

JPACT MEETING 10/8/81  
BOB BOTHMAN'S REVIEW OF THE SIX YEAR PLAN

File w/ JPACT  
minutes

verbatim transcript  
Infr

FIRST ITEM - BOB BOTHMAN REVIEW OF THE SIX YEAR PLAN

RNB -- QUICK INTRODUCTION TO THE SIX YEAR PLAN. Our Six Year Program constitutes the capital improvement program for the Oregon Department of Transportation and includes all our highway projects for the next six year period. It's updated every two years, then theoretically, we have completed two years of our current program and we tack two years on the end.

We have built this program in-house. This year we have a list of projects in our current program that aren't completed and another list of projects, our "want" list which has been developed from previous hearings, high accident studies, signal investigation warrants and so forth. We have prioritized all the projects at both the regional level and then taken those priorities and integrated them in a statewide priority list. We have a long list of projects we have in mind, then use that on a priority basis to build this program.

As you may know, there are some 32 different funding sources in federal funding, and you have to categorize the projects into those sources, and that helps build the program.

We're moving into our hearing process. We've having 18 hearings scattered around the state. Five hearings are in the Metro area, including Beaverton, Gresham, Oregon City, Hood River, and St. Helens. The purpose is to get a response from the local jurisdictions and the public vs. our priorities. At the same time, we're going around to all the local jurisdictions, the media, the highway user groups, and chambers of commerce as another vehicle to get people to respond, so that we can get some measure of our priorities.

Commission policy two years ago was to concentrate our program on preserving the system. Two years later, this year, they have said that 75 percent of the program will be preservation and 25 percent will be for new projects and improving the system. That dictates to us the projects in the program. In addition to that, we've experienced an average inflation rate of 14 percent in the highway business. That complicated this program in that our current program anticipated an 8 percent inflation rate, so obviously we have more projects in our current program than we could fund.

The other thing is that our revenues have dropped off. Mileage on the roads was increasing until 1971 at the rate of about 6 percent a year and the gas tax and the larger cars in those days kept our revenues increasing to keep up with inflation. After the OPEC years, the mileage dropped off and the miles per gallon of the cars increased, so our revenues dropped off. In the last 16 months, our revenues have been decreasing.

We've shifted our funding from construction to maintenance. Our maintenance program is not addressed in this book, but it's at about the same level, down only 20 percent from where it was. It's now about \$60 million whereas several years ago it was \$20 million.

From our current program, a lot of things have happened:

1. A lot of projects have been delayed. In the far right-hand column of our program, that is our current approved program. (see Page 10).--gives explanation of how to read the program--

2. In addition to slipping projects, some projects dropped off the end. (see Page 11). As an expedient two years ago, we put a number of projects in the program and designated them "later". That means we could not fund them within the current Six Year Program, but we identified them as a project we intended to build.

3/  
This year we have not done that because we can't earmark projects that we're going to build later. Our funding just doesn't allow it.

OK, if Andy wants to pick up on how that affects this region, specifically.

Andy -- This region's highway program has two major components. One, about 300+ million dollars worth of Interstate Transfer Projects which we've been dealing with for some time now. The other half is about \$300 million worth of Interstate projects, also essential to this region. \$288 million worth as described on my memo are in this last list that's getting deleted from the program. In effect, half this region's highway program is being deferred with no certainty of when they might be built. I've laid out some suggestions on how the Transportation Commission may want to consider the priority of these projects relative to what they are proposing in the Six Year Program, so that the parts that are essential to this region can move forward.

In the memo, a lot of these projects are bit items. \$50 - \$60 million worth of construction. A number of these projects can be broken into smaller pieces. Either break out the most important part of the project with the rest of it being deferred, or phasing over two to three years like the state's doing for I-205.

In particular, the East Marquam Bridge project consists of two different parts, ramps from McLoughlin and the ramps from Water Ave. The ramps from McLoughlin aren't essential until the McLoughlin widening takes place, but the Water Ave. ramps are essential to the industrial access in that area right now. The Slough Bridge project \$60 million can be broken down, too. The Banfield widening east of I-205 includes widening the freeway itself, but also includes reconstruction of the interchange at 181st, which is essential for a



primary route connection to US 26 via Burnside through Gresham.

Secondly, the program does include \$89 million worth of improvements to I-82 in eastern Oregon, another rather large project. We don't think it's practical to building one of our projects vs. building one of their projects. I think it's practical to suggest that the same thing be done with I-82 as is done with our projects; build critical pieces and free up some of the money for critical pieces of some of our projects.

