

W6D

AGENDA COVER MEMO

DATE: September 5, 2001

TO: Lane County Board of Commissioners

DEPARTMENT: Public Works Department

PRESENTED BY: Sonny Chickering, Acting Transportation Planning Engineer

TITLE: DISCUSSION AND ORDER/In the Matter of Recommending Pavement Preservation and Bridge Preservation and Replacement Projects to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and Requesting Funding for Individual Projects from State Bond Revenues Generated by the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act – House Bill 2142.

I. MOTION

Move approval of order authorizing the Board chair to sign the attached letter to the OTC.

II. ISSUE

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has requested that the County Board, acting as the Area Commission on Transportation (ACT), provide input on projects deserving consideration for funding with state bond revenues generated by the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act (HB 2142). Today staff is requesting Board direction on submission of project lists for two categories of expenditures allowed under HB 2142, Pavement Preservation Projects and Bridge Preservation and Replacement Projects.

The final category for HB 2142 projects is Modernization. Board discussion of a modernization project list is tentatively scheduled for the September 25th work session.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Background

HB 2142 authorizes the sale of \$400 million in bonds to finance highway projects over the next seven years. Fifty percent of these bond proceeds will be allocated to Pavement Preservation and Bridge Preservation and Replacement Projects. Of this amount, the OTC has allocated \$100 million to bridges, \$50 million to district highway preservation, and \$50 million to either district highways or bridges.

On July 30th of this year, the Public Works Director sent a letter to all cities within Lane County encouraging local government input on project proposals for funding under HB 2142. The deadline for non-metro area cities to provide written comment to staff was August 20 (none received). The Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) discussed these two project categories on August 16th. No specific project priorities were forwarded to the Board. The letter to cities indicated the Board would accept comment on proposed Pavement Preservation and Bridge Preservation and Replacement projects up to and including the September 5th regular meeting.

Attachment 1 contains project eligibility criteria and prioritization factors approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) on August 9th of this year. Although the Board discussion today is limited to proposed Pavement Preservation and Bridge Preservation and Replacement projects, the document also details criteria and factors to be used when considering projects for the Modernization category.

B. Analysis

Pavement Preservation. ODOT District 5 staff developed a list of District Level Highways in Lane County which may qualify for funding under HB 2142 (Attachment 2). The list was developed through a coarse technical evaluation using ODOT's internal pavement condition rating system, average daily traffic volumes and estimated unit preservation costs. The top five potential projects are numbered on the table.

The ODOT list was presented to the MPC at their August 16th meeting. No additional projects were nominated for inclusion in the list at that time. Although HB 2142 does allow project weighting by criteria such as leveraging of local funds or inter-jurisdictional transfers of improved roads after project completion, no cities have proposed utilizing these methods to improve a particular project's likelihood of funding. Likewise, county staff does not recommend that Lane County request transfer of district highway jurisdiction to Lane County under this program. However, the draft letter does request consideration of the top five District 5 district highway preservation priorities for HB 2142 funding.

Another class of projects which qualify for funding under the Pavement Preservation category are Load Limited Highways. Lane County has six load limited roads:

- Big Creek Road – MP 0.00 at US 101 to MP 13.31 (entire road)
- S. Canary Road – MP 5.74 SE of Florence to MP 6.52 Douglas County line
- Briggs Hill Road – MP 0.00 at Territorial Hwy. to MP 1.95
- Garoutte Road – MP 0.00 S of Cottage Grove to MP 2.51 (entire road)
- Molitor Hill Road – MP 0.00 at Sears Road to MP 0.98 (entire road)
- Sears Road – MP 0.66 N of Cottage Grove to MP 3.24

The draft letter requests consideration of the Sears Road project as a load-limited local project because it functions as a frontage road along the east side of I-5 from the Cottage Grove area to the Saginaw interchange.

Bridge Preservation and Replacement. Attachment 2 also contains a list of bridges within Lane County which may qualify for funding under HB 2142. Prepared by ODOT staff using their statewide inventory, the list consists of bridges that are deficient and currently weight restricted, have temporary repairs and are weight restricted, or will become weight restricted in the near future. As shown in Attachment 1, the bridge priorities are to be established on a technical basis by an ODOT bridge committee.

Conversations with District 5 ODOT staff indicates that two bridges on Interstate 5 are likely to be funded under this program. These bridges are in the Cottage Grove area: the Row River southbound bridge at mp 175.40; and the Coast Fork Willamette bridge southbound at mp 179.99. Replacement cost for these two bridges is estimated at about \$12.5 million.

The ODOT list was presented to the MPC at their August 16th meeting. No additional projects were nominated for inclusion in the list at that time.

Local agency bridges may also qualify for funding under the Bridge Preservation and Replacement category. Lane County has seven covered bridges that score well on the Standard Local Bridge HBRR Allocation Formula and may be competitive for funding under HB 2142 (Attachment 3). The Coyote Creek Covered Bridge #39C409 is the top ranked of these and is in need of a new roof. In addition, the Layng-Mosby Creek Covered Bridge #39C241 also needs a roof replacement. We estimate that these two roof replacements will cost about \$95,000. The other five bridges listed are in good condition. Because of their historic status, none of these covered bridges are candidates for modernization. They are listed at a replacement cost of \$5,520,120 in the HBRR list. The letter requests consideration of the two roof replacements and consideration of use of the unused portion of the bridge replacement cost in Lane County for district highway preservation.

