# **SAL History**

In 1977 the City adopted language for a E Streets Classification Policy. There were areas identified. The Policy stated "The areas designated as City Entrances and N responsibility of the Bureau of Parks"

In 1983 the Policies were updated, to "e designation of a system of major streets Parkways. Generally, Parkways are lin State of Oregon and Boulevards are cit

Item "1. d" stated, "Maintenance of la responsibility of the State Highway D as Boulevards shall be maintained by Forester."

Item "2. B." stated, "The maintenance as Parkways or Boulevards shall be guidance from the City Forester."

The most recent update was in'92; shall be maintained by the city thro dropped.

The current Beatification Policy is city..." there is no mention of maintenance,

Forester, with the assistance of the Urban Forestry Commission, should be develop comprehensive design plans for designated Boulevards."

The vegetation and trees along city arterials was (is) the responsibility of Parks.

#### **A Political Decision.**

In reviewing the Memo Commissioner Blumenauer wrote to Commissioner Lindberg, February 15, 1989 concerning Street Area Landscape it is clear that it was not his nor Councils intent to assign maintenance responsibilities to Transportation. The memo states...

"In considering your memo of January 31<sup>st</sup> on the subject of City Policy re: Street Area Landscape maintenance cost, further discussions with you and a review of the record lead me to believe that your staff recollection is incorrect.

anni Here's The Misson

# **SAL History**

In 1977 the City adopted language for a Beautification Policy, as part of an Arterial Streets Classification Policy. There were four "City Entrance and Major Focal Point" areas identified. The Policy stated "The maintenance of landscaping and street trees in areas designated as City Entrances and Major Focal Points shall be considered the responsibility of the Bureau of Parks"

In 1983 the Policies were updated, to "encourage the beatification of the city through the designation of a system of major streets suitable for landscaping as Boulevards and Parkways. Generally, Parkways are limited access facilities which are maintained by the State of Oregon and Boulevards are city arterials."

Item "1. d" stated, "Maintenance of landscape and plantings along Parkway shall be the responsibility of the State Highway Division. Landscaping along streets here designated as Boulevards shall be maintained by the city through a program administered by the City Forester."

Item "2. B." stated, "The maintenance of street trees planted along streets not designated as Parkways or Boulevards shall be the responsibility of the adjacent property owner with guidance from the City Forester."

The most recent update was in'92; the mention of "...streets designated as Boulevards shall be maintained by the city through a program administered by the City Forester" was dropped.

The current Beatification Policy is a policy that "encourages the beatification of the city..." **there is no mention of maintenance**, although item iv. states... "The City Forester, with the assistance of the Urban Forestry Commission, should be encouraged to develop comprehensive design plans for designated Boulevards."

The vegetation and trees along city arterials was (is) the responsibility of Parks.

#### **A Political Decision.**

In reviewing the Memo Commissioner Blumenauer wrote to Commissioner Lindberg, February 15, 1989 concerning Street Area Landscape it is clear that it was not his nor Councils intent to assign maintenance responsibilities to Transportation. The memo states...

"In considering your memo of January 31<sup>st</sup> on the subject of City Policy re: Street Area Landscape maintenance cost, further discussions with you and a review of the record lead me to believe that your staff recollection is incorrect.

Where there is adopted City policy with respect to street area landscape responsibility, that responsibility has been assigned to the Bureau of Parks. Further, in directing the Office of Transportation to subsidize the cost of this activity for FY 1988-89, the Council clearly stated that no precedent was being set for future years, and no change in policy was being made.

The City's policy on street area landscaping evolved over time and was formalized in the Arterial streets Classification Policy. I refer specifically to page 24 of the 1983 update:

"Landscaping along streets here designated as boulevards shall be maintained by the City through a program administered by the city Forester and the maintenance of landscaping and street trees in areas designated as city Entrances and Major focal Points shall be considered the responsibility of the bureau of Parks."

Over at least the last 12 years, the Bureau of Parks has integrated this program into its baseline operation plan and its current service level budget. The key factor driving the historic assignment of street area landscape maintenance is the fact that landscaping street areas fulfills the City's livability and aesthetic goals and not Transportation goals. Accordingly, the work has been assigned, managed and budgeted by the Bureau of Parks.

With regard to last spring's deliberations on the FY 1988-99 budget attached is a transcript of exactly what was said.

The City Council authorized \$355,000 in an interagency agreement between the Bureau of Maintenance and the Bureau of Parks to fund the contract maintenance of street area landscaping. This decision was expressly for budget year 1988-89 only, with direction that the Office of Transportation, bureau of Parks and OFA bring back a joint recommendation for subsequent years. No agreement was made to phase the movement of the cost of landscape maintenance. That is only on option that the Council may want to consider.

My strong feeling is that Parks should continue to be the keeper of the City's green growing things and that transportation continue in the business of getting people and goods safely and efficiently around the City. Toward this end, I have proposed to the Mayor and Council a Transportation budget request that continues the interagency agreement between Maintenance and Parks for contract work only. As you have pointed out, the bureaus have jointly reduced the cost of this contract to \$150,000. In support of the second half of the historic policy (that Transportation provide for the though movement of people and goods), I have proposed an add package in the Transportation budget request to assume responsibility for 11 miles of City streets that run through the parks and serve as part of the Transportation system.

If you would like, I am available to meet with you personally to discuss these issues or we could ask Felicia Trader, Cleve Williams and Steve Bauer to work their way through this and bring us a recommendation.

Work activities defined by Parks, as Street Area Landscape never was high on the list of priorities of work that Parks is responsible to manage, although it clearly had been assigned to parks and was an integral part of what they do. Historically, Transportation

considered this work to be related to the "City Beautification Policy". (Parks responsibility). It included trees and fountains on the Mall, Park Blocks, Park type facilities, among other things. It is apparent that in competing for funds with other park services, their SAL program was of lower priority. Parks informed me, that their solution was to put the work out to contract, in hopes of forcing Parks/Council to identify funds for the program. In 1988/89 FY the general fund was in trouble (Parks), gas tax funds were stable and the Commissioners agreed, **for one year only**, to fund the Park bureau program with gas tax revenue. The program work was done by contract with Park management support.

Parks defined the inventory, the level of service and costs. Parks identified the locations, as well as the work the contractor was to perform. The actual work that Parks performed was never clearly identified. In reviewing the billing 98/99, it appears that the contractor does the vast majority of work on the sites with the exception of what work Forestry performs. It was a huge surprise to discover (98/99) the extent of support BOM supplies Forestry in the IA.

Transportation support of Forestry was never an issue during the talks regarding Street Area Landscape. City Code and Policy have identified forestry work consistently as Park Bureau responsibility.

The decision to fund the IA each following year, (for landscape work-not forestry work), remained a political one.

Each year numerous concerns remained regarding the inventory and the costs. These concerns centered on BOM supporting in the IA; maintenance of the following type-sites:

Park Block type facilities Decorative fountains Street trees (on the mall and light rail, which had been identified in the construction matrix as the responsibility of parks) Parking strips, (identified in Code as the responsibility of the adjacent property owner) BOM paying for maintenance of sites that Parks had agreed to maintain Irrigation and water charges Park type facilities New sites Service levels Plant material

#### Coming and Going (they had us)

New sites are added to the inventory each year. Parks typically participates in the planning, design, establishment and the acceptance to maintain the new sites. The conflict of interest is in that Parks works with PDOT and ODOT and Developers and

Neighbors to design the landscape for the new projects and then turns around, adds them to the inventory and charged BOM to maintain them. As Parks was allowed to increase the IA each year, they had no incentive to encourage Developers, Business Districts, and adjacent property owners to maintain the new development and they had no incentive to say "no" to high maintenance design. Parks simply became accustomed to adding "New Sites" to the inventory, charging the ongoing maintenance of the ever-expanding inventory to BOM, and then point the finger of blame (for the costs/specific landscape elements/expanding inventory) at PDOT, Neighborhoods and Developers. They had no incentive to enforce the Code that clearly specifies street trees and all vegetation in the right-of-way, as being the adjacent property owner's responsibility.

# ...INCLUDE START \$ FIGURE AND TOP \$ FIGURE, BEFOR BREAKS WERE <u>PUT ON PARKS...STILL LOOKING FOR THE COUNCIL DOCUMENT</u> <u>REGARDING THE CONVERSATION BETWEEN LINDBERG/BLUMENAUR</u> <u>REGARDING ONE YEAR ONLY AND THE ONE YEAR DOLLAR VALUE- LOU</u> <u>THINKS IT WAS APPROX \$100,000- MY MEMORY THINKS MAYBE \$185,000-</u> <u>WE THINK THE TOP \$ WAS \$900,000....</u>

FY 98/99 Parks was directed to "maintain current service level". It was clearly explained to Parks, the serious financial situation BOM was experiencing. That year, council agreed to pick-up \$300,00 of the cost of the IA for Parks to do their maintenance on their inventory of SAL sites. Parks submitted an estimate reducing the service on some sites, and they increased service on others. Using their calculations and estimates from the preceding year, and comparing them to their estimates for 98/99, it was apparent that they could maintain "current service level" with a fund reduction of \$195,000. (22% reduction in the total cost of the IA.) This would have allowed no increase of service to any site, maintaining CSL on all sites, no increase for "New Sites" and no funds for "Bark" or "Renovation". Parks chose to ignore this and claimed dire consequences for the "cuts" they claimed they were to experience. It is interesting to note the Parks billed BOM \$696,000 for the SAL IA, FY 98/99. McNerney got TW to buy off on planting 60 trees on Jonesmore for a cost of \$33,000, which brought the IA funded/budgeted figures in at \$3,000 over the figure allocated. The trees were planted during the FY that Parks claimed the SAL would suffer horribly, if they did not get what they requested in their original budget requests. During FY 98/99, Park personnel bounced citizen concerns to numerous areas in BOM in an attempt to compromise BOM's position and responsibilities and ability to fund the SAL IA at a level congruent with BOM's priorities and available funds. These issues were finally resolved in a meeting with Judd, McNerny, Bruneau and Krieg. Parks agreed to handle citizens concerns regarding vegetation and trees and quit bouncing citizens to BOM. They agreed that Parks defined the inventory and level of service and agreed that it was best that BOM not begin to tell them what to or not to do, where, and when. (Such as reduce mowing from 32 times to 4, or turn of irrigation etc.)

Over the years, Parks got into the habit of shopping around for the answer they were after. Last year their shopping cost BOM \$53,000. (\$33,000 to plant 60 trees on Jonesmore and \$20,000 to spray elm trees on the Omaha Park Blocks) In the meeting that resolved the public bouncing issue (mentioned above), Parks and BOM also agreed that Park (specifically McNerney) would stop shopping around for the answer Parks wanted, and would direct all Park contact to Krieg. This agreement was reiterated in the meeting held with Judd, Mcnerney, Nyquist, Krieg in January of '00. In this meeting BOM's dire financial situation was again reiterated. It was explained to Parks that BOM's recommendation to council would be to ask again for the \$300,000 from general fund to assist in supporting the SAL IA FY 00/01, and then cut the IA to \$100,000, total, the next FY.

Parks maintained they could not establish any efficiencies, cost savings or recovery as the IA was as low and as good as it possibly could be. They stated that if asked to use CRCI (community service/convict labor) they would not incur cost savings for any of the work performed on the IA and it would in fact likely cost more. Parks maintained that "many agreements were made for the City to continue landscape maintenance," but thought it unlikely they could produce any. McNerney also stated that the SAL inventory was accepted by BOM Senior Manager Campbell a number of years ago as his justification as to why Parks charges BOM for the trees and fountains on the Mall. It was explained that trees and landscape are certainly valuable, important and pleasant and unfortunately cannot be a priority when held up to maintaining the streets, signals, bridges, patching pot holes and other business that BOM is responsible to maintain with such limited funds.

Parks agreed to identify all areas where they did maintenance (and the associated costs) in the parking strip area, including work on trees. BOM encouraged Parks to continue to look for efficiency's, opportunities for cost recovery and options for reducing the costs of maintaining their inventory.

#### **Transportation Maintenance sites**

Approximately 43 sites were dropped from the inventory of the SAL at BOM request 90/91. In prior years, Parks had identified \$78,000 as the costs associated to maintain these locations. The locations were removed from the IA and placed in a newly created "Transportation Maintenance" activity in BOM, with a reduced funding level. The 43 sites were turned predominately into wild flower meadows or dropped completely from any maintenance responsibility. Accounting did not want the section to combine the "wildflower" and "transportation maint." activities into one activity because it would complicate things for them. The two activities represent essentiality the same type of work,

BES funds the "Wildflower" activity and Transportation funds the "Transportation Maintenance" activities.

Had the 43 sites remained on the IA and received the inflation factor each year that the rest of the IA received, Parks would be charging BOM \$108,000 for what BOM funds

themselves at \$58,000. (FY 00/01) This represents a nearly 50% savings in "Transportation Maintenance" (ex-SAL IA) costs.

,

.

# SAL IA Cost Containment Options/Recommendations

Maintaining Parks inventory of street area landscape at Parks optimal level is a luxury we cannot afford. The best option for Transportation is to gain the political support to place Park street area landscape work back into the Park Bureau, competing with the rest of Park programs for general funds.

# Annual Cost Savings \$726,000

If we are not successful in moving Parks work back into the general fund it is critical we take an active role in defining the inventory. Tied to defining the inventory is the opportunity to identify what sites/work activities are to be funded by the general fund. Identifying general fund work/activities as "Park" type work will lay the groundwork for splitting out the inappropriate items in the SAL. (FY 99-00, Council agreed to contribute \$300,000 of general funds towards the SAL, for one year, it is BOM's intention to request the same support FY00-01 from the general fund).

Following are options/recommendations for managing the IA and associated costs. The costs savings are estimates using Parks 98/99 figures, without the 2% overhead on contracted Services, 2% overhead on utilities, and 16.58% overhead on Park's services, nor 3.5% inflation factor FY 00/01.

Reduce "forestry support" to emergency response specifically trees in the medians. The medians are the ONLY possible trees BOM could be considered responsible to maintain. (\$289,000 all forestry work =2/3rds estimated to be in the parking strips, leaving 1/3 as median trees= \$96,000 optimum service level. Allow 10% funding of "optimum maintenance" for emergency attention to hazardous conditions=\$10,000.) It is unlikely anyone will notice this reduced level of service.

### Annual Cost Savings \$280,000

Direct Parks to enforce the City Code in regards to forestry as well as vegetation in the parking strips and right-of –way.

Annual Cost Savings? Parks is in the process of identifying locations and associated costs

Direct Parks to adhere to the construction agreements/matrix's in regards to the Mall, Light Rail, and the decorative fountains

Annual Cost Savings \$17,000 for fountains only- savings for Mall/Light Rail realized in the above forestry position

Drop the Business District Landscape from the IA, with the expectation the Business Districts/Boosters/Parks will pick up maintenance responsibility as defined and agreed to during construction.

#### Annual Cost Savings \$19,000

Give the Park Blocks back to the Park Bureau Annual Cost Savings \$120,000

Reduce mowing on the Park Blocks to 6 times per year; turn off the irrigation Annual Cost savings \$90,000

Identify the Park Blocks as Park facilities, funded by the General Fund (out of the \$300,000 from the Commissioners.

Annual Cost Savings \$0, at this time, but will become \$120,000 when we are successful in splitting out the items/activities that truly belong to Parks and not BOM/gas tax

Replace the contractor with convict labor

Parks charges BOM \$273,000 for the contractor that maintains their SAL inventory. It is unknown at this point if this dollar value includes "Contract Administration" or represents the true cost of the contractor work.

Columbia River Corrections Institute charges \$400 per day. This is for 10-12 workers and a supervisor. The city would be responsible to provide the tools, training for all power tools, and safety gear, including TC, if necessary. It may be possible to contract with a "flagging/TC" business, to provide any necessary TC. If a 10-12-person crew worked five days a week all year long, the cost would be \$100,000. If they needed more work for this contract amount, we would add BOM sites to the inventory. A second option is to designate a crew 2-3 days a week at \$50,000, and designate \$50,000 for material, tools, traffic control, and a part time project manager/gardener. **Annual Cost Savings \$170,000** 

### Turn off all Irrigation

Annual Cost Savings \$85,000 (this identified cost is for water only, per Parks) unidentified savings would be in the elimination of the required annual back-flow device testing, the maintenance on the systems and the upgrade to the systems. It is unlikely the lack of irrigation would be noticed on any, but the park block sites. The cost to irrigate all the Park Blocks is \$17,000

Annual Cost Saving \$68,000 if we ID Park Blocks as General Fund \$ and the responsibility of Parks, and turn off the rest of the irrigation.

#### **Eliminate Renovation**

Annual Cost Savings \$30,000 It is unknown what this cost truly represents. Assumable upgrade to sites, storm damage or accident repair. It is unlikely many will notice the elimination of the activity. Particularly if Parks bills the responsible insurance companies for work required by accidents.

Eliminate Parks Shopping for Dollars **\$53,000 FY 98/99 Cost** 

### Eliminate Bark Annual Cost Saving \$9,000

If it is not possible to move the entire SAL IA into the general fund, it is critical to identify what specific sites are maintained with general fund money (and begin to identify the sites with Parks and Parks money). This is a good avenue to use to move the "Park Block" type facilities, the Forestry work (especially the Mall and trees in the parking strip), the Park type facilities (fountains, Park 51, Coe Circle) and the irrigation back into Parks/General fund permanently. (Thus removing BOM from this part of the equation.) BOM would then be able to focus on the contract work, new development and reducing the associated costs.

It is important to have BOM staff participation in all planning/design/construction phases for potential new sites. This will ensure our interests are represented. Once Parks realizes they no longer will receive more money each year, and that "new sites" will be competing for existing site maintenance funds, they will likely become proactive in representing our interests. Once Parks and BOM are moving in the same direction with the same goals and priorities, BOM participation and involvement should be reduced.

The benefits of this scenario include:

Ensuring adjacent property owners take their own responsibility Business/Neighborhood Associations/Developers will take maintenance responsibility for landscape they desire Base level of landscape design will be adhered to with minimal maintenance committed to, vs. high maintenance landscape designs Irrigation will be eliminated after establishment.

### Annual Cost Savings will vary with development in coming years

It is also to BOM and Parks advantage to begin a quarterly review process. Parks has been very hesitant in the past to share requested information. The quarterly exchange of information will enhance BOM/Park understanding and partnership and ensure that Park charges are reasonable and appropriate in the IA.

In this process, it is very important to avoid making BOM/PDOT a target for reduced service. To accomplish this we need to make certain that Parks continues to handle citizens concerns (no bouncing), and takes responsibility for the level of service. We need to make certain no announcements are made regarding any potential reduction in service. (Judd's comment that Parks had reduced and eliminated many trash cans in some parks, and experienced little public concern, compared to the year they made a public announcement that trash cans would be eliminated from parks and there was a tremendous public out cry.)

City of Portland, Oregon DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS       MAR 1 4 2000       Nº. 30754         BUC No.       BUREAU OF MAINTENANCE       MAR 1 4 2000       Nº. 30754         1/4 Section       \$028       SERVICE REQUEST FORESTRY DIVISION       Code         1/4 Section       \$028       SERVICE REQUEST FORESTRY DIVISION       Code         1/4 Section       \$028       SERVICE REQUEST FORESTRY DIVISION       Code         1/4 Section       \$028       ST BTWN       IOTH \$11174-         Service Requested       RESET TREE GEATES       Service Requested       Reserved By         Address       SIDE-WARKS       Received By       X1/238         Referred To       FORESTRY       Time       A.M.       PM.         Ivestigation       CUST CONDITION REPORT       Time       A.M.       PM.	
(LIST CONDITION BEFORE AND AFTER JOB IS COMPLETED)         C: POSTING FILES         AFF3 SOS 79 3 SOS 85         Signed         Date         335 (12/96)	

\*

		and a second
• - · · ·	10	<b>)</b>
	City of Portland, Oregon	1
	DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	Nº 30967
	BUREAU OF MAINTENANCE	
BUC No	SERVICE REQUEST	Code
212 5	SERVICE REQUEST	7-8 2000
1/4 Section8		3-8
	ISON ST BOWN 10TH AN & 11	
Service Requested RE-SE	T TREE GRATES. (SEE DA	GRAM)
Reported By STEVE HERE	3077 <del>1</del> Time □ A.M. □ P.M. P	hone x/738
Address SIDEWALKS	Received By	
Referred To FORESTRY	Tim	e 🗆 A.M. 🗔 P.M.
	RECE	IVED
Investigation	(LIST CONDITION BEFORE AND AFTER JOB IS COMPLE	
	MAR 9 -	2000
•		
C: POSTING FILES	URBAN FORES	
ATT 50576, 50577		Data
	Signed	Date
		335 (12/96)

\$







to re-set tree grates.

F21101.VSD

.

Mar 8, 2000

RECEIVED

# MAR y - 2000

URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION



- P Spalling
- T Other

# RECEIVED

MAR y - 2000

URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION



Charlie Hales, Commissioner 2929 N. Kerby Avenue Portland, Oregon 97227 (503) 823-1700 FAX (503) 823-4043 TDD 823-6868

Victor F. **Rhodes** Director

Eileen Argentina Information Technology

Elsa Coleman Finance

Steve Dotterrer Planning

Jeanne Nyquist Maintenance

Toby Widmer System Management

Brant Williams Engineering & Development

June 20, 2000

Brian McNerney, City Forester

FROM:

TO:

Russ Gilbert, SR. Manager Transportation Operations Maintenance

Tree Grate Repairs- Light Rail & Transit Mall SUBJECT:

Just wanted to say thanks for taking care of the problems with the tree grates along the Transit Mall & Light Rail corridor. I have received your memos dated June 6<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> 2000. I have also reviewed the documents you provided, as well as talking with the people you identified whom could provide a signed agreement that shows this to be our responsibility. I still have not seen any documents that would change my mind as to this being your responsibility.

I understand that you feel the Ordinances assigning you responsibility for these activities are too old (20+ years). We have agreements dating back to 1944 with the State of Oregon which we still honor. I'm sure that we cannot just decide that we are not going to honor them or abandon them because they're old. You may want to check with the legal folks.

As you know my concern here currently is only the grates on the Transit Mall & Light Rail areas for pedestrian safety as posted by my inspectors. In regard to your concerns about other tree grates throughout the city (Hollywood), unless there is a maintenance agreement or Ordinance assigning the responsibility to someone specifically, they will be posted to the adjacent property owners for repairs. Therefore, these should not be of concern now or in the future.

While reviewing these documents, City Codes, City Charter and related materials, I see that Transportation has provided some resources for street area landscapes. It appears to me that you may have the authority to enforce the codes that would make the adjacent property owners responsible for street trees and all vegetation in the right-of-way, as we do with sidewalks. If you would like more information on our Sidewalk Posting program let me know. I would be happy to share information with you. Maybe this could be the way to help fund street area landscapes and tree grate repair in the future.

#### McNerney MEMO June 20, 2000,

#### Pg 2 of 2

Also, you have requested that I instruct my inspectors to refrain from sending postings to you for tree grate work located on the Transit and Light Rail malls. Because I have been unable to find any documents changing or reassigning responsibilities for these areas, I have instructed my inspectors to continue to send these requests to Portland Parks for repair.

I realize we have differing views on this issue. Hopefully this will resolve it. If not, Jeanne Nyquist has informed me that you will be meeting with Roger Talley and Barbara Krieg in the near future to discuss management of the Parks/ BOM Interagency and related policy issues. You may want to include tree grates in your discussions as you work together to clarify responsibility for landscaping features. It is clear to me that the Mall Maintenance Agreement makes Parks responsible for tree grates. If you want to change this, it needs to be raised as a policy issue for council decision.

If you have any other questions or concerns feel free to call me at 823-1713.

cc. Vic Rhodes Jeanne Nyquist Toby Widmer David Judd Gary Hill Sidewalk Section Roger Talley Barbara Krieg Urban Forestry Division 10910 N Denver Portland, Oregon 97217 Phone (503) 823-4489 Fax (503) 823-4493



PORTLAND PARKS & RI

Transit mall Cbd ????

- DATE: May 11, 2000
- TO: Steve Herboth Sidewalk Inspector 316/Sidewalks
- FROM: Gary Hill Urban Forestry Program Supervisor 370/UF

RE: SERVICE REQUEST'S #30767, #33635, #30754, #30967, #30755, #30780.

I am returning the service requests, for grate maintenance, you sent to Urban Forestry. Urban Forestry is a division of Parks & Recreation and is not responsible for the maintenance of tree grates unless Parks & Recreation is the adjoining property owner.

Historically, Urban Forestry has provided occasional grate maintenance to these sites through an interagency agreement with the Bureau of Maintenance. The problem has become more extensive over time and has been identified as a capital need to the Bureau of Maintenance. The response from P.D.O.T. was to wait on the repairs and that they would be looking into funding options as well as other options. However, that has not yet happened and with B.O.M. budgetary shortages and more sites being added for service, there is not funding available to Urban Forestry to repair tree grates. If any work is to be done by Urban Forestry, funding must be provided by Transportation.

If you need any further information or have concerns I can be reached at 823-4002.

CT: George Bean, Sidewalk Supervisor, Bureau of Maintenance Mark Stairiker, Liability Claims Manager, Risk Management Brian McNerney, Urban Forest Manager, Portland Parks & Recreation Kathy Murrin, Horticultural Supervisor, Portland Parks & Recreation David Judd, Deputy Director, Portland Parks & Recreation Vic Rhodes, Director, Office of Transportation Jeanne Nyguist, Bureau of Maintenance Director Urban Forestry Division 10910 N Denver Portland, Oregon 97217 Phone (503) 823-4489 Fax (503) 823-4493



Ensuring access to leisure opportunities and enhancing Portland's natural beauty

# PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION

- DATE: May 11, 2000
- TO: Steve Herboth Sidewalk Inspector 316/Sidewalks



- FROM: Gary Hill Urban Forestry Program Supervisor 370/UF
- RE: SERVICE REQUEST'S #30767, #33635, #30754, #30967, #30755, #30780.

I am returning the service requests, for grate maintenance, you sent to Urban Forestry. Urban Forestry is a division of Parks & Recreation and is not responsible for the maintenance of tree grates unless Parks & Recreation is the adjoining property owner.

Historically, Urban Forestry has provided occasional grate maintenance to these sites through an interagency agreement with the Bureau of Maintenance. The problem has become more extensive over time and has been identified as a capital need to the Bureau of Maintenance. The response from P.D.O.T. was to wait on the repairs and that they would be looking into funding options as well as other options. However, that has not yet happened and with B.O.M. budgetary shortages and more sites being added for service, there is not funding available to Urban Forestry to repair tree grates. If any work is to be done by Urban Forestry, funding must be provided by Transportation.

If you need any further information or have concerns I can be reached at 823-4002.

CT: George Bean, Sidewalk Supervisor, Bureau of Maintenance Mark Stairiker, Liability Claims Manager, Risk Management Brian McNerney, Urban Forest Manager, Portland Parks & Recreation Kathy Murrin, Horticultural Supervisor, Portland Parks & Recreation David Judd, Deputy Director, Portland Parks & Recreation Vic Rhodes, Director, Office of Transportation Jeanne Nyquist, Bureau of Maintenance Director

		KEUEIVED
		City of Portland, Oregon DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS $MAR$ 1 $A$ 2000 NO 307F
BLIC No		
	3028	
Location	MSIDE SI	NYAMHILL ST BTWN IOTH & IMA
		SET TREE GRATES.
Reported B	Y STEVE HE	280774 Time □ A.M. □ P.M. Phone 2/ 7.38
Address	SIDEWALKS	Received By
Referred To	FOLISTRY	Time A.M.  P.M
		(LIST CONDITION BEFORE AND AFTER JOB IS COMPLETED)
CIDOST	NG FILES	
ACCOR 10 1000	50582, 50584	Signed Date
	50500 50501	335
	ین از این از این از این	RECEIVED
		City of Portland, Oregon MAY $3$ 2000 NO $3078$
		BUREAU OF MAINTENANCE
		SERVICE REQUEST FORESTRY DIVISIONCODE
		SERVICE REQUEST FORESTRY DIVISIONCODE
1/4 Section	3028	SERVICE REQUEST FORESTRY DIVISIONCode 5-1 20
1/4 Section	3028 5/SIDE ST	SERVICE REQUEST FORESTRY DIVISIONCODE 20 
1/4 Section	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE ST	SERVICE REQUEST <sup>N</sup> FORESTRY DIVISIONCode <u>5-1</u> N MORRISON ST BTINN 14TH & 15TH REPLACE BROKEN TREE GRATE ANTROX MID BLOCK
1/4 Section	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE ST	SERVICE REQUEST <sup>N</sup> FORESTRY DIVISIONCOde <u>5-1</u> <u>26</u> <u>5-1</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>10</u> <u>19</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u> <u>10</u>
1/4 Section Location Service Req	3028 5/SIDE ST Juested PLASE	SERVICE REQUEST NFORESTRY DIVISIONCOde <u>5-1</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10-</u> <u>10</u>
1/4 Section Location Service Req  Reported By	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE SU Juested PLASE WALK 1 STEVE HARBO	SERVICE REQUEST N FORESTRY DIVISIONCOde
1/4 Section Location Service Req  Reported By	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE SU Juested PLASE WALK 1 STEVE HARBO	SERVICE REQUEST N FORESTRY DIVISIONCOde
1/4 Section	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE ST Juested PLASE WALK I STEVE HERBO	SERVICE REQUEST NFORESTRY DIVISIONCode <u>5-1</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u> <u>19-</u>
1/4 Section Location Service Req Reported By Address Referred To	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE SI Juested PLASE WALK I STEVE HERBO	SERVICE REQUEST N FORESTRY DIVISIONCode <u>5-1</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>19</u> <u>112</u> <u>19</u> <u>112</u> <u>19</u> <u>112</u> <u>19</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u>112</u> <u></u>
1/4 Section	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE SI Juested PLASE WALK I STEVE HERBO	SERVICE REQUEST       26         5-1       19         19       19         10       MORRISON ST       BTWN       14/14 & 1574         120       MORRISON ST       BENNE       BLOCK         POSTED       #SORI3       150813       1238         121       Received By       11/238       11/238         121       Time       A.M.       P.M.       P.M.         121       Ist condition before and after job is completed)       A.M.       P.M.
1/4 Section	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE SI Juested PLASE WALK I STEVE HERBO	SERVICE REQUEST       26         5-1       19         19       19         10       MORRISON ST       BTWN       14/14 & 1574         120       MORRISON ST       BENNE       BLOCK         POSTED       #SORI3       150813       1238         121       Received By       11/238       11/238         121       Time       A.M.       P.M.       P.M.         121       Intermodeling       11/238       11/238         122       Time       A.M.       P.M.         123       Time       A.M.       P.M.         123       Time       A.M.       P.M.
1/4 Section	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE SI Juested PLASE WALK I STEVE HERBO	SERVICE REQUEST       260         5-1       19         19       19         10       MORRISON ST       BTWN       14/17H & 157H         120       MORRISON ST       BENNE GRAPTE       AMROX MID BLOCK         POSTED       450813       150813       1238         TH       Time       A.M.       P.M. Phone       N 1/238         Received By
1/4 Section Location Service Req Reported By Address Referred To	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE SI Juested PLASE WALK I STEVE HERBO	SERVICE REQUEST FORESTRY DIVISIONCODE
1/4 Section	<u>3028</u> 5/SIDE SI Juested PLASE WALK I STEVE HERBO	SERVICE REQUEST N FORESTRY DIVISIONCOde 120 5-1 19- N MORRISON ST BTINN 147H & 157H LEPLACE BROKEN TREE GRATE ANNON M10 BLOCK POSTED +50813 MA Time A.M. P.M. Phone N1238 Received By

RECEIVED	an all a fair an ann an ann an ann ann ann ann ann a
APR 1 9 2000 City of Portland, Oregon DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUREAU OF MAINTENANCE	Nº 30767
BUC NO. URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION SERVICE REQUEST	Code 🗌
1/4 Section	<u> </u>
Location MISIDE SW YAMHILL BOWN 12TH & 13TH	4
Service Requested PLEASE PE-SET TREE GRATES	
(WALK POSTED ATT 50798)	
Reported By_STEVE HERBOTH Time A.M. D	Phone ??38
Address Received By	
Referred To	- Please serd - Copy of SR to - Forcetry - B370,
Investigation	_ copy of SR to _
(LIST CONDITION BEFORE AND AFTER JOB IS C	" Forestry - B370.
	- thanks _
Signed	Date
	335 (12/96)
RI	ECEIVED
City of Portland Oregon	
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORK BUREAU OF MAINTENANCE	
BUC No SERVICE REQUE	
1/4 Section Su) Mom 5cm 5"	T 3-4 the The
Location	5-Side
Service Requested Broken Tr	re state
	0
Reported By Athi Time SIGAN	1. $\Box$ P.M. Phone $\frac{244-7383}{15}$
Receive	
Address Receive	1618
Referred ToREFER to sidewalk inspector	
Investigation 100000 100000000000000000000000000000	
4' x 3/4" 16" TO CUT-OUT REFER	TO FORESTRY
(LIST CONDITION BEFORE AND AFTER 4' x 3/4" 16" TO CUT CUT PUTPET AS per MAINTENANCE AGNER	MENT. 3-10-2000 AA,
Signed	Date

335	(12/96)
-----	---------

Horticultural Services 6437 SE Division Bldg 416 Portland, Oregon 97206 Phone (503) 823-1636 Fax (503) 823-2244



Dedicated to enriching the lives of citizens and caring for Portland's natural beauty

# MEMORANDUM

To:Brian McNerney, City ForesterFrom:Kathy Murrin, Horticultural Services SupervisorDate:June 21, 2000Subject:Level of Service Adjustments to Transportation Landscapes

In response to the need to reduce the service to Transportation landscapes by \$175,000, I have developed three alternatives which are outlined below. The alternatives attempt to provide the best service possible by using the available funds in a programmed fashion. Different program areas are identified in the three alternatives. Considerations used to craft the alternatives included preservation of infrastructure, public safety, and cost effectiveness. While one of the goals is to preserve infrastructure, this year's reduction in maintenance funding, coupled with earlier reductions and the addition of new responsibilities, makes loss of plant and system infrastructure a hard reality.

In 1998, the funds provided to Parks for maintaining Transportation landscapes was reduced by 17.5%, (\$154,000), to the current funding amount of \$750,941. Other factors that make the funding crisis more acute are a 7% cost increase for services delivered by our contractor, and \$29,000 in additional costs to maintain newly constructed properties (with \$11,000 more scheduled for FY '00-01). In order to respond to these cost pressures, services have already been reduced on some sites and services to other sites have been completely eliminated.

The three alternatives are as follows:

**Alternative A:** Maintain major thoroughfares and major "blocks", (sites like Transit Malls, Macadam, Powell, Airport Way etc.). Eliminate services to neighborhood traffic diverters and islands, (like Division Corridor, NE 7<sup>th</sup>, etc.), some thoroughfares and all bridgeheads, like Hawthorne, Sellwood, and Ross Island).

Alternative B: Maintain "blocks", (like Ainsworth, Omaha, Firland, Reedway, etc.), *Roccarey* neighborhood islands and bridgeheads. Eliminate services to thoroughfares, (arterials and collectors).

edwood oscistand

1

Alternative C: Maintain major thoroughfares and neighborhood islands. Eliminate services to bridgeheads, blocks and some miscellaneous sites.

There are, of course, pros and cons associated with each of these alternatives. For the purpose of discussion some pros and cons are identified below. The list, however is not exhaustive and there likely are additional pros and cons that will surface in the discussion.

Community Gardens • Native and Wetland Landscapes • Transportation Landscapes Bedding Plants • Landscape Plant Materials • Environmental Education • Parks Support Services All alternatives assume a \$550,000 funding package.

# Alternative A

Pros:

- The service priorities are aligned with priorities expressed by the BoM. Services focus on arterials, collector streets and major transit routes.
- Maintain greenways along major traffic routes. Services include pruning, shrub maintenance, litter collection, irrigation system maintenance etc.
- Lots of garbage removed managing the visual eyesore.

# Cons:

- Lose neighborhood connection no services provided to neighborhood sites.
- Concentrate maintenance in Downtown and SW areas perceived inequity in service delivery.
- Lots of funding spent on garbage management at the expense of infrastructure preservation.
- Landscapes constructed for Neighborhood and school safety programs receive no service.

# Alternative B

# Pros:

- Focus is on neighborhood traffic management devices.
- Maintain school and neighborhood safety.
- Plant infrastructure is maintained.
- This alternative does not dedicate significant funds to litter management.
- Service to these sites is most cost effective as less traffic management is required.

### Cons:

- No service is provided to trees on major thoroughfares which will result in loss of major infrastructure.
- Safety concerns on major thoroughfares from height clearance violations, blowing litter, obstacles to visibility, weeds and overgrown shrubs.
- Visible litter on major arterials.

# Alternative C

Pros:

- Maintain geographic distribution, spread the pain. Equity and localized impact.
- Addresses neighborhood and school safety.
- Preserves some green infrastructure on arterials.
- Limited number of sites dropped, (although they are significant sites).

