




METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Memorandum

Date: June 5, 1986

To: JPACT

From:  Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Regarding: ODOT Six-Year Highway Improvement Program

ODOT is nearing completion of their Six-Year Program update. They have released the "Final Draft" document and will hear comments at the June 17 meeting of the Transportation Commission. Adoption will be considered at the July 15 meeting.

In response to the recommendations contained in the "Final Draft," attached are proposed comments to be forwarded to the Transportation Commission. It is recommended that JPACT adopt these comments and present these concerns at the June 17 meeting.

For your reference, included in the attached material are the priorities adopted by the region with notations regarding ODOT's "Final Draft" recommendations. When a dollar amount is indicated, the project is recommended for construction. If "DEV" is indicated, ODOT is committed to construction at an unspecified later date and engineering and perhaps right-of-way acquisition will proceed. If "RECON" is indicated, ODOT will begin engineering and feasibility studies to better define the scope of the project and to provide sufficient information for consideration of a construction commitment at a later date.

ACC:lmk

Attachments

PORTLAND REGION COMMENTS ON
PROPOSED SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

June, 1986

- . ODOT is to be commended for its effort in preparing the Six-Year Highway Program, in following an open process, and for listening to local concerns. The Department has been responsive in selecting projects for funding from amongst the high priority projects adopted by the Portland region rather than the many other possible good candidates.
- . In general, the projects selected are consistent with adopted regional priorities (see Attachment A) but several project specific comments are appropriate:
 - 1) I-84 from 181st to Sundial is not identified in the Six-Year Program for construction (1987-1992) despite the fact that a portion will be funded with Interstate funds (FAI) which will only be provided through 1990 after which the program will expire. ODOT should initiate project development and when the FAI portion of the project has been identified, consider advancing that portion of the project to take advantage of the available FAI funds.
 - 2) The I-84 Arata Road Bridge (at the 238th Avenue interchange) is programmed for replacement in 1990. This should be done consistent with the project scope for the overall I-84 improvement project described above.
 - 3) The proposed program identifies the I-5/Stafford interchange for construction and the I-5/Highway 217/Kruse Way interchange for development only. The high priority projects for the region are the reverse of this proposal because of the importance of the I-5/Highway 217/Kruse Way interchange to the full Westside highway system and the severity of the existing traffic problem. ODOT should consider funding the I-5/Highway 217/Kruse Way project no later than 1992.
 - 4) It is recommended that ODOT consider funding a "reconnaissance and feasibility" study on the following top regional priorities:
 - a. Sandy Boulevard - 112th to 238th
 - b. 223rd - Halsey to Stark
 - c. Highway 217 Ramp Metering

If ODOT concurs with the above comments, all of the top priority projects adopted by the region over the past year will be addressed in some fashion. In those cases where ODOT chose not to fund construction, at least assistance will be available from ODOT in better specifying the scope of the other projects for consideration at a later date.

- . As shown on Attachment B, the overall distribution of funds for projects in the Portland region appears appropriate (@ 31 percent). However, in consideration of the specific categories of funds, this may not in fact be the case. The overwhelming factor that skews the picture is the predominance of funds in the Portland region to complete the Interstate system (FAI funds @ 85 percent). Because of this, the remainder of the funds are heavily skewed toward the rest of the state. FAI funds are only available for the next four years to complete the system -- a task initiated over 20 years ago and one that has already been accomplished elsewhere in the state.

Within the other funding categories, the funding available for safety and preservation-type activities (HBR, HES, FAP, FAS, and state funds) are the most heavily skewed to the rest of the state (Region 1 = 15 percent). This distribution is probably appropriate since ODOT is responsible for a very large number of miles elsewhere in the state.

The Interstate-4R category appears well balanced (@ 32 percent) because it is provided for a combination of preservation activities needed for the rest of the state and modernization projects needed in the growing urban areas like the Portland region.

The State Modernization Program appears the most problematic (with the Portland area @ 22 percent) in light of the fact that these funds are most important to promote and serve growth and economic development. The Portland area is where most of the growth has occurred for the past five years (65 percent of statewide growth) and where it is most likely that job growth can in fact be realized in response to a highway investment (see Attachment C).