C. Alternatives/Options

1. Approve order authorizing the Board chair to sign the attached letter forwarding project requests and comments to the OTC.
2. Modify the letter as directed by the Board.

D. Recommendation

Option 1.

E. Timing

Action is required today in order to meet the September 7 deadline for submitting Pavement Preservation and Bridge Preservation and Replacement projects to ODOT.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION/FOLLOW-UP

We will return to the Board on September 25th with a draft list of projects for funding under the Modernization category of HB 2142. The list will be a combined effort reflecting input from the MPC, the non-metro cities and County staff. Final Board approval of a Modernization category project list is scheduled for October 3rd.

ATTACHMENTS

Board Order with draft letter

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment 1 | Project eligibility criteria and prioritization factors approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) on August 9 th of this year. |
| Attachment 2 | List of bridges within Lane County which may qualify for funding under HB 2142. |
| Attachment 3 | Standard Local Bridge HBRR Allocation Formula |

September 5, 2001

Mr. Steven Corey, Chair
Oregon Transportation Commission
355 Capitol St., NE, Room 101
Salem, OR 97301-3871

Dear Mr. Corey,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the District Highway Preservation and Bridge program categories funded by the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. We have coordinated these comments with all the cities in Lane County and the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) for the Eugene-Springfield MPO area. We also have coordinated with Mr. Bob Pirrie and other local District 5 staff. They have provided us technical information on district highways and deficient bridges in Lane County. After review of this data and discussion with our local partners, we offer the following comments on this first part of the HB 2142 allocation process.

We have reviewed the attached District highway preservation list provided by District 5 staff and support preservation of these highways. We recommend the top five district highway preservation projects be funded. They are: Springfield-Creswell Hwy (Parkway Rd) mp 5.29 to mp 8.00; Springfield-Creswell Hwy (Cloverdale Rd) mp 11.63 to mp 14.88; Goshen-Divide Hwy (99) mp 0.00 to mp 14.76; Springfield-Creswell Hwy (Jasper Rd) mp 1.38 to 5.13; and Territorial Hwy, mp 0 to mp 18.7. The criteria in HB 2142 proposing that district highway preservation project funding facilitate transfers to local agencies has not generated interest from local governments in Lane County. There is a reluctance to take on the permanent responsibilities of district highway transfers to local agencies based solely on the benefit of this preservation program.

Lane County has five load limited county roads that were reviewed for funding under HB 2142. We request consideration of funding for Sears Road, mp 0.6 to mp 3.24. This road functions as a frontage road along the east side of I-5 from just north of Cottage Grove to the Saginaw interchange.

We support the replacement of important ODOT bridges in Lane County. Based on the technical recommendation of local ODOT staff, we support two specific bridge replacements in southern Lane County on Interstate 5. These are the southbound bridge over Row River at mp 175.40 (bridge #07829) and the southbound bridge over the Coast Fork Willamette River at mp 179.99 (bridge #07745). These two bridges are estimated to cost about \$12.5 million. We understand that this may be the extent of funding availability under this program in Lane County. We support replacement of other priority ODOT bridges in Lane County if funding becomes available.

The statewide local agency bridge list for HBRR allocation shows seven bridges in Lane County. Replacement cost for these bridges totals \$5,520,120. Since all of these bridges are historic covered bridges, we are not requesting modernization or replacement of these bridges. However, we do request consideration of a roof replacement on the Coyote Creek Covered Bridge (bridge #39C409) and the Layng-Mosby Creek Covered Bridge (bridge #39C241), at a total cost of about \$95,000. Since a portion of the bridge funding has been specified for local expenditures and because we are not requesting local bridge replacement from the HBRR priority list, we request that you use some portion of the remaining unused money for district highway preservation in Lane County as an alternative expenditure.

Sincerely,

LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Anna Morrison
Chair

c: Jeffrey Scheick, Region 2 Manager
Robert Pirrie, Area 5 Manager

**2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission**

Process Overview

Modernization	Pavement Preservation	Bridge Replacement / Rehabilitation
Applied by ACTs	Applied by ACTs	Applied by Bridge Project Selection Committees
<p>Eligibility Criteria: (used to determine if a project is eligible for funding under HB 2142) Modernization projects that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase lane capacity [sections 2(2)(a) and 2(3)(a) of HB 2142¹] or involve interchanges on multilane highways [section 2(2)(d) of HB 2142¹]. • Are consistent with applicable acknowledged comprehensive plans and/or adopted Transportation System Plans.² • Are consistent with the Oregon Highway Plan policy on Major Investment (1.G.1), where applicable.³ • Have achieved project readiness.⁴ 	<p>Eligibility Criteria: (used to determine if a project is eligible for funding under HB 2142) Pavement Preservation projects that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are located on District Highways [section 2(2)(e) of HB 2142] or be on a load limited highway [section 2, (2)(b) of HB 2142]. • Are consistent with applicable acknowledged comprehensive plans and/or adopted Transportation System Plans.² • Have achieved project readiness.⁴ 	<p>Eligibility Criteria: (used to determine if a project is eligible for funding under HB 2142) Bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are load limited bridges [section 2(2)(b) of HB 2142] or are state or local bridges [section 2(2)(c) of HB 2142]. • Have achieved project readiness.⁴
<p>Prioritizing Factors: (used to select projects for funding from the pool of eligible projects) Priority shall be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interchange projects on multi-lane highways [section 2(3) (c) of HB 2142] where applicable. • Projects that support important community areas and that are consistent with the Oregon Highway Plan Policy 1.B on Land Use and Transportation⁵, where applicable. • Projects that enhance Freight Mobility⁶, including access to intermodal facilities. • Projects that enhance the safety of the transportation system.⁷ • Projects that leverage other funds and public benefits.⁸ 	<p>Prioritizing Factors: (used to select projects for funding from the pool of eligible projects) Priority shall be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects that facilitate jurisdictional transfer [section 2(3)(d) of HB 2142]. • Projects identified by the Pavement Management System. • Projects that support important community areas⁵, where applicable. • Projects that enhance Freight Mobility⁶, including access to intermodal facilities. • Projects that enhance the safety of the transportation system.⁷ • Projects that leverage other funds and public benefits.⁸ 	<p>Prioritizing Factors: (used to select projects for funding from the pool of eligible projects) Priority shall be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects identified by the Bridge Management System [section 2(3)(b) of HB 2142]¹⁰. • Projects that support important community areas⁵, where applicable. • Projects that enhance Freight Mobility⁶, including access to intermodal facilities. • Projects that enhance the safety of the transportation system.⁷ • Projects that leverage other funds and public benefits.⁸

