

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

12-9-1982

Meeting Notes 1982-12-09

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 1982-12-09 " (1982). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 42.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/42

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

A G E N D A

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: December 9, 1982

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 a.m.

Place: Metro Conference Room A1/A2

- *1. AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE (TPAC) BYLAWS - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- *2. COMMENTING ON TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM OF REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL OF CLARK COUNTY (RPC) - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- *3. AMENDING THE TIP TO INCLUDE A NEW PROJECT - 185TH FROM ROCK CREEK BOULEVARD TO T.V. HIGHWAY - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- *4. AUTHORIZING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BICYCLING SAFETY AND ENCOURAGEMENT PROGRAM - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Richard Brandman.
- *5. CITY OF PORTLAND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS REPORT - INFORMATIONAL - Bob Robison.
- *6. ODOT SIX-YEAR PROGRAM - COMMENT ON FY 83 UPDATE - INFORMATIONAL - Ed Hardt.

*Material Enclosed.

Permalife
25% COTTON CONTENT

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: November 10, 1982

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Charlie Williamson, Ed Hardt (alternate), Mildred Schwab, Bob Oleson (alternate), Al Myers, John Frewing, Ed Ferguson, Corky Kirkpatrick, and Dennis Buchanan

Guests: Steve Dotterer and Jerry Markesino, City of Portland; Ted Spence, ODOT; Keith Ahola, WSDOT; Lee Hames, Tri-Met; Gil Mallery, Regional Planning Council of Clark County; Winston Kurth, Clackamas County; Elton Chang, FHWA (Salem); Marty Nizlek, Washington County; Bebe Rucker, Multnomah County; and Sarah Salazar, Port of Portland

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Bill Pettis, Karen Thackston, Rick Gustafson, Keith Lawton, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

Inasmuch as a quorum was lacking, Chairman Williamson called the meeting to order and advanced to non-action matters.

Andy Cotugno reported that the Pro Bike 82 Conference recognized Portland as having one of the most comprehensive bicycling programs in the nation. A summary of the conference was included in the packet.

Portland is also the first city in the country to have its air quality SIP approved by EPA.

1. RECOMMENDED SCOPE OF WORK - LRT STUDIES

Andy Cotugno reviewed the Scope of Work and phasing of the proposed LRT analysis, dividing the work into two stages: the LRT Systems Analysis (including Eastside, Westside and Central area studies) and LRT Corridor studies. The study will determine which parts of the region are appropriate for light-rail and whether the capital costs are justified. Andy stressed the need for gathering operating and capital costs while determining ridership potential in the corridor analysis. He then reviewed the various tasks involved in the two phases of the LRT study. He added that \$100,000 is budgeted for this year for the Long-Range Transitway study. Andy informed the committee of his intent to proceed with the analysis for the Milwaukie and

Bi-State Corridors with the likelihood that action will be needed to provide funding for consultants.

ABSENCE OF QUORUM

The following considerations were taken up by the Committee for recommendation to the Council without benefit of a quorum. However, Commissioner Buchanan, arriving prior to the close of the meeting and fulfilling the need of a quorum, cast his vote in favor of the two action agenda items.

2. AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) TO INCLUDE A NEW PROJECT ON NW EVERETT STREET -- 1ST AVENUE TO FRONT AVENUE

The purpose of this project is to dovetail construction on the ramps at the west end of the Steel Bridge to that of the Banfield LRT. This construction ties in with the City grid system. Since the project was requested very recently by the City of Portland, authorization for PE only is being requested.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval to amend the TIP to include a new project on NW Everett Street -- 1st Avenue to Front Avenue. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

3. AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE (TPAC) BYLAWS

Andy reviewed the proposed changes to the bylaws, including the deletion of reference to the now defunct Transportation Committee (with substitution of the Council Regional Development Committee) and the increase of citizen members from five to six.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval to amend the TPAC bylaws as presented. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

Andy informed the Committee that he was going to bring another TPAC bylaw change next month to change the Clark County membership and would hold this amendment to send to Council as a package.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: JPACT Members
Rick Gustafson
Don Carlson
Ray Barker

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No. _____

Meeting Date _____

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. _____ FOR THE
PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION POLICY
ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE (TPAC) BY-LAWS

Date: November 16, 1982

Presented by: Andy Cotugno

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) By-Laws provide membership for Vancouver, Clark County, Regional Planning Council of Clark County (RPC) and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). Vancouver and Clark County have decided their interests are adequately represented by RPC and WSDOT and that they no longer have a need for full membership. The TPAC By-Laws need to be amended to move Clark County and Vancouver from full membership to associate non-voting membership.

In addition, the Clark County Public Transit Benefit Area (CTAN) has requested an associate membership.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Recommend amendment of By-Laws.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION

KT/srb
7192B/327
11/17/82

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING)	RESOLUTION NO.
THE TRANSPORTATION POLICY)	
ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE (TPAC))	Introduced by the Joint
BY-LAWS)	Policy Advisory Committee
)	on Transportation

WHEREAS, The By-Laws of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) dated October 28, 1982, provide full membership privileges for Clark County and the city of Vancouver; and

WHEREAS, Clark County and Vancouver feel they are adequately represented by the Regional Planning Council of Clark County (RPC) and no longer need full privileges; and

WHEREAS, The Clark County Public Transit Benefit Area (CTRAN) has requested associate membership; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That Clark County, Vancouver and CTRAN shall become associate non-voting members of TPAC.
2. That the TPAC By-Laws shall be amended accordingly.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this _____ day of _____, 1982.

Presiding Officer

KT/srb
7192B/327
11/17/82

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. _____ FOR THE PURPOSE
OF COMMENTING ON THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM (TIP) AND ON THE DETERMINATION OF AIR
QUALITY CONSISTENCY FOR THE URBAN AREAS OF CLARK
COUNTY

Date:

Presented by: Andy Cotugno

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) prepares a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) describing projects programmed for its planning area. Coordination of these documents is set forth in the Metro/Regional Planning Council of Clark County (RPC) Memorandum of Agreement.

Metro staff has reviewed the TIP for the 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 phase of an important east/west arterial between I-5 and I-205 is currently under construction.
- 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; this project is currently under contract.
- Downtown transit center - construction of an on-street/off-street facility is anticipated in FY 1983. The center will improve passenger/bus/auto transfers.
- An ongoing program continues to implement and locate park and ride lots at various strategic locations throughout the area.

Additional projects may be found in the text for the TIP.


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.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the Resolution commenting on the TIP and on the determination of air quality consistency for the urban areas of Clark County.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION

BP/srb
7193B/327
11/17/82

 Permalife

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMMENTING ON)	RESOLUTION NO.
THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT)	
PROGRAM (TIP) AND ON THE)	Introduced by the Joint
DETERMINATION OF AIR QUALITY)	Policy Advisory Committee on
CONSISTENCY FOR THE URBAN AREAS)	Transportation
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 Regional Planning Council of Clark County (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 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Determination of Air Quality Consistency statement; and

WHEREAS, Metro staff has reviewed the FY 1983 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 1983 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 RPC be advised of this concurrence.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this _____ day of _____, 1982.

Presiding Officer

BP/srb
7193B/327
11/17/82

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No. _____

Meeting Date _____

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. _____ FOR THE
PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) TO INCLUDE A NEW
PROJECT--N.W. 185TH FROM ROCK CREEK BOULEVARD
TO TUALATIN VALLEY HIGHWAY

Date: November 16, 1982

Presented by: Andy Cotugno

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Washington County is proposing to carry out Preliminary Engineering (PE) and environmental studies on NW/SW 185th Avenue between Rock Creek Boulevard and Tualatin Valley Highway. Washington County concerns involving this facility center on existing capacity and structural problems, spacing relative to other north/south regional level arterials, and projected future traffic needs along the route.

Initial focus in the PE phase will be on widening 185th Avenue to five continuous lanes between Tualatin Valley Highway and Sunset Highway, and three continuous lanes from Sunset Highway to Rock Creek Boulevard. This upgrading will realign existing jogs, improve vertical alignment, and provide for curbs, sidewalks and bike lanes.

This project is supported by the Westside Technical Committee which recommends the PE studies as an aid in refining the alignment and establishing firm cost estimates. Construction funding will be considered from the remaining Westside Interstate Transfer reserve.