- . In light of these comments, it is recommended that:
 - 1) ODOT should recognize the remainder of the region's top priorities as high candidates for the remaining \$22 million of State Modernization funds.
 - 2) The OTC should establish criteria for release of these funds to specific projects when the project is needed to proceed as part of a larger public and/or private effort and when the other public/private commitments have been established.
 - 3) If a convention center is approved by the voters, the OTC members should consider the necessary transportation improvements as eligible for the remaining \$22 million of State Modernization funds.
 - 4) ODOT should consider such factors as where the funds are generated and where job creation has the greatest likelihood of occurring in response to a highway improvement when allocating the remaining State Modernization funds and when proposing future State Modernization programs.

old

- . As shown on Attachment B, the overall distribution of funds for projects in the Portland region appears appropriate (@ 31 percent). However, in consideration of the specific categories of funds, this may not in fact be the case. The overwhelming factor that skews the picture is the predominance of funds in the Portland region to complete the Interstate system (FAI funds @ 85 percent). Because of this, the remainder of the funds are heavily skewed toward the rest of the state. FAI funds are only available for the next four years to complete the system -- a task initiated over 20 years ago and one that has already been accomplished elsewhere in the state.

Within the other funding categories, the funding available for safety and preservation-type activities (HBR, HES, FAP, FAS, and state funds) are the most heavily skewed to the rest of the state (Region 1 = 15 percent). This distribution is probably appropriate since ODOT is responsible for a very large number of miles elsewhere in the state.

The Interstate-4R category appears well balanced (@ 32 percent) because it is provided for a combination of preservation activities needed for the rest of the state and modernization projects needed in the growing urban areas like the Portland region.

The State Modernization Program appears the most problematic (with the Portland area @ 22 percent) in light of the fact that these funds are most important to promote and serve growth and economic development. The Portland area is where most of the growth has occurred for the past five years (65 percent of statewide growth) and where it is most likely that job growth can in fact be realized in response to a highway investment (see Attachment C).

- . In light of these comments, it is recommended that:
 - 1) ODOT should recognize the remainder of the region's top priorities as high candidates for the remaining \$22 million of State Modernization funds.
 - 2) The OTC should establish criteria for release of these funds to specific projects when the project is needed to proceed as part of a larger public and/or private effort and when the other public/private commitments have been established.
 - 3) ODOT should consider such factors as where the funds are generated and where job creation has the greatest likelihood of occurring in response to a highway improvement when allocating the remaining State Modernization funds and when proposing future State Modernization programs.

I-205/Sunnyside Interchange		
Phase 1 - Offramps	\$ 0.5 million	.38
Phase 2 - Reconstruction	7.4	DEY.
I-205 Bikepath - Sunnyside to Main	0.65	1.31
I-5/I-205 Auxiliary Lanes	1.5	—
I-5/Kruse Way Interchange (including Bangy Road)	7.0	DEY.
I-5/Wilsonville Interchange	<u>4.0</u>	3.85
SUBTOTAL	\$21.05 million	

c. Washington County

I-5/Highway 217 Interchange	\$ 6.0 million	DEV.
I-5 Auxiliary Lanes N of I-205	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.3</u>

SUBTOTAL	\$11.3 million
----------	----------------

TOTAL RECOMMENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION	\$69.55 million
------------------------------------	-----------------

3. Interstate-4R Priorities for Development

I-5/Capitol Highway Interchange	\$ 4.5 million	DEV.
I-5/Terwilliger Curves	<u>12.45</u>	<u>RECON.</u>

Balance of I-84 Reconstruction - East of 181st	* 1	DEV.
--	-----	------

I-5/Interchange in the Stafford-Boeckman Area	<u>10.5</u>	(STAFFORD) [†] 5.67m.
---	-------------	--------------------------------

TOTAL RECOMMENDED FOR DEVELOPMENT	\$27.45 million
-----------------------------------	-----------------

*Funding in excess of that provided under "1" above.

1Upgrading of I-84 from 181st to Sundial Road involves reconstruction to Interstate standards, provision of four travel lanes with ability to expand to six, elimination of hazardous curves and obstacles, and upgrading of interchanges to be funded with a combination of "Interstate" and "Interstate-4R" funds. The elements of this project recommended for implementation include all "Interstate" funded elements plus the I-84/238th interchange if "Interstate-4R" funded. In addition, a new interchange at 223rd is identified for consideration. The remainder of the project is recommended for development with implementation to be pursued at a later date.

5064C/435

ODOT RECOMMENDATION

PROJECTS ON THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IN THE ODOT SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM



NE Portland Highway 82nd - I-205 at 60th	\$ 1.6 million 2.2	\$1.33m. DEV.
Marine Drive at BNRR	7.0	5.44
Sunset Highway at Zoo	3.0	2.7
Highway 224/212 - Ross Island Bridge to U.S. 26 Reconnaissance	0.5	} RECON
Phase 1 Construction (such as 224/Harrison interchange and 212 climbing lane)	5.0	
US 26 - Cornelius Pass	4.8	4.715
US 26 - Cornell	5.2	5.3
US 26 - 185th	5.0	DEV.
Highway 217 at 99W	4.6	DEV.
Scholls Ferry Road	3.8	1.56
Farmington Road (to 185th)	4.6	DEV.
257th Extension (Graham Road)	1.7	DEV.
State Street (to include application for \$0.4m of HES funds)	0.3-0.7	.7
Highway 217 Ramp Metering	0.4	-
TV Highway Reconnaissance	0.3	DEV.
Sandy Boulevard - 122nd to 238th	4.7	(@201/223) .32
TOTAL STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM	\$54.7-\$55.1 million	

