

## **Project Descriptions**

LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

01/13/2013 5:11 PM Page

## Sweet Creek Retaining Wall

MP 1.95 to 2.15

Map Key No 1

Estimated Road Fund Cost \$451,000


**Project Scope:** Remove existing retaining wall and construct a tieback-soldier pile retaining wall

<b>Project Limit</b>	MP 1.95 to 2.15	<b>Road Name</b>	Sweet Creek Road
<b>Functional Class</b>	Minor Collector	<b>Project Status</b>	Adopted
<b>Length</b>	1,050 feet	<b>Project Category</b>	Structures
<b>Funding Status</b>	Externally Funded		

**Existing Roadway Condition**

<b>Avg. Daily Traffic</b>	220 veh/day
<b>Pavement Type</b>	Asphalt Concrete.
<b>PCI</b>	85
<b>Width</b>	25 feet


<b>Crash Rate</b>	0
<b>Sidewalks</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Curbs</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Bike Lanes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Photograph 2 Existing steel HP piles and concrete panels.

**Define the Problem**

Pavement settlement, sunken grade, and movement of the road at the top of the existing 40-year old tieback retaining wall is evident suggesting the tie backs with the anchor blocks have



LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

failed or became loose. Failure of the structure would lead to failure of the road fill and would effectively cut off the area served by Sweet Creek Road. A catastrophic failure would also release fill into the Siuslaw River.

**Proposed Solution**

Remove the existing retaining wall and construct a new tieback soldier-pile wall and relocate closer to the roadway, about five feet away from the river. Piles will socket into shafts in bedrock providing the required structural stability. An opportunity will exist to improve the riverside habitat by planting trees on the 5-foot strip created by relocating the wall. A guardrail will also be installed on the riverside of the road.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Pre-Engineering	\$550	\$550				
Right-of-way Phase	\$50	\$50				
Construction Engineering	\$300	\$300				
Construction	\$3,905	\$3,905				
NEPA Process	\$401	\$401				
Total Cost <sup>a</sup>	\$5,206	\$5,206				

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12 <sup>b</sup>	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund (match, r-o-w)	\$451	\$451				
OFHP Fund <sup>c</sup>	\$4,755	\$4,755				
Reimbursable Road Fund	\$0	\$0				
Total Fund	\$5,206	\$5,206				

**Factors for Project Selection**

Safety Improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered		10

<sup>a</sup> The Oregon Forest Highway Program (OFHP) approved this project for a \$3,905,000 grant. Lane County committed a maximum local match of \$451,000 in kind. The County is performing all work related to the delivery of this project, including Preliminary Engineering (PE), environmental permits, and Construction Engineering (CE). All incurred costs beyond the committed amount are reimbursable and subject to negotiation.

<sup>b</sup> This project was approved for Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 and is in the second year of programming. In FY 2011, PE and environmental studies have been started. Bid and let are expected in this fiscal year.

<sup>c</sup> This project will be bid and administered by Lane County. Construction costs will be reimbursed as incurred by the County. Therefore, the full project cost is shown in the CIP although the majority of funding is grant assistance. Non-road fund expenses are shown as revenue in table 17 to reflect net road fund expenses.

### Schindler Landing Wayside Project

Highway 36 MP 10.5  
Estimated Road Fund Cost \$0



Map Key No. 2

**Project Scope: Construct a new road approach and parking area to serve Schindler Landing**

<b>Project Limit</b>	Hwy 36 MP 10.5	<b>Road Name</b>	Schindler Wayside
<b>Functional Class</b>	Local	<b>Project Status</b>	Proposed
<b>Length/ area</b>	11,400 sq feet	<b>Project Category</b>	General Construction
<b>Funding Status</b>	Externally Funded		

**Existing Roadway Condition**

<b>Avg. Daily Traffic</b>	NA	<b>Crash Rate</b>	0
<b>Pavement Type</b>	Asphalt Concrete	<b>Sidewalks</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>PCI</b>	NA	<b>Curbs</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Width</b>	NA	<b>Bike Lanes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>



LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**Define the Problem**

Schindler Landing Park is located on Highway 36. The park is accessed via an unimproved wayside road. Wayside road operations are under the county road maintenance scope. The site is a popular roadside rest area and boat launch area.

**Proposed Solution**

This project is intended to serve the public travelling along Highway 36. This convenient rest area also provides river access to anglers using the boat launch facility. This project improves the existing access to the park conforming to access management standards and improves the gravel parking area into paved area. Permanent sanitary service and facilities conforming to Americans with Disabilities Act requirements are also provided.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Pre-Engineering	\$15			\$15		
Right-of-way Phase	\$0			\$0		
Construction Engineering	\$15			\$15		
Construction	\$124			\$124		
Total Cost <sup>a</sup>	\$154			\$154		

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund (match, r-o-w)	\$0			\$0		
WFLHD	\$124			\$124		
Reimbursable Road Fund <sup>b</sup>	\$30			\$30		
Total Fund	\$154			\$154		

**Factors for Project Selection**

Safety Improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation <sup>c</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered <sup>d</sup>	6	

<sup>a</sup> The Western Federal Lands Highway Division approved a \$124,000 grant for this project under the Oregon Forest Highway Enhancement Program for federal fiscal year 2015. If the project is ready to go to construction and funds available, the project could be constructed before 2015.

<sup>b</sup> In addition to construction funding, funding for Preliminary Engineering (PE) and Construction Engineering (CE), and contract administration are also approved. PE and CE costs are likely to be reimbursed on an as-incurred basis.

<sup>c</sup> The proposed enhancement is expected to benefit tourists and individuals seeking recreation, including the provision of safety benefits. This project could potentially encourage earlier resting points during a traveler's journey.

<sup>d</sup> Although a low project ranking score, the project is included in the CIP due to the 100% external funding availability. The project does not compete for Road Funds with other candidate projects.

### Deadwood Covered Bridge

MP 0.31 Deadwood Loop Road  
Estimated Road Fund Cost \$25,000

Map Key No. 3

**Project Scope:** Re-roof the covered bridge.

<b>Project Limit:</b>	MP 0.307 to 0.340	<b>Road Name:</b>	Deadwood Loop Road
<b>Functional Class:</b>	Local	<b>Project Status:</b>	Adopted in FY 2011
<b>Length:</b>	0.033	<b>Project Category</b>	Preservation and Rehab.
<b>Funding Status:</b>	Externally Funded		

**Existing Bridge Condition**


<b>Avg. Daily Traffic</b>	260 vehicles/day	<b>Bridge No</b>	39C551
<b>Bridge Type</b>	Covered Bridge	<b>Truck Traffic</b>	10 trucks /day
<b>Sufficiency Rating</b>	64	<b>Load Rating</b>	10 Ton (operating)
<b>Width</b>	18.9 feet	<b>Height</b>	
<b>Span</b>	105 feet		

**Existing Bridge Views**



**Define the Problem**

The roof covering material on Deadwood Creek Covered Bridge is at the end of its useful life



LANS COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

and is in need of replacement. The existing roofing is composed of heavy materials and shows signs of water leaks. Currently, the bridge is posted for a load restriction (Posted Load 10 tons).

**Proposed Solution<sup>a</sup>**

The bridge is proposed for re-roofing to protect the wooden structural members from water exposure. The bridge roof will be dismantled and replaced with #1 fire-treated Class B heavy shakes at 10 inches exposure over an underlayment of "standard # 30 felt" using the American Society for Testing and Materials standards and re-use treated 1 x 4 sheathing.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Pre-Engineering	\$18	\$18				
Right-of-way Phase 1	\$0	\$0				
Construction Engineering	\$27	\$27				
Construction -structure	\$161	\$161				
Consultancy Service	\$0	\$0				
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$206</b>	<b>\$206</b>				

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16
Road Fund-NCHBP match	\$25	\$25				
Road Fund-LHBP match	\$0	\$0				
NCHBP grant <sup>b</sup>	\$181	\$181				
LHBP- grant <sup>c</sup>	\$0	\$0				
Un-funded (Other)	\$4	\$4				
<b>Total Fund</b>	<b>\$206</b>	<b>\$206</b>				

**Factors for Project Selection<sup>d</sup>**

Safety Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered		6

<sup>a</sup> The life of Deadwood Covered Bridge (current Sufficiency Rating of 60) may be extended by preventing further deterioration of structural members. The re-roofing works sheds some dead weight and protects wooden members from moisture.

<sup>b</sup> This project is funded by the 2010 National Historic Covered Bridge Program (NHCBP).

<sup>c</sup> The Deadwood Covered bridge has been on the National Register of Historic Places since 1979.

<sup>d</sup> The selection factors are shown for informational purposes only. Bridge maintenance priority is based on statewide bridge inspection and reporting program recommendations, also known as the National Bridge Inventory System.



