaawii Governance Center and July Grounds; safer trails needed.
- Official and maintained scenic trails.
- Add trail features, like benches, for elders/disabled people who exercise.
- Equity \& Accessibility
- More benches and shade along existing walkways.
- Golf cart or other electric device check-out system (i.e. e-bikes and e-scooters) to get around the Mission-to-Wildhorse area. Could include a couple designated pick-up/drop-off locations.
- Connectivity
- Connect with the levy trail.
- Extended taxi or dial-a-ride service to help seniors to do time-sensitive errands with limited mobility (e.g. can't get to a Kayak stop).
- CTUIR plane out of Pendleton's airport. Add another destination like Spokane, Las Vegas, or other place CTUIR community has connections with.
- No comments on goals around Coordination and Financial Stability.

Handout comments included:

- Safety concerns with traffic around Arrowhead gas station.
- Add crosswalks on all legs at Mission Market intersection.
- Provide better pathway to Nixyaawii Governance Center.
- Sidewalks up the hill to Wildhorse.
- Repaint speed bumps.
- New paths to river.
- New walking path along the river.
- On the TCI trail, need light to allow youth and elders to walk at night and improve safety.
- Provide path between school and Mission Market.
- Top destinations include school, grocery store, neighborhoods, and Mission Market.


## ONLINE INPUT

Members of the public were encouraged to provide input via an interactive map on the project website (https://www.ctuir.org/departments/tribal-planning-office/transportation-system-plan-update-2022/) from May 5 to June 14, 2022. Comments received include:

- Short Mile Road - River access.
- Parr Lane - River access.
- Mission Road near A Street - More crosswalks and signs for pedestrian on Mission, traffic is fast.
- Mission Road \& OR 331 - Lighting at intersection. It's dark at night!
- Mission Road \& OR 331 - Crosswalks across Mission and Highway 331.
- Mission Road - Sidewalk or trail to Pendleton.
- OR 331 - Sidewalk or trail along Highway 331.
- Theater Road, $56^{\text {th }}$ Street - Heavy trucks cut through here when there's bad weather and the freeway is closed. Is there any way to get Google to stop directing traffic that way? It destroys the dirt and gravel road.


## TREATY DAY OUTREACH

CTUIR staff set up a table at the annual Treaty Day celebration on June 9, 2022. Comments received include:

- Goathead seeds (spiked vine) on the shoulder of roads in the July Grounds area, it causes pedestrians to walk in the middle of the road.
- There are no sidewalks in the neighborhoods northeast of Mission Road, south of Short Mile (including both of those roads).
- Would like to see the sidewalk continued on Confederated Way all the way to the east end.
- Would like to see a pedestrian crossing on the Umatilla River bridge (Highway 331) and an ADA accessible fishing platform there.
- Lots of pedestrians on the shoulder near Wildhorse on Highway 331.
- Connect to Pendleton Riverwalk
- Two people thought the youth council comment regarding a sidewalk or trail on Mission Road to Pendleton was a good idea


## FALL 2022 OUTREACH SUMMARY

Date: December 22, 2022<br>To: Dani Schulte, CTUIR<br>Cheryl-Jarvis Smith, ODOT Region 5<br>From: Molly McCormick and Nick Foster AICP, RSP ${ }_{1}$<br>Project: Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation Transportation System Plan Update<br>Subject: Spring 2022 Outreach Summary
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## INTRODUCTION

The project team recently completed a second round of outreach efforts to guide the development of the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update, with the support of CTUIR and ODOT staff. These efforts included:

- Mission Market Outreach
- After School Program Outreach
- Kayak Driver Outreach
- Senior Center Outreach
- General Council Meeting
- Umatilla County Staff Meeting
- Land Protection \& Planning Commission
- Law \& Order Commission
- Fish \& Wildlife Commission
- Capital Improvements Committee
- Health Commission
- Online Input


## Fall 2022 Outreach

Overall, a total of approximately 83 people were reached in person during the Fall 2022 outreach events, between project-specific outreach events and attendance at council, commission, and committee meetings.

This memorandum summarizes the feedback received from these events as of December 22, 2022. Key and recurring themes from the feedback included:

- CTUIR and the project team received a lot of general support for the project list as a whole.
- Adding more walking and biking options was well received, especially along Mission Road and OR 331 and in support of student trips.
- People are supportive of adding lighting to multi-use paths and Mission Road.
- Projects R07, R08, and R09 had mixed reviews. Some members of the public were worried about attracting more traffic on these roadways, while more comments supported updates to the roadways to help during rainy conditions.
- People support the OR 331 transit hub project.
- Bus stop enhancements were well received, especially providing shelters and lighting.
- Roundabouts were discussed by different groups, both in support and in concern.
- There were conflicting opinions about the idea to construct a multi-use path along the river. Many people want access to the river and a route further west, while others are concerned about litter and vandalism if access is publicly provided. Umatilla County may have applicable experience to share with the community to further consider when P06 and P07 move forward.


