# **INVENTORY**

#### INTRODUCTION

Portland's urban transportation system serves an area of approximately 147 square miles and a population of 530,000 people. To better manage a city's transportation infrastructure, the State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requires local and regional transportation system plans (TSP) to include an inventory and general assessment of existing transportation facilities and services by function, type, capacity, and condition. The Portland Office of Transportation (PDOT) completed an extensive Transportation System Plan Inventory in 1996. The scope of the inventory exceeds the TPR's baseline requirements; it also includes air, freight, mainline, and pipeline facilities and a description and maps of environmental constraints.

This chapter summarizes the TPR requirements and the 1996 Inventory. Unless otherwise indicated, the results cited below are taken from that inventory. Supporting information, maps, and figures are available in the 1996 Inventory, under separate cover.

## **REQUIREMENTS**

## **Transportation Planning Rule**

The TPR requires an inventory and general assessment of existing transportation facilities and services by function, type, capacity, and condition for:

- 1. Road system of arterials, collectors, local streets, and other important non-collector street connections
- 2. Public transportation services
- 3. Network of bicy cle and pedestrian routes

The transportation capacity analysis for each element of the inventory must include:

- The capacities of existing and committed facilities.
- The degree to which those capacities have been reached or surpassed on existing facilities.
- The assumption supon which these capacities are based.
- For State and regional facilities, the transportation capacity analysis shall be consistent with standards of facility performance considered acceptable by the affected State or regional transportation agency.
- The transportation facility condition analysis shall describe the general physical and operational condition of each transportation facility (for example: very good, good, fair, poor, very poor).

#### INVENTORY

Table 9.1 shows the condition of each transportation facility. Based on 1995 ratings, most facilities are in good or very good condition; however, condition ratings have fallen in recenty ears. Two facilities (bridges and traffic signal hardware) are mostly in fair, poor, or very poor condition. Two additional facilities (pavement and traffic safety) are deteriorating as a result of inadequate funding. Even street lighting, the facility in the best condition, will be in poor condition within 15 years if capital replacement funding is not found.

### Street System

Portland's street system of arterials, collectors, local streets, and other important non-collector street connections is summarized below. In accordance with TPR requirements, streets are separated into arterial/collector and local streets for inventory reporting purposes. Chapter 2: Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, of the TSP contains a detailed explanation of the functional classification of streets in Portland. The modal plans in Chapter 5: Modal Plans and Management Plans, contain equivalency tables that compare the street classification schemes used in Portland's TSP with those used in Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

#### Jurisdiction

The Oreg on Department of Transportation (ODOT), Multnomah County, and the City of Portland are the primary jurisdictions within the City. The Port of Portland, railroads, and private owners are also involved in transportation in frastructure.

There are two primary considerations with respect to roadway jurisdiction: right-of-way (ROW) jurisdiction and route jurisdiction. In Portland, most roadways are either City streets on City ROW, ODOT routes on City ROW, or ODOT routes on ODOT ROW. (Figure 1 in the 1996 Inventory shows which government entity controlled the right-of-way and which controlled the route on all roadways in Portland in 1996.)

Table 9.1
Portland Transportation System:
Status, Condition, and Value (July 1995)

| Facility         | Status           | Replacement<br>Value | Condition<br>(Percent) |    |    | Unmet<br>Need |     |     |              |
|------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----|----|---------------|-----|-----|--------------|
|                  |                  |                      | VG                     | G  | F  | P             | VP  | TBD |              |
| Pavement         |                  |                      |                        |    |    |               |     |     |              |
| Improved Streets | 3,805 Lane Miles | \$2,825,935,274      | 27                     | 29 | 26 | 15            | 3   |     | \$34,850,000 |
| Unimproved (A)   | 160 Lane Miles   | N/A                  |                        |    |    |               | 100 |     | N/A          |
| Total Streets    | 3,965 Lane Miles | \$2,825,935,274      |                        |    |    |               | 100 |     | \$34,850,000 |
| Pedestrian Syste | em               |                      |                        |    |    |               |     |     |              |
| Sidewalks        | 1,900 Miles      | \$406,296,000        |                        |    |    |               |     | X   | N/A          |
| Curbs            | 2,924 Miles      | \$370,529,280        |                        |    |    |               |     | X   | TBD          |
| Corners          | 54,680           | \$60,000,000         |                        | 80 | 15 | 5             |     |     | \$4,297,000  |
| Total            |                  | \$836,825,280        |                        |    |    |               |     |     | \$4,297,000  |