Funding for the PE phase is to be made available from surplus Interstate Transfer authority arising from construction cost underruns currently in existence on Washington County's S.W. Jenkins/158th Project. The section between Walker Road and Sunset Highway will have two more lanes added when the 185th-Rock Creek Boulevard to Tualatin Valley Highway project is implemented. The widening improvement to 185th Avenue is included on the Regional Transportation Plan north to Sunset Highway; the RTP must be revised before construction from Sunset Highway to Rock Creek Blvd. can be undertaken.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the Resolution amending the TIP to include PE for the noted project.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION

BP/gl/7190B/327
11/26/82

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE)	RESOLUTION NO.
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT)	
PROGRAM (TIP) TO INCLUDE A NEW)	Introduced by the Joint
PROJECT--N.W. 185TH FROM ROCK)	Policy Advisory Committee
CREEK BOULEVARD TO THE TUALATIN)	on Transportation
VALLEY HIGHWAY)	

WHEREAS, Through Resolution No. 82-353, the Metro Council adopted the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and its FY 1983 Annual Element; and

WHEREAS, From time to time new projects must be entered into the TIP as an outgrowth of the adopted Regional Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, The noted project is identified in the RTP; and

WHEREAS, Washington County is proposing to carry out Preliminary Engineering (PE) and environmental studies to further define scope and costs of the project; and

WHEREAS, The project is supported by the Westside Technical Committee which recommends undertaking PE studies; and

WHEREAS, Surplus Interstate Transfer authority is available from another Washington County project for use on this project; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That \$170,000 of Interstate Transfer authority be transferred from the surplus on S. W. Jenkins/158th for PE use on this project.

2. That the TIP and its Annual Element be amended to reflect this authorization as set forth in Attachment 'A.'

3. That the Metro Council finds the project in

accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative, comprehensive planning process and, thereby, gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this _____ day of _____, 1982.

Presiding Officer

BP/gl
7190B/327
11/26/82

PROJECT INFORMATION FORM - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

ATTACHMENT A
PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

RESPONSIBILITY (AGENCY) Washington County
 LIMITS Rock Creek Boulevard to T.V. Highway LENGTH 3.5 miles
 DESCRIPTION Upgrade NW/SW 185th to a five-lane facility from T.V. Highway to Sunset Highway, and to a three-lane facility from Sunset Highway to Rock Creek Boulevard. Improvements to horizontal and vertical alignments will be included as well as sidewalks, curbs, and bike lane.

PROJECT NAME NW/SW 185th - Rock Creek Blvd. to T.V. Highway
 ID No FAU 9043
 APPLICANT Washington County

SCHEDULE

TO ODOT _____
 PE OK'D _____ EIS OK'D _____
 CAT'Y _____ BID LET _____
 HEARING _____ COMPL'T _____

RELATIONSHIP TO ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION PLAN

LONG RANGE ELEMENT X TSM ELEMENT _____

FUNDING PLAN BY FISCAL YEAR (\$000)

	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86	TOTAL
TOTAL		200*				200
FEDERAL		170				170
STATE						
LOCAL		30				30


*Preliminary Engineering

APPLICANT'S ESTIMATE OF TOTAL PROJECT COST

PRELIM ENGINEERING	\$ 680,000
CONSTRUCTION	6,519,000
RIGHT OF WAY	230,000
TRAFFIC CONTROL	
ILLUMIN, SIGNS, LANDSCAPING, ETC	
STRUCTURES	TBD
RAILROAD CROSSINGS	

TOTAL \$ 7,429,000

LOCATION MAP



SOURCE OF FUNDS (%)

FEDERAL	
FAUS (PORTLAND)	_____
FAUS (OREGON REGION)	_____
FAUS (WASH REGION)	_____
UMTA CAPITAL	UMTA OPRTG _____
INTERSTATE	_____
FED AID PRIMARY	_____
INTERSTATE SUBSTITUTION	85
NON FEDERAL	
STATE	LOCAL 15

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No. _____

Meeting Date _____

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. _____ FOR THE
PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
BICYCLING SAFETY AND ENCOURAGEMENT PROGRAM

Date: November 24, 1982

Presented by: Richard Brandman and
Janet Schaeffer

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Metro staff is currently working on the development of two bicycle programs--a revision of the 1976 CRAG Regional Bicycle Plan and the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program. Both the Plan and the Program have as their basic objectives improving bicycling safety and increasing the number of people who commute by bicycle throughout the region. The bicycle plan addresses route development, bicycle parking standards, route design criteria, enforcement of bicycle regulations, safety programs, and bicycling encouragement. This comprehensive bicycling development effort has resulted in the completion of over 70 miles of bicycle routes throughout the region at an investment of over \$6.5 million during the past ten years.

The Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program is funded by a grant from the Federal Highway Administration's Comprehensive "Transportation Systems Management" Assistance Program. The grant was awarded to the City of Portland and Metro in November 1981. The program as originally designed was hailed as the best example of a commuter-oriented bicycling encouragement program in the nation at a recent national meeting of bicycle planners. It is being directed by the City of Portland's Office of Public Works, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, which recently was awarded first place in a nationwide competition for comprehensive bicycle programs in cities with over 100,000 population.

To understand the significance of the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program for the Portland metropolitan area, it is necessary to place it in perspective. Locally and nationally, bicycling is continuing to grow in importance as a means of transportation and as a recreational activity. During the past 10 years, more bicycles than automobiles have been sold in the United States. Next to swimming, bicycling is the nation's most popular leisure activity. The new enthusiasm about bicycling for recreation has stimulated a corresponding growth in the use of bicycles for transportation. In Portland, bicycle commuting--already twice the national average as a percentage of all work trips--has doubled in volume since 1974.

Staff is requesting adoption of the attached resolution authorizing implementation of the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program. Last spring, the Metro Council authorized the first phase of the program, a random sample survey to determine the need and support for a bicycling safety and encouragement program in this region. The survey was conducted by the Columbia Research Center in May and June of this year. Key responses to the survey show that:

- Over half of all Portland area adults bicycled during the past year, mostly for recreational purposes.
- 119,000 area residents are potential bicycle commuters--more than ten times the number regularly commuting by bicycle today.
- Opportunity for exercise is the main reason why people ride bicycles.
- Concerns about safety and poor weather are the main reasons why people do not ride bicycles.
- There is considerable misunderstanding on the part of bicyclists and motorists about safe bicycling practices.
- 85 percent of the population think programs should be implemented to encourage bicycling and improve bicycling safety.

A summary report of the survey's findings is attached.

Potential Benefits of the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program

Substantial economic and environmental benefits are possible if the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program is successful. Based upon the survey results, approximately 11,000 Portlanders currently bicycle to work on a regular basis. On average, these individuals save \$400 per year by choosing to commute by bicycle when the weather is favorable. Their collective annual savings of \$4.4 million would be increased by another \$2.2 million if only 5 percent of potential bicycle commuters in the region begin to bicycle to work as a result of the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program.

In addition to these dollar savings, regional gasoline consumption would be reduced by 340,000 gallons per year and approximately 168 fewer tons of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons would be emitted annually if this 5 percent goal is met.

The staff, consultant, and the program Advisory Committee (composed of a citizen at-large, members of citizen bicycling organizations, and representatives of government agencies and local jurisdictions) all believe that the survey has

demonstrated a need for and support for the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program in this region. Three program elements have been developed, based on the survey's results, and have been endorsed by the Advisory Committee, FHWA and TPAC.

Proposed Work Program

The elements of the program, which would be implemented during spring and summer 1983, are:

1. Safety Education Campaign. Because the survey shows concerns about safety are the main disincentives to bicycling, the program should directly address the safety issue. A broad safety education campaign is proposed to assure that the safety information reaches as many people as possible -- motorists as well as bicyclists and potential bicyclists. The program would communicate rules for bicyclists and motorists to follow in order to safely share the road. A marketing firm would be contracted to develop specific safety and awareness messages and distribute them through public service announcements, transit advertisements, posters, and other communication channels. An effort would be made to obtain support from businesses in placing safety messages on milk cartons, bread wrappers, paper bags and the like.

Another focus of the campaign would be publication of a regional bicycle map. In the long term, the concern about lack of bicycle routes shown by the survey must be addressed by creating new routes, and efforts to do this are underway now throughout the region. In the meantime, people lack information about existing bicycle routes and good bicycling streets. Requests for maps are the most frequent citizen inquiries received by area bicycle programs. As Portland and Beaverton are the only jurisdictions in the region with bicycle maps, a regional map would fill an important need.

2. Employer Program. The survey shows great interest in bicycling to work in the metropolitan area. This second program element would allow direct contact with potential bicycle commuters at their place of work. Direct assistance and instruction is the most effective way to teach bicycling safety and encourage new riders. Tri-Met's ridesharing staff has offered assistance in reaching the 250 employers participating in their program. Employers would be encouraged to provide adequate bicycle parking and changing rooms for bicycle commuters. Bicycle maps and safety materials would be made available. Special services would be offered to interested employers, such as custom-tailored maps showing an individual's best route to work, and guided practices rides.

