

*Transportation  
Studies &  
Rep*

DATE SUBMITTED 2/10/88

(For Clerk's Use)  
Meeting Date 3/15/88 AM  
Agenda No. #1

REQUEST FOR PLACEMENT ON THE AGENDA

Subject: Gresham Roads Transfer

Informal Only\* 3/15/88 .A.M. (Date) Formal Only \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

DEPARTMENT DES/ DIVISION Transportation

CONTACT Larry Nicholas TELEPHONE x5050

\*NAME(S) OF PERSON MAKING PRESENTATION TO BOARD Larry Nicholas

BRIEF SUMMARY Should include other alternatives explored, if applicable, and clear statement of rationale for the action requested.

Presentation of Transportations Division's Analysis of City of Gresham's request to assume responsibility for county roads within the city.

*and County's Staff report regarding  
City of Gresham road proposal*

(IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS NEEDED, PLEASE USE REVERSE SIDE)

ACTION REQUESTED:

- INFORMATION ONLY
- PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
- POLICY DIRECTION
- APPROVAL

INDICATE THE ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON AGENDA \_\_\_\_\_

IMPACT:

PERSONNEL

- FISCAL/BUDGETARY
- General Fund

Other \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURES:

DEPARTMENT HEAD, ELECTED OFFICIAL, or COUNTY COMMISSIONER: Paul Yuborough / bkw

BUDGET / PERSONNEL \_\_\_\_\_

COUNTY COUNSEL (Ordinances, Resolutions, Agreements, Contracts) \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER \_\_\_\_\_  
(Purchasing, Facilities Management, etc.)

NOTE: If requesting unanimous consent, state situation requiring emergency action on back.

1988 FEB 19 PM 1:56  
CLERK COUNTY  
Clerk



# MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES  
TRANSPORTATION DIVISION  
1620 S.E. 190TH AVENUE  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97233  
(503) 248-5050

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
GLADYS McCOY • CHAIR OF THE BOARD  
PAULINE ANDERSON • DISTRICT 1 COMMISSIONER  
GRETCHEN KAFOURY • DISTRICT 2 COMMISSIONER  
CAROLINE MILLER • DISTRICT 3 COMMISSIONER  
POLLY CASTERLINE • DISTRICT 4 COMMISSIONER

## M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Barbara Jones, Assistant  
Clerk of the Board

FROM: *MB* Mike Gilsdorf  
Transportation Division

DATE: February 19, 1988

SUBJECT: Enclosed Report

1988 FEB 22 AM 10:02  
COUNTY CLERK  
J. Jones

As requested by Sherrill Rudolph, please find enclosed a copy of the report that is to be discussed by the Board during the week of **March 14, 1988.**

If there are any questions, Please contact me at 248-5084 or Susie Lahsene at 248-3636.

MG:vw

Enc.

**Multnomah County and the City of Gresham**

**TRANSFERRING ROAD RESPONSIBILITY**

**Analysis and Impacts**

**Prepared by Multnomah County  
Department of Environmental Services  
Division of Transportation  
February 1988**

Multnomah County and the City of Gresham

TRANSFERRING ROAD RESPONSIBILITY

Analysis and Impacts

Prepared by Multnomah County  
Department of Environmental Services  
Division of Transportation  
February 1988

## INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	i
I. Introduction	1
II. Current Approach to Delivery of Services	3
III. Impact Analysis and Summary	15
IV. Arguments For and Against	22
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	26
VI. References	32
Appendix A State Statutes, Ordinances, and Administrative Rules	34
Appendix B Precedents for Transfers	41
Appendix C Inventory of County Roads	44
Appendix D Distribution of County Road Fund Revenue	46
Appendix E Transfer of County Resources	55
Appendix F Detailed Impact Discussion	61

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Gresham has proposed the County surrender jurisdiction of County roads within the Gresham urban services area. The City feels that full control of the street system is essential to achieve and integrate their goals for economic development, improved traffic flow, and coordinated land use planning.

Problems with communication, coordination and cooperation between the City of Gresham and the County have created problems in overlapping responsibility and conflicting jurisdictional goals associated with the system of streets and roads.

Surrendering jurisdiction of county roads within the Gresham urban services area to Gresham requires an evaluation and reconsideration of the County's role as a provider of transportation service. To consider Gresham's proposal, the County should examine the issue on the basis of how transportation services are to be delivered. The choice must be made between retaining the County's present role or redefining it. Consideration of Gresham's proposal basically examines two questions.

- 1) What alternative represents the best configuration for transportation service delivery for the public
- 2) What should be the County's role in transportation.

Each of the choices has lasting long-term implications. Ultimately, the issue should be decided on the basis of what is in the best interest of the public at large.

Transportation services are presently provided both by Multnomah County and by the City of Gresham. The county has responsibility for 118 miles of County roads within the Gresham urban services area and Gresham has responsibility for 93 miles of basically neighborhood streets.

The County Transportation Division is a large mature organization which approaches the delivery of transportation services on a pro-active programmatic approach to planning an effective allocation of resources. Road maintenance is currently designed around a preventative maintenance program which has produced a road system with no deferred maintenance. Three primary planning tools are utilized to underlie the division budget and guide operations.

- 1) The Pavement Management Program and Master Road Inventory of all segments of County maintained roads
- 2) The Transportation Master Plan and Capital Improvement Plan
- 3) The Strategic Plan

There are four sections of the division that are impacted by the transfer of County roads to the City of Gresham: Engineering, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities, Administration.

The City of Gresham is a small organization, and prior to this budget year did not budget street revenues as a separate fund within the budget. The City of Gresham's Public Works Division is a division of the Community and Economic Development Department. The department is also responsible for land use planning, plan and development review, building code enforcement, inspection and maintenance and planning for the parks and recreation facilities. The City currently places emphasis on water and sewer operations primarily due to capital investment made in these

operations in the past and the lack of capital investment in the surface street system. The City currently does not have a formal street maintenance program. Maintenance is performed on a reactive as-needed basis rather than a programmatic approach.

To better understand the implications of the Gresham proposal, an examination of the impact to level of service was made by creating different scenarios. Each scenario contains a different set of assumptions regarding population annexed and road miles transferred to the cities of Portland and Gresham. Detailed budgets were prepared for the four impacted sections in the Transportation Division, Engineering, Maintenance, Traffic and Administration. The budgets provided basic information required for making decisions relative to resource allocations, levels of services, and resources transferred. Impacts were then evaluated by reviewing resource allocations among jurisdictions and the level of service provided for or possible.

Two scenarios described in detail the transfer of County roads to the City of Gresham. The implication of those transfers fall into four major categories; Organizational, County government in general, County-wide and Regional.

- A transfer of roads and resources to the City of Gresham would mean a decrease in economies of scale currently enjoyed by the region.
- Resources would be lost and services duplicated to create two organizations to provide services primarily provided by one presently. The resulting increase in cost for services further impacts the organization's ability to maintain the system or address capital needs.

- Transfer of responsibility would result in a reduction of revenue available for capital and a decrease in the level of road maintenance. All of the scenarios examined indicate that funds are inadequate to address the known capital needs on the system. This situation is amplified with the transfer of roads and resources to Gresham.
- Historically, Multnomah County coordinates and has consolidated the arterial and collector needs of the incorporated and unincorporated areas in east county into a single voice for this sub-region. Transportation planning, policy development and federal fund allocation for the County road system has been carried out through several committees comprised primarily of representatives from the counties, the City of Portland, State, Tri-Met and Metro. A consensus building approach has provided for successful competition for state and federal funds as well as transportation policy changes. This leadership role provided by the County would be diminished under the proposal.
- Transferring County road responsibility and revenue to Gresham and redefining the County's role as a transportation service provider would require a reduction in road fund support and contribution to overhead translating to a reduction in the general fund of \$277,000 presently.

Arguments for and against the Gresham proposal have been listed to show the advantages and disadvantages from each perspective.

The County argument for continuing in it's present role:

- Promotes efficiency, minimizes duplication of services, retains economy of scale
- Provides a comprehensive integrated approach to regional transportation planning, policy implementation and service delivery
- Recognizes that economic development is mutually interdependent and benefits the entire county region and state
- Maximizes funds available to address system-wide capital liability. Major capital liability for roads is retained by the County
- Retains a pro-active, programmatic approach to the delivery of services. Retains present level of service delivery throughout the County transportation system. Maintenance needs will be kept current, not deferred.
- Continues to provide contract services to the Cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview and Maywood Park

Gresham arguments against retaining the County role:

- Is not responsive to the City of Gresham's desire to set land use and transportation policies and goals
- Limits City responsibility to existing streets and does not recognize full services concept at the level sought

- City has a diminished role in transportation policy within the region
- City cannot respond directly to all road-related complaints or concerns
- Requires coordination for infrastructure development
- Requires coordination of land use requirements and street standards for development projects abutting county roads within the city
- Street maintenance standards are different

#### Conclusions

- Reorganization of county road responsibilities between the city and the county is not as straightforward as a similar restructuring was with the City of Portland. Portland and the County were both large, efficient, experienced and offered a full range of road services. Each organization was also primarily responsible for providing only road related services. They shared a historic responsibility and had a relatively equal investment in the system and they each expected to continue to provide services at the same relative levels without major reorganizational changes.
- The existing County transportation organization is focused to provide transportation services system-wide to the public. Over time systems have been developed and economies have been reached as a result of this focus. A decrease in resources and responsibilities will impact the organization and efficiencies

that have been developed to provide transportation services will be lost.

- The relative differences in the approach to service delivery, economies of scale, efficiency and maturity of Gresham and the County is considerable.
- Reduced responsibilities and resources to meet them will force a change in the approach to service delivery by the County. The present pro-active programmed approach to preventative road maintenance and capital needs will change to a reactive as-needed approach.
- If roads are transferred to the City of Gresham, personnel transfers and the timing of transfers will likely surface as a major issue. The number and classes of employees, the wide differences in rate of compensation and different bargaining units pose a considerable problem.
- Revenues derived from the Portland formula are not adequate for the County. If a decision is made to change the County role by transferring roads to Gresham, it can't be done on the basis of the present Portland formula. The formula must be changed for both Portland and Gresham to allow the County to be a viable provider of transportation services for its remaining responsibility.
- Arguments for and against the proposal to transfer road responsibilities from the County to the City of Gresham suggests that the transfer would benefit the City of Gresham in the short run, but would be at the expense of Multnomah County and its broader constituency in the long run.

- Currently, communication and coordination problems exist between the County and Gresham. None of these problems are insurmountable if both parties would sit down and resolve them. Many of Gresham's present concerns could be addressed by the development of joint strategies and policies in lieu of reassigning responsibilities.

### Recommendations

1) The present role of the County as a provider of transportation services is the appropriate one.

Duplication of services is minimized, efficiency is improved and economies of scale are retained. The present comprehensive integrated approach to regional transportation planning and policy implementation is retained. Capital improvement funds are maximized and major capital liability for roads in east county is centralized.

The present pro-active programmatic approach to delivery of services is retained. The present level of services will be retained throughout the County road system. Maintenance needs will continue to be kept current, not deferred with a growing backlog. The County will be able to continue providing contract maintenance services to Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village.

The present role also recognizes that economic development is mutually interdependent and benefits the entire county, the region and the state.

Retaining the present role is in the demonstrated best interest of the public in general. It recognizes the public investment in a superior system of roads and ensures that the investment is preserved.

2) The City of Gresham should be encouraged to reopen discussions with the County to develop programmed road maintenance services. The City could contract for surface improvement requirements from the County much the same as Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village. This approach reduces duplication of services, promotes efficiency and is more economical. Once a successful working relationship has been established, serious consideration should again be given to forming a Road Consortium with all four cities in East County. Joint policy development planning and implementation will ultimately provide the optimum service delivery for transportation needs.

3) Communication, coordination, and cooperation must be improved between Gresham and the County. A joint committee on policy and strategy should be formed to identify all problems and jointly work out effective solutions. It's important good working relationships be developed and maintained.

4) The intergovernmental agreement for transportation between Portland and the County must be renegotiated. Specifically the formula for determining revenue allocations must be reconstructed to provide a more equitable distribution. The County cannot approach the known ten-year capital liability without a significantly larger share of the revenue it receives.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The city of Gresham has proposed the county surrender jurisdiction over all 118 miles of county roads within the Gresham urban services area. The city desires to provide a full range of services to its citizens. Presently the city provides full police and fire services, land use and building inspection, development and maintenance of parks, sewer and (some) water as well as road maintenance for 93 miles of local streets and two (2) miles of arterial streets.

The city argues that to provide a full range of services to its citizens it should control county roads as well. They have cited difficulties created by overlapping responsibilities and conflicting jurisdictional goals associated with the system of streets and roads. The city feels full control of the street system is necessary to achieve and integrate its goals of economic development, improved traffic flow and coordinated land use planning.

Consideration of surrendering jurisdiction of county roads within the Gresham urban services boundary to Gresham requires an evaluation and reconsideration of the county's role as a provider of transportation services. Currently, Multnomah County has established policies and adopted goals relative to the delivery of transportation services. Any decision made that is inconsistent with these goals requires re-evaluation of that role.

Rethinking Road Maintenance by Don Barney & Associates prepared for the county in 1983 discusses jurisdictional responsibility and presents findings and a recommendation for restructuring county road responsibility. The report presented two basic options; consolidation or transfer of responsibility.

The report and recommendation was not officially adopted but it did provide the basis in part for transfer of responsibility for roads to the city of Portland. The remainder of the county road responsibility was judged then to be best met by consolidating responsibilities with the four cities in east county, Gresham, Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village. The Board of County Commissioners passed a resolution to that effect in March 1984.

The concept of consolidation was discussed at length with the jurisdictions. Eventually maintenance agreements were entered into between the county, Troutdale, Wood Village, and Fairview. Gresham chose not to participate.

To consider Gresham's proposal the county should examine the issue on the basis of how transportation services are to be delivered. A choice must be made between retaining the county's present role or redefining it.

A consideration of the proposal basically examines two questions:

- 1) What alternative represents the best configuration for transportation service delivery for the public?
- 2) What should be the county's role in transportation?

Each of the choices have lasting long term implications. Ultimately the issue must be decided on the basis of what is in the best interest of the public.