| Facility            | Status                                  | Replacement<br>Value |     |    |    | ditior<br>rcent) |    |          | Unmet<br>Need |
|---------------------|---|----------------------|-----|----|----|------------------|----|----------|---------------|
|                     |   |                      | VG  | G  | F  | P                | VP | TBD      |               |
| Bicycle Network     | (                                       |                      |     |    |    |                  |    |          |               |
| Bicycle Lanes (C)   | 64 Miles                                |                      |     |    |    |                  |    | X        | TBD           |
| Structures          |   |                      |     |    |    |                  |    |          |               |
| Bridges (D)         | 163                                     | \$128,269,168        | 36  | 13 | 14 | 15               | 22 |          | \$56,137,000  |
| Retaining Walls     | 202                                     | \$14,034,275         | 89  | 10 | 1  | 0                | 0  |          | TBD           |
| Stairways           | 169                                     | \$2,633,700          |     |    |    |                  |    | X        | TBI           |
| Guardrails          | 15 Miles                                | \$4,275,637          |     |    |    |                  |    | X        | TDI           |
| Harbor Wall         | 5,400 Feet                              | \$55,211,750         | 100 |    |    |                  |    |          | (             |
| Total               |   | \$204,424,530        |     |    |    |                  |    |          | \$56,137,000  |
| Traffic Signals     |   |                      |     |    |    |                  |    |          |               |
| Hardware            | 931                                     | \$77,273,000         |     | 46 | 33 | 21               |    |          | \$16,227,000  |
| Controllers         | 931                                     | \$6,517,000          |     | 77 | 15 | 8                |    |          | \$521,000     |
| Other<br>Equipment  | 170                                     | \$1,105,000          |     |    |    |                  |    |          | ТВГ           |
| Total               |   | \$84,895,000         |     |    |    |                  |    |          | \$16,748,000  |
| Traffic Safety      |   |                      |     |    |    |                  |    |          | •             |
| Maj. Intrsect. (E)  | 1,255                                   |                      |     | 81 | 17 | 2                |    |          | \$4,125,000   |
| Traffic Calming     |   |                      |     |    |    |                  |    |          |               |
| Calming Devices     | 378                                     | \$5,303,000          |     |    |    |                  |    | X        | TBI           |
| Street Lights       |   | 1070 07              | -   | _  |    | -                | ·  |          | -             |
| Street Lights       | 49,000                                  | \$33,000,000         |     | 94 | 4  | 2                |    |          | \$1,865,000   |
| Street Signs        | • | , ,                  |     |    |    |                  |    |          | . ,           |
| Street Name         | 68,750                                  | \$2,320,175          |     |    |    |                  |    | X        | ТВГ           |
| Parking             | 43,368                                  | \$1,677,474          |     |    |    |                  |    | X        | TBI           |
| Traffic Control     | 33,131                                  | \$2,570,435          |     |    |    |                  |    | X        | TBI           |
| Total               |   | \$6,568,084          |     |    |    |                  |    |          |               |
| Parking Meters      |   | + - 4/1 1 1          |     | •  |    |                  |    | <u> </u> | •             |
| Meters              | 5,376                                   | \$2,144,520          | 90  | 10 |    |                  |    |          | \$0           |
| Facilities          | 0,07 -                                  | 1 / 11/0 -           |     |    |    |                  |    |          | , .           |
| Subtotal            |   | \$3,999,095,688      |     |    |    |                  |    |          | \$118,022,00  |
| Right-Of-Way<br>(G) | 1,927 Miles                             | \$3,660,863,502      |     |    |    |                  |    |          | \$0           |
| TOTAL               |   | \$7,659,959,190      |     |    |    |                  |    |          | \$118,022,00  |

Source: Portland Transportation System: Status and Conditions Report, Executive Summary, July 1995.

#### Notes:

- N/A Not applicable. This is not currently the City's financial responsibility.
- TBD To be determined as part of the Infrastructure Management Project or other programs.
- A City investment has not been made on unimproved streets. The cost to improve these streets in 1996, including drainage improvements, was \$110.8 million.
- B The unmet need for corners does not include the \$41.5 million cost estimated in 1996 for installing curb ramps to meet ADA standards.
- C The replacement value for bicycle lanes is included in pavement replacement value. In addition, at the time of the inventory, there were 11 miles of bicycle boulevards and 53 miles of off-street paths.
- D The unmet need for bridges includes \$38.9 million for se ism ic retrofitting.
- E The replacement value for major intersections is included in the figures for pavement, traffic signals, and street signs.
- F The unmet need for traffic calming has not been calculated. At inventory time, there were 1,059 unfunded projects requested that met the minimum program requirements.
- G The replacement value for right-of-way represents the value of the land in the right-of-way.

Maintenance jurisdiction is som ewhat more complex than ROW or route jurisdiction, and depends on particular agreements between the City, ODOT, Multnomah County, and adjacent property owners. The City's Pavement Management System (PMS) maintains information about maintenance responsibility for City routes.

In 1984, the City of Portland and Multnomah County agreed to transfer all designated county roads within Portland to the City. As shown in Table 9.2, annexation of county roads has increased Portland's street inventory, and will continue to increase it as more roads within Portland's urban services boundary are annexed.

Table 9.2 Historical Comparison of Street Inventory (in Lane Miles)

|                      | April 1, 1984* |         | July 1 | ,1994   | Differen ce |         |
|----------------------|----------------|---------|--------|---------|-------------|---------|
| Туре                 | Number         | Percent | Number | Percent | Number      | Percent |
| Arterials/Collectors | 676            | 26      | 1,179  | 32      | 503         | 45      |
| Local Streets        | 1,890          | 74      | 2,499  | 68      | 609         | 55      |
| TOTAL                | 2,566          | 100     | 3,678  | 100     | 1,112       | 43      |

Source: Portland Transportation System: Status and Condition Report, July 1994

Between 1984 and 1994, the number of lane miles in Portland's street system increased by 43 percent to a total of 3,678, including 1,179 arterial and 2,499 local street lanemiles. Of this total of improved streets for which PDOT is responsible, 93 percent are hard-surfaced asphalt or concrete and 7 percent are oil or gravel. In addition, ODOT maintains 12 state highways within the City boundaries.