### Cons:

- Possible objections from citizens near the blocks.
- Unsightly blocks in various communities.
- Traffic safety issues related to visibility.
- Infrastructure at high risk, (lots of trees on blocks)



# CITY OF PORTLAND BUREAU OF PARKS AND RECREATION

OPERATIONS-HORTICULTURAL SERVICES 6437 S.E. DIMSION AVE. PORTLAND, OREGON 97206 (503) 823-1636

MIKE LINDBERG, Commissioner

CHARLES JORDAN, Director

#### MEMORANDUM

TO:

Dennis Campbell, Bureau of Maintenance, Operations Manager

Brian McNerney, Horticultural Services & Rose Gardens FROM:

DATE: November 6, 1991

SUBJECT: Street Sites Landscape Management. 

Attached is a final draft of a list that includes all of the sites that we discussed. I have attempted to reflect financial responsibility as well as maintenance responsibility for each site according to our joint decisions.

Please review the list and let me know if you find any areas of disagreement. After we finalize the draft, I will prepare a document for distribution. We can then meet with the original Bureau of Maintenance - Parks Team members to address questions and

We discussed meeting on a regular basis (quarterly) to discuss business issues and preserve the relationship we have established. Besides exchange of information, these meetings can be used to processes for accepting new responsibilities to adjacent property owners, and other critical sites, transferring tasks. I think we should pursue this goal. thoughts on a first meeting time? Do you have any

Thanks for all of the time and effort you expended on reviewing the sites with me. This was a gigantic effort but very worthwhile. I think we all have a better understanding of the program and feel more comfortable about our relationship. It was also good to hear that you feel better about the Street Tree care after reading Alex Wynstra's report. If you have any additional questions about the Tree Care Program, the Parks Bureau will be happy to answer your questions and concerns. I am looking forward to meeting with you

Thanks again.

#### STREET AREA LANDSCAPE FINANCIAL AND MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES November 6, 1991

#### BOM FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

M = BOM manages site in 1992-93 P = Parks manages site in 1992 - 93 **PM = Maintenance responsibilities are split** E Burnside 90th - 94th Μ -# 1 P # 2 E Harbor Drive (Oregon to Wheeler) W Light Rail SW 500 Tree Wells and Trees P # 3 # P 4 E Light Rail Williams to Sandy (tree portion) 븊 N Beech and Borthwick Μ 6 Μ # 7 N Columbia Blvd, Buchanan to Oswego # 9 N Concord and Going Μ P # 10 N Emanuel Circle # N Gertz @ 4800 P 11 PM # 12 N Going St Interstate Noise Barrier M # 13 N Going St Interstate Cul-de-sacs # 14 N Greeley and Interstate (Sidewalk strip) Μ N Greeley and Interstate (Battery Building). # 15 P N Mason & Gantenbein Μ # 16 Μ # 17 N Mocks Crest Triangle # 18 N Overlook Triangle (@ Shaver) Μ Μ # 19 N Prescott & Albina # 20 Ρ N St Johns Business District - Burlington Ave & Philadelphia # 21 N St Johns Business District - Lombard & Richmond P M # 22 N Vancouver Way M # 23 N Wall and Willamette JRAF P # 25 UNIT 4 - N Willamette & Portland P # 26 UNIT 4 - NE 24th & Thompson P UNIT 4 - NE 24th & Tillamook # 27 P # 28 UNIT 4 - NE 24th & Brazee P # 29 UNIT 4 - NE 21st & Thompson P # 30 UNIT 4 - NE 21st & Brazee P # 31 UNIT 4 - NE 35th & Grant Pl. P # 32 UNIT 4 - NE 36th & Grant Pl. P # 33 NE 37th Ave. @ Thompson P # 34 NE 37th Ave. @ Brazee P # 35 NE 37th Ave. @ Wistaria # 36 P NE 53rd & Hassalo P # 37 NE 53rd & Clackamas P # 38 NE Alameda & 38th P # 39 NE Alameda & Regents P # 40 NE Senate & Hassalo P # 41 NE 39th & Halsey P # 42 NE 57th & Hoyt P # 43 NE 68th & Halsey Μ # 44 NE 69th & Halsey Ρ # 45 NE 80th & Halsey # 46 P NE 81st & Halsey

NE Coe Circle 39th Glisan # 47 P NE Grand & Everett # 48 P NE 21st & Pacific P # 49 NE 22nd & Pacific # 50 P NE 33rd & Clackamas # 51 P NE 33rd & Clackamas # 52 P NE Senate & Sandy # 53 P NE East end of Steel Bridge (Light Rail) # 54 P NE Fargo Court & 162nd P # 55 NE Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - Duddleson P # 56 NE Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - Dyer # 57 P NE Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - 86th # 58 P NE Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - Siskiyou P # 59 NE Halsey & Weidler at 102nd # 62 М NE Halsey and 112th # 63 Μ Hollywood Business District (also trees) P # 64 thru Hollywood Business District (also trees) # 69 P NE 34th & Holman # 71 P NE 37th & Holman P # 72 NE 41st & Holman P # 73 NE Jonesmore/Broadway # 74 Μ NE Klickitat Mall P # 76 thru NE Klickitat Mall # 79 Ρ NE Lombard & 33rd # 80 M NE Lombard & 42nd # 81 M NE Mason & 19th PM # 82 NE Multnomah St. & Imperial # 83 P NE Prescott & 15th M # 84 NE Shaver & 17th # 85 Μ NE Thompson & 17th # 86 M NE Tillamook & 16th # 87 М NE MLK-Broadway to San Rafael # 88 P NE MLK-San Rafael to Lombard # 89 Ρ NE Williams & Jessup # 90 P NE Wistaria & 41st # 91 P NE Wistaria & 49th # 92 Ρ NW 25th & Marshall # 93 P NW 25th & Overton P # 94 NW 25th & Quimby # 95 P NW 29th & Wilson P # 96 NW Couch & I-405 @ 15th & 16th # 97 P NW Everett & Front (Steel Bridge Interchange) # 98 P # 99 NW Front & Nicolai P NW Luray Terrace Circle #100 Μ NW Quimby & 29th Μ #101 Ρ #102 NW Raleigh & 26th NW Raleigh & 27th P #103 NW Vaughn (trees and wells) P #104 NW Yeon & Front Overpass P #105 NW Yeon & Nicolai to St. Helens Ρ #106 SE 82nd - Division - Schifler P #107

SE 82nd & Division (trees and wells) #108 P SE 90th & Foster #109 Μ SE 90th & Woodstock #110 Μ SE 97th & Woodstock #111 М SE Foster Woodstock/Henry #112 M SE 97th & Henry #113 Ρ SE 103rd & Morrison Μ #114 SE 103rd & Stark #115 Μ SE Ankeny & 32nd #116 M SE Division - 8th & 9th (trees and wells) #117 P SE Henderson 42nd - 45th #118 Μ SE Ladd Traffic Diverters @ Ladd & Palm P #120 SE Ladd Traffic Diverters @ Ladd & Lavender #121 P SE Park 51 (@ 108th & Stark) #124 Ρ SE Powell (Ross Island Bridge to 50th) (trees and wells) P #125 #126 SE Powell & 28th Μ #127 SE Powell & 7th Ρ SE Powell & 9th - North #128 P SE Powell & 9th - South P #129 SE Powell & Milwaukie #130 P SE Powell - 50th to 92nd Ρ #131 SE Salmon & 16th P #132 SE Salmon & 27th #133 P SE Scott Dr & 65th - Greenleaf #134 P SE Waverleigh & 33rd Μ #135 SE 12th & Ash P #136 S. A. 2016 P #137 SE 16th & Ash SE 14th & Pine Ρ #138 SE 15th & Alder P #139 P #140 SE 14th & Taylor SE 13th & Salmon P #141 SE 13th & Madison P #142 SE 14th & Main Ρ #143 SE 15th & Oak Ρ #144 SE 72nd & Woodstock Μ #145 P #146 SE 56th & Woodward SE 58th & Woodward P #147 SW Alder - 15th Ρ #148 SW Arthur St Median - First to 4th P #149 SW Boonesferry and Terwilliger M #151 P #152 SW Broadway - 4th to 6th SW Burnside & Tichner #153 P SW Capitol Hwy & Terwilliger P #154 SW Car Wash Fountain P #155 SW Carl Place Μ #156 Ρ #157 SW Clifton & Park SW Collins Circle (18th & Jefferson) P #158 SW Dosch & Beaverton-Hillsdale P #159 #160 P SW First - Harrison to Arthur NW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to North Ρ #161 SW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to Harrison Ρ #162 P #163 SW Harbor Dr \* SW Harbor Dr & Clay P #164

```
SW Harrison St Median - Front to 4th
P
   #166
          SW Hawthorne Bridge - West End.
P
   #167
          SW Highland & US 26 (zoo)
Ρ
   #168
          SW Jackson & 6th bike path
  #169
M
   #170
          SW Kelly Fountain
P
          SW Lincoln Median - First to 4th
Ρ
   #171
          SW Macadam - West end of Sellwood Bridge
P
   #172
          SW Macadam - Bancroft to William. Moorage Blvd
P
   #173
          SW Macadam - Taylors Ferry Rd Pt, B/S Islands, Virginia Street
Ρ
   #174
          SW Madison - 5th to 6th
Ρ
   #175
          SW Patrick Place
M
   #176
P
   #177
          SW Patton Place
          Portland Center
P
   #178
Ρ
          Ross Island Bridgehead
   #179
          SW Sherwood Place ( on Fairmont)
P
   #180
                                              the first set
P
   #181
          SW Tyrol Circle
          SW Vermont 45th - 50th
   #182
Μ
          W Burnside Median 1st to Park
P
   #185
          N Omaha Parkway
P
   #217
   #218
          NE Ainsworth Blocks
P
          NE Roseway Blocks Parkway
P
   #219
          NW Light Rail 700
P
   #220
          SE Firland Parkway (72nd & Foster)
P
   #221
P
   #222
          SE Laurelwood Triangle
          SE Reed College Parkway (Reedway Blocks)
P
   #223
          SW Campbell Fountain, 18th & Burnside
P
   #224
   #225
          SW Light Rail 600
P
          SW Transit Mall (Madison-Burnside, 5th & 6th)
Ρ
   #228
          NE Convention Center - Bluff on Lloyd
   #229
M
          NE Hayden Island - Tomahawk Drive Medians
   #246
P
          Convention Center - RR Access and 6 trees & wells
Μ
  #247
          Convention Center - Holladay Off Ramp I-84
P
   #250
P
   #252
          Bertha, Barbur - Vermont
          Division Corridor - SE Lincoln & 32nd
P
   #253
          Division Corridor - SE Lincoln & 37th
P
   #254
          Division Corridor - SE Lincoln & 43rd
P
   #255
          Division Corridor - SE Lincoln & 46th
P
   #256
          Division Corridor - SE Lincoln & 51st
Ρ
   #257
          Division Corridor - SE Lincoln & 55th, A
P
  #258
          Division Corridor - SE Lincoln & 55th, B
P
   #259
          Division Corridor - SE Lincoln & 58th
P
   #260
          Division Corridor - SE Harrison & 37th
P
   #261
          Division Corridor - SE Harrison & 41st
P
   #262
          Division Corridor - SE Clinton & 23rd
P
   #263
          Division Corridor - SE Clinton & 31st
P
   #264
          Division Corridor - SE Clinton & 36th
P
   #265
          Division Corridor - SE Clinton & 45th
P
   #266
P
   #267
          Division Corridor - SE Clinton & 47th
          Division Corridor - SE Carruthers & 30th
P
   #268
          Division Corridor - SE 30th & Grant, A
P
   #269
Ρ
   #270
          Division Corridor - SE 30th & Grant, B
          Division Corridor - SE Hawthorne & 12th
P
   #271
          Division Corridor - SE 26th & Harrison
P
   #272
```

P	#273	Division Corridor - SE 39th & Lincoln
P	#274	Division Corridor - SE 39th & Clinton
P	#275	NE 47th Thompson & Brazee
P	#277	SW Convention Center - Overlook
P	#278	SW Terwilliger & Taylors Ferry to I-5

۰.,

# PARKS FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

-	# 70	NE Holman & 13th
P	#119	SE Ladd Circle
P	#165	SW 14th & Hall
P	#183	SW Vista Spring
P	#216	N Kerby & Failig Traffic Div (near Unthank Pk)
Ρ	#226	SW Terwilliger Blvd Parkway
P	#227	SW Thomas & 53rd

#### PARKS/BOM SPLIT FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

.PM # '8 N Columbia & Oswego

1.0

# INACTIVE AND/OR NO LONGER CITY RESPONSIBILITY

# 5 # 24	E LightRail - East of Sandy - no site to maintain Unit 4 - Fremont & Fremont Dr curb extension - adjoining property
# 60 # 61 # 75 #122 #123 #150 #184	owners NE Grant Pl - duplicate of # 31 & 32 NE Halsey & 102 - sold property NE Killingsworth & Lombard - ODOT responsibility SE McLoughlin & Milwaukie - ODOT responsibility SE McLoughlin & 17th - ODOT responsibility SW Barbur Blvd Hamilton to Bancroft - dropped SW Vista Ave Bridge - Volunteers maintain
#230 thru #244 #245 #248 #248 #249 #251 #251 #281	Western Edge Curb Extensions - Adjoining property owners Curb Extensions NE Hayden Island Drive - someone else maintains Convention Center 9th - adjoining property owner Convention Center @ 11th - adjoining property owner NE Minnesota & I-5 - ODOT SW Burnside & Tichnor - duplicate

...

6.0

NOTE:

# 186 - 215 These numbers are used by Parks to identify other nontransportation sites. Cost Savings Options for the SAL: FY 00-01

These are some ideas that we have been thinking about. However, we need help in evaluating the impacts related to each item. We would welcome some help in estimating the level of cost savings available from each item.

1. Reduce forestry support to emergency response only.

Our focus for emergency services would be primarily the trees located on median islands. Median trees appear to be the only trees where City Code, and Ordinances may direct Transportation to provide maintenance. This appears to be a research item.

2. Contact Business districts/Boosters regarding the pickup of all maintenance within specified locations. Some of these locations have a on-going agreement on file and the organizations may be sympathetic to our funding problems.

3. Take the "Park-like Blocks" off of the SAL inventory.

Ainsworth Blocks, Roseway Blocks, Firland Parkway, and Reed College Parkway properties all appear to be park-like and could be absorbed into the regular park maintenance. Research Ordinances.

4. Reduce mowing frequencies on Park-like blocks. Reduce mowing to 6 times per year and turn off irrigation.

5. Turn off all irrigation. The savings in the cost of water used for these areas and annual testing of back flow devices.

6. Eliminate Renovation Damaged items would be removed and not replaced.

7. Eliminate bark.

This would appear to be a small item. Some savings appear possible.

8. Eliminate Fountain Support.

Research Ordinances. These items do not seem transportation related.

9. Inmate Labor to perform current contract work.

Explore the savings available for the organization and development of an inmate labor team to provide services within the Standard Level of Service.

4

Teanne



Breakdown of Services Supplied to the Bureau of Maintenance through Portland Parks and Recreation

Grounds (Co	intractor)	182,914	-	Routine n
Grounds (No	n-Contractor)	93,317		weed co
Tree Services	5	165,645	-	Pruning, p
Turf Manager	nent	23,928	-	Mowing, f
Equipment Se	ervices	42,979	-	Backflow
Utilities		63,638	-	Water
Administration	n	75,515	-	Inspection
Supplies		25,426	-	Irrigation
Overhead		77,579	-	City overh

maintenance, litter pickup, blowing, leaf removal, ground cover edging, watering, trimming, ontrol, mulching, fertilization, de-suckering, vandalism repair, irrigation and landscape repair.

- planting, watering, pest monitoring and control.
- fertilization, and other turf care.
- services, major irrigation repair, debris removal.
  - on, billing, locates, complaints, cooordination, budget, maps, contract development.
- supplies, plants.
- rhead costs.

Urban Forestry Division 10910 N Denver Portland, Oregon 97217 Phone (503) 823-4489 Fax (503) 823-4493





jAl file

Ensuring access to leisure opportunities and enhancing Portland's natural beauty

# PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION

# **MEMORANDUM**

- TO: Russ Gilbert Transportation Operations Maintenance
- **FROM:** Brian McNerney, City Forester

**DATE:** June 12, 2000

SUBJECT: Tree Grate Repairs – Light Rail Transit Mall

Hi Russ. As per our phone conversation last week, I have asked our field supervisor to start repairing the six tree grates on the Light Rail corridor that you referenced in your memo of May 22, 2000. I am addressing this work for two reasons. First, I understand you do not have staff skilled in doing this work and contracting the work will delay the repairs. Secondly, we both understand the need to achieve these repairs quickly in the interest of public safety. I still feel agreements between our two bureaus place this responsibility in the Bureau of Maintenance portfolio and will be invoicing you for the labor and materials.

As you know, these repairs are just the tip of the iceberg and you can expect many more tree grate repairs in the future in Transportation landscapes throughout the city. I understand that you will be discussing an approach to this significant problem with Toby Widmer and Vic Rhodes. Please let me know what you decide. Also, please instruct the Bureau of Maintenance sidewalk inspectors to refrain from sending additional postings to Portland Parks for Transportation properties. We will however accept work orders if some mechanism is set in place to reimburse Parks for expenses.

It was interesting talking with you and hearing your views on the global issues. I look forward to hearing from you and am hopeful that a resolution to the problem is forthcoming.

c. David Judd Vic Rhodes Jeanne Nyquist Toby Widmer Gary Hill



Charlie Hales, Commissioner Engineering & Development Victor F. Rhodes, City Engineer 1120 S.W. 5th Avenue, Room 802 Portland, Oregon 97204-1914 (503) 823-7004 FAX (503) 823-7371 TDD 823-6868

July 19, 1996

Marc A. Labadie 2474 N.W. Savier Street Portland, Oregon 97210

of POR

OFFICE of TRANSPORTA

Dear Mr. Labadie,

I am sorry to hear about your unfortunate accident and the painful injuries you suffered as a result of stepping into a treewell. I hope that the "Ibuprofen and ministrations of a concerned and caring family" has helped you on your road to recovery.

In regards to your suggestion that tree grates be required in all high pedestrian volume areas, I agree with you that requiring tree grates is a reasonable idea. At this time there is no requirement for tree grates in all tree wells however as a matter of practice PDOT requires grates in the Central Business Districts when streets are being rebuilt and in certain areas (Lloyd district) where special design standards have been adopted which incorporate tree grates into the design.

PDOT is in the process of developing a set of "Pedestrian Design Guidelines" as part of the City's Pedestrian Master Plan. The issue of when and where to require tree grates is included in the list of items under consideration for those guidelines. There has been some concern expressed that requiring tree grates in all combination curb and sidewalk areas will discourage voluntary tree planting by small business owners and volunteer groups due to the cost of the grates, from three to five hundred dollars each. However, within the central city and other high pedestrian use areas, PDOT will be recommending that the grates be required.

If you have additional questions regarding how we are working to enhance the pedestrian environment please feel free to call Ellen Vanderslice with the PDOT pedestrian program. Ms. Vanderslice is the project manager for the Pedestrian Design Guidelines project and would be happy to answer any questions you may have regarding PDOT's work in this area.

Again let me express my sympathy an best wishes for your speedy recovery.

Sincerely,

Don Gardner

c: Charlie Hales, Commissioner Brian McNerney, City Forester Susan Feldman, Planning Ellen Vanderslice, Pedestrian Program s/mgmt/ltr/labadie RECEIVED

JUL 2 4 1996

**URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION** 

July 11, 1996

Commissioner Charlie Hales 1220 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Room 701 Portland, Oregon 97204

Dear Charlie,

First, the testimonial: I love Portland, especially in the summer! The weather, the parks, the bike paths, a list too long to continue. Most particularly, for the matter at hand, I love its vibrant downtown, with its active street life, including food stands which attract workers out of their offices and onto the streets.

Second, the disclaimer: This letter is <u>not</u> the first salvo leading to a lawsuit, despite reactions from friends ranging from "Sue the City - this is your two months in Tahiti!" to "Sue the Goodmans - this is your chance to stop that parking structure!" I'd be happy if I could just sleep through the night without pain and go to the park to play catch with my eight-year-old son.

Third (have I piqued your interest yet?), the anecdote: Monday at 12:30PM I was walking north along SW 9th Avenue across from the Guild Theater. Enjoying a lovely afternoon and thinking about work (mea culpa), I looked ahead to see a growing line at the Crepe House food stand on the corner. There was one line of tables along the east edge of the sidewalk; as the line of patrons was growing toward the west edge of the sidewalk; I stepped to the left to get around them. A split second later I was sprawled across the sidewalk with torn pants, a severely sprained ankle, a deeply bruised thigh and a fractured rib! I had stepped into a 3" to 4" deep unprotected tree well.

Finally, the solution (in addition to ibuprofen and the ministrations of a concerned and loving family): I don't know what requirements currently exist regarding street trees; it seems to me that individual property owners are typically responsible for sidewalk conditions adjacent to their property. In any event, <u>every</u> tree well in the pedestrian-friendly downtown (or in any designated pedestrian district!) should be grated or otherwise level. (Most of them are, in my experience; the condition which I fell into is not the norm.) Also, permitting of food stands should somehow be tied to an assurance that conditions are safe and pedestrianfriendly. I know these ultimately become enforcement issues, but with the participation of civic-minded businesses large and small they can be addressed.

Please be assured that I appreciate your ongoing efforts to maintain and enhance the liveability of the entire city and of its downtown core. Carry on!

Sincerely, Habarh.

Marc A. Labadie 2475 N.W. Savier Street Portland, Oregon 97210

cc:

Susan Feldman - Bureau of Planning Don Gardner - Bureau of Transportation Engineering Brian McNerney - Urban Forester Greg Goodman - City Center Parking Horticultural Services 6437 SE Division Bldg 416 Portland, Oregon 97206 Phone (503) 823-1636 Fax (503) 823-2244



Dedicated to enriching the lives of citizens and caring for Portland's natural beauty

BUREAU OF MAINTENANCE

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 5, 2000

TO: Roger Talley, Mike Boyle, BOM

FROM: Kathleen Murrin, Portland Parks & Recreation

SUBJECT: 00 – 01 City Landscape Site Interagency Agreement

The interagency agreement for this year has been adjusted to reflect the approximately \$175,000 reduction budgeted for maintaining these sites. Please see the listing of the sites and their costs. This list includes three sites that are on the interagency contract for a partial year (SW Sunset Hwy/Climbing Lane, N Marine Dr @ N Harbour Condos and SW 17<sup>th</sup> Harold – Milwaukie Islands). The sites that have all "0's" are no longer on the contract, but I've retained them on the list this year to more easily identify what has been removed. I have also included a list of sites ("Upcoming Sites") that normally would have been scheduled to come on the contract next year. This list is intended to be a "heads-up". There may actually be some other upcoming sites, and some of the sites listed may actually be delayed.

The service cuts made to meet the \$175,000 reduction fall into four categories:

- 1. Elimination of all landscape maintenance on some sites (see attached list "BOM Sites with Contracted Services Dropped in FY 00 01);
- 2. Elimination of landscape maintenance "behind the curb" ie on the rights of way along sides of the roadway on all sites (see attached list "BOM Sites With Contracted Services, Medians Only");
- 3. Elimination of tree services on the Street Boulevard Blocks (Ainsworth Blocks, Firland Parkway, Omaha Blocks, Reed College Blocks, Roseway Blocks)
- 4. All horticultural and irrigation renovation work is eliminated; all bark placement is eliminated

The budget for this work is \$575,941 for this fiscal year. Currently our numbers reflect \$556,941 in identified service costs, with the remaining \$19,492 designated for contingency. Since we have only just begun negotiations with our contractor for

Community Gardens • Native and Wetland Fandscapes • Transportation Landscapes Bedding Plants • Landscape Plant Materials • Environmental Education • Parks Support Services

Juni Francesconi, Commissioner 🔹 Charles Jordan, Director 🔹 Explore our website at www.parks.ci.portland.or.us
services, we are unclear what their true cost will be. At this point we believe that \$6,000 - \$7,000 of the contingency money will be needed for this purpose.

Please note that sites eliminated from the contract include those that meet various criteria, but also include those where all the work done previously was "behind the curb". There are some high-use, high visibility sites on both this list and the 'Medians Only" list. We believe that there will be some safety - related problems associated with eliminating care of the sites behind the curbs and the trees on the blocks. It is our hope that BOM will contact adjacent property owners to inform them of the shift in responsibility. It will also be imperative that Trimet be contacted so they know to direct their concerns with respect to trees along the light rail and on the transit mall elsewhere.

You had some questions about sites that had previously been on the interagency contract, but which have been dropped at some point. These are listed on "BOM Sites With No Contracted Services".

Please feel free to call me (X1603) if after looking at this material you have questions.

Cc David Judd Brian McNerney Jeanne Nyquist

 Standard Level of Service (LOS):
 1 visit/month Nov. to Mar.
 Leaf pickup once/month in Nov. and Dec.

 2 visits/month April to Oct.
 Trim ivy once/year and apply growth retardant

 Single, unirrigated tree wells in the median are serviced quarterly

 All other contract items:
 weed control, fertilization, litter, irrigation, etc.

Rece	eiver: BOM	Current Year Sites						Last U	lpdate:	06-Sep-00 Page 1 of 11
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	О/Н	Total per Site
2	E Harbor Drive (Oregon to Wheeler)	Maint	Contractor	м	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	W Light Rail SW 500 (tree wells & trees)	2.5	Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.01	E Light Rail Williams - Sandy / NE Holladay S	Maint	Contractor	Α	2,522	1,438	1,461	5,421	332	5,753
8	N Columbia & Oswego	5	Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	N Emanuel Circle		Contractor	Ρ	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	NE Gertz @ 4800		Contractor	A	695	235	1,207	2,137	229	2,367
20	N St. Johns Bus.DistrBurlington Av. & Phila		Contractor	М	1,661	249	1,380	3,290	262	3,553
21	N St. Johns Bus.DistrLombard & Richmond		Contractor	М ,	1,765	491	1,416	3,672	275	3,947
25	N Willamette & Portland Blvd - NTMP #4		Contractor	AU	373	178	435	986	87	1,072
26	NE Thompson & 24th - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	143	75	189	407	37	444
27	NE Tillamook & 24th - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	158	75	338	571	60	631
28	NE Brazee & 24th - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	131	75	189	395	37	432
29	NE Thompson & 21st - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	156	70	338	563	60	623
30	NE Brazee & 21st		Contractor	М	131	70	327	527	58	585
31	NE Grant PI & 35th - NTMP #4	i nanini na	Contractor	М	131	70	338	538	60	598
32	NE Grant PI & 36th - NTMP #4	8	Contractor	М	130	70	359	558	63	622
33	NE Thompson @ 37th Ave		Contractor	м	102	98	177	376	34	411

1

### **Current Year Sites**

Last Update: 06-Sep-00 Page 2 of 11

Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.		Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	0/н	Total per Site
34	NE Brazee @ 37th Ave		Contractor	м	129	103	215	447	42	489
35	NE Wistaria @ 37th Ave		Contractor	м	231	74	347	652	63	715
36	NE Hassalo & 53rd		Contractor	М	119	94	181	394	35	429
37	NE Clackamas & 53rd		Contractor	М	119	93	219	431	42	473
38	NE Alameda & 38th		Contractor	AU	589	179	240	1,007	57	1,064
• 39	NE Alameda & Regents		Contractor	м	284	115	505	903	96	999
41	NE Halsey & 39th Banfield		Contractor	N	966	0	2,289	3,255	405	3,660
42	NE Hoyt & 57th Banfield		Contractor	A	730	221	1,595	2,546	281	2,827
43	NE Halsey & 68th Banfield		Contractor	A	1,106	298	1,839	3,243	349	3,592
45	NE Halsey & 80th Banfield		Contractor	A	948	297	820	2,065	164	2,230
46	NE Halsey & 81st Banfield		Contractor	Ν	948	0	762	1,710	152	1,862
47	NE Glisan & 39th Coe Circle		Contractor	A	1,247	561	6,777	8,585	1,285	9,870
48	NE Grand & Everett		Contractor	A	2,295	454	4,075	6,824	736	7,560
51	NE Clackamas & 33rd		Contractor	A	2,900	363	1,415	4,678	312	4,990
55	NE Fargo Court & 162nd		Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
56	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Duddleson		Contractor	м	214	79	136	429	29	458
57	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Dyer		Contractor	М	153	71	136	360	28	388
58	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - 86th		Contractor	М	170	77	136	383	28	411
59	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Siskiyou		Contractor	М	131	76	136	343	27	370
64	NE Hollywood District - NE 42nd & Sandy		Contractor	М	472	113	1,638	2,223	290	2,513
65	NE Hollywood District - NE 45th & Sandy		Contractor	М	354	105	513	972	96	1,068
66	NE Hollywood District - NE Halsey & 42nd		Contractor	AU	0	0	0	0	0	0

8

### **Current Year Sites**

Last Update: 06-Sep-00 Page 3 of 11

Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	O/H	Total per Site
67	NE Hollywood District - NE Broadway, 41 Pl,		Contractor	AU	0	0	0	0	0	0
68	NE Hollywood District - NE 39th & Sandy		Contractor	N	300	0	845	1,145	143	1,288
69	NE Hollywood District - Street Trees, Rest of		Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
71	NE Holman & 34th		Contractor	М	115	91	251	457	48	504
72	NE Holman & 37th		Contractor	М	105	90	251	446	47	493
73	NE Holman & 41st		Contractor	М	133	92	251	476	48	524
76	NE Klickitat Mall - Entrance to 11th		Contractor	N	567	0	219	786	48	833
77	NE Klickitat Mall - 11th to 12th		Contractor	N	567	0	256	823	54	877
78	NE Klickitat Mall - 12th to 13th		Contractor	N	567	0	218	785	48	832
79	NE Klickitat Mall - 13th to 14th		Contractor	N	567	0	503	1,070	97	1,167
83	NE Multnomah & Imperial		Contractor	М	142	98	248	487	47	535
88	NE MLK-Broadway to San Rafael		Contractor	A	2,788	509	1,296	4,592	279	4,872
89	NE MLK-San Rafael to Lombard		Contractor	Ρ	3,000	677	3,191	6,868	591	7,459
90	N Jessup & Williams		Contractor	N	259	0	862	1,121	156	1,277
91	NE Wistaria & 41st		Contractor	М	390	103	1,322	1,815	238	2,053
92	NE Wistaria & 49th		Contractor	N	506	0	1,241	1,747	227	1,974
93	NW Marshall & 25th		Contractor	М	139	92	242	473	45	518
94	NW Overton & 25th		Contractor	М	122	90	242	454	45	499
95	NW Quimby & 25th		Contractor	М	107	91	175	373	34	407
96	NW Wilson & 29th		Contractor	м	347	113	426	886	83	969
97	NW Couch & I-405 @ 15th & 16th		Contractor	М	0	0	0	0	0	0
98	NW Everett & Front (Steel Bridge Interchang		Contractor	A	4,540	1,692	3,447	9,679	707	10,386

A

# **Current Year Sites**

Last Update:

06-Sep-00 Page 4 of 11

	1	r	<u> </u>	1	r	1	1	1	Y	Page 4 of 11
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.		Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	0/н	Total per Site
102	NW Raleigh & 26th		Contractor	м	150	92	181	423	36	459
103	NW Raleigh & 27th		Contractor	М	156	69	181	405	36	441
104	NW Vaughan Trees/Wells	Past Est.	Parks/ Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
106	NW Yeon & Nicholai to St. Helens		Contractor	A	0	0	0	0	0	0
107	SE Division - Schiller on 82nd		Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
108	SE Division & 82nd Tree Wells	Comp.	Parks/ Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
110	SE Woodstock on 90th	Estab/ Finish	Contractor/ BOM?	AU	1,099	469	947	2,515	187	2,702
113	SE Henry & 97th	Planning	Contractor	Α	429	97	538	1,064	104	1,167
120	SE Ladd & Palm Traffic Diverters	2	Contractor	М	107	64	182	353	35	387
121	SE Ladd & Lavender Traffic Diverters		Contractor	М	107	68	331	505	58	563
124	SE Stark & 108th Park 51		Contractor	A	2,986	1,316	3,097	7,399	627	8,026
125	SE Powell, Trees & Wells, Ross Is. Bridge to		Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
130	SE Powell & Milwaukie		Contractor	М	572	155	1,405	2,132	248	2,380
131	SE Powell - 50th to 92nd		Contractor	A	7,900	608	10,464	18,972	1,886	20,858
132	SE Salmon & 16th		Contractor	N	55	0	497	552	88	640
133	SE Salmon & 27th		Contractor	N	55	0	307	362	55	417
134	SE Scott Dr & 65th - Greenleaf		Contractor	N	587	0	142	729	37	765
136	SE Ash & 12th Western Edge		Contractor	М	97	97	250	443	47	490
137	SE Ash & 16th Western Edge		Contractor	М	185	97	320	601	61	662
138	SE Pine & 14th Western Edge		Contractor	М	185	96	320	600	61	662
139	SE Alder & 15th Western Edge		Contractor	М	185	93	320	598	61	659
140	SE Taylor & 14th Western Edge		Contractor	М	185	99	282	565	54	620

# **Current Year Sites**

Last Update:

06-Sep-00 Page 5 of 11

Rec No     Site Address, Description     Proj Stat.     Maint By     Irr       141     SE Salmon & 13th Western Edge     Contractor     M	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk	Est. Ttl		Total
			Supp. Cost	Maint Cost	O/H	per Site
	185	97	282	563	54	618
142     SE Madison & 13th     Contractor     M       Western Edge     M	131	97	328	555	61	616
143 SE Main & 14th Contractor M Western Edge	131	97	282	509	53	563
144     SE Oak & 15th     Contractor     M       Western Edge     M	185	97	282	563	54	618
146 SE Woodward & 56th Contractor M	185	112	300	597	58	655
147 SE Woodward & 58th Contractor M	114	91	251	456	47	503
149     SW Arthur St Median - First to 4th     Contractor     P	2,500	107	2,048	4,655	393	5,049
152 SW Broadway - 4th to 6th Contractor A	1,169	115	2,236	3,520	408	3,928
153 SW Burnside & Tichner Comp. Contractor N	573	0	459	1,032	92	1,123
154 SW Capitol Highway / Terwilliger Parks/ AU Contractor	855	276	1,720	2,851	322	3,174
155 SW Car Wash Fountain - Transit Mall Parks A/M	0	0	5,688	5,688	1,037	6,725
157 SW Clifton & Park Contractor AU	3,480	1,015	1,477	5,972	347	6,319
160 SW First - Harrison to Arthur Contractor M	4,000	107	6,050	10,158	1,056	11,214
161 NW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to North Contractor A	2,020	376	2,328	4,724	438	5,161
162 SW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to Harrison Contractor A	5,636	3,500	3,302	12,438	740	13,177
164 SW Harbor Dr & Clay Triangle Contractor A	1,100	1,222	1,779	4,101	357	4,458
165 SW Hall & 14th Finished Contractor A	4,211	0	0	4,211	84	4,295
166 SW Harrison St Median - Front to 4th Contractor M	1,850	107	2,094	4,051	388	4,439
167 SW Hawthorne Bridge (@ Madison, Jefferson Contractor AU	1,739	658	3,376	5,773	701	6,474
170 SW Kelly Fountain -Transit Mall Parks M	0	0	8,804	8,804	1,638	10,443
171 SW Lincoln Median - First to 4th Contractor M	1,850	107	3,024	4,981	532	5,513
172 SW Macadam - West end of Sellwood Bridge Contractor N	1,964	0	615	2,579	141	2,720

# **Current Year Sites**

Last Update: 06-

06-Sep-00 Page 6 of 11

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Ĭ	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Page 6 of 11
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	О/Н	Total per Site
173	SW Macadam - Bancroft to Willamette Moora		Contractor	AU	4,540	682	10,507	15,729	1,788	17,517
174	SW Macadam-Tay.Fer.Rd.Pt.,B/S Islands, Vi		Contractor	м	2,674	400	896	3,969	217	4,186
175	SW Madison - 5th to 6th		Contractor	A	225	405	453	1,083	86	1,169
177	SW Patton Place		Contractor	М	650	65	202	917	49	966
178	SW Portland Center (Front, Market & Harbor		Contractor	A	3,185	2,979	4,168	10,332	791	11,123
179	SW Ross Island Bridge Interchange (@ Hood		Contractor	М	12,349	2,068	6,505	20,922	1,545	22,468
181	SW Tyrol Circle		Contractor	N	238	65	362	665	69	734
183	SW Vista & Spring		Contractor	N	549	0	114	663	31	694
185	W Burnside Median 1st to Park		Contractor	М	1,670	457	4,144	6,270	701	6,972
187	SW Boones Ferry/Taylors Fry - NTMP #7A	Comp.	Contractor	М	329	97	480	906	92	998
189	SE Harold/Foster-52nd to 72nd, Median at 52	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	AU	145	97	350	592	65	657
192	N Smith-Others-B-NTMP Medians @Tyler & Buchanan	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	м	826	162	1,916	2,904	331	3,235
193	SW Virginia north of Taylors Ferry - NTMP	Estab/ Finish	Contractor/ COP	AU	454	86	542	1,082	105	1,187
196.01	N Marine Drive Grnwy, I-5 to Rivergate - Pha	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	М	0	0	0	0	0	0
201.01	SW Terwilliger, Sam Jackson to Homestead,	Estab	Contractor	Ν	552	Ø	182	734	43	776
201.02	SW Terwilliger Islands, Phase II Homestead - Capitol	Finish estab	Contractor	N	385	0	179	564	39	602
202	SW Barbur/Terwilliger I-5 Interchange Terwilliger & Canby	Estab	Contractor	Α	728	217	684	1,630	138	1,767
203	SE Tacoma/McLoughlin Interchange/Nehale Nehalem St. Closure	Estab	Contractor	AU	400	0	530	930	100	1,030
204	SE Brookside Dr/SE 117th PI	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	М	145	97	368	610	68	678
211	NE Convention Center - 15th/16th - Mult & Br	Estab/ Finish	Contractor/ COP?	A	573	208	454	1,235	94	1,329
217	N Omaha Parkway		Parks/ Contractor	М	1,280	3,433	4,553	9,266	1,009	10,274
218	NE Ainsworth Blocks		Parks/ Contractor	M	2,404	6,110	21,980	30,494	4,237	34,731