## II. CURRENT APPROACH TO DELIVERY OF SERVICES

### Transportation Division - Multnomah County

The Multnomah County Transportation Division is responsible for management of the County surface street system for maximum public benefit and safety. Resources are allocated to plan, develop, and maintain the system through a comprehensive, integrated approach. The guiding principles are increased public safety, economic development, travel needs, and quality of neighborhoods and communities.

To accomplish this mission, the Transportation Division has been organized into seven major reporting Sections: Engineering Services, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities, Administration, Surveying, Bridge Maintenance and Bridges Engineering. The division is headquartered in the Yeon Shop Complex located in Gresham, Bridge operations are located in a separate facility at the Hawthorne Bridge in Portland. Road Maintenance activities are also located in two outlying rural facilities, one in the northwest and one located in the Corbett - Springdale area.

The Division operates as a proactive organization. They utilize a programmatic approach to providing services which allows adequate planning and affective allocation of resources. Road Maintenance is essentially designed around a preventative maintenance program. The result of this approach has produced a road system which currently has no deferred maintenance.

There are three primary planning tools underlying the division budget used to guide operations.

- 1) The Pavement Management Program and Master Road Inventory of all segments of County maintained roads. The Master Road List provides data on pavement width, length, right-of-way widths, surface type,

date of construction and last date resurfaced. The Pavement Management Program includes pavement condition rating, square yards of surface, tons of resurfacing material required and the projected year for required resurfacing based on the programmed life expectancy of the road. This data is utilized to project resurfacing requirements with cost data for one year increments through the year 2000.

- 2) The Transportation Master Plan and the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The Transportation Master Plan provides data on present and projected traffic volumes and employment and population trends. This data is used to analyze current and future traffic demands on the transportation system. The CIP contains a detailed listing of needed improvements to the system for a five year period. The plan prioritizes projects and available funds.
- 3) The Strategic Plan. This document contains the division's mission statement, defined objectives, goals and strategies. It serves as the framework for individual sections detailed work plans and provides for the measurement of accomplishments.

The four Sections of this Division that are impacted by the transfer of County roads to the city of Gresham are Engineering, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities and Administration. Surveying is funded by the General Fund and reimbursed by the road fund for work provided in support of ongoing activities related to capital. The Willamette River Bridge, Engineering and Maintenance Sections are funded separately from revenue set-aside for that purpose. These three Sections are not discussed in the following material but the Survey Section is impacted by a reduction in capital funding.

Each of the four Sections impacted by the transfer of responsibility is discussed to provide an understanding of their function, services provided and level of service.

## Engineering Services

The County Engineering Services Section of the Transportation Division is responsible for the design and construction of the County surface street system. The purpose of engineering is to prepare construction documents and assume compliance with standards and specifications during construction.

The level of service provided by this Section is reactive to the amount of revenue allocated to the capital improvement program for the surface street system of the County. The Section administers the projects selected for inclusion in the capital improvement program of the Division. Contracts are funded with revenue from County, State, and Federal sources. The Section also provides engineering for storm drainage and maintains records of sewer inventory which includes storm drainage facilities of all types. Additionally, oversight of private development is provided through the project agreement process.

The Section is responsible for issuing and administering right-of-way permits program. This program ensures that work done within the public right-of-way is performed according to the established standards.

The Engineering Section also administers Local Improvement Districts, Street Lighting Districts, and the improvement of local access roads through the petition street process (LIDs).

## Road Maintenance

The Road Maintenance Section currently provides full service maintenance for 520+ miles of County roads. Currently maintenance is provided on a contract basis for Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village as well.

Road maintenance functions consist of 50 separate work tasks. For cost accounting and work scheduling purposes, these tasks are divided into major programs: Contract Asphalt Paving, Surface Maintenance, Right-of-Way Maintenance, Drainage Maintenance, Emergency Maintenance, Support Services, and aggregate production.

All work tasks have been assigned a unit of measure. This allows monitoring of work accomplished, time allocated to accomplish the work, and the cost of performing the work.

### Traffic Facilities

The Traffic Facilities Section manufactures, installs and replaces the traffic signs, maintains traffic signals and controllers, stripes roads and places pavement markings on all County maintained roads.

The Section also maintains the traffic data base containing accident data, traffic volumes, sign inventory and signal locations.

The Section also provides traffic services on a contract basis at cost for agencies other than the county. Services include the maintenance of some traffic signals and the fabrication of some traffic signs for the city of Gresham and the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview and Maywood Park.

### Administration

The Administrative Services Section provides support to the Engineering, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities, and Surveying and Bridge Sections of the Division.

In addition, they also provide administrative support to the Parks Services and Fleet & Electronic Services Divisions of the Department of Environmental Services. These two Divisions are located at the Yeon Shop Complex with the Transportation Division.

Examples of the type of support this Section provides are:

- Maintain the legal records of road proceedings;
- Assist in the development and administration of contracts for the performance of construction and maintenance projects;
- Perform cost accounting and payroll functions for the three Divisions;
- Provide word processing support;
- Operate the warehouse which provides materials and parts for the Transportation Division, Fleet & Electronics Services and Parks Services;
- Develop the majority of purchasing supply contracts and perform the purchasing for all three Divisions;
- Verify accounts payable invoices for materials and supplies;
- Perform transportation planning, environmental studies, and capital improvement programming;
- Administer the safety program for the Transportation Division
- Research, monitor and make application for outside revenue sources including federal funds;
- Prepare quarterly reports of expenditures on all capital projects;
- Serve as staff for East Multnomah County Transportation Committee.

Engineering and Public Works Division - City of Gresham

Information regarding services provided, level of service, and organizational structure of the City of Gresham was obtained from the City's fiscal year 1987/88 budget, and discussions with members of the City staff.

Prior to this budget year, the City of Gresham did not budget street revenues as a separate fund within the budget. The city of Gresham's Public Works Division is a division of the Community and Economic Development Department. This Department also is responsible for land use planning, plan and development review, building code enforcement and inspection, and maintenance and planning for the parks and recreation facilities. The engineering and public works related personnel functions are carried in four separate funds: General, Street Tax, Water, and Sewer Funds.

Gresham currently places emphasis on water and sewer operations primarily due to capital investment made in these operations in the past, and a lack of capital investment in the surface street system.

The city of Gresham currently does not have a formal street maintenance program. Maintenance is performed on a reactive as needed basis rather than a programmed basis. In 1986, Multnomah County personnel developed an inventory of city streets and suggested a pavement resurfacing program for the city of Gresham in conjunction with the East County Road Consortium discussions. Prior to this, the City did not have a formal inventory of streets or a pavement management system. It is not clear if these items exist at this time but work was progressing on developing a pavement management program. The City has a maintenance program for the sewer and water operations. Primarily the program is directed towards pumps and valves that require periodic service.

Public Works Division employees work in all three areas of responsibility streets, water, and sewer regardless of which fund they are budgeted for. This flexibility allows management to accomplish tasks in all three areas by assigning personnel on a priority basis. The city does not have a formal cost accounting system but presumably the level of effort balances between funds by year end. Public Works personnel perform tasks such as water meter installation and repair, cleaning and repair of sewer mains, manholes and lateral connections,

inspection of new and old sewer mains with television, excavation and backfill of utility trenches, pavement patching, street sweeping, sign installation, and snow plowing and sanding as required.

In the past, the City manufactured street and traffic signs from individual letters or purchased them from commercial sources. Currently the City is acquiring some signs from the county. The City also performs a limited amount of pavement marking and striping.

In addition to water, sewer and roads the City also provides engineering for building and development. An engineer is also available for work on local improvements and capital improvements.

Budgeted capital improvement funds indicate an emphasis on sewer construction, the least amount of capital is budgeted for roads. The City of Gresham performed some pavement resurfacing during past year and contracted for a slurry seal application on some roads.

The Public Works Division currently has a limited amount of equipment available for street, water, sewer, and parks maintenance. Existing equipment includes: one (1) 1947 era road grader, three (3) backhoes, three (3) 6 yard dump trucks and assorted pickups and flatbed trucks.

The city of Gresham's employee classification job descriptions, and minimal requirements for the appropriate classes were compared with Multnomah County positions to obtain the best match possible. Table 1 lists city and county employees by class and allocates them to assigned work units.

Table 2 contains a comparison of job titles and comparable earnings for the city and the county.

Presently no review of the respective bargaining unit contracts has been made. The majority of effected Multnomah County employees are represented by American Federation of State, County, Municipal Employees (AFSCME) AFL-CIO Union Local 88. Gresham city employees are represented by the 223 Teamsters Union. No comparisons relative to employee seniority or compensation was determined.

The following additional positions are listed as Gresham full time employees for the Community and Economic Development Department. There are no corresponding county positions performing similar functions within the county Transportation Division.

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>FTE</u>
General	City Building Official	1.0
	Code Enforcement Officer	1.0
	Community Code Inspector I	1.5
	Community Code Inspector II	6.5
	Community Code Inspector III	1.0
	Community Planner I	3.0
	Community Planner II	5.0
	Parks Planner/Coordinator	1.0
	Parks Planning/Assistant	1.0
	Permit Aide	1.0
Municipal Education		
Service Center		
	Building Maintenance Technician	1.0
	Subtotal	<u>23.0</u>
	Total Gresham	87.9

TABLE 1-1

## Multnomah County Transportation Division - Current FTE

Positions	Engr. Section	Road Section	Traffic Fac. Section	Admin Section	Totals
Admin. Specialist				2	2
Admin. Technician				1	1
Blacksmith		1			1
Carpenter Maint.		1			1
Civil Engineer Assoc	2				2
Electrician				2	2
Electrician - Lead				1	1
Engineering Tech Aid	1				1
Engineering Tech Asst	10		1		11
Engineering Tech Assoc	5				5
Engineering Tech Senior	2				2
Engineering Tech Princ	2		1		3
Heavy Equip. Operator		6			6
Maint. Worker		21	2		23
Maint. Worker - Lead		6	1		7
Office Asst. - 2	1			5	6
Office Asst. - 3				1	1
Office Asst. - 4				1	1
Planner Senior				1	1
Program Develop Special				2	2
Right of Way Permits Ch	1				1
Sign Painter - Lead			1		1
Sign Painter			1		1
Striping Machine Oper			4		4
Truck Driver		13			13
Admin. Asst.				1	1
Engineer - Traffic			1		1
Maint Oper. Supervisor		1	1		2
Maint. Supervisor - Road		5			5
Program Manager - 2	1	1		1	3
Program Manager - 3				1	1
Program Staff. Asst	1			2	3
TOTALS:	26	54	17	18	115

TABLE 1-2

## City of Gresham Engineering and Public Works Division - Current FTE

Position	General Fund	Street Tax Fund	Water Fund	Sewer Fund	Totals
Asst. City Manager	.9				.9
City Engineer	.45	.05	.2	.3	1.0
Civil Engineer I	.5	1.0		1.0	2.5
Civil Engineer II	1.5	.5		1.0	3.0
Civil Engineer III	.1		1.0	.9	2.0
Comm Develop Direct	1.0				1.0
Engineering Tech I	.5	.15		.35	1.0
Engineering Tech II	1.0	.15	1.85	1.0	4.0
Engineering Tech III	1.1	1.05	1.1	.75	4.0
Office Asst. I	3.5				3.5
Office Asst. II	3.45	.35	.6	1.6	6.0
Office Asst. III	1.75			.25	2.0
PW Const. Inspector	1.0	.35	.5	1.15	3.0
PW Oper Superintendent	.25	.3	.3	.15	1.0
PW Specialist	.2	.3	.3	.2	1.0
PW Supervisor	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.0
Public Utility Worker II	3.5	6.0	7.0	4.5	21.0
Sanitary Engineer				1.0	1.0
Staff Assistant	1.0			1.0	2.0
Water Service Specialist			1.0		1.0
TOTALS	22.7	11.2	14.85	16.15	64.9

TABLE 2

## Comparison of Positions and Salaries

CITY OF GRESHAM		MULTNOMAH COUNTY	
Position Title	Max Monthly Salary	Position Title	Max Monthly Salary
Civil Engineer I	\$3026	Civil Engineer Assistant	\$2831
Civil Engineer II	\$3502	Civil Engineer Associate	3034
Engineer Tech I	1946	Engineer Tech Aide	2054
		Engineer Tech Assistant	2232
Engineer Tech II	2233	Engineer Tech Associate	2436
Engineer Tech III	2744	Engineer Tech Senior	2831
		Engineer Tech Principle	3034
Public Utility Worker II			
Step A:	1429	Maintenance Worker	1785
Step C:	1564	Truck Driver	1916
Step F:	1794	Heavy Equipment Operator	2293
RW Supervisor	2744	Maintenance Supervisor Roads	2742
PW Oper. Superintendent	4054	Program Manager 2	4011

## Notes:

The City does not currently have separate positions for Maintenance Worker, Truck Driver, or Heavy Equipment Operator. City work is assigned on a seniority basis among the Public Utility Worker II's. County positions were matched to the corresponding step of the City position.

All salaries shown are the maximum monthly base salary, without fringe, for the position and step indicated.

### III. IMPACT ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY

An examination of the impacts to level of service was conducted by creating scenarios to compare the implications of transferring road responsibilities.

Each scenario contains a different set of assumptions regarding population annexed and road miles transferred to the cities of Portland and Gresham. Detailed budgets were prepared for the four impacted sections in the Transportation Division, Engineering, Maintenance, Traffic and Administration for each scenario. The budgets provided basic information required for making decisions relative to resource allocations, levels of service and resources transferred. Impacts were then evaluated by reviewing resource allocations among jurisdictions and level of service provided or possible.

Three scenarios were developed to transfer some, all or none of the county roads to Gresham on the basis of Portland annexing the balance of the urban service area. Three additional scenarios were also developed representing the present status of Portland's annexation program.

Comparing differences between ultimate conditions and present conditions allowed decisions to be made about personnel and equipment requirements overtime. Revenue, personnel and equipment within each alternative budget provided realistic assessments about the level of service each would afford.

The following assumptions were incorporated into the impact analysis:

- An intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with the city of Gresham would provide for the transfer of roads, revenue, personnel and equipment from Multnomah County to the city of Gresham.