3. Bicycling Encouragement Events. The survey indicates that most bicyclists are recreational riders. Communities around the nation are experiencing a growing interest in participation events such as group bicycle rides and bike-to-work days. Such events help generate new interest in bicycling. They can also help people make the transition from recreational riding to use of bicycles for commuting and other purposeful trips. Possibilities for the metropolitan area include participation in a national bike-to-work day to be sponsored next May by the Southland Corp. (7-11 stores). Another possibility would be a family bicycle ride like a recent event in San Diego, sponsored by Frito Lay, which attracted 2,000 participants. Project staff would recruit corporate sponsors and help organize one or more such events in the region.

The combined impact of the three program elements should achieve the two-fold purpose of the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program:

- To improve bicycling safety on streets and highways in the Portland metropolitan area.
- To increase the number of adults who choose to bicycle to work and for other transportation purposes.

Budget Impact

Funds for the implementation of the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program were awarded from the Federal Highway Administration. No local match is required. A breakdown of expenditures for implementing the program is shown in Attachment "A." Metro's primary responsibilities will be overall program administration, production of the regional bicycle map, and assistance in program evaluation. The City of Portland is under contract to Metro and will be responsible for day-to-day management of program activities and program evaluation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the Resolution authorizing implementation of the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program as described above.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION

RB/gl
7257B/327
11/29/82

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING) RESOLUTION NO.
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BICYCLING)
SAFETY AND ENCOURAGEMENT PROGRAM) Introduced by the Joint Policy
Advisory Committee on Transportation

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District and the City of Portland have received a \$174,000 grant from the Federal Highway Administration for the purpose of improving bicycling safety and encouraging bicycle riding in the metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, The random sample survey recently conducted for this program by the Columbia Research Center provides the basis for the proposed scope of work; and

WHEREAS, The Bicycling Encouragement Program Advisory Committee has endorsed the proposed work scope; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council authorizes implementation of the Bicycling Safety and Encouragement Program, as described in the staff report.

2. That expenditures for the Bicycling Encouragement Program be in accordance with the budget shown in "Attachment A".

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this _____ day of _____, 1982.

Presiding Officer

RB:JS:lmk
11-29-82

BICYCLING SAFETY AND ENCOURAGEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET¹

<u>PROGRAM ELEMENT</u>	<u>METRO</u>	<u>CITY OF PORTLAND</u>	<u>MATERIALS & SERVICES</u>	<u>TOTALS²</u>
<u>Completed Tasks</u>				
Attitude Survey	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,500	\$ 6,000	\$ 10,500
Program Development	9,000	6,500	0	15,500
Subtotal	<u>\$12,000</u>	<u>\$ 8,000</u>	<u>\$ 6,000</u>	<u>\$ 26,000</u>
<u>Proposed Tasks</u>				
Safety Education Campaign				
Public Information	2,000	2,000	46,000	50,000
Regional Bicycle Map	8,700	1,500	10,000	20,200
Employer Program	2,000	2,000	32,000	36,000
Encouragement Events	2,000	6,300	4,000	12,300
Final Evaluation + Report	2,500	4,000	6,000	12,500
Subtotal	<u>\$17,200</u>	<u>\$15,800</u>	<u>\$ 98,000</u>	<u>\$131,000</u>
<u>Program Administration</u>	<u>\$10,000</u>	<u>\$ 7,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>\$ 17,000</u>
<u>GRAND TOTAL</u>	<u>\$39,200</u>	<u>\$30,800</u>	<u>\$104,000</u>	<u>\$174,000</u>

¹Funded entirely from FHWA grant. No local match required.

²Up to \$10,000 in additional funding for the support of encouragement events and other appropriate elements of the program is anticipated to come from private sources.

ATTITUDE STUDY
FOR THE
PORTLAND METROPOLITAN
BICYCLING ENCOURAGEMENT PROGRAM

Prepared by:

Columbia Research Center, Inc.
401 E. McLoughlin
Vancouver, WA. 98660

October, 1982

This report has been prepared by Columbia Research Center and does not necessarily reflect the opinions or position of the Metropolitan Service District or the City of Portland.

SUMMARY OF THE BICYCLING ATTITUDE STUDY REPORT

This report presents findings of a recent survey conducted by the Columbia Research Center, Inc. concerning public attitudes about bicycling as an alternative mode of transportation. The survey is the first phase of the Metropolitan Portland Bicycling Encouragement Program, a program to encourage adults to consider bicycling for a variety of travel purposes and increase the number of persons commuting to work by bicycle. The Bicycling Encouragement Program and the survey are funded exclusively by a grant from the Federal Highway Administration to the Metropolitan Service District (Metro) and the City of Portland through the federal Comprehensive Transportation Systems Management Assistance Program.

The major objectives of the survey were to better define:

1. Public attitudes toward bicycling (both positive and negative);
2. The most important factors influencing the decision to use a bicycle as a means of transportation;

3. Public support, if any, for programs which encouraged bicycle riding and improved bicycling safety; and
4. What would make bicycling a realistic transportation option in this region.

The report also presents Columbia Research Center's recommendations for the Bicycling Encouragement Program, based upon the survey results.

Methodology

The 601 respondents in the survey were selected by a random sampling technique from the urbanized portion of the tri-county Portland metropolitan area. A nearly equal number of women and men over the age of 18 with valid driver's licenses were interviewed.

The survey was conducted during late May and early June. Weather during the three-week period of the survey was intermittently rainy and sunny.

This sample size affords a standard error factor of plus or minus 4% at the 95% confidence level.

Questions were structured to determine the extent of

bicycling at present, degree of interest in bicycling (particularly interest in bicycling to work), reasons why people choose not to bicycle to work under current conditions, and changes needed to assist people interested in bicycling. In addition, the survey addressed motorists' concerns about sharing the road with bicyclists and other safety issues.

Survey Findings

The survey results demonstrate widespread bicycle use and strong support for bicycle programs in the Portland area.

The key findings of the survey are:

- * 85 percent of the respondents said that programs which improve bicycle safety and encourage bicycle riding should be started
- * 51 percent of the survey respondents, representing 395,000 people regionally, have ridden a bicycle within the past year
- * 5.2 percent of the sample, or 40,000 area residents, have commuted to work by bicycle at some point during the last year
- * 3.6 percent of the sample, or 28,000 residents, have commuted to work by bicycle during the month prior to the survey
- * 15 percent of the respondents, representing 119,000 area residents, think that riding a bicycle to work is a possibility for them

These results suggest that programs to encourage bicycling

and safe bicycling practices have the potential to greatly increase the current use of bicycles for work-trip commuting in this region.

For an encouragement program to be successful in increasing the level of bicycle use, it is necessary to determine what motivates people to ride bicycles. The opportunity for exercise was the most important reason according to 72% of the respondents. Fifty-eight percent responded that the opportunity to enjoy the outdoors was a very important factor, and 52% stated that saving energy and reducing pollution were very important concerns.

Several questions were also asked to determine the relative importance of factors which influence one's decision not to ride a bicycle. As was anticipated, the three primary factors deterring people from bicycling were the perception that it is dangerous to bicycle in traffic (55%), poor weather (52%), and lack of bicycle routes (44%). Other factors such as bad road conditions and the effort required to pedal a bicycle were considered less important. While the encouragement program obviously cannot effect a change in the weather, the program can address the safety issue in a variety of ways and can provide information on preferred bicycle routes. (New bicycle routes and facilities are also being developed through the implementation of regional and local bicycle plans.)

The negative effects of Portland's weather on general bicycle use was not an important factor when the more specific question was asked, "What is the major reason you have not used a bicycle to get to work?" While safety was still a concern, the greatest concern was distance--i.e., the distance between home and the workplace. Given the relatively short work trip commute distance in this region (38% of the survey respondents lived within five miles of the workplace), this problem may be as much of a perceived problem as a real problem, and one which can be addressed in the implementation of the Bicycling Encouragement Program.

Consultant Recommendations

These and other results from the survey provided insight into the needs of people interested in bicycling and will help establish guidelines for design of the Bicycling Encouragement Program:

- * The program should assist recreational riders in beginning to ride to work. The purpose of most current bicycle trips is for recreation. The encouragement program may be more successful in motivating current recreational riders to bicycle to work than in encouraging non-bicyclists to begin riding.
- * The program should point out the respective roles of motorists and bicyclists in improving bicycling safety. Seventy-five percent of the respondents were unaware that bicycling next to the curb is not legally required and is often unsafe. From the motorist point of view, respondents indicated that a combination of

poor cycling practices, such as weaving in and out of traffic, are the major problems that result when bicycles and motor vehicles share the road.