#### **Pavement Conditions**

PDOT put its PMS into full operation in 1983 to identify the current condition of all streets within the City. Based on field evaluations, street segments are assigned a coded rating for each of five distress characteristics. Scores are calculated, a maintenance strategy is selected, and work is performed. Street treatments include street resurfacing, overlay, sealing, patching, base repair, and reconstruction.

Five categories, ranging from very good to very poor, are used to represent the street condition, with lower scores representing a better condition. After the pavement is treated, the coded rating automatically reverts back to zero, or "very good." Table 9.3 shows the percentage of lane miles by condition for fiscal years 1988-89 to 1993-94.

Table 9.3
Pavement Condition (in Percent)

|                          | FY 88-89 | FY 89-90 | FY 90-91 | FY 91-92 | FY 92-93 | FY 93-94 |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Total Lane Miles in City | 3,426    | 3,453    | 3,508    | 3,540    | 3,576    | 3,678    |
| Very Good                | 13%      | 16%      | 18%      | 21%      | 25%      | 27%      |
| Good                     | 48%      | 49%      | 44%      | 41%      | 38%      | 35%      |
| Fair                     | 24%      | 22%      | 24%      | 23%      | 23%      | 23%      |
| Fair or Better           | 85%      | 87%      | 86%      | 85%      | 86%      | 85%      |
| Poor                     | 12%      | 10%      | 11%      | 12%      | 11%      | 12%      |
| Very Poor                | 3%       | 3%       | 3%       | 3%       | 3%       | 3%       |
| Poor or Worse            | 15%      | 13%      | 14%      | 15%      | 14%      | 15%      |

Source: Portland Transportation System: Status and Condition Report, July 1994

<sup>\*</sup>Pre-City/County Agreement and Pre-Annexation

### Number of Lanes and Lane Widths

The PMS inventory identifies the number of lanes on any given roadway segment and the curb-to-curb width. The PMS covers only roadway sunder City jurisdiction; it does not include other roadway sthat are within the City limits but maintained by other jurisdictions. (Figure 2 in the 1996 Inventory depicts the number of travel lanes on Portland's arterial streets.)

# **Traffic Signals**

The City maintains all signals within Portland, except for a few signals on State highways in recently annexed areas, which the State still maintains. For traffic signals at intersections or interchanges between State highways and City streets, the State reim burses the City 50 percent of maintenance and power costs for signals installed or remodeled after 1971.

As a result of annexation and new signal installations, Portland's signalized intersections have increased from 872 in 1986 to 923 in 1994. (Figure 3 in the 1996 Inventory shows the government entity responsible for maintenance at each traffic signal location. Figure 4 in the 1996 Inventory shows the signal type at each location.)

Each signal has two major components: intersection hardware and signal controller. The condition of the hardware has deteriorated since 1986; the percentage in good condition decreased from 69 to 48 percent between 1986 and 1994, while the percentage in poor condition increased from 11 to 20 percent. Because of decreased agency revenue, the level of expenditures for replacements has not kept up with the need.

The condition of intersection controllers has improved between 1986 and 1994; the percentage in good condition increased from 66 to 75 percent, while the percentage in poor condition dropped from 23 to 12 percent. The current level of investment has raised the condition of the controller inventory to an acceptable level.

Table 9.4 summarizes the condition of traffic signal hardware and signal controllers.

Table 9.4
Traffic Signal Condition

|             | 19     | 86      | 1994   |         |  |  |
|-------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--|--|
| Hardware    | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |  |  |
| Good        | 602    | 69      | 443    | 48      |  |  |
| Fair        | 174    | 20      | 295    | 32      |  |  |
| Poor        | 96     | 11      | 185    | 20      |  |  |
| Total       | 872    | 100     | 923    | 100     |  |  |
| Controllers | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |  |  |
| Good        | 575    | 66      | 692    | 75      |  |  |
| Fair        | 96     | 11      | 120    | 13      |  |  |
| Poor        | 201    | 23      | 111    | 12      |  |  |
| Total       | 872    | 100     | 923    | 100     |  |  |

Source: Portland Transportation System: Status and Condition Report, July 1994

## **Traffic Signs**

There were approximately 144,300 traffic signs within the City of Portland in 1996. Since that time, a complete inventory, including location, condition, and maintenance history, has been developed. The GIS-based sign inventory is part of the Infrastructure Management System (IMS) project and is maintained by the PDOT Bureau of Maintenance (BOM). (Figure 5 in the 1996 Inventory shows the 1991 arterial sign inventory by sign type.)

#### **Structures**

The structures inventoried in 1996 comprise 158 bridges, 202 retaining walls, 15 miles of guardrails, 169 stairways, and the harbor wall along the Willamette River.

Between 1986 and 1996, Portland's bridge inventory grew from 109 to 158 as a result of annexation, ODOT construction projects, and new local construction. To analyze bridge condition, bridge components built at different times or of different materials are counted separately, bringing the total bridge inventory to 158.

Several jurisdictions maintain bridges within the City boundaries. At the time of the 1996 inventory, in addition to the City's 158 bridges, the State of Oregon was responsible for 250 bridges, Burlington Northern Railroad for 3 bridges, and Multnomah County for 5 of the Willamette River bridges. County bridges are composed of various structural approaches and spans, which constitute 21 separate bridges for inventory purposes.