- The intergovernmental agreement with Gresham would utilize the same revenue distribution formula contained in the Portland IGA.
- The intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Portland would remain unchanged.
- Road mileage is calculated from the County Master Road inventory.
  - Total miles of county roads within the Gresham urban services area is 118 miles: 64 miles of collectors and arterial streets, 54 miles of local or neighborhood streets.
  - During FY 88-89 the city of Portland will have accepted responsibility for a total of 395 miles of county roads.
- Based upon the county's Capital Improvement Program and Master Transportation Plan, there is an estimated ten-year capital liability of \$52 million for the county road system. County roads within the Gresham urban services area represent \$23.9 million of the total 10 year capital liability for the county road system. An additional \$27 million will be required for the I-84 US 26 connector and \$10.4 million for the Willamette River Bridges.
- Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village will continue to contract for maintenance services from the county.

Scenario 1A assumes 395 miles of county roads have currently been transferred to Portland, and the city of Gresham will accept responsibility for all 118 miles within the urban services area. The county will retain interim responsibility for 378 miles.

Scenario 2A assumes 395 miles of county roads have currently been transferred to Portland and the city of Gresham will accept responsibility for only 54 miles of local county roads within the urban services area. The county will retain interim responsibility for 441 miles.

Scenario 3A assumes 395 miles have currently been transferred to Portland. The county will retain 494 miles of county roads. No roads are transferred to Gresham.

Scenario 1B assumes the city of Portland has completed annexations within the urban services boundary and accepted 526 miles of county roads. The city of Gresham will accept responsibility for 118 miles of county roads in the urban service boundary. The county will have a remaining responsibility for 247 miles of primarily rural county roads.

Scenario 2B assumes the city of Portland has completed annexation within the urban services area and accepted responsibility for 526 miles of county roads. The city of Gresham will accept responsibility for only 54 miles of local county roads within the urban services area. The county will have a remaining responsibility for 311 miles of county roads.

Scenario 3B assumes the city of Portland has completed annexations and accepted responsibility for 526 miles of county's roads. The county will retain 364 miles of county roads. No roads are transferred to Gresham.

Detailed budgets, and resource allocations including personnel and equipment transfers are contained in Appendix E.

### Summary

The scenarios created, accounted for planned transfer of county roads to the city of Portland per the existing intergovernmental agreement. They also accounted for impacts associated with transferring to Gresham some or all of the county's road system within the Gresham urban services area.

Scenarios 1B and 2B in Appendix F describe in detail the implication of transferring county roads to the city of Gresham. The implications of such a transfer fall into four major categories; organizational, county government in general, countywide and regional.

For the existing county transportation organization a transfer of roads and resources to the city of Gresham, would mean a decrease in economies of scale currently enjoyed by the region. Resources would be lost and services duplicated to create two organizations to provide the same services originally handled by one. The result would be an increase in costs for those services further impacting the organization's ability to maintain the system or address capital needs.

The countywide impacts resulting from transferring roads and resources to Gresham would be reduced capital and decrease in road maintenance. The level of service for maintenance would be reduced under both scenarios because of the decrease in resources. Drainage, shoulder maintenance, chip sealing, snow plowing and sand efforts would be reduced. Surface preparation, the recycled asphalt program and maintenance contracts with Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview and Maywood Park would be eliminated with the transfer of all levels of county roads in the Gresham urban services boundary to Gresham. Maintenance of the county system under these scenarios would change from a proactive, programmatic approach to a reactive approach to road maintenance with a growing back log of unmet needs.

All of the scenarios suggest that funds are inadequate to address the known capital needs on the system. Even by providing a reduced level of service for maintenance, funds for capital are inadequate to address the needs outside the Portland urban services boundary. The county's known \$52,000,000 ten year road capital liability is funded currently at a rate of \$1.5 million per year. This level of funding is inadequate currently to effectively address the capital needs of the system.

This situation is amplified with the transfer of roads and resources to Gresham. The road fund revenues transferred to Gresham (per the Portland formula) reduces the Division of Transportation's ability to deliver services by approximately \$2.5 million for scenario 1B and by \$1.7 million for scenario 2B. A reduction of \$2.5 million to the division virtually eliminates the capital program. However, in terms of funding capital needs, scenario 2B; transferring local roads only to Gresham, puts the county in the least effective position of serving the public interest. By transferring local roads only \$1.7 million in revenue would be transferred to Gresham and the entire \$52,000,000 liability would be retained by the county. The capital needs identified are not on the local system.

The county role in the area of regional transportation planning, policy development and federal fund allocation would be reduced. Currently those activities are carried on within a number of committees comprised primarily of representatives from the counties, the city of Portland, the state, Tri-Met and Metro. Historically, Multnomah County has coordinated and consolidated the arterial and collector needs of the unincorporated areas and east county cities into a single voice for this subregion. This consensus building approach has provided for successful competition for state and federal funds as well as transportation policy changes.

A change in the role of Multnomah County would ultimately be reflected in the balance of the committees. The question of participation would likely increase the number of representatives in the decision-making process. The county voice currently coordinating an integrated comprehensive approach to transportation policy and planning would be replaced by several voices representing different interests. The effectiveness afforded by the consensus building approach would be lost.

Transferring county road responsibilities and revenue to Gresham and changing the county's role in the area of transportation service delivery

would also affect county government; specifically the general fund. The current size of the road fund and related personnel equipment and capital projects demands a level of support from the other county departments. For example indirect costs for FY 88-89, which support the Budget office, the Auditor, County Counsel, the Board of County Commissioners, Finance, Personnel, etc., are expected to be \$553,287. If roads are transferred to Gresham resulting in transfer of revenue, personnel, and equipment the indirect costs would be less (see Table 3). Similarly as the division decreases in size the fixed costs currently shared by several divisions will most likely increase.

A reduction in road fund support and needs will impact the General fund by \$277,000 if all roads in Gresham's urban services area are transferred and by \$280,000 if local roads only are transferred.

Discussion of personnel, revenue and equipment required and identified for transfer are included in Appendix F of this paper.

Table 3

## Road Fund Allocation for Indirect Costs by Scenario

## SCENARIOS

County Organizations	% Allocations	FY 88-89 Proposed*	1A	1B	2A	2B	3A	3B
Budget	5.6	31,020	21,245	15,453	24,186	17,652	27,758	21,523
Auditor	6.6	36,592	25,038	18,213	28,505	20,804	32,709	25,366
County Counsel	15.2	84,099	57,662	41,944	65,648	47,912	75,329	58,419
BCC & Chair	41.8	231,272	158,573	115,346	180,531	131,758	207,156	160,652
Finance	12.0	66,278	45,522	33,114	51,827	37,825	59,471	46,120
Purchasing	8.5	46,912	32,245	23,455	36,711	26,793	42,125	32,668
Telecommunications	2.3	12,752	8,725	6,347	9,934	7,250	11,398	8,840
Personnel	5.7	31,733	21,623	15,729	24,618	17,967	28,249	21,907
Records	2.3	12,629	8,725	6,347	9,934	7,249	11,398	8,840
Total	100.0	553,287	379,358	275,947	431,893	315,210	495,588	384,335
Reduction from FY 88-89*			31%	51%	22%	43%	11%	30%
Dollars			173,929	277,340	121,394	280,077	57,699	168,952

\* For upcoming FY 88-89 Budget

As per memo 1-8-88 from DGS Division of Planning and Budget

3874V

## V. ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST

Arguments for and against the Gresham proposal are basically the advantages and disadvantages from each perspective. The arguments are listed to assist in assessing the ultimate role for the county which will produce the greatest overall benefit for its constituency.

Two sets of arguments are presented, one is for the county retaining its present role, the other is for changing the county role in favor of the Gresham proposal.

### County Retains Present Role

Jurisdiction of county roads is not transferred to Gresham.

#### A. County Arguments for Continuing Present Role

- Promotes efficiency, minimizes duplication of services, and retains economy of scale.
- Provides a comprehensive, integrated approach to regional transportation planning, policy implementation and service delivery.
- Recognizes that economic development is mutually interdependent and benefits the entire county, region, and state.
- Maximizes funds available to address system-wide capital liability. Major capital liability for roads is retained by the county.
- Retains a proactive, programmatic approach to delivery of services.

- Retains present level of service delivery throughout the county transportation system. Maintenance needs will be kept current, not deferred. Continues to provide contract services to the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview and Maywood Park.

B. Gresham Arguments Against Retaining County Role

- Is not responsive to the city of Gresham's desire to set land use and transportation policies and goals.
- Limits city responsibility to existing streets and does not recognize full services concept at the level sought.
- City has a diminished role in transportation policy within the region.
- City cannot respond directly to all road related complaints or concerns.
- Requires coordination for infrastructure development.
- Requires coordination of land use requirements and street standards for development projects abutting county roads within the city.
- Street maintenance standards are different.

County Role Changed

Multnomah County surrenders jurisdiction of county roads located within the city of Gresham urban services area to the city.

A. Gresham Arguments for the Proposal

- Centralizes land use and transportation policies within the city of Gresham.
- Provides for centralized coordination of land use requirements and street standards for development projects within the city of Gresham.
- Centralizes coordination for infrastructure development within the city of Gresham.
- Establishes city of Gresham transportation system policies and goals.
- Establishes a priority policy relative to capital investment and road maintenance for the city of Gresham.
- Establishes a single standard of road maintenance within the city of Gresham.
- Centralizes complaint response within the city of Gresham.
- City of Gresham gains an increased role in the transportation policy development within the region.

B. County Arguments Against the Gresham Proposal

- Promotes the duplication of services, reduces efficiency, and increase the cost to the public for delivery of services. Present advantage of economy of scale are lost to the region.

- Reduces funds available to address system-wide capital liability, shifts priorities, and is unresponsive to capital needs.
- Forces reduction of overall service level provided by the county for the remaining transportation system.
- Eliminates ability to provide contract maintenance services to Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview and Maywood Park.
- Ignores the concept of regional services and responsibility.
- A mutually exclusive approach to establishing city of Gresham transportation policies and goals is not in the regions best interest.
- Present coordinated transportation policies and goals are compromised.
- Gresham has not demonstrated there is a benefit to the public countywide.
- Maintenance standards differ system-wide.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

### Organizational Comparison

Reorganization of county road responsibilities between the County and Portland was relatively straight forward. Both transportation organizations were large, efficient, experienced and offered a full range of road services. Each organization was also primarily responsible for providing only road related services. They shared historic responsibility and had a relatively equal investment in the system. They each expected to continue to provide services at the same relative levels without major organizational changes.

The existing county transportation organization is focused to provide transportation services system wide to the public. Overtime, systems have been developed and economies have been reached as a result of this focus. A decrease in resources and responsibilities will impact the organization and efficiencies that have been developed to provide transportation services will be lost.

The relative difference in the approach to service delivery, economies of scale, efficiency and maturity of Gresham and the county is considerable.

### Organizational Impacts

Reduced responsibilities and resources to meet them will force a change in the approach to the delivery of services by the county. The present proactive programmed approach to preventative road maintenance and capital needs will change to a reactive, as needed approach.

If roads are transferred to the city of Gresham personnel transfers and the timing of transfers are likely to be a major issue. The needs of the two organizations will differ from those of a single organization. The

compliment of personnel and equipment needed to maintain the county system until Portland completes annexations will be a different mix than what the county will ultimately need. Therefore, transfer of jurisdiction and resources to Gresham should not occur until after the city of Portland completes annexations if a changed role for the county is chosen.

ORS 236.610 - 236 - 650 provides that no public employee shall be deprived of employment solely because the duties of employment have been assumed or acquired by another public employer, whether or not an agreement, annexation or consolidation with the present employer is involved.

This particular provision of the law underscores the caution needed in deciding on a changed role for the county. Reconfiguring county service delivery required by transferring county roads to Gresham will mean a host of employees will no longer be needed by the county.

For example the resource summary for scenario 1B lists 20 employees remaining to be transferred to Portland per the agreement and 30 employees to Gresham. Gresham estimates they will require 17 additional employees for the same scenario. The difference occurs because of the loss of major county programs and capital construction.

The difference in wage rates for various classes of employees will also prove to be a major negotiating issue both with Gresham and the Union. Union Local 88 AFSCME can also be counted on to work hard for its employees. They will fight the loss of 30 additional members as well as the threat of lower wages or red circled wages.

#### Countywide Concerns

Transferring county roads and services from Multnomah County to the city of Gresham promotes duplication of services and loss of efficiency. The present advantage of economies of scale accrued to the county would be

lost to the region. Two organizations providing similar services in the same general location at an overall lower level of service would replace the existing primary organization currently providing the service.

By creating two organizations to provide transportation services limited resources for the road system would be reduced overall. Whether all county roads in Gresham's urban services boundary or a portion of them were transferred to Gresham, the ability of the county and the city of Gresham to address the known \$52 million dollar 10 year road capital liability would be reduced. Potentially the capital needs of the county's remaining system would necessarily go unmet to meet minimal maintenance requirements. The public's investment in the road system would ultimately be jeopardized on a long term basis.

Revenues derived from the Portland formula are not adequate for the county. If the decision is made to change the county role by transferring roads to Gresham it cannot be done on the basis of the present Portland formula. The formula has to be changed for both Portland and Gresham to allow the county to be a viable provider of transportation services for its remaining responsibility.

Transfer of all or a portion of the county road system would force policy changes relative to the way the system is managed. The potentially mutually exclusive approach to transportation policy development that may result could bring about a fragmented system with inconsistent standards.

There is no evidence based on past practice or present policies that the city of Gresham would give priority to road maintenance. An unbalanced city response to economic development may shift emphasis from maintenance of the system to capital investment, producing added long term costs. This would jeopardize overtime the public's investment.

A review of arguments for and against the proposal to transfer road responsibilities from Multnomah County to the city of Gresham suggests that while the transfer could benefit the city of Gresham in the short run it would be at the expense of Multnomah County and its broader constituency.

Communication and coordination problems currently exist between the county and Gresham. None of these problems are insurmountable if they would be willing to resolve them. Many of Gresham's concerns could be addressed by development of joint strategies and policies in lieu of reassigning responsibilities.