- * The program should develop and disseminate information on good bicycle routes. Forty-four percent of the survey respondents indicated that lack of bicycle routes is an important disincentive to bicycling. Through maps and other guides, the program could provide information on the location of existing good bicycle routes that avoid busy streets.
- * At the workplace, the program should focus on the need for secure parking, route information, and places to change clothes. Respondents rated these needs high, more important than training in bicycling safety and basic bicycle maintenance.
- * The program should focus on bicycling opportunities during the good weather months of the year. Although bicyclists can be seen in the Portland area on almost every day of the year, the number of rainy-season bicyclists will never be large in proportion to fair-weather bicyclists.
- * The Bicycling Encouragement Program must be prepared to deal with differing perceptions about the use of bicycles. The survey found that, as people became more experienced bicyclists, their perceptions about the problems associated with bicycling changed.
- * The program should address factors that motivate people to ride bicycles. Even though a large number of area residents are interested in bicycling for transportation, they will not begin to use a bicycle unless they have the personal motivation to do so.

In general, the responses suggest a significant increase in the use of bicycles will occur only when bicycling is perceived by bicyclists and motorists to be safer than it is perceived to be at this time. Additional bicycle routes, increased awareness of the existing bicycle route network, and increased understanding of the rights and responsibilities of both motorists and bicyclists are needed.

In conclusion, this survey has found that there is a large

population of recreational bicyclists in the Portland metropolitan area. A significant portion of these cyclists feel that bicycling to work would be an option for them. An even greater number of bicyclists and non-bicyclists alike feel that programs which improve bicycling safety and encourage bicycle riding should be implemented. The task now is for Metro, the City of Portland, and their Advisory Committee to design a work scope which will fulfill the goals of the Bicycling Encouragement Program.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ROUTING REQUIREMENTS

CFR 49, Section 379.9 (adopted by the State of Oregon)

- (a) Unless there is no practicable alternative, a motor vehicle which contains hazardous materials must be operated over routes which do not go through or near heavily populated areas, places where crowds are assembled, tunnels, narrow streets, or alleys. Operating convenience is not a basis for determining whether it is practicable to operate a motor vehicle in accordance with this paragraph.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SHIPMENTS IN OREGON


February, 1979

OBSERVED HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SHIPMENT
FREQUENCY BY HAZARD CLASS - February, 1979

Flammable	63%
Corrosive	12%
Combustible	6%
"Dangerous"	4%
Non-Flammable Gas	4%
Flammable Gas	3%
Poison	3%
Oxidizer	2%
Flammable Solid	1%
Explosives A & B	1%
Radioactive	.4%

Source: Oregon Public Utility Commission

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ROUTING METHOD



Adopted from Figure 2. of the "Guidelines for Applying Criteria to Designate routes for Transporting Hazardous Materials". U.S. Department of Transportation, FHWA, 1980.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS HIGHWAY ROUTING STUDY: OVERVIEW

Trucks hauling hazardous materials which, if involved in an accident, may require an evacuation or damage sensitive environmental areas, should use the safest available highway routes. A group of public safety officials from communities in the metropolitan area, representatives of local industries, and state and federal regulatory agencies are working together to determine if safest available routes can be determined.

Who

The study is financed as a national demonstration by a grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation; the Portland Office of Emergency Management is acting as the lead agency and providing staff support. A Study Advisory Committee is providing guidance to the study. The Advisory Committee includes representatives from the five counties surrounding the metropolitan area, local chemical manufacturers and trucking firms, and pertinent state and federal regulatory agencies.

What

The U.S. Federal Highway Administration has established guidelines for state and local governments to use in designating hazardous materials highway routes. The procedures call for a cooperative effort among all local communities who might be affected, as well as with local industries. It also outlines a quantitative risk analysis methodology which allows the comparison of two available routes based on the probability of an accident (determined through accident rates) and the possible consequences if an accident does occur. The quantitative comparison of routes is augmented by consideration of other "subjective" variables, such as especially vulnerable groups along a certain route, unique emergency response problems, environmentally sensitive areas, etc.

The study will consider only those hazardous materials shipments which would require an evacuation or cause serious environmental damage if involved in an accident. It will not consider all shipments and routes, such as deliveries of home heating oil and to gasoline stations. It will focus on primary routes which pass through the region, as well as primary feeder-routes for delivery to local depots and manufacturing facilities.

Highway routing is seen as only one way of ensuring that hazardous materials are properly handled. After reviewing the appropriateness of highway routing, the Study Advisory Committee will be looking at other ways in which hazardous materials safety may be enhanced.

How

Industries which use the types of hazardous materials of concern for highway routing will be identified and surveyed. The surveys will be done in cooperation with the fire departments with responsibility

ROUTING STUDY OVERVIEW
PAGE TWO

and authority for that area. The surveys will indicate the specific commodities common to highways in this area, as well as provide information about currently used routes and other shipping patterns.

Information about hazardous materials traffic volumes along specific routes will be collected through roadside observations. Secondary data about shipping patterns and accident rates will also be collected from relevant state and federal agencies.

Where

The analysis of routes may include any set of alternatives within Clackamas, Clark, Columbia, Multnomah and Washington Counties. Planning authority limits the City of Portland to analysis of alternative routes which affect the City of Portland, unless otherwise requested. Project staff will aid in the analysis of other alternative routes affecting any jurisdiction within the 5-county region, upon the request of that jurisdiction.

When

The routing study is scheduled to be completed by May, 1983. The review of other safety measures will be completed by June, 1983.

For more information contact:

City of Portland
Office of Emergency Management
1120 S.W. 5th Avenue, 5th Floor
Portland, OR 97204

Telephone: (503) 796-5200

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
HIGHWAY ROUTING STUDY

Goals, Objectives and Related Activities

I. Project Goals

A. Primary:

To identify the available alternative highway routes for those hazardous materials which may cause an evacuation or damage sensitive environmental areas, and determine which of those routes is safest. The safest routes will be determined by using the risk analysis methodology developed by the Federal Highway Administration, described in the "Guidelines for Applying Criteria to Designate Routes for Transporting Hazardous Materials".

The analysis will focus on routing choices of primary routes *where alternatives exist*. (Facilities in compliance with land use and zoning codes will not be severed from highway service.)

The analysis will include routes carrying hazardous materials through the region (i.e. neither originating nor terminating) and primary feeder routes used for delivery to local facilities.

B. Secondary

To identify other means by which the risks of hazardous materials transportation and use within the region can be minimized.

II. Participating Agencies

A study advisory committee will oversee the design and implementation of the study. It will be composed of representatives of all counties within the metropolitan region, potentially affected industries, as well as relevant regional, state, and federal authorities (see attached list). The Portland Office of Emergency Management will act as lead agency for the study, providing staff support to the Advisory Committee and coordinating

the technical analysis of alternative routes.

III. Geographic Scope:

The analysis of routes may include any set of alternatives within Clackamas, Clark, Columbia, Multnomah and Washington Counties. Planning authority limits the City of Portland to analysis of alternative routes which affect the City of Portland, unless otherwise requested. *Project staff will analyze other alternative routes affecting any jurisdiction within the 5-county region, upon the request of that jurisdiction.*

IV. Project Objectives

Objective A - Identify hazardous materials which are commonly transported by truck in the four-county region, and which are of concern for highway routing.

Activity A.1 - Criteria for selecting hazardous materials of concern for routing:

"Hazardous materials shipments which, by nature of volume and commodity characteristics, will require the evacuation of citizens and/or serious environmental damage to sensitive areas if there is a potential or actual fire, spill, or leak".

Activity A.2 - For local deliveries: Identify and survey facilities which handle hazardous materials which meet the above criteria, in cooperation with the appropriate fire service authorities.

Activity A.3 - For through shipments: Review origin and destination data available through the Washington State Utility and Transportation Commission, Oregon Department of Transportation Weighmasters and other available data sources.

Activity A.4 - Conduct roadside observations, including multiple-site simultaneous observations of through-routes. (This data is also useful for determining accident probability, described in the risk analysis section below.) (Activity C.2)

Objective B - Identify Alternative Routes

Activity B.1 - For local deliveries:

Identify, in cooperation with participating local jurisdictions and affected facilities, those alternative routes providing access to major depots, manufacturing and other fixed-site facilities.