In December 1986, PDOT completed a Structural Capital Evaluation Project that assessed the current condition and use of the City inventory of bridges and retaining walls. A 10-year structural capital improvement program was developed through that project.

Table 9.5 describes the condition categories for structures. Table 9.6 shows the condition of bridges based on that rating system. In 1994, 48 percent of the City's bridges were in very good or good condition, 29 percent were in fair or poor condition, and 23 percent were in very poor condition. The changes in bridge condition from 1986 to 1994 result from the increased number of bridges and the policy change that separates bridges at the same location if they were built at different times or of different materials. (Figure 6 in the 1996 Inventory maps bridge condition by location.)

Table 9.5 Structures Inventory Rating System (Overall)

| Condition | Descri pti on  | Rating Number |
|-----------|--|---------------|
| Very Good | No defects; minimal maintenance required; normal traffic     | Over 75       |
| Good      | Min or defects; potential for min or repairs; normal traffic | 66-75         |
| Fair      | Moderate defects; satisfactory with normal maintenance;      | 56-65         |
|           | potential major repair required; min or effect on traffic    |               |
| Poor      | Major defects; major repairs required; reduced traffic       | 46-55         |
| Very Poor | Major defects; major rehabilitation or replacement           | Below 46      |
|           | required; inadequate for traffic                             |               |

Source: Portland Transportation System: Status and Condition Report, July 1994

Table 9.6 Bridge Condition

|           | 19             | 86  | 1994   |         |  |
|-----------|----------------|-----|--------|---------|--|
| Condition | Number Percent |     | Number | Percent |  |
| Very Good | 44             | 40  | 54     | 34      |  |
| Good      | 29             | 27  | 22     | 14      |  |
| Fair      | 21             | 19  | 25     | 16      |  |
| Poor      | 10             | 9   | 21     | 13      |  |
| Very Poor | 5              | 5   | 36     | 23      |  |
| Total     | 109            | 100 | 158    | 100     |  |

Source: Portland Transportation System: Status and Condition Report, July 1994

Overall, the condition of the retaining walls in 1994 was good or very good, with only two percent in fair or worse condition. The increase from 167 to 202 retaining walls between 1986 and 1994 results from annexation and new construction. Table 9.7 summarizes the condition of retaining walls.

Table 9.7
Retaining Wall Condition

|            | 19             | 86  | 1994   |         |  |  |
|------------|----------------|-----|--------|---------|--|--|
| Con dition | Number Percent |     | Number | Percent |  |  |
| Very Good  | 147            | 88  | 180    | 89      |  |  |
| Good       | 16             | 10  | 20     | 10      |  |  |
| Fair       | 4              | 2   | 2      | 2       |  |  |
| Poor       | 0              | 0   | 0      | 0       |  |  |
| Very Poor  | 0              | 0   | 0      | 0       |  |  |
| Total      | 167            | 100 | 202    | 101     |  |  |

Source: Portland Transportation System: Status and Condition Report, July 1994

The harbor wall located on the west bank of the Willam ette River in downtown Portland is not included in the analysis of structures. Build in 1929, the harbor wall is in spected every other year, and after the departure of the Rose Festival fleet if funds are available. Its condition is rated a svery good, based on a minimal rate of settlement and movement since its construction.

#### Traffic Volume and Level of Service

The City of Portland collects ongoing traffic data. The Bureau of Traffic Management combines this actual count data with the City's EMME2 model to produce an average daily traffic flow map that shows generalized traffic volumes for all of Portland's arterial streets. (See Figure 7 of the 1996 Inventory.)

Level of service (LOS), defined either as the ratio of volume to capacity or as average vehicle delay, has historically been used as the sole measure of a transportation system's performance. The City is broadening this traditional congestion-based measure to incorporate the following factors:

1. District Accessibility: Measures the ability of people in motorized vehicles to gain access to defined geographic areas called access districts. It provides a picture of the level of service for a district as a whole, rather than for specific intersections within it.

2. Street Use Characteristics: Looks at the origin and destination of trips using a specific facility and the consistency of those trip types with the street's classification as defined in the TE.

- 3. Travel Time: Measures the time it takes for a motor vehicle to go from point A to point B.
- 4. Traffic Flow: Defined as the movement of traffic along a street. Its performance is based on vehicle speed profiles and the number of stops made.
- 5. Multimodal Service Level: The above four measures apply only to motor vehicle traffic. This measure incorporates non-motorized modes (bicy cling and walking). Its emphasis is on the person-carrying capacity of the corridor, rather than the vehicle-carrying capacity, to arrive at an averaged service level for all modes.

# **Right-of-Way Access**

ODOT recommends an inventory of the number and location of accesses. The City currently has no readily accessible data on curb cuts or other access management devices. However, PDOT's IMS mapping group is in the process of documenting the location of curb cuts, medians, etc.

# **High-Crash Locations**

PDOT instituted a system in 1985 to identify high-crash intersections within the City. PDOT annually updates State of Oregon crash information and analyzes the number of crashes per entering vehicle and the costs of crashes by arterial intersection. This system identifies the need for arterial intersection modifications to reduce crashes.

Intersections with more than six crashes over a four-year period are termed 'major intersections.' Major intersections typically carry through-moving traffic on non-local streets. At the time of the 1996 inventory, Portland had 1,327 major intersections.