In the short run, transferring responsibility for any part of the county road system to Gresham will result in a reduced level of service for the remainder of the county road system. In the long run if the transfer occurs, the capital needs will out pace either the county or Gresham's ability to address them. Ultimately both jurisdictions will be unable to maintain the system. The public investment in a system which currently has no deferred maintenance will be put at risk.

A changed role for the county as a provider of transportation services occasioned by the transferring responsibility for roads to Gresham is not in the public's best interest.

#### Recommendations

The Gresham proposal presents a choice between the county retaining its present role in transportation or redefining it. Retaining the present role is consistent with the existing mission and goals of the county. Redefining the role will mean restating those ideals.

- 1) The present role of the county as a provider of transportation services is the appropriate one. Duplication of services is minimized, efficiency is improved and economies of scale are retained.

The present comprehensive, integrated approach to regional transportation planning and policy implementation is retained.

Capital improvement funds are maximized and major capital liability for roads in the east county is centralized.

The present proactive, programmatic approach to delivery of services is retained. The present level of service will be retained throughout the county road system. Maintenance needs will continue to be kept current, not deferred with a growing backlog. The county will be able to continue providing contract maintenance services to Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village.

The present role also recognizes that economic development is mutually interdependent and benefits the entire county, the region and the state.

Retaining the present role is in the demonstrated best interest of the public in general. It recognizes the public investment in a superior system of roads and insures that the investment is preserved.

- 2) The city of Gresham should be encouraged to reopen discussions with the county to develop programmed road maintenance services. The city could contract for surface improvement requirements from the county much the same as Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village. This approach reduces duplication of services, promotes efficiency and is more economical.

Once a successful working relationship has been established, serious consideration should again be given to forming a road consortium with all four cities in east county. Joint policy development, planning and implementation will ultimately produce the optimum service delivery for transportation needs.

- 3) Communication, coordination and cooperation must be improved between Gresham and the county. A joint committee on policy and strategies should be formed to identify all problems and jointly work out effective solutions. It is important that good working relationships be developed and maintained.
  
- 4) The intergovernmental agreement for transportation between Portland and the county must be renegotiated, specifically the formula for determining revenue allocations must be reconstructed to provide a more equitable distribution. The county cannot approach the known 10 year capital liability without a significantly larger share of the revenue it receives.

## VII REFERENCES

The following is a listing of the documents, laws, agreements, etc., that were utilized as reference material during the development of this report.

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS)

Multnomah County Code (MCC)

Multnomah County Adopted Budget, Fiscal Year 1987/88

Multnomah County Employee Classification Plan

Multnomah County Employee Compensation Plan

Multnomah County Street Standards, Codes and Rules, February 19, 1987

Multnomah County Transportation Division,

Five Year Capital Improvement Plan

Multnomah County Transportation Division

Draft Master Transportation Plan

Multnomah County Transportation Division

Road Functional Classification Plan

Multnomah County Transportation Division

Master Road List and Pavement Management Program

City of Gresham, Adopted Budget, Fiscal Year 1987/88

City of Gresham, Employee Classification Plan

City of Gresham, Employee Compensation Plan

City of Portland/Multnomah County, Intergovernmental Agreement,

Transition of Urban Services, August 1984 (As Amended)

Metropolitan Service District/Oregon Department of Transportation,  
House Bill 2112 Revenue Projections  
Oregon Department of Transportation, Data Resource Section,  
Regional Development Trends  
Portland State University, Population Research and Census Center,  
City Population and Projected Growth  
Clackamas County/City of Lake Oswego, Intergovernmental Agreement,  
Transfer of Certain Roads and Bridges, December 10, 1987  
Lane County/Cities of Eugene and Springfield, Intergovernmental  
Agreement, Urban Transition Agreement - Streets and Roads, July 18, 1987  
Lane County/Cities of Veneta, Intergovernmental Agreement,  
Urban Transition Agreement - Streets and Roads, December 1, 1987  
Don Barney and Associates, Rethinking Road Maintenance,  
a report to the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners, 1983.

## APPENDIX A. STATE STATUTES, ORDINANCES AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

The county provides road services according to a variety of state statutes, ordinances and administrative rules. A brief review has been included to provide some understanding of influencing factors.

### Definitions

The following are road definitions contained in ORS 368.001:

- (1) "County road" means a public road under the jurisdiction of a county that has been designated as a county road under ORS 368.016.
- (2) "Local access road" means a public road that is not a county road, state highway, or federal road.
- (3) "Public road" means a road over which the public has a right of use that is a matter of public record.
- (4) "Road" means the entire right of way of any public or private way that provides ingress to or egress from property by means of vehicles or other means or that provides travel between places by means of vehicles. "Road" includes, but is not limited to:
  - (a) Ways described as streets, highways, throughways, or alleys;
  - (b) Road related structures that are in the right of way such as tunnels, culverts, or similar structures; and
  - (c) Structures that provide for continuity of the right of way such as bridges. [1981 c.153 Subsection 2]

### Authority and Responsibility

The county is granted general authority and power over matters of county concern in ORS 203.035 and Chapter II of Multnomah County Home Rule Charter.

The broad scope of county authority is refined as it applies to roads by various ORS statutes, primarily those contained in Chapter 368 as follows:

- (1) 368.011 - Provides for the enacting of ordinances to supersede provisions of Chapter 368 with certain exceptions.
- (2) 368.016 - The exercise of governmental powers relating to a road within a county is a matter of county concern. A county governing body may by resolution or order make any public road within its jurisdiction a county road but has no jurisdiction over a state highway and shall only take action involving a local access road within a city if the city governing body consents to the action.
- (3) 368.031 - The county has jurisdiction over local access roads outside a city in the same manner as county roads except the county and its officers are not liable for failure to improve or keep it in repair. A county governing body may spend county money on local access roads if it determines the work is an emergency or if the county road official recommends the expenditure, and public use of the road justifies the expenditure.
- (4) 368.041 - Provides for the width of a county road and for the maintenance of a public road after the county governing body designated it a county road.

- (5) 368.046 - The county governing body may hire a county road official who shall work under their direction, assist them in preparing specifications for county work on roads within the county, superintend work done by the county upon roads, recommend methods to be adopted for construction, improvement, repair and maintenance of roads.
- (6) MCC 11.60 (Street Standards Code) establishes responsibility with the Director of Environmental Services to exercise the county's authority under ORS 368, Multnomah County Code, and other authorizing statutes to adopt rules generally for the following purposes: to design, construct, manage, and maintain roads and streets under the county's jurisdiction.
- (7) 368.051 - County road official shall maintain a complete and accurate cost account for road work performed by the county as required under ORS 279.023.
- (8) 368.073-368.131 - Authorizes the acquisition of real property for roads and provides the procedure on how it may be acquired for road purposes.
- (9) 368.251-368.281 - Prohibits an owner or lawful occupant of land adjacent to a road from creating a road hazard or damaging a public road. These statutes provide procedures the county may follow to abate hazards.
- (10) 368.942-368.990 - Prohibits posting of notices, signs, or pictures on structures within county road right of ways, provides punishments for violations, and authorizes a county road official to remove unlawfully posted material.

- (11) 374.305-374.340 - Requires a permit from the county to place or construct any thing or structure within the right of way of a county road. A person has the right to free use of a public road outside a city such as the location of water, gas, electric or communication facilities, subject to county regulations of the use and issuance of a permit.
- (12) 368.326-368.366 - Establishes procedures by which a county governing body may vacate a subdivision, part of a subdivision, a public road, a trail, a public easement, public square, or any other public property or public interest in property under the jurisdiction of the county governing body outside the corporate limits of a city.
- (13) 371.605-371.660 - Establishes procedures by which improvement of roads in unincorporated areas may be initiated by petition of the abutting property owners or resolution by the county governing body.
- (14) 373.270 - Establishes procedures for the transferring of jurisdiction over county roads within a city to the city.
- (15) 366.514 - One percent of funds received by the county from the State Highway Fund shall be spent to provide footpaths and bicycle trails.
- (16) 810.210 - Traffic Control Devices  
Provides for the installation and maintenance of traffic control devices on roads under the jurisdiction of the county lying outside city limits for the safe, expeditious control of traffic, necessary to carry out the provisions of the vehicle code or local traffic ordinances or necessary to regulate, warn, or guide traffic.

All traffic control devices erected shall conform to the state manual and specifications of uniform standards.

Revenue

Oregon Constitution, Article IX, Section 3A

Any tax or excise levied on the ownership, operations, or use of motor vehicles and any tax levied on motor vehicle fuel or any other product used for propulsion of motor vehicles shall be used exclusively for administration, construction, operations, and use of public highways, roads, streets, and roadside rest areas.

State Highway Fund

ORS 153.630(2)(b) Money collected from arrest or complaints made by Highway Division Weighmaster.

ORS 767.635 Surplus money in Motor Carrier Account of General Fund transferred to State Highway Fund. Motor Carrier Account consists of all fees, taxes, charges, and other sums collected by the Public Utility Commission under ORS Chapter 767.

ORS 802.110 Monies collected by the Motor Vehicles Division from motor vehicle fuel tax, motor vehicle registration and titling, driving licenses and permits, operation of vehicles on highways and of vehicle size, weight, and use limits, after approved expenses of the division, shall be transferred to the State Highway Fund.

ORS 366.524

Formula for distribution of State Highway Fund:

<u>TAX</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>COUNTIES</u>	<u>CITIES</u>
11¢	68%	20%	12%
3¢	50%	30%	20%
2¢ (1-1-89)	50%	30%	20%
2¢ (1-1-90)	68%	20%	12%

ORS 366.530

Basis of allocation of appropriation to counties.

Proportion of the number of vehicles, trailers, semi-trailers, pole trailers, and pole or pipe trailers registered in each county, to the total number of such vehicles registered in the state.

Other

MCC 5.30.030(A)(2)

County business license fee is imposed on every dealer on the basis of three (3) cents per gallon on motor vehicle fuel.

ORS 272.085

Five (5) percent of the sales of public lands and material of United States public lands in the state is turned over to the State Treasurer and distributed to the counties on the basis of the average square mile area of each county. Those funds shall be used for the benefit of the public roads and bridges in the county.

ORS 294.060

Federal Forest Yield county share: 75% to Road Fund, 25% to School Fund.

- MCC 5.10.215-  
MCC 5.10.220                   Miscellaneous Permit Fees  
Various fees for permits issued for certain activities, construction, alteration, installation, build or construct with a public right of way for services provided and responsibility performed.
- MCC 5.10.225                   Fee for filing a road vacation application is \$300.
- MCC 5.10.230                   Fee for Street and Road Widening Permit  
Directs Director of the Department of Environmental Services to adopt administrative rules establishing a flexible fee schedule for design and construction administration for street and road widening permits. The fee shall be based upon the county's actual cost of providing the service, including salaries, overhead, and fringe benefits.
- MCC 5.10.235                   Fee for Project Agreements  
Director of Department of Environmental Services' administrative rules establishes a flexible project administration fee based upon the county's actual cost incurred including salaries, overhead, and fringe benefits.
- ORS 190.003-  
ORS 190.110                   Intergovernmental Agreements  
Reimbursement for services provided by county personnel from other governmental agencies.
- ORS 294.080                   Interest earned on Road Fund shall be credited to the Road Fund.

## APPENDIX B. PRECEDENTS FOR ROAD TRANSFERS

### Clackamas County

Clackamas County has a basic policy for the surrendering of a county road to a city whereby they will turn over funds based upon the cost of a two-inch asphaltic concrete overlay over the existing pavement in exchange for the city accepting jurisdiction.

Clackamas County and the City of Lake Oswego just completed an agreement whereby 40 miles of county roads were surrendered to the city based upon the county paying to the city the cost of a two-inch overlay, payable over ten years at \$250,000 per year for a total of \$2,500,000. This agreement also provides the surrendering of county roads in future annexation upon payment of funds on the same basis.

Clackamas County does not share any part of their road funds with any city except by agreement as stated above.

### Jackson County

Jackson County has no basic policy for providing funds along with the surrendering of county roads to cities. Each street is evaluated on its particular situation.

Jackson County does not share any part of its road fund with any of the cities in the county.

### Marion County

Under ORS 373.320, all county roads within the City of Salem are city streets, and this covers annexations as they occur.

Surrendering county roads in other cities in Marion County is evaluated on a street by street basis and a decision is made as to the particulars.

Marion County does not share any part of its road fund with any of the cities in the county.

#### Washington County

Washington County has adopted a transportation plan for the entire county, and their basic philosophy is not to surrender any street classified as an arterial. They will review any request for a collector street but will surrender without hesitation any local or residential street. They do not provide any county funds when surrendering a county road to a city. Basically, each street is evaluated at the time the situation arises.

Washington County does not share any part of the state motor vehicle revenue but does share with the cities the serial levy for roads which the voters passed.

By the way, Washington County requires the formation of a maintenance Local Improvement District as a condition of subdivision street acceptance into the county road system.

#### Lane County

Lane County and cities within that county have adopted a Regional Road System and have entered into agreements whereby all county roads within cities are surrendered to the respective cities. Certain funds are transferred to the cities as follows:

- (1) All cities yearly share \$1,500,000 from county timber receipts with each city's share based upon percentage of total city miles, plus county road miles (excluding Regional Road Network miles) in city to total road miles in all cities.

- (2) All cities share on a yearly basis an amount equal to the county's overlay budget (but not less than \$1,500,000) divided by 1235 miles of county paved roads, times the number of Regional Road Network miles within the city.
  
- (3) Cities of Eugene and Springfield also receive funds for maintenance activities on the Regional Road Network within the cities based upon a five year average of county road maintenance cost per mile which currently equals \$4,000 per Regional Road Network mile.

APPENDIX C. INVENTORY OF ROAD SYSTEM

The Multnomah County Road Mileage By Jurisdiction Table lists the miles of county roads by Functional Classification within each political subdivision of the county. It also shows responsibility transferred to the city of Portland to date and miles remaining to be transferred upon completion of annexation to the urban services boundary.