Activity B.2 - For through routes:

Identify major through-region routes affecting the metropolitan area, in cooperation with affected industries, local, state, and federal agencies (primarily through the Study Advisory Committee).

Objective C - Analyze and compare alternative routes to determine those which are safest.

Activity C.1 - Identify mandatory physical or legal factors which may affect one of the available alternatives.

Activity C.2 - Perform risk calculations as described in the FHWA Guidelines. Determine accident probabilities and consequences based on data collected through roadside observations, the industry survey, and data available from other agencies.

Activity C.3 - Analyze subjective factors involved in route selection, including special emergency response problems, special populations, environmentally sensitive areas, etc.

Objective D - Compare alternatives and, *if analysis warrants*, recommend hazardous materials routes. Members of the Study Advisory Committee will develop a plan for presenting any routing recommendations to appropriate decision-making groups.

Objective E - Identify and analyze other activities which may enhance hazardous materials highway safety, as well as other transportation modes and fixed facilities.

Note: Suggestions made to date which will be analyzed during this project are listed below. *Other ideas are encouraged and welcomed!*

- Inventory emergency response resources within the region for mutual aid purposes.
- Establish basic criteria as to what equipment and training are useful and/or necessary for each emergency response agency along a major route.
- For hazardous materials shipments through some high-risk areas (such as the Terwilliger Curves), establish reduced speed limits, restrict trucks to slow lanes, and prohibit lane changes.
- Enhance driver ability and attitudes through training, certification, and other mechanisms.
- Increased attention to vehicle inspection.
- Restrictions on certain very dangerous shipments from some routes during peak traffic hours (i.e. time-of-day restrictions).
- Notification of emergency response agencies prior to certain very dangerous shipments.

Possible Outcomes of this Study

- Identification of safer routes
- Regional identification of major facilities
- Identification of hazardous materials transported within the region
- Broad-based planning group to address other hazardous materials safety issues

HIGHWAY ROUTING STUDY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES

Industry

Cal Arnold, Vice President
Operations Arrow Transportation Company
P.O. Box 10106
Portland, OR 97210
222-1875

Karen Trogden
Rhône-Poulenc Chemical Company
P.O. Box 10224
Portland, OR 97210
222-3571

Byron Dougan
Willbridge Plant Manager
Shell Oil
Representing Western Oil & Gas Assoc.
5880 N.W. St. Helens Road
Portland, OR 97210
228-7321

Michael Mattingly
Director of Transportation
Chem-Security Systems
P.O. Box 1866
Bellvue, WA 98009-1866
(206) 827-2774

Michael A. Meredith, Manager
Oregon Trucking Associations Inc.
1500 N.E. Irving, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97232
233-7673

Pete Pedone & Ginny Bass
Hazard Materials Regulatory Compliance
Widing Transportation Inc.
10145 N. Portland Road
Portland, OR 97203
286-3661
(206) 464-7518

Neighboring Jurisdictions

Clackamas County:

Casey Marley, Director
Clackamas County Emergency Management
2223 Kaen Road
Oregon City, OR 97045
655-8218

Jack W. Snook
Fire Chief/Lake Oswego
351 First Street
Lake Oswego, OR 97034
636-3601

Jesse C. Villarreal
Assist. Chief/Fire Marshall
City of Milwaukie
11022 S.E. 37th
Milwaukie, OR 97222
659-4042

HIGHWAY ROUTING STUDY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES

Neighboring Jurisdictions (Cont'd)

Clark County

Ron Mitchell, Director
Clark-Skamania Dept.
Dept. of Emergency Management
P.O. Box 1995
Vancouver, WA 98668
(206) 695-6405

Pat Humphries, Chief
Clark County Fire Dist. 5
Clark Co. Fire Chiefs Assoc.
7110 N.E. 63rd
Vancouver, WA 98664
(206) 892-4323

Dan Olsen, Chief Fire Marshall
Clark County
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98668
(206) 699-2267

Otto Jensen, Chief
City of Vancouver Fire Dept.
900 W. Evergreen Blvd.
Vancouver, WA 98660
(206) 696-8168

Columbia County

John DeFrance
Columbia Co. Office of Emerg. Mgmt.
Courthouse
St. Helens, OR 97051
397-2100

Lee Broadbent
St. Helens Fire Department
1221 Columbia Blvd.
St. Helens, OR 97051
396-2990

Multnomah County

Cherilyn Foglio, Coordinator
City of Gresham
Emergency Management
1333 N.W. Eastman
Gresham, OR 97030
661-3000

Penny Malmquist, Coordinator
Hazardous Materials Program
Multnomah County
Office of Emergency Management
12240 N.W. Glisan
Portland, OR 97230
255-3600 (Bldg. 313/118)

Washington County

Tom G. Thompson
Tualatin Fire District
Washington County Fire Defense
Board
P.O. 127
Tualatin, OR 97062
682-2601

Washington State

Capt. R. L. Bullock
District Commander
Washington State Patrol
P.O. Box 1439
Vancouver, WA 98668
(206) 696-6162 - Washington
289-2442 - Portland

HIGHWAY ROUTING STUDY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES

Neighboring Jurisdictions (Cont'd)

Metropolitan Service District

James A. Giesecking, Jr.
Transportation Planner
Metropolitan Service District
527 S.W. Hall
Portland, OR 97205
221-1646
(Inter-Office Bl27/MSD)

----- State and Federal Agencies -----

Bob Hagan
Officer-in-Charge
Oregon Field Office
U.S. DOT - Motor Carrier
100 Equitable Building
Salem, OR 97310
378-3832

Paul Henry & Jack Quigley
Oregon PUC
Room 420
Labor Industries Building
Salem, OR 97310
378-6736

Robert Rottweiler, Region Safety Officer
Oregon Department of Transportation
9002 S.E. McLoughlin
Milwaukie, OR 97222
653-3090

Rich Reiter
Oregon Department of Environmental
Quality
P.O. Box 1760
Portland, OR 97207
229-6434

Ray Paris
Radiation Control Section
State Health Division
P.O. Box 231
Portland, OR 97207
229-5797

Corky K. Forbes, Sergeant
Oregon State Police
P.O. Box 66009
Portland, OR 97266
238-8434

HIGHWAY ROUTING STUDY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES

City of Portland

Mike Bauer
Traffic Engineer
Portland Bureau of Traffic Engineering
1120 S.W. 5th Avenue, 9th Floor
Portland, OR 97204
(Inter-office 106/902)
796-5170

Jim Klum, Staff Lt.
Portland Fire Bureau
55 S.W. Ash
Portland, OR
(Inter-office 139/Fire Bureau)
248-4375

Ross Neely
Police Officer
City of Portland
Motor Carrier Safety Officer
4735 E. Burnside
Portland, OR
(Inter-office 333/PPB)
248-5688
248-5694

Alan Orr
Police Lieutenant
City of Portland
222 S.W. Pine
Portland, OR
(Inter-office 126/105)
248-5600

Bob Robison
Portland Office of Emergency Management
1120 S.W. Fifth Avenue, 5th floor
Portland, OR 97204-1973
796-5200

Date: November 17, 1982
To: Regional Development Committee
From: Ted Spence, ODOT
Regarding: Project Recommendations for State Highways

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is currently undertaking a major update to its Six-Year Highway Improvement Program adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission in January, 1982. This review is more extensive than in the past and takes the form of meetings and presentations to staff, local governmental bodies, public officials, and the citizenry at large. Emphasis is placed on soliciting recommendations for Federal Aid projects on the State highway system.

Metro is supporting ODOT's action by bringing it to the attention of member transportation committees. Enclosed are attachments which define in detail the preparation of the Six-Year Highway Transportation Improvement Program:

Attachment #1 - Letter from Ed Hardt soliciting project recommendations.

Attachment #2 - Procedures in the development of the program.

Attachment #3 - Construction projects in the region currently identified for funding in the program.

Attachment #4 - Potential highway improvements currently in the program but not funded.

Attachment #5 - List of projects (incomplete) suggested by member jurisdictions for consideration for inclusion in the program.

Please review this information and provide input at the next Committee meeting regarding potential projects to consider.

TS:AC:lmk



VICTOR ATIYEH
GOVERNOR

Department of Transportation
HIGHWAY DIVISION

Region I

9002 SE. McLOUGHLIN BLVD., MILWAUKIE, OREGON 97222 PHONE 653-3090
October 5, 1982

In Reply Refer to
File No.:

The Oregon State Highway Division is beginning the process of updating the Six Year Highway Improvement Program. This process will culminate in a preliminary program for 1984-89 by July 1, 1983, followed by formal public review in September-October 1983, and Transportation Commission adoption in January 1984.