The inventory of major intersections comprises three groups:

- Level A: Intersections with 20 or more crashes occurring within the foury ears preceding the inventory and a crash cost greater than or equal to \$48,000 per million vehicles entering, or a crash rate greater than or equal to 1.60 crashes per million entering vehicles.
- Level B: Intersections with 20 or more crashes within the last four years and a crash cost less than \$48,000 per million entering vehicles, or a crash rate less than 1.60 crashes per million entering vehicles.
- Lev el C: Intersections with between 6 and 19 crashes (inclusive) within the last four years.

Table 9.8 shows that 31 (2 percent) of the major intersections are rated in poor condition and require special attention. There are 230 major intersections (17 percent) in fair

condition. The remaining 81 percent of major intersections are in good condition, with a relatively low accident frequency. (Figure 8 in the 1996 inventory shows accident locations for 1991 through 1994.)

Table 9.8 Major Intersections\*

| Group | Con dition | Number | Percent |
|-------|------------|--------|---------|
| A     | Poor       | 31     | 2       |
| В     | Fair       | 230    | 17      |
| С     | Good       | 1,066  | 81      |
| Total |            | 1,327  | 100     |

Source: Portland Transportation System: Status and Condition Report, July 1994. \*Major intersections are based on the number and severity of accidents over a four-year period from 1989 to 1992.

### **Bicycle Network**

### Classification

The three bikeway classifications in the 1996 Inventory are:

- Bicy cle routes, which are designed to establish adequate and convenient routes for bicy cling and to provide access to public transit
- Local service streets, which are intended to provide local circulation and access for bicy cle and pedestrian movements
- Bicy cle paths, which are off-street facilities designed to establish adequate and convenient routes for bicy cling, and which may be shared with pedestrians

The 1996 inventory identifies 127.68 miles of bikeways and 24.68 miles of planned bikeways. (Figure 9 in the 1996 Inventory shows the existing and planned bicycle facilities.)

#### Width

The City standard for bikeways is five feet wide preferred, four feet wide at a minimum in some situations, and up to six feet wide in some situations. All bikeways within the City of Portland met this standard at the time of the 1996 inventory, except for SE 26th Street between Clinton and Gladstone. The sidewalks on the Hawthorne, Steel, Sellwood, St. Johns, and Ross Island bridges did not meet the preferred 10-foot standard for off-street paths.

#### Jurisdiction

All designated bikeways fall within the City of Portland's jurisdiction, except the Willam ette River bridges and State-owned streets within City limits. Multnomah County owns the Hawthorne, Morrison, Burnside, Broadway, and Sellwood Bridges, and the State of Oregon owns the Ross Island and St. Johns Bridges. The Union Pacific Railroad owns the Steel Bridge. State-owned streets are St. Helens Road, SE McLoughlin

Bou lev ard, Macadam, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, Sandy Boulevard, 82<sup>nd</sup> Av enue, Lombard Street, SW Barbur Boulevard, SE Powell Boulevard, and Grand Av enue.

### Condition/Surface

At the time of the 1996 inventory, all bikeways in the City of Portland had an asphalt surface, except for the Willam ette River bridges and Waterfront Park, which have a concrete surface. Most are in fair to good condition.

#### **Pedestrian Network**

#### Jurisdiction

The City of Portland has regulatory responsibility of all designated pedestrianways, except for State-owned streets within City limits and the Willamette River bridges. (See Figure 1 of the 1996 Inventory.) Adjacent property owners are responsible for maintaining sidewalks on pedestrianways, as well as sidewalks on other streets. The two exceptions are street corners and public stairways, which the City of Portland maintains.

### Sidewalk and Curb Inventory

PDOT developed a complete inventory of sidewalks and curb ramps on all Portland streets in fall 1994. The inventory identifies a total of 31,027 street segments. (Appendix B of the 1996 Inventory describes the inventory methodology.)

### Sidewalk Inventory Results

The 1996 Inventory analyzed sidewalk inventory data for arterial streets and local streets in each of the eight Transportation Districts defined in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 2 of the TSP). Sidewalk data were analyzed in three categories:

- Street segments with 100 percent sidewalk on both sides
- Street segments with 100 percent sidewalk on one side, but not the other
- Street segments with less than 100 percent sidewalk on both sides

This methodology does not take into account the discontinuity of the sidewalk between blocks. In the category of street segments with 100 percent sidewalk on one side, for example, a sidewalk that jumps from one side of the street to the other is counted no differently than a sidewalk that continues on the same side.

Tables 9.9 through 9.11 summarize the inventory results, organized by Transportation District. The data are grouped by total sidewalk miles, total miles on arterial streets, and total miles on local service streets. (Figure 10 in the 1996 Inventory depicts these results in bar chart form. Figure 11 in the 1996 Inventory shows the geographic distribution of the blocks with full sidewalks on at least one side.)

As might be expected, the inventory results show that older, inner neighborhoods (such as Southeast and Northeast) are much more likely to have completed sidewalk systems on at least one side of the street than them ore recently annexed areas of the City (such as Southwest or outer east neighborhoods).