There are discretionary funds that may become available, and ODOT will pursue those as a matter of course, but this reinforces that. And finally, the state does have commitments to match a number of Interstate Transfer projects with state money and the state should not lose sight of that commitment as we pursue the other half of our highway program, the Interstate Transfer half. I suggest these comments be forwarded in a letter form signed by the chairman to the Commission and as many jurisdictions as possible testify at the hearings to get some of these, and any other points you might have, across.

Q. How did you determine which projects to delete?

A RNB - strictly on a priority basis. This is an in-house recommendation so in each of the five regions we prioritized projects and then blended at the state level, and went down as far as the money went. On the primary and secondary highway projects, we drew a line at \$2 million per mile, so if the improvement of the facility was in excess of \$2 million per mile it was dropped off the program. There were a few exceptions, but primarily those on the Coos Bay-Roseburg Hwy. were all dropped off. There are some new projects in here because of the preservation requirement.

*Robin Lundquist*



I call your attention to the double asterisk. In the program it indicates projects caught up in the 1¢ gas tax. This goes into effect in January, if there is no referendum. The 1¢ gas tax gives us the state funds to match federal funds on these projects. The 3¢ gas tax is another issue. That's the one on the ballot in May. We have not addressed projects for that money.

Q. How did you distinguish between maintenance projects and construction or reconstruction projects?

A. RNB -- Maintenance is pothole patching, snowplowing, striping, electricity for signals, mowing lawns --. We draw the line in the paving at dumping it out of a truck and spread it with a shovel to patch, and construction is layed with a paving machine and by the mile.

Q. What about bridge?

A. RNB -- same thing. An in-house operation vs. a contracted operation. About \$50,000 under state law, we do our own work. Over \$50,000 is contracted and that's construction.

Q. How did you weigh the number of people that use your new freeway out at Pendleton or wherever vs. the number using the East Marquam Interchange?

Q. Was that an important factor in prioritizing? How many people use it or how many accidents?

A. RNB - The key factor was, we didn't weight the traffic volume -- There we're dealing with about 7500 cars a day on I-82. That's forecasted traffic in 20 years, and here we deal with over 100,000. That's a critical link that's tied to the Interstate Freeway system. That's the link between the freeway built in Washington and the Tri-City areas north and down to I-84.

Q. You don't have some neat weighing of accidents, volumes, and things and add 'em all up and that comes ahead of E. Marquam.

A. RNB - No.

*Antler*  
Q. The project that widens I-205 to the full size, a few months ago you said you'll build that when it's needed, and I see here that it's in the program for 84-85. Is that a change?

A. Our Commission policy has placed a number one priority on I-205. On I-205 we initially planned to complete it in 1982. Because of funding being reduced, we've had to stage into three phases. (explains interchanges, phases, etc.). Possibly it might be better to delay that third phase and pick up something else in the later years.

Q. What are the chances of changing any of these priorities?

A. Good Chance. I would say there won't be any major changes, but a few of them can and will change. I think the area that Steve brought up is a kind of thing that can change.

Steve -- Andy, it would seem that whatever kind of letter JPACT sends that comment about having some relation between demand and use of the facility and its priority ought to be one of this region's comments. There ought to be some rational relationship to the accidents involved and priority.

*Williamson*  
Q. When do we have to have comments in on this?

A. RNB -- The hearings are all this month, so the comments should be in by the first of November.

My only comment is that Andy's comments seem very mild. One project I'm concerned about is the Stadium Freeway. The new landfill and all the garbage trucks to that Wildwood site through northwest Portland and that could hinge on that Stadium Freeway project that was dropped out, which is \$2 million. I think there's got to be a way to build these. What about more funding? Is that an appropriate comment?

A. RNB -- I don't think at this point in time it is because this program is based on the funding we anticipated from initial FHWA administrations proposals back in March, an 8.2 billion national budget. As you all know, that should be cut 12 percent according to the President. I would guess that if anything, the federal level will be reduced.

Q. How about the fact that these are dropping off after 1986. Is the Interstate program end then or just the Interstate Transfer?



A. RNB -- Under current law that ends this year. Under the new law I don't think there's much question about extending it then. Just like I'm pretty sure the Interstate Transfer program will be extended.

Q. Was any consideration given to downgrading certain structures or state highway, with regard to maintenance, and thereby saving some bucks? Or is that outside this process.