## MISSION MARKET OUTREACH

The project team and CTUIR staff solicitated public input at Mission Market during two time periods: 12:00 to 3:00 PM on September 21, 2022 and 12:00 to 1:00 PM on September 22, 2022. Community members were able to provide verbal comments or mark comments on two poster boards showing proposed projects for the study area. 21 people provided input to the project team on September $21^{\text {st }}$ and six provided input on September $22^{\text {nd }}$.

Comments included:

- Symbol for intersection reconfiguration is confusing.
- Will R03 include adding drainage?
- Four people liked projects R07, R08, and R09. Those roads get washed out during rainy conditions.
- Two people are worried about projects R07, R08, and R09 bringing additional traffic to those roadways.
- Is project R10 necessary?
- Straighten the River Road/White Road intersection.
- One person liked project R06.
- Kanine Ridge Road is not a good detour route when there are events on I-84.

- Two people liked project R01.
- Whirlwind Drive and Willow Lane need maintenance for potholes.
- Add a southbound truck lane on OR 331 from Mission Road to I-84.
- One person liked the transit hub concept.
- One person liked the traffic control concept at the OR 331/Spilya Road intersection.
- Within Arrowhead area, can trucks and passenger vehicles be separated?
- If roundabouts move forward, the community will need education.
- One person liked project P07.
- Four people noted that more biking and walking options are good, especially trails.
- One person liked the walking options connecting the school to Mission Market. Students walk between these locations frequently.
- Four people liked project P09 and three noted how dark that corridor currently is for walking at night.
- Can a rest area be included with project P09?
- Three people liked project P14 and creating a walking/biking loop.
- One person liked projects filling sidewalk and bicycle facility gaps on Mission Road in the July Grounds area, noting the facilities are currently narrow or non-existent.
- Two people liked project P12.
- One person liked project P22.
- Two people liked project P18.
- Can there be a road connection from Wildhorse Boulevard to Cayuse Road?
- The current Arrowhead bus stop is dangerous with drivers speeding through the parking lot.
- The Wildhorse shuttle serves Mission area at the top of the hour and can be in the way of Kayak vehicles.
- Bring back 4 PM Walla Walla bus service.


## AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAM OUTREACH

Members of the project team and CTUIR staff were available at the July Grounds Gym during afterschool program pickup on September 21, 2022 from 3:00 to 4:30 PM, soliciting feedback via two poster boards showing proposed projects. A traffic safety maze was set up for kids to explore when the adults were providing feedback. Nine people provided input to the project team.

Comments included:

- One person liked project R03.
- One person liked projects R07, R08, and R09. These roads are bumpy and difficult for emergency response access.
- One person liked roundabouts as the long-term traffic control at the OR 331 intersections with Wildhorse Boulevard and Spilya Road.
- One person liked the concept of reducing access at Kusi Road to right-in, right-out only.
- There are near-misses often at the Kusi Road/Arrowhead Road intersection.
- With development up the hill, like the idea of more sidewalks and walkability.
- Two people noted that Riverside Avenue needs sidewalks.
- One person liked project P07 and noted how it can connect to the levy.
- One person liked project P10 and noted that it will support the high school running team.
- Two people liked projects filling sidewalk and bicycle facility gaps on Mission Road in the July Grounds area.
- Mission Road is too dark to walk at night and during the winter season.
- Trains that go through the community are supposed to go 40 MPH but most travel faster.



## KAYAK DRIVER OUTREACH

The project team and CTUIR staff solicitated input from Kayak drivers on September 22, 2022. Eight people provided input to the project team.

Comments received include:

- Need more signs/shelters so passengers know where the stops are located. Signs get vandalized.
- Like the Arrowhead area transit shelter. Going into the Arrowhead area is tough, especially during summertime.
- Put one shelter on either side of OR 331, instead of only on east side.
- Safe crossings of OR 331 are needed. Please improve any existing crossings of OR 331.
- Could there be a truck right-in into Arrowhead?
- Interested in pullouts for stops.
- Ridership in Tutuilla, McKinley, and other rural areas is close to zero.
- Turning onto OR 331 from Timíne Way is challenging. Will go to Mission instead.
- Turning onto Timíne Way from the bus barn is challenging. People drive fast on Timíne Way and people walking don't use crosswalks.
- July Grounds is dark at night. Can the shelter be moved to other entrance? Lots of elders ask to be dropped off at other entrance.


## SENIOR CENTER LUNCH

CTUIR staff visited the Senior Center during lunch in November 2022. There were approximately 25 people attendees.

Comments included:

- Are you going to bring back taxi tickets?
- Are you going to get any new trails? Like up to the casino?
- When is the Thornhollow Bridge going to be finished?
- Concerns about lights, safety on TCI trail, and young cottonwood trees falling over in the Wetlands Park area, causing trail maintenance issues.
- Kayak used to go to Thornhollow, it would be nice if they did again. Maybe the flood buyouts mean there's not enough houses there anymore.
- Sheltered bus stops are a good idea, especially this time of year.
- Umatilla County is difficult, they don't care when we ask for road maintenance on their roads. They don't plow Thornhollow grade.
- Mission - better lighting on mission between 4-corners and Wetlands Park. "I'm an elder, it's scary driving there at night."


## GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING TABLING

CTUIR staff manned a table in the rotunda outside the General Council meeting at the Nixyaawii Governance Center on October 20, 2022. This provided the opportunity to provide project updates to attendees and solicit input via larger maps. Due to community circumstances, the meeting was covering three months' worth of agendas, and many attendees did not take time to stop to discuss the TSP. No comments were received.

## UMATILLA COUNTY STAFF MEETING

CTUIR staff met with Umatilla County staff in September 2022 to gather feedback on the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Four County staff were present.

Comments received include:

- Generally thought it is a good list. Suggested that they should incorporate this project list into their County TSP update. The County recently won a TGM award for, so might get rolling in a year or so.
- Called out R04 and R12 as not being on County roads, and CTUIR staff noted that they were partially on county roads but not completely. Is there enough room in the column to list both owners in the project table? R04 is County/BIA, R12 is County/CTUIR.
- The County didn't think that R13 was necessary because there's a stop sign just north of the river at the railroad crossing. Thought it was unlikely people could travel too fast between the sharp curve coming down off Cayuse and the railroad stop sign.
- The group was able to answer the question of whether the Wildhorse Creek bridge is on or off the reservation. Technically Wildhorse Creek is the reservation boundary, so it's both. However, the bridge is really just someone's driveway bridge, it only serves one house, and our GIS system doesn't even identify the road it's on as a road, tribal county or otherwise. So R16 can be removed from the project list.
- CTUIR noted that had previously listed the Highway 11/331 intersection and removed it since it's offreservation but nearby and is important to the community. The County didn't have a preference either way, so keep out of the project list for now.
- The County had questions about the alignment of P07. CTUIR discussed prioritizing the path of least resistance during the project design process, and that some of the floated ideas are the road, the river, and the sewer main easement. This was a good conversation to establish some coordination with their part of the trail, since it will have to cross county land before it reaches Pendleton.
- County staff asked about cross sections for bus pull outs. CTUIR noted that there aren't that many bus stops and it might be a bit much, but it could be worth including in the next proposal for the road standards - what width of pavement should be provided to accommodate bus pull-outs. Currently, mostly stop in-lane unless that's prohibited or not safe, which is pretty much just on Mission Road and Highway 331.
- It could also be included in the text of the Mission Road pedestrian improvements, to incorporate bus pull-outs into the improvement designs for cost efficiency.


## COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

## Land Protection \& Planning Commission

Four CTUIR planning staff attended the September 2022 commission meeting to gather feedback on community needs and the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Four commission members were present.

Comments received include:

- One commissioner took issue with the exclusion of transit that's outside the reservation boundary since it's outside our jurisdiction. Concerned about the removal of the bus stop on the east end of Pendleton which was removed without our knowledge when construction began for a new gas station, next door to Tum-aLum Lumber. Kayak is currently working with ODOT and the City of Pendleton to re-establish the bus stop.
- Pleased with the improvement to bus stops and shelters. Suggested that we add lighting.
- The commission was generally favorable to roundabouts. They initiated a conversation about how much safer they are, and how they just take some getting used to. CTUIR staff noted that have received some negative opinion through public comment, and a few of members had heard about their proposal from disapproving friends and family members.


## Law \& Order Commission

CTUIR staff attended the October 4, 2022 commission meeting to gather feedback on community needs and the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Four commission members were present.

Comments received include:

- One member expressed concern about horses on Mission, safety, spooking \& proximity to cars.
- People speed on Mission, concerned about pedestrian safety.
- In response to possible speed reductions on Mission/331: "my brothers are gonna hate that."
- Suggest a signal at Timíne Way and Mission intersection


## Fish \& Wildlife Commission

CTUIR staff attended the October 11, 2022 commission meeting to gather feedback on community needs and the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Five commission members were present.

Comments received include:

- Public river access - one member expressed staunch opposition to that. Concern about protecting treaty rights, fishing poachers, protecting fisheries and water quality, and restricted access as a means to manage fish resources.
- When CTUIR raised the topic of official facilities to make fishing accessible to community members with disabilities, they seemed more amenable, but wanted to make sure any program like that would consider policing and prevention of poaching.
- One member stated that they were anti-lighting because of protecting lamprey and fisheries in general.
- Concerns about who is responsible for policing any new trail alignments - TPD is already spread thin.
- Suggest emergency phones on trails as a safety feature.


## Capital Improvements Committee

CTUIR staff attended the October 11, 2022 commission meeting to gather feedback on community needs and the proposed projects from Technical Memo \#4. Ten commission members were present.

Comments received include:

- One member noted concern about mapping affecting negotiations with property owners. not liking roundabouts, and that ODOT should pay for the Kash Kash road fix.
- One proposal for a fix for the land negotiation impact - incorporate the "grid" mandate component into the site plan process that's required for subdivisions, PUD, and large commercial development. This would make sure that any major new use of land would be required to grid out as part of the zoning permitting process, rather than requiring an extra reviewer (which is anticipated for things like the cross sections adherence).
- There was a lot of discussion about roundabouts.