Table 9.9 Sidewalk Inventory by District for All Streets

| District         | Total<br>Miles | Total<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on Both<br>Sides | % of Total<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on Both<br>Sides | Total<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on at<br>Least One<br>Side | % of Total<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on One<br>Side | Total Miles w/ Incomplete or No Sidewalks | % of Total<br>Miles with<br>Incomplete<br>or No<br>Sidewalk |
|------------------|----------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| North            | 255            | 134   | 53   | 28  | 11   | 93  | 36  |
| Northeast        | 426            | 295   | 69   | 20  | 5  | 110                                       | 26  |
| Far<br>Northeast | 153            | 46  | 30   | 15  | 10   | 92  | 60  |
| Far<br>Southeast | 200            | 42  | 21   | 20  | 10   | 138                                       | 69  |
| Southeast        | 524            | 385   | 74   | 35  | 7  | 104                                       | 20  |
| Southwest        | 322            | 36  | 11   | 23  | 7  | 263                                       | 82  |
| Northwest        | 116            | 39  | 34   | 15  | 13   | 62  | 54  |
| Central City     | 107            | 76  | 71   | 11  | 10   | 21  | 20  |
| Whole City       | 2,102          | 1,054   | 50%  | 166   | 8%   | 883                                       | 42%   |

Source: Pedes trian Program Inventory, March 1996

Table 9.10 Sidewalk Inventory by District for Arterial Streets

| District         | Total<br>Miles<br>on<br>Arterial<br>Streets | Arterial<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on Both<br>Sides | % of<br>Arterial<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on Both<br>Sides | Arterial Miles w/ Sidewalk on at Least One Side | % of<br>Arterial<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on One<br>Side | Arterial<br>Miles w/<br>Incomplete<br>or No<br>Sidewalks | % of<br>Arterial<br>Miles w/<br>Incomplete<br>or No<br>Sidewalk |
|------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| North            | 47  | 21   | 46   | 8   | 18   | 17   | 37  |
| Northeast        | 87  | 50   | 57   | 6   | 6  | 32   | 37  |
| Far<br>Northeast | 53  | 15   | 29   | 10  | 20   | 27   | 52  |
| Far<br>Southeast | 46  | 12   | 26   | 6   | 14   | 28   | 61  |
| Southeast        | 90  | 73   | 81   | 5   | 6  | 12   | 13  |
| Southwest        | 78  | 8  | 11   | 9   | 12   | 60   | 78  |
| Northwest        | 31  | 12   | 39   | 7   | 23   | 12   | 38  |
| Central City     | 34  | 18   | 53   | 10  | 29   | 6  | 19  |
| Whole City       | 465   | 210  | 45%  | 62  | 13%  | 194  | 42%   |

Source: Pedestrian Program Inventory, March 1996

Table 9.11 Sidewalk Inventory by District for Local Streets

| District         | Total Miles on Local Service Streets | Local<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on Both<br>Sides | % of Local<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on Both<br>Sides | Local<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on at<br>Least One<br>Side | % of<br>Local<br>Miles w/<br>Sidewalk<br>on One<br>Side | Local Miles<br>w/<br>Incomplete<br>or No<br>Sidewalks | % of Local<br>Miles w/<br>Incomplete<br>or No<br>Sidewalk |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| North            | 208                                  | 113   | 54   | 19  | 9   | 76  | 36  |
| Northeast        | 338                                  | 245   | 73   | 15  | 4   | 78  | 23  |
| Far<br>Northeast | 101                                  | 31  | 31   | 5   | 5   | 65  | 64  |
| Far<br>Southeast | 154                                  | 30  | 20   | 14  | 9   | 110   | 72  |
| Southeast        | 434                                  | 312   | 72   | 29  | 7   | 92  | 21  |
| Southwest        | 244                                  | 28  | 11   | 14  | 6   | 203   | 83  |
| Northwest        | 85                                   | 27  | 32   | 8   | 9   | 50  | 59  |
| Central<br>City  | 73                                   | 58  | 79   | 1   | 1   | 15  | 20  |
| Citywide         | 1,637                                | 844   | 52%  | 104   | 6%  | 689   | 42%   |

Source: Pedestrian Program Inventory, March 1996

### Curb Ramp Inventory Results

The 1996 Inventory analyzed curb ramp data for regular corners and for 'T' intersections. Corners were classified by the existence or lack of curb ramps. For corners with a single ramp, the data do not identify whether it is a diagonal ramp serving both travel paths or a straight ramp serving only one path. A T intersection generally has two legal crosswalks that extend between corners on one side of the intersection to a straight curb on the other side. Ramps on the straight curb were designated as a single entry.

Table 9.12 shows the 1996 Inventory distribution of corners and T intersections across the eight districts. The Portland BOM has an ongoing program to install curb ramps throughout the City, with priority given to business districts and transit streets. The number of curb ramps installed each year varies, and can be a smany as 400 to 600. (Figure 12 in the 1996 Inventory illustrates the distribution of corners and T intersections across the City, and Figure 13 shows all the existing curb ramps in the City at the time of the inventory.)

Table 9.12 Curb Ramp Inventory by Transportation District

| District        | <b>Total Corners</b> | Corners with at<br>Least One Ramp | % of Corners with at<br>Least One Ramp |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| North           | 5,812                | 1,900                             | 33                                     |
| Northeast       | 11,430               | 2,967                             | 26                                     |
| Far N orth east | 3,324                | 569                               | 17                                     |
| Far Southeast   | 4,478                | 722                               | 16                                     |
| South east      | 16,186               | 5,010                             | 31                                     |
| Southwest       | 7,384                | 775                               | 10                                     |
| Northwest       | 2,248                | 920                               | 41                                     |
| Central City    | 3,712                | 2,086                             | 56                                     |
| Citywide        | 54,574               | 14,949                            | 27%                                    |

Source: Pedestrian Program Inventory, March 1996

#### Sidewalk Condition

The 1996 Inventory did not collect sidewalk condition data. However, the general condition of Portland's existing sidewalk infrastructure is very good, owing to an excellent ongoing sidewalk inspection program. In spectors regularly check the condition of sidewalks throughout Portland. In the Central Business District, sidewalks are inspected every twoyears. Neighborhood sidewalks are inspected at least every 10 years. Trips, gaps, breaks, and other possible hazards to pedestrians are noted, and the adjacent property owners are notified to repair the hazard. In addition to their regular inspection routine, sidewalk investigators also investigate citizen complaints.