### Hyacinth Street Sidewalk Installation

Hyacinth Street MP 0 to MP 0.664  
Estimated Road Fund Cost \$44,000

Map Key No. 4


**Project Scope:** Improve Hyacinth Street to accommodate one sidewalk within the available right-of-way

<b>Project Limit:</b>	MP 0 to 0.664	<b>Road Name:</b>	Hyacinth Street
<b>Functional Class:</b>	Minor Collector	<b>Project Status:</b>	Adopted in FY 10
<b>Length:</b>	3,190 feet	<b>Project Category:</b>	Bike and Ped.
<b>Funding Status:</b>	Underfunded / External		


**Existing Road Condition**

<b>Avg. Daily Traffic</b>	2,000 vehicles./ day	<b>Crash Rate</b>	0
<b>Pedestrian Traffic</b>	About 50 (estimated)	<b>Sidewalks</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>PCI</b>	86	<b>Curbs</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Width</b>	36 feet	<b>Bike Lanes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Right of Way</b>	60 feet	<b>Parking Lanes</b>	On-street parking
<b>Pavement Type</b>	Asphalt Concrete	<b>Lanes</b>	Un-striped

**Location Map and Existing Road Condition**



**Proposed Roadway Section**



Standard Treatment:  
One Foot Bench From  
Back Of Sidewalk, And  
Then Match Existing Ground.

PROPOSED TYPICAL SECTION

- 6-Foot Wide Sidewalk, West Side Only
- Standard Curb And Gutter

**Define the Problem**

Hyacinth Street is a Minor Collector Road serves Irving Elementary School, neighboring communities, and provides a convenient connection between Irvington Road and Irving Road. The road has curbs and gutters but no sidewalks to provide connectivity for walking

LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

and biking school children. The roadway is used for parking on both sides, leaving a narrow roadway shared by bikes, pedestrians, and autos.

**Proposed Solution<sup>a</sup>**

Provide a 6-foot wide sidewalk on the west side (the school side) adjacent to the existing curb and gutter, matching the existing roadway grade and profile. Accommodate bike lanes within the existing roadway width in a separate restriping project.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Pre-Engineering	\$87		\$87			
Right-of-way	\$56		\$56			
Construction Engineering	\$41		\$41			
Utility relocation	\$0		\$0			
Construction <sup>b</sup>	\$344		\$344			
Total Cost	\$528		\$528			

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund-local match <sup>c</sup>	\$44		\$44			
STP-U Funding	\$389		\$389			
School Match	\$0		\$0			
Assessment	\$0		\$0			
Additional Funds Needed <sup>d</sup>	\$95		\$95			
Total Fund	\$528		\$528			

**Factors for Project Selection**

Safety Improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity <sup>e</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support <sup>f</sup>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered		8

<sup>a</sup> Sidewalks, either setback or curbside, are required on both sides of arterial and collector roads in urban areas. This project proposes to retrofit Hyacinth Street with one, one-sided sidewalk. A separate design standard deviation process will need to be initiated.

<sup>b</sup> The construction cost is recently revised to address stormwater management issues. In order to cut costs, the design team is exploring alternative design, including reducing sidewalk length. This option requires the pedestrians to cross Hyacinth Street twice.

<sup>c</sup> The Road Fund cost shown is the required local match for federal funding at 10.27%.

<sup>d</sup> The project is currently underfunded. Additional work on stormwater improvements increased the project cost. Lane County has approval for \$433,000 from the Surface Transportation Program -Urban (STP-U). Staff will seek additional funding from the program.

<sup>e</sup> Sidewalk projects are typically financed through adjacent property assessments. Due to the federal grants involved, it is assumed that adjacent property owners will not be assessed.

<sup>f</sup> Irving Elementary School requested this project in 2006. School staff gathered local residents' support for the project. Previously, Lane County staff worked with the school staff to develop a project and apply for an ODOT Pedestrian or Bicycle improvement grant which was not made available.

### 30th Ave Overlay

MP 0 to MP 2.01

Map Key No. 5


Estimated Road Fund Cost \$246,000

**Project Scope: Overlay roadway section with a 3" thick Asphalt Concrete by mill and fill of travel lanes including ramps**


<b>Project Limit</b>	MP 0 to 2.01	<b>Road Name</b>	30 <sup>th</sup> Ave.
<b>Functional Class</b>	Minor Arterial	<b>Project Status</b>	Adopted
<b>Length</b>	2.01 mile	<b>Project Category</b>	Pavement Pres.
<b>Funding Status</b>	Externally Funded		

**Existing Roadway Condition**

<b>Avg. Daily Traffic</b>	20,000 vehicles./day	<b>Crash Rate</b>	0.1 crash/million veh
<b>Pedestrian Traffic</b>		<b>Shoulders</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>PCI</b>	53	<b>Curbs</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Width</b>	Up to 78 feet	<b>Bike Lanes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Right of Way</b>		<b>Parking Lanes</b>	
<b>Pavement Type</b>	AC	<b>Lanes</b>	4-5 lanes



**Existing Roadway Section**



LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**Define the Problem**

Annual pavement inspection revealed signs of pavement distress. The latest PCI dropped below 60, an indication that a preservation project is overdue. If not addressed soon, the pavement rating may slip below 40 at which point the roadway will have to be reconstructed.

**Proposed Solution**

Considering the high traffic volume and type of vehicles, an overlay of 3 inches of asphalt concrete is proposed. To enhance the roadway safety durable thermoplastic striping is also proposed.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Preliminary Engineering	\$94		\$94			
Right-of-way Phase						
Construction Engineering	\$71		\$71			
Construction <sup>a</sup>	\$1,035		\$1,035			
Utility relocation						
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$1,200</b>		<b>\$1,200</b>			

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund (Local Match)	\$91		\$91			
Road Fund (construction) <sup>b</sup>	\$155		\$155			
Road Fund (PE /CE)	\$165		\$165			
STP-U Fund	\$790		\$790			
<b>Total Fund</b>	<b>\$1,200</b>		<b>\$1,200</b>			

**Factors for Project Selection<sup>c</sup>**

Safety Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity <sup>d</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered	6	

<sup>a</sup> Lane County has approval for \$880,000 in STP-U funds for this project. The County is to provide a 10.27% local match to the grant. The project scope was recently refined to include the 30<sup>th</sup> Ave. ramps. This change in scope has increased the construction cost to \$1.03 million. The remainder of the project cost is proposed from the Road Fund.

<sup>b</sup> To minimize the project construction cost, the design team is exploring alternatives. The project is proposed for a mill-and-fill approach to reduce AC quantities needed for the project.

<sup>c</sup> The selection factors shown here are for informational purposes only. Pavement Overlay projects are prioritized based on the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) rating system, annual pavement inspection and reporting. The PCI provides an estimate about the health of a pavement. A PCI below 70 is a candidate for an overlay.

<sup>d</sup> The project scope does not address bike and pedestrian connectivity needs. The roadway shoulders will be striped with thermoplastic paint to increase visibility.

### Pengra / Wendling Covered Bridge

MP 0.03 Pengra Road, MP 3.535 Wendling Road  
Estimated Road Fund Cost \$42,000

Map Key No. 6 / 8

**Project Scope: Re-roof Pengra and Wendling Covered Bridges and replace deteriorated structural members**

<b>Project Limit:</b>	Bridge area	<b>Road Name:</b>	Pengra and Wendling
<b>Functional Class:</b>	Local	<b>Project Status:</b>	Adopted in FY 2011
<b>Length:</b>	200 feet each	<b>Project Category:</b>	Pres and Rehab
<b>Funding Status:</b>	Un Funded		


**Existing Bridge Condition**

<b>Avg. Daily Traffic</b>	260 vehicles /day	<b>Bridge No</b>	C39004 / 39C174
<b>Bridge Type</b>	Covered Bridge	<b>Truck Traffic</b>	10
<b>Sufficiency Rating</b>	55 / 43	<b>Load Rating</b>	15 Ton / 18 Ton
<b>Width</b>	20 feet / 17 feet	<b>Height</b>	14.5 feet / 12 feet
<b>Span</b>	120 feet / 60 feet		

**Existing Bridge Views (Pengra Covered Bridge)**



**Existing Bridge Views (Wendling Covered Bridge)**



LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**Define the Problem**

Roofing materials on these bridges are heavy and at the end of service life. This project will replace heavy roofing materials to reduce some weight and reduce dead load on the structures.

**Proposed Solution**

Replace the existing roofing material with a lightweight roof, thereby reducing dead load. This strategy will defer costly structural improvements needed for the bridges. The project is unfunded at this time. Re-roofing bridgework is eligible for National Historic Covered Bridge Program (NHCBP)<sup>a</sup> funding.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Pre-Engineering	\$20			\$10	\$10	
Right-of-way						
Construction Engineering	\$20			\$10	\$10	
Construction -structure	\$402			\$201	\$201	
Consultancy Service	\$0			\$0	\$0	
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$442</b>			<b>\$221</b>	<b>\$221</b>	

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund-local match	\$42			\$21	\$21	
NHCBP Funding <sup>b</sup>	\$400			\$200	\$200	
State Aid						
Other						
<b>Total Fund</b>	<b>\$442</b>			<b>\$221</b>	<b>\$221</b>	

**Factors for Project Selection<sup>c</sup>**

Safety Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered	7	

<sup>a</sup> It is assumed that National Historic Covered Bridge Program (NHCBP) funds will be available for repairing one bridge at a time from FY 2014 and 2015, not in any particular order. Lane County regularly applies for NHCBP funds to preserve the historic bridges for minor repairs such as re-roofing. Structural issues may be addressed separately by seeking other eligible funding from external funding sources, namely the Local Highway Bridge Program, as opportunities become available.

<sup>b</sup> The Road Fund cost shown is required local match for federal funding, which is calculated at the required match rate, of up to 20%. The project costs shown are tentative and based on similar projects completed in the past. The cost will be updated when scope and funding details become available.

<sup>c</sup> Project selection factors are shown for informational purposes only. These projects are prioritized based on maintenance recommendations prepared by the bridge inspectors. These bridges have been recommended for rehabilitation in the recent bridge inspection report.