## Health Commission

CTUIR staff was scheduled to present the 20-Year Transportation Plan at the October 11, 2022 regular commission meeting. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the commission had to cancel that meeting, and chose to email a comment document instead. Commissioners were provided a Planning PowerPoint Presentation and the website link to develop comments. The commission voted to provide the following comments to CTUIR staff at their November 2, 2022 meeting.

- We would like to preface that a walk or bicycle ride is a great, simple and free preventative action patients can do on their own. There are multiple deterrents that make a simple walk or bike ride difficult in our community, and we are focusing on those in our preliminary comments.
- Responding to the PowerPoint "TSP Update Presentation" is a little confusing without staff dialogue. Commissioners attempted to reflect on whether changes were made and reactions to environmental and social events that may have impacted the 2001 plan.
- Projects from 2001 TSP: Road to access Agency Cemetery would improve access for community.
- Suggestion: add parking lot (gravel or paved) to Agency cemetery, and make remainder of path beyond cemetery going west (28) a bike path only
- Concern: if used in 2022 update, road would reopen concern about "East Bench" development, building a road could unearth more human remains, and if area west of cemetery were a bike path you would not have to dig into potential garbage from the old dump site.
- All areas of additional develop should include proper lighting and more lighting is needed for existing neighborhoods and walking paths for safety reasons and to encourage healthy choices
- Warning signs about wildlife should be added to current and future walking paths; bears, cougars, coyotes and even raccoons.
- Identify transportation changes and improvements over time that were completed and have to be redone now. The projects that were in this plan, were they funded, since this was passed by previous committees and commissions and BOTs -are there resolutions to accompany previous decisions?
- Greater UIR area projects from 2001 TSP
- Were the "reservation wide" transportation projects a reaction to flooding incidents or were these infrastructure updates? Where did the funds come from? What does this map look like now since at least one of the bridges is out right now due to flooding?
- Safety for drivers should be a priority in plan development of prioritizing: sections on North Cayuse Road continue to have limited visibility and road must be widened or adjusted to protect families who use this road
- Bike Path options for reservation-wide map. Existing partnership with UPRR could make it so a "bike route" exists along River Road, to Sampson Lane and Short Mile Road to reach Mission and Wildhorse areas. Goatheads must be exterminated. The 2001 transportation plan excluded community members who want to have a "green" or healthy transportation option to ride their
bicycles to work or appointments. If managing goatheads is a part of the URPP Agreement, this would suffice for local non-Mission area residents, so bicycles are a transportation option.
- Identify transportation changes over time to show community how much change has occurred for RESERVATION-WIDE map. How much work has been "reactionary" to environmental changes and how much has been done due to partnerships (landowners, UPRR, federal and state)?
- Commissioner comments regarding an updated Transportation Plan
- More community engagement to ensure decisions being made are for the good of people who actually live in and use this area
- What looks good on paper or sounds good to reduce a carbon footprint may not always work for the ones who live here now
- Understand the need to build more so more tribal members can move home, please don't forget about those who have lived here

Streetlights need improvement and there needs to be more

- Consider the safety needs at bus stops; lights and signage
- Contact Pendleton, Athena and Pilot Rock school districts to coordinate with their transportation managers to ensure bus routes are safe for students reservation-wide
- Lots of pedestrians right now, lights will improve safety
- More bike paths and walkways
- Work with departments to prioritize extinguishing goat heads from roads and pathways (Housing, Public Works, DNR, DECD [TERF and Coyote Biz Park])
- Create A Weed/Invasive Plant Management Plan specifically for roads and pathways
- Having A Plan available for community members, departments or partners to reference could enable community-sponsored activities. Example: sports teams could address invasive plants per A Plan in return for a donation from a private tribal member or department. Also having A Plan could be a tool for tribal court to reference for restorative justices sentencing options
- If we are separating transportation options into "Mission Area" and "Reservation Wide" suggest expanding Reservation Wide into subsections. Get those residents' comments, dedicate meetings and comments for those areas, and identify per subsection any partnerships (state, federal, private, NGOs) the tribe has regarding transportation options and hurdles
- Riverside-Pendleton
- North Reservation (Johnley Rd to Adams-Weston areas)
- Cayuse-N. Cayuse Road Route
- Up-River-Bingham
- The Flats (Tutuilla-Holmes-Reservoir)
- South Reservation (Upper Spring Creek Road-McKay Creek-Pilot Rock)
- Foothills-Meacham (Emigrant Hwy past Cayuse Rd to Meacham)
- Although Tribes are exempt from ADA, we should follow it in good faith to provide adequate access to our ever increasing disabled or handicap population. Easy access to sidewalks, properly designated handicap parking and signage to inform the public of accessibility are vital. We have a large population of Baby Boomers who are aging, and easy access will be important in the near future.
- Partner with CTUIR departments to add permanent restrooms on or near TCI path.
- Add safety features like fencing around playgrounds or recreation buildings, so children and families can play outside day or night to address fear of strangers entering play zones without parental knowledge.