**2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission**

Process Description and Guidance

This document outlines the project selection process for the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The Oregon Transportation Commission will make the final selections for projects to be funded under the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The Commission will rely on the advice and recommendations that it receives from Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) and regional advisory groups. In making final project selections, the Oregon Transportation Commission will ensure that ACTs and regional advisory groups have based their considerations on the criteria and will ensure projects are distributed equitably statewide.

ACTs and regional advisory groups should use this document as a guide when they evaluate projects to recommend for funding to ensure consistent application of project eligibility criteria and prioritizing factors. It may also provide information to those who are preparing project proposals.

ACTs and regional advisory groups may use additional criteria to select and rank projects provided that the criteria are consistent with the criteria adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission. If an ACT or regional advisory group chooses to use additional criteria, they must inform those developing project proposals about the criteria.

The 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act shall be used to finance modernization and preservation projects.

- **Modernization projects:** A “modernization project” is any project that includes improvements that add capacity to highways, including but not limited to new or widened lanes and new bypasses. Projects that build bridges in places where there was no bridge or that rebuild a bridge to add travel lanes are modernization projects.
- **Preservation:** A “preservation project” is any project which includes paving, striping and reconstruction designed to add useful life to existing highways. Preservation includes bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects so long as capacity is not added.

2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission

Process Description and Guidance

I. Project Eligibility Criteria

Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs), the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), or any other body advising the Oregon Transportation Commission on the selection of projects for funding shall apply the project eligibility criteria. The project eligibility criteria are a first screen so that additional efforts can be focused to determine what projects they will evaluate further for funding under the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The eligibility criteria are not listed in any particular order. Projects must satisfy these criteria, at a minimum, before they are given further consideration.

¹Lane Capacity Projects and Interchange Projects

The 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act funds modernization projects on:

- Highways that need increased lane capacity where lane capacity projects are chosen from a constrained list [sections 2(2)(a) and 2(3)(a) of House Bill 2142].
- Interchange projects on multi-lane highways [section 2(2)(d) of House Bill 2142].

The phrase “lane capacity projects” may be understood broadly. Lane capacity projects may include any project intended to address capacity problems. This includes bypasses, adding a lane or lanes to an existing facility, passing lanes, turn refuges, signalization including timing traffic signals, lane widening or alignment, bus turnouts, and bicycle lanes.

The term constrained list has different meaning depending on whether a project is located inside or outside a metropolitan planning organization’s (MPO) boundaries. The term does not restrict the consideration of modernization projects to only those projects located within MPO boundaries.

- Inside MPO boundaries: TSP or transportation improvement programs are developed following a federally-prescribed process. This includes a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources and which projects are to be implemented using proposed revenue sources (while the existing transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained). (See Attachment D, an excerpt from the Code of Federal Regulations.)
- Outside MPO boundaries: The legislature intended a broader definition than is used inside MPOs for those jurisdictions outside of an MPO. Those jurisdictions should identify projects using documents such as TSPs, corridor plans, or transportation or capital improvement plans.

**2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission**

Process Description and Guidance

²Consistency with Comprehensive Plans and Transportation System Plans (TSP)

Projects must be consistent with the applicable adopted comprehensive plan or transportation system plan (TSP). If the applicable adopted plan or TSP is not acknowledged by the Department of Land Conservation and Development, the proposal must include findings that the project is consistent with the applicable Statewide Planning Goals. If such consistency cannot be demonstrated at the time an ACT or regional advisory group approves a project, the ACT or regional advisory group shall specify a future date by which such consistency shall be achieved and the ACT or regional advisory group shall note what changes to the TSP or comprehensive plan are needed.

³Consistency with Oregon Highway Plan policy on Major Investment (1.G.1)

A project must also be consistent with Policy 1.G.1, Major Investment. In order to demonstrate that a project is consistent, the proposal must show that the project and/or the TSP clearly addressed the prioritization criteria found in Policy 1.G.1 of the Oregon Highway Plan.