## Goodpasture Covered Bridge

Goodpasture Road MP 0.02  
Estimated Road Fund Cost \$206,000

Map Key No. 7


**Project Scope: Structural repair / rehabilitation of bridge members of Goodpasture Covered Bridge**

<b>Project Limit:</b>	MP 0.013 to 0.058	<b>Road Name:</b>	Goodpasture Road
<b>Functional Class:</b>	Minor Collector	<b>Project Status:</b>	Proposed
<b>Length:</b>	0.045	<b>Project Category:</b>	Pres and Rehab
<b>Funding Status:</b>	Externally Funded		

**Existing Bridge Condition**


<b>ADT</b>	1,000	<b>Bridge No</b>	39C118
<b>Bridge Type</b>	Covered Bridge	<b>Truck Traffic</b>	100
<b>Sufficiency Rating</b>	20	<b>Load Rating</b>	15 Ton
<b>Width</b>	19 feet	<b>Height</b>	15.25 feet
<b>Span</b>	240 feet		

**Location / Vicinity Map**



**Define the Problem**

The bridge is a 71-year old timber structure having a 240-foot long span. The extensive span together with decaying bridge members, and heavy roof dead load have resulted in a poor



LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

bridge rating. Previous repairs using steel tie rods and glulams have added significant weight to the bridge. As a result, the bridge is progressively sagging at the mid span. The current bridge sufficiency rating is 20. The bridge was recently load rated at 15 tons after discovering pockets of rot and cracking in the bottom chord. The Goodpasture Covered Bridge is an irreplaceable historic monument<sup>a</sup>.

**Proposed Solution**

The bridge trusses can be raised by the use of temporary steel trusses supported on the main span piers in conjunction with replacing decaying structural members and post-tensioning of bottom chords. The bridge roof has been recently replaced with light roof materials to address the sagging issue<sup>b</sup>. Floor beams and other primary structural members are also proposed for replacement. The bridge sidings will need to be changed to conform to the new profile<sup>c</sup>.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Pre-Engineering	\$100		\$100			
Pre-Eng Consultant	\$309		\$309			
Right-of-way	\$10		\$10			
Construction Engineering	\$272		\$272			
Construction -structure	\$850		\$850			
Protection Works	\$205		\$205			
Contingencies	\$256		\$256			
Total Cost	\$2,002		\$2,002			

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund-NHCBP /HBP <sup>d</sup>	\$206		\$206			
HBP Fund	\$1,796		\$1,796			
NCHBP Fund						
Total Fund	\$2,002		\$2,002			

**Factors for Project Selection**

Safety Improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered		9

<sup>a</sup> Although the project cost of the rehabilitation project is comparable to a new bridge replacement cost, the rehabilitation decision is reached due to its historic significance and based on public input.

<sup>b</sup> The project was originally programmed for re-roofing under a 2008 National Historic Covered Bridge Program grant for FY 2011. The bridge's key structural members were showing signs of deterioration requiring replacement of the members. Staff sought the Local Highway Bridge Program funds for addressing the structural issues in addition to the NHCBP funds.

<sup>c</sup> There will be no change in horizontal roadway alignment but a slight change in vertical alignment, vertical clearances, and lane width. Staff will seek a design exception for these changes.

<sup>d</sup> This CIP shows the local match at 10.27% for NHCBP and LHBP funds. The project will be bid and administered by ODOT.



LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**Winberry Creek Road Overlay**

MP 0 to MP 4.42

Map Key No. 9


Estimated Road Fund Cost \$0

**Project Scope: Overlay roadway section with a 1.5" thick Asphalt Concrete**


<b>Project Limit:</b>	MP 0 to 4.42	<b>Road Name:</b>	Winberry Ck Road
<b>Functional Class:</b>	Minor Collector	<b>Project Status:</b>	Proposed
<b>Length:</b>	4.42 mile	<b>Project Category:</b>	Pavement Pres.
<b>Funding Status:</b>	Externally Funded	<b>Project Number:</b>	

**Existing Roadway Condition**

<b>Avg. Daily Traffic</b>	300	<b>Crash Rate</b>	0
<b>Pedestrian Traffic</b>		<b>Sidewalks</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>PCI</b>	81	<b>Curbs</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Width</b>	22-26 feet	<b>Bike Lanes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Right of Way</b>	40 feet	<b>Parking Lanes</b>	
<b>Pavement Type</b>	AC	<b>Lanes</b>	2



**Project Location**



LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**Define the Problem**

This road serves mostly national forest lands, and is the primary access road to resource lands east of Place Road and access to Fall Creek recreational area. Winberry Creek Road, as a Forest Highway, is used by logging trucks. The existing Pavement Condition Index (PCI) indicates it is time to resurface with a new asphalt concrete overlay.

**Proposed Solution**

The project proposes to keep the existing asphalt concrete surface in repair. The proposed 1.5 inch-thick overlay will provide a new roadway surface as well as structural load carrying capacity for logging trucks. The remaining section of Winberry Creek Road where truck traffic is lower is proposed for a chip seal.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)<sup>a</sup>**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Preliminary Engineering	\$10	\$10				
Right-of-way Phase						
Construction Engineering						
Construction <sup>b</sup>	\$470	\$470				
Utility relocation						
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$480</b>	<b>\$480</b>				

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund <sup>c</sup>	\$0	\$0				
WFLHD Fund	\$480	\$480				
Unsecured Funds						
Other						
<b>Total Fund</b>	<b>\$480</b>	<b>\$480</b>				

**Factors for Project Selection<sup>d</sup>**

Safety Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support <sup>e</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered		6

<sup>a</sup> This project is funded through the Federal Highway Administration, Western Federal Lands Highway Division (WFLHD). County roads inside or near national forests are eligible for Oregon Forest Highway program grants.

<sup>b</sup> Lane County is administering the project in combination with another WFLHD funded Forest Highway overlay project, the Row River Road Overlay project.

<sup>c</sup> This project does not involve any Road Funds towards construction costs.

<sup>d</sup> The selection factors shown here are for informational purposes only. Pavement Overlay project prioritization is based on the PCI rating system, annual pavement inspection, and reporting. The PCI provides an estimate about the health of a pavement. Pavements with a PCI below 70 are candidates for an overlay.

## Layng Covered Bridge

MP 0.033

Map Key No. 10

Estimated Road Fund Cost \$122,000


**Project Scope:** Rehabilitate the covered bridge by replacing failed members and replace roof

<b>Project Limit:</b>	MP 0.202 to 0.235	<b>Road Name:</b>	Layng Road
<b>Functional Class:</b>	Local	<b>Project Status:</b>	Adopted in FY11
<b>Length:</b>	0.033	<b>Project Category:</b>	Pres and Rehab
<b>Funding Status:</b>	Externally Funded		

**Existing Bridge Condition**


<b>Avg. Daily Traffic:</b>	260 vehicles./day	<b>Bridge No.:</b>	39C241
<b>Bridge Type:</b>	Covered Bridge	<b>Truck Traffic:</b>	10
<b>Sufficiency Rating:</b>	25.9	<b>Load Rating:</b>	8 Ton (operating)
<b>Width:</b>	15.1 feet	<b>Height:</b>	12 feet 4 inches
<b>Span:</b>	135 feet		

**Existing Bridge Views**



**Define the Problem**

This bridge is in a deteriorated condition due to traffic, weathering, vandalism, and pests. Key



bridge members such as trusses, stringers, and floor beams are in a state of decay, and are

LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

affecting its load carrying capacity. Currently, the bridge is posted for a load restriction (Posted Load 8 tons).

**Proposed Solution<sup>a</sup>**

The state of structural members' decay requires a new bridge. However, considering the historic importance of the covered bridge, it may merit restoration by replacing only the members that have decayed or damaged. Decayed stringers, floor beam, and decking may also need replacement. The bridge will be dismantled during restoration, and rebuilt completely with sound structural members. The bridge roof will also be removed and replaced with a more lightweight roof.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Pre-Engineering	\$127			\$127		
Right-of-way Phase 1	\$10			\$10		
Construction Engineering	\$181			\$181		
Construction -structure	\$754			\$754		
Consultancy Service	\$115			\$115		
Total Cost	\$1,187			\$1,187		

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund-NCHBP match	\$103			\$103		
Road Fund-LHBP match	\$19			\$19		
NCHBP grant <sup>b</sup>	\$897			\$897		
LHBP- grant <sup>c</sup>	\$168			\$168		
Total Fund	\$1,187			\$1,187		

**Factors for Project Selection<sup>d</sup>**

Safety Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered	9	

<sup>a</sup> The Layng Covered Bridge is a candidate for rehabilitation/replacement owing to its poor structural condition rating and low overall bridge sufficiency rating (SR). Bridges with an SR below 50 are generally replaced with a new structure.

<sup>b</sup> This project is funded from the 2010 National Historic Covered Bridge Program (NHCBP).

<sup>c</sup> The project is also approved by the ODOT Local Agency Bridge Selection Committee for an additional \$168,000 from the Local Highway Bridge Program (LHBP) for Fiscal Year 2014/15. The additional funding is contingent on reauthorization of the federal transportation bill. The Oregon Transportation Commission is anticipated to adopt this project in the State Transportation Improvement Program.

<sup>d</sup> The selection factors are shown for informational purposes only. Bridge projects are typically not ranked, as are other project types. Bridge maintenance priority is based on the statewide bridge inspection and reporting program, also known as National Bridge Inventory System, recommendations.