TABLE 1

MULTNOMAH COUNTY  
ROAD MILEAGE BY JURISDICTION

## FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

JURISDICTION	ARTERIAL	COLLECTOR	URBAN-LOCAL	RURAL-LOCAL	TOTAL
Multnomah County, January 1984	116.63	159.26	427.88	203.23	907.0
Transferred to Portland 7/84-1/88	56.22	85.36	220.07	0.0	361.65
County Roads maintained by Portland under Oct. 84 agreement	0.0	0.0	16.95	0.0	16.95
Multnomah County, January 1988	60.41	73.9	190.86	203.23	528.4
Portland, January 1988	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gresham	32.3	32.3	53.4	0.0	118.0
Fairview	1.6	1.5	2.9	0.0	6.0
Troutdale	4.9	5.1	1.2	0.0	11.2
Wood Village	2.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	2.6
Maywood Park	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	1.4
Lake Oswego	0.61	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.61
Portland Urban Service area (Future Transfers)	16.89	19.87	127.59	0.0	164.35
County Responsibility less future transfers to Portland	43.52	54.03	63.27	203.23	364.05
County Responsibility less mileage in Gresham	11.22	21.73	9.87	203.23	246.05

3773V

## APPENDIX D. REVENUES

Multnomah County's road fund revenues are described to identify funds used for the county's transportation system and funds to be transferred to the cities of Portland and Gresham as they accept responsibility for road miles.

### Sources of Funds

Revenues representing Multnomah County's road fund are derived primarily from three sources. They are dedicated by the state constitutions and county ordinance for road purposes.

- (1) The state gasoline tax distributed among the state, counties, and cities under ORS 366.524 is established at 14¢ per gallon effective January 1, 1988. HB 2112 approved by the 1987 legislature provides for an increase of 2¢ per year to an ultimate tax of 18¢ per gallon. In FY 88-89 the state gasoline tax distributed to Multnomah County (including the increase) is anticipated to be approximately \$12,900,000.
- (2) County gasoline tax collected under MCC 5.30.030 imposes 3¢ per gallon as a business license fee on motor vehicle fuel in Multnomah County. Approximately \$7,400,000 will be realized in FY 88-89.
- (3) Federal forest receipts are distributed to the county under ORS. 294.060; seventy five percent allotted to roads and 25 percent to schools. Multnomah County will receive approximately \$400,000 in FY 88-89.

Road Fund Revenue from other sources are derived primarily from service reimbursements, cash transfers and interest on investments. By statute or county code, revenues accrue to the road fund and are restricted to road purposes. Other revenues presently range from \$2,000,000 to \$1,500,000, annually.

Distribution Formula

(1) City of Portland

In March 1984 Multnomah County entered into an intergovernmental agreement with the city of Portland to transfer responsibility for roads within the incorporated city limits. As the city of Portland annexes territory it accepts county roads within the city limits. Road revenues are transferred by formula. Equipment and personnel are transferred on a prorata basis according to underlying responsibility requirements.

1983-84 County Road Fund base revenue

(State Gas Tax, County Gas Tax and Forest Receipts)	14,687,793
Less Willamette River Bridge (WRB) Maintenance Funds	(1,409,120)
Less WRB Capital Funds	(1,060,000)
Less 1% Bicycle Funds	( 110,000)
Less County Overhead	<u>( 400,000)</u>
Net Revenue for distribution	11,708,673

(a) Road Mileage Distribution

<u>Co. Rd. Miles in City</u>	X Net Rev. for	= City of Portland
<u>Total County Rd. Miles</u>	distribution	share
395	X 11,708,673	= 5,151,816
<u>907</u>		

(b) Bike Mileage Distribution

<u>Co. Rd. Miles in City</u>	X Net Rev. for	= City of Portland
<u>Total County Rd. Miles</u>	distribution	share
395	X 117,087	= 49,127
<u>907</u>		

(c) Population Distribution

New Revenue (current State & Co. Gas Tax plus Forest Receipts)	20,711,600
Less Base Revenue (1983-84)	<u>(14,687,793)</u>
Net Revenue for Population Distribution	6,023,807
Percentage of City Population X Net Rev. for Distr. = City's Share	
.77 X 6,023,807 = 4,638,331	
Road Mileage Share	5,151,816
Bike Mileage Share	49,127
Population Share	<u>4,638,331</u>
Total County Road Fund Revenue Transferred to City of Portland in FY 88-89	\$9,839,274

(2) City of Gresham

As noted, if roads are transferred to the city of Gresham, it is assumed revenues will be transferred according to the city of Portland Formula. This illustration is based 118 miles of the county road system transferred to Gresham.

1983-84 County Road Fund Base Revenue	14,687,793
Less WRB Capital & Maintenance, Bike & Overhead FY 88-89	<u>(2,979,120)</u>
Net Revenue for Distribution	11,708,673

(a) Road Mileage Distribution

$$\frac{118}{907} \times 11,708,673 = 1,522,127$$

(b) Bike Mileage Distribution

$$\frac{118}{907} \times 111,650 = 14,514$$

(c) Population Distribution

New Revenue	20,711,600
Less Base Revenue	<u>(14,687,793)</u>

Net Revenue for Population Distribution 6,023,807

$$.10 \times 6,023,807 = 602,381$$

Road Mileage Share	1,522,127
Bike Mileage Share	14,514
Population Share	<u>602,380</u>

Total County Road Fund Revenue to be Transferred  
to City of Gresham in FY 88-89 \$2,139,021

(3) Multnomah County

Surrendering jurisdiction of 118 miles of county roads to the city of Gresham, together with an additional 33 miles of county roads to Portland, will leave a present balance of 378 miles (not including 17 miles of roads in the west side pockets) for which the county is responsible for.

Total County Road Fund available for road purposes:

FY 88-89 Estimated Road Fund Revenue (State Gas Tax, Co. Gas Tax & Forest Receipts)	\$20,711,600
Less dollars transferred to city of Portland	(9,839,274)
Less dollars transferred to city of Gresham	(2,139,021)
Less WRB Maint. and Capital, Bike Fund and Overhead	(2,981,605)
Less Service Reimbursements	<u>(430,000)</u>
5,321,700	
Plus Other Revenue	<u>1,532,000</u>
Net Revenue Available for road Purposes	<u><u>\$6,805,700</u></u>

The following tables describe the road fund revenue projected for Multnomah County over the next 10 year period. Included in this table are the assumptions made associated with the application of the Portland agreement formula. For example, it is assumed that when the city of Portland accepts responsibility for 395 miles of the county road system they will have annexed 77 percent of the county's total population. Similarly, it is assumed when the city of Gresham accepts responsibility for 118 miles of the county road system, they will have accepted responsibility for about 10 percent of the county's population. These and other assumptions were used to develop the road fund constraint for the Transportation Division's Engineering, Road Maintenance, Traffic, and Administration sections. The constraint serves as the basis for determining impacts to those existing organizations overtime in terms of operations, level of service, and cost effectiveness.

In addition to the assumptions regarding population annexed and miles transferred by year, the following assumptions were used:

- In Table 2 the city of Portland's annexation policy is not complete until 1990-91, and the population in the city does not increase beyond 85 percent for the next ten years.
- In Table 2 the city of Gresham's annexation policy is complete, but the population increases at a rate of 3 percent over the first five years and then levels off.
- In Table 2 the Multnomah County set aside includes the WRB capital, held constant at \$1,060,000; the WRB maintenance increasing at a rate of 4 percent per year; bike funds increasing at a rate of 1.5 percent/year and overhead, held constant.
- In Table 3 Total Revenue represents the road fund, comprised of state and county gasoline tax (not including HB 2112) increasing at a rate of 1.5 percent/year and federal forest receipts held constant at \$400,000.

- In Table 3 the Additional Pennies for State Gas Tax accounts for 2 cents in place in January 1, 1988, an additional 2 cents in January 1, 1989, and the final 2 cents in January 1, 1990, shared on the allocation formula allowed under HB 2112.
- In Table 4 it is assumed that Other Road Fund Revenue comprised of interest and investments and service reimbursements will decrease after FY 88-89 at a rate of 7 percent/year based on loss of miles in the system and funds transferred to cities of Portland and Gresham.
- In Table 4 the Road Fund Constraint are those funds remaining after the road fund is allocated to accounting and administration.

TABLE 2

## ROAD FUND DISTRIBUTION FOR SCENARIOS 1A and 1B (118 miles)

YEAR	MILES TRANSFERRED				% POPULATION		1983-84 BASE REVENUE	MULTCO SET ASIDE*	NET REV. FOR DIST.
	COP	%	GRESH	%	COP	GRESH			
87-88	362.66	0.4	118	0.13	0.72	0.097	14687793	2923000	11764793
88-89	395	0.44	118	0.13	0.77	0.1	14687793	2979120	11708673
89-90	445	0.49	118	0.13	0.82	0.103	14687793	3037404	11650389
90-91	507	0.56	118	0.13	0.85	0.106	14687793	3097940	11589853
91-92	526	0.58	118	0.13	0.85	0.109	14687793	3160818	11526975
92-93	526	0.58	118	0.13	0.85	0.109	14687793	3226131	11461662
93-94	526	0.58	118	0.13	0.85	0.109	14687793	3293977	11393816
94-95	526	0.58	118	0.13	0.85	0.109	14687793	3364456	11323337
95-96	526	0.58	118	0.13	0.85	0.109	14687793	3437674	11250119
96-97	526	0.58	118	0.13	0.85	0.109	14687793	3513741	11174052
97-98	526	0.58	118	0.13	0.85	0.109	14687793	3592771	11095022

-52-

## ROAD FUND DISTRIBUTION FOR SCENARIOS 2A and 2B (53.4 miles)

YEAR	MILES TRANSFERRED				% POPULATION		1983-84 BASE REVENUE	MULTCO SET ASIDE*	NET REV. FOR DIST.
	COP	%	GRESH	%	COP	GRESH			
87-88	362.66	0.4	53.4	0.059	0.72	0.097	14687793	2923000	11764793
88-89	395	0.44	53.4	0.059	0.77	0.1	14687793	2979120	11708673
89-90	445	0.49	53.4	0.059	0.82	0.103	14687793	3037404	11650389
90-91	507	0.56	53.4	0.059	0.85	0.106	14687793	3097940	11589853
91-92	526	0.58	53.4	0.059	0.85	0.109	14687793	3160818	11526975
92-93	526	0.58	53.4	0.059	0.85	0.109	14687793	3226131	11461662
93-94	526	0.58	53.4	0.059	0.85	0.109	14687793	3293977	11393816
94-95	526	0.58	53.4	0.059	0.85	0.109	14687793	3364456	11323337
95-96	526	0.58	53.4	0.059	0.85	0.109	14687793	3437674	11250119
96-97	526	0.58	53.4	0.059	0.85	0.109	14687793	3513741	11174052
97-98	526	0.58	53.4	0.059	0.85	0.109	14687793	3592771	11095022

\* Includes Willamette River Bridge Maintenance and Capital, Bike and Overhead

TABLE 3

## ROAD FUND DISTRIBUTION FOR SCENARIOS 1A and 1B (118 miles)

YEAR	TOTAL REVENUE*	MILEAGE DIST		POP INCREASE		BIKE FUND		\$ TRANSFER		ADDITIONAL	\$ TRANSFER	
		COP	GRESH	COP	GRESH	COP	GRESH	COP	GRESH	PENNIES OF STATE GAS TAX	COP	GRESH
87-88	18780000	4705917.	1529423.	2946389.	396944.0	44000	14300	7696306.	1940667.	531000	382320	51507
88-89	18800000	5151816.	1522127.	3166399.	411220.7	49126	14514.5	8367341.	1947862.	1911600	1471932	191160
89-90	19100000	5708690.	1514550.	3618009.	454457.3	55529.12	14732.21	9382229.	1983740.	3451500	2830230	355504.5
90-91	19400000	6490317.	1406680.	4005375.	499493.9	64413.78	14953.20	10560107.	2021128.	4602000	3911700	487812
91-92	19700000	6685645.	1498506.	4260375.	546330.5	67714.99	15177.49	11013736.	2060014.	4655100	3956835	507405.9
92-93	20000000	6647763.	1490016.	4515375.	579030.5	68730.71	15405.16	11231870	2084451.	4690500	3986925	511264.5
93-94	20300000	6608413.	1481196.	4770375.	611730.5	69761.68	15636.23	114485500	2108562.	4743600	4032060	517052.4
94-95	20600000	6567535.	1472033.	5025375.	644430.5	70808.10	15870.78	11663719	2132335.	4796700	4077195	522840.3
95-96	20900000	6525069.	1462515.	5280375.	677130.5	71870.22	16108.84	11877315	2155754.	4832100	4107285	526698.9
96-97	21200000	6480950.	1452626.	5535375.	709830.5	72948.28	16350.47	12089274	2178807.	4832100	4107285	526698.9
97-98	21600000	6435112.	1442352.	5875375.	753430.5	74042.50	16595.73	12384531	2212379.	4832100	4107285	526698.9

## ROAD FUND DISTRIBUTION FOR SCENARIOS 2A and 2B (53.4 miles)

YEAR	TOTAL REVENUE*	MILEAGE DIST		POP INCREASE		BIKE FUND		\$ TRANSFER		ADDITIONAL	\$ TRANSFER	
		COP	GRESH	COP	GRESH	COP	GRESH	COP	GRESH	PENNIES OF STATE GAS TAX	COP	GRESH
87-88	18780000	4705917.	694122.7	2946389.	396944.0	44000	6490	7696306.	1097556.	531000	382320	51507
88-89	18800000	5151816.	690811.7	3166399.	411220.7	49126	6587.35	8367341.	1108619.	1911600	1471932	191160
89-90	19100000	5708690.	687372.9	3618009.	454457.3	55529.12	6686.160	9382229.	1148516.	3451500	2830230	355504.5
90-91	19400000	6490317.	683801.3	4005375.	499493.9	64413.78	6786.452	10560107	1190081.	4602000	3911700	487812
91-92	19700000	6685645.	680091.5	4260375.	546330.5	67714.99	6888.249	11013736.	1233310.	4655100	3956835	507405.9
92-93	20000000	6647763.	676238.0	4515375.	579030.5	68730.71	6991.573	11231870	1262260.	4690500	3986925	511264.5
93-94	20300000	6608413.	672235.1	4770375.	611730.5	69761.68	7096.446	11448550	1291062.	4743600	4032060	517052.4
94-95	20600000	6567535.	668076.8	5025375.	644430.5	70808.10	7202.893	11663719	1319710.	4796700	4077195	522840.3
95-96	20900000	6525069.	663757.0	5280375.	677130.5	71870.22	7310.936	11877315	1348198.	4832100	4107285	526698.9
96-97	21200000	6480950.	659269.0	5535375.	709830.5	72948.28	7420.600	12089274	1376520.	4832100	4107285	526698.9
97-98	21600000	6435112.	654606.2	5875375.	753430.5	74042.50	7531.909	12384531	1415568.	4832100	4107285	526698.9

\* State Gasoline Tax, (before HB 2112 increase)  
County Gasoline Tax and Federal Forest Receipts

TABLE 4

## ROAD FUND DISTRIBUTION FOR SCENARIOS 1A and 1B (118 miles)

YEAR	ROAD FUND BALANCE (AFTER CITIES ALLOCATION)	OTHER ROAD FUND REVENUE*	TOTAL ALL	ROAD FUND BALANCE AFTER WILLAMETTE BRIDGES PRICE ALLOCATION	ROAD FUND CONSTRAINT**
87-88	9240199.	2079682	11319881	8395909.	7965909
88-89	8733303.	1532000	10265303	7283698.	6853698.
89-90	7999795.	1424760	9424555.	6384494.	5954494.
90-91	7021252.	1325026.	8346279.	5246314.	4816314.
91-92	6817107.	1232274.	8049382	4886656.	4456656.
92-93	6875988.	1232274	8108262.	4880207	4450207.
93-94	6937373.	1232274	8169647.	4873725.	4443725.
94-95	7000610.	1232274	8232884.	4866461.	4436461.
95-96	7065046.	1232274	8296320.	4856664.	4427664.
96-97	7130033.	1232274	8362307.	4846585.	4416585.
97-98	7201205.	1232274	8433479.	4838727.	4408727.