Please note: Where needed to assure consistency with the above noted Oregon Highway Plan policy, the ACTs or regional advisory groups shall negotiate conditions for project approval with an applicant to enhance community livability and/or to preserve the capacity of the state highway for long-distance travel. These conditions shall be attached to the application approved by the ACT or regional advisory group, shall be as specific as possible given the stage of development of the project, and may include such items as access management and interchange management plans, needed local street improvements, traffic management plans, land use plan designations, and other similar conditions.

⁴Project Readiness

The intent of the "project readiness" screening criteria is to identify projects, or portions or phases of projects that can be delivered within the timeframe allowed under bonding requirements. The project does not have to have been on the "shelf," but there needs to be information that indicates that the project can get the necessary permits and be built in the timeframe indicated. Areas to assess readiness include, but are not limited to environmental, right-of-way, alternative analysis and consistency with state land use goals.

"Project readiness" responds to a commitment to the Legislative Assembly to move quickly to implement the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. It is the understanding of the Oregon Transportation Commission that the Legislative Assembly intended the Act to fund projects that make visible improvements to Oregon's highways, roads and streets and are deliverable. It should be possible to move a project from design to construction, meeting the

**2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission**

Process Description and Guidance

normal public outreach, environmental requirements, and land use requirements with a minimum of delays.

In addition, bond proceeds will be used to finance projects under the 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act. Bonding imposes requirements (for example, to spend proceeds within three years) that emphasize the need to move quickly.

The department anticipates three bond issues associated with 2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act, with the last occurring about October 2005. All projects must be finished and all expenditures complete before October 2008.

**2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission**

Process Description and Guidance

II. Prioritization Factors

The prioritization factors are guidance offered by the Oregon Transportation Commission to ensure consistent consideration of projects by ACTs and regional advisory groups. The prioritization factors are not listed in any particular order and do not have any implied weight. ACTs and regional advisory groups may use additional criteria to rank projects provided that the factors are consistent with the criteria adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission. If an ACT or regional advisory group chooses to use additional prioritization factors, they must inform those developing project proposals about the factors.

⁵Support Important Community Areas

To show consistency with Policy 1.B of the Oregon Highway Plan, a project should not detract from efforts to improve downtowns and main streets and to reduce sprawling development patterns.

The intent of this prioritization factor is to support projects that are consistent with the Livability Initiative where applicable. These projects assist in the following:

- Stimulate economic opportunities in rural and distressed communities.
- Revitalize downtowns and mainstreets. Projects contribute to revitalization of a downtown area or creating a mainstreet atmosphere.
- Reducing traffic congestion. Projects increase the effectiveness of the transportation system which reduces the amount of traffic congestion.
- When located outside a downtown, mainstreet, or other community center, that appropriate access management is provided.

⁶Freight Mobility

Freight mobility means the safe, reliable, and efficient movement of goods between and among local, national, and international markets. In considering projects, ACTs and regional advisory groups should evaluate how a project:

- Provides for an efficient movement of freight.
- Demonstrates that it will not negatively affect freight movement.

Projects that address freight mobility concerns may include access to intermodal terminals and may ensure movement of farm and forest equipment on farm to market roads.

⁷Safety

A project that focuses on an area (or areas) with a high Safety Program Index System number would be more likely to be funded, all other things being equal. Where appropriate, projects should also address safety for other modes.

2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission

Process Description and Guidance

⁸Leverage and Public Benefit

ACTs and regional advisory groups should evaluate how proposed projects leverage additional funding or collateral community benefits and make wise and efficient use of infrastructure and natural resources. Examples of leverage could include:

- Other funding contributions, such as additional federal funds, local matching funds or provision of project right-of-way, private funding.
- Bundling with other infrastructure projects (provided there is no adverse affect on project readiness).
- Fish enhancement, such as culvert replacement and improved drainage.
- Transfer of jurisdiction from state to local control.

⁹District Highways

The Oregon Department of Transportation is engaged in an administrative rule-making to define “district highway.” The department will make a recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission at its September meeting to adopt an administrative rule defining “district highway.” The proposed rule would define a district highway as below:

“District Highway” means a state facility of county-wide significance that functions largely as a county and city arterial or collector.

The comment period for the temporary rule has closed.

¹⁰Bridge Prioritization

STATE BRIDGE PROJECT SELECTION

State bridge projects proposed for funding under the Oregon Transportation Improvement Act were selected based on the desire to maintain and improve transportation’s role in Oregon’s economy.

Focusing on the Interstate Highway and Freight Route systems, bridges were considered as candidates based on the following:

- Bridges that are presently load restricted.
- Bridges that have needed temporary repair, but still have some load restrictions.
- Bridges that have deterioration that will cause load restrictions in the near future.

With bridges being inspected at least every two years, the most current inspection information was used to develop a list of bridges meeting the criteria above. This list contained 137 bridges at an uninflated replacement cost of \$585 million.

**2001 Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RECOMMENDED Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritizing Factors
Established by the Oregon Transportation Commission**

Process Description and Guidance

The list was further prioritized by listing only Interstate Highway system bridges that matched the criteria. This reduced the proposed list to 42 bridges, at an uninflated replacement cost of \$220 million.

Due to the magnitude of bridge needs, an additional prioritization was necessary to further reduce the bridge list. Only the bridges on the Interstate Highway system that have experienced load restrictions in the recent past and those that have deterioration that will cause load restrictions in the near future were considered. This resulted in the current list of candidate State Bridge projects and consists of 13 bridges, at an uninflated replacement cost of \$115 million.