### Row River Road Overlay

MP 12.0 to MP 13.31  
Estimated Road Fund Cost \$0


Map key No. 11

**Project Scope: Overlay roadway section with a 1.5" thick Asphalt Concrete**

<b>Project Limit</b>	MP 12-13.31	<b>Road Name</b>	Row River Road
<b>Functional Class</b>	Minor Collector	<b>Project Status</b>	Proposed
<b>Length</b>	1.31 mile	<b>Project Category</b>	Pavement Pres.
<b>Funding Status</b>	Externally Funded		

**Existing Roadway Condition**


<b>Avg. Daily Traffic</b>	1,400 vehicles /day	<b>Crash Rate</b>	0
<b>Pedestrian Traffic</b>		<b>Sidewalks</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>PCI</b>	62	<b>Curbs</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Width</b>	30 feet	<b>Bike Lanes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Right of Way</b>	50 feet	<b>Shoulders</b>	Yes
<b>Pavement Type</b>	AC	<b>Lanes</b>	2



**Define the Problem**

Row River Road as a Forest Highway experiences a high volume of logging trucks. To keep

**Project Location**



LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

the road in repair, frequent overlays are needed. The existing PCI is an indication that the roadway is in distress. This road serves as the primary access to Dorena Reservoir as well as resource lands beyond.

**Proposed Solution**

The project proposes to add a 1.5 inch-thick layer of asphalt concrete to preserve the roadway. The proposed 1.5 inch overlay will provide a new roadway surface as well as structural load carrying capacity for anticipated logging trucks.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)<sup>a</sup>**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Preliminary Engineering						
Right-of-way Phase						
Construction Engineering						
Construction <sup>b</sup>	\$205	\$205				
Utility relocation						
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$205</b>	<b>\$205</b>				

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund <sup>c</sup>	\$0	\$0				
WFLHD Fund	\$205	\$205				
Unsecured Funds						
Other						
<b>Total Fund</b>	<b>\$205</b>	<b>\$205</b>				

**Factors for Project Selection<sup>d</sup>**

Safety Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered		6

<sup>a</sup> This project is funded through a Federal Highway Administration, Western Federal Lands Highway Division (WFLHD) grant. County roads inside or near national forests are eligible for Oregon Forest Highway program grants.

<sup>b</sup> Lane County is administering this project together with another forest highway AC project funded under a \$685,000 WFLHD grant (The 4.2-mile Winberry Road Overlay project cost is estimated at \$470,000).

<sup>c</sup> This project does not involve any Road Funds towards construction costs. The amount shown is the anticipated County contribution in kind for preliminary engineering or construction engineering costs for completion of the project.

<sup>d</sup> The selection factors shown here are for informational purposes only. Overlays and pavement rehabilitation projects are typically ranked as are other general construction types of projects for funding priority. Pavement Overlay project priority is based on the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) rating system, annual pavement inspection, and reporting. A PCI below 70 is a candidate for an overlay.

### Traffic Signals Upgrade in Metro Area

**Various Intersections**

**Map Page No. 2**

**Estimated Road Fund Cost \$22,500**


**Project Scope: Upgrade Traffic Signals and accessories in the Metro area**

<b>Project Limit:</b>	Lane MPO Area	<b>Road Name:</b>	Var. County Roads
<b>Functional Class:</b>	Collectors/Arterials	<b>Project Status:</b>	Adopted in FY11
<b>Length:</b>	NA	<b>Project Category:</b>	Safety Improvement
<b>Funding Status:</b>	Externally Funded		

**Existing Roadway Condition**


<b>Avg. Daily Traffic</b>	NA	<b>Crash Rate</b>	Various
<b>Pavement Type</b>	Asphalt Concrete	<b>Sidewalks</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>PCI</b>	NA	<b>Curbs</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Width</b>	Various	<b>Bike Lanes</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Location / Vicinity Map**



**Define the Problem**

Lane County currently operates 24 traffic signals inside the Eugene-Springfield Metro area, mostly in River Road / Santa Clara. These signals were installed at different times; some signals were installed 20 years ago. The signals have outdated road name signs, hardware,



**Outdated / Damaged Hardware**

LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

and accessories.

**Proposed Solution**

The proposal includes replacing outdated hardware and non-functional components with industry standard units. The improvement needs vary from intersection to intersection. Some intersections will merely require replacing road signs while others require hardware updates. With the proposed new interface software and repair of existing cable interconnections, the project will enable coordination of most of city and county signals in the River Road area.

**Project Cost (\$,000s)**

PROJECT ELEMENT	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Pre-Engineering	\$32	\$32				
Right-of-way	0	0				
Construction Engineering	\$10	\$10				
Construction	\$20.5	\$20.5				
Software	\$25	\$25				
Hardware <sup>a</sup>	\$131	\$131				
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$218.5</b>	<b>\$218.5</b>				

**Funding Source (\$,000s)**

FUND SOURCE	TOTAL	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16
Road Fund <sup>b</sup>	\$22.5	\$22.5				
STP-U <sup>c</sup>	\$196	\$196				
ARRA	0	0				
State Aid	0	0				
Federal Aid	0	0				
<b>Total Fund</b>	<b>\$218.5</b>	<b>\$218.5</b>				

**Factors for Project Selection**

Safety Improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Plan Consistency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Structural Capacity Enhancement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Congestion Improvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Supports Tourism, Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provides Bike /Ped Connectivity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preserves Bridge / Pavement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leverages Other Projects/Funds	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Has Public Requests / Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Degree of Users Benefit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Total Factors Considered	9	

<sup>a</sup> The project area extends to 15 intersections controlled by Lane County within the Eugene-Springfield Metro boundary. The scope includes updating outdated or damaged hardware at most of the 15 identified intersections.

<sup>b</sup> The Road Fund amount shown is the required local match of 10.27% for Surface Transportation Program – Urban (STP-U) funds. This amount is shown in the CIP.

<sup>c</sup> This project is programmed with STP-U funds for federal fiscal year 2010.



## **Appendix A**

### **Past CIP Project Status**

EXHIBIT A  
Page 64 of 70  
LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

*intentional blank page*

EXHIBIT A  
Page 65 of 70  
LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**Table 19: Project History and Status**

Project	CIP Schedule FY	Const Start <sup>i</sup>	CIP Amount	Contract Authorized Amount	Completed Year	Status	Final Cost (Year To Date)			Remarks
							Road Fund	Other Source	Total	
<b>Structures</b>										
Brice Creek mp 3.31	2009	NA	\$183,936	NA	NA	Deleted	NA	NA	NA	
Clear Lake Road	2005	2005	\$400,000		2006		\$744,266		\$744,266	100% complete
Coyate Covered Bridge	2006	2006	\$200,000	\$316,209	2007	complete	\$305,240		\$305,240	
Dorena Covered Bridge	2006		\$100,000				\$115,791		\$115,791	
Fir Butte Road, mp 0.68 (HBRR)	2006	NA	NA	NA	NA	deleted				
London Road, mp 11.25 (OTIA III)			\$225,000							
London Road, mp 13.01 (OTIA III)	2007	2007	\$1,500,000	\$1,939,549	2009	complete		\$1,977,451	\$1,977,451	
London Road, mp 8.73 (OTIA III)			\$252,000							
Lowell Covered Bridge	2005	2006	\$2,200,000		2006	complete	\$493,368	\$1,700,000	\$2,193,368	FHEP,STP funds
Maxwell Road, mp 1.29 (repair)	2006	NA	\$50,000							Bid cancelled
Parvin Covered Bridge	2008		\$83,290							Went to bid
Row River Bridge, mp 16.64 (OTIA III)	2005	2006	\$799,000	\$1,430,832	2008	completed		\$1,745,853	\$1,745,853	
Sharps Creek Road, mp 6.48 (OTIA III)	2005	2006	\$606,000	\$931,086	2008	completed		\$872,732	\$872,732	
Sharps Creek Road, mp 8.72 (HBRR)	2007	NA			2008	cancelled			\$0	
<b>General Construction</b>										
42nd Street, Phase 2				\$1,581,064			\$1,546,460		\$1,546,460	
Bernhardt Height Road	2004	2006	\$385,000	\$708,785	2008	completed	\$829,863		\$829,863	
Bob Straub Parkway, Environmental mitigation	2007		\$385,000	NA	NA	delete				Project bundled with WMD projects
Bob Straub Parkway, S 57th to Jasper Rd	2006	2007	\$5,700,000	\$5,810,045	2008	Complete	\$5,667,017		\$5,667,017	100% complete
Bolton Hill Road, Territorial to Dogwood Ln	2006	2008	\$1,750,000	\$1,650,565	2009	complete	\$1,387,729	\$235,736	\$1,623,465	100% complete
Briggs Hill Road, mp 2.5 to mp 4.01	2005	NA	NA	NA	NA	deleted	NA	NA	NA	Reduced scope to AC