Our process has been revised and this year we are asking for local input to the program before the preliminary draft is developed. I have attached copies of project lists identified under various categories in the current Six Year Program book. These include funded projects and others that have been identified but are not funded due to fiscal restraints. I would like your suggestions on any new projects on the State Highway System to add to the program. A brief written description of these would be helpful. Also, please prepare any comments you may have on those projects identified and listed in the book but not programmed for funding.

During our last update, we were forced to remove projects. We are hopeful that we will be able to reinstate some of the deleted projects as well as add work in the new update. This is an optimistic observation based on Federal legislation presently being considered. By the same token, State funds from existing sources may not be sufficient to provide the match we need in the later years. Since this new program will be developed to use all of our anticipated Federal-aid funds, we will rely upon the Legislature to provide the State revenue needed to match Federal funds.

If you have comments about projects already identified, or have new projects in mind, I'd like to discuss them with you in the next four to six weeks. Vickie Rocker, Public Affairs Representative, will be contacting you soon to schedule a meeting, at which time we can discuss the new program and any candidate projects you may have.

Edward L. Hardt
Metro Region Engineer

1984-89

SIX YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project Identification - September 1, 1982 to January 1, 1983

identify new projects and review projects in current program for changes in scope, costs, and scheduling

Project Requests - January 1, 1983 to February 1, 1983

provide specific data on each project recommended for the program

Categorization - February 1, 1983 to February 15, 1983

group all projects by similar work

Technical Ranking - February 15, 1983 to April 1, 1983

assign a statewide priority to each project based on technical merit

Non-Technical Ranking - February 15, 1983 to April 15, 1983

develop a final statewide priority for each project considering technical criteria and non-technical criteria including policy positions of the Transportation Commission, prior commitments, fund availability, etc.

Draft Preliminary Program - May 1, 1983 to June 1, 1983Recommended Program Approval - June 1, 1983 to July 1, 1983Preliminary Program Approval - July 1, 1983 to September 15, 1983

Transportation Commission approval

Public Review - September 15, 1983 to November 1, 1983

present Preliminary Six Year Program to the public for review

Proposed Program - November 1, 1983 to January 1, 1984

develop a proposed 6YHIP that considers projects in the preliminary program and changes suggested by the public and approved by the Transportation Commission

Commission Approval - January 1984

REG-1

Map Index	Route No.	Highway Name	County ^{1/}	Section Name	Begin M.P.	Length (Miles)	Work	Est. Cost ^{2/} (\$1,000)	Fund
<u>FISCAL YEAR 1982 PROJECTS</u>									
101	I-5	Pacific	Multnomah	Fremont Viaduct #8958	303.0	0.3	Overlay	880	FAI-4R
102	I-84	Columbia River & OOT	Various	I-84 Logo Sign Project	44.0	330.0	Logo Signs (St. Force)	29	FAI-4R
103	I-84	Columbia River	Hood River	Safety Rest Area Improvements	54.5	0.1	Handicap Improvement	130	FAI-4R
104	I-205	E. Portland Fwy.	Multnomah	Col. Riv. Br.-S.E. Powell Blvd. (Portland)	0.0	0.0	Jail Exercise Yard	241	FAI
105	I-205	E. Portland Fwy.	Multnomah	S. Banfield Intchge.	21.1	0.3	Grade-"NW" Structure	3,790	FAI
106	I-205	E. Portland Fwy.	Multnomah	Col. Riv. Br.-S.E. Powell Blvd.	24.9	5.9	P-Sn-111-Sigs.	26,200	FAI
107	US-30	Lower Columbia River	Multnomah	N.W. Nicolai St.-W. Fremont Intchge.	0.0	0.1	Building Demolition	58	FAI
108	US-26	Mt. Hood	Multnomah	Mt. Hood Hwy. @ Birdsdale Ave. (Gresham)	11.6	0.0	5 Ph Signal	90	HES
109	US-26	Mt. Hood	Multnomah	Mt. Hood Hwy. @ Towle Ave. (Gresham)	12.0	0.0	5 Ph Signal	72	HES
110	US-26	Sunset	Clatsop	Jewell Jct.-Summit (M.P. 23.3-M.P. 23.5)	23.3	0.2	Climb Lane Extension	1,420	HES
111	US-26	Sunset	Washington	Davies O'xing Section	49.3	0.4	G-P-Str.-Illum.	980	HES/FA
112	US-26	Sunset	Multnomah	Sylvan Intchge.-Vista Ridge Tunnel	71.3	2.5	O'Lay-GM Barrier-Safety	2,554	FA
113	US-30	Lower Columbia River	Multnomah	L. Col. Riv. Hwy. @ Sauvies Island Rd.	10.8	0.0	3 Ph Signal	70	HES
114	US-30	Lower Columbia River	Columbia	L. Col. Riv. Hwy. @ E.M. Watts & S.W. Maple St. (Scappoose)	20.5	0.1	3 Ph Signal-Channel	100	FA
115	US-30	Lower Columbia River	Columbia	Rainier Slide Section	46.6	0.2	Slide Repair	290	FA
116	US-30	Lower Columbia River	Columbia	Lower Col. Riv. Hwy. @ First St. (Rainier)	47.0	0.0	2 Ph Signal	60	FA
117	US-30	Lower Columbia River	Columbia	Col. Riv. Hwy. @ W. Rainier Rd. (Rainier)	48.3	0.0	5 Ph Signal	55	HES
118	US-30	Lower Columbia River	Columbia	L. Col. Riv. Hwy. at Heath Rd.	51.3	0.1	G-P-Sn, Lt. Turn	39	HES
119	OR-35	Mt. Hood	Hood River	Polallie Cr.-Mt. Hood	75.8	8.9	G-P-Structure-O'Lay	10,070	ER
120	OR-43	Oswego	Clackamas	Oswego Hwy. @ Marylhurst College Entrance	7.6	0.2	Channelize-Signal	180	STATE
121	OR-99E	Pacific East	Multnomah	Pacific Hwy. E. @ Marine Drive (Portland)	5.8	0.0	3 Ph Signal	70	HES
122	OR-99E	Pacific East	Clackamas	U'xing S.P. Co.-M.P. 13.4	12.6	0.8	Rockfall Protection	250	FA
123	OR-99E	Pacific East	Clackamas	M.P. 17.35 - 17.72	17.4	0.4	Rockfall Protection	80	FA
124	OR-99W	Pacific West	Multnomah	Pac. Hwy. W. @ N. Killingsworth St. (Port.)	3.1	0.0	5 Ph Sig- Lt. Turn Refuge	120	HES
125	OR-210	Scholls	Washington	Scholls Hwy. @ SW 135th Ave. and Old Scholls Ferry Rd.	7.5	0.0	See Page 47 for Details		
126	OR-210	Scholls	Washington	Fanno Creek Bridge (Scholls Hwy.) #4973	8.7	0.0	G-P-Structure	328	HBR
127	OR-217	Beaverton-Tigard	Washington	S.B. On-Ramp @ Beaverton/Hillsdale Hwy.	1.8	1.0	G-P-Slide Repair	87	FA
128		Hood River	Hood River	E. Fk. Hood River (Dimmick Park) Bridge	18.0	0.5	Grading-Structure	26	ER

FISCAL YEAR 1983 PROJECTS

129	I-5	Pacific	Multnomah	Willamette Riv. (Marquam) Bridge	300.9	1.0	Overlay	6,050	FAI-4R
130	I-5	Pacific	Multnomah	Greeley Ave. Connection to I-5	303.4	0.4	G-P-Str-Sn-Sigs-Illum.	12,200	FAI-4R*
131	I-205	E. Portland Fwy.	Multnomah	Columbia River Bridge	25.8	0.2	P-Sn-Illum.	10,000	FAI
132	US-30	Lower Columbia Riv.	Columbia	Columbia Blvd.-St. Helens Rd.	28.6	0.1	G-P-Widen-Signal	480	FA
133	US-30	Lower Columbia Riv.	Columbia	Lower Columbia R. Hwy. at Dike, Lost Cr. and Lindberg Rds.	19.1	38.3	Lt. Turn Refuges (3)	330	FA
134	OR-8	Tualatin Valley	Washington	Tualatin Valley Hwy. @ S.W. Murray Blvd.	4.3	0.4	G-P-Rt. Turn Refuge-Sigs-RR	510	FA
135	OR-210	Scholls	Washington	Scholls Hwy. at Nichol Rd.	11.7	0.0	See Page 47 for Details		

*Matching funds by City of Portland. Construction in 1983 will depend upon the availability of Interstate 4R Funds and adequate Federal-Aid obligation authority.