## ONLINE INPUT

Members of the public were encouraged to provide input via an interactive map on the project website (https://www.ctuir.org/departments/tribal-planning-office/transportation-system-plan-update-2022/) from September 19 to October 19, 2022. There were over 300 item views.

The one comment received was:

- T02 - Bus Stop Enhancements: It would seem to be a priority to ensure that each bus stop is well lit (not the case in several); safe and kept clean. Some of the stops do not even have shelter for people waiting in the rain or other weather.


## OTHER INPUT

CTUIR staff conducted door-to-door outreach with ODOT during November 2022 to discuss the Exit 216 project.
One comment was received that was related more to the CTUIR TSP than to the Exit 216 project:

- Thompson Road gets flooded by Patawa Creek; it's getting worse each year. This issue may be exacerbated by the new truck traffic on Thompson Road during winter weather events on Cabbage Hill, as it's already creating unsafe conditions with the trucks that travel from the gravel mine at the end of Thompson Road.


## January 10, 2023 - TSP Update Freight Survey Summary

The Freight Survey was conducted from 1pm-4pm on Tuesday, January $10^{\text {th }}$ at the Arrowhead Travel Plaza. We received 26 responses. A few staff members took a survey or asked questions about the project in addition to the target population of truck drivers. The survey had 4 questions:

1. How often do you travel through the Umatilla Indian Reservation?
2. What routes do you travel most frequently on the Umatilla Indian Reservation?
3. What feedback would you like to share about your general experience driving in the area?
4. What feedback would you like to share about the proposed improvements in this area of Highway 331?

Most respondents did not look at the map in detail, and were provided by the surveyors with a summary of the suggested Highway 331 improvements. Improvements highlighted included pedestrian amenities like trails, sidewalks, and crosswalks, and intersection improvements like traffic signals or roundabouts.

## Frequency of UIR Travel


$62 \%$ of respondents travel through the UIR at least once a week. The route most frequently used by all but two respondents (who did not respond to this question) was I-84. This question allowed respondents to "select all that apply" so additional routes identified included Highway 331 and Highway 11. One respondent specified "Other: Mission Road", however all other "other" routes identified were not located on the Umatilla Indian Reservation.

## General Feedback

The word cloud below shows the top 50 topicrelevant words (i.e. excluding "and" and "the" type connecter words) recorded in the surveys. The most frequently cited concern was parking. Five respondents replied "none" to the question about general feedback, which we interpret to mean they're generally satisfied with the facilities available. The most frequently repeated topics were: 1. More parking (8); 2. Driver education (6); and; 3. More activites nearby (6).

Of the desired activities nearby, some cited the
 proposed Highway 331 trail as a possible recreation facility, as they would like to be able to exercise during
their breaks at Arrowhead. Many wished for a greater variety of dining opportunities near Arrowhead, and one respondent would like to see children's activites, as they drive with their children during the summer.


Some of the unique suggestions included:

1. Add a wind speed meter/sign
2. Heated roads for winter ice
3. In addition to RRFBs for pedestrians, higher visibility tools like lights embedded in the crosswalk paint on the ground (driver suggested an example from California).
4. [Freight] truck ride-alongs for road designers, to see what the limitations are in-person.

## Highway 331 Improvements

Two respondents were pleased to see the overflow parking project, identified as R10 on the map. However a third respondent suggested it would be better if it were on the north side of the freeway, closer to Arrowhead and other amenities in case drivers would prefer not to wait for a shuttle, or are willing to walk but would rather not walk over the overpass.

Of the three new project areas highlighted in the project map, feedback was distributed into one of three feedback groups where the respondent gave input about a specific feature - positive, neutral, or negative. Constructive feedback which did not explicitly support or dislike a project was categorized as neutral, as was feedback where the respondent indicated they could go either way. Such constructive feedback includes responses such as "put crosswalks north [of Spilyay] to avoid pedestrians making it harder to get in and out [of Arrowhead]."

| Project | Positive | Neutral | Negative |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roundabouts | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Trails | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| Crosswalks | 3 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |

## Arrowhead-specific Feedback

Arrowhead Travel Plaza-specific feedback has fairly little bearing on the Transportation System Plan as a whole, but may inform local business development by Arrowhead or DLCD. As such, I'll include some of the comments we received specific to Arrowhead:

1. Would like to see overflow truck parking area with basic amenities - restrooms, showers, vending machines.
2. More dining options
3. More parking for smaller commercial rigs
4. Truck wash
5. Pet area would be nice/larger pet area.

## PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE DISSEMINATION RECORD

File \#: Transportation System Plan 20-Year Update filed by CTUIR Tribal Planning Office, 46411 Timíne Way, Pendleton, OR 97801

Land Protection Planning Commission Public Hearing Date: March 14, 2023

Newspaper and Date Published; East Oregonian: March 4, 2023
CUJ: March 2, 2023

Posted in six public Places;

1. Mission Market: March 1, 2023
2. Yellowhawk Tribal Health Clinic: March 1, 2023
3. BIA Umatilla Agency: March 1, 2023
4. CTUIR Housing Department: March 1, 2023
5. Nixyáawii Governance Center March 3, 2023
6. CTUIR web site: https://ctuir.org/events/lppc-public-hearing-v-23-001-tsp-20-year-update/

Attached are copies of the public hearing notices that were posted, published and mailed to all interested parties, subject property owners and adjacent property owners, as required by Land Development Code Section 13.020.