### **Current Year Sites**

Last Update:

06-Sep-00 Page 7 of 11

		T		1	1		l	i		Page 7 of 11
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	0/н	Total per Site
219	NE Roseway Blocks Parkway		Parks/ Contractor	м	2,263	1,674	9,308	13,245	1,938	15,183
221	SE Firland Parkway SE 72nd & Foster		Parks/ Contractor	A	1,280	1,175	6,511	8,966	1,356	10,322
223	SE Reed College Parkway (Reedway Blocks)		Parks/ Contractor	м	1,373	6,008	13,744	21,125	2,712	23,837
224	SW Campbell Fountain, 18th & Burnside		Parks	м	0	0	6,374	6,374	1,195	7,569
228.01	SW Transit Mall (Madison-Burnside, 5th & 6t		Parks	Ν	0	0	0	0	0	0
246	NE Hayden Island - Tomahawk Drive Median		Contractor	Α	414	445	1,267	2,126	230	2,356
250	Convention Center-Holladay Off Ramp I-84	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	Α	1,002	658	2,472	4,132	457	4,588
253	SE Lincoln & 32nd Division Corridor		Contractor	м	164	108	145	417	30	447
254	SE Lincoln & 37th Division Corridor		Contractor	м	164	69	294	526	53	579
255	SE Lincoln & 43rd Division Corridor		Contractor	м	99	66	145	310	28	338
256	SE Lincoln & 46th Division Corridor		Contractor	М	83	74	851	1,009	138	1,147
257	SE Lincoln & 51st Division Corridor		Contractor	М	165	70	369	604	66	670
258	SE Lincoln & 55th (East) Division Corridor		Contractor	М	107	66	221	393	42	435
259	SE Lincoln & 55th (West) Division Corridor		Contractor	М	90	66	927	1,083	151	1,234
260	SE Lincoln & 58th Division Corridor		Contractor	М	105	67	183	354	35	389
261	SE Harrison & 37th Division Corridor		Contractor	м	164	70	369	603	66	669
262	SE Harrison & 41st Division Corridor		Contractor	М	164	69	221	453	43	496
263	SE Clinton & 23rd Division Corridor		Contractor	М	147	68	221	435	42	478
264	SE Clinton & 31st Division Corridor		Contractor	М	142	68	183	392	36	428
265	SE Clinton & 36th Division Corridor		Contractor	М	164	68	407	638	71	709
266	SE Clinton & 45th Division Corridor		Contractor	М	107	66	332	504	58	563
267	SE Clinton & 47th Division Corridor		Contractor	м	141	67	332	539	59	598

# **Current Year Sites**

Last Update:

06-Sep-00 Page 8 of 11

Rec	Site Address, Description	Proj	Maint	1	Contr	\A/4- /	Eat Di-	E.4. 711		
No	She Address, Description	Stat.		Irr	Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	O/H	Total per Site
268	SE Carruthers & 30th		Contractor	м	110	67	332	508	58	567
	Division Corridor									007
269	SE Grant & 30th (North)	1	Contractor	М	83	65	999	1,147	161	1,308
	Division Corridor	1								.,
270	SE Grant & 30th (South)		Contractor	М	83	71	1,075	1,229	174	1,403
	Division Corridor									,
271	SE Hawthorne & 12th		Contractor -	Ν	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Division Corridor		Ad.Pr.							
272	SE Harrison & 26th		Contractor	М	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Division Corridor									
273	SE Lincoln & 39th		Contractor	М	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Division Corridor									
274	SE Clinton & 39th		Contractor	М	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Division Corridor									
275.01	NE Brazee & 47th		Contractor	м	144	135	258	538	50	588
275.02	NE Thompson & 47th		Contractor	М	144	135	258	538	50	588
276.02	NE Schuyler & 28th	Maint	Contractor	М	142	105	287	535	55	590
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
276.04	NE Schuyler & 32nd	Maint	Contractor	М	287	75	287	650	57	707
	NE Hollywood - New FM								·	
276.05	NE Weidler & 28th	Maint	Contractor	М	211	71	287	569	55	624
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
276.06	NE Halsey & 28th	Maint	Contractor	М	311	80	287	678	58	736
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
276.07	NE Clackamas & 28th	Maint	Contractor	М	278	105	287	671	57	728
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
276.08	NE Wasco & 28th	Maint	Contractor	Ν	185	0	204	389	39	428
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
277	Convention Center-River Overlook	Maint	Contractor	A	1,878	896	1,191	3,965	263	4,228
279.01	NE Tillamook & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	м	112	69	320	501	59	560
279.02	NE Sacramento & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	м	112	69	320	501	59	560
279.03	NE Russell & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	М	112	68	320	500	59	559
279.04	NE Graham & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	М	112	80	320	512	59	572
279.05	NE Morris & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	М	112	70	320	502	59	561
279.06	NE Cook & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	М	102	70	320	492	59	551

# **Current Year Sites**

Last Update:

06-Sep-00 Page 9 of 11

	1	1	T	-		r		1	1	Page 9 of 11
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	0/н	Total per Site
282.01	SE Eastmoreland B, 37 & Bybee - NTMP #6A	Maint	Contractor	м	95	70	110	274	22	297
282.02	SE Eastmoreland C, 34th & Bybee - NTMP #	Maint	Contractor	м	262	70	1,323	1,655	214	1,869
290	Airport Way Phase I NE Holman to 138th	Maint	Contractor	A	3,897	521	6,451	10,869	1,142	12,011
291	Airport Way Phase II NE 138th to 181st	Maint	Contractor	A	8,364	684	10,528	19,577	1,911	21,488
293.01	West Side Corridor Lt, Rail Extension - Jeffer Jeff-18th-Morr-Yamhill	Maint	Contractor	A	3,021	940	1,126	5,087	273	5,359
293.02	West Side Corridor Lt. Rail Extension - Jeffer Non-irr trees on Morrison & Yamhill	Estab/ maint	Parks	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
294	NW Nicolai/Yeon Intersection - 3 trees		Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
297	SW Moody St Extension	Maint	Contractor	Α	166	130	768	1,064	132	1,195
300	N Sumner/Haight Device (N Iris Ct. Apts) N Iris Ct. Apts	Maint	Contractor	М	145	68	181	393	35	429
304	NE Arena Project	Maint	Contractor	Α	2,283	940	821	4,044	206	4,251
305	NW Transit Mall Extension	Maint	Parks	Ν	0	0	0	0	0	0
306.01	NE Alberta & 14th Place		Contractor	AU	312	156	507	975	97	1,072
306.02	NE Killingsworth & 14th Place	Maint	Contractor	AU	312	156	507	975	97	1,072
309.01	SE Johnson Creek Blvd & 45th - Sprngwtr Co Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	Α	709	203	1,267	2,179	236	2,415
309.02	SE 82nd-Harney to Crystal Sprgs Blvd Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	Α	354	97	416	867	80	947
309.03	SE Flavel - 87th to 89th Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	Α	354	97	374	824	72	896
309.04	SE 92nd - Knapp to Knapp Pl Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	Α	709	97	871	1,677	167	1,844
309.05	SE Foster - 103rd PI to 106th Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	A	354	97	1,364	1,815	245	2,060
309.06	SE 122nd - Martins to Ramona Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	A	354	97	357	808	70	878
312.01	SE Gladstone & 28th Pl	Maint	Contractor	AU	430	141	512	1,083	98	1,181
312.02	SE Gladstone & 30th	Maint	Contractor	AU	343	109	373	825	74	899
312.03	SE Gladstone & 34th	Maint	Contractor	AU	343	109	373	825	74	899

# **Current Year Sites**

Last Update: 06-Sep-00 Page 10 of 11

	1		1				(		r	
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	0/н	Total per Site
			-		COSI	ļ	COSI	COSI		2116
312.04	SE Gladstone & 37th	Maint	Contractor	AU	430	109	522	1,061	99	1,160
314	SW Sunset Hwy/Climbing Lane	Planning	COP/ Contr	A	5,400	400	3,060	8,860	650	9,509
315	NE Convention Center - Lloyd to 16th S of Lloyd Cinemas	Maint	Contractor	A	1,647	311	1,244	3,202	255	3,458
318	NE Oregon & 122nd	Maint	Contractor	AU	999	178	787	1,963	161	2,124
319	SW Barbur Bike Path - Miles to Hamilton	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
320	SW Highland and Zoo Interchange, north side Northwest section	Maint	Contractor	Α	1,200	208	1,217	2,625	241	2,866
325.01	SE Lents School - SE Harold & 97th School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	AU	431	178	380	989	78	1,067
325.02	SE Steele & 92nd (south)- Lents School School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	N	74	0	167	241	31	271
325.03	SE Steele & 92nd (north)- Lents School School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	AU	193	70	214	476	42	518
326	N Willis & Emerald - Peninsula School School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	N	74	0	304	378	54	433
327	SE Stark & 52nd - Glencoe School School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	AU	193	69	380	642	71	713
335.01	NE Siskiyou & 33rd	Maint	Contractor	AU	702	69	466	1,237	96	1,333
335.02	NE Klickitat & 33rd	Maint	Contractor	AU	702	69	487	1,258	100	1,358
335.03	NE Bryce & 33rd	Maint	Contractor	AU	702	79	487	1,268	100	1,368
335.04	NE Portland Blvd & 33rd	Maint	Contractor	AU	702	79	984	1,765	187	1,952
338	SE Water Ave LID	Estab	Contractor	A	1,857	282	593	2,732	145	2,877
339	SE Steele & 49th School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	N	138	0	173	311	33	343
340	SE Market & 117th School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	N	138	0	173	311	33	343
341	SE Sandy & Ankeny/11th	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	N	144	0	317	461	58	520
342	NW Pettygrove & 25th - Chapman School School Safety Project	Constr	Contractor	N	98	0	272	370	50	420
343	NE Alberta & 6th - King School School Safety Project	Constr	Contractor	N	86	0	135	221	25	246
344.01	NE Fremont & 18th - Sabin School School Safety Project	Constr	Contractor	N	98	0	135	233	26	258

P

.

# **Current Year Sites**

Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	O/H	Total per Site
344.02	NE Shaver & 17th - Sabin School School Safety Project	Constr	Contractor	N	77	0	135	212	25	237
349	N Marine Dr @ Gantenbein	Constr	Contractor	AU	200	118	242	559	48	607
360	N Williams & Portland Blvd	Estab	Contractor	N	98	0	197	295	36	331
361	N Williams & Killingsworth	Estab	2	N	80	0	173	253	32	284
362	N Marine Drive @ N Harbour Condos	Estab/ Maint	Contractor	N	300	0	423	723	80	803
363	SE 17th, Harold - Milwaukie Islands	Estab	Contractor	N	500	0	779	1,279	146	1,425
364	SW Lt Rail, Madison & Portal, Phase III	Construc ted	Contractor	A	1,389	423	487	2,299	120	2,419
400	Bark			N	0	0	0	0	0	0
410	Renovation			N	0	0	0	0	0	0
					174,998 2% of Cont \$ 3,500	60,198 <b>2% of</b> Water 1,204	269,367	504,563	51,886 Total OH	556,449
					178,498	61,402				

Sub- Total	\$556,449
<b>Contingency Fund</b>	\$19,492
Grand Total	\$575,941

4

# **Current Year Sites**

Last Update: 06-Sep-00 Page 11 of 11

Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	O/H	Total per Site
344.02	NE Shaver & 17th - Sabin School School Safety Project	Constr	Contractor	N	77	0	135	212	25	237
349	N Marine Dr @ Gantenbein	Constr	Contractor	AU	200	118	242	559	48	607
360	N Williams & Portland Blvd	Estab	Contractor	N	98	0	197	295	36	331
361	N Williams & Killingsworth	Estab		N	80	0	173	253	32	284
362	N Marine Drive @ N Harbour Condos	Estab/ Maint	Contractor	N	300	0	423	723	80	803
363	SE 17th, Harold - Milwaukie Islands	Estab	Contractor	N	500	0	779	1,279	146	1,425
364	SW Lt Rail, Madison & Portal, Phase III	Construc ted	Contractor	A	1,389	423	487	2,299	120	2,419
400	Bark			N	0	0	0	0	0	0
410	Renovation			N	0	0	0	0	0	0
					174,998	60,198	269,367	504,563	51,886	556,449
					2% of Cont \$	2% of Water	6		Total OH	
					3,500	1,204				
					178,498	61,402	an ann dhaanaan A			20 1

Sub-T	otal	\$556,449

<b>Contingency Fund</b>	\$19,492

Grand Total \$575,941

Recei	ver: BOM Upcomin	ng Sites	Last Update:	December 23, 1999 Page 1 of 1
Rec No	Site Address, Description			
150	SW Barbur Blvd & Hamilton - Bike Path Phase II		2	
206	Airport Way Wetlands Mitigation			
215	East Riverbank			
295	NE Wistaria @ 43rd			
303	NE River Overlook to Steel Bridge - Pedest. Bridge			
316	N Albina Overcrossing at Russell			
321	SW Sylvan/Highland Interchange - Phase I			-
322	N Willamette Curb Extensions			
328	SE 17th, McLoughlin to Nehalem		4	
329	SW Sylvan/Highland Interchange - Phase II			
330	NE Sandy Blvd, 102nd to 122nd, Bike Path			
336	NE Hassalo, 39th to 33rd	Medians and Curb Extensions		
348	SE Holgate & 78th - Marysville School	School Safety Project		
350	NE Dekum & Oneonta - Woodlawn School	School Safety Project		
351.01	N Clarendon Cul-de-sac - Clarendon School	School Safety Project		
351.02	N Portsmouth & Newark - Clarendon School	School Safety Project		
352	NE Alberta - MLK to 33rd			
354	SE Woodstock - 39th to 45th			

Last Update:

06-Sep-00 BOM Sites With Contracted Services Dropped in FY 00-01 Page 1 of 1 Rec Site Address, Description No 2 E Harbor Drive (Oregon to Wheeler) W Light Rail SW 500 (tree wells & trees) 3 8 N Columbia & Oswego 10 N Emanuel Circle 55 NE Fargo Court & 162nd 66 NE Hollywood District - NE Halsey & 42nd NE Hollywood District - NE Broadway, 41 Pl, 42nd 67 69 NE Hollywood District - Street Trees, Rest of Pots 97 NW Couch & I-405 @ 15th & 16th 104 NW Vaughan Trees/Wells NW Yeon & Nicholai to St. Helens 106 107 SE Division - Schiller on 82nd 108 SE Division & 82nd Tree Wells 125 SE Powell, Trees & Wells, Ross Is. Bridge to 50th N Marine Drive Grnwy, I-5 to Rivergate - Phase I 196.01 SW Transit Mall (Madison-Burnside, 5th & 6th)TREES 228.01 SE Hawthorne & 12th **Division Corridor** 271 SE Harrison & 26th **Division** Corridor 272 273 SE Lincoln & 39th **Division Corridor** SE Clinton & 39th 274 **Division Corridor** 293.02 West Side Corridor Lt. Rail Extension - Jefferson - tree Non-irr trees on Morrison & Yamhill NW Nicolai/Yeon Intersection - 3 trees 294 305 NW Transit Mall Extension SW Barbur Bike Path - Miles to Hamilton 319 400 Bark 410 Renovation

	<b>BOM Sites With Contracted</b>	Services, Medians Only	06-Sep-00 Page 1 of 1
Rec No	Site Address, Description		
4.01	E Light Rail Williams - Sandy / NE Holladay St		
88	NE MLK-Broadway to San Rafael		
89	NE MLK-San Rafael to Lombard		
131	SE Powell - 50th to 92nd		
149	SW Arthur St Median - First to 4th		
153	SW Burnside & Tichner		
160	SW First - Harrison to Arthur		
161	NW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to North		
162	SW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to Harrison		
166	SW Harrison St Median - Front to 4th		
171	SW Lincoln Median - First to 4th		
173	SW Macadam - Bancroft to Willamette Moorage Blvd		
185	W Burnside Median 1st to Park		
250	Convention Center-Holladay Off Ramp I-84		
290	Airport Way Phase I	NE Holman to 138th	
291	Airport Way Phase II	NE 138th to 181st	
293.01	West Side Corridor Lt. Rail Extension - Jefferson	Jeff-18th-Morr-Yamhill	
338	SE Water Ave LID		

#### SAL TEAM

#### **OUTCOMES**

Get David and Jeanne prepared to go to Council with recommendations for managing the Street Area Landscape inventory.

- Describe a vision for SAL how we want the sites to look in the future.
- Define the desired best case scenario and cost
- Define the potential worst case scenario with description of impact
- Describe in general the roles and responsibilities of the Parks and Transportation
- Prepare your recommendations in writing (outline of no more than four pages) by November 1 with a mid point briefing October 1.
- . Addendum of other considerations @ OCt 1.

**RESOURCES:** David, Jeanne and Martha

**TIME COMMITMENT:** 20 hours maximum. We anticipate 4 meetings plus preparation time.

#### CRITERIA

- Funding is unstable
- Roles may change in the future
- Best/worst case scenarios must present a true picture
- Any solutions have to be in line with the Bureaus' missions

**AUTHORITY:** Jeanne and David will make the final decision based on your recommendations. Funding decision lies with Council

Jeannes David marketing strategy

# SAL TEAM

# OUTCOMES

Get David and Jeanne prepared to go to Council with recommendations for managing the Street Area Landscape inventory.

- Describe a vision for SAL how we want the sites to look in the future.
- Define the desired best case scenario and cost
- Define the potential worst case scenario with description of impact
- Describe in general the roles and responsibilities of Parks and Transportation
- Prepare your recommendations in writing (outline of no more than four pages) by November 1, with a mid point briefing October 1.

**RESOURCES:** David, Jeanne and Martha

**TIME COMMITMENT:** 20 hours maximum. We anticipate 4 meetings plus preparation time.

# CRITERIA

- Funding is unstable
- Roles may change in the future
- Best/worst case scenarios must present a true picture
- Any solutions have to be in line with the Bureaus' missions

**AUTHORITY:** Jeanne and David will make the final decision based on your recommendations. Funding decision lies with Council.



Task	Timeline					
Get the team set up	Early September*					
Identify appropriate outside group contacts	Mid September*					
Develop Work Plan	Mid September*					
Get pictures of our locations October	Late September – Early					
Develop our overall philosophy and vision	Late September					
Develop and describe the future real ideal						
Develop earlier (prior) service level description, current service level description, future service level description if continues as is	Late September					
<ul> <li>Brainstorm solutions and make recommendations</li> <li>Compare solutions to criteria</li> <li>Select best solutions</li> </ul>						
Establish cost of proposed service level	Early October					
Develop consequences to continue current service level						
Midpoint Check in (+/- October 11)						
Get/Check with other N.W. Cities regarding their practices/procedures/service levels: References and pictures/benchmarking	Early October					
Compile written document	Early – Mid October					
Prep for report process	Mid October					
Present report (+/- October 25)	Mid – Late October					

Align product with current PDX development codes and philosophy. This may be an outcome of process, but I don't think we can guarantee it – it's outside of our control

\* currently underway

### SAL ROOT CAUSES (WHY).

- No Operating Dollars come with Construction
- 98 Percent of Funding is dependent on non-stable gas tax
- Comm and trust between Parks and Maintenance lowers optimal post?
- Flawed formula for funding in current society
- SAL Inventory is not recognized as piece of Transportation System
- SAL is not universally accepted in Transportation
- Transportation continues to build and increase inventory without providing Dollars for ongoing maintenance
- Based on use capital Dollars and hope for the best
- No organized institutionalized approach to Identify and ear mark capital repair and replacement of major assets
- Records and data are not complete on the Transportation side Major gaps exist
- Maintenance does not get construction records
- Early involvement of Parks and Recreation and Maintenance with construction is uneven and not institutionalized.
- Involvement in front end is driven by passing permit process versus long term success
  of sites
- City Code does not address green and growing in title 17
- There is a disconnect between code and construction standards
- SAL team lacks understanding of code and guidelines outside of their direct area
- No regular workable forum to problem solve and recommend since 1992 No SAL Team
- Maintenance hears after the fact that something has been added to SAL
- Outside of the Portland Building is out of the loop
- Projects are treated piece meal versus as an integrated piece
- No central entity that addresses "cradle to grave" all of bureaus involvement's
- Owner and Operator not Identified prior to design City Council
- Landscapes are popular and politically correct and used and over used
- Funding State and Federal requires landscaping
- Fears that if the City asks for maintenance dollars at the project application time the whole idea will be shot down.
- Some SAL sites come from neighborhood problems with no clear guidelines for assessing the neighborhood for the costs
- One time dollars are easy to get Ongoing dollars are tight
- City standards for meeting citizen expectations are high
- Citizens don't get the big picture on SAL
- Lack of full package info makes I hard to say no to some requests from citizens
- Invasive Species like ivy and black berry continue to increase on sites
- SAL's not equal to other elements of the Transportation System
- Uneducated citizenry request horticulture choices and dollars
- No formula for maintenance costs with types of sites

- More complex environment with regulations i.e. Endangered Species, water quality, etc.
- Single source provider

1.5.5

- American Elms prevalent on SAL sites and threatened by Dutch Elm disease
- Multiple long term dollar projects that are suggested but have no funding
- No universal standard guidelines for landscapes

#### **BOM** Project

• What Was

1990 # sites; \_\_\_\_# dollars (Brian will investigate)

Before the emergency plan

#### Preservation of Infrastructure

- No re-investment of capital for major repairs
- Preservation of infrastructure
- Litter and debris not landscape harmful
- Manageable turf damage
- Irrigation repairs but not upgraded

#### Meeting Functional Requirements

- Replacement plantings
- Site improvement work

#### Safety/Liability

Pruning prevented vegetation encroachment

#### Efficient Use of City Resources

- Site adjustments made for long-term efficiencies
- Only using low maintenance disease-resistant, stress tolerant low water plants (80 20 rule; we aren't always consulted or followed, but usually are)
- Always recommend the above/some sites and other factors override
- No comprehensive data base
- Mulch to conserve water and keep down weeds, dress up the site
- No link between construction and maintenance costs
- 2 year establishment period paid on project end

#### Meeting City Goals, Plans, Directives

- Street beautification plan in place
- Overall congruity
- Invasive plants control

#### City Reputation/Service

- Few citizen complaints
- PDOT doesn't act like owner

#### What Is

#### Emergency plan

208 site base; 26 more sites dropped/abandonned in this fiscal year; 18 sites where now do medians only (where before did sides also)

#### Preservation of Infrastructure

- All behind the curb work dropped
- No tree services on street boulevard blocks
- No tree, shrub, or ground cover replanting; no irrigation improvements
- No fertilization
- Pruning limited to minor
- 166 sites not being maintained
- No current status on dropped sites
- Dead trees
- Abandoned irrigation systems
- Increased focus on cosmetic appearance vs infrastructure
- Losing capital investment trees, shrubs and groundcover, irrigation systems, concrete

#### Meeting Functional Requirements

Functional benefit declined

#### Safety/Liability

- Increase in safety problems/ increase in liability exposure for City
- Traffic visibility impaired from overgrowth

#### Efficient Use of City Resources

- Not cost effective/pouring \$ down drain
- No bark mulching
- Can't use \$ savy (?)
- Maintenance \$ used in establishment
- Wasting \$'s
- Inconsistency with project managers

#### Meeting City Goals, Plans, Directives

- No longer meet City goals
- Practices are not consistent with standards for community
- Invasive plants take over and seed
- Growing inventory
- Criterion for making cuts include safety, geographic distribution, visibility, goals, cost effectiveness, consistency
- Environmental standards not good invasive species, water conservation, storm water
- Unsound hort and business principles

#### City Reputation/Service

- Leaf pick-up declined; sites less attractive; turf declined
  Left to chance vs city standard
- Citizen calls increased
- Implementing practices visibly unsound, even by layman
- Maintain current contractor level .
- Down street tree work (?) 6
- Operating on X less and % 8
- Total inventory of sites = (577?)
- X sites taken by someone else and service level

#### **BOM Project**

#### What Should Be – Real/Ideal

Landscapes that are constructed with good design features that factor in a standard Standard uniformly applied at design phase

Standards – plants support function of landscape; plants respect original purpose of site Regular system for review

Owners/operators are recognized early at the frond end. Pre-design

Transportation Maintenance clearly recognize/publicize ownership of SAL sites Landscapes we're proud of (look good); community takes pride and ownership

Free of litter X percent

Healthy plants; minimize excess replacement & cost

No landscapes with big holes

No unsafe sites due to maintenance

All sites will have a visual impact of "professional care"

Put X sites back on maintenance

Keep X sites off the list

166 sites re eval

- Attractive
- Professionally maintained
- Safe
- Clean
- Maintain function
- Efficient
- Invest \$ to save \$
- Support City beautification

Maintenance and Hort needs are factored into design

X% meet City environmental goals

100% are considered for:

- Light
- Beautification
- Water use
- Stormwater
- Transportation clearances
- Livability

100% construction design built to ensure the above Maintenance costs are more accessible at the front end Owner and who will operate identified per design Use figures that meet base level

# **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

~

#### MISSION STATEMENT

Recognizing the community's values and the City's philosophy of building quality into systems and maintaining that quality to make the City look good and also meet functional requirements, Portland Parks & Recreation and the Bureau of Maintenance are committed to working collaboratively, with the application of science and technology, to design, build and maintain quality projects that will perform well over time. We also recognize that to achieve this, there must be further collaboration linking Parks and BoM with the Bureau of Transportation Engineering, city planners, and the community. Early participation of all partners can better assure that the multiple goals of the City and the Community, (beautification, traffic management/circulation, environmental, livability, etc.), will be met and serve all stakeholders well, demonstrating cost effectiveness over a long period of time.

# Team Report Criterion

No Matter what we develop it . . .

- Must have validity in larger city context
- It can be backed up
- It can withstand the test of time
- It must be written well and be compelling
- It must be concise
- It must be realistic
- It must be understandable to a non technical person
- It must be integrated with the "big" City picture
- It must include visuals and pictorals
- It must reflect historical and City Code context
- It must factor in the construction dilemma
- That the emergency status isn't the baseline for service level
- Must be formatted so it can be easily reused and updated
- It must not require reinventing the wheel again and again
- It must I.D. issues to be addressed that are easily transferred to both documents.

# Problem Solving Criterian

No matter what we recommend it should . . .

- Can be backed up by solid data
- Be linked to growth of additional sites\*
- Not be in conflict with the Bureau Mission
- Reflect current City Philosophy
- Recognize fund instability\*
- Be flexible for future role changes
- Present a true picture\*
- Be easy to care for
- Allow for cost benefit efficiency
- Address the problem of construction with no maintenance / operations funding
- Honor city livability
- Honor the stakeholders
- Must address functional value
- Must be practical and doable
- Must reflect sound horticultural principals
- Be a standard that can be applied evenly throughout the city.
- Must be fair and equitable
- Must use creative resources
- Not conflict with environmental considerations
- Must be legal\*
- Increase possibility of community buy-in

\* Drop Dead – Without which . . .

# SAL Committee Problem Solving Steps

- 1) Identify the problem prioritize it ; What is then, what should be.
- 2) Set Criterion

~

- 3) Brainstorm potential improvements
- 4) Compare step 2 to 3 and then select
- 5) Action steps developed
  Present 1 5
- 6) Test, monitor, adjust and confirm.

# SAL Committee Meeting Ground Rules

- Start and Stop on time
- We will carry over items to the next meeting.
- We will make an agenda for the next meeting.
- We will be good listeners.
- We will turn off phones and beepers.
- We will come prepared
  - We will notify the committee when we are not prepared.
- It's OK to say that we were not realistic Let's adjust.
- We all need to try and be at the meetings.
  - In an emergency, please notify and send material.
  - We will cancel the meeting if either bureau has no representatives present.
- We will have two readings of all decisions -
  - Decisions will be final if not contested at the second reading.
- We will identify deadlocks or when we fail to reach concensus.
  - We will elevate the issue if necessary.
- We will use the modified consensus form of decision making.
- We can modify the ground rules if necessary.
- Have fun.
- Our confidentiality rule is:
  - It is OK to test ideas with appropriate people outside of the team we must be clear of the stage and the purpose.
  - We must first raise problems and issues within the Team and in the team forums.

• Use good judgement on sneak previews and "mights."

# AGENDA SAL Meeting 9-13-00

- Assignments
- Overview
- Left over Charter Clarification
- Ground Rules
- Criterion
- Pieces of the Work Plan
- Schedule Meetings
- Develop next agenda

# AGENDA SAL Meeting

- Finalize Work Plan
- Ratify and OK, with changes
- Assignments
  Philosophy statement
  Gap Analysis

# SAL AGENDA 9-26-2000

# North Conference Room

•1

- Gap Analysis
- Ratify Philosophy
- Picture Update (and other assignments)
- Updated Work Plan

# SAL AGENDA October 3, 2000

• Finish Gap Analysis

\*\*

- Set Date for Construction Person to come to Meeting
  - Send questions regarding Construction to Brian

A ....

- Look at Preliminary preparations
- Set Dates for future meetings
# SAL AGENDA 10-3-2000

- Assignments
- Finish
  - Root causes
  - "Real Ideal"
  - "First Solutions"
- Loose Ends for Midpoint

# SAL Meeting Assignments 9-13-2000

Brian will scout for a construction/development engineering point of contact (perhaps meet with Jeanne).

We (SAL Committee) must be ready to ratify the Ground Rules and Criteria at our next meeting on 9-19-2000.

Kathy and Roger will work on a rough draft of the work plan for the 9-19-2000 meeting (a rough timeline for the work plan).

Brian will bring rough draft of the Mission statement and philosophy of SAL Committee.

Roger will look for a one hour block of time with Jeanne and David for the afternoon of 10-3 or 10-4.

SAL Meeting Assignments

9-26-2000

Brian will scout for a construction/development engineering point of contact: Must have influence; must be someone with most amount of influence and respect and can make a time commitment.

Kathy and Roger will work on a draft of the work plan for the 9-26-2000 meeting.

Roger will look for a one hour block of time with Jeanne and David for the afternoon of 10-3 or 10-4.

Kathy will assemble a picture portfolio and briefly report on this at the 9-26 Meeting.

# SAL Meeting Assignments

For All:

- Questions for Jeanne and David
- Look for any statistics to back up "what is and what should be"
- Review Brian's historical documents and prepare feedback for 10-20-00
- Answer questions: How is process going and what do you think about the group?
- Strategy for cost estimation on sites

# Kathy:

- What should be the ideal
- Level of service contracts

# Brian:

• City beautification standards? Surveys??

# Roger:

- Running list of things accomplished products that we have produced
- Schedule final meeting with Jeanne and David

# Mike:

- Prepare mid-point packets
  - Include copies of all documents "Drafts"
  - Include copies of all Agendas
- Schedule meeting rooms, etc.

#### **BOM Project**

#### 10/3/2000

#### What Should Be - Real/Ideal

Landscapes that are constructed with good design features that factor in a standard Standard uniformly applied at design phase

Standards – plants support function of landscape; plants respect original purpose of site Regular system for review

Owners/operators are recognized early at the frond end. Pre-design

Transportation Maintenance clearly recognize/publicize ownership of SAL sites Landscapes we're proud of (look good); community takes pride and ownership

Free of litter X percent

Healthy plants; minimize excess replacement & cost

No landscapes with big holes

No unsafe sites due to maintenance

All sites will have a visual impact of "professional care"

Put X sites back on maintenance

Keep X sites off the list

166 sites re eval

- Attractive
- Professionally maintained
- Safe
- Clean
- Maintain function
- Efficient
- Invest \$ to save \$
- Support City beautification

Maintenance and Hort needs are factored into design

X% meet City environmental goals

100% are considered for:

- Light
- Beautification
- Water use
- Stormwater
- Transportation clearances
- Livability

100% construction design built to ensure the above Maintenance costs are more accessible at the front end Owner and who will operate identified per design Use figures that meet base level

# SAL Parking Lot Issues

•

• Maintenance cost is not linked with the initial plans and construction in multiple areas – Roger/Brian.

Wolf, Bev

SAL file

I am in receipt of two claims regarding the tree wells and grates downtown adjacent to the light rail lines on SW Yamhill and SW Morrison. I have asked Urban Forestry to help me investigate both of these claims. One claim involves a person alleging he fell on a raised tree grate on the corner of SW Broadway and Morrison. The second claim involves a person who fell when they twisted their ankle on a tree well where the grate was removed.

I have given Urban Forestry a work request to begin repairing, adjusting and removing grates along the CBD Transit Mall and Light Rail lines. I spoke with Gary Hill today and he told me they have started working on the grates this week. They are recording the completion of their work by dating the inventory records.

I will try to describe the tree grate maintenance primer as I know it.

Tree grates throughout the City are the responsibility of the adjacent property owner. When they are identified as problems, they are posted through the Sidewalk posting process.

Exceptions to this exist adjacent to Parks and on the CBD Transit Mall and Light Rail lines. From Brian's e-mail, he wants Dave Kahler, 503 823-1691, to address those grates adjacent to the park properties.

The grates along the CBD Transit Mall and Light Rail Lines have always been controversial. I have stepped forward to try and solve the short term maintenance problems associated with grates. In an earlier claim related to another fall on a tree grate at SW Yamhill and 9th Avenue, I told you that it was my recommendation to settle the claim and charge it to the Bureau of Maintenance. I also indicated that I was not prepared to be the responsible party on every claim. That has not changed. I will work with you to come to some agreement as we conclude the investigation on these two issues. While the current repair process is underway, report tree grate problems on the CBD Transit Mall and Light Rail Lines to me.

I am working on a report to the Director's Team at Transportation that will highlight this problem and suggest that there be some serious thought about the future design and use of tree grates. I also hope to work the tree grate maintenance responsibility into future discussions with the downtown business community concerning their request that the City rebuild the Transit Mall. I will copy you all with a final disposition on these outstanding issues as well as the report to go forward.

MA	9 A 1954		21226	(	God Frag		j
	HOLLYWOOD	TRANSPORTATION	IMPROVEMENTS I		. /		
		MAINTENANCE /	AGREEMENT		<u>FEB</u>	<u>]</u> <u>1984</u>	
"City", and is for the improvement	nd between the nd the <u>Hollywo</u> e purpose of p nts to be insta	ntered into this <u>City of Portlar</u> od Boosters, her roviding continu alled in and arc	nd, hereinafter reinafter refer ned maintenance	r referred rred to as e of certa	s "Boosters		

WHEREAS, City Council adopted Resolution No. 32460 on June 28, 1979, adopting "Plan D", which describes proposed transportation improvements for the Hollywood Business District, and

in the City of Portland, under the Hollywood Transportation Improvements

WHEREAS, "Plan D" is the result of joint planning efforts by City staff, the Boosters, and the Hollywood Neighborhood, and

staff f

project.

INFORMATION REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER

copies to Vic CAANIE

R. Relly

Jeanne

the imp

FRANCESCONI

Hollywc for imp Distri accord

shall:

Booste

of imp

the re

s are being prepared by City

or continuous maintenance of )llywood Business District;

appropriate bureaus, and the ume maintenance responsibility alled in the Hollywood Business Improvements Project in , 1984, attached hereto, and

onsibility herein, the Boosters otecting the City and the ) the existence or maintenance escribed in Exhibit A as being insurance shall be in sums not

less than \$100,000/300,000 ro, poerry ry, and \$300,000 for property damage per occurrence, OR a single limit policy in the minimum amount of \$300,000, covering all claims per occurrence, and,

Maintenance services and responsibility described herein shall commence upon acceptance by the City of the contractor's work as satisfactory and complete, and

\_ If any improvement identified herein is not properly maintained, and/or poses a hazard to public safety, or becomes an eyesore, as determined by the City Engineer, the City reserves the right to remove the improvement(s). Prior to removal, the City shall provide ninety (90)

21226

FER

# HOLLYWOOD TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

(98A

MAR 6

# MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT, entered into this \_\_\_\_\_\_ day of <u>ManeH</u>., 1984 by and between the <u>City of Portland</u>, hereinafter referred to as "City", and the <u>Hollywood Boosters</u>, hereinafter referred to as "Boosters", is for the purpose of providing continued maintenance of certain identified improvements to be installed in and around the Hollywood Business District, in the City of Portland, under the Hollywood Transportation Improvements project.