LOCAL BRIDGE PROJECT SELECTION

Local bridges that are currently load restricted may become candidates for funding through the Oregon Transportation Improvement Act. ODOT maintains data in the National Bridge Inventory System and a record of inspections on bridges owned by local jurisdictions.

Deficient bridges with a sufficiency rating of 80 or less will be considered for rehabilitation. Those bridges with a sufficiency rating of 50 or less will be considered for replacement. This follows the methodology outlined in Sections XIII through XVII of the 2001-03 Federal -Aid Agreement .

The State Bridge Engineer will request that bridge owners indicate by letter which bridges should be considered for funding by the Oregon Transportation Investment Act. The letters of request will be submitted to the ODOT Region Manager who will forward the information to the State Bridge Engineer and the Local Bridge Selection Review Committee. Only those bridges requested by owners will be considered for funding.

The Local Bridge Selection Review Committee will consider bridges in two categories: small bridges (deck area less than 30,000 square feet) and large bridges (deck area of 30,000 square feet or more).

The Local Bridge Selection Review Committee will compile and rank small bridge projects in priority order according to the Technical Ranking System (TRS). The TRS formula considers factors such as the structural condition, average daily traffic, detour length, safety features, construction cost and the bridge's load capacity; providing a single point total number for each candidate bridge project. Higher point totals signify a higher priority.

For candidate large bridges (deck area of 30,000 square feet or greater), the Local Bridge Selection Review Committee will review the applications and prioritize the projects based upon the bridge's service to the state and local economy.

Information on District Level Highway Preservation and Bridge Preservation and Replacement Projects

DISTRICT LEVEL HIGHWAY PRESERVATION. Nine highways in District 5 serve a predominantly local function and are classified in the Oregon Highway Plan as District Level Highways. Eight of those District level highways are within Lane County. With the exception of the Springfield Highway (Pioneer Parkway) and the "Old" McKenzie Highway, the surface condition of the district level highways in the Lane County area is generally rated Fair or Poor. Only 43% of the District Level Highways in the Lane County area are in "Fair or Better" condition. This rating is comparable to the other districts in Region 2. The majority of "Fair" rated District Level highways in District 5 are expected to fall into the Poor category within the next 6 years. No District Level highways in the area are programmed for preservation in the current STIP cycle. Given current ODOT program resource levels it is unlikely that any significant improvements will be possible to address their poor surface condition.

The attached table titled "District Level Highway Preservation Project Ranking for HB 2142" represents segmentation and prioritization of those highways for consideration as potential HB 2142 Preservation Projects. Potential project limits were determined based on Pavement Management System rating factors, traditional project limits, as well as local safety and operational considerations. The top 5 potential projects are numbered on the table.

These priorities were developed locally by District 5 in consultation with transportation staff of Lane County, Springfield and Eugene. Since all but two of the area's District level highways have comparable surface conditions highway usage (Average Daily Trips-ADT) and unit preservation cost were weighted heavily in selecting the top candidates. HB 2142 allows for weighting of other criteria in project selection for opportunities such as leveraging of state funds with local participation or potential inter-jurisdictional transfers. To-date, no such opportunities have been identified or discussed in any depth.

BRIDGE PRESERVATION AND REPLACEMENT. The attached list of bridges titled "District 5, Region 2 Bridges List for HB 2142 Projects" is a sub-set of a statewide list of bridges being considered for replacement with funding from HB 2142. The table has been edited and includes only bridges in the Lane County area. Several Bridge Maintenance System rating factors were removed from this version of the table in order to reduce the size for ease in presentation. The bridges being considered statewide were selected based on the following criteria:

- Bridges that are deficient and currently weight restricted.
- Bridges that have temporary repairs and are weight restricted.
- Bridges that will become weight restricted in the near future.

Also Attached is a table listing the bridges in the Lane County area which are currently programmed for construction as part of the 2002-2005 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (02-05 STIP).

DISTRICT 5, REGION 2

District Level Highway Preservation Project Ranking for HB 2142

	NAME	ROUTE	START MP	END MP	TOTAL MILES	PAVING COND	COMMENTS (Approximate ADT)	ESTIMATED COST/MILE
1	Springfield-Creswell Hwy	Parkway	5.29	8.0	2.71	Fair	Jasper to Willamette Hwy, Rte 58 (4800)	Moderate
2	Springfield-Creswell Hwy	Cloverdale	11.63	14.88	3.25	Poor	Hendricks Rd to Creswell & I-5 (3500)	Moderate
3	Goshen-Divide Hwy	OR 99	0.00	14.76	14.76	Fair	Goshen to Cottage Grove (6000)	Moderate
4	Springfield-Creswell Hwy	42d St - Jasper Rd	1.38	5.13	3.75	Poor	Springfield City Limits to Jasper (6500)	Mod-High
5	Territorial Hwy	N/A	0.0	18.7	18.7	Poor	Monroe to Elmira (1600)	Mod-High
	Territorial Hwy	N/A	20.75	42.08	21.39	Poor	Veneta to Douglas Co. Line (1700)	High
	Mapleton-Jct. City Hwy	OR 36	46.55	51.59	5.04	Fair	Hall Rd to Pacific Highway Rte 99 (2000)	Moderate
	McVay Hwy	Franklin Blvd	0.01	2.53	2.52	Fair	Glenwood to 30 th Ave & I-5 (13,000); Probable urban standards needed.	Mod-High
	Springfield-Creswell Hwy	42d St - Jasper Rd	0.0	0.8	0.8	Poor	McKenzie Hwy, Rte 126B to Jasper Rd (6500); Urban Standards needed.	High
	Springfield-Creswell Hwy	42d St - Jasper Rd	0.8	1.38	1.27	Poor	42d St to City Limits (6500); Urban Standard needed.	High
	Mapleton-Jct. City Hwy	OR 36	8.39	46.55	38.16	Poor	Swiss Home to Hall Rd (900)	Mod-High
	Goshen-Divide Hwy	OR 99	14.76	20.05	5.29	Fair	Cottage Grove to Pacific Hwy, I-5 (2000)	Moderate
	Crescent Lake Hwy	FH 243	0	2.39	2.39	Poor	Jct Rte 58 to Crescent Lake in Klamath County/Deschutes National Forest (300)	Low