# **Public Transportation Services**

#### Transit Network

Tri-Met is the transit provider for Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties. As of the 1996 inventory, Tri-Met operated 90 bus routes (six of which provide crosstown service) and Eastside MAX, a light rail line extending from downtown Portland to downtown Gresham. Since the inventory, West side MAX and Airport MAX have been built, and the Interstate MAX line is currently under construction.

#### Routes

As of the 1996 Inventory, Tri-Met operated the following 90 bus routes and East side light rail: 5 trunk routes, including East side MAX; 22 city radial lines; 6 crosst own lines; 38 radial/feeder lines; and 20 peak radial/feeder lines. (This information is viewable on the Tri-Met route map.)

### Transit Centers, Stops, and Park-and-Rides

There were five transit centers within the City of Portland at the time of the 1996 Inventory.

In general, bus stops are located at two-block intervals along each route. (See Tri-Met's May 5,1995, Master Stops List.)

At the time of the inventory, Tri-Met operated 58 park-and-ride lots in the tri-county region, 18 of which are located within Portland's City limits. These City lots provide approximately 2,380 parking spaces. (See Tri-Met Park and Ride map.) The Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Policy 6.9, Transit-Oriented Development, Objective D) states that regional transit access should be provided with the highest priority given to the development of effective feeder bus or van pool service, and the lowest priority to park-and-ride lots. Consistent with this policy, the City resists the development of additional park-and-ride lots within City limits.

#### Fleet

At the time of the 1996 Inventory, Tri-Met had a total fleet of 644 vehicles, including 25 mini-buses. (the 1996 Inventory, Appendix C: District's Fleet Status as dated September 3,1995, provides additional information about the fleet vehicles.)

### Frequency, Ridership, and Loading

Route frequency is based on the average load factor and time of day. Figure 14 in the 1996 Inventory shows inventory year Tri-Met routes with 20-minute or more frequent peak-hour service. These routes have an average load factor of 0.47. (The following appendices of the 1996 Inventory provide additional information: Appendix D: Transit Frequency Table; Appendix E: Average Weekday Boarding Rides [Fiscal Year 1987 to 1995] and Average Daily Boarding Rides; Appendix F: Average Load Factor for All Routes [Weekdays] and Average Load Factors – September 3 to December 2,1995 [Weekdays].)

### Special Transit Services

The LIFT Program provides service to registered customers certified as unable to use Tri-Met's regular service because of a physical or mental disability. In 1996, the program provided more than 1,800 door-to-door rides per day in the tri-county area. The LIFT service area is three-quarters of a mile from a regular Tri-Met route; both the origin and destination of a trip must be within this boundary. The service operates a fleet of over 100 small, lift-equipped buses from 4:30 a.m. to 2:30 a.m., seven days a week. (See Tri-Met's LIFT Rider's Guide, 1996 A DA Paratransit Plan Update.)

Tri-Met's Special Events Transit Service (SETS) augments regular Tri-Met service to accommodate special events. In most cases, the event sponsor requests the service. Examples of the special event destinations are Portland Meadows, the Coliseum and the Oregon Arena, and the Interstate Pavilion. (See Appendix G: Tri-Met Special Events Transit Service (SETS) '95, of the 1996 Inventory.)

### Transit Underserved Population

The tables in Appendix H: Transit-Underserved Population, of the 1996 Inventory identify Tri-Met lines that do not operate at levels specified by Tri-Met's service standards. The tables are organized by route type, and policy headways are indicated.

Seventeen major locations are not being served. All would qualify for radial/feeder service. These areas include one or more of Metro's regional traffic zones in which less than 25 percent of the population is served by transit (i.e., is not within one-quarter mile of existing transit service).

### **Intercity Bus and Rail**

Policy 6.19 of the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan states:

Union Station is the hub of the multimodal Transportation Center located in the North Downtown area and should serve as the primary passenger rail and intercity bus terminal in the Portland metropolitan area, providing direct connections between passenger rail, light rail, vintage trolleys, intracity buses, taxis and airport bus shuttles.

Portland's Greyhound terminal is located next to Union Station and provides bus service to cities and towns throughout the United States. (See Greyhound System Timetable [effective 1/10/96].)

Five Am trak trains serve Portland along the Pacific Northwest Corridor: four provide daily service between Vancouver, British Columbia, and Eugene, Oregon, and one provides Sunday, Tuesday, and Thursday service between Seattle and Eugene. Two of those trains also provide service from Portland to Chicago.

### Air

Portland International Airport (PDX), owned and operated by the Port of Portland, is the primary commercial air transportation facility in the region. The airport is located on approximately 3,200 acres of land about 5 miles northeast of downtown Portland and primarily serves the surrounding Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Multnomah, and Clark Counties. PDX also serves the counties beyond this primary area, depending on the range and character of airline service provided in nearby cities such as Boise, Seattle, and Spokane.