<sup>ii</sup> Actual construction start year

EXHIBIT A  
Page 66 of 70

LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project	CIP Schedule FY	Const. Start	CIP Amount	Contract Authorized Amount	Completed Year	Status	Final Cost (Year To Date)			Remarks
							Road Fund	Other Source	Total	
										overlay
Cedar Flat Road, Hwy 126 to East Cedar Flat Rd	2005	2005	\$500,000	\$697,104		complete	\$656,834		\$656,834	
Game Farm Road, Springfield to Coburg Rd	2004	2005	\$2,750,000	\$2,214,255	2005	complete	\$2,242,902		\$2,242,902	
Hall Road, mp 4.56 to mp 5.88										Project scope downgraded to overlay project
Harvey Road, Scott Ave. UGB	2008	2008	\$2,500,000	\$2,246,370		Complete	\$1,210,200	\$850,000	\$2,060,200	Includes utility project
Jasper-Lowell Road reconstruction mp 10.545-11.00	2004	2005	\$470,000	\$609,020	2006	complete	\$599,407		\$599,407	
Lowell Assisted Housing	2008		\$325,000							Paid to city
Marcola Road	2005	2007	\$3,200,000	\$1,135,603	2008	complete	\$1,121,481		\$1,121,481	re-scoped to overlay project only
Martin Luther king Jr Blvd	2004	2005	\$4,740,000	\$7,648,271	2007	complete	\$7,352,877		\$7,352,842	
Mill Road Realignment at Hwy 58	2005						\$208,877		\$208,877	Paid in full as CaPP
<b>Safety Improvement</b>										
Brice Creek Road, mp 6.7	2005	2006	\$200,000	\$233,986	2007	complete	\$214,304		\$214,304	
Hwy 126 at Deerhorn Road	2006		\$50,000			complete	\$13,007		\$13,007	Payment to State
School Zone speed Limit Flashers	2006									Bid Cancelled
Shoestring Road Slide repair		2005				completed	\$328,417		\$328,417	
Irving Road / NW Expressway Railroad Crossing	2008	2011	\$130,000			In bid				STP-U for road related improvement
<b>Preservation / Rehabilitation</b>										
Delta Hwy Overlay	2006	2006	\$1,556,000		2007	completed	\$1,148,734		\$1,148,734	LGIP deposit to ODOT
Harlow / Hayden Bridge Road	2008	2010	\$337,000	\$913,227		Bid	\$83,094	\$830,133	\$913,227	STP-U and ARRA funds
<b>Fish Passage Projects</b>										
Nelson Mountain Road (Knapp Creek) mp 5.8-5.9	2007		\$50,000			Delete				Replaces Nelson Mountain Knapp Creek project
Siuslaw Road (Holland Ck), mp 29.1	2008	2009	\$50,000	County Force	2009	complete	\$60,453	\$209,300	\$269,753	
Thompson Creek Fish Culvert	2008	2009	\$275,000	County Force	2009	complete	\$85,660	\$141,400	\$227,060	
Five Rivers Road Fish Passage	2008	2011	\$900,000			Bid ready				
<b>Road for Assisted Housing</b>										

EXHIBIT A  
Page 67 of 70

FRANKLIN COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project	CIP Schedule FY	Const Start	CIP Amount	Contract Authorized Amount	Completed Year	Status	Final Cost (Year To Date)			Remarks
							Road Fund	Other Source	Total	
Heather Glen	2007	2007	\$150,000	\$231,933	2008	complete	\$222,931		\$222,931	
Prairie View Affordable housing	2007		\$213,700	\$291,303	2008	complete	\$284,685		\$284,685	
Turtle Creek Housing Project				\$326,832	2006		\$302,320		\$302,320	
Westtown at 8th	2006	2008	\$275,000		2008	complete	\$273,614		\$273,614	Paid in full
<b>Payment to Other Government Agencies</b>										
42nd Street Signal at Eug./Sprfld. Hwy westbound on-ramp		2005	\$200,000		2005	complete	\$200,000			researching
County City Road Partnership Payment						complete				Paid in full
OTIA III Pass-through Payments to Cities										researching
Springfield/ Creswell Hwy Bike/ Pedestrian Facility at I-5	2005					deleted				Dropped
Wayne Morse Federal Courthouse	2005	2005	\$1,600,000		2008	complete	\$1566,399		\$1,566,399	Paid in full
Coburg I-5 Interchange Area	2010		\$1,030,000			deleted				Dropped in FY 2011
<b>Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements</b>										
Latham Road, Hwy 99 to London Road	2005					deleted				
Ridgeway Road, Hwy 58 to mp 1	2005					deleted				
South Jetty Road, Hwy 101 to BLM Road	2005					deleted				
Warten Road, Territorial Hwy to knight Rd	2005					deleted				
Wendling Road, Marcola to Paschelke Road	2005					deleted				


LAMAR COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Intentional Page Page

CLINE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Intentional Blank Page

EXHIBIT A  
Page 70 of 70  
LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM



Lane County Public Works Department  
3040 North Delta Highway  
Eugene OR 97408-1696



## ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 26, 2011

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Anderson, Sean Barrett, Jeff Paschal, Jim Wilcox  
**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Kent Fleming + two vacancies  
**STAFF & OTHER PRESENT:** Marsha Miller, Bill Morgan, Mike Russell, Cella Barry, Shashi Bajracharya, Lydia McKinney, Howard Schussler, Christy Mosier; Visitor/Observer David Northey visiting as a potential appointed member.

Anderson called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

- I. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.
- II. Committee members and staff introductions were done.
- III. GUEST PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION ON THE OREGON FOREST HIGHWAY PROGRAM – Jon Oshel  
Oshel is filling in for the Forest Highway speaker tonight and has worked with this program over 25 years. Jon provided the group with a brochure explaining the Forest Highway Program, network, and how planning takes place and funding is awarded. Oshel explained Western Federal Lands Highway funding – saying it's an office at Federal Highway Administration in Vancouver, WA with a separate pot of money that is totally different than the rest of Federal Aid Funds. The vast majority of Federal Aid Funds goes from the district office in Salem and is administered by ODOT. Western Federal Lands basically does anything to do with public lands – roads, parks, national wildlife refuges, etc. Oshel explained the Public Lands Program that splits several ways – one that covers public lands for roads that tour through public lands. Oshel said within this is a Federal Forest Highway Program, which is the piece Oshel is here to talk about. This is for public agency roads (county and state highways) that go to or through national forest (not BLM). Historically the money goes half into State Highways and half into County Roads. There are three discretionary subsets of this program. The governing body is a tri-agency that meets bi-annually to direct the program and make the selection of projects. The tri-agency is made up of board members including the Director of Western Federal Lands, ODOT representative, and the National Forest Highway Program. Oshel explained the three types of projects – including Design/Build/Major construction of a roadway, Enhancement projects, and Overlays. Oshel summarized the newly created Highway Plan and provided handouts and said Federal Forest Highway does not own the roads, and instead uses the program within each area's policy and structure. Oshel said we have about a month to submit feedback. Barry said Transportation Planning staff are reviewing this to see how to enhance our Transportation Systems Plan (TSP). Oshel said the key for selection of a project is to make sure it is tied to Forest, such as recreation etc. Russell commented this program has been very good for Lane County. Morgan talked about Sweet Creek retaining wall as a project example along with other work. Russell explained we are asking for \$1.7 million worth of projects for preservations, and we are matching about \$700,000 in order to receive the total of 1.7 million – which is an example of how we can leverage the amount of priorities we can address.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - December 1, 2010 –  
**Motion:** Barrett moved to approve the Minutes of December 1, 2010, as written. Wilcox seconded; all present voted in favor.

V. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Anderson stated he felt the Chair position should move around and not the same person for a long period of time.

Motion: Anderson moved to elect Fleming as the Chair; Wilcox seconded;

Motion: Barrett moved to close the nominations; motion seconded; all present voted in favor. Fleming elected as Chair for 2011.

Anderson opened the floor for Vice Chair nominations.

Motion: Anderson moved to elect Barrett as Vice Chair; Wilcox seconded;

Motion: Paschall moved to close the nominations; motion seconded; all present voted in favor.

Barrett elected as Vice-Chair for

The meeting facilitation was turned over to Barrett as Acting Chair in Fleming's absence.

VI. FISCAL YEAR 2012-2016 DRAFT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM – Shashi Bajracharya

Bajracharya passed out the summary document and explained he needs the committee's approval to release this document and hold the public hearing at the next Roads Advisory Meeting. The group reviewed projects as Bajracharya guided the group to key points.

Barrett asked if the committee had any questions for Bajracharya and the report provided.

- Wilcox shared requests he is getting from cyclists for signage on 30<sup>th</sup> avenue. Barry said she will take care of the request through Ed Chastain.

General discussion ensued regarding new and old projects and where they are listed on the CIP. Russell said to note that the preservation funds have changed for the first time, as we used to use the full \$4.5 million for routine maintenance and add additional funds when necessary for funding matches such as for special grants for fish passage and covered bridges. With this CIP, all match funds must come from the \$4.5 million preservation fund. Morgan also pointed out that the fiscal year 2013 pavement preservation drops down to \$3 million, which is further evidence that we are having to restrict our funding and lower our level of service in this CIP planning document. Morgan added that this document matches the FIN Plan,.

Motion: Anderson moved to release the CIP; Wilcox seconded; all present voted in favor.

The group discussed the possibility of having the committee deliberations after the public hearing concludes on February 26 rather than waiting until the next RAC meeting on March 30<sup>th</sup>. However, Bajracharya pointed out that the record is typically left open for additional public comments, so the decision needs to be delayed until March.

VII. FINALIZE 2010 COMMITTEE ACCOMPLISHMENTS & 2011 WORK PLAN TO BE FILED WITH THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS (DUE FEB 2, 2011)

Mosier provided the committee with updated documents reflecting the changes requested through their last meeting.