WHEREAS, City Council adopted Resolution No. 32460 on June 28, 1979, adopting "Plan D", which describes proposed transportation improvements for the Hollywood Business District, and

WHEREAS, "Plan D" is the result of joint planning efforts by City staff, the Boosters, and the Hollywood Neighborhood, and

WHEREAS, final plans and specifications are being prepared by City staff for construction, and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to provide for continuous maintenance of the improvements to be constructed in the Hollywood Business District;

NOW, THEREFORE, the City, through its appropriate bureaus, and the Hollywood Boosters do mutually agree to assume maintenance responsibility for improvements to be constructed and installed in the Hollywood Business District under the Hollywood Transportation Improvements Project in accordance with Exhibit A, dated January 19, 1984, attached hereto, and

Pursuant to assuming maintenance responsibility herein, the Boosters shall provide Public Liability insurance protecting the City and the Boosters from claims relating in any way to the existence or maintenance of improvements, and performance of work described in Exhibit A as being the responsibility of the Boosters. Such insurance shall be in sums not less than \$100,000/300,000 for bodily injury, and \$300,000 for property damage per occurrence, OR a single limit policy in the minimum amount of \$300,000, covering all claims per occurrence, and,

Maintenance services and responsibility described herein shall commence upon acceptance by the City of the contractor's work as satisfactory and complete, and

If any improvement identified herein is not properly maintained, and/or poses a hazard to public safety, or becomes an eyesore, as determined by the City Engineer, the City reserves the right to remove the improvement(s). Prior to removal, the City shall provide ninety (90) calendar days notice to the Boosters to correct deficiencies. However, if the defect poses a safety hazard as determined by the City Engineer, notification time shall be twenty (20) calendar days. Removal of the improvement(s) shall be the only recourse to the Boosters for failure to properly maintain improvements herein.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City and the Hollywood Boosters have executed this Agreement as of the  $\underline{}$  day of  $\underline{}$  day of  $\underline{}$   $\underline{}$   $\underline{}$  day of  $\underline{}$   $\underline{$ 

CITY OF PORTLAND Lindber Ke Commissioner of Public Works Jewe Audito City

APPROVED AS TO FORM APPROVED AS TO FORM P. Transfing Eistona 1

City Attorney TORNEY

200

HOLLYWOOD BOOSTERS

President

ELY:mmc 5-26-83

#### EXHIBIT A January 19, 1984

# HOLLYWOOD TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

# MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES

Responsibility for continued maintenance of improvements in the Hollywood Business District shall be as follows:

#### 1. City of Portland

- Α. Maintenance Bureau
  - Pavement on island at NE 39th and Sandy
  - Street pavement
  - Sidewalk corners
  - Trash receptacles

Ite (no wand?

- Island at NE 40th and Sandy Concrete Pavement in the public right-of-way section of the "Hancock Plaza," located at NE Sandy Boulevard and NE Hancock Street
- Traffic signals
- Crosswalk striping
- Traffic & parking signs
- Street markings
- Park Bureau
  - Tree pruning and replacement
  - Tree well grate covers, and bricks
  - Plants and ground cover maintenance and replacement
  - Irrigation system at ground cover areas
- С. Street Lighting Bureau
  - Street lights and poles owned by City of Portland
  - Pedestrian lights at Hancock Plaza, and on island at 39th & Sandy
- D. Bicycle Program
  - Bike racks
- Ε. Water Bureau
  - Drinking fountains
- 2. Hollywood Boosters

A. Maintenance and repair of all the following items in the project area:

- Benches
  - Planter tubs
- Β. Performance of the following work on the island at NE 45th and Sandy, at the "Hancock Plaza," and on the island at NE 39th and Sandy:

- Weed and water ground cover, plants and trees

- Snow removal, cleaning, and washing at Hancock Plaza

Β.

# ORDINANCE No. 155564

An Ordinance authorizing the City to enter into an agreement with the Hollywood Boosters providing for on-going maintenance of improvements to be installed in the Hollywood Business District under the Hollywood Transportation Improvements Project, and declaring an emergency.

The City of Portland ordains:

Section 1. The Council finds:

- 1. City Council adopted Resolution No. 33570 on December 14, 1983 approving final plans and construction of the Hollywood Transportation Improvements Project.
- Federal Aid Interstate Transfer (FAIX) funds have been allocated by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to finance project improvements.
- 3. The Hollywood Boosters and appropriate City bureaus have agreed to undertake maintenance responsibility for the various improvements to be installed under the project.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Council directs:

That the Commissioner of Public Works and the Auditor are authorized to execute, on behalf of the City, a maintenance agreement similar in form to the agreement attached hereto, and by this reference made a part hereof.

Section 2. The Council declares that an emergency exists because maintenance responsibility should be determined for improvements prior to construction to avoid future confusion and misunderstanding as to such responsibility; therefore, this Ordinance shall be in force and effect after its passage by the Council.

Passed by the Council, FEB 1 1984 Commissioner Mike Lindberg ELY:am

JEWEL LANSING

Auditor of the City of Portland

By Corna Cerve

Page No.

RESOLUTION NO.

ALLER BETELLETING OUTMINISTER

LEL = 1977

WHEREAS, the City of Portland has allocated Housing and Community Development funds for the St. Johns neighborhood, and is acting by and through the Portland Development Commission in undertaking and carrying out activities previously approved by the Office of Planning and Development, the City Council, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the St. Johns Business District; and

31995

WHEREAS, the St. Johns Business District Improvement Association has held public meetings and has worked for over a year to develop a program of capital improvements for the Business District; and

WHEREAS, the City's Housing and Community Development Program in the St. Johns Neighborhood includes Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization intended to improve the district's economic performance through the provision of public improvements, i.e. traffic control, pedestrian plazas, street furniture, public signing, street lighting: and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that these improvements are in the public interest of the entire St. Johns Business District and surrounding residential neighborhood and not for the sole benefit of any particular property owner; and

WHEREAS, the St. Johns Business District has pledged a maximum yearly contribution of \$4,500 towards the maintenance cost of these improvements.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the City Council direct the Office of Planning and Development, to submit an Ordinance authorizing the transfer of \$601,500 of Housing and Community Development contingency funds to the City of Portland Development Commission Contract for construction of improvements in public right-of-ways in the St. Johns Business District FY 77/78.

2. That the Council does direct the Office of Planning and Development, acting through the Portland Development Commission, to install benches, bike racks, standard trash receptacles, and treewell pavers in the street areas of the St. Johns Business District, at locations and of types approved by the City Engineer.

3. That the Council does direct the Office of the City Engineer to submit a City Ordinance granting a revocable permit to the St. Johns Boosters, Inc. to install kiosks and entrance signs in the street areas of St. Johns Business District.

4. That the Council does hereby direct the Office of Planning and Development to secure evidence of primary insurance liability by the St. Johns Business District for those improvements identified in three (3) above and to be approved by City Ordinance. 5. That the City Council assume responsibility for maintenance and primary insurance liability for all other public improvements installed as part of the St. Johns Business District Improvement Program, e.g., Welcome Island, Central Plaza and U.S. 30 improvements.

6. That the Council does also direct the Office of the City Engineer to submit an Ordinance authorizing an agreement for the redesignation of the Highway Route 30 from N. Lombard to N. Ivanhoe within the St. Johns Business District.

7. That the Council does also hereby direct the Maintenance Bureau and the Bureau of Parks to include in their respective maintenance budget requests a sufficient amount to meet the total maintenance requirements for those improvements identified by this Resolution and/or City Ordinance for the St. Johns Business District Improvements.

8. That the Council does accept an annual pledge not to exceed \$4,500 from the St. Johns Business District to be applied towards the total cost of the ongoing maintenance program.

9. That the Council direct the City Engineer to review and approve the St. Johns Business District Improvements and to issue the necessary permits to accomplish their installation.

10. That the Council does hereby direct the Office of Planning and Development, through the Portland Development Commission, to provide a maintenance impact analysis for the FY 78/79 St. Johns Business District construction program prior to any design.

11. That the Council direct the Commissioner of Public Works to work with appropriate City Bureaus and Departments to develop standards for other special public works improvement projects.

Adopted by the Council  $\,$  NOV  $2\,\,3\,\,1977$ 

City of Portland

Mayor Goldschmidt November 16, 1977 MSL:bw

#### ST. J S BUSINESS DISIKILI IMPRUVEME

#### MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT, entered into this 7 day of 7, 1978 by and between the Office of Planning and Development and the Maintenance Bureau, is for the purpose of providing continued maintenance of certain identified improvements installed in the St. Johns Business District located in the area bounded by St. Louis, Oswego, Central and Syracuse Streets within the City of Portland.

WHEREAS, the Portland Development Commission, through the City's Housing and Community Development (HCD) Program, has provided for construction and installation of certain improvements on the above described locations; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary and in the public interest to provide for continuing maintenance of these improvements; and

WHEREAS, the City Council passed Resolution No. 31995 assuming responsibility for maintenance and primary insurance liability for all public improvements installed in the St. Johns Business District improvement program, e.g., welcome island, central plaza; and

WHEREAS, the City Council passed Resolution No. 31995 directing the Maintenance Bureau and the Bureau of Parks to include in their respective maintenance budget request for sufficient amount to meet the total maintenance requirements for the St. Johns Business District; and

WHEREAS, the City passed Resolution No. 32042 authorizing preparation of working drawings for the public improvements in public right-of-ways.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto do mutually agree as follows:

The Office of the City Engineer through the Maintenance Bureau agrees to maintain the following improvements, as described in the plans and specifications approved by the Maintenance Bureau and City Council, for the St. Johns Business District, that area bounded by St. Louis, Oswego, Central and Syracuse Streets;

- N.W. corner Lombard and Oswego Street (adjacent the St. Johns Funeral Home).
   1. Sidewalk; extending from Oswego Street to St. Johns Funeral Home driveway access from Lombard Street.
- Welcome Island
   1. Sidewalk, curbing, and bollards.
- Richmond/Jersey Intersection
   All bollards.
- Central Plaza
  - 1. Sidewalk\*, curbing, and bollards.
  - 2. All surfaces (Excluding that area normally the responsibility of adjacent property owners, as delineated by an expansion joint along old curb line.)
  - 3. Retaining walls.
  - 4. All planters; fixed and movable.
  - 5. All lighting standards.
  - 6. All benches.
  - 7. Tree grates and guards.
  - 8. Parking area.
- Excluding that portion of the sidewalk extending 12' from the property line and elineated by an expansion joint.

- 1. Curbing, sidewalk (area extending from old curb line to new curb line)
- 2. Bench
- Trash Receptacles
   All City standard trash receptacles throughout the business district.
- Benches
  1. All benches throughout the business district.

Maintenance services described herein shall commence on acceptance of the contractor's work by the City.

a proper stim Subject to bodget neila A. e.

Cowles Mallory

City Engineer

Dick Schmidt, Chief Bureau of Maintenance

Butler, Administrator Dovo office of Planning and Development

# City of Portland Street Area Landscapes Summary Report and Recommendations November 13, 2000

# **Overview**

The purpose of this document is to report the findings of a task force assigned to examine the Street Area Landscape Maintenance Program. The task force was comprised of managers from the Bureau of Maintenance, (Roger Talley & Michael Boyle), and managers from Portland Parks, (Brian McNerney & Katherine Murrin). David Judd, Deputy Director of Parks, and Jeanne Nyquist, Director of the Bureau of Maintenance commissioned the task force. Martha Bueche, management consultant, facilitated the group process and development of the finished product.

#### The Assignment:

The study group was charged with preparing Jeanne Nyquist and David Judd for a presentation to City Council by providing them with the following information:

- A clear vision of how the transportation landscapes should look in the future.
- A definition of the best-case maintenance scenario and related costs.
- A definition of the worst case maintenance scenario including identification of impacts and related costs.
- A general description of the roles and responsibilities of Portland Parks and the Office of Transportation.

The group met nearly a dozen times to develop a vision statement, share collective history, identify root causes, brainstorm solutions, and develop the final product and recommendation.

## **Vision Statement:**

Recognizing the community's values and the City's philosophy of building quality into systems and maintaining that quality to make the City look good and also meet functional requirements, Portland Parks & Recreation and the Bureau of Maintenance are committed to working collaboratively, with the application of science and technology, to design, build and maintain quality projects that will perform well over time. We also recognize that to achieve this, there must be further collaboration linking Parks and BoM with the Bureau of Transportation Engineering, city planners, and the community. Early participation of all partners can better assure that the multiple goals of the City and the Community, (beautification, traffic management/circulation, environmental, livability, etc.), will be met and serve all stakeholders well, demonstrating cost effectiveness over a long period of time.

#### SAL History - Trends and Dollars

The creation of locations regarded, as Street Area Landscape inventory has traditionally been a part of every major public improvement project constructed as part of the transportation system. Beginning in the mid-1980s, and continuing through the last decade, Portland has undergone major changes within our transportation system. Along with a desire to accommodate alternative methods of travel, there has been a major initiative to build traffic control devices to calm traffic, control neighborhood cutthrough, and create pedestrian friendly streetscapes. Islands, traffic diverters and circles, curb extensions, and center of street refuge areas have been built throughout Portland to enhance safety. Almost all of these devices have landscape components.

In 1983, City Council acted on a number of recommendations to create a City of Portland Beautification Program. That program included specific direction for the development and inclusion of landscaped areas during construction on all transportation projects. In many cases, where projects were partially or wholly funded by Federal transportation agencies, landscaping was a construction requirement. Since that time, the requirements for constructing landscaped areas in conjunction with transportation projects have been reaffirmed in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, Pedestrian Design Guidelines, Trees Shrubs and Traffic Safety Initiative, Skinny Street and LID Programs. This is in keeping with the City of Portland's national reputation as a place where neighborhood safety, environmental values and community livability are recognized as promoting economic vitality.

Because of the requirement to construct landscape on transportation projects and the large number of projects needed to achieve community transportation goals, we have constructed more landscaped areas than our funding will allow maintenance. Indeed, the trend to add traffic control devices, include bicycles and light rail facilities have rapidly increased the maintenance inventory while funding sources for maintaining the transportation system have decreased. The reduction in landscape inventory funding has resulted in an annual decrease of nearly \$300,000, and the decision to drop maintenance on 166 locations. In addition the landscape inventory and support systems have suffered from a lack of capital investment. Vital landscape infrastructure has been lost or become inoperable. Continued lack of financial support for the landscape inventory will result in the decision to abandon scheduled maintenance on the entire inventory and place access to Federal funding for future transportation projects in jeopardy. A spreadsheet is attached to illustrate the history of these locations between 1990-2000.

# **History**:

In 1965, Portland Parks was funded with \$77,000 to maintain many of the Transportation landscapes with Public Works funds. The funding came from two sources, the Motor Vehicle Fuel Fund and the State Tax Fuel Fund. Twenty six sites were listed in the 1965 service package. The package consisted of sites like bridgeheads, Ainsworth Blocks, Omaha Parkway, Barbur Blvd., early traffic circles, etc.

For reasons unknown to the group, the funding provided to Parks was interrupted prior to 1990 and maintenance services to the sites were provided only on a complaint response basis. This level of service was not acceptable to the community and Federal funds for new PDOT improvements were threatened because of the City's failure to maintain landscapes that were previously built with Federal funds. From approximately 1990, and for the next ten years, the Bureau of Maintenance contracted with Portland Parks to provide landscape maintenance services to the sites and there was a period of relative stability. In the late 90's the inability of the gas tax to provide adequate resources to fund Transportation system needs caused new pressures on the landscaped street sites. The funds provided to Parks to service the sites have been dramatically reduced over the last 3 years, leading to the current crisis.

# **Root Causes:**

The group identified many root causes that contributed to the current state of affairs. The complete list of root causes appears in the appendix, however, the following root causes seem to be major factors.

- There is no institutionalized plan for funding maintenance. The current model is "build and hope for the best"
- Ninety-eight percent of maintenance funding is dependent on unstable gas tax.
- Confusion of ownership and maintenance responsibilities.
- Many new landscaped sites continue to be built, adding to the workload.
- No regularly meeting inter-bureau management team is in place to steer the program and solve problems.

# The Service Delivery Split:

What has become the paradigm for the Street Area Landscape program is the pattern of disassociation practiced by the City following the establishment of these sites. Most SAL sites are developed and completed by the Office of Transportation or the Portland Development Commission then turned over to the Bureau of Maintenance and maintained by the Bureau of Parks and Recreation. It should be made clear that the SAL sites belong to Transportation and function as transportation facilities. The City's guiding principle on SAL sites has been: "Hard surface" belongs to Maintenance and "green and growing" belongs to Parks. The dilemma created for the SAL sites is the ownership versus maintenance issue. Though the issue may be defined in City Code it has not always been clearly recognized by the City's Bureaus or its Agency's. The result has been a disconnect between the growing inventory of SAL sites and the lack of sufficient funding for operations and maintenance. It should be emphasized that this is a City-wide problem – dollars for construction are easier to find than dollars for operations and maintenance – it happens in all City Bureaus. This "rule of thumb" was a recurring topic of discussion at several SAL meetings and the primary focus of one meeting in particular.

What has become clear through these meetings is the desire by both parties to deal with the SAL sites in a responsible manner consistent with the City's goals. Acknowledging ownership while leaving maintenance to another party is consistent with the "rule of thumb." Service delivery based on expertise is consistent with responsible use of resources. BOM maintenance of "hard surface" and Park's maintenance of "green and growing" at SAL sites should become the model for all of the City's infrastructure.

# Service Levels

The Bureau of Maintenance/Parks focus group identified three service levels for consideration; *Bare Minimum, Standard, and Desired.* The service levels are designed as "packages" that can be implemented and consistently applied throughout the City. In each of the three service levels, it is the group's recommendation that the whole inventory of street area landscapes be included, (sites currently receiving service and landscaped sites that no longer receive service), to achieve the overall goal of the service level.

#### **Bare Minimum Service Level** –384 sites, \$400,000.

The intention of this service level is to spend the bare minimum of resources that will insulate the City from lawsuits without regard for other City values. However, there is no guarantee that lawsuits will be avoided. This level of service is reactive in nature, (no scheduled maintenance or irrigation is provided), and does not address aesthetics, air/water quality, environmental goals, or good neighbor policies. Maintenance services that are not directly related to safety or a safety function will be deferred. The key elements of this service program include:

- *Inspections* All street area landscapes will receive scheduled inspections twice each year. Complaints or referrals will initiate additional inspections.
- *Repairs* If the inspection discovers site situations that pose a significant threat to people or property, a work order will be written to remedy the hazard. The list of work orders will be prioritized by seriousness of hazard and the date of discovery. Resources will be applied to remedy the most serious hazards until budgeted resources are exhausted, hoping that the hazard will be addressed before persons or property are harmed.
- Future Construction This model cannot be defended or explained if new transportation projects continue to be built according to current standards. The investment in new landscapes will be lost at the *Bare Minimum Service Level*. This level requires a moratorium on construction of new transportation projects or the modification of development codes and design standards to allow new construction without landscaping.

#### Standard Service Level - \$1,115,232

This intention of this level of service is to provide programmed maintenance services to the list of 202 currently maintained sites and to inspect twice yearly and respond to <u>all</u> of the safety issues identified, (as in the *Bare Minimum* level plan), at the remaining 182 sites not currently serviced. This level of service should result in the entire inventory of sites being in a safe condition. In addition, this level provides some resources to address the basic health, quality, and appearance of the 202 maintained landscapes after safety and function needs have been satisfied. The frequency of the service visits should result in the 202 maintained sites being rated fair to good in terms of aesthetics and health 60% of the time. A modest amount of funding will be set aside for standard repairs to landscapes and systems. At this level there are no resources to apply new science or technologies that could provide long term efficiencies, (example – automating irrigation systems).

#### Standard Level of Service Features Include:

- All 384 sites receive scheduled inspections and are safe most of the time.
- Limited ability to introduce new technology or engineered solutions for long term efficiencies.
- Provides financial reserve for routine system repairs and replacement of plants.
- Allows for construction of new projects with landscapes as long as ongoing maintenance resources are provided.

Current list of 202 maintained sites receive:

- Scheduled standard bundle of maintenance services (see appendix).
- Higher level of plant health, cleanliness, and appearance than *Bare Minimum* package, although there will be periods of poor appearance.
- Recovery plan provides for restoration of plants and systems.

#### Desired Level of Service - \$1,950,000

This level of service recognizes the value of the landscapes as environmental and community livability elements of the transportation system. Included in this program is the same bundle of services, (see appendix), identified in the *Standard*<sup>2</sup> *Level of Service* package. These services are applied at an increased frequency to the list of 202 currently maintained sites. The remaining list of 182 sites are improved through a restoration plan and receive the less frequent *Standard Service Level*. The 202 sites are in good health and aesthetically pleasing 90-95% of the time. The remaining 182 sites are less complex and receive service less frequently. Appearance on these sites is fair to good 60% of the time. In addition to programmed maintenance services, this program has the following elements:

- Allows for construction of new transportation landscapes or new additions to the landscape inventory on condition that ongoing operating and maintenance funding is provided at the time the construction budget is approved or site is acquired.
- Provides capital resources for anticipated major repairs/renovations, system improvements, efficiency upgrades, and scheduled tree care.
- Provides capital funding to recover the 182 historic sites and bring into an acceptable range, functionally and aesthetically.
- Provides funding for staff to educate and involve citizens and property owners in the stewardship of landscapes behind the curb where feasible, (with City retaining design authority).
- Provides funding to respond to new governmental mandates and regulations

These additional program elements combined with more frequent service visits will make the formal landscapes safe, fully functional, healthy and aesthetically pleasing 95% of the time and all sites safe. Services will be mostly programmed and rarely reactive.

## **BOM Project**

# The Top Eight List of Other Ideas

\*Give time and resources to continue SAL team

\*Develop universal standards for landscapes

\*Sign-off system which includes sign-offs by SAL representatives to clear development process

\*Develop clearer formula for designers to up-front budget ongoing costs

\*Auto-inclusion of O/M figures with new sites

\*Ratification by Council of ownership, management, direction of SAL sites

\*Increase outreach, marketing, education of public and internal PDX staff and managers

\*Stable funding source

# **BOM Project**

Ideas/Practices Already Considered or Put in Place

#### Tried/Failed

Use of business associations and neighborhood associations to meet needs

# Tried/Using

#### Horticulture

 Good horticultural practices – maintain plant health *Plus*

> Less need for chemical interventions, plant replacements Landscapes maintain function they were built for

# Minus

Costs more than the mow 'n blow approach

 Ensure (through design review)/provide low water, low maintenance, disease resistant, low fertilizer, good drainage, good soil etc landscapes

Plus

Lower costs through time; fewer problems, less chemical needs, more environmentally sensitive

Minus

None

Use mix of bark and compost for mulch

Plus

Fewer weeds, less water needed, looks good, mix reduces problems with buildup. Use material composted from other city sites in mix (recycling.

# Minus

# Cost of mulch

 Build street landscapes for stressful situations – include irrigation systems when needed; provide good soil, large enough planting spaces Plus

Landscapes are successful long-term, or can be repaired easily

# Minus

Up-front costs; sometimes competing needs for space

Use of native plants where appropriate

Use tree species that will not lead to problems (suckering, monocultures)

# **Business/System**

1 or 2 year establishment

# Plus

Landscapes come already established with the problems already worked out

#### Minus

# Higher up-front costs

 Do design review, construction inspection, landscape construction to produce healthy, viable landscapes

Plus

Healthy, viable, functional landscapes with fewer long and short term problems

#### Minus

Takes time to be involved in design review; don't always receive notice that project is underway; sometimes project manager does not use our comments

 Work with neighbors during construction process to provide something that they are happy to maintain

Plus

# Good public relations

More likely to successfully turn landscapes over to adjacent property owners for long-term maintenance

# Minus

# Takes time

Actively monitor sites and contractor work

Plus

Get good value from contractor

Identify problems early

Minus Takes time

#### **Use Resources Wisely**

Use outside contractor where appropriate

#### Plus

*Efficient use of resources, use contractor for routine tasks Benefit to the contractor, and to the community* 

## Minus

State law requires hiring of rehabilitation contractor; our contractor requires more administrative time than our past commercial contractor with lower results

Turn water off unless needed; maintain irrigation infrastructure

#### Plus

Maintain ability to water at end of season, in drought, when new plantings occur Maintain irrigation infrastructure Carefully use water resource Lower water costs

Minus

# Cost to maintain irrigation system, even when not used

Install Unik or electronic controllers where needed

Plus

Reduce manual labor Improve water management Result in healthier plants

## Minus

# Cost of installing and maintaining systems

- Use interested neighbors and volunteers as resource to meet needs
- Put single-tree landscapes on a quarterly maintenance schedule
- Use alternative service crews (ACS) and prison crews
- Use Parks crews when site is on a park maintenance route
- Mechanize where possible large mowers, leaf vacs, edging, groundcover mowers etc

# City of Portland Street Area Landscapes Summary Report and Recommendations November 13, 2000

# **Overview**

The purpose of this document is to report the findings of a task force assigned to examine the Street Area Landscape Maintenance Program. The task force was comprised of managers from the Bureau of Maintenance, (Roger Talley & Michael Boyle), and managers from Portland Parks, (Brian McNerney & Katherine Murrin). David Judd, Deputy Director of Parks, and Jeanne Nyquist, Director of the Bureau of Maintenance commissioned the task force. Martha Bueche, management consultant, facilitated the group process and development of the finished product.

#### The Assignment:

The study group was charged with preparing Jeanne Nyquist and David Judd for a presentation to City Council by providing them with the following information:

- A clear vision of how the transportation landscapes should look in the future.
- A definition of the best-case maintenance scenario and related costs.
- A definition of the worst case maintenance scenario including identification of impacts and related costs.
- A general description of the roles and responsibilities of Portland Parks and the Office of Transportation.

The group met nearly a dozen times to develop a vision statement, share collective history, identify root causes, brainstorm solutions, and develop the final product and recommendation.

#### **Vision Statement:**

Recognizing the community's values and the City's philosophy of building quality into systems and maintaining that quality to make the City look good and also meet functional requirements, Portland Parks & Recreation and the Bureau of Maintenance are committed to working collaboratively, with the application of science and technology, to design, build and maintain quality projects that will perform well over time. We also recognize that to achieve this, there must be further collaboration linking Parks and BoM with the Bureau of Transportation Engineering, city planners, and the community. Early participation of all partners can better assure that the multiple goals of the City and the Community, (beautification, traffic management/circulation, environmental, livability, etc.), will be met and serve all stakeholders well, demonstrating cost effectiveness over a long period of time.

# **SAL History - Trends and Dollars**

The creation of locations regarded, as Street Area Landscape inventory has traditionally been a part of every major public improvement project constructed as part of the transportation system. Beginning in the mid-1980s, and continuing through the last decade, Portland has undergone major changes within our transportation system. Along with a desire to accommodate alternative methods of travel, there has been a major initiative to build traffic control devices to calm traffic, control neighborhood cutthrough, and create pedestrian friendly streetscapes. Islands, traffic diverters and circles, curb extensions, and center of street refuge areas have been built throughout Portland to enhance safety. Almost all of these devices have landscape components.

In 1983, City Council acted on a number of recommendations to create a City of Portland Beautification Program. That program included specific direction for the development and inclusion of landscaped areas during construction on all transportation projects. In many cases, where projects were partially or wholly funded by Federal transportation agencies, landscaping was a construction requirement. Since that time, the requirements for constructing landscaped areas in conjunction with transportation projects have been reaffirmed in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, Pedestrian Design Guidelines, Trees Shrubs and Traffic Safety Initiative, Skinny Street and LID Programs. This is in keeping with the City of Portland's national reputation as a place where neighborhood safety, environmental values and community livability are recognized as promoting economic vitality.

Because of the requirement to construct landscape on transportation projects and the large number of projects needed to achieve community transportation goals, we have constructed more landscaped areas than our funding will allow maintenance. Indeed, the trend to add traffic control devices, include bicycles and light rail facilities have rapidly increased the maintenance inventory while funding sources for maintaining the transportation system have decreased. The reduction in landscape inventory funding has

2

resulted in an annual decrease of nearly \$300,000, and the decision to drop maintenance on 166 locations. In addition the landscape inventory and support systems have suffered from a lack of capital investment. Vital landscape infrastructure has been lost or become inoperable. Continued lack of financial support for the landscape inventory will result in the decision to abandon scheduled maintenance on the entire inventory and place access to Federal funding for future transportation projects in jeopardy. A spreadsheet is attached to illustrate the history of these locations between 1990-2000.

# **History**:

In 1965, Portland Parks was funded with \$77,000 to maintain many of the Transportation landscapes with Public Works funds. The funding came from two sources, the Motor Vehicle Fuel Fund and the State Tax Fuel Fund. Twenty six sites were listed in the 1965 service package. The package consisted of sites like bridgeheads, Ainsworth Blocks, Omaha Parkway, Barbur Blvd., early traffic circles, etc.

For reasons unknown to the group, the funding provided to Parks was interrupted prior to 1990 and maintenance services to the sites were provided only on a complaint response basis. This level of service was not acceptable to the community and Federal funds for new PDOT improvements were threatened because of the City's failure to maintain landscapes that were previously built with Federal funds. From approximately 1990, and for the next ten years, the Bureau of Maintenance contracted with Portland Parks to provide landscape maintenance services to the sites and there was a period of relative stability. In the late 90's the inability of the gas tax to provide adequate resources to fund Transportation system needs caused new pressures on the landscaped street sites. The funds provided to Parks to service the sites have been dramatically reduced over the last 3 years, leading to the current crisis.

# **Root Causes:**

The group identified many root causes that contributed to the current state of affairs. The complete list of root causes appears in the appendix, however, the following root causes seem to be major factors.

- There is no institutionalized plan for funding maintenance. The current model is "build and hope for the best"
- Ninety-eight percent of maintenance funding is dependent on unstable gas tax.
- Confusion of ownership and maintenance responsibilities.
- Many new landscaped sites continue to be built, adding to the workload.
- No regularly meeting inter-bureau management team is in place to steer the program and solve problems.

# The Service Delivery Split:

What has become the paradigm for the Street Area Landscape program is the pattern of disassociation practiced by the City following the establishment of these sites. Most SAL sites are developed and completed by the Office of Transportation or the Portland Development Commission then turned over to the Bureau of Maintenance and maintained by the Bureau of Parks and Recreation. It should be made clear that the SAL sites belong to Transportation and function as transportation facilities. The City's guiding principle on SAL sites has been: "Hard surface" belongs to Maintenance and "green and growing" belongs to Parks. The dilemma created for the SAL sites is the ownership versus maintenance issue. Though the issue may be defined in City Code it has not always been clearly recognized by the City's Bureaus or its Agency's. The result has been a disconnect between the growing inventory of SAL sites and the lack of sufficient funding for operations and maintenance. It should be emphasized that this is a City-wide problem – dollars for construction are easier to find than dollars for operations and maintenance – it happens in all City Bureaus. This "rule of thumb" was a recurring topic of discussion at several SAL meetings and the primary focus of one meeting in particular.

What has become clear through these meetings is the desire by both parties to deal with the SAL sites in a responsible manner consistent with the City's goals. Acknowledging ownership while leaving maintenance to another party is consistent with the "rule of thumb." Service delivery based on expertise is consistent with responsible use of resources. BOM maintenance of "hard surface" and Park's maintenance of "green and growing" at SAL sites should become the model for all of the City's infrastructure.

# Service Levels

The Bureau of Maintenance/Parks focus group identified three service levels for consideration; *Bare Minimum, Standard, and Desired.* The service levels are designed as "packages" that can be implemented and consistently applied throughout the City. In each of the three service levels, it is the group's recommendation that the whole inventory of street area landscapes be included, (sites currently receiving service and landscaped sites that no longer receive service), to achieve the overall goal of the service level.

#### Bare Minimum Service Level -384 sites, \$400,000.

The intention of this service level is to spend the bare minimum of resources that will insulate the City from lawsuits without regard for other City values. However, there is no guarantee that lawsuits will be avoided. This level of service is reactive in nature, (no scheduled maintenance or irrigation is provided), and does not address aesthetics, air/water quality, environmental goals, or good neighbor policies. Maintenance services that are not directly related to safety or a safety function will be deferred. The key elements of this service program include:

- *Inspections* All street area landscapes will receive scheduled inspections twice each year. Complaints or referrals will initiate additional inspections.
- *Repairs* If the inspection discovers site situations that pose a significant threat to people or property, a work order will be written to remedy the hazard. The list of work orders will be prioritized by seriousness of hazard and the date of discovery. Resources will be applied to remedy the most serious hazards until budgeted resources are exhausted, hoping that the hazard will be addressed before persons or property are harmed.
- Future Construction This model cannot be defended or explained if new transportation projects continue to be built according to current standards. The investment in new landscapes will be lost at the *Bare Minimum Service Level*. This level requires a moratorium on construction of new transportation projects or the modification of development codes and design standards to allow new construction without landscaping.

#### Standard Service Level - \$1,115,232

This intention of this level of service is to provide programmed maintenance services to the list of 202 currently maintained sites and to inspect twice yearly and respond to <u>all</u> of the safety issues identified, (as in the *Bare Minimum* level plan), at the remaining 182 sites not currently serviced. This level of service should result in the entire inventory of sites being in a safe condition. In addition, this level provides some resources to address the basic health, quality, and appearance of the 202 maintained landscapes after safety and function needs have been satisfied. The frequency of the service visits should result in the 202 maintained sites being rated fair to good in terms of aesthetics and health 60% of the time. A modest amount of funding will be set aside for standard repairs to landscapes and systems. At this level there are no resources to apply new science or technologies that could provide long term efficiencies, (example – automating irrigation systems).

## Standard Level of Service Features Include:

- All 384 sites receive scheduled inspections and are safe most of the time.
- Limited ability to introduce new technology or engineered solutions for long term efficiencies.
- Provides financial reserve for routine system repairs and replacement of plants.
- Allows for construction of new projects with landscapes as long as ongoing maintenance resources are provided.

Current list of 202 maintained sites receive:

- Scheduled standard bundle of maintenance services (see appendix).
- Higher level of plant health, cleanliness, and appearance than *Bare Minimum* package, although there will be periods of poor appearance.
- Recovery plan provides for restoration of plants and systems.

# Desired Level of Service - \$1,950,000

5

This level of service recognizes the value of the landscapes as environmental and community livability elements of the transportation system. Included in this program is the same bundle of services, (see appendix), identified in the *Standard*: *Level of Service* package. These services are applied at an increased frequency to the list of 202 currently maintained sites. The remaining list of 182 sites are improved through a restoration plan and receive the less frequent *Standard Service Level*. The 202 sites are in good health and aesthetically pleasing 90-95% of the time. The remaining 182 sites are less complex and receive service less frequently. Appearance on these sites is fair to good 60% of the time. In addition to programmed maintenance services, this program has the following elements:

- Allows for construction of new transportation landscapes or new additions to the landscape inventory on condition that ongoing operating and maintenance funding is provided at the time the construction budget is approved or site is acquired.
- Provides capital resources for anticipated major repairs/renovations, system improvements, efficiency upgrades, and scheduled tree care.
- Provides capital funding to recover the 182 historic sites and bring into an acceptable range, functionally and aesthetically.
- Provides funding for staff to educate and involve citizens and property owners in the stewardship of landscapes behind the curb where feasible, (with City retaining design authority).
- Provides funding to respond to new governmental mandates and regulations

These additional program elements combined with more frequent service visits will make the formal landscapes safe, fully functional, healthy and aesthetically pleasing 95% of the time and all sites safe. Services will be mostly programmed and rarely reactive.

# **BOM Project**

# The Top Eight List of Other Ideas

\*Give time and resources to continue SAL team

\*Develop universal standards for landscapes

\*Sign-off system which includes sign-offs by SAL representatives to clear development process

\*Develop clearer formula for designers to up-front budget ongoing costs

\*Auto-inclusion of O/M figures with new sites

\*Ratification by Council of ownership, management, direction of SAL sites

\*Increase outreach, marketing, education of public and internal PDX staff and managers

\*Stable funding source

# **BOM Project**

Ideas/Practices Already Considered or Put in Place

#### Tried/Failed

Use of business associations and neighborhood associations to meet needs

# Tried/Using

#### Horticulture

 Good horticultural practices – maintain plant health *Plus*

> Less need for chemical interventions, plant replacements Landscapes maintain function they were built for

# Minus

Costs more than the mow 'n blow approach

 Ensure (through design review)/provide low water, low maintenance, disease resistant, low fertilizer, good drainage, good soil etc landscapes

Plus

Lower costs through time; fewer problems, less chemical needs, more environmentally sensitive

Minus

None

Use mix of bark and compost for mulch

Plus

Fewer weeds, less water needed, looks good, mix reduces problems with buildup. Use material composted from other city sites in mix (recycling.