^{1/}Project may extend into another county. The county listed is where the largest part of the project is located.

^{2/}Estimated Construction Cost in 1982 Dollars.

REGION 1 - continued

Map Index	Route No.	Highway Name	County ^{1/}	Section Name	Begin M.P.	Length (Miles)	Work	Est. Cost ^{2/} (\$1,000)	Fund
<u>FISCAL YEAR 1984 PROJECTS</u>									
136	I-5	Pacific	Washington	Lower Boones Ferry Rd. Intchge.	290.5	0.0	Signals (2)	160	FA
137	I-5	Pacific	Multnomah	Oregon Slough Bridge (Northbound)	307.5	0.2	Widen Structure	18,160	FAI*
138	I-84	Columbia River	Multnomah	N.E. 181st Intchge. E. Bound Off-Ramp	13.0	0.8	G-P-Sign	530	FAI
139	I-205	E. Portland Fwy.	Multnomah	E. Burnside St.-S.E. Harold St.	20.9	0.3	Bikeway Signals	100	FAI
140	I-205	E. Portland Fwy.	Multnomah	S. Banfield Intchge.	21.5	0.6	G-P-"SW" Str.-Sn-Illum.	10,850	FAI**
141	US-26	Mt. Hood	Multnomah	Ross Island Bridge Section #5054	0.5	0.6	Plane-Joints-Overlay	1,370	FA
142		Crown Point	Multnomah	Knieriem Rd.-Larch Mtn. Rd.	10.5	0.1	Rock Binwall	550	FAS
<u>FISCAL YEAR 1985 PROJECTS</u>									
143	I-84	Columbia River	Multnomah	Sundial-Sandy River	16.6	1.0	Overlay-Illum.-Safety	760	FAI-4R
144	I-84	Columbia River	Multnomah	Troutdale-Hood River	17.8	46.6	Guard Rail Ends	80	FAI-4R
145	I-84	Columbia River	Washington	Eagle Creek-Mitchell Point	41.5	16.7	Overlay	3,500	FAI-4R
146	US-30	Lower Columbia Riv.	Washington	N.W. Nicolai St.-W. Fremont Intchge.	2.6	0.5	G-P-Str-Sn-Sig-Illum.	22,400	FAI
147	US-26	Sunset	Washington	Murray Blvd. Interchange	67.2	0.1	G-P-Lt. Turn-Sig.	320	FA
<u>FISCAL YEAR 1986 PROJECTS</u>									
148	I-5	Pacific	Multnomah	S.E. Waters Ave. Ramp (Phase 1)	300.5	0.3	G-P-Substructure	12,000	FAI*
149	I-84	Columbia River	Multnomah	O'xing Crown Pt. Hwy. @ OWR&N R.R. (E. & W. Bound)	35.1	0.1	Deck Seal-Overlay	680	FAI-4R
150	US-26	Mt. Hood	Clackamas	Wildwood-Zigzag	38.7	1.9	G-P-Widen (5 Lane)	3,100	FA
<u>FISCAL YEAR 1987 PROJECTS</u>									
151	I-5	Pacific	Washington	Tualatin Park and Ride Lot	290.5	0.0	Park & Ride Lot	420	FAI-4R***
152	I-5	Pacific	Multnomah	Marquam Bridge-S.W. Haines Rd.	293.1	7.3	Ramp Metering	470	FAI-4R
153	I-5	Pacific	Multnomah	N. Tigard Intchge.-S. Tigard Intchge.	294.2	1.7	G-P-Str-Sn-Sigs-Illum.	18,300	FAI
154	I-5	Pacific	Multnomah	Oregon Slough Bridge (Southbound)	307.5	0.2	Widen Structure	17,000	FAI*
155	I-205	E. Portland Fwy.	Clackamas	Oregon City Park and Ride Lot	9.3	0.0	Park & Ride Lot	350	FAI-4R***
156	I-205	E. Portland Fwy.	Multnomah	Lents Park and Ride Lot	17.8	0.0	Park & Ride Lot	350	FAI-4R***
157	I-205	E. Portland Fwy.	Multnomah	Columbia Blvd./Sandy Blvd. Park & Ride Lot	23.4	0.0	Park & Ride Lot	350	FAI-4R***

*Our ability to fund this project is unknown. Construction will depend upon the availability of Interstate Funds and adequate Federal-Aid obligation authority.

**Schedule so that completion will coordinate with completion of Banfield Project.

***Matching funds by Tri-met.

^{1/}Project may extend into another county. The county listed is where the largest part of the project is located.
^{2/}Estimated Construction Cost in 1982 Dollars.

The following projects were identified by the public and Highway Division staff as possible improvements to the state highway system. For the most part, they have not been evaluated to determine if they provide sufficient benefits to Oregon's road users to warrant future consideration. For this reason, extensive revisions to the work and estimated cost may be necessary. If additional funds become available, these projects will be considered along with many other needed improvements.

The listing does not include projects that normally would be funded with Interstate funds and does not include the many projects that come up for preservation of the system such as overlays.

REGION 1

Route No.	Highway Name	County	Section Name	Begin M.P.	Length (Miles)	Work	Est. Cost (\$1,000)
US-26	Mt. Hood	Multnomah	Powell Blvd. at 190th Drive	10.8	0.0	G-P-Signal	1,000
US-26	M.t Hood	Multnomah	S.E. Orient Dr.-Palmquist Rd.	14.6	0.2	Intersec. Improve. (2)	120
US-26	Mt. Hood	Multnomah	Mt. Hood Hwy. at Palmquist Rd. (Gresham)	14.8	0.0	Signal	85
US-26	Mt. Hood	Clackamas	Zig Zag-Rhododendron	42.1	2.4	G-P (4 Ln.)	3,000
US-26	Sunset	Washington	Wolf Creek Bridge #2029	37.4	0.1	Widen Structure	180
US-26	Sunset	Washington	W. Fork Dairy Creek #2362	50.2	0.1	Widen Structure	150
US-26	Sunset	Washington	Jackson Rd. Intchge.	58.5	0.5	Intchge Ramps	5,000
US-26	Sunset	Washington	Helvetia Rd. Intchge.	60.8	0.5	Intchge Ramp	5,000
US-26	Sunset	Washington	N.W. 185th Ave. Intchge.	64.3	0.0	Signals-Ramp	150
US-26	Sunset	Washington	Cornell Rd. Interchange	65.9	0.1	G-P-Sigs. (Ramp Rev.)	1,350
US-26	Sunset	Multnomah	Cedar Hills-Vista Ridge	69.2	4.8	Ramp Metering	900
US-26	Sunset	Multnomah	Sylvan Section	71.1	0.4	G-P-Sig Rev. (Off Ramps)	180
US-30	Lower Columbia Riv.	Columbia	Scappoose S.C.L.-Mult. Co. Line	18.5	1.8	G-P-Widen	1,500
US-30	Lower Columbia Riv.	Columbia	Columbia City NCL-Warren	26.1	5.9	G-P(4-Ln)	1,900
US-30	Lower Columbia Riv.	Columbia	Gable Rd.-N. Vernonia Rd.	27.9	1.2	G-P-Widen	340
US-30	Lower Columbia Riv.	Columbia	Vernonia Rd./West St. Overcrossing	29.1	0.1	Structure	450
OR-6	Wilson River	Tillamook	Tunnel Cut Section	30.8	0.0	Rockfall	180
OR-43	Oswego	Multnomah	Sellwood Bridge-South	2.8	0.2	G-P (Add Lane)	330
OR-43	Oswego	Clackamas	Portland Ave. at Pimlico Dr.	9.7	0.1	Signal-Channelize	100
OR-43	Oswego	Clackamas	Portland Ave. at McKillican/Hood	10.9	0.1	Channelize	130
OR-99E	Pacific East	Clackamas	17th Ave.-Kellogg Lake	5.7	0.3	G-P-Widen (Add Lane)	3,000
OR-99E	Pacific East	Clackamas	Arlington St. Intersection	11.0	0.1	Intersection Improvement	400
OR-99W	Pacific West	Washington	Beaverton/Tualatin Hwy. Intersection	8.8	0.1	Channelization	80
OR-210	Scholls	Washington	S.W. 121st Ave.-Progress Intchge.	8.3	0.9	G-P-Curbs-Widen	2,450
OR-210	Scholls	Washington	S.W. Hall Blvd. Intersec.	9.6	0.0	G-P-Channelize-Signals	500
OR-210	Scholls	Washington	Scholls Hwy. at Denny Rd.	10.5	0.0	Signal	70
OR-212	Clackamas-Boring	Clackamas	Clackamas Hwy.-172nd Ave..	0.0	0.9	G-P-Widen (E.B. Clim.)	2,100
OR-212	Clackamas-Boring	Clackamas	Clackamas/Boring Hwy. at S.E. Richey (Boring)	6.9	0.1	Signal-Channelize	130
OR-212	Clackamas-Boring	Clackamas	Clackamas/Boring Hwy. at S.E. 282nd Ave. (Boring)	7.0	0.1	Signal-Channelize	130
OR-213	Cascade South	Clackamas	City Hall-Taylor St. (Oregon City)	0.6	0.4	Rebase	110
OR-213	Cascade South	Clackamas	Spangler Hill-Mulino	8.0	3.0	G-P-Climb. Lanes	900
OR-217	Beaverton-Tigard	Washington	Jct. Sunset Hwy.-Scholls Hwy.	0.0	4.3	Ramp Metering	370
	Beaverton-Tualatin	Washington	S.W. Nyberg St.-S.W. Avery St. (Tualatin)	9.4	0.8	G-P-Drain-Widen	800
	Hood River	Hood River	12th-13th St. Couplet (Hood Riv.)	0.3	0.4	Reconstruction	1,100
	Hood River	Hood River	E. Fork Hood River #640	18.2	0.0	Structure	500
	Ode11	Hood River	Dethman Ridge Rd.	1.3	0.0	Intersec. Improve.	200
REGION 1 TOTAL							35,005