DISTRICT 5, REGION 2 BRIDGE LIST FOR HB2142 PROJECTS

Highway	Milepoint	Bridge Number	Bridge Name	Characteristics		ADT	% Trucks	Material	Condition Information			Replacement Costs			
				Year Built	Design Load				Substruct Condition	Superstruct Condition	Sufficiency Rating	Sufficiency Status	Replacement Width (meters)	Replacement Length (meters)	Estimated Replacement Cost
MP	#	NAME	Yr	Design	ADT	%	Material	Rating	Rating	Rating	Status	Width	New Length	Cost	
I-5	174.41	07830	OP - SB	1956	HS20	11,300	22	Concrete	7	7	42.3	Obsolete	14.0	39.6	1,663,200
I-5	175.40	07829	Row - SB	1956	HS20	15,950	22	Concrete	8	3	9.0	Deficient	14.0	113.3	4,758,600
I-5	175.60	07871A	Row - NB	1961	HS20	15,950	22	Concrete	7	7	49.3	Not Def.	14.0	67.1	2,818,200
I-5	179.64	07756	NB	1956	HS20	15,950	22	Concrete	7	6	32.3	Deficient	14.0	37.4	1,570,800
I-5	179.99	07745	SB	1956	HS20	15,950	22	Prestress	7	3	9.0	Deficient	14.0	188.1	7,900,200
Rte 58	001.96	05285A	Willamette	1955	HS20	11,600	33	Concrete	7	5	61.3	Not Def.	14.0	40.7	1,709,400
Rte 58	002.46	05286	Willamette	1950	HS20	11,200	33	Steel	7	5	53.3	Deficient	14.0	146.3	6,144,600
Rte 58	002.71	05287B	C. Fork	1957	HS20	11,300	33	Concrete	4	7	62.9	Deficient	18.0	35.2	1,900,800
Rte 58	008.08	07110	SPRR	1949	H 15	7,100	33	Concrete	6	5	47.3	Not Def.	14.0	124.3	5,220,600
Rte 58	030.76	03994A	Decep Cr	1953	HS15	5,300	33	Concrete	8	8	59.3	Obsolete	14.0	30.8	1,293,600
Rte 58	055.98	07188	Viaduct	1939	H 15	3,700	33	Concrete	6	6	53.2	Obsolete	14.0	75.9	3,187,800
Rte 58	056.23	07185	Viaduct	1939	H 15	3,700	33	Concrete	7	7	65.7	Obsolete	14.0	83.6	3,511,200
Rte 58	056.29	07186	Viaduct	1939	H 15	3,700	33	Concrete	6	4	39.0	Deficient	14.0	41.8	1,755,600
Rte 58	056.32	07187	Viaduct	1939	H 15	3,700	33	Concrete	5	4	39.0	Deficient	14.0	58.3	2,448,600
Rte 58	067.95	01826	Odell Cr	1933	H 15	3,600	33	Steel	7	7	86.0	Not Def.	14.0	31.9	1,339,800
Rte 126	005.00	09208	5th St	1964	H 20	52,100	6	Prestress	8	8	73.2	Not Def.	22.0	50.6	3,339,600
Rte 126	006.71	09066E	28th St	1965	H 20	20,600	6	Prestress	8	7	80.6	Not Def.	14.0	81.4	3,418,800
Rte 126	006.71	09066W	WB 28th	1965	H 20	20,600	6	Prestress	8	8	80.6	Not Def.	14.0	83.6	3,511,200