Minus

# Cost of mulch

7

 Build street landscapes for stressful situations – include irrigation systems when needed; provide good soil, large enough planting spaces Plus

Landscapes are successful long-term, or can be repaired easily

# Minus

Up-front costs; sometimes competing needs for space

Use of native plants where appropriate

Use tree species that will not lead to problems (suckering, monocultures)

#### **Business/System**

1 or 2 year establishment

### Plus

Landscapes come already established with the problems already worked out

#### Minus

# Higher up-front costs

 Do design review, construction inspection, landscape construction to produce healthy, viable landscapes

Plus

Healthy, viable, functional landscapes with fewer long and short term problems

#### Minus

Takes time to be involved in design review; don't always receive notice that project is underway; sometimes project manager does not use our comments

 Work with neighbors during construction process to provide something that they are happy to maintain

Plus

## Good public relations

More likely to successfully turn landscapes over to adjacent property owners for long-term maintenance

Minus

# Takes time

Actively monitor sites and contractor work

Plus

Get good value from contractor

Identify problems early

Minus Takes time

#### **Use Resources Wisely**

Use outside contractor where appropriate

#### Plus

*Efficient use of resources, use contractor for routine tasks Benefit to the contractor, and to the community* 

# Minus

State law requires hiring of rehabilitation contractor; our contractor requires more administrative time than our past commercial contractor with lower results

Turn water off unless needed; maintain irrigation infrastructure

# Plus

Maintain ability to water at end of season, in drought, when new plantings occur Maintain irrigation infrastructure Carefully use water resource

Lower water costs

#### Minus

Cost to maintain irrigation system, even when not used

Install Unik or electronic controllers where needed

Plus

Reduce manual labor Improve water management Result in healthier plants

Minus

# Cost of installing and maintaining systems

- Use interested neighbors and volunteers as resource to meet needs
- Put single-tree landscapes on a quarterly maintenance schedule
- Use alternative service crews (ACS) and prison crews
- Use Parks crews when site is on a park maintenance route
- Mechanize where possible large mowers, leaf vacs, edging, groundcover mowers etc



DATE:	1/25/2002
-------	-----------

TO: JEANNE NYQUIST AND ROGER TALLEY, BOM

FROM: KATHLEEN MURRIN, PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION, HORTICULTURAL SERVICES

RE: FY 2002-2003 INTERAGENCY BUDGET

I am sending you a copy of the CSL budget for next fiscal year to provide landscape services for the BOM sites. I am aware that you are not currently planning to continue service at this level, however I thought it might be useful to you to have this information.

The attached spreadsheet reflects a 3% overall increase in the interagency budget covering the following changes from this fiscal year:

- > A 3% increase for the contractor, and increases in park unit rates;
- An increase in the water budget;
- Three new sites (NE Ainsworth, SE Woodstock, and N Clarendon);
- > A decrease in the contingency fund to balance.

Please let me know if I can answer any questions regarding this budget.

# City of Portland Parks and Recreation Horticultural Services Street Area Landscape Maintenance: FY 2002-2003 Interagency Contract

Standard Level of Service (LOS):	1 visit/month Nov. to Mar.	Leaf pickup once/month in Nov. and Dec.			
	2 visits/month April to Oct.	Trim ivy once/year and apply growth retardant			
	Single, unirrigated tree wells in the median are serviced quarterly				
	All other contract items: weed control, fertilization, litter, irrigation, etc.				

Rece	eiver: BOM Current Year	Sites	Includir	ng F	artial Y	'ear Sil	les	Last U		14-Jan-02 Page 1 of 11
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	0/н	Total per Site
4.01	E Light Rail Williams - Sandy / NE Holladay St	Maint	Contractor	А	3,669	1,629	1,531	6,829	393	7,223
11	NE Gertz & 13th Truck Trap		Contractor	A	402	266	1,293	1,961	257	2,218
20	N St. Johns Bus.DistrBurlington Av. & Philad	2	Contractor	М	1,054	283	1,405	2,742	288	3,030
21	N St. Johns Bus.DistrLombard & Richmond		Contractor	М	2,102	556	1,436	4,094	321	4,414
25	N Willamette & Portland Blvd - NTMP #4		Contractor	AU	386	201	462	1,049	99	1,148
26	NE Thompson & 24th - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	148	85	196	429	41	471
27	NE Tillamook & 24th - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	164	85	348	597	70	667
28	NE Brazee & 24th - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	135	85	196	416	41	457
29	NE Thompson & 21st - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	162	79	348	589	70	659
30	NE Brazee & 21st		Contractor	М	135	79	336	551	67	618
31	NE Grant PI & 35th - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	135	79	348	562	69	631
32	NE Grant PI & 36th - NTMP #4		Contractor	М	134	79	371	584	74	658
33	NE Thompson @ 37th Ave		Contractor	М	106	111	184	401	39	440
34	NE Brazee @ 37th Ave		Contractor	М	133	118	225	475	47	522
35	NE Wistaria @ 37th Ave		Contractor	М	239	84	357	680	73	753
36	NE Hassalo & 53rd		Contractor	М	123	107	188	418	40	458
37	NE Clackamas & 53rd		Contractor	М	123	106	229	458	48	505
Last Update: 14-Jan-02 Page 2 of 11

Rec	Site Address, Description	Proj	Maint	Irr	Contr	Wtr/	Est. Pk	Est. Ttl	1	Total
No	Sile Address, Description	Stat.			Bid	Util.	Supp.	Maint	0/н	per
			,		Cost		Cost	Cost	0/11	Site
38	NE Alameda & 38th		Contractor	AU	610	202	251	1,063	63	1,126
39	NE Alameda & Regents		Contractor	М	294	130	536	960	109	1,069
41	NE Halsey & 39th Banfield		Contractor	N	483	0	2,738	3,221	522	3,744
42	NE Hoyt & 57th Banfield		Contractor	A	238	251	1,926	2,415	369	2,784
43	NE Halsey & 68th Banfield		Contractor	A	627	338	1,973	2,938	391	3,328
45	NE Halsey & 80th Banfield	~ -	Contractor	А	452	337	528	1,316	115	1,431
46	NE Halsey & 81st Banfield		Contractor	N	603	0	813	1,416	165	1,581
47	NE Glisan & 39th Coe Circle		Contractor	A	1,048	636	7,366	9,050	1,520	10,570
48	NE Grand & Everett Banfield		Contractor	A	2,377	515	4,277	7,169	859	8,027
51	NE Clackamas & 33rd Banfield		Contractor	A	1,611	411	1,508	3,530	324	3,854
56	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Duddleson		Contractor	М	221	89	139	449	32	481
57	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Dyer		Contractor	М	159	81	139	379	31	410
58	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - 86th		Contractor	М	176	87	139	402	31	433
59	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Siskiyou		Contractor	М	135	86	139	360	30	390
64	NE Hollywood District - NE 42nd & Sandy		Contractor	М	357	128	1,937	2,422	373	2,794
65	NE Hollywood District - NE 45th & Sandy		Contractor	М	171	119	364	654	74	728
68	NE Hollywood District - NE 39th & Sandy		Contractor	N	140	0	874	1,014	166	1,180
71	NE Holman & 34th		Contractor	М	119	103	263	486	54	540
72	NE Holman & 37th		Contractor	М	109	102	263	475	54	528
73	NE Holman & 41st		Contractor	М	137	105	263	505	54	559
76	NE Klickitat Mall - Entrance to 11th		Contractor	Ν	740	0	230	970	58	1,028
77	NE Klickitat Mall - 11th to 12th		Contractor	N	740	0	270	1,010	65	1,075

Ŧ

P

Last Update: 14-Jan-02 Page 3 of 11

Rec	Site Address, Description	Proj	Maint	Irr	Contr	Wtr/	Est. Pk	Est. Ttl		Total
No	She Address, Description	Stat.			Bid	Util.	Supp.	Maint	O/H	per
					Cost		Cost	Cost	1	Site
78	NE Klickitat Mall - 12th to 13th		Contractor	Ν	317	0	229	546	49	595
79	NE Klickitat Mall - 13th to 14th		Contractor	N	317	0	536	853	107	960
83	NE Multnomah & Imperial		Contractor	М	147	111	253	511	52	563
88	NE MLK-Broadway to San Rafael		Contractor	A	2,887	576	1,335	4,798	319	5,117
89	NE MLK-San Rafael to Lombard		Contractor	Ρ	2,649	767	3,105	6,521	647	7,168
90	N Jessup & Williams		Contractor	N	269	0	560	829	111	940
91	NE Wistaria & 41st	5	Contractor	М	404	118	1,406	1,928	275	2,202
92	NE Wistaria & 49th	- 15 	Contractor	N	290	0	1,334	1,624	257	1,881
93	NW Marshall & 25th		Contractor	М	143	105	249	496	51	548
94	NW Overton & 25th		Contractor	М	127	102	249	478	51	529
95	NW Quimby & 25th		Contractor	М	111	103	182	396	38	435
96	NW Wilson & 29th		Contractor	М	359	128	451	938	95	1,033
98	NW Everett & Front (Steel Bridge Interchange		Contractor	A	4,744	1,917	3,924	10,585	868	11,453
102	NW Raleigh & 26th		Contractor	М	156	105	188	449	40	489
103	NW Raleigh & 27th		Contractor	М	162	78	188	428	40	468
110	SE Woodstock on 90th	Estab/ Finish	Contractor/ BOM?	AU	1,138	531	972	2,642	215	2,857
113	SE Henry & 97th	Planning	Contractor	A	445	110	565	1,120	117	1,237
120	SE Ladd & Palm Traffic Diverters		Contractor	М	111	73	189	373	39	412
121	SE Ladd & Lavender Traffic Diverters		Contractor	М	111	77	341	529	67	596
124	SE Stark & 108th Park 51		Contractor	A	3,332	1,491	3,037	7,859	668	8,527
130	SE Powell & Milwaukie		Contractor	М	526	176	1,464	2,166	288	2,454
131	SE Powell - 50th to 92nd		Contractor	A	13,179	689	11,076	24,943	2,339	27,282

Date Printed: Tuesday, January 22, 2002

.

# Current Year Sites Including Partial Year Sites

Last Update: 14-Jan-02 Page 4 of 11

_		1	I	Τ.					I	
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.		Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	0/н	Total per Site
132	SE Salmon & 16th		Contractor	N	57	0	534	591	102	692
133	SE Salmon & 27th		Contractor	N	57	0	330	387	63	450
134	SE Scott Dr & 65th - Greenleaf		Contractor	N	608	0	153	761	41	801
136	SE Ash & 12th Western Edge		Contractor	м	100	110	262	472	53	526
137	SE Ash & 16th Western Edge		Contractor	М	192	110	338	640	69	709
138	SE Pine & 14th Western Edge		Contractor	М	192	109	338	639	69	708
139	SE Alder & 15th Western Edge		Contractor	М	192	106	338	636	69	705
140	SE Taylor & 14th Western Edge		Contractor	М	192	112	297	601	62	663
141	SE Salmon & 13th Western Edge		Contractor	М	192	110	297	599	62	661
142	SE Madison & 13th Western Edge		Contractor	М	135	110	340	585	69	654
143	SE Main & 14th Western Edge		Contractor	М	135	110	297	542	61	603
144	SE Oak & 15th Western Edge		Contractor	М	192	110	297	599	62	661
146	SE Woodward & 56th		Contractor	М	192	127	317	635	66	701
147	SE Woodward & 58th		Contractor	М	118	103	263	485	54	539
149	SW Arthur St Median - First to 4th		Contractor	Ρ	1,395	121	2,514	4,030	500	4,531
152	SW Broadway - 4th to 6th		Contractor	A	1,564	130	2,362	4,056	477	4,533
153	SW Burnside & Tichner	Comp.	Contractor	Ν	256	0	493	749	98	847
154	SW Capitol Highway / Terwilliger	2	Parks/ Contractor	AU	1,045	314	1,836	3,195	373	3,568
155	SW Car Wash Fountain - Transit Mall		Parks	A/M x	0	0	5,967	5,967	1,183	7,150
157	SW Clifton & Park		Contractor	AU	3,668	1,150	1,569	6,386	391	6,777
160	SW First - Harrison to Arthur		Contractor	Ρ	2,141	121	6,613	8,875	1,277	10,152
161	NW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to North		Contractor	A	2,092	426	2,429	4,947	505	5,452

Date Printed: Tuesday, January 22, 2002

,

,

Receiver: BOM

Last Update: 14-Jan-02 Page 5 of 11

Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	0/н	Total per Site
162	SW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to Harrison		Contractor	А	6,624	3,966	3,848	14,438	931	15,369
164	SW Harbor Dr & Clay Triangle		Contractor	А	1,146	1,385	1,906	4,437	409	4,846
166	SW Harrison St Median - Front to 4th		Contractor	Ρ	544	121	2,610	3,275	501	3,776
167	SW Hawthorne Bridge (@ Madison, Jefferson		Contractor	AU	1,801	746	3,328	5,875	767	6,642
170	SW Kelly Fountain -Transit Mall		Parks	Мx	0	0	9,164	9,164	1,852	11,016
171	SW Lincoln Median - First to 4th	₹ ·	Contractor	Ρ	667	121	3,128	3,916	600	4,515
172	SW Macadam - West end of Sellwood Bridge		Contractor	N	3,064	0	1,024	4,088	253	4,341
173	SW Macadam - Bancroft to Willamette Moora		Contractor	AU	2,620	773	10,090	13,483	1,944	15,427
174	SW Macadam-Tay.Fer.Rd.Pt.,B/S Islands, Vir		Contractor	Ρ	3,803	452	942	5,198	262	5,460
175	SW Madison - 5th to 6th		Contractor	A	235	459	457	1,151	99	1,250
177	SW Patton Place		Contractor	М	781	74	210	1,065	56	1,121
178	SW Portland Center (Front, Market & Harbor		Contractor	A	3,299	3,375	4,419	11,093	956	12,048
179	SW Ross Island Bridge Interchange (@ Hood		Contractor	Ρ	12,791	2,343	6,540	21,674	1,672	23,346
181	SW Tyrol Circle		Contractor	N	317	74	389	780	81	861
185	W Burnside Median 1st to Park		Contractor	Ρ	694	0	4,174	4,868	790	5,659
187	SW Boones Ferry/Taylors Fry - NTMP #7A	Comp.	Contractor	Ρ	341	110	509	960	105	1,065
189	SE Harold/Foster-52nd to 72nd, Median at 52	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	AU	150	110	363	623	73	697
192	N Smith-Others-B-NTMP Medians @Tyler & Buchanan	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	М	856	184	1,941	2,981	382	3,363
193	SW Virginia north of Taylors Ferry - NTMP	Estab/ Finish	Contractor/ COP	AU	470	98	575	1,143	120	1,263
201.01	SW Terwilliger, Sam Jackson to Homestead,	Estab	Contractor	N	572	0	195	767	48	816
201.02	SW Terwilliger Islands, Phase II Homestead - Capitol	Finish estab	Contractor	N	399	0	192	591	44	635
202	SW Barbur/Terwilliger I-5 Interchange Terwilliger & Canby	Estab	Contractor	А	1,282	246	723	2,251	166	2,417

.

Last Update: 14-Jan-02 Page 6 of 11

							Fage 0 01 11			
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	О/Н	Total per Site
203	SE Tacoma/McLoughlin Interchange/Nehale Nehalem St. Closure	Estab	Contractor	AU	414	0	471	885	97	982
204	SE Brookside Dr/SE 117th PI	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	М	150	110	382	642	77	719
211	NE Convention Center - 15th/16th - Mult & Br	Estab/ Finish	Contractor/ COP?	A	593	235	475	1,303	106	1,409
217	N Omaha Parkway		Parks/ Contractor	М	1,326	3,890	5,315	10,530	1,250	11,780
218	NE Ainsworth Blocks		Parks/ Contractor	М	2,491	6,922	22,133	31,546	4,688	36,235
219	NE Roseway Blocks Parkway		Parks/ Contractor	М	2,344	1,896	9,610	13,851	2,165	16,016
221	SE Firland Parkway SE 72nd & Foster		Parks/ Contractor	A	1,326	1,331	6,842	9,499	1,534	11,033
223	SE Reed College Parkway (Reedway Blocks)		Parks/ Contractor	М	1,422	6,808	14,048	22,278	3,023	25,301
224	SW Campbell Fountain, 18th & Burnside		Parks	Мx	0	0	6,608	6,608	1,345	7,954
246	NE Hayden Island - Tomahawk Drive Median		Contractor	A	633	504	1,299	2,436	266	2,702
250	Convention Center-Holladay Off Ramp I-84	Estab/ Finish	Contractor	A	846	746	4,342	5,934	848	6,782
253	SE Lincoln & 32nd Division Corridor		Contractor	М	170	122	149	441	34	475
254	SE Lincoln & 37th Division Corridor		Contractor	М	170	78	301	549	61	610
255	SE Lincoln & 43rd Division Corridor		Contractor	М	102	75	149	326	31	358
256	SE Lincoln & 46th Division Corridor		Contractor	М	85	84	872	1,041	165	1,206
257	SE Lincoln & 51st Division Corridor		Contractor	М	171	79	382	633	76	709
258	SE Lincoln & 55th (East) Division Corridor		Contractor	М	111	75	231	417	47	464
259	SE Lincoln & 55th (West) Division Corridor		Contractor	М	93	75	954	1,121	181	1,302
260	SE Lincoln & 58th Division Corridor		Contractor	М	109	76	190	375	39	414
261	SE Harrison & 37th Division Corridor		Contractor	М	170	79	382	632	76	708
262	SE Harrison & 41st Division Corridor		Contractor	М	170	78	231	479	48	527
263	SE Clinton & 23rd Division Corridor		Contractor	М	152	77	231	460	48	508

Date Printed: Tuesday, January 22, 2002

ŧ

.

Last Update:

14-Jan-02 Page 7 of 11

D			I	Τ.		NAV1 /			1	
Rec	Site Address, Description	Proj	Maint	Irr	1000 Deck De 1000000	Wtr/	Est. Pk	Est. Ttl		Total
No		Stat.	Ву		Bid Cost	Util.	Supp. Cost	Maint Cost	O/H	per Site
		+			1		(			1
264	SE Clinton & 31st		Contractor	М	147	77	190	414	40	454
	Division Corridor									
265	SE Clinton & 36th		Contractor	М	170	77	418	665	83	748
	Division Corridor	_								
266	SE Clinton & 45th		Contractor	М	111	75	342	527	67	595
	Division Corridor									
267	SE Clinton & 47th	1	Contractor	М	146	76	342	564	68	632
	Division Corridor									
268	SE Carruthers & 30th		Contractor	М	114	76	342	532	68	599
	Division Corridor	_								
269	SE Grant & 30th (North)		Contractor	М	85	74	1,023	1,181	193	1,375
	Division Corridor									
270	SE Grant & 30th (South)		Contractor	М	85	80	1,104	1,269	209	1,478
	Division Corridor	_								
275.01	NE Brazee & 47th		Contractor	М	149	153	272	573	57	630
275.02	NE Thompson & 47th		Contractor	м	149	153	272	573	57	630
215.02			Contractor	101	149	155	212	575	57	630
276.02	NE Schuyler & 28th	Maint	Contractor	М	147	119	303	569	62	631
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
276.04	NE Schuyler & 32nd	Maint	Contractor	М	297	85	303	685	65	749
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
276.05	NE Weidler & 28th	Maint	Contractor	М	218	80	303	601	63	664
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
276.06	NE Halsey & 28th	Maint	Contractor	М	322	90	303	715	65	780
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
276.07	NE Clackamas & 28th	Maint	Contractor	М	288	119	303	710	65	775
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
276.08	NE Wasco & 28th	Maint	Contractor	Ν	192	0	220	412	45	457
	NE Hollywood - New FM									
277	Convention Center-River Overlook	Maint	Contractor	А	1,987	1,015	1,273	4,275	300	4,575
279.01	NE Tillamook & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	м	116	78	337	532	67	599
210.01			Contractor		110	10	557	552	07	299
279.02	NE Sacramento & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	М	116	78	337	532	67	599
279.03	NE Russell & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	М	116	77	337	530	67	598
279.04	NE Graham & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	М	116	90	337	544	67	611
279.05	NE Morris & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	М	116	79	337	533	67	600
070.00			Que ta di							
279.06	NE Cook & 7th - NTMP #5	Maint	Contractor	М	106	79	337	523	67	590
		I					I			

÷ .

# **Current Year Sites Including Partial Year Sites**

Last Update: 14-Jan-02 Page 8 of 11

Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	0/н	Total per Site
282.01	SE Eastmoreland B, 37 & Bybee - NTMP #6A	Maint	Contractor	М	98	79	112	289	24	313
282.02	SE Eastmoreland C, 34th & Bybee - NTMP #6	Maint	Contractor	М	272	79	1,347	1,699	257	1,956
290	Airport Way Phase I NE Holman to 138th	Maint	Contractor	A	6,150	590	5,656	12,395	1,187	13,582
291	Airport Way Phase II NE 138th to 181st	Maint	Contractor	A	12,677	776	11,239	24,692	2,361	27,052
293.01	West Side Corridor Lt. Rail Extension - Jeffers Jeff-18th-Morr-Yamhill	Maint	Contractor	A	1,333	1,065	1,156	3,554	264	3,818
297	SW Moody St Extension	Maint	Contractor	A	172	147	789	1,109	154	1,262
300	N Sumner/Haight Device (N Iris Ct. Apts) N Iris Ct. Apts	Maint	Contractor	М	150	77	188	415	40	455
304	NE Arena Project	Maint	Contractor	A	2,417	1,065	856	4,338	230	4,569
306.01	NE Alberta & 14th Place		Contractor	AU	330	177	525	1,032	109	1,141
306.02	NE Killingsworth & 14th Place	Maint	Contractor	AU	317	177	525	1,019	108	1,127
309.01	SE Johnson Creek Blvd & 45th - Sprngwtr Co Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	A	489	230	1,318	2,037	261	2,298
309.02	SE 82nd-Harney to Crystal Sprgs Blvd Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	А	489	110	438	1,037	94	1,131
309.03	SE Flavel - 87th to 89th Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	A	489	110	378	977	82	1,059
309.04	SE 92nd - Knapp to Knapp PI Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	A	489	110	926	1,525	186	1,711
309.05	SE Foster - 103rd PI to 106th Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	A	489	110	1,436	2,035	282	2,316
309.06	SE 122nd - Martins to Ramona Springwater Corridor & Medians	Maint	Contractor	A	489	110	374	973	82	1,055
312.01	SE Gladstone & 28th Pl	Maint	Contractor	AU	446	160	536	1,142	112	1,254
312.02	SE Gladstone & 30th	Maint	Contractor	AU	355	123	395	873	84	957
312.03	SE Gladstone & 34th	Maint	Contractor	AU	355	123	395	873	84	957
312.04	SE Gladstone & 37th	Maint	Contractor	AU	446	123	547	1,116	114	1,229
314	SW Sylvan-Climbing Lane	Planning	COP/ Contr	A	6,301	453	2,966	9,721	693	10,414
315	NE Convention Center - Lloyd to 16th S of Lloyd Cinemas	Maint	Contractor	A	2,271	352	1,318	3,941	300	4,241

.

.

Receiver: BOM

Last Update:

14-Jan-02 Page 9 of 11

			1	1	1		1	1	1	
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	О/Н	Total per Site
318	NE Oregon & 122nd	Maint	Contractor	AU	1,034	201	719	1,955	160	2,115
320	SW Highland and Zoo Interchange, north side Northwest section	Maint	Contractor	A	1,242	235	1,137	2,614	243	2,857
325.01	SE Harold & 97th - SE Lents School School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	AU	447	201	402	1,050	88	1,139
325.02	SE Steele & 92nd (south)- Lents School School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	N	76	0	179	255	35	290
325.03	SE Steele & 92nd (north)- Lents School School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	AU	200	79	222	502	47	549
326	N Willis & Emerald - Peninsula School School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	N	76	0	278	354	54	408
327	SE Stark & 52nd - Glencoe School School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	AU	200	78	402	680	81	761
330	NE Sandy Blvd, 102nd to 122nd	Plng/ Constr	Park/ Adj.Prop	A	1,446	440	1,386	3,272	297	3,570
335.01	NE Siskiyou & 33rd	Maint	Contractor	AU	726	78	494	1,298	109	1,407
335.02	NE Klickitat & 33rd	Maint	Contractor	AU	726	78	517	1,321	113	1,434
335.03	NE Bryce & 33rd	Maint	Contractor	AU	726	89	517	1,332	113	1,446
335.04	NE Portland Blvd & 33rd	Maint	Contractor	AU	726	89	1,051	1,866	214	2,080
336.1	NE Hassalo & 39th Medians and Curb Extensions	Constr	Contractor	Y	343	94	587	1,024	119	1,143
336.2	NE Hassalo & 37th Medians and Curb Extensions	Constr	Contractor	Y	898	94	587	1,579	130	1,709
336.3	NE Hassalo & Imperial Medians and Curb Extensions	Constr	Contractor	Y	449	94	587	1,130	121	1,251
336.4	NE Hassalo & Peerless Pl Medians and Curb Extensions	Constr	Contractor	Y	397	94	587	1,078	120	1,198
338	SE Water Ave LID	Estab	Contractor	A	1,923	319	617	2,859	160	3,019
339	SE Steele & 49th School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	N	142	0	186	328	38	366
340	SE Market & 117th School Safety Project	Maint	Contractor	N	142	0	186	328	38	366
341		Estab/ Finish	Contractor	N	149	0	342	491	67	558
342	NW Pettygrove & 25th - Chapman School School Safety Project	Constr	Contractor	Ν	101	0	293	394	57	451
344.01		Constr	Contractor	N	101	0	145	246	29	276

.

# Current Year Sites Including Partial Year Sites

Last Update: 14-Jan-02 Page 10 of 11

		I		l				F.4. 74		Tabul
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.	Maint By	Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	O/H	Total per Site
					Î					
344.02	NE Shaver & 17th - Sabin School	Constr	Contractor	N	79	0	145	224	29	253
	School Safety Project	Dianning	Contractor		0	0	0	0	0	0
348	SE Holgate & 78th - Marysville School	Planning	Contractor	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
	School Safety Project	Canata	Contractor		1 1 2 2	133	253	1,518	73	1,591
349	N Marine Dr @ Gantenbein	Constr	Contractor	AU	1,132	133	203	1,516	73	1,591
351.01	N Clarendon Cul-de-sac - Clarendon School	Planning	Adj Prop	А	650	95	517	1,262	112	1,374
001.01	School Safety Project									
351.02	N Portsmouth & Newark	Planning		N	439	0	749	1,188	149	1,337
001.02	School Safety Project									
354.1	SE Woodstock & 41st		Contract	A	450	105	530	1,085	111	1,196
554.1										
354.2	SE Woodstock & 44th		Contract	А	450	105	530	1,085	111	1,196
354.3	SE Woodstock & 49th		Contract	А	450	105	530	1,085	111	1,196
354.4	SE Woodstock & 51st		Contract	A	450	105	530	1,085	111	1,196
							0.1.1	0.10		054
360	N Williams & Portland Blvd	Estab	Contractor	Ν	101	0	211	312	42	354
					05		100	004	07	040
361	N Williams & Killingsworth	Estab		Ν	95	0	186	281	37	318
		Establ	Oratoritan		470	0	450	022	05	1 0 2 7
362	N Marine Drive @ N Harbour Condos	Estab/ Maint	Contractor	Ν	476	0	456	932	95	1,027
				N	95	0	182	277	36	313
363.1	SE Harold & 17th			Ν	95	0	102	211	30	313
					05	0	182	277	36	313
363.2	SE Knapp & 17th			Ν	95	0	102	211	30	515
					05		100	077	36	313
363.3	SE Claybourne & 17th			Ν	95	0	182	277	30	313
000.4				N	127	0	223	350	44	394
363.4	SE Milwaukie & 17th			Ν	127	0	223	350	44	394
004	OM/LADail Madiana & Dartal Dhana III	Construc	Contractor	A	1 420	480	948	2,867	216	3,083
364	SW Lt Rail, Madison & Portal, Phase III	ted	Contractor	А	1,439	400	940	2,007	210	3,003
0.05				NI	126	0	167	293	34	327
365	SE Knapp & 13th			Ν	120	0	107	295	54	521
000.4					250	0	239	489	50	538
366.1	NE Buffalo & Albina				250	0	239	409	50	550
260.0	NE Ainquigth & Karby				160	0	229	389	46	435
366.2	NE Ainsworth & Kerby				100	0	229	505	+0	-55
366.3	NE Ainsworth & Mallory				160	0	229	389	46	435
500.5					100	Ű	225	000	TU	.00
366.4	NE Ainsworth & Albina				250	0	239	489	50	538
500.4					200	Ű	200		50	
366.4	NE Ainsworth & Albina				250	0	239	489	50	538

1. 6

Receiver: BOM

Receiver: BOM         Current Year Sites Including Partial Year Sites         Last Update:										
Rec No	Site Address, Description	Proj Stat.		Irr	Contr Bid Cost	Wtr/ Util.	Est. Pk Supp. Cost	Est. Ttl Maint Cost	O/H	Total per Site
					185,196	69,024	290,370	544,590	61,284	605,874
					2% of Cont \$	2% of Water			Total OH	
					3,704	1,380				
					188,900	70,405				
						Sub-	Total		\$60	)5,874
	Contin	genc	y Fund		\$4	,142	+ \$78	= 0	\$	\$4,922
						Tar		\$610,796		

SAL Services Retained at \$105K	Estimated Annual Expenditures
Mowing 9 locations until brown:	\$30,000
<ul> <li>Omaha, Ainsworth, Firland, Roseway &amp; Reedway park</li> </ul>	
blocks	
<ul> <li>Hawthorne, Ross Island, Sellwood bridgeheads</li> </ul>	
Market/Clay/Harbor triangle	
Landscape Maint 3 Bridgeheads :	\$30,000
<ul> <li>Sellwood, Ross Island, Hawthorne</li> </ul>	
Landscape Maint. – 3 Fountains:	\$21,000
• Car Wash & Kelly on Transit Mall, Campbell Memorial on W	
Burnside	
Emergency Tree Service on complaint basis	\$4,000
Mothball Utility Services	\$20,000
Irrigation not provided. Fixed costs to place water and electrical	
system on standby and provide irrigation system locates.	
Expenditure Totals	\$105,000

## **TMS Services**

The reduction in the TMS program will be accomplished by:

- increasing the use of chemicals for weed and brush control and reducing mechanical brush cutting.
- Elimination of wildflower lots.

#### Service Alternatives

The 02-03 funding level does not support adequate landscape maintenance and does not allow PDOT or the Park Bureau to meet requirements of several agreements for maintenance of landscaping in business areas such as the Central, Hollywood and St. Johns business district. We are examining alternative ways of providing some services including:

- Increasing use of community service and/or inmate crews to provide service to non-sensitive areas, such as bridge heads and medians. We are currently conducting a pilot project with Multnomah County Sheriff's crews.
- Establishing an "adopt–a-landscape" program for neighborhood volunteers or court mandated community service workers to perform landscape maintenance in neighborhood areas. We have initiated discussions with ONI to determine the feasibility. This may require a partial subsidy to provide resources for ONI to help organize volunteers.

 Negotiating agreements with business associations to maintain SAL sites in their area. The City already has some maintenance agreements in place with local community and business groups. We have made initial contacts with some of the business associations.
 PDOT may be able to leverage limited dollars by funding some services, such as irrigation, in exchange for site maintenance.

Even if all of the alternative service methods prove successful, the 02/03 budget of \$105,000 does not provide enough money to leverage the alternative services, and will result in sporadic, inconsistent levels of maintenance.

#### **ALTERNATIVE FUNDING**

For the short term, we need to identify an additional \$300,000 to fund SAL work at the minimum service level for FY 02/03. The funding could "bridge" services, reducing loss of valuable plant inventory until permanent alternative funding solutions are found for either Parks and/or Transportation Bureaus. Under this scenario, we would restore a minimum level of service to the 216 SAL sites; but not to the 168 TMS sites.

#### Minimum Service Level Bridge for SAL Program FY02/03: \$400,000:

- Standard service provided to 33 locations
- Irrigation restored to preserve plant infrastructure
- 183 sites receive inspection and remediation of hazards
- No programmed maintenance of PDOT street trees

SAL Services "Bridged" at \$400K	Estimated Annual Expenditure
Mowing 9 locations	\$32,000
Landscape Maint – 3 bridgeheads	\$30,000
Landscape Maint – 3 Fountains	\$21,000
Emergency Tree Service	\$4,000
Restore irrigation & utilities	\$60,000
Continue new plant establishment at 2 locations	\$10,000
Restore maintenance to 5 major park blocks	\$100,000
Restore maintenance to 19 median locations on arterial	\$107,000
streets	
Inspect/remediate hazards	\$36,000
Expenditure Totals	\$400,000

#### **Standard Service Level \$1.1 million:**

Both PDOT and the Park Bureau recognize the value of properly maintaining the entire inventory of Street Area Landscape sites. Our long-term goal is to provide adequate funding to maintain an expanding inventory. If alternative funding can be secured by FY 03-04, the recommended Standard Service Level should be funded at \$1.1 million. This service level would provide adequate maintenance to the existing Street Area Landscape (SAL) and Transportation Maintenance Sites (TMS) identified on the attached inventory as follows:

- Scheduled standard maintenance to 202 priority sites, including site inspections, turf care, litter removal, plant pruning and tree care.
- Scheduled minimum maintenance to 182 sites, including site inspections and remediation of hazards.

#### NEXT STEPS

We appreciate the opportunity to discuss this issue with you. If you approve, we will work to identify possible bridge funding to preserve some SAL services for FY02/03. In addition, we will continue working with your office to discuss the possibility of future alternative funding sources for Transportation and/or Parks Bureaus to restore adequate maintenance to the combined inventory of 384 sites.

Cc: Transportation Director City Forester

Date:	July 22, 2002
To:	Commissioner Francesconi
From:	Jeanne Nyquist Maintenance Director
Subject:	Transportation Landscape Maintenance

PDOTs adopted 2002-03 budget reduces funding for maintenance of transportation-related landscape assets by 83%. The purpose of this memo is to provide you with background on management of this asset, service impact of the current budget cut, and options for restoring services.

## BACKGROUND

Beginning in the 1980's, Portland's transportation system underwent major changes. Along with a desire to accommodate alternative methods of travel, there was an initiative to build devices to calm traffic and create pedestrian friendly streetscapes. Islands, traffic diverters, circles, curb extensions and boulevards were built throughout Portland to enhance safety and livability. Nearly all of these devices have landscape components.

The maintenance of the Street Area Landscapes (SAL) has been funded and managed in a variety of ways over time. Since approximately 1990, PDOT provided funding for the program. The Park Bureau initially maintained all of the sites through an I/A with PDOTs Maintenance Bureau. During the 1990s, a number of sites were removed from the I/A to reduce costs. These were transferred to the Maintenance Bureau's inventory and received a very low level of care as Transportation Maintenance Sites (TMS). The combined SAL and TMS inventory now totals 384 sites encompassing approximately 170 acres (see attached summary of inventory) with maintenance responsibility (prior to 02/03) divided as follows:

• SAL: The Park Bureau provided maintenance to 216 landscaped sites. The standard service level included site inspections, turf care, litter removal, leaf removal, plant pruning and tree care. The program was funded at \$850,000, but had been reduced to \$598,000 by FY01-02.

• TMS: The Maintenance Bureau provided a minimal level of service to 168 sites including inspection, brush control and mowing for fire prevention and visibility. Some of the sites were converted into low maintenance wildflower lots. The program was funded at xxx, but had been reduced to xxx by FY01-02.

In November of 2000, Maintenance and Park Bureau staff completed a review of the Street Area Landscape program. The report outlined the following optional service levels:

- Minimum Service Level Provide scheduled inspection and repair hazards.
- Standard Service Level Provide programmed maintenance to include litter removal, weed control, hard surface cleaning, mulching, leaf removal, edging of turf and groundcovers, mowing and fertilization, and maintenance to PDOT owned street trees.
- Desired Service Level Provide programmed maintenance as described in Standard Service Level, as well as provide higher level of plant care and replacement of deteriorated infrastructure such as irrigation and hard surface features.

The report recommended that the program be funded at \$1.1 million to provide the standard service level to 202 sites and the minimum service level to 182 sites.

PDOTs financial condition made it impossible to fund even the minimum service level for FY02-03, resulting in elimination of service to all but a few of the highest priority sites.

#### **REDUCED SERVICE LEVEL** FY 02-03

	FY 00-01	FY02-03	FY03-04
216 Street Area Landscape sites	\$752,000	\$593,000	<b>\$0</b>
168 Transportation Maintenance sites	<u>\$ 58,000</u>	<u>\$ 38,000</u>	<u>\$105,000</u>
384 Total	\$810,000	\$631,000	\$105,000

The result of the budget cut is that all 384 sites will be transferred to the Maintenance Bureau's inventory and treated as Transportation Maintenance Sites (TMS). Fixed costs to place irrigation and utility systems on standby total nearly \$20,000 annually, leaving very limited funding for maintenance services. Only 12 high priority locations (bridgeheads and park blocks) will receive limited service. The remainder of the system will not receive any programmed maintenance, resulting in loss of plant inventory and irrigation infrastructure, sight distance problems from overgrowth, and unsightly conditions from litter and weed invasion.

#### Service Alternatives

The 02-03 funding level does not support adequate landscape maintenance and does not allow PDOT or the Park Bureau to meet requirements of several agreements for maintenance of landscaping in business areas such as the Central, Hollywood and St. Johns business district. We are examining alternative ways of providing some services including:

- Increasing use of community service and/or inmate crews to provide service to non-sensitive areas, such as bridgeheads and medians. We are currently conducting a pilot project with Multnomah County Sheriff's crews.
- Establishing an "adopt–a-landscape" program for neighborhood volunteers or court mandated community service workers to perform landscape maintenance in neighborhood areas. We have initiated discussions with ONI to determine the feasibility. This may require a partial subsidy to provide resources for ONI to help organize volunteers.
- Negotiating agreements with business associations to maintain SAL sites in their area. The City already has some maintenance agreements in place with local community and business groups. We have made initial contacts with some of the business associations.
   PDOT may be able to leverage limited dollars by funding some services, such as irrigation, in exchange for site maintenance.