-54-

## ROAD FUND DISTRIBUTION FOR SCENARIOS 2A and 2B (53.4 miles)

YEAR	ROAD FUND BALANCE (AFTER CITIES ALLOCATION)	OTHER ROAD FUND REVENUE*	TOTAL ALL	ROAD FUND BALANCE AFTER WILLAMETTE BRIDGES PRICE ALLOCATION	ROAD FUND CONSTRAINT**
87-88	10083309	2079682	12162991	9239991.	880991.
88-89	9572546.	1532000	11104546	8125426	7695426.
89-90	8835019	1424760	1424760	7222375	6792375
90-91	7852298.	1325026.	9177325.	6079385.	5649385.
91-92	7643812.	1232274.	8876087.	5715269.	5285269.
92-93	7698179.	1232274	8930453.	5704322.	5274322.
93-94	7754874	1232274	8987148.	5693171.	5263171
94-95	7813234.	1232274	9045508.	5681052.	5251052.
95-96	7872602.	1232274	9104876.	566202.	5237202
96-97	7932321.	1232274	9164595.	5650854.	5220854
97-98	7998016.	1232274	9230290	5637519.	5207519

\* From Service Reimbursements and Interest on investments.

\*\* Road Fund Balance after allocation to accounting and DES Admin. Funds available for Transportation Division's Engineering, Road Maintenance, Traffic and Administration.

## APPENDIX E. TRANSFER OF RESOURCES

To illustrate the impact of surrendering jurisdiction of county roads in the city of Gresham six scenarios were developed for study. Each scenario contains a different set of assumptions regarding population annexed and road miles transferred to the cities of Portland and Gresham. Detailed budgets were prepared for the four impacted sections in the Transportation Division--Engineering, Maintenance, Traffic, and Administration, provide the basis for making decisions relative to the levels of service provided, personnel retained and transferred.

Table 5 summarize budgets for each of the four sections for each scenario.

Survey personnel are not accounted for in Table 5. Survey is charged to services reimbursements in engineering at the rate of \$100,000 per crew of three per year. Impacts are accounted for elsewhere.

Table 6 describes those county resources that would transfer with the mileage transfer. It is assumed that the Portland agreement personnel and equipment transfers take precedence over any agreement negotiated with Gresham.

TABLE 5

## COUNTY BUDGET SUMMARY BY SCENARIO

	<u>Engineering</u>	<u>Maintenance</u>	<u>Traffic</u>	<u>Admin</u>	<u>Total</u>	
SCENARIO 1A						
	FTE	19	40	14	12	85
Portland takes 395 mi.	PS	823,000	1,434,000	579,000	408,000	3,244,000
Gresham takes 118 mi.	M/S	208,000	1,360,000	288,000	458,000	2,314,000
County retains 378 mi.	Cap	1,261,000	10,000	10,000	15,000	1,296,000
	Total	2,292,000	2,804,000	877,000	881,000	6,854,000
SCENARIO 1B						
	FTE	8	29	8	9	54
Portland takes 526 mi.	PS	351,000	1,070,000	318,000	314,000	2,053,000
Gresham takes 118 mi.	M/S	175,000	1,037,000	199,000	380,000	1,791,000
County retains 247 mi.	Cap	580,000	13,000	10,000	10,000	613,000
	Total	1,116,000	2,120,000	527,000	704,000	4,457,000
SCENARIO 2A						
	FTE	23	44	17	15	99
Portland takes 395 mi.	PS	1,004,000	1,674,000	697,000	510,000	3,885,000
Gresham takes 54 mi.	M/S	212,000	1,433,000	329,000	466,000	2,440,000
County retains 441 mi.	Cap	1,236,000	5,000	10,000	10,000	1,261,000
	Total	2,452,000	3,112,000	1,036,000	986,000	7,536,000
SCENARIO 2B						
	FTE	10	34	14	11	69
Portland takes 526 mi.	PS	426,000	1,232,000	572,000	385,000	2,615,000
Gresham takes 54 mi.	M/S	202,000	1,047,000	250,000	393,000	1,892,000
County retains 311 mi.	Cap	754,000	8,000	4,000	12,000	778,000
	Total	1,382,000	2,287,000	826,000	790,000	5,285,000
SCENARIO 3A						
	FTE	26.5	50	17	18	111.5
Portland takes 395 mi.	PS	1,175,000	1,863,000	706,000	615,000	4,359,000
Gresham takes 0 mi.	M/S	245,000	1,880,000	400,000	554,000	3,079,000
County retains 496 mi.	Cap	1,500,000	40,000	15,000	---	1,555,000
	Total	2,920,000	3,783,000	1,121,000	1,169,000	8,993,000
SCENARIO 3B						
	FTE	19	41	14	12	86
Portland takes 526 mi.	PS	823,000	1,484,000	579,000	408,000	3,294,000
Gresham takes 0 mi.	M/S	208,000	1,396,000	288,000	458,000	2,350,000
County retains 364 mi.	Cap	1,345,000	10,000	10,000	15,000	1,380,000
	Total	2,376,000	2,890,000	877,000	881,000	7,024,000

TABLE 6-1

## RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUMMARY SCENARIOS

	1A				1B				2A				
	County	Portland	Gresham	Attr	County	Portland	Gresham	Attr	County	Portland	Gresham	Attr	
1. Road Miles	378	395	118		247	526	118		441	395	54		
2. Revenue	6,854,000	9,839,273	2,139,022		4,457,000	14,979,511	2,567,419		7,695,000	9,839,000	1,299,779		
3. Personnel FY 87-88													
	Current												
Rd. Maint.	55	40	3	10	(2)	29	16	8	(2)	44	3	6	(2)
Eng.	26.5	19		7.5		8		10	(8.5)	22		4.5	
Traffic	17	14		3		8	4	4	(1)	17			
Admin.	18	12		6		9		8	(1)	16			
Total	116.5	85	3	26.5	(2)	54	20	30	(12.5)	101	3	12.5	(2)
	-57-												
	2B				3A				3B				
	County	Portland	Gresham	Attr	County	Portland	Gresham	Attr	County	Portland	Gresham	Attr	
1. Road Miles	311	526	54		495	395	0		364	526			
2. Revenue	5,285,000	14,970,571	1,740,715		8,993,000	9,839,273			7,024,000	14,970,571			
3. Personnel FY 87-88													
Rd. Maint.	34	16	3	(2)	50	3		(2)	41	16*		(2)	
Eng.	10		7	(9.5)	26.5				19			(7.5)	
Traffic	14	4*			17				14	4*			
Admin.	11		5	(2)	18				12			(4)	
	69	20*	15	13.5	111.5	3		(2)	89	20		(13.5)	

Survey personnel will be impacted for each of these scenarios. The impact is dependent of size of capital program. The survey personnel required is 5 in Scenario 3A to 3 in Scenario 1A, 2A and 2B to 2 in Scenario 1B and 2B.

\* Two known retirements in Road Maintenance and known required personnel for maintenance of 364 miles on county roads suggests Portland agreement may need to be adjusted.

TABLE 6-2

## Equipment

	1A		1B			2A			2B			3A		3B		
	Cur.	Co.	Port	Gresh	Co.	Port	Gresh	Co.	Port	Gresh.	Co.	Port	Gresh	Co.	Port	Gresh
<u>Road Maintenance</u>																
Sedan, Midsize	1	1			1						1					1
4X4 Pickup (Supvsr)	6	3		3	3		3	3		3		3	6			3
3/4 T Pickup	3	2		1	2		1	2		1		1	3			2
4X4 1 T Pickup Dump w/Plow	2	2			2			2					2			2
1 Ton Pickup Dump	14	12	3		8	3	3	12	3		9	3	2	13	3	12
15 Passenger Van	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
5 Cu. Yd. Dump Truck	10	3	1	6	3	1	6	3	1	6	3	1	6	9	1	1
10 Cu. Yd. Dump Truck	7	8			5			8			5		7			8
FWD Truck w/King Sander	3	3			2		1	3			2		1	3		3
Tractor Mower w/Ditch	2	2			2			2			2		2			2
Tractor Boom	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Water Flusher Truck	2	2					2	2			1		1	2		2
Clam (T-20)	1	1					1	1					1	1		1
Tractor (T-17)	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Asphalt Distributor	2	2	1		1	1		2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1
Road Grader	3	3			2		1	3			2		1	3		3
Backhoe	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Drott	1	1									1		1			1
4 WD Loader	3	3			3		1	3			3		3			3
Tracked Loader	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
3 Wheel Loader	4	4			2		2	4			2		2	4		4
Street Sweeper	2	1	1			1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1
Athey Loader	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Chip Spreader	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Road Planner	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Pugmill	1	1					1	1					1	1		1
D-6 Cat w/Dozer	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Wrecker	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Unimog w/Plow	1	1					1		1				1	1		1
Unimog w/Blower	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Snow Blower/Loader	1	1			1			1			1		1			1
Air Compressor	2	3			2			3			2		2			2

TABLE 6-3

Road Maintenance, Cont'd

	Cur.	Co.	1A			1B			2A			2B			3A		3B	
			Port	Gresh	Co.	Port	Gresh											
Brush Chipper	2	2			2			2						2		2		
Tarpot	5	3		2	3		2	3	2	3		2	5		3			
Cracksealer	2	1		1	1		1	1	1	1		1	2		1			
Patch Roller w/Trailer	3	4			3			4		3			4		3			
Tampo Roller	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
8/10 Ton Roller	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
10/12 Ton Roller	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
Early Warner	3	3			3			3		3			3		3			
Pipe Flusher	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
Asphalt Hot Box	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
Layton Asphalt Pull-Box	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
Barber Green Paver	1	1					1	1				1	1		1			
3000 Gal. Tar Trailer	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
Lowboy Trailer #6	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
Tilt Trailer #5	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
3-Axle Trailer #12	1	1					1	1		1			1		1			
Tow Broom	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
Snow Plow/Small	3	3			3			3		3			3		3			
Snow Plow/Large	5	10			7		10	7		7			5		10			
Drop-in Sander	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
Epoke Sander	7	1			7		10	7		7			7		10			
Prismo Hot Air Lance w/Compr	1	1			1			1		1			1		1			
Vac All	1			1			1		1			1	1					
Mini Planner	1			1			1		1			1	1					

Administration Equipment

Sedan, Midsize	1	1			1			1		1			1		1	
Sedan, Compact	4	3		1	2		2	4		3		1	4		3	

Engineering Equipment

Sedan, Midsize	2	2		1	1		1	1		1		1	2		1	
Sedan, Compact	12	5		7	1		11	11		1		4	8	12	9	
Pickup, Compact	4			4			4			4		4	4		4	
Van, Material Testing	1	1			1			1					1		1	

TABLE 6-4

Traffic Facilities Equipment

	Cur.	Co.	1A			1B			2A			2B			3A			3B	
			Port	Gresh	Co.	Port	Gresh	Co.	Port	Gresh.	Co.	Port	Gresh	Co.	Port	Gresh	Co	Port	Gresh
Sedan, Midsize	1	1			1			1						1					1
Sedan, Compact	1			1			1	1						1					1
P14 Sign Truck	1	1			1			1						1					1
P22 Signal Truck, Aerial	1	1			1			1						1					1
P27 Spray Truck	1			1			1	1						1					1
P33 Signal Truck	1			1			1	1				1		1					1
P36 Paint Truck	1		1			1			1			1		1	1				1
P44 Flatbed Truck	1	1			1			1						1					1
P45 Sign Truck	1	1			1			1						1					1
P46 Supervisor's Truck	1	1			1			1						1					1
P49 Paint Truck	1	1			1			1						1					1
P50 Paint Truck	1	1			1			1						1					1
P51 Utility Truck	1		1			1			1				1		1				1
P55 Signal Truck, Aerial	1	1					1	1						1					1
T19 Cartpenter's Truck	1	1			1			1						1					1
T35 Striper Truck	1	1			1			1						1					1

## APPENDIX F. DETAILED SCENARIO IMPACTS

### SCENARIO 1A

This scenario assumes that 395 miles of county roads have been transferred to the city of Portland, and that the city of Gresham has accepted responsibility for all 118 miles of county roads within its urban service area. Multnomah County would retain responsibility for 378 miles of road.

Based upon the road fund distribution formula currently in existence with the city of Portland, available county road funds are transferred to both cities. Following the transfer of funds, Multnomah County Transportation Division road fund constraint for the four impacted sections--Engineering Services, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities, and Administration--is \$6,854,000.