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) classifies Portland as a medium air traffic hub. The FAA defines a medium hub as a metropolitan region enplaning 0.5 percent or more of the total passengers enplaned on certified route air carriers in scheduled service in the 50 states and the District of Columbia; Portland accounted for 0.74 percent in 1991.

As of August 1992, PDX was served by 10 scheduled passenger airlines, including 6 major airlines. As of that date, 5 charter airlines and 14 all-cargo airlines also provided service at the airport. Table 9.13 lists the airlines serving the airport. In addition, 66 general aviation aircraft are based at the airport.

Table 9.13
Airlines Serving Portland International Airport

| Major<br>Ai rlines   | Nati onal<br>Ai rlines              | Regional &<br>Commuter<br>Airlines              | All-Cargo<br>Ai dines  | Charter<br>Ai rlines  |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| American<br>Continental<br>Delta *<br>Northwest<br>Trans World<br>United | Alaska<br>America West<br>Southwest | Horizon<br>United Express<br>Reno Air<br>Air BC | Air Pac Airborne Express Ameriflight Burlington Air Express DHL Emery Worldwide Empire Airways Federal Express Premier Jets Regional Express Salair Sports Air Travel United Parcel Service Viking | Morris Air<br>Great America<br>Fiesta West<br>Casino Express<br>Sun Country |

Source: Portland International Airport: Master Plan Update, Summary Report, April 1993

The PDX airfield consists of three active runways and supporting taxiways. A recent renovation and expansion of the passenger terminal complex has resulted in a terminal of approximately 940,000 square feet, with 37 air carrier aircraft gates and 6 commuter aircraft gates. This terminal complex has a capacity of more than 10 million passengers per year.

### **Mainline Facilities**

There are three chief categories of mainline facilities in the region: navigable waterways, railroad main lines, and main roadway routes. Table 9.14 describes these facilities. In addition, there are road connector and rail connector facilities (i.e., branch lines and industrial leads). (Figure 16 in the 1996 Inventory shows rail lines by company.)

Table 9.14 Mainline Facilities in the Region

| Mainline Categories | Facilities   |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Navigable Waterways | Willamette and Columbia Rivers   |  |  |  |
| Railroad Main Lines | Uni on Pacific, Southern Pacific, and Burlington Northern<br>Main Routes |  |  |  |
| Main Roadway Routes | I-84, I-5, I-205, I-405, US 26, US 30, Hwy 99E, Hwy 99W,<br>Hwy 212/224  |  |  |  |

Source: Port of Portland

# Freight

As of the 1996 Inventory, there are 273 freight facilities within the City of Portland. Table 9.15 summarizes freight facilities in the Portlandmetropolitan region by freight type. (Appendix I of the 1996 Inventory has a complete list of freight facilities. Figure 15 in the 1996 Inventory shows the location of freight facilities by category.)

<sup>\*</sup> Provides domestic and international airline service.

Table 9.15 Freight Facilities in the Region

| Facility   | Number of  |
|--|------------|
| •  | Facilities |
| Marine Facility                                    |            |
| General Cargo Terminal                             | 8          |
| Bulk Terminal                                      | 22         |
| For est Products Terminal                          | 2          |
| Grain Elevator Terminal                            | 9          |
| Auto Terminal                                      | 3          |
| Contain er Terminal                                | 1          |
| Rail Facility                                      |            |
| Rail Passenger Station                             | 1          |
| Interm odal Yard                                   | 5          |
| Switching Yard                                     | 3          |
| Airport  |            |
| Air Passenger Terminal                             | 1          |
| Air Cargo Facility                                 | 14         |
| Reload Facility                                    |            |
| General Rail/Truck Reload                          | 39         |
| Petroleum Rail/Truck Reload                        | 1          |
| Truck/Truck Rel cad                                | 102        |
| Grain rail/Truck Reload                            | 0          |
| Truck Terminal                                     | 30         |
| Distribution Facility                              | 35         |
| Carrier (no on site freight handling capabilities) | 31         |
| Freight Forwarder & Customs Broker (no on site     |            |
| freight handling capabilities)                     | 7          |

Source: RTP Freight Element: Freight Facilities, Port of Portland

# **Pipelines**

Portland has 20 pipeline distribution centers located along the Willam ette River: 17 in Northwest Portland and 3 in North Portland. (Figure 17 in the 1996 Inventory shows the locations of these centers.)

#### **Environmental Constraints**

#### Natural

The environmental zoning shown on the Portland Comprehensive Plan maps identifies many of the natural features to consider when making transportation planning decisions.

As defined in the Portland zoning code, environmental zones are intended to protect resources and functional values the City identifies as providing benefits to the public. The environmental protection zone provides the highest level of protection to the most important resources and functional values. The environmental conservation zone conserves important resources and functional values in areas that can withstand environmentally sensitive urban development. In addition to environmentally zoned land, parks, golf courses, and open spaces are also constrained by their zoning. (Figures 18 and 19 in the 1996 Inventory identify these features.)

# Cultural

Transportation planning decisions need to consider cultural as well as natural features. The City's Historic Resource Inventory (1984) lists approximately 5,000 historic resources that are protected from demolition. This inventory includes districts, buildings, trees, and landmarks of historic value. These inventories are being updated as part of the community planning process.