From Bean to Apperson

Ormond Bean
In attempting to arrive at a satisfactory solution for the development of the Front Avenue and Foothills Boulevard project, the following indefinite conditions should be kept in mind and should be settled where possible before final submission to the council:

1 - The Highway Commission agreed to an allotment of approximately $450,000 for 1935 for construction purposes. No written statement has been obtained from the Highway Commission as to this allotment.

2 - The Highway Commission discussed favorably the future allotment each year of some similar sum for construction purposes but no written statement has been obtained from the Highway Commission.

3 - The Oregon State Administrator for WPA agreed that $1,000,000 was to be earmarked for removal of buildings, etc. No written statement has been obtained for this allotment.

4 - We understand that the Highway Commission is prohibited from placing federal monies upon highways not on the federal aid highway system. The State of Oregon, through the addition of arterial streets in cities to the federal aid system for maintenance purposes has exceeded its federal allowance without including Front avenue or the Foothills Boulevard. We understand that a special dispensation from the Federal Bureau of Roads will be necessary to place these upon the federal aid system.

5 - We understand that WPA monies cannot be used upon federal aid highway systems except for landscaping, etc. Therefore, we understand that if WPA monies are used on these projects it would be necessary to do the WPA work before the streets were placed upon the federal aid highway system.

6 - Legal remonstrators, as per assessed value (not including utility property) .... 45.34%

Utility property remonstrating, as per estimated assessed value .................. 1.47%

Total legal remonstrance .................. 46.81%
Re monstrating as per area of district: 65.65%

Re monstrating as per notices sent out by Auditor:
- Cards mailed by Auditor: 6,190
- Written protests received by Auditor: 3,170

Total re monstrating: 51.39%
Deduction for repetition:
- 10%: 5.13

Total probable re monstrating: 46.17%

6-a - As a check, the district bounded by 2nd avenue, 11th avenue, Burnside street and Pine street, Jefferson to 4th, Salmon to 2nd, was studied in detail and it was found that 48% of the district by area re monstrated.

7 - Less than one-half hour before the hearing on December 17th, a petition containing a large number of names was filed with the Auditor. These petitioners favored the project but because of lack of time, no check was made of them except that some repetition of names was noticed. Many names did not include any suggestion that they represented or were interested in property within the district. Few names were followed by description of property in the district. The petition in the shape presented was of little value in determining the actual amount of property owners who favored the project.

8 - The actual location of the widened street on the so-called Front avenue section was not definitely agreed upon by those backing the project. The question of whether the street widening should be confined to Front avenue, or should be Front avenue to Caruthers, and then down Water avenue to the waterfront, and whether to extend north on the waterfront to Glisan street, or to angle from the waterfront north of Morrison to Front avenue and then via Front avenue to Glisan was not determined.

9 - The purchase of property between Front avenue and the waterfront between Morrison and Burnside or Glisan street was a moot question.

10 - Whether to extend the Foothills Boulevard to 10th avenue, 14th avenue or 21st and Burnside was a controversial question.
11 - The purchase of property between the west end of the Ross Island Bridge and Barbur Boulevard was questioned because of the likelihood of this improvement being far in the future.

12 - The purchase of property south of Ross Island Bridge and connecting with Macadam Road was questioned.

13 - The proposed assessment was for the purchase of right of way only. Payment of interest on purchase of right of way where money for construction is not available or may not be available for a number of years should be avoided if possible as an uneconomical waste of interest money.

14 - The law under which the proceedings were started is indefinite in some parts and if used should be cleared of the indefiniteness.

15 - The Council should require the proponents of a proposed improvement to so assert themselves that there will be a definite determination of the proportion of those in favor of the project.

Ormond R. Bean
List of persons who attended meeting held in office of Commissioner Bean on January 17, 1936, to discuss the Front Avenue, Diagonal and Foothill Boulevard Development Project.

D. B. Simpson
L. Enderud
F. E. Taylor
Aaron Frank
F. H. Strong
A. F. Smith
W. J. Gearin
Owilym G. Jones
A. Sherrill
O. L. Price
R. H. Strong

Wm. F. Woodward
James Wilson
C. H. Boost
C. E. Wade
U. L. Upson
J. G. Edwards
H. F. Corbett
J. R. Haight
L. G. Apperson
O. H. Bean
Front Ave., Barbur Blvd. to Sheridan St. ........ $ 65,000
Sheridan to Jefferson St. ............ 135,000
Jefferson to Glisan St. ............ 1,800,000
Foothill Blvd., Front to 14th Ave. ............ 350,000
14th Ave. to Jefferson St. ............ 250,000
Jefferson St. to 21st Ave. ............ 250,000
Water Ave. Con. & Ross Island Bridge Approach .... 150,000

$3,000,000