Motion: Wilcox moved to approve the 2010 Accomplishments as-is; Anderson seconded; all present voted in favor.

Motion: Paschall moved to approve the 2011 Work Plan as-is; Anderson seconded; all present voted in favor.

VIII. LANE ACT UPDATE – Celia Barry

Barry summarized recent action including at the last RAC meeting when the RAC appointed Fleming as the primary and Barrett as the alternate representative on the Lane ACT. She said the Board of Commissioners appointed Jay Bozievich as the Primary and Sid Leiken as the Alternate representatives for the Board. Additionally, the bylaws required the Board to appoint someone to represent the Highway 126 East area – since this area does not have an incorporated city. Charles Tannenbaum, a local resident, was appointed with John Dunn, another resident who works at ODOT as the Alternate representative. Barry said the first Lane Act meeting is February 9<sup>th</sup>, 5:30pm, at the Springfield ODOT office.

IX. STATUS UPDATE: FACILITATED PROCESS ON THE EVOLVING ROLE OF THE RAC – Howard Schussler  
Schussler distributed the cognitive map that summarizes the RAC's process to help them decide if they needed to expand or modify the RAC's mission. Schussler put together the committee's work on the map and refreshed the group on the purpose of mapping. Now that the map is complete, the only question is to identify if we've missed anything on the map and to get that feedback in ASAP.

Schussler stated it seems from this map that the RAC's mission probably won't change much. Wilcox asked how the map can be used as a tool. Schussler answered first to review it and make sure people are comfortable with it. Then the group will need to determine if they should change the mission or committee name, and the map can be used as a way to ensure things the committee do fit into this and helps the committee check in and guide its actions.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

2011 Meeting Schedule:

- Committee agreed to move March 23, 2011 meeting to March 30<sup>th</sup> 2011
- Committee agreed to have one meeting for November and December – to be held on December 7<sup>th</sup> to avoid both holidays.

XI. NEXT MEETING – January 26, 2011

- Committee to finalize cognitive map.

Meeting adjourned @6:50p.m.

---

Christy Mosier, Executive Assistant – Director's Office

**DRAFT**

## ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 23, 2011

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Kent Fleming, John Anderson, Jeff Paschall, D.W. Northey, Mark Callahan  
**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Sean Barrett, Jim Wilcox  
**STAFF & OTHER PRESENT:** Marsha Miller, Bill Morgan, Celia Barry, Mike Russell, Shashi Bajracharya, Christy Mosier.

Fleming called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

- I. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – None.
- II. **GROUP INTRODUCTIONS/WELCOME NEW MEMBERS D.W. Northey & Mark Callahan**  
Fleming introduced D.W. Northey and Mark Callahan as newly appointed members to the committee. Committee and staff did introductions. Callahan said he was appointed by Sid Leiken and shared his background has primarily been in the Information Technology industry. Northey stated he was appointed by Jay Bozievich and is a retired Utility Contractor.
- III. **BRIEFING FOR TONIGHT'S AGENDA**  
Fleming explained we have postponed the Cognitive Map item until next meeting when we have a full committee. Fleming stated we will stay in this room for our regular meeting items and will transition to the room next door for the Public Hearing. Fleming added that the purpose of the public hearing is to take record of what people have to say, with minimal comments or discussion with committee and that next month we will deliberate the comments received.
- IV. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 26, 2011**  
**Motion:** Anderson moved to approve the minutes as written; Paschal seconded. All present voted in favor.
- V. **FOLLOW UP: BOB STRAUB PARKWAY PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS** – Bill Morgan  
Morgan said Barnett is here to represent the partner in this project. Morgan summarized the long history and background of Bob Straub Parkway. Morgan explained it was originally a metro loop system similar to Beltline. Morgan explained ODOT was involved and was the purchaser of the wide corridor section. It became an issue of "who is going to champion this project". Morgan explained when the County took this on, we went through the standard process of fitting it into the Capital Improvement Program, and a lengthy Design Concept was created and moved through the approval process through multiple public hearings and received a lot of public testimony. Morgan explained a lot of the public testimony was from the residents on Mt. Vernon Cemetery Road wanting to get traffic off of local roads and onto a collector arterial that would connect Jasper Highway to Highway 126. This was well before constraints on greenhouse gas and development were major planning considerations. The project was developed and went through with a 3-2 vote from the Board in 2001 with the focus on getting traffic from one point to the other. Looking back on the project, Morgan explained in addition to there being new developments after the project was completed, the lessons learned include the current trend is to be more cognizant of pedestrian movements and people getting from one neighborhood to another. If we were to do this over in today's setting, the discussions would probably have included more conversations from community members saying they want more things considered such as roundabouts and narrower lanes.

About a year ago, city residents began approaching Springfield in wanting the city to provide alternatives for safer pedestrian crossings. Springfield came up with 17 alternatives. Morgan

explained because it's more involved than just painting a stripe on the road or putting up a sign, we began looking into the issues at hand to understand the dynamics out there. Staff and the RAC agreed to find out what the average/85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is. Once we learned through study that the average speed is 53MPH in the 45MPH zone, with a 100' crossing, staff became very concerned. Staff have analyzed and heavily researched the 17 options, including looking at what's working in similar environments and what the success rates are with each option. Research included looking up ODOT traffic manuals, outreach to people in Arizona who have experience with these systems, research through literature and outreach to OSU professors. Morgan stated they came up with 3 options from the 17 alternatives. The three selected options include a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) system, a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB) system, or an option of doing nothing. Morgan summarized the differences, similarities, success rates, and costs for options for one and two. Morgan cited examples in Eugene and Springfield of both options and said staff collectively recommends option two, the PHB system.

With regard to option one, Morgan explained it was determined that the crossing point of 100' is too far for someone to attempt in one crossing but this area doesn't have enough room for a half-way island point to break the distance up. Consequently, staff determined the crossing will need to be pushed further north by 500'. Morgan explained costs with a lot being influenced by sidewalk installations. Morgan summarized the negative considerations of option one including that it's very difficult to change human behavior, which is what option one attempts to do with yellow flashers. Staff would not feel good about spending a significant \$100,000 on an improvement and still have a death occur due to the higher human behavior risk factor with option one.

Morgan explained more on option two (PHB System) and key advantages are a higher rate of people obeying due to the right light indicator and it being a very active system. While this option hasn't been installed in a lot of places, the feedback is that it would work well in this high speed setting. Morgan said this system is not designed with a median where the pedestrian would rest while crossing; however, the crossing would be calibrated to provide average crossing time – of about 25-30 seconds for this distance. This is the same system installed on Gateway. Morgan said they would also want to see continental ladder-style cross walks for better visibility rather than two parallel lines. Morgan summarized cost ranges from \$100,000 to \$150,000. Morgan added an additional benefit of option two is that if this intersection ever warrants traffic signal installation, the poles used for this device are the same poles to be used for a traffic signal in the future. Morgan explained that there would only need to be some basic modifications made and two more poles added to complete a signal in the future.

Anderson asked if this signal might confuse people. Anderson has noticed people pulling out the apartment complex on Gateway as the lights are flashing have made the pedestrian rush across the road. Barnett responded that this is the downside of this option; however, this problem has not been reported as an issue in Arizona where the studies have been conducted. General discussion ensued.

Morgan said Barnett and Chastain also identified that most traffic are taking a right, heading to Springfield, and therefore the crossing should be put on the south side where there is not as much traffic. Morgan said staff suggests that the RAC recommend this item be placed in the CIP, under Projects for Development. Morgan explained having a project on this list allow staff to mobilize and do preliminary work including determining the budget and seek funding opportunities. Morgan said they do not have a recommendation to fund it out of this CIP because it's estimated at \$150,000 and it would mean a project would have to come off of the list in order to accommodate it. Morgan added that, doing the preliminary work helps prevent us from discretionary immunity. Miller added that by adding this to the list, if future funding comes open for another project on the list, it frees up funding to come back for items like this.

Callahan asked how costs are determined. Morgan explained we use ODOT methodology, specific standard costs for things such as sidewalk installation, lights, etc. and we use past experience to develop the costs. Callahan asked if this is a project that would be bid out. Morgan answered typically on a CIP project, staff puts together a design package and then bid it out through a competitive bidding process.

Morgan reiterated that County and Springfield staff are a unified front of support and the next step is for the committee to make a recommendation. Barnett stated there are 250 households and more in the future that need accessibility.

Motion: Anderson moved to recommend option 2 by adding this to the CIP projects for future development list. Fleming said option 2 doesn't get the project done but allows us to do the right thing by doing the preliminary work that will be required to secure funding opportunities as they arise. D.W. commented he'd prefer to see the example at Gateway first. Anderson said he will vote in favor of option 2 because we as a committee make recommendations to the Board, who then can decide whether they want to do something or not, or which option to ultimately go with.

Motion: Anderson moved to recommend option 2 by adding this to the CIP projects for development list. Paschall seconded. Fleming called for a vote for all those in favor, D.W. abstained; all others voted in favor.

VI. FINALIZE COGNITIVE MAP/THE EVOLVING ROLE OF THE RAC – Postponed until next meeting.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Fleming said Lane Act had their first meeting. Barry provided the history and purpose of the ACT for the two new members. General discussion ensued.

VIII. NEXT MEETING – March 30, 2011 due to spring break.

IX. 7:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – 2012-2016 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM –

Chair Fleming called the hearing to order, explained the format, and stated we are here to take public comment in order to deliberate and make a recommendation at our next committee meeting on March 23. On March 23 we will make our recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. Bajracharya gave a brief presentation along with printed materials.