## Transportation System Plan 20-Year Update Hearing Public Notice Recipients

## Agency Recipients

| Contact | Agency | Address |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bob Waldher, Planning <br> Director | Umatilla County | 416 SE 4 <br> th Street <br> Pendleton, OR 97801 |
| Public Works Director | Umatilla County | 3920 Westgate <br> Pendleton, OR 97801 |
| Superintendent | BIA | via e-mail |
| District \#12 | ODOT | 1327 SE 3rd Street <br> Pendleton, OR 97801 |
| Rob Corbett, City <br> Manager | City of Pendleton | 500 SW Dorion Avenue <br> Pendleton, OR 97801 |
| Eric Watrud, Forest <br> Supervisor | United States <br> Forest Service | 72510 Coyote Road <br> Pendleton, OR 97801 |

## PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Land Protection Planning Commission of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) will hold the following public hearings:

Conditional Use File \#CU-23-001 - Applicant, CTUIR Department of Natural Resources - Range, Agricultural and Forestry Program seeks approval from the Land Protection Planning Commission to complete a timber harvest on multiple lots owned by the CTUIR in fee and trust. The subject properties are identified as Tax Lots 110, 133, 140, 4660, 4670, 4690, $4800,4900,5000,6300,6400,6500,6600,6800,6900$, and 7000 within Umatilla County Tax Map $2 N 35$ in sections 20, 21 , $22,30,31$, and 32 along with trust lots $513,514,547,548,550,694,764,765,766,767,768,808,890,892,893,896,898$, $912,916,956,1021,1178,1191,1278,1043-A, 1057-A, 766-A$, T1017, T1018, T1125, T2110, T2111, T2121, T546, T844-C, T844-D, and T897 all within the external boundaries of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. The proposed harvest would be a timber harvest within the taxlots to reduce fire danger and improve forest health. The subject property is zoned G-1, Big Game Grazing, where a timber harvest to remove more than 5,000 board foot gross is listed as a Conditional Use. Conditional Use approvals are subject to the CTUIR Land Development Code Chapters 6 and 13. This hearing is rescheduled from the February 28, 2023 meeting of the LPPC.

Variance File \#V-23-001 - Applicant, Verizon Wireless through agent Kimberly Spongberg of Blackrock LLC, P.O. Box 1744 Tualatin, OR 97062, seeks approval from the Land Protection Planning Commission for a variance to the height standard in the C-D, Commercial zone to construct a new wireless communications facility consisting of a 150 ' monopole with antennas (up to a height of 154') within lot 12 of Coyote Business Park North, a portion of Tribal Trust property T2103A. The proposed location is at 72544 Coyote Road, and is located within Township 2N Range 33E, Section 21 on the Umatilla Indian Reservation. The allowed height limit within the C-D zone is $120^{\prime}$. Variance approvals are subject to the CTUIR Land Development Code Chapters 8 and 13.

Transportation System Plan 20-Year Update - Applicant, Tribal Planning Office, seeks a recommendation from the Land Protection \& Planning Commission that the Board of Trustees adopt the updated Transportation System Plan (TSP) to replace the 2001 TSP. This plan updates the 2001 project list based on research of past plans; traffic analysis; and community input and feedback. It also develops criteria for evaluating future proposed projects based on seven (7) proposed goals: Safety; Environment and Cultural Heritage; Health; Equity and Accessibility; Connectivity; Coordination; and Financial Stability. More information about the plan can be found at: https://ctuir.org/departments/tribal-planning-office/transportation-system-plan-update-2022/

These hearings will be held on Tuesday, March 14, 2023 beginning at 9:00 a.m. Individuals may attend the meeting in the Walúula and Wanaqit conference rooms at the Nixyáawii Governance Center, virtually, or by phone. Information on joining the meeting online is available at https://ctuir.org/events/lppc-public-hearing-v-23-001-tsp-20-year-update/. Participation in the hearing will also be available by phone at 321-754-9526 starting at 9:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. The conference ID will be 586048 574\#.

Staff reports and other materials pertaining to the hearing are available for review at the link above, or can be requested from the Tribal Planning Office by calling 541-276-3099.

The public is entitled and encouraged to participate in the hearing and submit testimony regarding the request. Written comments may be sent to tpo@ctuir.org or to the Tribal Planning Office at 46411 Timíne Way Pendleton, OR 97801 for receipt by 4:00 p.m. March 13, 2023.

## PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Land Protection Planning Commission of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) will hold the following public hearings:

Conditional Use File \#CU-23-001 - Applicant, CTUIR Department of Natural Resources Range, Agricultural and Forestry Program seeks approval from the Land Protection Planning Commission to complete a timber harvest on multiple lots owned by the CTUIR in fee and trust. The subject properties are identified as Tax Lots 110, 133, 140, 4660, 4670, 4690, 4800, 4900, $5000,6300,6400,6500,6600,6800,6900$, and 7000 within Umatilla County Tax Map 2N35 in sections $20,21,22,30,31$, and 32 along with trust lots $513,514,547,548,550,694,764,765$, $766,767,768,808,890,892,893,896,898,912,916,956,1021,1178,1191,1278,1043-\mathrm{A}, 1057-$ A, 766-A, T1017, T1018, T1125, T2110, T2111, T2121, T546, T844-C, T844-D, and T897 all within the external boundaries of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. The proposed harvest would be a timber harvest within the taxlots to reduce fire danger and improve forest health. The subject property is zoned G-1, Big Game Grazing, where a timber harvest to remove more than 5,000 board foot gross is listed as a Conditional Use. Conditional Use approvals are subject to the CTUIR Land Development Code Chapters 6 and 13. This hearing is rescheduled from the February 28, 2023 meeting of the LPPC.

Variance File \#V-23-001 - Applicant, Verizon Wireless through agent Kimberly Spongberg of Blackrock LLC, PO Box 1744 Tualatin, OR 97062, seeks approval from the Land Protection Planning Commission for a variance to the height standard in the C-D, Commercial zone to construct a new wireless communications facility consisting of a 150 ' monopole with antennas (up to a height of $154^{\prime}$ ) within lot 12 of Coyote Business Park North, a portion of Tribal Trust property T2103-A. The proposed location is at 72544 Coyote Road, and is located within Township 2N Range 33E, Section 21 on the Umatilla Indian Reservation. The allowed height limit within the CD zone is $120^{\prime}$. Variance approvals are subject to the CTUIR Land Development Code Chapters 8 and 13.

Transportation System Plan 20-Year Update - Applicant, Tribal Planning Office, seeks a recommendation from the Land Protection \& Planning Commission that the Board of Trustees adopt the updated Transportation System Plan (TSP) to replace the 2001 TSP. This plan updates the 2001 project list based on research of past plans; traffic analysis; and community input and feedback. It also develops criteria for evaluating future proposed projects based on seven (7) proposed goals: Safety; Environment and Cultural Heritage; Health; Equity and Accessibility; Connectivity; Coordination; and Financial Stability. More information about the plan can be found at: https://ctuir.org/departments/tribal-planning-office/transportation-system-plan-update2022/

These hearings will be held on Tuesday, March 14, 2023 beginning at 9:00 a.m. Individuals may attend the meeting in the Walúula and Wanaqit conference rooms at the Nixyáawii Governance Center, virtually, or by phone. Information on joining the meeting online is available at https://ctuir.org/events/lppc-public-hearing-v-23-001-tsp-20-year-update/. Participation in the
hearing will also be available by phone at 321-754-9526 starting at 9:00 a.m. on the day of the hearing. The conference ID will be 586048 574\#.

Staff reports and other materials pertaining to the hearing are available for review at the link above, or can be requested from the Tribal Planning Office by calling 541-276-3099.

The public is entitled and encouraged to participate in the hearing and submit testimony regarding the request. Written comments may be sent to tpo@ctuir.org or to the Tribal Planning Office at 46411 Timíne Way Pendleton, OR 97801 for receipt by 4:00 p.m. March 13, 2023.

## MEMORANDUM

| DATE: | February 8, 2023 |
| :--- | :--- |
| TO: | Tribal Staff Review Committee (TSRC) |
| FROM: | Holly Anderson, Associate Planner, Tribal Planning Office |
| REGARDING: | Meeting Wednesday, February 15, 2023, 10:30 am, in the Waluula and Wanaqit Conference |
|  | Room at the Nixyáawii Governance Center or via Microsoft Teams |

The Tribal Staff Review Committee will meet on Wednesday, February 15, 2023 at 10:30 am to review the following application:

Variance Application File \#V-23-001 - Applicant, Verizon Wireless through agent Kimberly Spongberg of Blackrock LLC seeks approval from the Land Protection Planning Commission for a variance to the height standard in the C-D, Commercial zone to construct a new wireless communications facility consisting of a 150 ' monopole with antennas (tip height $154^{\prime}$ ) within lot 12 of Coyote Business Park North, a portion of Tribal Trust property T2103-A. The allowed height limit within the C-D zone is $120^{\prime}$. The proposed location is at 72544 Coyote Road, and is located within Township 2N Range 33E, Section 21 on the Umatilla Indian Reservation. Variance approvals are subject to the CTUIR Land Development Code Chapters 8 and 13.

Note, this application was originally submitted in 2019 and a TSRC Meeting held December 9, 2019. Since then the Cultural Resources review and NEPA analysis have been completed with a Finding of no Significant Impact (FONSI) issued by the BIA on March 4, 2021.