2002-05 STIP -- Lane County Area State Bridge Projects

8/6/01

CN/YR KEY	SECTION	HWY/NAME	ROUTE	MP	PE% COST	RW% COST	CN% COST	DESCRIPTION
2002 09302	WILLAMETTE RIVER & O'XING HWY 15 & SPRR BR #08329	PACIFIC	I-5	192.52	\$ 157,000	\$ -	\$ 1,759,000	SEISMIC RETROFIT FOR EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS
2002 10592	NB O'XING GAME FARM RD (EUGENE) BR #08182N	PACIFIC	I-5	195.75	\$ 37,000	\$ -	\$ 406,000	SEISMIC RETROFIT COLUMNS FOR EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS
2002 11794	CAPE CREEK TUNNEL (NORTH PORTAL)	OREGON COAST	US-101	178.42	\$ 105,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 1,088,000	INSTALL TUNNEL LINER IN UNLINED PORTION (#03961)
2003 10606	WILLAMETTE R (SPRINGFIELD) BRIDGES #8051 & #1223	MCKENZIE	OR-126	1.25	\$ 231,000	\$ -	\$ 2,550,000	BRIDGE OVERLAY & RAIL RETROFIT
2003 10618	BOB CREEK BRIDGE #01177	OREGON COAST	US-101	169.6	\$ 230,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 2,163,000	REPLACE BRIDGE
2003 11790	NB COAST FORK RELIEF OPENING STALDER SLOUGH	PACIFIC	I-5	179.64	\$ 64,000	\$ -	\$ 700,000	DECK REPAIR AND OVERLAY (BRIDGE #07756)
2004 09317	SALT CR TUNNEL (#02539)	WILLAMETTE SPRINGFIELD-CRESWELL	OR-88	56.1	\$ 488,000	\$ -	\$ 2,250,000	TUNNEL IMPROVEMENTS
2004 10607	WILLAMETTE RIVER (JASPER) BRIDGE #04117A	Parkway		5.2	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ 454,000	BRIDGE OVERLAY & BRIDGE RAIL IMPROVEMENT
2005 12131	ROCK CREEK BRIDGE #01176	OREGON COAST	US-101	174.4	\$ 375,000	\$ -	\$ 2,499,000	CATHODIC PROTECTION TO REPAIR DAMAGE FROM CORROSION
2005 07028	LONDON ROAD U'XING BRIDGE #07860	PACIFIC	I-5	172.24	\$ 219,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 2,563,000	RAISE BRIDGE, REPAIR STEEL BEAM
2005 11700	SIUSLAW RIVER & O'XING RIVERVIEW AVENUE BRIDGE	FLORENCE-EUGENE	OR-126	14.48	\$ 49,000	\$ -	\$ 557,000	SEISMIC RETROFIT (EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS) BRIDGE #02049A
2005 11791	N FORK SIUSLAW RIVER BRIDGE #01183A	FLORENCE-EUGENE	OR-126	1.17	\$ 570,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 5,690,000	REPLACE BRIDGE