- Transportation Division budget, less capital improvement carryover, reduced from FY 87/88 level by \$3,016,241 or 30%.
- Division full-time employees reduced from FY 87/88 level by 30 positions or 26%.
- Road Mileage under the jurisdiction of Multnomah County is reduced by 29%.

#### Engineering Services Section

- Engineering, Drafting and Inspection staff reduced 28% or 7.5 positions from FY 87/88 level.
- Funds available for the capital improvement program, excluding carryover, reduced by 16% from FY 87/88 level.

- Reduction of staff would reflect in a loss of 16,500 hours available for project design, petition street road construction, permits and project agreements.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex also reduced by approximately 30%.

#### Road Maintenance Section

- Reduction of 10 full-time employees from the FY 87/88 level is a 20% reduction, or the elimination of one (1) crew.
- Staff reductions forces a level of service reduction in the following programs:

- Chip Sealing
- Recycled Asphalt Paving (RAP)
- Contract resurfacing maintenance
- Drainage and shoulder maintenance
- Snow plowing and sanding

- If monies available, some of the above services may be contracted.
- Reduction in the services offered to the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview, and Maywood Park through maintenance contracts.
- Space needs at Yeon Shop Complex reduced by an estimated 60% as crews are reorganized. Requirement for equipment storage area and one office would remain.

### Traffic Facilities Section

- Reduction of four full-time employees does not impact section significantly due to the type of roads, and miles of roads transferred to Gresham.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex remain the same.

### Administration Section

- Support staff for the division reduced by 34% from present level.
- Reduction of staff would be reflected in reduced services in the following areas:

Transportation planning

Project development related work

Support furnished to Parks Services and Fleet Services Divisions

- Support staff represents 9% of the overall divisions staff including WRB capital and maintenance, and Survey Sections.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex reduced approximately 30%.

### SCENARIO 1B

This scenario could be referred to as the "worst case" scenario. This is due to the limited amount of road funds that would remain with the county following the distribution of funds to the cities under the current road fund distribution formula. To protect the public's investment in the remaining road system, the priority for the available funds must be towards maintenance, not towards addressing the capital improvements required on the road system.

This scenario assumes that the city of Portland has completed annexations to their urban services boundary and has accepted 526 miles of county roads, and the city of Gresham has accepted responsibility for all 118 miles of county roads within their urban services area. The county would retain responsibility for 247 miles of primarily rural roads.

Road funds are transferred to both cities based upon the formula currently in use with Portland. Following the transfer of funds, the Multnomah County Transportation Division road fund constraint for the four impacted sections--Engineering Services, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities, and Administration--is \$4,457,000.

- Transportation Division budget, less capital improvement carryover, reduced from FY 87/88 level by \$5,413,241 or 55%.
- Division full-time employees reduced from FY 87/88 level by 61 positions or 54%.
- Road mileage under jurisdiction of Multnomah County reduced by 53%.

#### Engineering Services Section

- Engineering, Drafting, and Inspection staff reduced by 70% or 18.5 positions from FY 87/88 level.
- Funds available for the capital improvement program excluding carryover, reduced 61% from FY 87/88 level.
- Engineering assistance to the cities of Fairview, Wood Village and Troutdale severely reduced from present level.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex reduced by approximately 70%.

### Road Maintenance Section

- Reduction of 21 full-time employees from FY 87/88 level is a 42% reduction, or the elimination of two (2) crews.
- Elimination of the following programs:

Maintenance contracts with the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview, and Maywood Park.

Recycled Asphalt Paving (RAP)

Contract resurfacing preparation

- Contract resurfacing preparation would be included in the resurfacing contracts, therefore increasing the cost per ton and reducing the level of service.
- Reduction in level of service in the following programs:

Drainage maintenance

Shoulder maintenance

Chip sealing

Snow plowing and sanding

- Change from a proactive programmatic maintenance program to a reactive non-programmatic system.
- Space needs at Yeon Shop Complex reduced by an estimated 85% as crews are reorganized. Requirement for minimum equipment storage area and one office would remain.

### Traffic Facilities Section

- Reduction of 9 full-time employee from FY 87/88 level is a 47% reduction.

- Elimination of the following services:

Yeon Shop Complex grounds maintenance  
Yeon Shop electrical maintenance  
Sign designing  
Sign production for county agencies  
Sign production for other government agencies  
Door lettering  
Traffic signal maintenance

- Possible elimination of all sign production based upon cost analysis of purchasing from outside sources.

- Traffic signal maintenance would have to be contracted from outside agency.

- Reduction in level of service in the following:

Traffic counts  
Accident analysis  
Traffic flow analysis

- Dependent upon sign production, space requirements at the Yeon Shop Complex would be reduced by 50 to 75%.

Administration Section

- Support staff for the division reduced by 50% from present level.

- Elimination of the following functions:

Transportation planning  
Project development

- Reduction of the estimated 50% in support provided to Parks Services and Fleet and Electronic Services Divisions.
- Support staff represents approximately 9% of overall division staff including WRB capital and maintenance programs and Survey Section.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex reduced by an estimated 25%.

#### SCENARIO 2A

This scenario assumes that 395 miles of county roads have been transferred to the city of Portland, and that the city of Gresham has accepted responsibility for the 54 miles of local classification roads within its urban services area. The county would retain responsibility for 441 miles of roads.

Road funds are transferred to both cities based upon the formula currently in use with the city of Portland. Following transfer of funds, the Multnomah County Transportation Division road fund constraint for the four impacted sections--Engineering Services, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities, and Administration--is \$7,695,000.

- Transportation Division budget, less capital improvement carryover, reduced from FY 87/88 level by \$2,334,241 or 24%.
- Division full-time employees reduced from FY 87/88 level by 16 positions or 14%.
- Road mileage under the jurisdiction of Multnomah County is reduced by 16%.

### Engineering Services Section

- Engineering, Drafting and Inspection staff reduced 13% or 3.5 positions from FY 87/88 level.
- Funds available for the capital improvement program, excluding carryover, reduced by 18% from FY 87/88 level.
- Capital liability for arterial and collector roads remains with county, therefore, a strong capital program is assumed.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex reduced by approximately 10%.

### Road Maintenance Section

- Reduction of 6 full-time employees from the FY 87/88 level is a 12% reduction, or the elimination of one half (1/2) of a crew.
- Staff reductions forces a level of service reduction in the following programs:
  - Chip Sealing
  - Recycled Asphalt Paving (RAP)
  - Contract resurfacing preparation
  - Drainage and shoulder maintenance
  - Snow plowing and sanding
- Slight reduction in services provided to the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview, and Maywood Park through maintenance contracts.
- Space needs at Yeon Shop Complex reduced by an estimated 60% as crews are reorganized. Requirement for equipment storage area and one office would remain.

### Traffic Facilities Section

- Not a significant impact upon this section due to the local roads not requiring a major level of service.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex remain the same.

### Administration Section

- Support staff for the division reduced by 17% from present level.
- Reduction of level of service currently provided in the following areas:

Computer support personnel

Office support personnel

- Support staff represents 10% of the overall divisions staff including WRB capital and maintenance, and Survey Sections.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex reduced approximately 10%.

### SCENARIO 2B

This is the second "worst case" scenario due to the roads remaining under the jurisdiction of Multnomah County representing the bulk of the \$52,000,000 road capital liability, and the funds needed to maintain the remaining system dictating the dollars available to address this liability.

This scenario assumes that the city of Portland has completed annexations to its urban services boundary and has accepted 526 miles of county roads, and the city of Gresham has accepted responsibility for the 54 miles of local classification roads within its urban services area. The county would retain responsibility for 311 miles of roads.

Road funds are transferred to both cities based upon the formula currently in use with the city of Portland. Following the transfer of funds, the Multnomah County Transportation Division road fund constraint for the four impacted sections--Engineering Services, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities, and Administration--is \$5,285,000.

- Division budget, less capital improvement carryover, reduced from FY 87/88 level by \$4,585,241 or 46%.
- Division full-time employees reduced from FY 87/88 level by 46 positions, or 40%.
- Road mileage under Multnomah County jurisdiction reduced by 41%.

#### Engineering Services Section

- Engineering, Drafting and Inspection staff reduced 38% or 10 positions from FY 87/88 level.
- Funds available for the capital improvement program, excluding carryover, reduced by 18% from FY 87/88 level.
- Type of roads retained by county dictated funds be allocated in favor of maintenance process. Shortage in engineering personnel in relationship to capital funds will result in a bottleneck for project construction.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex also reduced by approximately 35%.

#### Road Maintenance Section

- Reduction of 16 full-time employees from the FY 87/88 level is a 32% reduction, or the elimination of one and one half (1-1/2) crews.

- Staff reductions forces a level of service reduction in the following programs:

- Chip Sealing
- Recycled Asphalt Paving (RAP)
- Contract resurfacing preparation
- Drainage and shoulder maintenance
- Snow plowing and sanding

- If monies available, some of the above services may be contracted.
- Reduction in the services offered to the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview, and Maywood Park through maintenance contracts.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex reduced approximately 65% as crews are reorganized. Requirement remains for some equipment storage area and office space.

#### Administration Section

- Support staff for the division reduced by 39% from present level.
- Reduction of level of services currently provided in the following areas:

- Transportation planning
- Computer support personnel
- Support furnished to Parks Services and Fleet Services Divisions

- Support staff represents 9% of the overall divisions staff including WRB capital and maintenance programs and Survey Sections.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex reduced approximately 35%.

## SCENARIO 3A

This scenario represents the status quo, and is a projection of the situation very similar to what the Transportation Division's FY 88/89 budget will be.

Under this scenario, it is assumed that 395 miles of county roads have been transferred to the city of Portland, and that no roads are transferred to the city of Gresham. The county would retain responsibility for 494 miles of roads.

Road funds are transferred to the city of Portland based upon the formula currently in use. Following transfer of funds, the Multnomah County Transportation Division road fund constraint for the four impacted sections--Engineering Services, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities, and Administration--is \$8,993,000.

- Division budget, less capital improvement carryover, reduced from FY 87/88 level by \$877,241 or 8%.
- Division full-time employees reduced from FY 87/88 level by 3.5 positions or 3%.
- Road mileage under Multnomah County jurisdiction reduced by 41%.

### Engineering Services Section

- Staff levels remain the same to address the new 1.5 million dollars in capital funds as well as the capital improvement carryover.

- Funding for capital improvement remains the same as in FY 87/88.
- No space requirement reduction at Yeon Shop Complex.

#### Road Maintenance Section

- Reduction in full-time employees from FY 87/88 is not significant.
- Road maintenance programs continued at the same level of service.
- In case of a major winter storm requiring 24-hour operations, some contracting with private industry may be required.
- No reduction in level of service provided to the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview, and Maywood Park through maintenance contracts.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop complex do not change.

#### Traffic Facilities Section

- Present level of service would continue.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex do not change.

#### Administration Section

- Present level of service would continue.
- Support staff represents approximately 9% of overall division staff including WRB capital and maintenance programs and Survey Section.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex do not change.

## SCENARIO 3B

This scenario assumes that the city of Portland has completed annexations to its urban services boundary and has excepted 526 miles of county roads, and that no roads are transferred to the city of Gresham. Multnomah County would retain jurisdiction over 364 miles of roads.

Road funds are transferred to the city of Portland based upon the formula currently in use. Following transfer of funds, the Multnomah County Transportation Division road fund constraint for the impacted sections--Engineering Services, Road Maintenance, Traffic Facilities, and Administration--is \$7,024,000.

- Division budget, less capital improvement carryover, reduced from FY 87/88 level by \$2,846,241 or 29%.
- Division full-time employees reduced from FY 87/88 level by 29 positions or 25%.
- Road mileage under Multnomah County jurisdiction reduced by 31%.

### Engineering Services Section

- Engineering, Drafting and Inspection staff reduced 28% or 7.5 positions from FY 87/88 level.
- Funds available for the capital improvement program, excluding carryover, reduced by 10% from FY 87/88 level.
- Largest part of the \$52 million capital improvement liability is retained by the county, however, types of roads retained dictate funds be prioritized towards maintenance to protect the public's investment.

### Road Maintenance Section

- Reduction of 9 full-time employees from the FY 87/88 level is a 18% reduction, or the elimination of one (1) crew.
- Staff reductions forces a level of service reduction in the following programs:

- Chip Sealing
- Recycled Asphalt Paving (RAP)
- Contract resurfacing preparation
- Drainage and shoulder maintenance
- Snow plowing and sanding

- If monies are available, some of the above programs may be contracted.
- Reduction in level of services offered to the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview, and Maywood Park through maintenance contracts.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex reduced approximately 15%.

### Traffic Facilities Section

- Staff reduced by 3 full-time positions from FY 87/88 level.
- Roads transferred to Portland account for staff reduction, therefore, there is not a level of service reduction for any programs.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex do not change.

### Administration Section

- Support staff for the division reduced by 33% from present level.

- Reduction of level of service currently provided in the following areas:

- Computer support personnel

- Support planning

- Support furnished to the Parks Services and Fleet Services Divisions

- Support staff represents 9% of the overall divisions staff including WRB capital and maintenance programs and Survey Section.
- Space requirements at Yeon Shop Complex are reduced by approximately 30%.

## EFFECT ON GENERAL FUND

### DES Divisions

#### Administration and Accounting

Under each scenario, the current level of internal reimbursement for the Department of Environmental Services' Administration and Accounting Sections has been included in the budgets developed. Due to the decrease in the total personnel and capital improvement funds under each scenario, the amount budgeted for internal reimbursement may not be warranted.

These two sections may be adversely impacted due to the reduced level of service required by the Transportation Division. In fact, under the fiscal year 87/88 adopted budget the road fund supports approximately 70% of their current programs. A reduction in road fund support for these programs could mean supporting the road fund contribution with general funds.

In the situation of the accounting section a reduction in their program may occur.

For example, under scenario 1B, the road fund constraint for the Transportation Division has been reduced by 50% from the present level, with the most significant reductions occurring in the Engineering and Administration Sections. Because the Accounting Section's workload for the road fund function is directly related to the level of personnel within the Transportation Division and the amount of road work under contract, it seems to follow that the impact to the Accounting Section would also be a reduction in personnel and funds by the appropriate percentage. This implies that between one and two positions would also be available for transfer under that scenario.