5064C/435

RURAL RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE 3-COUNTY AREA

Hwy 213 - Spangler Hill	\$1.4m.
U.S. 26 - Wildwood to ZigZag	4.8
Wilson River Hwy	4.0

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IN THE
ODOT SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

A. Recommended for Implementation

N.E. 181st/Airport Way

Unit I	\$ 0.62 million	} \$3.5
*Unit II	3.88	
*223rd Avenue Halsey to Stark	1.5	-
*Johnson Creek Boulevard Extension	1.8	1.8
*Tualatin - Sherwood Road	4.5	RECON
Baseline Road	3.9	RECON

SUBTOTAL \$16.2 million

*Top priority projects for implementation.

B. Recommended for Consideration for funding now or future allocations or recommended for development:

S.E. 9th/Division/SPRR	\$ 0.15 million	-
Beavercreek Road	2.6	-
Cornelius Pass Road	1.45	-
Shute Road	1.49	1.0
Marine Drive - Portland Road to Slough	2.3	-
Harbor Drive	2.6	-
Glisan Street - 203rd to 223rd	1.25	-
37th Avenue - RR Avenue to Highway 224	.68	-

\$12.52 million

ATTACHMENT B

Proposed Six-Year Highway Improvement Program Funding Distribution

	<u>Region 1</u>	<u>Balance of State</u>	<u>Total</u>
Interstate	\$ 87.94 m. 84.6%	\$ 16.0 m.	\$103.94 m.
Interstate-4R	84.53 m. 32.3%	177.43 m.	261.96 m.
State Modernization*	46.669 m. 35.7%	130.666 m.	177.335 m.
Balance of Program	50.578 m. 15.3%	279.24 m.	329.818 m.
Total	\$269.717 m. 30.9%	\$603.336 m.	\$873.053 m.
Population*	1,130,450 42.2%		2,675,800
*3-County Metro Area State Modernization Population	\$ 38.635 m. 21.8% 1,078,000 40.3%		

ATTACHMENT C

Population and Employment Growth
1980-1985

	<u>Population</u>		<u>Growth</u>	<u>% of State</u>
	<u>1980</u>	<u>1985</u>		
Clackamas Co.	241,911	248,200		
Multnomah Co.	562,647	561,800		
Washington Co.	245,860	268,000		
Subtotal	1,050,418	1,078,000	+27,582	65%
Columbia	35,646	36,100		
Hood River	15,835	16,350		
Region 1	1,101,899	1,130,450	+28,551	67%
Oregon	2,633,156	2,675,800	+42,644	

B. Increase Revenues -- The currently available revenue alternatives allowed under the Tri-Met statute are limited and not very attractive:

1. Payroll Tax -- This is at the statutory maximum of .6 percent and would require a special session of the Legislature to increase the limit in time to meet the need by October. Furthermore, this would result in an increased burden on the business community, contrary to recommendations that their share of the burden be reduced.
2. Business License Fees -- The Tri-Met statute provides that imposition of a business license must be accompanied by removal of the payroll tax on that business. As such, an across-the-board business license fee would be a very large tax in order to both replace the payroll tax and raise the needed \$10-\$12 million. The end result is simply a shift in tax burden within the business community.

A more selective business license fee (such as a fee on paid parking, a fee on the sale of petroleum products or a fee on new and used auto sales) results in a heavy burden on a very narrow segment of the business community. In addition, the petroleum and auto alternatives are constitutionally clouded and subject to the uncertainty and delay of a court challenge.

3. Property Tax -- Property tax relief has been at the forefront of Oregon politics and further increases appear inappropriate.
4. Income Tax -- This is a new tax and would involve a major effort to implement the necessary collection mechanism, but it would result in a better balance of the cost of transit service between individuals and businesses.

Summary and Conclusion

Adopting an income tax provides a means of buying time for the new Tri-Met Board to improve the cost-efficiency of the agency and pursue other revenue alternatives with the Legislature while averting a financial crisis and disruption in service.

1. A drastic cut in the level of transit service is not appropriate and contrary to regional objectives regarding highway operations, personal mobility and air quality; this is not an acceptable short- or long-term option.
2. Cost savings through improved efficiencies may be a long-term option, but cannot be implemented to correct short-term financial problems.