Chair Fleming requested comments:

PUBLIC COMMENT –

- **Brian Barnett, City of Springfield – 225 Fifth Street, Springfield OR 97477.** Barnett addressed the project brought up in the RAC meeting and said he appreciated the recommendation of it being placed on the projects to be developed list. Barnett restated that it's important that the 250 homes and their traffic patterns of 50-150 pedestrian trips a day have safety and accessibility.

Fleming closed the public hearing at 7:12 p.m. Meeting adjourned.

---

Christy Mosier, Executive Assistant – Director's Office

RE: 01170

MAR 07 2011

03/02/11

To Whom It may Concern:

I am Beverley Ashwill. I moved to 315 Dublin Avenue in September of 2010. I was pleased to see my house was only 11 houses down from a bus stop on Scenic Drive. I work 4 or 5 days a week downtown Eugene and the bus is important for my transportation. Not to mention Doctor's and other medical appointments. I own a van with a lift which I can no longer drive, but I use it only when the bus doesn't get me to where I need to go. I am 67 years old and an honored rider for free on the LTD bus system. So it is important economically as well to use the bus. It also allows me more independence than depending on someone else to drive me.

I travel in a power wheelchair because I've had Rheumatoid Arthritis for over 40 years and can not walk.

Soon after I moved into the Dublin Avenue house, I attempted to use the bus stop at the end of Dublin Avenue on Scenic Drive. It was very difficult. There is no sidewalk or curbs so the lift was much steeper than the normal ratio of 1 to 12. I made it in, but rammed my wheelchair into the equipment near the driver's seat. The bus driver and I concurred this wasn't an appropriate stop for me due to the lack of that 6 inch rise of the sidewalk/curb. So I then had to go out from my house to Shannon Street, Then turn right on River Loop #2 and cross River Road at the traffic light to get to the nearest accessible bus stop. That is about a 5 minute ride in my wheelchair. Nearly all of the time, I am in the street. River Loop #2 is a busy street with no cement side. It is a gravel shoulder which I can get stuck in. So far, I have not been hit.

That is the crux of my story. It is not safe for me to travel in the busy street. I have friends in wheelchairs who have been hit by vehicles and badly injured. It is not uncommon. After all, sitting in our wheelchairs makes us shorter than most people. Drivers are very busy people. They are handling their kids in the back seat, grabbing for that cup of coffee, or heaven forbid talking or texting on their cells. If it is wet or dark, it makes it even harder. They get distracted for many reasons. I am making every effort to be safe. Research has shown that drivers are looking for cars or trucks and when they see a bike, or a scooter or a wheelchair, it takes them longer to process this is something to avoid. I am playing Russian roulette with my wellbeing every time (twice a day on weekdays) I travel in the street to get my bus.

Making the Scenic Drive bus stop accessible for me would be a major step in my safety and preserving my life. (for which I would be eternally grateful).

In addition, I have friends and guests that travel in wheelchairs as well. We host international guests for MIUSA (Mobility International USA) and their perceptions of bus accessibility flavors their perception of the USA.

I contacted LTD Bus system about the problem. They sent out a bus to check out the situation. Their findings were that they could build a platform for me there, but they would need curbs and they don't do curbs. I found out through phone calling around that the streets here are under the jurisdiction of Lane County Public Works. I intended to be at your hearing but was unable to attend because of the weather situation. I am writing this letter to ask you to be willing to work with LTD and create a short curb at the bus stop area so LTD can create the accessible platform I would need to use that bus stop.

I understand the budget concerns. I am hoping this small and hopefully inexpensive project could be seen in the light of the physical safety and well being of one (or more) of your citizens (a taxpayer) as opposed to measuring it with more expensive and major concerns, all of which have good merit.

Sincerely,  
Beverly J. Ashwill



**DRAFT**

## ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 30, 2011

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Kent Fleming, John Anderson, Jeff Paschall, D.W. Northey, Mark Callahan  
Sean Barrett, Jim Wilcox

**STAFF & OTHER PRESENT:** Marsha Miller, Bill Morgan, Celia Barry, Mike Russell, Shashi Bajracharya,  
Howard Schussler, Christy Mosler.

Fleming called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

- I. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – **Beverly Ashwill, 315 Dublin Ave, Eugene OR 97404, 541-343-7248** (See staff memo provided). Ms. Ashwill previously provided written testimony to staff regarding Scenic Drive. Ms. Ashwill requested installation of sidewalk and curb to facilitate boarding on the Lane Transit District operated bus on the Scenic Drive Route. Ms. Ashwill is an electric wheelchair user who regularly uses the LTD bus service but is unable to board the bus conveniently at her closest bus stop on Scenic Drive due to the lack of sidewalks or ADA compliant boarding pad. As a result, she is required to use an alternative bus stop five minutes farther away on River Road, traversing along River Loop #2 shoulder in the wheelchair. River Loop #2 is also a County facility with no curb or sidewalks, and she said she is exposed to more traffic in this longer commute due to the lack of improvements on Scenic Drive. She approached LTD for necessary improvements at the bus stop. In a March 9, 2011 letter to Ms. Ashwill, the agency said it would not be able to meet her request until the County improves Scenic Drive with full curb and sidewalk. Ms. Ashwill acknowledged this request is costly and that the County has a lot of priorities right now, but that this is a safety concern for her and for others in wheelchairs that have been injured due to traffic not seeing them on the side of the road. She added that in regards to LTD's letter suggesting she use RideSource, it would cost \$6 per ride and as someone on a fixed income this would be a financial hardship for her to get to her part time job. Ms. Ashwill added that she runs a host family at her house for international people that come from about 40 different countries and is often hosting people or guests in wheelchairs. .
- II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 23, 2011**  
**Motion:** D.W. moved to approve the Minutes of February 23, 2011, as written. Wilcox seconded; all present voted in favor.
- III. **FISCAL LEAR 2012-2016 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DELIBERATION – Shashi Bajracharya**  
Bajracharya recapped the steps the RAC and staff have taken so far and that today staff is requesting the RAC adopt the updated CIP, which is not substantially different than the one previously viewed.

Bajracharya started by referring the group to the staff memo provided regarding Beverley Ashwill's public comment that was received after last month's public hearing. Bajracharya summarized the request and said after much research, staff is compelled to recommend the do-nothing option. He directed the RAC's attention to the County Engineer's explanation in the CIP materials, and invited Mr. Morgan to provide additional information. Morgan summarized the reasons stated in his memo for not recommending doing something in response to Ms. Ashwill's request. He briefly described the engineering policy and guidelines, ADA requirements, and liability issues that are taken into account with modifications such as those requested. Morgan said if the RAC and the Board wanted to pursue otherwise, we'd have to have more conversation about design exceptions and discretionary immunity. Morgan said safety is the big concern, and when we try to modify ADA guidelines, we end up with unintended consequences. Morgan said it's a difficult position to be in, because we want to help citizens, and at the same time, staff has to advise the board of policy and liability issues involved. Morgan invited the group to ask questions regarding the findings provided in the memo. Russell

stated that the Road Maintenance Division supports the recommendation of not doing a substandard improvement, noting that placing an isolated paved section at the bus stop in an area that was otherwise gravel would like introduce parking, enforcement, and drainage issues, and that the gravel will eventually cover the pavement and it becomes a maintenance issue. Morgan said staff did not know until tonight's testimony that it cost \$6 for the resident to use Ride Source as a means of travel. Wilcox asked if there is a better place to move the bus stop to. Russell said this area is characterized by this kind of development with assorted paved and unpaved areas without shoulders and gravel. Because of this, Miss Ashwill would still have to use the travel lane to get through the neighborhood. Callahan asked why we couldn't just install a curb just at that stop, and then LTD could then install a pad since that's LTD's requirement. Morgan explained it comes back to being a safety issue and that any time you put an isolated object out in the road, when not connected to a continuous curb and sidewalk it could be hit by someone. General discussion ensued. Morgan added that LTD's intention in their guidelines is to install a pad where there is continuous curbed setting, and not an isolated pad.

Bajracharya referred the group to the memo seeking the recommendation on the draft Capital Improvement Plan. Bajracharya said staff is proposing to add two new projects for development. Bajracharya stated these are unfunded projects, and therefore will not affect the funding level shown in the previous draft. The first addition is the Bob Straub Parkway (BSP)/Mt. Vernon Road Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon System which the RAC included during our last meeting. The second proposed is the 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue off-ramp design modification project which is a safety project.

Fleming asked how we establish priorities. Bajracharya referred Fleming to the matrix on Attachment two and explained the matrix system. Fleming asked if more funds come up, what happens to the unfunded items – does the first item on the list automatically get funding? Barry said circumstances change over time, and it could be that certain funding could be better for one project than another, so not necessarily.

In response to a question, Barry said the CIP is required to be adopted 30 days prior to the fiscal budget adoption, so the RAC is being asked to make a recommendation tonight. She explained this would not prevent the RAC from asking staff to work on any issues that remain of concern, such as that which was discussed in public comment tonight.

Motion: Anderson moved to approve the CIP as recommended by staff; Barrett seconded; Discussion followed. Callahan asked for clarification about whether the committee is voting on everything in the prioritization matrix. Barry explained the vote is on the CIP document as a whole in Attachment 1, in order to move CIP financing forward.