You may attend this TSRC meeting in person or through Microsoft Teams Video Conference:

## Microsoft Teams meeting

## Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

Click here to join the meeting
Meeting ID: 224772351497 | Passcode: Pm3eVK
Or call in (audio only)
+1 321-754-9526,,251582954\# | phone conference ID: 251582 954\#
The application and supporting materials for this request are posted on the Free4all shared Drive in the TPO folder. If you have questions or need further information, please contact Holly Anderson at 541-429-7517.
Each committee member should review the proposals:

- To determine its compatibility with the Tribes' Comprehensive Plan, Land Development Code, and other Tribal Statutes, Resolutions, and Policies;
- To determine the overall impacts this request may impose on Tribal services and utilities, the environment, wildlife, and on the Reservation

Please see application materials on the $\mathrm{Z}: / \mathrm{drive}$. Written comments will be accepted until the end of the day on Tuesday, February 21, 2023.

A public hearing with the Land Planning Protection Commission (LPPC) is proposed to be scheduled for March 14, 2023 at 9 .


[^0]:    Table source: CTUIR 2001 TSP and ODOT TransGIS
    ${ }^{1}$ The Umatilla County Roadway Department does not have jurisdiction over this railroad crossing. Therefore, it is assumed that the crossing is local access controlled.
    ${ }^{2}$ The ODOT Rail Division Crossing Log does not account for the local access crossings at Hart Lane (MP 219.12) and Williams Lane (MP 219.65). These crossings are assumed local access controlled.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ https://ctuir.org/media/sychezsg/2018updated-2010 Gpmprehgnpiveplan-3yebversion.pdf

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ https://ctuir.org/departments/office-offegahcorunsel/coses-statytas-layschand-development-code/

[^3]:    Umatilla Indian Reservation Boundary
    Mission Hub
    July Grounds Hub
    Figure 2
    Gateway Hub
    Pendleton UGB

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Local fixed-route transit service is required by Federal Law to have complementary origin-to-destination service along a $3 / 4$ mile buffer of the fixed-route to serve those with certified temporary or permanent disabilities.

[^5]:    ${ }^{2}$ The only roadway segment within the UIR boundary that is classified as a principal arterial is the portion of OR 11 approaching Pendleton in the northeast corner of the study area.
    ${ }^{3}$ The only roadway segment within the UIR boundary that has four or more lanes is OR 331 from north of Kusi Road to South of Spilya Road.
    ${ }^{4}$ Posted speed values were used for study segments where posted speed was already collected for LTS analysis or where the posted speed GIS data was available. For segments where speed data was unavailable, CTUIR's GIS data for "road type" was used as a proxy for speed. Segments listed as a federal/state route or as a public paved/hard-surface road were assumed to have a posted speed of 35 MPH or greater.
    5 "Other" zoning includes all zoning classifications within the Oregon Spatial Data Library (OSDL) with the exception of residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, and farm-use zoning. Examples of "Other" zoning including forest/federal lands, coastline, parks, range, and public health. Based on OSDL 2017 zoning data, most of the study area is categorized as "other" zoning, except the areas to the south that are not connected to the primary boundary.

[^6]:    ${ }^{6}$ The entire UIR boundary meets the high population over 64 threshold of $16.8 \%$, with only three census blocks covering the study area.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Source: https://www.eastoregonian.com/news/local/Nixyáawii-holds-first-open-house-in-newbuilding/article 16a6e81c-caa1-11e9-9035-7bb97a1574f5.html

[^8]:    The SRT-Malheur Express and Snake River Transit services provide a mix of local and intercity service between Ontario, Fruitland and Payette.

[^9]:    1 Depending on the reconfiguration of the intersection, consider incorporating bus pull-outs into the project design.
    2 This project may be completed in conjunction with future replacement of the Exit 216 l-84 overpass.

[^10]:    *McDonald, Norcen, Austh Brown, Lauren Marchett1, and Margo Pedroso. 20t1. "U.S. School Trawal 2009: An Assessment of Trends." Amencan Journal of Prewentive Medicine.

    + Centers for Disease Control. www.cde gow/physlcalactivitylbasics/childron/indax.htm
    "- McDonald, N., Stolner, R., Lee, C., Rhoulac Smith, T., Zhu, X, and Y. Yang. (2014). Impact of the Safe Routes to School Program on Walklng and Elcycling. Journal of the American Planning Assoclation.

[^11]:    24

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ The following additional recommendation has been cost-estimated below but has been removed from the nearterm list because it is not recommended for the current grant opportunity: Install 6' sidewalks along the east side of Hwy 331 north of the existing sidewalk at the Four Corners intersection extending to Showaway Ln.

[^13]:    ${ }^{2}$ SF = Square Feet, LF = Linear Feet, EA $=$ Each, LS = Lump Sum, CA/CEI = Construction Administration/Construction Engineering Inspections

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ The Seasonal Trend Table accessed in February 2022 is based off the 2019 values due to the irregularity caused by the Covid-19 pandemic.

[^15]:    ${ }^{2}$ The Seasonal Trend Table accessed in February 2022 is based off the 2019 values due to the irregularity caused by the Covid-19 pandemic.