Even if all of the alternative service methods prove successful, the 02/03 budget of \$105,000 does not provide enough money to leverage the alternative services, and will result in sporadic, inconsistent levels of maintenance.

#### ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVELS

Both PDOT and the Park Bureau recognize the value of properly maintaining the entire inventory of Street Area Landscape sites. Our long-term goal is to provide funding to adequately maintain an expanding inventory. The following table summarizes service levels and funding for 3 fiscal years 01 - 03 and projects costs for 4 alternative service levels. This information is also depicted on an attached graph which summarizes system condition at each of the funding levels.

	00-01	01-02	02-03	Bridge	Poor	Fair	Good
FUNDING	\$810K	\$631K	\$105K	\$400K	\$800K	\$1.2m	\$2M
SERVICE LEVEL	#sites						
Desired	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Standard	29	0	0	29	29	202	182
Minimum	179	208	12	0	179	182	0
Hazard Elim. Only	72	72	0	187	72	0	0
No Service	96	96	372	168	96	0	0

#### Service Level Bridge for SAL Program FY02/03: \$400,000:

For the short term, we need to identify an additional \$300,000 to maintain the inventory at the minimum service level for FY 02/03. The funding could "bridge" services, reducing loss of valuable plant inventory until permanent alternative funding solutions are found for either Parks and/or Transportation Bureaus. Under this scenario, the following services would be provided:

- Standard service provided to 29 locations
- 187 sites receive inspection and remediation of hazards
- Irrigation restored to preserve plant infrastructure
- No service to 168 sites
- No programmed maintenance of PDOT street trees

#### Service Level: Poor - \$800,000

If alternative funding can be secured for Transportation Services for 03-04, we recommending restoring the landscape inventory to at a "poor" level of appearance. This level of funding would accomplish the following:

- Standard service provided to 29 locations
- Minimum service provided to 179 locations
- 72 sites receive inspection and remediation of hazards
- No service to 96 sites
- No programmed maintenance of PDOT street trees

#### Service Level: Fair - \$1.2 million

If alternative funding can be secured for both Transportation and Parks services for 03-04, we recommend that maintenance be increased to achieve a "fair" level of appearance at most sites. This level of funding would accomplish the following:

- Standard service provided to 202 locations
- Minimum service provided to 182 locations

#### Service Level: Good - \$2M

A funding level of \$2 million is required to maintain the entire existing inventory in "good" condition. This should be considered a future goal and is not recommended at this time, considering other competing priorities for limited funding. This level of funding would accomplish the following:

- Desired service provided to 202 locations
- Standard service provided to 182 locations

#### NEXT STEPS

We appreciate the opportunity to discuss this issue with you. If you approve, we will work to identify possible bridge funding to preserve some landscape services for FY02/03. In addition, we will continue working with your office to discuss the possibility of future alternative funding sources for Transportation and/or Parks Bureaus to restore adequate maintenance to the combined inventory of 384 sites.

Cc: Transportation Director City Forester

Asset	Type	Qty	ACREAGE
<ul><li>Bridgehead</li><li>Hawthorne, Sellwood, Ross Island, Ste</li></ul>	SAL el	4	14
<ul><li>Park Block</li><li>Omaha, Ainsworth, Firland, Roseway Reedway</li></ul>	SAL	5	22
Fountain Landscape	SAL	3	1
Medians	SAL	17	12
Traffic Control Devices	SAL	187	20
Subtotal	SAL	216	70
Transportation Maintenance Site	TMS	168	100
Grand Total		384	170

## TRANSPORTATION LANDSCAPE INVENTORY

SAL Street Area Landscape Site. Previously maintained by Park Bureau through I/A with PDOT until 7/1/02

# TMS Transportation Maintenance Site.

Maintained by Bureau of Maintenance, including mowing, weed control, wildflower lots.

SAL Services Retained at \$300K	Estimate	d Annual
	Expenditures	
Service	Low	High
Water Utility Services (290	\$48,000	\$52,000
Devices)		
Electrical Utility Services (33	\$6,500	\$8,000
Services)		
Irrigation System Locates	\$8,000	\$9,500
Turf Maintenance at 19 Locations	\$28,000	\$32,000
Emergency Tree Services	\$3,500	\$5,500
Current Project Establishment	\$8,250	\$10,250
Restore Water to 181 irrigated	\$25,000	\$35,000
SAL Sites		
Restore Maintenance to 3	\$21,000	\$26,500
Fountains		
Restore Maintenance to 3		\$35,000
Bridgeheads	and the second	
Restore Maintenance to 5 Major	\$75,000	\$100,000
Blocks		
Expenditure Totals	\$253,250	\$313,750

At the \$400,000 level, maintenance is restored to an additional 19 locations on arterials where only the median islands are serviced. For example, the type of landscaped medians along NE MLK Blvd.

			0.1
SAL Services Retained at \$400K	Estimated	d Annual	mothball
	Expend	ditures	unba
Service	Low	High	not
Water Utility Services (290	\$48,000	\$52,000	
Devices)			Lat
Electrical Utility Services (33	\$6,500	\$8,000	20
services)	_		0
Irrigation System Locates	\$8,000	\$9,500	
Turf Maintenance at 19 locations	\$28,000	\$32,000	
Emergency Tree Services	\$3,500	\$5,500	1
Continue Establishment at 2	\$8,250	\$10,250	
locations		- C	50
Restore Water to 181 irrigated	\$25,000	\$35,000	
SAL Sites			
Restore Maintenance to 3	\$21,000	\$26,500	
Fountains			1
Restore Maintenance to 3	\$30,000	\$35,000	V .
Bridgeheads	<b>*==</b> 0.00	<b>*</b> • • • • • • •	
Restore Maintenance to 5 Major	\$75,000	\$100,000	
Blocks	<b>***</b>	<b>•</b> • • • • • • •	
Restore Maintenance to 19	\$92,500	\$106,500	
median only locations	0.15 5-5	<b>.</b>	
Expenditure Totals	\$345,750	\$420,250	

With the exception of regular watering on the SAL inventory, the remaining 174 locations would not receive any additional city funded services.

The services that would be discontinued at the non-served locations would include the following:Regular Litter RemovalPre and Post Emergent Weed ControlHard Surface CleaningMulchingLeaf RemovalSucker Removal, Pruning and Low LimbingEdging of Turf and GroundcoversMowing

**<u>Summary</u>** - Contractor work and contract have been terminated effective July 1, 2002. Maintenance possible at \$100K

A		
SAL Services Retained at	Estimated Annual	
\$100K	Expen	ditures
Service	Low	High
Water Utility Services (290	\$48,000	\$52,000
Services)		
Electrical Utility Services (33	\$6,500	\$8,000
Services)		
Irrigation System Locates	\$8,000	\$9,500
Turf Maintenance (19 Locations)	\$28,000	\$32,000
Emergency Tree Services	\$3,500	\$5,500
Expenditure Totals	\$94,000	\$107,000

Places inventory in a "mothballed" status

Water and Electrical Utility Systems are maintained at an operational level.

Mowing continues at 19 locations until brown from eliminated watering.

Emergency service requests related to safety and sight distances are addressed on a complaint basis.

Minimum services provided by Park Bureau FTEs

196 locations do not receive any City funded services. Total served locations is 19. No regular tree maintenance on PDOT street trees

#### Maintenance possible at \$200K

SAL Services Retained at \$200K	Estimate	ed Annual
	Expenditures	
Service	Low	High
Water Utility Services	\$48,000	\$52,000
Electrical Utility Services	\$6,500	\$8,000
Irrigation System Locates	\$8,000	\$9,500
Turf Maintenance	\$28,000	\$32,000
Emergency Tree Services	\$3,500	\$5,500
Continue Establishment at 2	\$8,250	\$10,250
Locations		
Restore Water to 181 SAL Sites	\$25,000	\$35,000
Restore Maintenance 3	\$21,000	\$26,500
Fountains		
Restore Maintenance 3	\$30,000	\$35,000
Bridgeheads		
Expenditure Totals	\$178,250	\$213,750

Service restored to 8 additional locations. Total served locations is 27 Services provided by Park Bureau FTEs Watering restored to 181 irrigated locations 188 locations do not receive City funded services No regular maintenance on PDOT street trees

Maintenance possible at \$300K

SAL Services Retained at \$300K	Estimated Annual
	Expenditures

	<u>FY 01-02</u>	FY02-03
217 Street Area Landscape sites	\$ 593,000	\$100,000
167 Transportation Maintenance sites	\$ 38,000	\$ 5,000
Total	\$ 631,000	\$105,000

The 02-03 funding level will in effect place the system in a "mothballed" status. Irrigation will not be provided. However, fixed costs to place water and electrical systems on standby and to provide irrigation system locates are approximately \$20,000 annually. Minimal maintenance will be provided by Park Bureau staff as follows:

SAL Services Retained at \$105K	Estimated Annual Expendi <del>tures</del>
Mowing 19 locations until brown - includes Omaha, Ainsworth, Firland, Roseway & Reedway park blocks	\$30,000
Turf/Landscape Maint 3 Bridgeheads - Sellwood, Ross Island, Hawthorne	\$30,000
Turf/Landscape Maint. – 3 Fountains - Car Wash, Kelly, Campbell Memorial	\$21,000
Emergency Tree Service on complaint basis	\$4,000
Mothball Utility Services	\$20,000
Expenditure Totals	\$105,000

Discontinued Services:

xxx locations will not receive any programmed maintenance services, resulting in loss of plant inventory and irrigation infrastructure, sight distance problems from overgrowth, and unsightly conditions from litter and weed invasion. Discontinued services include:

-Litter Removal	-Weed Control
-Hard Surface Cleaning	-Mulching
-Leaf Removal	-Maintenance to PDOT owned street trees
-Edging of Turf and Groundcovers	-Mowing and Fertilization

## **Alternative Funding Proposal**

Identify an additional \$300,000 **from where?** to fund SAL work at the minimum service level for FY 02/03. The funding could "bridge" the service level, reducing loss of valuable plant inventory, as well as provide resources to retain Park Bureau employees until permanent alternative funding solutions are found for either Parks and/or Transportation services.

Minimum Service Level Bridge FY02/03: \$400,000:

- Standard service provided to 51 locations
- Irrigation restored to 181 sites to preserve plant infrastructure
- 333 sites receive inspection and remediation of hazards
- No programmed maintenance of PDOT street trees

SAL Services "Bridged" at \$400K	Estimated Annual
	Expenditures
Mowing 19 locations	\$32,000
Turf, Landscape Maint – 3 bridgeheads	\$30,000

Turf, Landscape Maint – 3 Fountains	\$21,000
Emergency Tree Service	\$4,000
Restore water & utilities to 181 SAL sites	\$60,000
Continue new plant establishment at 2 locations	\$10,000
Restore maintenance to 5 major park blocks	\$100,000
Restore maintenance to 19 median locations on arterial streets	\$107,000
Inspect/remediate hazards	\$36,000
Expenditure Totals	\$400,000

Both PDOT and the Park Bureau recognize the value of properly maintaining the entire inventory of Street Area Landscape sites. If alternative funding can be secured by FY 03-04, the recommended Standard Service Level should be funded at \$1.1 million. This service level would provide:

- Scheduled standard maintenance to 202 sites, including site inspections, turf care, litter removal, plant pruning and tree care.
- Scheduled minimum maintenance to 182 sites, including site inspections and remediation of hazards.

#### Alternative Methods of Maintaining Non-Served locations

Services may be supplemented through use of the Sheriff's crews.

Meet with the supervision of the Sheriff's crews to determine what services they could provide and on what frequency and cost. Start with the current standard level of service document.

Neighborhood volunteers adopt locations for maintenance.

Develop an adopt-a-landscape program. Outline what kinds of maintenance things that neighborhood volunteers are allowed to do on PDOT locations. Organize this through the Neighborhood Coalition offices. Might require a partial subsidy for the neighborhood volunteer coordinator's position. Use Neighborhood Coalition office volunteer coordinators to intake neighborhood adopt-a-landscape proposals. Assign a PDOT liaison to work with Coalition office coordinators. Evaluate SAL locations for volunteer safety. Determine a list of SAL-locations that can be adopted by volunteers. Neighborhood Coalition offices have liability insurance covering neighborhood associations for volunteer activities. Insurance indemnifies the City against claims.

## Negotiate agreements with Business for SAL locations in their area.

The City already has some maintenance agreements in place with local community and business groups. Pattern agreements after existing agreements with Hollywood District or St. Johns boosters. Business contacts familiar with this problem have suggested PDOT leverage our limited dollars by paying for things, like watering. Agreements need to be negotiated and managed.

It is unknown whether any of these methods will be effective.

# Wolf, Bev

1

From: Sent: To: Subject: Talley, Roger Wednesday, July 10, 2002 8:04 AM Nyquist, Jeanne; Johnson, Randy SAL Inventory Listed by Type

Sabe

Here is the list sorted by device. There are some locations marked Delete at the end of the list. I did not cut them from the file because I want to make sure we know that they should be deleted before they are eliminated from our records.



\*

STATUS	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	DESCRIPTION 2	IRR	STREET	TYPE
				TREES	
CC	N Omaha Parkway	N. Omaha, Killingsworth to Lombard	M	Yx	Park BLK
CC	NE Ainsworth Blocks	NE Ainsworth, MLK Blvd to NE 33rd Ave.	M	Yx	Park BLK
CC	NE Roseway Blocks Parkway	NE Roseway Parkway, Sandy Blvd to Prescott	M	Yx	Park BLK
CC	SE Firland Parkway	SE 72nd & Foster	A	Yx	Park BLK
CC	SE Reed College Parkway (Reedway Blocks)	SE Reed College Parkway, Tolman St to Crystal Springs Blvd	M	Yx	Park BLK
N	SE Hawthorne Bridgehead - East End Ramps		N	N	Bridgehead
CC	SW Hawthorne Bridge (@ Madison, Jefferson & Main)		AU	Y	Bridgehead
CC	SW Macadam - West end of Sellwood Bridge		N	Y	Bridgehead
CC	SW Ross Island Bridge Interchange (@ Hood)		P	Y	Bridgehead
С	SW Campbell Fountain, 18th & Burnside		Mx	?	Fountain
С	SW Car Wash Fountain - Transit Mall		A/Mx	?	Fountain
С	SW Kelly Fountain -Transit Mall		Mx	?	
ССМ	Airport Way Phase I	NE Holman to 138th	A	Y	Fountain
CCM	Airport Way Phase II	NE 138th to 181st			Median
CCM	E Light Rail Williams - Sandy / NE Holladay St		A	Y	Median
Х	N Emanuel Circle		A	Yx	Median
N	NE Convention Center - Hassalo/Multnomah Connec	\ \	P	Y	Median
CC	NE Hayden Island - Tomahawk Drive Medians		N	N	Median
CCM	NE MLK-San Rafael to Lombard		A	Y	Median
CC	NE Sandy Blvd, 102nd to 122nd		P	Y	Median
CCM	NW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to North		A	Y	Median
CCM	SE Powell - 50th to 92nd		A	Y	Median
CCM	SW Arthur St Median - First to 4th		A	Y	Median
CCM	SW First - Harrison to Arthur		Р	Y	Median
CCM	SW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to Harrison		Р	Y	Median
CCM	SW Harrison St Median - Front to 4th		A	Y	Median
CCM	SW Lincoln Median - First to 4th		Р	Y	Median
CCM	SW Macadam - Bancroft to Willamette Moorage Blva		Р	Y	Median
CCM	W Burnside Median 1st to Park		AU	Y	Median
CCM	Convention Center-Holladay Off Ramp I-84		P	Y	Median
CC	Convention Center-River Overlook		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	E Burnside - 90th to 94th		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
X	E Harbor Drive (Oregon to Wheeler)		N	Ν	Traffic Control Device
N	E Light Rail Williams-Sandy, Holladay Renovation		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	Minnesota & I-5		A	N	Traffic Control Device
C	N Clarendon Cul-de-sac - Clarendon School		A	Ν	Traffic Control Device
X		School Safety Project	A		Traffic Control Device
^ N	N Columbia & Oswego N Columbia Blvd, Buchanan to Oswego		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N			P	Ν	Traffic Control Device
N	N Concord & Going	N Going, I-5 to Greeley	Р	N	Traffic Control Device
N	N Delta Park Interchange		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N		N Going, I-5 to Greeley	N	N	Traffic Control Device
	N Going St Interstate Noise Barrier	N Going, I-5 to Greeley	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	N Greeley & Interstate		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	N Ida - Willamette to Lombard - NTMP		N	Ν	Traffic Control Device
CC	N Jessup & Williams		N	?	Traffic Control Device

Page 1

~

\*

N	N Kerby & Failing Traffic Div (near Unthank Pk)*		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	N Marine Dr @ Gantenbein		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCU	N Marine Drive @ N Harbour Condos		N	Ŷ	Traffic Control Device
Х	N Marine Drive Grnwy, I-5 to Rivergate - Phase I		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	N Mason & Gantenbein		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	N Mocks Crest Triangle	N Willamette & Wabash	M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	N Overlook Triangle (@ Shaver)		P	N	Traffic Control Device
CCU	N Portsmouth & Newark	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	N Prescott & Albina		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	N Smith-Columbia Way/Fessenden-A-NTMP #7C Curl	o Ext	N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	N Smith-Others-B-NTMP Medians	@Tyler & Buchanan	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	N St. Johns Bus.DistrBurlington Av. & Philadel		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	N St. Johns Bus.DistrLombard & Richmond		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	N Sumner/Haight Device (N Iris Ct. Apts)	N Iris Ct. Apts	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
Ν	N Vancouver & Portland Blvd	School Safety Project	M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	N Vancouver Way		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	N Wall & Willamette		P	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	N Willamette & Portland Blvd - NTMP #4		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCU	N Williams & Killingsworth		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCU	N Williams & Portland Blvd		N	Ý	Traffic Control Device
CC	N Willis & Emerald - Peninsula School	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Glisan & 39th	Coe Circle	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE 21st - Regents & Siskiyou		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE 24th - Siskiyou & Klickitat		N	N	Traffic Control Device
PU	NE Ainsworth & Albina			1.1	Traffic Control Device
PU	NE Ainsworth & Kerby				Traffic Control Device
PU	NE Ainsworth & Mallory				Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Alameda & 38th		AU	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Alameda & Regents		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Alberta & 14th Place		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
nx	NE Alberta & 6th - King School	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Arena Project	,	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Brazee & 21st		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Brazee & 24th - NTMP #4		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Brazee & 47th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Brazee @ 37th Ave		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Broadway & 25th (Fred Meyer)		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Broadway & 26th (Fred Meyer)		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Broadway & 27th (Fred Meyer)		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Bryce & 33rd		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
PU	NE Buffalo & Albina		A0	ſ	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Clackamas & 28th	NE Hollywood - New FM	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Clackamas & 33rd	Banfield	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Clackamas & 33rd (Turf)	Banfield	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	NE Clackamas & 53rd		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Convention Center - 15th/16th - Mult & Broadway	,	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Convention Center - Clackamas & 15th		A		Traffic Control Device
		1	N	N	Traffic Control Device

.

CC	NE Convention Center - Lloyd to 16th	S of Lloyd Cinemas	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Convention Center - Multnomah, 13th-16th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Cook & 7th - NTMP #5		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE East end of Steel Bridge (Light Rail)		N	N	Traffic Control Device
Х	NE Fargo Court & 162nd		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Fremont & 18th - Sabin School	School Safety Project	N	. Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Fremont & 7th - Curb Ext - NW corner - NTMP #5		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Fremont & Fremont Dr - NTMP #4		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - 86th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Duddleson		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Dyer		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Siskiyou		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Gertz & 13th	Truck Trap	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Graham & 7th - NTMP #5		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Grand & Everett	Banfield	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Grant PI & 35th - NTMP #4		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Grant PI & 36th - NTMP #4		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Halsey & 102nd		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Halsey & 112th		Р	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Halsey & 28th	NE Hollywood - New FM	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Halsey & 39th	Banfield	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Halsey & 68th	Banfield	A	Ý	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Halsey & 80th	Banfield	A	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Halsey & 81st	Banfield	N	N	Traffic Control Device
CCMU	NE Hassalo & 37th	Medians and Curb Extensions	Y	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCMU	NE Hassalo & 39th	Medians and Curb Extensions	Y	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Hassalo & 53rd		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCMU	NE Hassalo & Imperial	Medians and Curb Extensions	Y	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCMU	NE Hassalo & Peerless Pl	Medians and Curb Extensions	Y	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Hollywood District - NE 39th & Sandy		N N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Hollywood District - NE 42nd & Sandy		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Hollywood District - NE 45th & Sandy		M	Ý	Traffic Control Device
Х	NE Hollywood District - NE Broadway, 41 Pl, 42nd		AU	Ý	Traffic Control Device
Х	NE Hollywood District - NE Halsey & 42nd		AU	?	Traffic Control Device
Х	NE Hollywood District - Street Trees, Rest of Pots		N	Ý	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Holman & 13th		P	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Holman & 34th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Holman & 37th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Holman & 41st		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Hoyt & 57th	Banfield	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Jonesmore/Broadway @ 68th to 77th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
СС	NE Killingsworth & 14th Place		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Klickitat & 33rd		AU	Y	
CC	NE Klickitat Mall - 11th to 12th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Klickitat Mall - 12th to 13th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Klickitat Mall - 13th to 14th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Klickitat Mall - Entrance to 11th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device Traffic Control Device

N	NE Lombard & 33rd		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Lombard & 42nd		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Mason & 19th - Landscape & triangle @ base		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Mason & 19th - West of 19th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
ССМ	NE MLK-Broadway to San Rafael		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Morris & 7th - NTMP #5		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Multnomah & Imperial		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Oregon & 122nd		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
nx	NE Oregon & 60th				Traffic Control Device
N	NE Pacific & 21st	Banfield	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Pacific & 22nd	Banfield	N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Portland Blvd & 33rd		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Prescott & 15th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Russell & 7th - NTMP #5		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Sacramento & 7th - NTMP #5		M	Ý	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Schuyler & 28th	NE Hollywood - New FM	M	Ŷ	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Schuyler & 32nd	NE Hollywood - New FM	M	Ŷ	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Senate & Hassalo	Banfield	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Senate & Sandy	Banfield	N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Shaver & 17th - Sabin School	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Siskiyou & 33rd		AU	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Thompson & 17th		P	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Thompson & 21st - NTMP #4		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Thompson & 24th - NTMP #4		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Thompson & 47th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Thompson @ 37th Ave		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Tillamook & 16th		P	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Tillamook & 24th - NTMP #4		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Tillamook & 7th - NTMP #5		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Wasco & 28th	NE Hollywood - New FM	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Weidler & 24th	NE Hollywood - New FM	M	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Weidler & 28th	NE Hollywood - New FM	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Weidler at 102nd		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Wiedler & 24th A - NTMP #6C		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Wiedler & 24th B - NTMP #6C		M	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Wistaria & 41st		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Wistaria & 42nd - NTMP #6D		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Wistaria & 47th A - NTMP #6B		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NE Wistaria & 47th B - NTMP #6B		M	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Wistaria & 49th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NE Wistaria @ 37th Ave		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NW Burnside & 23rd- 25th		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	NW Cornell & Westover		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
Х	NW Couch & I-405 @ 15th & 16th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NW Everett & Front (Steel Bridge Interchange)		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NW Front & Nicolai (trees & wells)		A	Y N	Traffic Control Device
N	NW Hoyt & 9th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device

.

N	NW I-405 Nicoli-Vaughan		?	N	Traffic Control Device
СС	NW Marshall & 25th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
Х	NW Nicolai/Yeon Intersection - 3 trees		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	NW Overton & 25th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NW Pettygrove & 25th - Chapman School	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	NW Quimby & 25th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NW Quimby & 29th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	NW Raleigh & 26th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NW Raleigh & 27th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
Х	NW Transit Mall Extension		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
Х	NW Vaughan Trees/Wells		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	NW Wilson & 29th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	NW Yeon & Front (Overpass)		N	N	Traffic Control Device
Х	NW Yeon & Nicholai to St. Helens		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 11th & Carruthers	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 11th & Grant	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE 122nd - Martins to Ramona	Springwater Corridor & Medians	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 12th & Carruthers	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 12th & Clay	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 12th & Elliot	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 12th & Grant	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 12th & Harrison	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 12th & Mill	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 12th & Stephans	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 12th/Mulberry/Market	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 13th & Belmont & 13th	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 14th & Belmont	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 15th Stark	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE 17th, McLoughlin to Nehalem	•	AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE 82nd-Harney to Crystal Sprgs Blvd	Springwater Corridor & Medians	A	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE 92nd - Knapp to Knapp Pl	Springwater Corridor & Medians	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Alder & 15th	Western Edge	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Ankeny & 32nd		Р	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Ash & 12th	Western Edge	M	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Ash & 16th	Western Edge	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Brookside Dr/SE 117th Pl	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Bybee & 17th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Bybee & 27th - Golf		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Carruthers & 30th	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Claybourne & 17th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Clinton & 23rd	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Clinton & 31st	Division Corridor	M	Ŷ	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Clinton & 36th	Division Corridor	M	Ý	Traffic Control Device
Х	SE Clinton & 39th	Division Corridor	M	Ý	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Clinton & 45th	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Clinton & 47th	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Division - 8th & 9th (tree wells)		N	N	Traffic Control Device

Х	SE Division - Schiller on 82nd		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Division & Elliot & 12th, Curb Extension		?	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Duke & 78th - Woodmere School	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Eastmoreland B, 37 & Bybee - NTMP #6A		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Eastmoreland C, 34th & Bybee - NTMP #6A		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Elliot & Birch	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Flavel - 87th to 89th	Springwater Corridor & Medians	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Foster - 103rd PI to 106th	Springwater Corridor & Medians	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Foster & 94th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Foster on 90th		Р	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Foster Rd - Woodstock & Henry Str		M	Ν	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Gladstone & 28th Pl		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Gladstone & 30th		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Gladstone & 34th		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Gladstone & 37th		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Grant & 30th (North)	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Grant & 30th (South)	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Harold & 17th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Harold & 97th - SE Lents School	School Safety Project	AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Harold/Foster-52nd to 72nd, Median at 52nd		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
X	SE Harrison & 26th	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Harrison & 37th	Division Corridor	M	Ý	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Harrison & 41st	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
X	SE Hawthorne & 12th	Division Corridor	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Henry & 97th		A	Ý	Traffic Control Device
P	SE Holgate & 78th - Marysville School	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Johnson Creek Blvd & 45th - Sprngwtr Corr	Springwater Corridor & Medians	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CU	SE Knapp & 13th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Knapp & 17th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Ladd & Lavender Traffic Diverters		M	Ý	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Ladd & Palm Traffic Diverters		M	Ŷ	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Ladd Circle		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Ladds & 20th - Curb Ext, Trees/wells		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Laurelwood Triangle		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Lincoln & 32nd	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Lincoln & 37th	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
Х	SE Lincoln & 39th	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Lincoln & 43rd	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Lincoln & 46th	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Lincoln & 51st	Division Corridor	M	Ý	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Lincoln & 55th (East)	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Lincoln & 55th (West)	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Lincoln & 58th	Division Corridor	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Madison & 13th	Western Edge	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Main & 14th	Western Edge	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Market & 117th	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Market @ 32nd & 30th - Edwards School	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device

N	SE McLoughlin & 17th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE McLoughlin & Milwaukee		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Milwaukie & 17th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Morrison & 103rd		N	N	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Oak & 15th	Western Edge	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Pine & 14th	Western Edge	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Powell & 28th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Powell & 7th	END CARE CONTRACTOR FOR CARE AND A CONTRACTOR AND A CONTRAC	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Powell & 9th - North		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Powell & 9th - South		N	N	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Powell & Milwaukie		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
Х	SE Powell, Trees & Wells, Ross Is. Bridge to 50th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Salmon & 13th	Western Edge	М	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Salmon & 16th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Salmon & 27th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Sandy & Ankeny/11th		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Scott Dr & 65th - Greenleaf		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Stark & 103rd		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Stark & 108th	Park 51	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Stark & 16th	Western Edge - Curb Ext.	N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Stark & 52nd - Glencoe School	School Safety Project	AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Stark & I 205 Ramp		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Stark @ 16th/18th	School Safety Project	M	N	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Steele & 49th	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Steele & 92nd (north)- Lents School	School Safety Project	AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Steele & 92nd (south)- Lents School	School Safety Project	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Tacoma - 28th to 32nd		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Tacoma/McLoughlin Interchange/Nehalem	Nehalem St. Closure	AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Taylor & 14th	Western Edge	M	Ý	Traffic Control Device
CCM	SE Water Ave LID		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Waverleigh & 33rd		P	N	Traffic Control Device
CCP	SE Woodstock & 41st		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCP	SE Woodstock & 44th		A	Ý	Traffic Control Device
CCP	SE Woodstock & 49th		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCP	SE Woodstock & 51st		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Woodstock & 72nd		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Woodstock on 90th		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Woodstock on 97th		M	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SE Woodward & 56th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	SE Woodward & 58th		M	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Alder & 15th		A	N	Traffic Control Device
X	SW Barbur Bike Path - Miles to Hamilton		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Barbur/Terwilliger I-5 Interchange	Terwilliger & Canby	A	Ý	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Bertha/Barber - Vermont	,	N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Boones Ferry & Terwilliger		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Boones Ferry/Taylors Fry - NTMP #7A		P	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Broadway - 4th to 6th		A	Y	Traffic Control Device

CCM	SW Burnside & Tichner		N	Ν	Traffic Control Device
СС	SW Capitol Highway / Terwilliger		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Carl Place		N	N	Traffic Control Device
СС	SW Clifton & Park		AU	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Collins Circle (18th & Jefferson)		A	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Corbett-South		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Dosch & Beaverton-Hillsdale		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Harbor Dr & Clay Triangle		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Harbor Drive		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Highland & US 26 (Zoo)		Р	N	Traffic Control Device
CC		Northwest section	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Jackson & 6th (Bike Path)		Р	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Lt Rail, Madison & Portal, Phase III		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Macadam-Tay.Fer.Rd.Pt.,B/S Islands, Virg.Str.		Р	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Madison - 5th to 6th		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Modusch - office office SW Moody St Extension		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Patrick Place		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Patton Place	SW Patton/Talbot/Greenway	M	Y	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Portland Center (Front, Market & Harbor Dr)	SW Fallon/Tabol/Oleenway	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Sherwood Place (on Fairmont)		N	N	Traffic Control Device
	SW Sylvan-Climbing Lane		A	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCN			N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Taylors Ferry & Terwilliger - NTMP #7A		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Terwilliger & Taylor's Ferry		M	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SW Terwilliger Blvd Parkway	literation of the Constitution		N	
CC	SW Terwilliger Islands, Phase II	Homestead - Capitol	N		Traffic Control Device
N	SW Thomas & 53rd			N	Traffic Control Device
Х	SW Transit Mall (Madison-Burnside, 5th & 6th)TREES		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
СС	SW Tyrol Circle		N	N	Traffic Control Device
Ν	SW Vermont 45th to 50th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
CC	SW Virginia north of Taylors Ferry - NTMP		AU	N	Traffic Control Device
Ν	SW Vista Avenue Bridge		P	N	Traffic Control Device
Х	W Light Rail SW 500 (tree wells & trees)		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
CCM	West Side Corridor Lt. Rail Extension - Jefferson	Jeff-18th-Morr-Yamhill	A	Y	Traffic Control Device
Х	West Side Corridor Lt. Rail Extension - Jefferson - trees	Non-irr trees on Morrison & Yamhill	N	Y	Traffic Control Device
N	158th, Sandy to Marine Drive		N	Y	Traffic Control Device
Ν	Convention Center-Lloyd Ext @ 11th, North		A?	Ν	Traffic Control Device
N	Convention Center-Lloyd Ext @ 9th & Oregon, North		A?	N	Traffic Control Device
N	Convention Center-Lloyd Ext West side		A?	N	Traffic Control Device
N	Convention Center-South side of Lloyd		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	E Light Rail - East of Sandy Blvd		N	Ν	Traffic Control Device
N	N Denver, McClellan & Kirkpatrick		N	Ν	Traffic Control Device
N	NW Light Rail 700		N	Ν	Traffic Control Device
N	NW Luray Terrace Circle		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Henderson 42nd to 45th		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Marquam Ramps, Water Ave - Phase I		N	N	Traffic Control Device
N	SE Marguam Ramps, Water Ave, Esplanade - Phase I		N	N	Traffic Control Device

<	Bark		N	Ν	DELETE
J	N Beech & Borthwick		N	Ν	DELETE
1	N Going St Interstate Noise Barrier - Rough Mow	N Going, I-5 to Greeley	N	Ν	DELETE
1	N Greely & Interstate (Sidewalk Strip)		A	N	DELETE
J	N Marine Drive Grnwy, I-5 to Rivergate - Phase II,		N	N	DELETE
1	NE 148th/ Sandy-Marine Dr.			Y	DELETE
U	NE Ainsworth, Albina - Interstate				DELETE
1	NE Broadway & 30th	NE Hollywood - New FM	N	Ν	DELETE
1	NE Convention Center-MLK		A?	Ν	DELETE
1	NE Fremont to Prescott on 15th -ATCP		N	Ν	DELETE
1	NE Grant Place - 35th		M	N	DELETE
1	NE Halsey & 69th	Banfield	N	Ν	DELETE
1	NE Hancock - Fremont @ 7th (Curb Ext) - NTMP #5		N	Ν	DELETE
1	NE Hayden Island Drive - Medians		A	N	DELETE
1	NE Hollywood - New Hollywood Fred Meyers		M	N	DELETE
1	NE Killingsworth & Lombard (Portland Hwy)		N	Ν	DELETE
1	NE Multnomah & 122		M?	N	DELETE
1	NE Shaver & 17th		M	Ν	DELETE
١	NW Cornell Rd Collector		N	N	DELETE
(	Renovation		N	Ν	DELETE
>	SE 17th, Harold - Milwaukie Islands		N	Y	DELETE
<	SE Division & 82nd Tree Wells		N	Y	DELETE
V	SE Eastmoreland A, Curb Extensions - NTMP #6A		Μ	N	DELETE
V	SE Harold/Foster-52nd to 72nd, B - NTMP		N	Ν	DELETE
V	SE Johnson Creek, 32nd to 45th		N	Ν	DELETE
1	SE Market - 96th - 122nd		N	Y	DELETE
V	SE Milwaukie, Ogden - Kelly		N	Y	DELETE
V	Street Area Landscapes Locations		N	Ν	DELETE
N	SW Burnside & Tichner		N	Ν	DELETE
CC	SW Terwilliger, Sam Jackson to Homestead, Phase I		N	Ν	DELETE
N	Transit Mall Rehabilitation		N	N	DELETE

# MESSAGE CONFIRMATION

06/21/2002 12:51 ID=MAINT. BUREAU

DATE	S,R-TIME	DISTANT STATION ID	MODE	PAGES	RESULT	
06/21	00'16"	95032568665	ТХ	01	OK	0000

06/21/2002	12:50	MAINT. BUREAU →	95032568665	NO.505	<b>P</b> Ø1

ĩ

# **BOM Turf Sites**

Site	Currently mowed by
SW Hawthorne Bridgehead	Parks
SW Market, Clay, Harbor Dr. Triangle	Parks
SW Ross Island Bridgehead	Parks
SE Firland Pkway	Parks
SE Reedway Blocks	Parks
NE Ainsworth Blocks	Parks
NE Glisan & 39 <sup>th</sup>	Parks
NE Roseway Blocks	Parks
N Omaha	Parks
NE River Overlook	Contractor
NW Everett & Front	Contractor
SW Clifton & Park	Contractor
SE Scott Dr & 65th	Contractor
SE Stark & 108 <sup>th</sup> Traffic triangle	Contractor
NE Alameda & 38 <sup>th</sup>	Contractor
NE Arena Triangle	Contractor
NE Clackamas & 33 <sup>rd</sup>	Contractor

Asset	Түре	Qty	ACREAGE
Bridgehead • Hawthorne, Sellwood, Ross Island, Ste	SAL el	4	14
<ul><li>Park Block</li><li>Omaha, Ainsworth, Firland, Roseway Reedway</li></ul>	SAL	5	22
Fountain Landscape Medians Traffic Control Devices	SAL SAL SAL	3 17 187	1 12 20
Subtotal	SAL	216	70
Roadside Vegetation Control	TMS	168	100
Grand Total		384	170

## TRANSPORTATION LANDSCAPE INVENTORY

SAL Street Area Landscape Site.

Previously maintained by Park Bureau through I/A with PDOT until 7/1/02

TMS Transportation Maintenance Site.

Maintained by Bureau of Maintenance, including mowing, brushcutting, weed control, wildflower lots, pedestrian areas.
• TMS: The Maintenance Bureau provided a minimal level of service to 168 sites including inspection, brush control and mowing for fire prevention and visibility. Some of the sites were converted into low maintenance wildflower lots.