## Yeon Complex and Facilities Management Division

Under each scenario, the space requirements for the Transportation Division at the Yeon Shop Complex are reduced. This reduction will occur overtime as a result of the phasing of the road transfers to the city of Portland.

As the staff level and resources in the Transportation Division are reduced the cost burden of the facility for the remaining tenants will increase. This will continue until adequate space is available to lease to a new tenant, assuming there is one. The impact on the Division will then be for the cost of moving and leasing another facility. If new tenants can be found for the Yeon Complex the long term impact may not be significant for Facilities Management and the remaining tenants.

## Parks Division

The reduction of personnel within the Administration Section of the Transportation Division will impact the available support for the Parks Services Division. This reduction would occur at a time when the Parks Services Division is requiring additional administrative support for the centralized parks reservation system and the Regional Park and Blue Lake Park Master Development plans. Until such time the Transportation Division vacates enough space to make leasing to an outside agency a viable alternative, this division may be faced with paying additional fixed costs for the Yeon Shop Complex.

## Fleet and Electronic Services Division

The impact upon the Fleet and Electronic Services Division of the Department of Environmental Services caused by the transfer of roads to the city of Gresham is two fold.

First, this Division would suffer a loss of funding as it is currently supported by internal reimbursements from users of county vehicles and equipment. As the amount of vehicles and equipment utilized by the various sections of the Transportation Division is reduced under each scenario, the funding level for the Fleet and Electronic Services Division is lowered.

This Division performed an analysis of this effect and has determined that this loss of funding would result in the following projected personnel reductions.

- Scenario 1A: Reduce by 2 positions
- Scenario 1B: Reduce by 3 positions
- Scenario 2A: Reduce by 2 positions
- Scenario 2B: Reduce by 2 positions
- Scenario 3A: No reductions required
- Scenario 3B: Reduce personnel by 2 positions (programmed attrition)

The second impact upon the Fleet and Electronic Services Division would be an increase in the fixed cost to this Division for the space it utilizes at the Yeon Shop Complex. This cost would increase as the Transportation Division reduced its space utilization, unless other tenants were found for the available space and charged for the fixed costs. If the Fleet and Electronic Services Division's fixed costs for the Yeon Shop Complex were increased, this increase would be reflected in an increased charge for motor pool services to all county users.

#### Other County Organizations

The effect of the transfer of county road miles in the Gresham urban services boundary to the city of Gresham will have a ripple effect not only on the rest of the Department of Environmental Services but also on

other departments in the county. Under each of the scenarios the same rate of indirect costs was assumed. In reality this rate may vary from year to year. By applying the rate to the "adjusted road fund budget" for each scenario, projections of the impact of the road fund allocation to administration services of DGS divisions and non-departmental organizations can be identified. The Table 7 is a summary of those projected road fund allocations by scenario.

The result of the reduction in road fund revenues can be translated directly to an impact to the General Fund. General fund contributions from those organizations to offset the reduction in road fund support or programs may have to decrease. A summary of the total road fund impact by scenario follows. These totals take into account the impacts identified on Table 7.

Scenario 1A	\$173,929
Scenario 1B	\$277,340
Scenario 2A	\$121,394
Scenario 2B	\$280,077
Scenario 3A	\$57,699
Scenario 3B	\$168,952

Table 7

## Road Fund Allocation for Indirect Costs by Scenario

## SCENARIOS

County Organizations	% Allocations	FY 88-89 Proposed*	1A	1B	2A	2B	3A	3B
Budget	5.6	31,020	21,245	15,453	24,186	17,652	27,758	21,523
Auditor	6.6	36,592	25,038	18,213	28,505	20,804	32,709	25,366
County Counsel	15.2	84,099	57,662	41,944	65,648	47,912	75,329	58,419
BCC & Chair	41.8	231,272	158,573	115,346	180,531	131,758	207,156	160,652
Finance	12.0	66,278	45,522	33,114	51,827	37,825	59,471	46,120
Purchasing	8.5	46,912	32,245	23,455	36,711	26,793	42,125	32,668
Telecommunications	2.3	12,752	8,725	6,347	9,934	7,250	11,398	8,840
Personnel	5.7	31,733	21,623	15,729	24,618	17,967	28,249	21,907
Records	2.3	12,629	8,725	6,347	9,934	7,249	11,398	8,840
Total	100.0	553,287	379,358	275,947	431,893	315,210	495,588	384,335
Reduction from FY 88-89*			31%	51%	22%	43%	11%	30%
Dollars			173,929	277,340	121,394	280,077	57,699	168,952

\* For upcoming FY 88-89 Budget  
As per memo 1-8-88 from DGS Division of Planning and Budget

Indirect Cost Calculations

CURRENT \*

$$\frac{\text{Indirect Cost Rate}}{\text{Road Fund Share of Costs}} \quad \times \quad \frac{\quad}{\text{Adjusted Budget}} \quad **$$

$$\frac{.0597}{553,000} \quad \times \quad \frac{1.00\%}{9,265,000}$$

Scenario 1A

Adjusted Budget

$$(\text{Constraint} - \text{Capital}) + 515,800 + 280,000 = 6,353,800$$

$$\frac{.0597}{553,000} \quad \times \quad \frac{\quad}{6,353,800} \quad \times = .686$$

553,000 X .686 = 379,358 available for allocation for administrative costs of DGS and non-departmental

Scenario 1B

$$4,457,000 - 613,000 + 495,000 + 280,000 = 4,619,000$$

$$\frac{.0597}{553,000} \quad \times \quad \frac{\quad}{4,619,000} \quad \times = .499$$

275,947 available for allocation for administrative costs of DGS and non-departmental

\* Per Budget Office Memo (1/8/88)

\*\* Personal Services and Materials and Services of Accounting, Engineering, Surveying, Road Maintenance and Traffic

Scenario 2A

$$7,695,000 - 1,261,000 + 515,800 + 280,000 = 7,229,800$$

$$\frac{.0597}{553,000} \quad X \quad \frac{X}{7,229,000} \quad X = .781$$

431,893 available for allocation for administrative costs of DGS and non-departmental

Scenario 2B

$$5,285,000 - 778,000 + 495,800 + 280,000 = 5,282,000$$

$$\frac{.0597}{553,000} \quad X \quad \frac{X}{5,282,000} \quad X = .570$$

315,210 available for allocation for administrative costs of DGS and non-departmental

Scenario 3A

$$8,993,000 - 1,565,000 + 595,800 + 280,000 = 8,303,800$$

$$\frac{.0597}{553,000} \quad X \quad \frac{X}{8,303,800} \quad X = .896$$

495,488 available for allocation for administrative costs of DGS and non-departmental

Scenario 3B

$$7,024,000 - 1,380,000 + 515,800 + 280,000 = 6,439,800$$

$$\frac{.0597}{553,000} \quad X \quad \frac{X}{6,439,800} \quad X = .695$$

384,335 available for allocation for administrative costs of DGS and non-departmental

## Countywide Transportation Services

A representative for the county currently participates in regional committees with representatives from the two other counties, the city of Portland, the representative for the small cities of the counties, Tri-Met, ODOT, FHWA, and area citizens. The current configuration of this regional body at the staff level (JPACT) as well as at the elected official level (JPACT) is relatively balanced. A transfer of the road mileage to the city of Gresham would call into question the county's role as spokesperson regarding the allocation of federal and regional funds for the system. In fact, representation would be more equitable if based on road miles, in which case from Multnomah County there may be representatives from the city of Portland, Gresham, and one from the small cities, each with possibly mutually exclusive interests.

The county, because of its position as provider of transportation services, has provided the forum and has facilitated discussions on a system that extends beyond city boundaries and self interests. The county has represented a balance for the jurisdictions by focusing on the transportation system as a whole rather than limiting to a city jurisdictional boundary. The fracturing of the remainder of the county system will possibly eliminate the ability to develop consensus in east county. With the major portion of the remaining capital liability located in this area, the need for a consensus building body is the greatest ever. Dividing up the remainder of the system between two bodies (Multnomah County and the City of Gresham), or among many (all small cities), would make planning and project development very difficult. The self interests of each jurisdiction and the lack of large capital would extend the project planning and development time frame.

Under each of the scenarios, different staff levels exist for planning and project development. The transfer of miles from the county to another jurisdiction destroys the economy of scale that exists with a larger

organization; so while the need for additional project planning and development may exist, the staff to provide that support may not.

Transportation-wide services the county currently provides:

- Staff East Multnomah County Transportation Committee comprised of elected official of the county and east county cities.
- Represents county (existing road system) in all regional transportation committees:
  - Transportation Improvement Subcommittee (staff)
  - Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (staff)
  - Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (elected official)
  - Public-Private Task Force for Transit (staff and elected official)
- Provides transportation planning for countywide system.
  - Currently completing Master Transportation Plan Phase I
- Provides capital improvement programming for countywide road and bridge system.
- Competes for federal funds for county or city federal aid designated routes.
- Monitors expenditure of federal funds.
- Is certified to design and manage construction federal aid projects (east county cities are not).

DATE SUBMITTED March 7, 1988

(For Clerk's Use)

Meeting Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Agenda No. \_\_\_\_\_

REQUEST FOR PLACEMENT ON THE AGENDA

Subject: Roads

Informal Only \* March 15, 1988 A.M.  
(Date)

Formal Only \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

DEPARTMENT DES DIVISION \_\_\_\_\_

CONTACT Paul Yarborough TELEPHONE 248-5000

\*NAME(S) OF PERSON MAKING PRESENTATION TO BOARD \_\_\_\_\_

BRIEF SUMMARY Should include other alternatives explored, if applicable, and clear statement of rationale for the action requested.

Staff report regarding City of Gresham's road proposal

(IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS NEEDED, PLEASE USE REVERSE SIDE)

ACTION REQUESTED:

INFORMATION ONLY     PRELIMINARY APPROVAL     POLICY DIRECTION     APPROVAL

INDICATE THE ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON AGENDA \_\_\_\_\_

IMPACT:

PERSONNEL

FISCAL/BUDGETARY

General Fund

Other \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURES:

DEPARTMENT HEAD, ELECTED OFFICIAL, or COUNTY COMMISSICNER: Gladys McCoy

BUDGET / PERSONNEL \_\_\_\_\_

COUNTY COUNSEL (Ordinances, Resolutions, Agreements, Contracts) \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER \_\_\_\_\_  
(Purchasing, Facilities Management, etc.)

NOTE: If requesting unanimous consent, state situation requiring emergency action on back.

MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON



DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES  
TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

CHART 2

CITY OF GRESHAM PROPOSAL

- Transfer of:
  - 122 miles of county roads (Co. 118)
  - 19 Personnel & Equipment 33
  - 3.1 Road Fund Dollars
  - Based upon "Portland Type" arrangement
  
- Reasons:
  - Full control of street system for economic development
  - Improved traffic flow
  - Coordination of land use planning
  
- Cited Difficulties:
  - Coordination
  - Cooperation
  - Communication

Relative to:

- Overlapping responsibilities
- Conflicting goals
- Different standards
- Citizen complaints

CHART 3

CURRENT COUNTY ROLE IN TRANSPORTATION

- Responsible for
  - 528 miles of roads throughout county
  - Willamette River and other bridges
  - Maintenance contracts
  
- Major role in regional transportation planning & development
  - Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)
  - Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)
  - East County Transportation Committee (ECTC)  
*Rep from all 4 E Co. etc.*
  
- Approach to resource allocation & management
  - Highest priority to maintenance of the current system
    - Tools: Pavement Management System
    - Master Road Inventory
    - Maintenance Standards
  - Capital Planning based on regional needs
    - Tools: Master Transportation Plan - *Bal of HL & Co.*
    - Capital Improvement Plan
    - Major Criteria for Priorities
      - Economic Development
      - Traffic Safety
      - Roadway Capacity
      - Current/Projected Volume
    - County-wide participation

## CHART 4

### ANALYSIS OF IMPLEMENTING ALL OR PART OF THE GRESHAM PROPOSAL

- Based on three scenarios
  1. Transfer of all 122 miles of roads
  2. Transfer of local roads only (54 miles) *neighborhood streets in Gresham*
  3. Status Quo
  
- Each scenario analyzed objectively based on a "Portland Type" arrangement  
Identified
  - Remaining county road system
  - Road fund dollars to be transferred
  - Equipment we could afford to keep and therefore that which is surplus to our needs
  - Personnel we could afford to keep and therefore that which is surplus to our needs
  - Remaining capability to handle a range of different maintenance activities
  - Remaining ability to handle capital planning and development

CHART 5-A

IMPACTS OF GRESHAM PROPOSAL

- Has implications at different levels
  - Organizational
  - County government
  - County-wide
  - Regional
  
- Fragments the current system
  - Decrease economy of scale
  - Creates duplication of services
  - Reduces revenue available for capital
  - Decreases level of road maintenance for balance of county system
  - Eliminates county ability to provide maintenance contract services to the cities of Troutdale, Wood Village, Fairview and Maywood Park
  - Ends the county's leadership role in regional transportation planning

*Findings*

CHART 5-B

- Other considerations
  - Reduces road fund contribution for county support system with consequential impact on general fund and unit costs
  
  - Creates large scale, very difficult personnel issues

CHART 6

CONCLUSIONS

- Implementation of Gresham Proposal:
  - More complicated than Portland transfer
  - Result in dismantling effective transportation provider
  - May have short term benefits to city,  
but  
Ignores interests of broader public constituency
  - Not responsive to regional transportation issues/needs
  
- Communication/coordination problems
  - Are resolvable
  - Do not require restructure of present system

CHART 7

THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

- What alternative represents the best system for transportation services delivery for the public?
- What should the county's role be in transportation?

## CHART 8

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- The present role of the county is the appropriate role.
- City of Gresham should be encouraged to take advantage of the county's system by contracting for maintenance services and ultimately becoming part of an east county road consortium for optimum service delivery.
- The County and Gresham should form a joint committee for improved project coordination.
- The IGA with Portland must be renegotiated - specifically the formula for distribution of funds must be reconstructed for more equitable distribution.