ATTACHMENT 3

STANDARD LOCAL BRIDGE HBRR ALLOCATION FORMULA

Count	Owner	Region	Bridge Number	Name	Total Score	Hist Sign	Suff PTS	Suff Rate	Cost Factor	Str Length	Deck Width	Est. Cost	Replacement Cost	ADT	Load Capacity	Oper /rate	Suff Status	FA System	Accumulated Total
					if	PTS	PTS	PTS	PTS	(Feet)	(Feet)	(Feet)	Cost		PTS	Metric			
59	Linn	2	12853	Calapoola River	54.3	5	49.3	38.4	0	121	16.7	\$637,602	50	5	29.4	StrDef	OFF	\$637,602	
10	Yamhill	2	11503	Baker Creek	70.1	4	55.4	30.7	4.7	40	16.1	\$198,528	300	10	12.2	StrDef	OFF	\$836,130	
06	Washington	1	671404	Scoggins Creek	76.2	4	66.2	17.2	0	77	22.6	\$1,006,740	300	10	11.4	StrDef	ON	\$1,842,870	
05	Wasco	4	65C75	Union Pacific	78.6	4	66.8	16.7	0	90	15.7	\$446,688	84	10	16.3	StrDef	OFF	\$2,289,558	
51	Wallowa	4	63C129	Big Sheep Creek	66.2	5	46.2	42.2	0	36	18	\$203,040	5	10	17.1	StrDef	OFF	\$2,482,598	
21	Wallowa	5	063C17	Trout Creek	63.8	5	53.8	32.7	0	33	19.7	\$284,256	159	10	14.7	FunObs	ON	\$2,776,854	
12	Wallowa	5	63C019	Wallowa River	68.4	5	58.4	27	0	60	16.4	\$297,792	42	10	14.7	StrDef	OFF	\$3,074,646	
57	Umatilla	5	59C421	Dry Creek	54.6	5	44.6	42.7	0	42	18.7	\$363,216	5	10	7.3	StrDef	OFF	\$3,437,862	
53	Umatilla	5	59C603	West Fork	55.8	5	45.8	42.7	0	25	24	\$221,088	30	10	16.3	NotDef	OFF	\$3,668,950	
40	Umatilla	5	59C401	Wildhorse Creek	59.5	5	49.6	38	0	26	19.7	\$228,984	30	10	11.4	StrDef	OFF	\$3,887,934	
37	Umatilla	5	59C727	Umatilla River	61.8	5	56.8	37.6	0	104	22.6	\$900,144	268	10	15.5	StrDef	ON	\$4,789,078	
25	Tillamook	2	57C26	Tillamook Rv	69.6	5	59.6	29	0	102	24	\$884,352	650	5	24.5	StrDef	ON	\$5,672,430	
39	Polk	2	53C113	Willamette River	60.4	5	50.4	37	0	180	21	\$1,563,408	100	10	4.1	StrDef	OFF	\$7,235,638	
35	Polk	2	53C089	W Fork Salt Creek	82.7	5	72.7	9.1	0	36	24.3	\$270,720	50	10	4.1	StrDef	OFF	\$7,506,558	
02	Polk	2	53C136	Clayton Creek	82.7	5	72.7	9.1	0	28	12.1	\$139,872	50	10	8.2	StrDef	OFF	\$7,646,430	
13	OTHER	2	18745	Eugene Water Board	88.2	5	78.2	27.3	0	77	17.1	\$407,490	20	10	4.1	StrDef	OFF	\$8,053,920	
03	OTHER	2	43C36	One Horse Slough	81.4	5	71.4	10.7	0	45	16.7	\$394,600	50	10	3.3	StrDef	OFF	\$8,448,720	
01	OTHER	2	41C28	Canal Creek	88.4	5	78.4	2	0	78	12.1	\$388,032	50	10	14.7	StrDef	OFF	\$8,836,752	
42	Marion	2	05381	Abiqua Creek	58.9	1	48.9	38.9	0	146	15.1	\$726,432	230	10	13.9	FunObs	OFF	\$9,563,184	
50	Malheur	5	45C611	Owyhee River	56.3	1	46.3	42.1	0	280	16.4	\$236,880	66	10	13.1	NotDef	OFF	\$10,952,880	
47	Malheur	5	45R10	Low Lift Canal	57.8	5	47.8	40.2	0	27	24.9	\$221,088	205	5	20.4	StrDef	ON	\$11,189,760	
44	Malheur	5	45C121	Bully Cr Canal	58.6	5	52.2	34.7	1.4	25	33.1	\$365,190	800	10	16.3	StrDef	ON	\$11,410,848	
19	Malheur	5	45C220	Owyhee Canal	65.1	5	48.8	39	6.3	34	27.9	\$397,056	44	10	8.2	StrDef	OFF	\$11,776,038	
04	Malheur	5	45C609	Cow Creek	77.2	1	67.2	16	0	80	14.1	\$397,056	44	10	16.3	FunObs	OFF	\$12,173,094	
27	Linn	2	12948	Thomas Creek	61.4	1	51.4	35.8	0	153	20.3	\$1,326,528	310	10	11.4	StrDef	OFF	\$13,499,822	
17	Linn	2	12569	Calapoola River	66.5	5	56.5	29.4	0	135	18.4	\$1,176,504	65	10	8.2	StrDef	OFF	\$14,876,128	
43	Lane	2	39C409	Coyote Creek	58.7	1	48.7	39.1	0	105	15.4	\$523,392	150	10	13.9	StrDef	OFF	\$15,199,518	
38	Lane	3	39C176	Mohawk R. Covered	59.7	1	49.7	37.9	0	137	17.1	\$723,894	130	10	14.7	StrDef	OFF	\$15,823,412	
18	Lane	2	014721	Unity Covered	66.2	4	56.2	29.7	0	162	20.3	\$1,405,488	160	10	8.2	StrDef	OFF	\$17,328,900	
16	Lane	2	39C643	Parvin	67.6	4	57.6	28	0	132	14.1	\$654,240	290	10	13.9	StrDef	OFF	\$17,983,140	
15	Lane	2	39C241	Mosby Creek	67.8	1	57.8	27.7	0	135	15.1	\$672,288	260	10	13.9	FunObs	OFF	\$18,855,428	
11	Lane	2	39C174	Mill Cr Covered	69.0	4	59.0	26.2	0	85	18	\$742,224	350	10	13.1	StrDef	OFF	\$19,397,652	
08	Lane	2	39C446	Wildcat Cr Covered	73.0	1	63.0	21.3	0	161	15.1	\$798,624	90	10	40.8	StrDef	OFF	\$20,196,276	
33	Josephine	3	144005	Grave Creek	60.6	5	60.6	24.2	0	110	26.6	\$955,416	110	0	15.5	FunObs	OFF	\$21,151,692	
26	Josephine	3	122005	Coyote Creek	63.6	5	62.0	35	1.6	30	20	\$260,568	249	10	15.5	FunObs	OFF	\$21,412,260	
23	Jackson	3	29C211	Wimer Covered	61.5	1	51.5	35.6	0	171	18	\$954,288	670	10	5.7	FunObs	ON	\$22,366,548	
52	Harney	5	25A82	Ninemile Slough	55.9	5	45.9	42.6	0	25	28.2	\$221,088	110	10	16.3	StrDef	ON	\$22,587,636	
29	Douglas	3	19C220	South Myrtle Creek	61.0	2	51.0	36.2	0	72	17.1	\$378,726	160	10	15.5	FunObs	OFF	\$22,966,362	
07	Douglas	3	19C018	Little River	75.2	2	65.2	18.5	0	150	17.7	\$837,540	180	10	15.5	FunObs	OFF	\$23,803,902	
54	Deschutes	4	09C35	Tumalo	55.6	5	37.1	53.6	8.5	26	32.2	\$228,984	1,200	10	16.3	NotDef	ON	\$24,032,886	
32	Deschutes	4	17C26	Deschutes	60.6	3	50.6	36.8	0	53	18.7	\$457,968	165	10	8.2	FunObs	OFF	\$24,490,854	
31	Coos	3	11C108	Drain Ditch	60.7	5	50.7	36.6	0	24	24	\$205,296	11	10	13.1	StrDef	OFF	\$24,696,150	
41	Columbia	1	00136	Beaver Creek	59.3	4	49.3	38.4	0	70	22.6	\$607,992	320	10	18	FunObs	ON	\$25,304,142	
34	Columbia	1	00157	Beaver Creek	60.5	4	50.5	36.9	0	70	22.6	\$607,992	320	10	18	FunObs	ON	\$25,912,134	
48	Clackamas	1	06572	Salmon River	57.3	4	47.3	40.9	0	117	16.1	\$582,048	216	10	18	FunObs	OFF	\$26,494,182	