A. RNB - That's a valid comment. I raise that question to local jurisdictions. If they feel our maintenance is too high or too low, that's a good comment. The only problem is that we've dropped it too low. Down in Oregon City, they were critical of our sanding through Oregon City in the wintertime. We've reduced our manpower on the crew that takes care of the hills in Oregon City. In the old days, we put more equipment and people out quicker in the morning. Just look at landscaping, we dropped off it this year in the city of Portland, and the City said no that's unsatisfactory. So under duress we cranked up our landscaping maintenance. We've dropped off almost all our mowing, turned off our water.

*Hewings* Q. Blumenauer gave this idea some weeks back -- downgrading some county roads, at Ottercrest loop at the beach, that aside from some houses, there's four miles there that basically serves only tourist value. That seems a case where those segments and let the bottom have of the highway slough off as it's doing.

A. RNB -- That's valid, the sea route we get about 120 cars a day. We haven't gone to turning them to gravel, when the potholes get so bad.

*Chair*

If we want to take some action on this, we should do it shortly.

Does anybody want to propose any additions to the comments or changes?

*Andy*

I've got an addition in using demand as part of the priority consideration that the last stage of I-205 be deferred and the suggestion that maintenance standards be reduced on low-use facilities.

*Steve*

I think there should be a fairly strong statement about I-505 as being a higher priority. When the freeway withdrawal was made by the city and by the region, the statement was made ~~by the city and the region~~ that the highest priority for that money was for the I-505 replacement. I think it's very important the region continue to say that.

I would agree with that if there's no objection --

*Chair*

Any other comments --

RNB -- To reinforce that, with the e(4) program, we are moving forward with that portion. So if we ~~xxxxxxx~~ follow our e(4) schedule, that's a little iffy, obviously, and if we follow this program, we'd end up with a gap in the middle from the Fremont Bridge down to Nicolai and Vaughn and the city would have to do something to make

that connection. We'd have two ends built without the center.

~~Andy~~xxx

Steve -- Relating to that, I think it's important to point out that we are planning to do some kind of couplet improvement that will last for a couple of years as an interim connection.

Chair -- Any other comments? I think individual jurisdictions could make similar comments themselves.

-- I believe the city of Vancouver is planning to discuss the I-5 Slough Bridge project. If you were to use some criteria as far as demand is concerned, that would be right at the top of the list.

Steve -- We have in here the I-5 reconstruction Maruqam Bridge to Interstate Bridge project and I understood that had been rejected by FHWA. Are we still assuming?

RNB - That's deleted.

Steve -- Andy, you've got it on your list of projects of concern. I wonder if maybe we should take it out of there. If we're really not going to build it that will reduce by \$9 million.

RNB -- We probably shouldn't have had it in our program two years ago. We put it in there because it was a real program to be funded out of Interstate and was rejected at the federal level.



DICK

~~XXXX~~ -- Maybe a comment about what we're doing in Wshington.

We

Chair -- Are there any objections to the comments we have now?

We can deem this to be a vote? Thank you for letting me know what you vote (into the silence).

Dick - Just a comment that we're going to open bids on our SR 14 I-5 interchange just north of the river next Wednesday, the 14th. That project will be underway and completed in two to three years. It provides three full lanes coming in from the Vancouver area.

RNB - What he's saying is that he's having a six-lane freeway coming into our four-lane freeway.

Dick -- We're in kind of a quandry as you folks are with I-82 on the Washington side, because we have ~~x~~ the same amount of traffic about on I-82 compared to I-5 and I-90 and so forth.

-- Is there a possibility that Washington DOT could respond to the program because obviously the improvmeents going into the western part of Clark County vs I-82 and which the Department deems most importnat?

Dick -- Oh, we'll respond to Bob and ODOT.

11.  
Q -- Will there be a Washington DOT judgement on I-5 vs. I-82?

Dick -- We're hoping that our two commissions are going to get together in November and discuss this problem and perhaps come up with some policy guidelines. I know we'll coordinate a response on it.

-- I wonder if we ought to add as one of our criteria that they should take into consideration interface with other abutting state projects?

A -- I think we have that now.

Chair -- I think the Metro Council may want to make a separate recommendation regarding that I-405 freeway because of its relationship with the garbage hauling.

Chair -- Is there anything else on the Six Year Program?

end of that section (indicator at DC90 - point 39).