In November of 2000, Maintenance and Park Bureau staff completed a review of the Street Area Landscape program. The report outlined the following optional service levels:

- Minimum Service Level \$400,000 Provide scheduled inspection of all 384 sites and repair only the most serious hazards. Not recommended.
- Recommended Standard Service Level \$1.1 million Provide programmed maintenance to all 384 sites with standard service level to 202 priority sites; minimum service level to remaining 182 sites.

PDOTs financial condition made it impossible to fund even the minimum service level, resulting in significant service reductions for FY 02/03.

<b>REDUCED SERVICE LEVEL</b>	FY 02-03		
216 Street Area Landscape (SAL)		<u>FY 01-02</u> \$ 593,000	<u>FY02-03</u> \$ <del>105,00</del> 0
<b>168 Transportation Maintenance</b>	(TMS) sites	<u>\$ 191,700</u> 38	\$ 84,000 105
Total	58	\$ 784,700	\$189,000
	810	631,	105

#### **SAL Services**

The SAL system will, in effect be placed in a "mothballed" status, with most services discontinued. 12 locations will receive reduced services, while 204 sites will not receive any programmed maintenance, resulting in loss of plant inventory and irrigation infrastructure, sight distance problems from overgrowth, and unsightly conditions from litter and weed invasion. Discontinued services include:

-Litter Removal-Weed Control-Hard Surface Cleaning-Mulching-Leaf Removal-Maintenance to PDOT owned street trees-Edging of Turf and Groundcovers-Mowing and Fertilization

Following is a description of minimal services to be provided for the SAL program:

expenditure history # 105 # Bridge #700 #1.1 # 105 # Bridge #700 #1.1

# Street Area Landscape Funding / Service levels very Poor Alternative 1 Alternative 1 Alternative 1 Alternative 1 Alternative 1 Alternative 1 Alternative 1

200

		0 - 0	FILL		/	/	
	<b>00/01</b> <sup>l</sup>	01/02	02/03	Bridge	Póor	Fair	Good
Funding	\$810K	\$631K	\$105K	\$400K	\$800K	\$1.2 M	\$2M
Service Level	# sites	# sites	# sites	# sites	# sites	# sites	# sites
Desired	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Standard	29	0	0	29	29	202	182
Minimum	179	208	12	0	179	182	0

No Routine Maintenance

Hazard Elimination	72	72		187	72	0	0
No Service	96	96	372	168	96	0	0



· for 1 \*

Street Arca Landscape Funding Service Levels

	00/01	01/02	02/03	Bridg	e Poor	Fair	Good
Funding	\$ 810K	\$631K	#105 K	#400K	\$ 800 K	\$1.2M	
ServiceLevel	# SILLES	#5(+e5	# SITES	# 51405	# SITES	# SI Kes	#2M #Sites
Desired	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Standard	29	0	0	29	29	202	182
Plannom	179	208	12	0	179	182	0 -
No Routine Maintenance	0				1		
Hazard Elimination	72	12		187	72	0	0
No Service	96	96	372	168	96	0	0





Progress is at 3/08/01



PORTLAND OFFICE OF TRANSPOR Estimated 1999 Rose Festival C	
Traffic, signal, and parking control; barricading; striping; and cleanup for Grand Floral, Starlight, and Junior parades and other official events	\$ 61,297
Ship docking assistance	\$ 30,242
Total	\$ 91,539

Note: Costs include a \$5,111 interagency with the Parks Bureau for PIR striping.

Per This cale was warded way that by bruary estions time the questions time the questions time the questions time the guestion time the gu Updated 2/16/00

#### EXPLANATION

The Rose Festival Association pays the standard Class D fee for each major event (the 3 parades, etc.). This fee was established to capture the City's administrative costs, police costs, and maintenance costs for coordination, planning and implementation. The fee was last set in 1996. All other fees to the RFA for Rose Festival associated parade activities are waived per Council Ordinance(s). Cynthia Warren writes these ordinances and manages this process on behalf of the City.

Transportation issues a few meter hoods for parking free of charge, as part of the Rose Festival parade activity. Staff time consists of parade route traffic/parking control coordination, planning and implementation, and assistance with ship docking (for all ships). BTSM also writes a few permits to various independent vendors media, etc., for parking and street use associated with Rose Festival associated parades/events. These have been issued at no charge, because they have been associated with Rose Festival parade events.

Transportation bureaus do not separate Rose Festival Association costs from overall Rose Festival event costs. Transportation does not directly promote or support the Rose Festival Association or the US Navy through permit issuance.

Starlight GFP 62 pass Skaters htor DOX barb Pecycling BoyScouls APP PGE morepolite public 1 Sofa 1 incident w/chair



## CITY of PORTLAND

Charlie Hales, Commissioner Bureau of Maintenance Jeanne E. Nyquist, Director 2929 N. Kerby Avenue Portland, Oregon 97227 (503) 823-1700 FAX (503) 823-4043

Date: June 13, 2000

To: Rose Festival Committee Willie Washington From: Willie Washington Maintenance Bureau

Subject: 2000 Parade Cleanup

I am pleased to report that the 2000 Rose Festival Parade cleanup project was very successful, thanks to the combined efforts of volunteers and City staff which were supported by the following organizations:

Portland General Electric, PGE Stop Oregon Litter and Vandalism, SOLV Portland Police Bureau Association for Portland Progress Oregon Recycling Systems Waste Management The Trash Masters Heilberg Garbage & Recycling

The purpose of this memo is to report on the activities and support for each parade and to thank everyone involved for their participation. I have attached a copy of the amount of debris picked up from the Starlight and Grand Floral Parades. The Junior Parade debris wasn't taken to Waste Management, therefore we do not have numbers for it yet. As you will notice the total garbage produced at both parades is down approximately 9% from 1999 parades. Total recoverable recyclable from both parades is down approximately 7% from 1999. A lot of this may be due to the fact that the Grand Floral Parade had a lot of rain, although there were record crowds at the Starlight Parade. I will have the actual cost of the cleanups at a later date. **2000 parades produced more lose, non-recyclable garbage than the 1999 parades**.

cc: Jeanne Nyquist Roger Talley Kc Christensen Linda Johnson Scott Weaver Mike Boyle

## WASTE MANAGEMENT OF OREGON

#### 2000 ROSE FESTIVAL PARADES GARBAGE/RECYCLING REPORT

2000 Starlight Parade		2000 Grand Floral Parade	2000 Startight & Grand Floral Parades Summary	C
	Weight in Pounds	Weight in Pounds	Weight in Pounds	ے بن ن ن ح بن ن ک
Garbage in-bound	<b>594</b> 0	6600	12540	r r
Bottles & Cans All Paper & Cardboard SOLV Bags Total Recyclables	535 920 381 1836	594 524 <u>322</u> 1840	1129 1844 <u>703</u> 3676	
Number of SOLV Bags	3795	3200	6995	
Garbage Out-bound	4104	4760	8864	
Recycling %	30.92%	27.87%	29.31%	

NOTES: Total garbage produced at both parades is down approximately 9% from 1999 parades. Total recoverable recyclables from both parades is down approximately 7% from 1999. 2000 parades produced more lose, non-recyclable garbage than the 1999 parades.

151/9R

7000

F Ŀ 0 t



I appreciated your timely response to my letter regarding leaf removal. However, many of the "points" in your response have added to my agitation and re-enforced my strong belief that most of you don't understand the issues and you rarely address these issues rationally or objectively. In the latter portion of your response you state, quote, "the leaf removal program is very popular within the few neighborhoods that are served by it", however, in the third sentence of your letter you refer to the "numerous" neighborhoods with heavy leaf fall served by the city! Come on, which is it? You can't have it both ways. It is clear by your "flip-flop" and "Spin" you will justify your position by any means possible. By the city's own accounting, there are 17 neighborhoods designated as heavily treed, you mentioned the 17 leaf districts in your letter. Is this 17, a few neighborhoods? Exactly how many neighborhoods make up the 17 "leaf districts"? Are these terms's interchangeable, leaf district and neighborhood? I am really disappointed in your lack of candor, it's double speak and SPIN!

There is another "point" you make in the second paragraph that seems ludicrous. Your quote, " it is important to remove fine particles from the street, as these will enter and clog the storm sewer system more easily than large particles that impact street appearance". Wha-wha what? You will have to explain this one to me. We always taught our kids not to throw large particles or things in the sink, because it might clog the drain, I never found any problems with the small particles. How do small particles "clog" storm drains? Furthermore, if what you say is true, why are dozens of commercial landscape and yard maintenance companies in our city allowed to spew grass clippings, dirt, leaves and all other forms of small yard debris into the streets via 200mph leaf blowers? On my little street alone, there are 3 different neighbors with 3 different vard service companies, all of which when finished with lawn mowing and trimming, blow the debris into the street and then leave!!! I have never heard or read of any city employee speaking out on this. The only time I hear or read about this matter is when the city finger points at the residential homeowner (taxpayer) in the heavily treed neighborhoods/districts. It's OK for the commercial guys but not us taxpayers? Wow!

Of course, being a dedicated bureaucrat, you have to drag out the tried and true, " the city is in a serious financial dilemma", well, join the crowd. I am sorry, but one of your reasons for the city's financial difficulty is in you own words "increased vehicle fuel efficiency"! This is laugh out loud, funny! I thought we were all supposed to <u>get rid</u> of our gas guzzling SUV's? I guess not in the City of Portland. Gee, maybe we can make the national news again, as the only city that <u>encourages</u> gasoline consumption because it helps the revenue picture, so the city can continue picking up leaves. I am sorry to be so sarcastic, but none of your responses suggest any type of problem solving or positive suggestions, it is jam-packed with justifications and finger pointing and whining.

Additionally, I did not write or E-mail you for the benefit of just my neighborhood as you suggest in your response. You will please note the fact that I referred to the 17 neighbothoods.

Please provide me with a copy of the city budget that details the street cleaning and leaf removal missions, and include numbers of vehicles and or necessary equipment. Please include salaries and wages for the various workers and administrators that are associated with the overall task. I would appreciate the information prior to the Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association meeting on December 20,2001.

Best regards,

Dennis E. Larson

cc: Mr. Dave Newton, President, Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association

November 26, 2001

Dennis E. Larson 3503 SE Henry Portland, OR 97202

Dear Mr. Larson:

I have received your e-mail via Mr. Johnson. Thank you for expressing your concerns about the leaf removal program.

There are numerous neighborhoods in the City with mature street trees that are affected by heavy leaf fall. The Bureau of Maintenance takes the livability of the City of Portland very seriously and makes every effort to keep the City clean all year round. We pick up over 20,000 cubic yards of leaves from the first of October through the end of January (a four-month period). Most of these leaves are collected in17 leaf districts, where the leaf drop is so heavy that specially equipped crews are required to clean the streets. In addition, a great number of leaves are collected through leaf depots and regular street sweeping activities in other neighborhoods. In addition to the leaves picked up during the fall, the Maintenance Bureau picks up an additional 27,000 cubic yards of debris from the streets between the end of January through September.

You are correct that the streets are scheduled for regular cleaning throughout the year. All areas in the City of Portland deserve basic services. Although sweepers clean on routinely scheduled routes, if the route does not need sweeping, the operator continues on to where more attention is needed. Sweeping benefits water quality, as well as the appearance of the street. It is important to remove fine particles from the street, as these will enter and clog the storm sewer system more easily than large particles that impact street appearance.

I do not agree with you that the City sweeps residential streets unnecessarily. The street sweeping program has been cut repeatedly over the past several years. We used to sweep all residential streets 12 times per year. The neighborhoods looked great, and there was minimal debris flowing into our stormwater system. Today we sweep residential streets approximately four times per year. There has been an impact to our stormwater collection system, and I am frankly ashamed of how filthy many of our neighborhoods are. Understandably, we receive many complaints from neighborhoods demanding more service.

The City is in a serious financial dilemma. The gas tax is the funding source for street maintenance, including street cleaning and the leaf removal program. Unfortunately, the gas tax is not indexed to inflation. We have not had an increase in the gas tax in over 10 years. The combination of inflation, unfunded regulatory mandates, and increased fuel efficiency has seriously reduced our revenue. Our current funding level is not enough to maintain the City's transportation system.

Reluctantly, I have recommended additional cuts in the residential sweeping program, as you suggested. These cuts will have an impact on all neighborhoods in the City. Unfortunately, I have also had to recommend deep cuts in basic maintenance to the City's street infrastructure, including pavements, structures, signage and landscaping.

I understand from your email that your greatest concern is to retain the leaf removal program in your neighborhood. The City Council will make the final decision on service cuts. They understand that the leaf removal program is very popular within the few neighborhoods that are served by it. We are not recommending a cut in the program at this time. This could be reconsidered if our financial situation, or other pressures worsen.

I'm glad that citizens like you appreciate the leaf removal program. I hope you will help us communicate our message to your neighbors by encouraging them to cooperate with our efforts by removing their vehicles from streets on leaf removal days and by refraining from placing leaves or yard debris from private property in the street.

If you have further questions regarding the City Of Portland's Street Cleaning program feel free to call Randy Johnson at 823-4659 or me at 823-1798.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Nyquist Bureau of Maintenance Director

cc: Randy Johnson

#### Nyquist, Jeanne

From:	Johnson, Randy Monday, November 26, 2001 4:12 PM Nyquist, Jeanne FW: blowing grass debris into streets???
Sent:	Monday, November 26, 2001 4:12 PM
To:	Nyquist, Jeanne
Subject:	FW: blowing grass debris into streets???

#### Here's another one

-----Original Message-----

From:	Boyle, Michael
From: Sent: To: Subject:	Monday, November 26, 2001 12:47 PM
To:	Johnson, Randy
Subject:	FW: blowing grass debris into streets???

-----Original Message-----

From:	Mills, Michael
Sent:	Monday, August 06, 2001 9:11 AM
To: Cc:	Boardman, Sandy
Cc:	Christensen, KC; Boyle, Michael; Chiao, Becky; Rice, Robbie;
	VanOrden, Paul; Phillips, Jackie; Mock, Michael
Subject:	RE: blowing grass debris into streets???

Sandy: If this is being addressed, by either Transportation or the Noise Control office, I do not see a need for us to get involved, at least not at this time. Thanks, Michael (Mills)

-----Original Message-----

From:	Mock, Michael
From: Sent: To: Cc:	Friday, August 03, 2001 5:04 PM
To:	'DE Larson'
Cc:	Christensen, KC; Boyle, Michael; Boardman, Sandy; Mills, Michael;
	Chiao, Becky; Rice, Robbie
Subject:	RE: blowing grass debris into streets???

Dear Mr. Larson:

Thank you for the clarification.

I tried to indicate to you that I was seeking help in addressing your concern about blower applications, but

have to admit that I, and other city workers I consulted, thought your issue was focused on what a leaf blower was called. Unfortunately, some citizens have written to Mayor Katz with lesser concerns.

As I stated in my last email to you, I have directed your question to the Office of the Ombudsman. I am also waiting for a response from the Maintenance Division of the Office of Transportation. Since I am also forwarding this email to them, they may take interest in knowing more about the companies you refer to.

Sincerely, Michael Mock

## Nyquist, Jeanne

From:Johnson, RandySent:Monday, November 26, 2001 4:13 PMTo:Nyquist, JeanneSubject:FW: Hello

-----Original Message-----

From:Boyle, MichaelSent:Monday, November 26, 2001 12:49 PMTo:Johnson, RandySubject:FW: Hello

This was the last e-mail shared with Mr. Larson.

-----Original Message-----

From:	Boyle, Michael
From: Sent: To:	Tuesday, October 02, 2001 4:11 PM
To:	'Larson, Dean'
Subject:	RE: Hello

Hello Mr. Larson. Everything seems to be going well. Thank you for asking.

Mike Boyle

503-823-4659

-----Original Message-----

From:	Larson, Dean [mailto:DLarson@wm.com]
Sent:	Tuesday, October 02, 2001 3:56 PM
From: Sent: To: Subject:	'michael.boyle@trans.ci.portland.or.us'
Subject:	Hello

I just wanted to drop you a note to see how everything was going. I trust everything is going well.

Dean Larson

503-331-2240

#### Nyquist, Jeanne

From:	Johnson, Randy
Sent:	Johnson, Randy Monday, November 26, 2001 4:11 PM Nyquist, Jeanne FW: Leaf Blowing into the Street
To:	Nyquist, Jeanne
Subject:	FW: Leaf Blowing into the Street

Hoere one>

-----Original Message-----

From:	Boyle, Michael
From: Sent: To: Subject:	Monday, November 26, 2001 12:48 PM
To:	Johnson, Randy
Subject:	FW: Leaf Blowing into the Street

-----Original Message-----

From:	Mock, Michael
From: Sent:	Wednesday, September 12, 2001 4:36 PM
To:	Boyle, Michael; Boardman, Sandy
Cc:	Ames, Betsy; Mills, Michael
To: Cc: Subject:	RE: Leaf Blowing into the Street

I wonder why he didn't want to "rat" on the commercial yard services he has complained about?

Ask him that, Mike. (I'm not going to!)

-----Original Message-----

From:	Boyle, Michael
Sent:	Wednesday, September 12, 2001 4:01 PM
To:	Mock, Michael; Boardman, Sandy
From: Sent: To: Subject:	FW: Leaf Blowing into the Street

Michael and Sandy:

I think, even though I will be in Street Maintenance, I will look for Mr. Larson to be cleaning his leaves into the street and hope that the rest of the city that does not get this gold plated service rises up and leaves him with his leaves. I have vented and now I feel better.

Mike.

-----Original Message-----

From:	DE Larson [mailto:dennisl@hevanet.com]
From: Sent: To: Subject:	Wednesday, September 12, 2001 12:48 PM
To:	Boyle, Michael
Subject:	Re: Leaf Blowing into the Street

Dear Mr. Boyle,

Obviously in light of current national events, this is of minor consequence, however, I have to take advantage of the time I have to respond to your E-mail of 9-8-01. I really find it reprehensible that you would ask me to "report" to the city the neighbors and the yard services they use, so you may or may not "educate" them! Your other point, about talking to my neighbors about this problem is

a non issue on our street. We all have talked to each other about the travesty of the city telling us not to rake or blow leaves into the street and then we watch, ALL YEAR LONG, as the commercial landscapers blow all sorts of yard debris into the streets. BALDERDASH!

I jog in and around Berkley Park and Westmoreland Park several times a week and observe city personnel and parks personnel blow and rake leaves into the street, so, before you start asking me to "rat on" neighbors, perhaps you should take stock of your own "house"!!!!!

I can't wait to start blowing my leaves into Southeast Henry street, just like the commercial "boys", I will relish every minute of it!

Best regards,

Dennis Larson dennisl@hevanet.com

----- Original Message -----

From:	"Boyle, Michael" < <u>Michael.Boyle@pdxtrans.org</u> >
To:	<dennisl@hevanet.com></dennisl@hevanet.com>
From: To: Cc:	"Mock, Michael" < <u>mmock@ci.portland.or.us</u> >; "Boardman, Sandy"
	<sandy.boardman@pdxtrans.org></sandy.boardman@pdxtrans.org>
Sent:	Saturday, September 08, 2001 2:39 PM
Sent: Subject:	Leaf Blowing into the Street

#### Dear Mr. Larson:

I apologize for the time it has taken for someone to get back to you. As you indicate in your e-mail, enforcement is the issue. Although we at Bureau of Maintenance may hand out copies of the applicable City Code, we are not deputized to do anything about violations. We view our role as educating the violator. If we see someone blowing their yard debris into the street we may stop and speak with them about Code and what it means

for

the rest of the City. I sincerely doubt that a call to the Police Bureau would result in an officer coming to the scene of the crime (blowing grass cuttings, etc., into the street) and issuing a citation. I believe the event would have to be egregious to an extreme for such to occur. What we can control is where we pick up leaves. When I have been faced with a homeowner that has put yard debris (in sufficient quantity to warrant our attention) we have notified the owner that we will not pick up the leaves

in

front of the home until the non-recyclable materials have been removed. I believe that we can also notify the Nuisance Division of the Bureau of Buildings about the problem and they have the ability to cite property owners for depositing debris in the street.

Mr. Larson, if you could notify me of the days that yard service is performed at your neighbors homes I will ask our supervisors to spend some time in the area and see if they can observe and educate the offenders. addition, if you are presented with the opportunity to educate your neighbors about the violations being committed by their yard service companies I hope that you would tell them. Portland is a big city and only if we all work together can we hope to meet with success in keeping our streets clean. Hopefully this answers your question. If I can be of further assistance please contact me by e-mail (michael.boyle@trans.ci.portland.or.us) or call me at 503-823-4659.

-----Original Message-----

From: DE Larson [mailto:dennisl@hevanet.com] Sent: Sunday, September 02, 2001 3:16 PM To: Mock, Michael Subject: Re: blowing grass debris into streets???

#### Dear Mr. Mock,

It has been a month since you informed me that "someone" from the city or one of the offices you outlined below would be in contact with me

## regarding

the blowing of yard debris into and onto city streets.

Let me clarify my question, maybe it will help move this along. I live in a portion of the city that receives leaf removal twice during the late fall period. Usually one removal in November and a second removal in December.

#### We

receive door-hangers from the city with pre-determined dates for the removals. Imprinted on these door-hangers is a strongly worded warning to the effect that raking or blowing leaves onto city streets or right of

#### ways

is against city ordinances and can result in a fine. This is my question:

1

witness, almost daily, commercial yard services blowing leaves, grass clippings, dirt, dust and general yard debris into city streets. Three of these commercial yard services do yards on my street, and ALL of them blow the grass and sidewalk debris into the street when they finish mowing the yard. How do they get away with that, all year long, and us lowly property taxpayers are subject to a fine for blowing leaves into the street a

#### couple

Dennis E. Larson 3503 SE Henry 503-777-2464

In

-----Original Message-----

From:	DE Larson [mailto:dennisl@hevanet.com]
From: Sent: To: Subject:	Friday, August 03, 2001 3:57 PM
To:	Mock, Michael
Subject:	Re: blowing grass debris into streets???

Dear Mr. Mock,

QUOTE ...

"I can think of many times, for example, when

I have used a chair as a ladder, a pipe wrench as a hammer or a rake as a tool for retrieval."

Whatever your point was in the quote above, totally escapes me. The 3 scenarios have zero impact on anyone elses enviornment. Using "leaf" blowers to move dirt, dust, twigs, grass clippings, wrappers, and other debris only moves the material on to someone elses property or the street, and makes it their problem. The flying debris degrades air and noise quality.

Futhermore, why is it that when the notice comes in the fall from the City of Portland announcing the dates for leaf removel, there is a BOLD FACED portion of the notice informing us that by city ordinance it is unlawful to place leaves or other yard debis into city streets. I observe 3 different commercial lawn care companies blow yard debris onto my street every week after they mow and edge the neighbors yards!!! Why is it OK for them and not for us lowly taxpayers????

Please, no more inane remarks.

Dennis E. Larson

SAC

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## TRANSPORTATIN MAINTENANCE SITES

Presented March 12, 2003

By Tanna Goff, Colette Hubert, and Nicole Sams

#### **Project Results**

After a considerable amount of careful research and accurate data collection the Transportation Maintenance Sites have now been correctly identified and cataloged into three books and three lists. The team collected and entered data for each site that included the correct address, description, map book #, digital pictures, level of priority, visits per year, square feet, irrigation, street trees, vegetation, traffic control, weed control, number of islands and remarks. The Transportation Maintenance Sites (TMS) include corrected working lists that will be put into an efficient route book format for the Bike Paths, Brush Cut/Spray Areas, Mow Lots, and Pedestrian Areas. The Transportation Maintenance Sites also include all the Street Area Landscape sites, which the Bureau of Maintenance is now responsible for as a result of BOM not funding the Park Bureau to continue maintenance on PDOT streetscapes. The lists could only be corrected after researching Inter-Agency Agreements to determine that some sites have become property owners responsibility and that other sites no longer existed.

We have determined eight different types of inventory sites for the Transportation Maintenance Sites shown in the outline below. These categories will effectively define Transportation Maintenance Sites as a whole. Through these categories new and planned sites can be put into BOM inventory.

1

Outline of entire Transportation Maintenance Sites	page 2
Recommendations	page 3
Resources	page 3

#### 2003 TRANSPORTATION MAINTENANCE SITE INVENTORY

#### CATEGORY RECOMMENDATION OUTLINE

Bike Paths	Total	14
off street travel ways for bikes and pedestrians		
<b>Brushcut / Spray</b> machine mowing to remove overgrown vegetatin that impairs drainage or impacts motor vehicle opertator safety	Total	230
<b>Contract/Sheriffs Crew</b> larger medians and islands in Right of Way and are in high traffic areas	Total	43
<b>Drive-By Inspection</b> sites which are mainly concrete and require little to no maintenance	Total	16
Mow Lot	Total	138
any landscaping area that rrequires mowing.		
Park Bureau park like landscapes in high visibility areas, requiring frequent visits and higher levels of service	Total	14
<b>Pedestrian Area and Walkway</b> landscaping areas in Right of Way, usually involving the whole Right of Way, and usually containing trails or strairs.	Total	175
Street Landscapes ie: traffic calming circles, islands, and triangles, curb extensions, bridge ends, dead end/sound wall plantings	Total	170
<b>Deleted</b> sites that are property owners responsibility, no longer exist or have been duplicated	Total	105
Transportation Maintenance Sites	Total	800

## Recommendations

Brief list of ideas to consider for future development

- Designated Transportation Maintenance Site program coordinator/community outreach specialist to be the liaison for the Bureau of Maintenance and the other sources for outside funding and maintenance of these sites
- Art sites: created by a variety of sources such as schools, local artists etc., then to be placed by the BOM
- Very low maintenance vegetation grasses and decorative rock
- Concrete stamping, and coloring
- Business and Neighborhood Association alignment with BOM to form Adopt-A-Transportation Maintenance Site program
- Let individuals, senior and youth groups, religious and civic organizations, and businesses take over sites, have a designated sign made for them to advertise their group example: "This Transportation Maintenance Site made beautiful by ......" with date
- Target larger regional and national businesses
- Grant writing
- Media involvement to educate the public about the current budget situation
- Contest for Best Site, maybe quarterly, semi-annually, or annually

#### Resources

Compiled information in various books, etc. all located in Reference Library in the Street Cleaning Division

Transportation Maintenance Sites Book (sites that were BOM responsibility already) 80 Total Sites after deletes made Completed March 10, 2003

Transportation Maintenance Sites Books 1 and 2 Originally Street Area Landscape (sites contracted out to Parks now BOM responsibility) 214 Total Sites after deletes made Completed March 7, 2003

Transportation Maintenance Sites Agreements Book (will be completed by March 14, 2003)

Transportation Maintenance Sites Identified in a designated Map Book

Computer database of Transportation Maintenance Sites inventory information with pictures Wall Map with Transportation Maintenance Sites identified in the Street Cleaning Division area (completed December, 2002)

## Interoffice Memo

Date:7/24/02To:Brant WilliamsFrom:Jeanne NyquistSubject:SAL

Good news. I checked with Sandy Peterson. Our year-end numbers are looking better than projected. Sandy discovered some encumbrances that actually were already paid. So, we should be able to contribute \$100K to the SAL solution. It would be great if you would match us so we could fun the SAL to at least the 300K level. Here's a quick description of what we could buy at the various funding levels.

Service Description	\$100K	\$200K	\$300K	\$400K
5 park blocks – mow 'til brown	Х	X	X	X
Omaha, Ainsworth, Firland, Roseway, Reedway				
3 bridgeheads – minimal landscape maint.	X	X	X	X
Sellwood, Ross Island, Hawthorne				
3 Fountains landscape maint.	X	X	X	X
Car Wash, Kelly, Campbell Memorial				
Emergency tree service complaint basis - \$4K	X	X	X	X
will only take care of one tree				
Mothball irrigation/utility services -\$20K	X	X	X	X
Restore water to all 181 irrigated sites		X	X	X
Respond to complaint calls		Х	X	X
Additional mowing to park blocks,	2	Х	X	X
bridgeheads listed above as result of irrigation				
19 medians – major arterials –			X	X
inspect/remediate hazards				
19 medians – major arterials – restore				X
maintenance - litter removal, plant care, trimming,				
on routine cycle				
187 sites – respond to complaints				X

Please keep in mind that I'm giving an educated (?) guess as to the services these various funding levels would support. I'm meeting Monday with Mary Huff from Parks to discuss this issue.

Date:	July 22, 2002
То:	Commissioner Francesconi
From:	Jeanne Nyquist Maintenance Director
Subject:	Transportation Landscape Maintenance

PDOTs adopted 2002-03 budget reduces funding for maintenance of transportation-related landscape assets by 83%. The purpose of this memo is to provide you with background on management of this asset, service impact of the current budget cut, and options for restoring services.

## BACKGROUND

.

Beginning in the 1980's, Portland's transportation system underwent major changes. Along with a desire to accommodate alternative methods of travel, there was an initiative to build devices to calm traffic and create pedestrian friendly streetscapes. Islands, traffic diverters, circles, curb extensions and boulevards were built throughout Portland to enhance safety and livability. Nearly all of these devices have landscape components.

The maintenance of the Street Area Landscapes (SAL) has been funded and managed in a variety of ways over time. Since approximately 1990, PDOT provided funding for the program. The Park Bureau initially maintained all of the sites through an I/A with PDOTs Maintenance Bureau. During the 1990s, a number of sites were removed from the I/A to reduce costs. These were transferred to the Maintenance Bureau's inventory and received a very low level of care as Transportation Maintenance Sites (TMS). The combined SAL and TMS inventory now totals 384 sites encompassing approximately 170 acres (see attached summary of inventory) with maintenance responsibility (prior to 02/03) divided as follows:

• SAL: The Park Bureau provided maintenance to 216 landscaped sites. The standard service level included site inspections, turf care, litter removal, leaf removal, plant pruning and tree care. The program was funded at \$850,000 in the mid-90's, but had been reduced to \$598,000 by FY01-02.

• TMS: The Maintenance Bureau provided a minimal level of service to 168 sites including inspection, brush control and mowing for fire prevention and visibility. Some of the sites were converted into low maintenance wildflower lots. The program was funded at xxx, but had been reduced to xxx by FY01-02.

In November of 2000, Maintenance and Park Bureau staff completed a review of the Street Area Landscape program. The report outlined the following optional service levels:

- Minimum Service Level Provide scheduled inspection and repair hazards.
- Standard Service Level Provide programmed maintenance to include litter removal, weed control, hard surface cleaning, mulching, leaf removal, edging of turf and groundcovers, mowing and fertilization, and maintenance to PDOT owned street trees.
- Desired Service Level Provide programmed maintenance as described in Standard Service Level, as well as higher level of plant care and replacement of deteriorated infrastructure such as irrigation systems and hard surface features.

The report recommended that the program be funded at \$1.1 million to provide the standard service level to 202 sites and the minimum service level to 182 sites.

PDOTs financial condition made it impossible to fund even the minimum service level for FY02-03, resulting in elimination of service to all but a few of the highest priority sites.

## **REDUCED SERVICE LEVEL** FY 02-03

	FY 00-01	FY02-03	FY03-04
216 Street Area Landscape sites	\$752,000	\$593,000	\$0
<b><u>168</u></b> Transportation Maintenance sites	<u>\$ 58,000</u>	<u>\$ 38,000</u>	<u>\$105,000</u>
384 Total	\$810,000	\$631,000	\$105,000

The result of the budget cut is that all 384 sites will be transferred to the Maintenance Bureau's inventory and treated as Transportation Maintenance Sites (TMS). Fixed costs to place irrigation and utility systems on standby total nearly \$20,000 annually, leaving very limited funding for maintenance services. Only 12 high priority locations (bridgeheads and park blocks) will receive limited service. The remainder of the system will not receive any programmed maintenance, resulting in loss of plant inventory and irrigation infrastructure, sight distance problems from overgrowth, and unsightly conditions from litter and weed invasion.

Memo To Commissioner Francesconi July 19, 2002 Page 3

## **Service Alternatives**

The 02-03 funding level does not support adequate landscape maintenance and does not allow PDOT or the Park Bureau to meet requirements of several agreements for maintenance of landscaping in business areas such as the Central, Hollywood and St. Johns business district. We are examining alternative ways of providing some services including:

- Increasing use of community service and/or inmate crews to provide service to non-sensitive areas, such as bridgeheads and medians. We are currently conducting a pilot project with Multhomah County Sheriff's crews.
- Establishing an "adopt–a-landscape" program for neighborhood volunteers or court mandated community service workers to perform landscape maintenance in neighborhood areas. We have initiated discussions with ONI to determine the feasibility. This may require a partial subsidy to provide resources for ONI to help organize volunteers.
- Negotiating agreements with business associations to maintain SAL sites in their area. The City already has some maintenance agreements in place with local community and business groups. We have made initial contacts with some of the business associations. PDOT may be able to leverage limited dollars by funding some services, such as irrigation, in exchange for site maintenance.

Even if all of the alternative service methods prove successful, the 02/03 budget of \$105,000 does not provide enough money to leverage the alternative services, and will result in sporadic, inconsistent levels of maintenance.

## **ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVELS**

Both PDOT and the Park Bureau recognize the value of properly maintaining the entire inventory of Street Area Landscape sites. Our long-term goal is to provide funding to adequately maintain an expanding inventory. The following table summarizes service levels and funding for 3 fiscal years 01 - 03 and projects costs for 4 alternative service levels. This information is also depicted on an attached graph which summarizes system condition at each of the funding levels.

	00-01	01-02	02-03	Bridge	Poor	Fair	Good
FUNDING	\$810K	\$631K	\$105K	\$400K	\$800K	\$1.2m	\$2M
SERVICE LEVEL	#sites						
Desired	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Standard	29	0	0	29	29	202	182
Minimum	179	208	12	0	179	182	0
Hazard Elim. Only	72	72	0	187	72	0	0
No Service	96	96	372	168	96	0	0

Memo To Commissioner Francesconi July 19, 2002 Page 4

## Service Level Bridge for SAL Program FY02/03: \$400,000:

For the short term, we need to identify an additional \$300,000 to maintain the inventory at the minimum service level for FY 02/03. The funding could "bridge" services, reducing loss of valuable plant inventory until permanent alternative funding solutions are found for either Parks and/or Transportation Bureaus. Under this scenario, the following services would be provided:

- Standard service provided to 29 locations
- 187 sites receive inspection and remediation of hazards
- Irrigation restored to preserve plant infrastructure
- No service to 168 sites
- No programmed maintenance of PDOT street trees

#### Service Level: Poor - \$800,000

If alternative funding can be secured for Transportation Services for 03-04, we recommending restoring the landscape inventory to at a "poor" level of appearance. This level of funding would accomplish the following:

- Standard service provided to 29 locations
- Minimum service provided to 179 locations
- 72 sites receive inspection and remediation of hazards
- No service to 96 sites
- No programmed maintenance of PDOT street trees

#### Service Level: Fair - \$1.2 million

If alternative funding can be secured for both Transportation and Parks services for 03-04, we recommend that maintenance be increased to achieve a "fair" level of appearance at most sites. This level of funding would accomplish the following:

- Standard service provided to 202 locations
- Minimum service provided to 182 locations

## Service Level: Good - \$2M

A funding level of \$2 million is required to maintain the entire existing inventory in "good" condition. This should be considered a future goal and is not recommended at this time, considering other competing priorities for limited funding. This level of funding would accomplish the following:

- Desired service provided to 202 locations
- Standard service provided to 182 locations

Memo To Commissioner Francesconi July 19, 2002 Page 5

## NEXT STEPS

We appreciate the opportunity to discuss this issue with you. If you approve, we will work to identify possible bridge funding to preserve some landscape services for FY02/03. In addition, we will continue working with your office to discuss the possibility of future alternative funding sources for Transportation and/or Parks Bureaus to restore adequate maintenance to the combined inventory of 384 sites.

Cc: Transportation Director City Forester

Asset	Type	Qty	ACREAGE
Bridgehead Hawthorne, Sellwood, Ross Island, Steel	SAL	4	14
Park Block Omaha, Ainsworth, Firland, Roseway Reedway	SAL	5	22
Fountain Landscape Medians Traffic Control Devices	SAL SAL SAL	3 17 187	1 12 20
Subtotal	SAL	216	70
Transportation Maintenance Site	TMS	168	100
Grand Total		384	170

## TRANSPORTATION LANDSCAPE INVENTORY

SAL Street Area Landscape Site. Previously maintained by Park Bureau through I/A with PDOT until 7/1/02

TMS Transportation Maintenance Site. Maintained by Bureau of Maintenance, including mowing, weed control, wildflower lots.

## **MEMORANDUM**

Date: August 12, 2004

To: Jeanne Nyquist Sam Irving

From: Randy Johnson

**Re:** Transportation Landscape Maintenance

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide you with background on management of this asset and service impact of current the budget (use of \$300K add package) on services.

#### Background

In the 1980's, Portland's transportation system underwent major changes. Along with a desire to accommodate alternative methods of travel, there was an initiative to build devices to calm traffic and create pedestrian friendly streetscapes. Traffic islands, diverters, circles, curb extensions, and boulevards were built throughout Portland to enhance safety and livability. Nearly all of these devices have landscape components.