Tri-Met FY 87 Budget Proposal
Overview and Comments

Service Cuts

- . Reduce service hours by 5 percent - \$1.6 million savings.
- . Cuts are based upon cutting least productive service, resulting in greater cuts in off-peak and weekend service, including elimination of seven lines, all owl service plus various other curtailments.
- . Reduce "extra-board" from 17 percent to 10 percent; reduce on-street supervision; results in 3-4 percent random missed pull-outs and 15 percent drop in on-time route performance.
- . Cut service for Special Needs Transportation from \$2.8 to \$2.4 million.
- . Retain opening of LRT.

Maintenance and Operations Cost

- . Assumes reduced absenteeism.
- . Assumes reduced workers' compensation claims by 50 percent to \$1.9 million.
- . Eliminate Transit Police (\$364,000).
- . Reduce maintenance staff and materials (\$927,000).
- . Reduce liability insurance through increased self-insurance (\$1.15 million).
- . Purchase of diesel fuel @ 40¢/gallon (10¢/gallon error - \$0.5 million).
- . Retains fleet replacement.

Administration and Planning

- . Cut staff and consultants for accounting, auditing, parts control, and management information (\$400,000).
- . Eliminate fare inspectors required for Fareless Square (\$92,000).
- . Elimination of staff and consultant for strategic planning, long-range planning and coordination and capital project development (\$340,000).
- . Reduction in marketing staff advertising and customer response staff (\$1,300,000).
- . Retains pension payment at \$2.4 million.

Working Capital

- . Over the past five years, Tri-Met has spent \$20 million more revenue than they collected; this budget continues this trend by reducing working capital by \$5.2 million from \$7.4 to \$2.2 million. This resource would therefore not be available for the following year's budget.

Summary

- . 5 percent cut in service (in addition to 14 percent cut since 1982).
- . 30 percent cut in administrative costs.
- . 70 percent cut in working capital.
- . Requires extraordinary action to stay in balance, including:
 - 1) significant drop in workmens' compensation and absenteeism
 - 2) diesel fuel remaining low
 - 3) claims against self-insurance remaining in line with past experience
 - 4) modest drop in ridership

Comments

- 1) Express concern that the financial problem is not solved -- the "balanced budget" is predicated on several key optimistic assumptions and \$5 million of working capital. If this trend is continued, the consequences next year and beyond may be more severe.
- 2) Express concern about short-term impacts on the reliability of service due to cuts in maintenance, the extra-board, scheduled overtime and road supervisors.
- 3) Express concern about the 1-2 year impact on service when further cuts will clearly be necessary without new revenue.
- 4) Request the Tri-Met Board to work with the region over the next three months to establish the scope of transit service to operate in the next five years and define a legislative agenda for 1987.

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 6/12/86 — 7:30 am

NAME	AFFILIATION
M- <u>Merv Weidyle</u>	<u>Cities of Multnomah Co</u>
M- <u>LARRY COLE</u>	<u>" " WASHINGTON CO.</u>
G- <u>Zed Jensen</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
M- <u>FRED HANSEN</u>	<u>DEQ</u>
MA- <u>Bob Bohman</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
M- <u>Ron Thom</u>	<u>Cities of Clackamas Cty</u>
M- <u>George (Van) Bergen</u>	<u>Metro</u>
M- <u>RICHARD WAKER</u>	<u>METRO</u>
G- <u>Geraldine L. Ball</u>	<u>CWFF + DJB, Inc.</u>
G- <u>Peter F Fry</u>	<u>CEIC</u>
G- <u>MISIE LARSEN</u>	<u>MULCO</u>
G- <u>Gary Spanovich</u>	<u>Clackamas County</u>
G- <u>Rick Kuehn</u>	<u>ODOT - Region 1</u>
G- <u>GRACE CEUNICAN</u>	<u>Pdx</u>
S- <u>Bill Pettis</u>	<u>Metro</u>
G- <u>G.I. Murray</u>	<u>I.R.C.</u>
G- <u>Keith Abola</u>	<u>WSDOT</u>
G- <u>STEPHEN IWATA</u>	<u>PORTLAND</u>
G- <u>Lee James</u>	<u>TRI-MET</u>
S- <u>Richard Hardman</u>	<u>Metro</u>
M- <u>Margaret Straden</u>	<u>City of Portland</u>
S- <u>Karen Thackston</u>	<u>Metro</u>
G- <u>Bob Post</u>	<u>TRI-MET</u>

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE _____

NAME

AFFILIATION

G- Donnie Hays

Wash. Co. Commissioner

G- Julia Somers

Strachan: City of Portland

S- Andrew Catugno

Metro

M- Wes Myltenback

Metro

S- Rick Gustafson

Metro

U