Fleming called for a vote for those in favor of approving the draft CIP; all present voted in favor and the motion carried.

#### IV. FINALIZE COGNITIVE MAP/THE EVOLVING ROLE OF THE RAC – Howard Schussler

Schussler summarized, for the committee's newest members, why they've done this work including that with road funding depleted, few road projects remain other than preservation related. Schussler explained the final graph which clearly shows what the RAC's goals, purpose, outcomes, impacts, purposes, values, and issues it deals with. Schussler said if people are still comfortable with this map and what it states, the RAC should use this as a guide for a couple years. Callahan asked how many of these items will be taken on by the ACT. Schussler said none. Schussler stated without changes, we would memorialize this and use it as a guide. Anderson commented the RAC should use this and let it evolve in time as needed.

#### V. FISH CULVERT PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION – Mike Russell

Russell gave a presentation on the history of why designs and work have evolved. Russell explained culverts are usually maintenance projects vs. CIP items. In the past, we would dig up a culvert and fix it in a week's time; now they average two years due to regulations and planning. Russell explained how in 2000, the ODFW identified 292 fish barriers throughout Lane County that needed to be fixed, totaling \$12 million. The Board then set priorities of the 292 and we decided that if it was a road value/priority and one of the 292 identified that we would do it. The County's goal is to replace 5-6 a year. Russell explained the difficulty of installing culverts and the complexity of keeping the roadway open at all times while doing the work. Morgan explained the State's expectations will continue to change, presenting a constant challenge. Russell explained we've replaced 69 of the 292 culverts, but one of the keys to this program is that we've run out of road priorities and are now down to fish-only priority culverts. Staff is partnering with ODFW, watershed councils, BLM, Forest Service, and others to see if they have funding sources so we can continue the work. *(See presentation slides for complete details and figures).*

General discussion ensued. Wilcox said this is a good story to tell, and he'd like to get word out to fishing groups such as Caddis Fly. Fleming and Wilcox agreed to follow up with groups like these to see how we can do this.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Schussler said its legislative time of year and suggested members exercise caution when they are commenting on legislative issues or sending letters to the editor by being clear who you are representing – if you offer your name and sign it including the committee you belong with, it can imply you are speaking on behalf of the committee instead of yourself.

Wilcox said he will look into the Ride Source cost further.

VII. NEXT MEETING – (April 27)

- Agenda Request: follow up on committee consolidation considerations.
- Upcoming Construction Projects Overview – Bill Morgan
- Schedule future field tour day with the RAC and Road Maintenance.

Meeting adjourned at 7:18p.m.

---

Christy Mosier, Executive Assistant – Director's Office

**BAJRACHARYA Shashi**

**From:** MORGAN Bill F  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2011 1:33 PM  
**To:** BAJRACHARYA Shashi  
**Cc:** BROWN David L  
**Subject:** Scenic Drive Comments

Shashi:

I have had the opportunity to review the memorandum to the Roads Advisory Committee (RAC) for the draft Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2012 through 2016, more particularly the Summary of Public Comments and Analysis for the request by Ms. Beverley Ashwill. In particular, I have the following comments on the low cost improvements (shoulder paving or a concrete boarding pad) proposal under consideration regarding Ms. Ashwill's request for an *Americans with Disabilities Act* (ADA) compliant bus stop improvement on Scenic Drive.

In the area, there is an overall lack of roadways built to meet urban standards, or having curbs, gutters or sidewalks. One of the fundamental principals of why we have urban standards is so that ADA guidelines can be met. If roads are not built to urban standards, then ADA guidelines are very difficult if not possible to meet.

I looked at the latest edition of ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG), and found the following guidelines in Section 10, Transportation Facilities. I have bolded a few areas for easy reference and emphasis.

*10.2.1 New Construction.*

*(1) Where new bus stop pads are constructed at bus stops, bays or other areas where a lift or ramp is to be deployed, they shall have a firm, stable surface; a minimum clear length of 96 inches (measured from the curb or vehicle roadway edge) and a minimum clear width of 60 inches (measured parallel to the vehicle roadway) to the maximum extent allowed by legal or site constraints; **and shall be connected to streets, sidewalks or pedestrian paths by an accessible route complying with 4.3 and 4.4.** The slope of the pad parallel to the roadway shall, to the extent practicable, be the same as the roadway. For water drainage, a maximum slope of 1:50 (2%) perpendicular to the roadway is allowed.*

*(2) Where provided, new or replaced bus shelters shall be installed or positioned so as to permit a wheelchair or mobility aid user to enter from the public way and to reach a location, having a minimum clear floor area of 30 inches by 48 inches, entirely within the perimeter of the shelter. **Such shelters shall be connected by an accessible route to the boarding area provided under paragraph (1) of this section.***

*(3) Where provided, all new bus route identification signs shall comply with 4.30.5. In addition, to the maximum extent practicable, all new bus route identification signs shall comply with 4.30.2 and 4.30.3. Signs that are sized to the maximum dimensions permitted under legitimate local, state or federal regulations or ordinances shall be considered in compliance with 4.30.2 and 4.30.3 for purposes of this section.*

*EXCEPTION: Bus schedules, timetables, or maps that are posted at the bus stop or bus bay are not required to comply with this provision.*

**10.2.2 Bus Stop Siting and Alterations.**

*(1) Bus stop sites shall be chosen such that, to the maximum extent practicable, the areas where lifts or ramps are to be deployed comply with section 10.2.1(1) and (2).*

*(2) When new bus route identification signs are installed or old signs are replaced, they shall comply with the requirements of 10.2.1(3).*

In my opinion, many roads in the area (including Scenic Drive) do not have accessible routes meeting ADA guidelines. Instead, everyone is required to walk, bike or travel in the travel lanes, or to use the unimproved shoulders. None of these areas meet ADA guidelines, so under 10.2.2 above, bus stop sites, to the maximum extent practicable, should be constructed to both meet ADA standards and to connect to a system that meets ADA standards. This is not the case under options 2 and 3 in the memo.

In summary, it is my professional opinion that Scenic Drive does not have adequate space needed to safely accommodate a fully ADA compliant access ramp. The proposed options of a boarding pad improvement or a paved shoulder would not meet existing ADA standards and County Road Design Standards, subjecting the County to potential risk of litigation. Further, I have concerns that a standalone concrete boarding pad or paved shoulder does not meet the "connected by an accessible route" criteria in 10.2.1 (2), and would cause additional safety and risk problems beyond the "do nothing" alternative. Also, LTD has indicated that the rider can use the RideSource Program in order to safely meet her travel requirements since she is unable to access the transit system due to the requirements for an accessible sidewalk or raised landing.

For the above reasons, I can not recommend either of the low cost improvements under consideration.

Bill Morgan, PE  
County Engineer  
Lane County Public Works  
[bill.morgan@co.lane.or.us](mailto:bill.morgan@co.lane.or.us)  
(541) 682-6990



Lane Transit District

March 9, 2011

Beverly Jo Ashwill  
315 Dublin Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon 97404

RE: Bus Stop Ramp and Pad Request on Scenic Drive

Dear Ms. Ashwill:

I recognize that it has taken us some time to get back to you about your request for improvements at the bus stop on Scenic Drive at Dublin Avenue. Please be assured that we appreciate and carefully considered your request. LTD staff visited the site, consulted with County personnel, and discussed this with LTD managers.

For these reasons LTD will not be making improvements to this stop:

1. LTD does not have the resources or the jurisdiction to construct or maintain basic street improvements such as curbs or sidewalks on unimproved streets.
2. When LTD does make individual bus stop improvements such as the installation of concrete pads, ramps, or curb cuts that connect to existing curbs and sidewalks, or to install a bench or shelter, decisions are based on the use of the stop as well as improving accessibility for people with disabilities. The Scenic Drive and Dublin Avenue stop has generally low use.
3. This site does not appear to have the space needed to safely accommodate an access ramp and landing requirements. Buses, bikes, and pedestrians all need room to maneuver along with regular traffic. Further investment in design and layout is needed.

LTD is aware of the issue for riders like you who are unable to use the current style of ramps on low-floor vehicles when the ramp is deployed to the ground. Our next vehicle purchases will have newly designed ramps that have a reduced ramp slope of 1:6 to alleviate the problem. The first of these should arrive in the fall. Obviously, this offers a long-term, not an immediate solution since it takes time and money to get all of the old equipment replaced.



Beverly Ashwill  
March 9, 2011  
Page 2

For any trip throughout the system that you are unable to access due to the requirement for an accessible sidewalk or raised landing, you are eligible to use *RideSource*. *RideSource* may take you the entire length of a trip or to the closest LTD station that allows you to complete a trip on your own. Enclosed is a *RideSource* RideGuide for your reference in accessing the *RideSource* system.

Should Lane County go forward with full curb and sidewalk improvements on Scenic Drive, LTD bus stop pads would be installed at that time. Please feel free to give me a call at 541-682-3245 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Terry Parker".

Terry Parker  
Accessible Services Manager


TP/sjh

cc: RideSource Call Center  
Shashi Bajracharya, Lane County

Enclosure: *RideSource* RideGuide

Google maps Address 315 Dublin Ave  
Eugene, OR 97404

Get Google Maps on your  
Text the word "GMAPS" to 4



Project Request Location



SCENIC DR - 310800, N; DMI: 0.0309 Lat/Long: -123.1305/44.1202; X/Y 4230




Illustration of an ADA 5'x8' Concrete Pad



Site Photo