JS

## COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE

IPACT

DATE

10-8-81 - 7:30 am

## NAME

## AFFILIATION

G	Bebe Rucker	Multnomah County
G	Ted Spence	ODOT
G	Winston Smith	Clack. Co.
M	Bob Behrman	ODOT
M	LARRY COLE	CITY OF BEAVERTON
M	Charlie Williamson	Metro
M	Derek Pokornowski	City of Vancouver
M	ED FERGUSON	WSDOT
M	JOHN FREMINS	TRI-MET
M	ROBIN LINDQUIST	GLADSTONE
M	AL MYERS	CITY OF GRESHAM
G	Carl A. Neuburger	Citizens for Better Highways
G	Greg Kullberg	City of Portland
G	Sarah Salazar	Port of Portland
G	JERRY MARKESINO	City of Portland
G	John Price	FHWA
G	STEVE DOTTERKER	CITY OF PORTLAND
S	Keith Lawton	Metro
G	David Peach	WSDOT
G	PAUL BAY	TRI-MET
S	Jerry Bolstad	Metro
G	Alan Willis	Port of Portland
G	Mike Burton	METRO



COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

AFFILIATION

5 Pea Herwood

Metro

G Art Mallory

Regional Planning Council  
Part

G But also

Metre

5 Karen Thackston

Metro

S Andrew Cotugno

Metro

## AGENDA MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

TO: JPACT  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Commenting on the Transportation Improvement Program and on the Determination of Air Quality Consistency for the Urban Areas of Clark County

### I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council concurrence of a resolution commenting on the Clark County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- B. POLICY IMPACT: Partial fulfillment of the Metro/Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC) Memorandum of Agreement setting forth interstate coordination requirements.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget funds staff coordination activities with the RPC.

### II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: Each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) prepares a TIP describing projects programmed for its planning area. Coordination of these documents is set forth in the Metro/RPC Memorandum of Agreement.

Metro staff has reviewed the TIP for Clark County RPC and has identified projects which impact the Oregon side of the Columbia River. These projects and improvements consist of:

- I-5/SR-500 interchange - This provides the first phase of an important east/west arterial between I-5 and I-205; cost - \$14 million.
- Vancouver freeway and SR-14 interchange - Reconstruction of interchange and widening of freeway to six lanes on north edge of the Columbia River bridge will improve traffic flow on I-5; cost - \$25 million.
- I-205 completion from bridge to SR-500 - Final paving to eight lanes, signing, lighting and landscaping in accordance with ultimate design; cost - \$15 million.
- Intermodal transportation center - Immediate construction of an interim, on-street facility (cost - \$100,000) followed by a permanent intermodal station (cost - \$5 million) will improve passenger/bus/auto transfers.

- A phased program will be implemented to locate park and ride lots at Battleground, 164th, SR-14 and Camas; cost - \$2 million.

Additional projects may be found in the text for the TIP available at Metro or Clark County Regional Planning Council.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: None.

C. CONCLUSION: Staff has reviewed the documents and finds that the projects proposed to be undertaken in Clark County are consistent with the policies, plans and programs of Metro.

BP/gl  
4352B/252  
10/16/81



FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMMENTING ON )  
THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT )  
PROGRAM AND ON THE DETERMINATION )  
OF AIR QUALITY CONSISTENCY FOR THE )  
URBAN AREAS OF CLARK COUNTY )

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Oregon portion of the Portland/Vancouver urbanized area, and the Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC) is the designated MPO for the Washington portion; and

WHEREAS, Metro and the RPC have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement specifying mechanisms to ensure adequate coordination of transportation policies, plans and programs; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with the Metro and RPC Memorandum of Agreement, the RPC has requested comments from Metro on its TIP and Determination of Air Quality Consistency statement; and

WHEREAS, Metro staff has reviewed the FY 1982 TIP for the urban areas of Clark County and the Determination of Air Quality Consistency; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the projects and programs described in the FY 1982 TIP for the urban areas of Clark County and the Determination of Air Quality Consistency are found by Metro Council to be consistent with the policies, plans and programs of the Metropolitan Service District.

2. That the Clark County RPC be advised of this concurrence.

BP/gl  
4354B/252  
10/16/81

7 RECEIVED OCT 19 1981



VICTOR ATIYEH  
GOVERNOR

## *Oregon Transportation Commission*

OFFICE OF ANTHONY YTURRI, 89 S.W. THIRD AVENUE, OREGON 97914

In Reply Refer To  
File No.:

October 1, 1981

Metropolitan Service District  
527 S.W. Hall St.  
Portland, OR 97201

Att: Charlie Williamson  
Metro Councilor, District 2  
Chairman, JPACT

Dear Mr. Williamson:

I wish to personally thank you most sincerely and in behalf of the Oregon Transportation Commission and the department staff for your splendid commendatory letter of September 10, 1981. Actually, it is not with undue frequency that we receive letters commending us upon the actions we have taken and the plans we have made. Consequently, your letter is up-lifting and certainly most welcome.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

*Anthony Yturri*  
Anthony Yturri  
Chairman

AY:HRF