6 YEAR PROJECTS

JURISDICTION	HWY.	PROJECT	IMPROVEMENT	COST
LT. COUNTY	181st INTERCHANGE	AIRPORT WAY: 138th TO 181st	BUILD INTERSECTION AT 181st FOR AIRPORT WAY.	
T. COUNTY	GRAHAM ROAD	SE. 257th, CONNECTING U.S. 26 AND I-84 - OVERPASS EXPANSION -	WIDEN GRAHAM ROAD OVERPASS TO ACCOMMODATE INCREASED TRAFFIC FROM 257th WHEN COMPLETED.	
LT. COUNTY	PALMQUIST - ORIENT	PALMQUIST - HWY 26 INTERSECTION	BUILD INTERSECTION TO: PULL TOGETHER ORIENT DRIVE AND CAWE RD.; USE PALMQUIST IN PLACE OF ORIENT; SEPARATE U.S. 26 TRAFFIC.	
OUTDALE CITY ①	GRAHAM ROAD	OVERPASS EXPANSION	WIDEN GRAHAM ROAD OVERPASS OVER RAILROAD TRACKS TO ACCOMMODATE INCREASED TRAFFIC FROM 257th COMPLET.	
OUTDALE CITY ②	GRAHAM ROAD	EAST ON RAMP - SURVEY	IDENTIFY PROPERTY LINES ON EAST SIDE GRAHAM RD, SOUTH OF I-84 ON RAMP, FOR INDUSTRIAL PARK DEVELOPMENT	
OUTDALE CITY ③	COLUMBIA HWY.	CURB ON COLUMBIA HWY	BUILD CURB FROM KIBLING TO SANDY RIVER BRIDGE TO CONTROL RUN OFF WATER AND DEFINE RIGHT OF WAY	
OUTDALE C. ④	COLUMBIA & BUXTON	STORM DRAIN - CONNECT DRAINS TO TRUNK STORM SEWER	RUN OFF FROM BUXTON AND COLUMBIA NEED TO BE CONNECTED TO A TRUNK STORM SEWER TO DISCHARGE INTO BEAVERCREEK -	

JURISDICTION	HWY	PROJECT	IMPROVEMENT	COST
ROUTDALE ⑤	JACKSON ROAD	INTERSECTION FOR COLUMBIA & JACKSON	IMPROVE INTERSECTION TO CONTROL ILLEGAL PARKING AT INTERSECTION AND ON JACKSON RD.	
ROUTDALE ⑥	FRONTAGE RD.	INTERSECTION OF: FRONTAGE RD, I-84 OFFRAMP, & MARINE DR.	ANALYZE SIGHT LINES FOR ALL STOPS, CHANGE TO HELP VISIBILITY FOR INCREASE IN TRAFFIC FROM MOTEL 6 CONSTRUCTION.	
JLT. COUNTY	TAYLORS FERRY RD.	TAYLORS FERRY AND I-5 SOUTHBOUND INTERSECTION	LENGTHEN OFFRAMP FROM I-5 S.B. AND SIGNALIZE TO CONTROL TRAFFIC ONTO TAYLORS FERRY RD.	
JLT. COUNTY	SYLVAN AT SUNSET	1) CANYON DRIVE	1) MOVE CANYON DRIVE INTERCHANGE NORTH ON SKYLINE TO MEET PRIVATE ROAD	
" "	" "	2) SCHOLLS FERRY RD	2) CHANGE ONE LANE TO TWO LANES ON SCHOLLS ON HILL TO SYLVAN.	
" "	" "	3) OFF RAMP - WEST BOUND	3) ADD A LANE ON NORTH SIDE OF INTERCHANGE FOR WEST BOUND OFF-RAMP.	

REDUCTION	HWY	PROJECT	IMPROVEMENT	COST
OREGON CITY	HWY 213 CASCADE S	ABERNATHY RD - CLAC.C.C.	THE SECTION WILL BE TURNED OVER TO CITY WHEN BYPASS IS COMPLETED. (OVERLAY?)	
DEKAMAS CO	HWY 212	ROCK CR JCT - MT HOOD HWY	CONSTRUCT CURBS AND LANE O'LAY	
DEKAMAS CO	HWY 22A	GRADE SEPARA- TIONS	ALL AT-GRADE INTERSECTIONS	
DEKAMAS CO the bridge	HWY 43	TERWINGER INTERSECTION	CHANNELIZATION & SIGNAL	
DEKAMAS CO Oregon City	HWY 213	ABERNATHY CR	REPLACE EXIST BRIDGE WITH CULVERT	
DEKAMAS CO Oregon City	HWY 99E	JEFFERSON ST @ 99E	CHANNELIZATION & SIGNAL	
DEKAMAS CO	HWY 213	SPANGLER HILL - MULINO	RECONSTRUCTION OF ROADWAY	
DEKAMAS CO Oregon City		OREGON CITY PARK & RIDE	CONSTRUCT P&R & ANGUS ST	
DEKAMAS CO	HWY 213	HARMONY - SUNNYSIDE	RE-ALIGN INTER- SECTION	
DEKAMAS CO	HWY 213	JOHNSON CR STR	REPLACE EXISTING JOHNSON CR STR	
DEKAMAS CO		BANGY RD	EXTEND BANGY RD	
DEKAMAS CO Linn		MILWAUKIE PARK & RIDE	CONSTRUCT P&R	

JURISDICTION	HWY	PROJECT	IMPROVEMENT	COST
LACUMAS CO WILSONVILLE		WILSONVILLE RD	WIDEN TO 6 LANES	
LACUMAS CO WILSONVILLE	I-5	STAFFORD RD INTCH.	RECONSTRUCT INTCH	

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE

JPACT

DATE

12/9 — 7:30 a.m.

NAME

AFFILIATION

M- DENNIS BUCHANAN	MULINOMAH COUNTY
MA- Ed Hardt	ODOT
G- Ted Spence	ODOT
G- STEVE DOTERRER	CITY OF PORTLAND
M- Dick Pokornowski	City of Vancouver
M- LARRY COLE	CITIES OF WASHINGTON COUNTY
M- Charlie Withowson	Metro
M- Al Myers (Greenham)	East County Cities
M- Robin Ludwigist	Cities of Clackamas County
M- Corky Knipftrick	Metro
S- Andy Cotugno	Metro
S- Rich Gustafson	Metro
M- J L FRENWIST	JRI. MET
M- Jim Fisher	Wash Co.
G- Mrs. Geraldine Ball	DJB, Inc.
S- Richard Brandman	Metro
S- T. Keith Lawton	Metro
S- James Gieseking, Jr.	Metro
S- Karen Thackston	Metro
S- Peg Henwood	Metro
S- Bill Pettis	Metro
G- Jan Schaeffer	City of Port.
G- Gil Mallery	RPC of Clark County

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 12/9/82 — 7:30 a.m.

NAME

AFFILIATION

G- Bob Robison

G- Larry Rice

G- Bruce Etlinger

G- John Price

G- Bebe Rucker

G- Jerry Markesino

Washington County

Metro Councilor

FHWA

Multnomah County

City of Portland