The maintenance of these sites has been funded and managed in a variety of ways throughout the years. Since approximately 1990, PDOT provided funding for the maintenance of these sites. Initially, the Park Bureau maintained all of these sites through an inter-agency agreement with the Bureau of Maintenance. In fiscal year 92-93, a number of sites were removed from the inter-agency agreement and maintenance responsibilities were taken over by the Bureau of Maintenance. In fiscal year 02-03, the remainder of the sites were removed from the inter-agency agreement and maintenance responsibilities were taken over by the Bureau of Maintenance. At that time, a comprehensive inventory of the sites was completed to develop a database so that we could better manage this asset. This reconciliation documented a number of sites that had not previously been entered on the written inventory. An \$100,000 interagency agreement with the Park Bureau remained so they could respond to emergencies such as tree removal and provide other urgent services.

The total number of sites is constantly increasing as the assets are built. In 2003, prior to the Bureau of Maintenance taking over maintenance, there were a total of 384 sites or about 170 acres. Previously, the maintenance responsibilities were divided up as follows:

• Park Bureau - 216 Street Area Landscape (SAL) sites

These sites were maintained by the Park Bureau or contracted out for maintenance to non-city workers. The standard service level included site inspections, turf care, litter removal, leaf removal, plant pruning, and tree care.

• Bureau of Maintenance – 168 Transportation Maintenance Sites (TMS) The Maintenance Bureau provided minimal level of service on these sites. The standard level of service included inspection, litter removal, brush control, and mowing for fire prevention and visibility. Some of the sites were converted to low maintenance wildflower lots.

In November of 2000, BOM and Park Bureau staff completed a review of the maintenance of the sites. The report outlined the following optional service levels:

- Minimum Service Level \$400,000 Provide scheduled inspection of all sites and repair only the most serious hazards. Not recommended.
- Standard Service Level \$1.1 million Provide programmed maintenance to all sites with standard service level to 202 sites; minimum service level to the remaining 182 sites. **Recommended.**

PDOT's financial condition in fiscal 02-03 made it impossible to fund even the minimum service level, resulting in service reductions.

#### **Budget History**

	F/Y 97-98	F/Y 98-99	F/Y 99-00	F/Y 00-01	F/Y 01-02	F/Y 02-03	F/Y 03-04	<u>F/Y 04-05</u>
I/A	\$ 833,528	\$ 726,982	\$ 728,442	\$ 752,430	\$ 593,006	\$ 105,000	\$ 121,540	\$ 241,540
BOM	\$ 198,141	\$ 167,250	\$ 170,411	\$ 173,332	<u>\$211,880</u>	\$ 203,532	\$ 227,285	\$ 407,285
	\$1,031,669	\$894,232	\$ 898,853	\$ 925,762	\$ 804,886	\$ 308,532	\$ 348,825	\$ 648,825

## BRIDGING ESSENTIAL SERVICES FOR LAST OF F/Y 03-04

FY 02/03 budget cuts forced the Maintenance Bureau to maintain the Street Area Landscape (SAL) sites, historically maintained by the Park Bureau, because there was no funding to sustain the BOM/Parks inter-agency agreement. In an attempt to save money, the irrigation to all of the Street Area Landscape (SAL) and Transportation Maintenance Sites (TMS) was turned off. By September of 2003, the Bureau of Maintenance recognized that the loss of the plant inventory and the poor visual condition of many sites was unacceptable. At that time, we started to test and turn on irrigation to the most sensitive sites to minimize further loss of plant inventory. We then expanded the scope of work of an existing contract with the Multnomah County Corrections Office (MCCO) to provide maintenance services to some of the high visibility transportation sites that the Park Bureau turned back over to us. Once BOM took over the maintenance for the SAL and TMS sites, to avoid confusion we consider all sites as Landscaped Transportation Sites.

#### <u>300K ADD PACKAGE (04/05)</u>

The \$300,000 add package to increase Landscaped Transportation Site maintenance was accomplished by increasing the Park Bureau inter-agency by \$120,000 and by adding \$180,000 to Bureau of Maintenance activities. Bellow is a breakdown of the services provided by BOM & Parks.

## BUREAU OF MAINTENANCE SERVICE INCREASE (\$180,000) F/Y 04-05

The Bureau of Maintenance increased its services by expanding the scope of work of an existing contract with the Multnomah County Corrections Office (MCCO). The contract provided for maintenance and cleanup on some of our Landscaped Transportation Sites (\$75,000). In the fall of 2003, the water was turned back on to the irrigation systems, and \$65,000 was added back into the budget to pay for projected water usage for irrigation that had previously been cut. BOM had no budget to maintain its failing irrigation system. Thus, \$15,000 was added to the budget to

maintain the irrigation systems. An additional \$25,000 was added to the budget for materials and services for any emergency work required.

F/Y 03-04 F/Y 04-05 Increase									
<u>F/Y O3-0</u>	4	<u>F/Y 04-05</u>	<u>F/Y 04-05</u>						
Landscaped Transportatio	n Sites	Landscaped Transportation	Landscaped Transportation Sites						
Complaint driven only	un-funded	MCCO Sheriff's crew	\$75,000	\$75,000					
Water for irrigation	un-funded	Water for irrigation	\$65,000	\$65,000					
Irrigation Maintenance	un-funded	Irrigation Maintenance	\$15,000	\$15,000					
Re-vegetation Material	un-funded	Re-vegetation Material	\$25,000	\$25,000					
Weed Control (spray progra	am) \$71,263	Weed Control (spray progra	um) \$67,923	-\$3,340					
Mowing	\$71,956	Mowing	\$71,956	\$0					
Clean Trans. Sites	\$84,066	Clean Trans. Sites	\$87,406	\$3,340					
Total	\$227,285	Total	\$407,285	\$180,000					

#### BUREAU OF MAINTENANCE SERVICE COMPARISON F/Y 03-04 vs. 04-05

#### PARK BUREAU SERVICE INCREASE (\$120,000) F/Y 04-05

The Bureau of Maintenance increased it inter-agency agreement with the Park Bureau by \$120,000. In this agreement, the Park Bureau will maintain the four Downtown fountains that were previously maintained by the Bureau of Maintenance (\$33,000). The majority of the increase (\$62,000) was allocated to Urban Forestry for necessary tree maintenance in areas that are at risk of major tree damage due to neglect. The Ainsworth Park Blocks suffered significant loss of trees. Therefore \$25,000 was budgeted for tree replacement for this area alone.

F/Y O3-04	1/1 0	F/Y 04-05	Increase	
			Increase	
Horticultural Services		Horticultural Services		
Administration	\$5,000	Administration \$5,000	\$0	
Irrigation / locates	\$7,000	Irrigation / locates \$7,000	\$0	
<b>Emergency Tree Watering</b>	\$13,000	Emergency Tree Watering \$0	-\$13,000	
		Maintain (4) Downtown Landscapes:		
		Carwash Fountain \$7,000	\$7,000	
		Kelly Fountain \$11,000	\$11,000	
		Campbell Fountain \$8,000	\$8,000	
		• SW Hawthorne Bridgehead \$7,000	\$7,000	
Turf Services (mowing 10 sites)	\$28,040	Turf Services (mowing 10 sites)\$28,040	\$0	
Urban Forestry		Urban Forestry		
Emergency Tree Response	\$25,000	Emergency Tree Response \$25,500	\$500	
Tree Establishment	\$13,000	Tree Establishment \$13,000	\$0	
Light Rail Pruning	\$30,500	Light Rail Pruning/follow-up \$10,000	-\$20,500	
Light Kall Pruning	\$30,300		-\$20,300	
		Tree Replacement (Ainsworth Blocks)	# <b>2</b> 5 000	
		\$25,000	\$25,000	
		SW Macadam Tree Maintenance		
		\$45,000	\$45,000	
		Transit Mall Pruning \$30,000	\$30,000	
		Hollywood Pruning \$20,000	\$20,000	
Totals	\$121,540	\$241,540	\$120,000	

#### PARK BUREAU INTERAGENCY SERVICE COMPARISON F/Y 03-04 vs. 04-05

## SERVICE LEVELS FOR LANDSCAPED TRANSPORTATION SITES

The Bureau of Maintenance took the inventory of the Landscaped Transportation Sites and divided them into three categories: high priority sites, moderate priority sites and low priority

#### Page 4 of 5

sites. High priority sites are highly visible, with high traffic volume, and have a high hazard assessment. Crews work on these sites from BOM, Park Bureau, and Multnomah County Corrections Office (MCCO). Moderate priority sites are moderately visible, with moderate traffic volume and have a moderate hazard assessment. Work performed on these sites is primarily done by BOM. Low priority sites are low visibility, with low traffic volume, and have a low hazard assessment. Work performed on these sites is complaint driven and maintenance is provided only when hazards exist, or conditions are extreme. Work is performed typically by BOM.

#### SERVICE LEVEL TABLE F/Y 04-05

	and the second	HIGH PRIOF	RITY SITES	
(H	ligh visibilit	y, high traffic vol	ume, high hazard ass	essment)
ASSET	# of Sites	Maintained by	Annual Schedule	Type of Work
Bridge (Heads 2 each)	4	MCCO/Parks	3	Pruning, weeding, litter,
Medians-Arterial	23	MCCO	3	mulching, edging, limbing,
Park Blocks	5	MCCO/Parks	As needed	mowing, revegetation, site
Mow lots	37	BOM	3	reconstruction, leaf removal,
Pedestrian Sites	4	BOM/MCCO	As needed	chemical application, debris
Traffic Calming	29	BOM/MCCO	3	removal, hand and power
Devices				tool use, traffic control,
Water Fountains	3	Parks	As needed	irrigation maintenance
Total	105			
	N	<b>IODERATE PR</b>	IORITY SITES	
			ume, and hazard asse	
ASSET	# of Sites	Maintained	Annual	Type of Work
		by	Schedule	2
Roadside right of way	(300	BOM	2	Pruning, weeding, litter,
	miles)			mulching, edging, limbing,
Mow sites	125	BOM	3	mowing, revegetation, site
Pedestrian Sites	130	BOM	8	reconstruction, leaf removal,
Traffic Calming	19	BOM	2	chemical application, debris
Devices				removal, hand and power
				tool use, traffic control,
Total	274			Irrigation maintenance
gen and a second se				
	(Low visibi	LOW PRIOR lity, traffic volum	<b>TTY SITES</b> ne, and hazard assess	nent)
ASSET	# of Sites	Maintained	Annual	Type of Work
		by	Schedule	
Overpass landscapes	17	BOM	0	Non-programmed work.
Median-Other	5	BOM	0	
Traffic Calming	200	BOM	0	
Devices				
Total	223			

## **ALTERNATIVE MAINTENANCE APPROACHES**

The Bureau of Maintenance is continually looking for ways to stretch our budget. We are working on a pilot project for an "Adopt-A-Site/Road" program to encourage or allow citizens to assist in maintaining or picking up litter on suitable Landscaped Transportation Sites. An example of working with citizens on Landscaped Transportation Sites was the work completed in Coe Circle (Joan of Arc) at SE 39<sup>th</sup> and Glisan. The Bureau of Maintenance worked with the

#### Page 5 of 5

Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association to coordinate volunteer work for new planting around the statue.

Another example of the Bureau of Maintenance stretching our budget in addition to providing the community with a viable program is the use of the "Youth Futures Program". We have been utilizing this group to pick up litter and weed sites where they are not at risk while performing these tasks.

I greatly appreciate the support both Commissioner Jim Francesconi and PDOT Director Brant Williams have given to provide additional funding for maintenance of the city's Landscaped Transportation Sites. Without their support, our Landscaped Transportation Sites would be in much worse condition. However, if we are to continue to provide the City with clean, well-vegetated sites, we should recognize that we are currently funded at 63% of the 97-98 fiscal budget; with an inventory that has grown since that time.

Even with the additional funding for Landscaped Transportation Sites, we will be challenged to keep these sites in an acceptable condition. Most of our sites that receive maintenance will be limited to only three visits per year. This includes the high priority / high visibility sites along major arterial streets. The maintenance would consist of litter pickup, weeding, and minor trimming. The five residential Park Blocks mowed by the Park Bureau will continue to be mowed as needed. However, BOM will perform litter pickup, minor trimming, and edging on these sites 3 times a year.

There are 347 sites that do not receive regularly scheduled maintenance. These sites receive maintenance on a complaint driven basis. We respond only if there is an immediate hazard. At the current funding level, there is no scheduled maintenance for street trees. All work on street trees is reactive. Historically, all street trees on Landscaped Transportation Sites were on a three-year maintenance/inspection cycle. This is no longer being done. Fungicidal treatment for trees located on Landscaped Transportation Sites are not funded. There is no funding for vegetation inventory loss.

It is clear that the condition of our Landscaped Transportation Sites will continue to suffer due to insufficient funding for maintenance. I hope that Brant and Jim continue their support and understanding of the funding problem.

CC. Brian McNerney Kathy Murrin Gary Hill



## PORTLAND OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION BUREAU OF MAINTENANCE

SAU

Jim Francesconi, Commissioner Jeanne Nyquist, Director 2929 N. Kerby Avenue Portland, Oregon 97227 (503) 823-1700 FAX (503) 823-4043 TDD 823-6868

Williams Director Ju

**Eileen Argentina** System Management

Brant

Don Gardner Engineering & Development

**Jeanne** Nyquist Maintenance

**Richard** Steinbrugge Finance

Laurel Wentworth Planning

> Parks BOM

July 30, 2004

Charles D. Bates 4126 NE Wistaria Dr. Portland, OR 97212

Dear Charles D. Bates:

Mayor Katz has asked me to respond directly to you about your concerns regarding the condition of the traffic island located at NE 39<sup>th</sup> and Wistaria Drive. Thank you for showing your concern regarding livability of our community. Unfortunately, funding to maintain landscaped transportation sites have been dramatically reduced in recent years. Some sites have degraded and are in dire need of substantial work in order for them to be returned to pristine condition.

I have had this site evaluated. Crews have cleaned up the site, and one of the trees has been removed. I will notify Urban Forestry to replace the tree. I expect the planting to occur sometime this winter. The irrigation system had been checked and turned on earlier this season. The system is set to turn on three times a week. Other re-vegetation may occur as funding allows.

The following is a quick summarization of funding, budget history, Strategies for maintenance, and alternative maintenance approaches:

#### Funding

The maintenance of landscaped transportation sites has been funded and managed in a variety of ways throughout the years. Since approximately 1990, PDOT provided funding for the maintenance of these sites. Initially, the Park Bureau maintained all of these sites through an interagency agreement with the Bureau of Maintenance. In fiscal year 92-93, a number of sites were removed from the interagency agreement and maintenance responsibilities were taken over by the Bureau of Maintenance. In fiscal year 02-03 funding for the Park Bureau interagency was dramatically cut. Sites once maintained under the Park Bureau interagency were turned over to the Bureau of Maintenance, with no funding to support the maintenance. At that time, a comprehensive inventory of the sites was completed to develop a database so that we could better manage this asset. An \$100,000 interagency agreement with the Park Bureau remained so they could respond to emergencies such as tree removal and provide other urgent services.

#### **Budget History**

<u>F/Y 97-98</u>	<u>F/Y 98-99</u>	<u>F/Y 99-00</u>	F/Y 00-01	F/Y 01-02	F/Y 02-03	F/Y 03-04	F/Y 04-05
\$ 833,528	\$ 726,982	\$ 728,442	\$ 752,430	\$ 593,006	\$ 105,000	\$ 121,540	\$ 241,540
\$ 198,141	\$ 167,250	\$ 170,411	\$173,332	\$211,880	\$ 203,532	\$ 227,285	\$ 407,285
\$1,031,669	\$894,232	\$ 898,853	\$ 925,762	\$ 804,886	\$ 308,532	\$ 348,825	\$ 648,825

## **Strategies for maintenance**

In an attempt to save money due to the budget cuts made in FY 02/03, the irrigation to all of the Landscaped Transportation Sites was turned off. By September of 2003, the Bureau of Maintenance recognized that the loss of the plant inventory and the poor visual condition of many

Date: July 28, 2004

To: Sam Irving Randy Johnson Terry Kelsey

From: Kc Christensen

RE: Traffic Island at N.E. Wisteria and 39<sup>th</sup>

The following information is in regards to the Traffic Island at NE Wisteria and 39<sup>th</sup> (AKA 41<sup>st</sup>).

This site is a traffic-calming device at the intersections of 39<sup>th</sup>, 41, and Wisteria in NE.

- > We resumed responsibility for this Traffic Island from Parks in 02-03.
- In 2003 we visited this site a total of five times to weed, pick up litter, prune trees and shrubs, edge, remove leaves, and to pre-emerge (treat chemically for weed reduction).
- I believe that we visited this site due to complaints from citizens, but my cursory look through my 03 phone logs does not support this.
- We have not visited this site in 04. However, Roger Cole has checked the back-flow device, turned on the water, and turned on the controller to water the site three times a week for 15 minutes each start.
- The island is an old landscape. There have been several plants removed from the sites over the years. However, I would venture to say that this streetscape looks no worse, perhaps even better than some sites. Roger agrees with that assessment.
- This may be an appropriate site for adoption, as the vegetation is minimal, and the traffic pattern is low to moderate. It also has a curb on the west side of the island.

This site is in our SAL book. Book 2, Volume 2, page 204.

Please see attached photos, SWAMI map, and citizen letter.

Kc




4126 N.E. Wistaria Dr. Portland, OR. 97212

July 15, 2004

Hon. Vera Katz Mayor, City of Portland 1121 S.W. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 340 Portland, OR. 97204

Dear Mayor Katz:

There is a traffic island at the intersection of N.E. 39<sup>th</sup> and N.E. Wistaria Drive. I live at the other end of the block.

When the island was installed years ago, it was planted with trees and shrubs. An irrigation system was installed to water this sunny spot.

Over the years, the irrigation system has failed frequently. Most of the original plantings have died. The island is choked with tall weeds, which, in combination with the dead tree, will become a fire hazard in the near future.

My wife and I have made lots of contacts with various City agencies about this. They generally are helpful in the short run, but one or two passes through and the island is again a foster child shunted from agency to agency.

In the past, some of us in the neighborhood have removed weeds, and turned on the irrigation system when it worked. It's hard to keep up any enthusiasm for this now.

I'm sure the budget for this is tight, but the island really would look better if it were just paved over.

Thank you for your help.

Yours sincerely,

ranho DBattes\_

Charles D. Bates 503-284-0616

MM

14967

04 JUL 19 PH 1:17





Earl Blumenauer. Commissioner Transportation Engineering 1120 S.W. Fifth Avenue Room 802 Portland, Oregon 97204-1971 (503) 796-7004

OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION

## FAX TRANSMISSION

Date: _	3/21/90	Time: 4110	A.M	P.M. K
To:	Barbara Krieg			
ę	Barbara Krica Rookleinschmi	L		
From:	PONICOIRITATI			
Numbe	er of Pages (including thi	s one)		
<b>A</b>	ent:			
Comm	eat:		inne dh'fhang Manage Thaige tao chunan a' ann an bha an ba an bar a bha an bha an bha an bha an bha an bha an b	
				nau Paris, i naužinais (SPRAShan Parishina angli (SPRAS) (SPRAS) (SPRAS)
				an na an a barran an an air fa an an Afrikanan ann ainm ann an
			ander yn 'n maaan weder yn it maakt i met 'n minister yn 190 dat dat dat sam t	an and an internet of the state

Please call 503-796-7003, if you have any questions.

Our FAX Number is 503-796-7371



March 21, 1991

TO: Barbara Krieg Bureau of Maintenance

FROM: Ron Kleinschmit OCC Project Manager

RE: River Overlook History

You inquired as to the history of the River Overlook in connection the Oregon Convention Center Transportation Capital Improvements Program and Financing Strategy. Attached for your information is:

- 1988 Area Development Strategy Map designating the River Overlook / Park.
- · January 18, 1989 memo from Mike Lindberg, defining Parks priority
- for Overlook and Holladay Park.
- Excerpt for the Financing Strategy, March 1989. Transportation secured the funding for the Capital Improvements Program, including \$847,000 for the Overlook and Holladay Park.

You are partially correct in that Transportation has been involved in the actual development and creation of the Overlook, however, it is not driven by transportation needs. It is part of the total district plan including parks and open spaces.

In early 1988, transportation was co-signer of a Greenway Permit for the Greeley Ramps Project. Part of the requirements were to begin landscaping the edge to create the beginning of the Overlook. Transportation attempted to designate approximately \$80,000 of money available to further enhance the area in concert with the Greeley Project. The proposal fell apart when Parks desired to enter on the railroad right-of-way to do additional clearing and limb up the cotton wood trees. This was at a time when delicate negotiations were underway with the railroad to obtain other land for the Greeley Project.

Over the course of the next two years, transportation working with the railroad security personnel convinced the railroad to sell the other half of what is now the Overlook to the City. This was with the understanding that it would be used for open space, create a public activity and also eliminate a transient problem. ODOT agreed to issue a land use permit to create the remainder of what is now the Overlook.

During formation of the Enhancement Finance Strategy, Transportation identified the \$847,000 to support the Park's needs and development desires. This is the subject of the memo from Mike Lindberg. Also using the above funding, the plans and specifications for the project were prepared and signed by the City Engineer. Through an intergovernmental agreement, Transportation added the Overlook Construction to the Tri-Met work ongoing in the area...the project is nearly complete.

#### ranless

The last conversation I had with a Parks person concerning the future of the Overlook was, that if I could transfer all the right-of-way connected with it to Parks, they considered it a transportation element. Regardless, we upon final completion of the project, we will have accomplished what we set out to do, create an open space (and

a nice one at that), and one that is or will be a key link to the Greenway, eliminated a problem, and was a Parks and District priority.



Figure A — Area Development Concept

### CONVENTION CENTER TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

March 6, 1989

#### FINANCE AGREEMENT

#### CONVENTION CENTER TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

#### MARCH 6, 1989

We the undersigned do hereby commit our support to implementation of a public improvement program for the Convention Center Area substantially in conformance with the attached Exhibit "A". In so doing, we recognize that the scope and breadth of individual projects remains flexible and subject to the recommendations of the Policy Team and approval of the City Council, but that our mutual intent is to implement these improvements to the highest and best interests of the redevelopment of the district and to complement the public's existing investment in the Oregon Convention Center. To that end, we pledge our combined resources as outlined in the attached Exhibit "A". Recognizing that we as individuals may not possess sole authority to commut corporate or public resources to this end, we agree to seek and obtain such authority as is necessary within forty-five days of execution of this agreement. Should any party hereto, for whatever reason, choose not to fully participate as outlined in Exhibit "A", that action, by virtue of this agreement, shall be cause for the other parties to reduce their fiscal commitment by a commensurate amount. In any case, no such reduction will be accommodated by deletion of elemental projects described in Exhibit "A" and shall be made in a way which preserves the maximum integrity of the program in attempting to meet the stated goals and objectives. In addition to the program outlined in Exhibit "A", the parties understand public safety is a priority issue that will be addressed through a separate program.

By execution of this understanding and agreement, we pledge to one another our continuing support for the overall program and agree to work in good faith to achieve the objectives set forth in Exhibit "A".

Earl Blumenauer, Commissioner City of Portland

Ted Runstein ERC

MA Don Forbes

Oregon Department of Transportation

Larry Trover Lloyd Center

Loren Wyss

Tri-Met Milliam CEAt

Bill Scott Pacific Development

Harry Demotest Portland Development Commission

Tom Walsh Metro/OCC

#### CONVENTION CENTER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY March 6, 1989

#### REQUIREMENTS

Element	Budget Estimate (Millions)
Holladay/Union at O.C.C.	3 2327
Holladay, Union to 13th	5.106
Multnomah/Hassalo	0.787
Hotel Site Acquisition	4.300
16th Two-Way, 15th/16th Right-of-Way*	5.026 0.100
Williams/Hassalo Intersection	0.205
District Lighting	2.377
Overlook & Holladay Park	0.847
District Maintenance Projects	ODOT
General Contingency (4.7%) Program Total	<u>1.047</u> 322.322
Baseline Area Total	<u>11.381</u> \$33.703

"Railroad property purchase. Remainder donated in exchange for equal land area from street vacations.

1411 - 211 V



Mike Lindberg, Commissioner 1220 S.W. Fifth Ave. Portland, OR 97204 (503) 248-4145

January 18, 1989

Mr. Larry Troyer Lloyd Center Management Office 2201 Lloyd Center Portland, Oregon 97232

Dear Mr. Troyer:

It is my understanding that you will be meeting Friday, January 20, 1989, to discuss the Convention Center Enhancement Program. I would like to encourage you to endorse the Lloyd District Transportation Capital Improvements Program (Exhibit A), and specifically the improvement package for the River Overlook and Holladay Park.

The total improvement package will strengthen the district in such a way as to be vitally supportive of the Convention Center. The conventioneer must be "captured" by Portland and transformed from a one-time conventioneer into a repeat visitor. I know that this is everyone's goal. We all recognize that the Oregon Convention Center can only be a resounding success if the surrounding environment is safe and inviting and offers something unique to the visitor.

In this vein, it is not only important to strengthen the immediate area directly in front of the Oregon Convention Center but along Holladay to the east as well as west to the river and the downtown.

As you know, when this location was chosen for the Oregon Convention Center, the Mayor specifically cited the visual and physical links offered by this site over all others. He and others saw the visual connection to the downtown, the river connection and the rail connection east and west as a key attraction. We should not ignore this orientation particularly at these early stages.

Debbie Kennedy, Director of the State of Oregon Tourism Office, and I have discussed tourism strategies, including our plans for the Willamette River for development of the River Overlook, the Eastside Esplanade, the connection of OMSI, and eventually river taxi and tour boat marina docking at the base of the overlook. The possibilities are tremendously exciting and will be directly supportive of the Oregon Convention Center. The first step is drawing people to the river overlook. January 18, 1989 Page Two

I would call your attention to the program element which allocates approximately \$850,000, for Phase I improvements at the River Overlook and Holladay Park. I feel that this is a reasonable allocation and we should be able to accomplish our goals at both park locations. Each of these Phase I improvements plans should be implemented now as they are integral to the overall success of the Convention Center strategy.

Sincerely,

mike Lindberg

MIKE LINOBERG Commissioner Office of Public Affairs

MDL: 1mdb

D034



# PORTLAND, OREGON

CITY OF

Earl Blumenauer, Commissioner Bureau of Maintenance John D. Widmer, Director 2929 N. Kerby Ave. Portland, Oregon 97227 (503) 823-1700 FAX (503) 823-4043

Brian McNerney Bureau of Parks Building 106 Room 1302

Dear Brian,

As our Budget preparation draws to a close I want to express my appreciation for the time and effort you devoted to the development of our New Interagency. I know we all spent a great deal of time reviewing the documentation, visiting sites and reaching agreements and I think its' paid dividends. Although initially I had hoped to reduce the overall costs involved with the Interagency, I am still pleased with the results we've reached and the processes we've put into place.

Our efforts in transferring certain sites to Maintenance & adjacent property owners, reducing the existing inventory, and settling ownership and responsibility issues involving the "other sites" has helped to keep the costs down. I am really pleased that we've established the 92-93 Interagency as our base. This will allow us to simply add new sites, add an inflation factor and reach agreement much sooner than in the past. I would anticipate that using this formula will allow us a real opportunity to focus on particular problems or issues and get them settled in a timely manner. I look forward to building and strengthening the relationship between our Bureaus and I hope we can set a quarterly meeting schedule as soon as possible.

Thanks Again!

Sincerely

enno

Dennis Campbell Operations Manager Sanitary Systems Division

cc: J. Widmer D. Judd R. Maynard M. Harris

DC/trr



Street Arca Landscape Funding | Service Levels

-	00/01	01/02	02/03	Bridg	e Poor	Fair	Good
Funding	# 810K	\$631K		\$400K	#860 K	\$1.2M	#2M
ServiceLevel	# SILES	#5(+e5	# 51+85	# 5142.5	# 51 + 5	Ff SI tes	
Desired	0	0		<i></i>	0	0	202
Standard	29	. 0	0	29	29	202	182
Planom	179	208	12	0	179	182	0
No Routine Maintenance	e						
Hazard Elimination	72	12		187	72	$\mathcal{O}$	0
No Service	96	96	372	168	96	O	0



Victor F. Rhodes Director

Eileen Argentina Information Technology

Elsa Coleman Finance

Steve Dotterrer Planning

Jeanne Nyquist Maintenance

**Toby Widmer** System Management

Brant Williams Engineering & Development July 29, 2002

Debbie Fleming, Assistant Property Manager Multi-Services, Inc. American Plaza Condominiums 5200 SW Macadam, Suite 160 Portland, OR 97201

Re: Maintenance of SW First Avenue Median

Dear Debbie,

Thanks for your letter regarding the maintenance of the plant material in the median island located adjacent to the American Plaza Condominiums. My letter today is intended to give you reassurance that I am attempting to do everything I possibly can to fulfill the maintenance commitments of the City related to the median islands on SW First Avenue. Please pass this information along to your Board of Directors.

When I last spoke to Mr. Ronning, I told him that the budget for the Street Area Landscape Inventory had been cut by City Council for the fiscal year 2002-2003. The budget for that work was cut by 83%, resulting in 384 of our traffic control devices and other transportation facilities needing continued care without a funded source of maintenance. I told him that I was exploring several possible solutions, ranging from use of the Sheriff's Work Crews to the possible adoption of landscaped areas by neighborhoods or business organizations. Mr. Ronning mentioned his intention of approaching the Board of Directors about adopting the landscaped areas of the medians.

During our conversation, I mentioned closing the opening in the median. At that time, I was unaware of the need for that opening as an access and egress point for the condominium complex. I told him I would visit the location and inspect the plant materials. While the plant materials on the median islands could use a trim, I believe that simple maintenance will probably not satisfactorily correct the visibility problems you reported. There appears to be potential traffic control, planting, and overall median design issues related to vehicle access and egress from the condominium complex contributing to vehicle operator's visibility problems.

During my visit, I drove my vehicle North on SW First Avenue and turned left into the condominium complex entrance. The visibility needed to safely make a left turn to enter the property appeared to be adequate. However, while I was at that location, I witnessed a vehicle exit the condominium complex, turn right onto SW First Avenue, proceed South to the crossing in the median, and complete a U-turn to go North toward SW Lincoln Street. It is my belief that exiting the condominium complex to go South to make a U-turn through the median crossing in an effort to proceed North toward SW Lincoln places the vehicle operator at the greatest risk in terms of a potential accident. Indeed, the possibility of two vehicles colliding there appears likely under the right circumstance.

At this point, it is my opinion that a simple trimming of the vegetation on the median island may improve this situation only marginally. It appears to me that the plant design and tree growth on the median, placement of traffic control signs, and the use of the median crossing to make a U-turn by vehicle operators to travel North on SW First Avenue are all factors that may be contributing to the vehicle operator's difficulty with visibility.



2929 N. Kerby Avenue Portland, Oregon 97227 (503) 823-1700 FAX (503) 823-4043 TDD 823-6868 I plan to address the problem by scheduling the Sheriff's Work Team to provide trimming to the ground cover on the median islands and request a traffic investigation by the Bureau of Transportation Systems Management into the other problems I witnessed.

A work crew will be scheduled as soon as possible and I will forward your letter with a copy of my response to the City Traffic Engineer, Mr. Robert Burchfield at the Bureau of Transportation Systems Management.

The City and its maintenance agencies will always investigate and attempt to resolve problems reported by the constituency. However, there are factors beyond the City's control that can contribute to an accident where vehicles and the flow of traffic are concerned. The Bureau of Risk Management would receive and process any damage and/or personal injury claims filed against the City of Portland. Should there be a need to contact them regarding a claim, they may be reached at 503 823-5101.

Thank you for bringing this problem to my attention. Someone from the Bureau of Transportation Systems Management will be in contact with your office to continue the traffic investigation part of this process.

If I can be of further help, do not hesitate to call me at 503 823-1720. I look forward to serving you in the future.

Sincerely,

Roger Falley

Roger Talley, Senior Public Works Manager Street Cleaning and Emergency Preparedness

Cc: Mayor Vera Katz 40 Anie Burkle Commissioner Jim Francesconi 40 michael Harrison Brant Williams, Director, Portland Office of Transportation Robert Burchfield, City Traffic Engineer – Hutson's photos provided to Rob. Jeanne Nyquist, Maintenance Director

Attachment: July 24, 2002 letter from Debbie Fleming, Assistant Property Manager Representing American Plaza Condominiums

## AMERICAN PLAZA CONDOMINIUMS

5200 S.W. MACADAM, SUITE 160 PORTLAND, OREGON 97201 (503) 222-7243

July 24, 2002

Mr. Roger Talley Senior Public Works Manager City of Portland, Maintenance Bureau 2929 N. Kerby Portland, OR 97227

#### Re: Maintenance of SW First Avenue Median

Dear Mr. Talley:

American Plaza Condominiums consists of 337 units and is located at the corner of SW First and Lincoln. Heading north on First Avenue to and from American Plaza requires crossing this median. Employees and patrons of local businesses must also cross this median.

Due to the overgrowth of the plant material in the median, the possibility of an accident is extremely high; it is impossible to see over the plantings for any oncoming traffic. The Superintendent of this property, Ron Ronning, has contacted you in regard to pruning the plant material and was told it is not in the budget to prune the tops, only the sides along the curb, that this area would not be maintained, and that the turn lane across the median may even be removed!

We have received several complaints from residents due to the hazardous situation of crossing this median. The Board of Directors discussed the dangerous situation at their July 18<sup>th</sup> Board of Directors meeting and has asked that you confirm, in writing, that the City will not be maintaining this median and will assume any liability for accidents caused at this intersection because of the very poor visibility.

Please submit this information in writing to the address above. If you have any questions as to our concern, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Devoi Ferning

Debbie Fleming Assistant Property Manager Multi-Services, Inc. Managing Agent for American Plaza Condominiums

Cc: Commissioner Jim Francesconi Mayor Vera Katz Levonne Sedgwick, Board Chair Dave Stephens, Account Executive



Earl Blumenauer, Commissioner Kevin R. Kohnstamm, Development Liaison 1120 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Room 702 Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 796-7583 FAX (503) 796-7576

September 25, 1992

Mr. Paul Zumwalt Architectural Consultant Oregon Arena Project, Suite 270 825 NE Multnomah Street Portland, Oregon 97232



Dear Paul:

Thank you for the attached site plan dated September 21, 1992 and titled, Oregon Arena Project Landscape Maintenance Areas.

I have reviewed the drawing with Toby Widmer, Director, Bureau of Maintenance. PDOT accepts the proposal. We do, however, want to point out that although OAC will maintain the oval in the center of Hassalo Street, we intend for that area to be public right-of-way.

Happy gardening.

Sincerely,

Kevin R. Kohnstamm Development Liaison

c. Bob Collier Don Gardner Chris Kopca Toby Widmer



From:	Talley, Roger
Sent:	Monday, July 29, 2002 2:12 PM
То:	Murrin, Kathy
Subject:	RE: BOM/Parks Interagency

So is this the list as you understand it?

Locates7,000Hort ServicesIrrigation44,89340 locations proposed by RobTurf Mnt.27,489Cut back summer service due to brown grass.EM Tree wrk5,000I already have one project that will take care of this!Est. Serv.10,000NE 15th/Prescott and Coe Circle (Is it really going to take this much?) Seems high? About 4 treesat 15th and a 30 ft. circle with grass on Coe.94,382

I don't have a big problem adding in some money for administration. However, the billings I receive have include an overhead charge. I raise this issue because when our Bureau includes an overhead charge, supervision and administration are included in that charge. I have asked the accountant to contact your acounting department to find out whether that is the way they operate too.

GIS has completed an electronic mapped inventory of the locations. We are supposed to get that online by August 18th. I have some pretty detailed records that Barbara created related to each location related to what is there. Someone could start with that info and get it into a data base format that can be tied to the GIS maps. Getting you folks access to the GIS layers and coming up with a common data base so we can share information would be a good thing.

In addition, your suggestion about the upgrades to some of our locations is exactly what I discussed with the downtown engineering group last week. they intend to get a bunch of us together and explore the sustainability potential for some of these locations. Also coming up with facility designs where drought resistant plantings are included, strom waters are captured and treated, and some other ideas. Your name was mentioned as a participant, along with two or three others from Parks.

Can Rob help us identify which water meters need to remain on to allow watering on the 40 locations? I need to let the Water Bureau know which ones to leave active.

 From:
 Murrin, Kathy

 Sent:
 Friday, July 26, 2002 2:56 PM

 To:
 Talley, Roger

 Subject:
 BOM/Parks Interagency

#### Hi Roger,

Previously, we had agreed verbally that Parks would provide several services on the BOM sites. As a result, we are currently doing this work, though we never made a written agreement to proceed. I'd like to close that gap now as well as confirm that you want us to continue with these activities. I know that services may be increased if additional funding is found, at which time we will need to add to the list...but we'll do that at that time. For now, my understanding is that you would like Parks to provide the following:

Section	Work
Budget	
Horticultural Ser	Locates
7,000	
Irrigation	Backflow testing *IT NOW LOOKS LIKE A DIFFERENT ARRANGEMENT HAS BEEN MADE*
17,400	
Turf	Mowing of the sites that have been mown in the past by Parks (9 locations)
27,489	
Urban Forestry	Emergency tree work
4 or 5,000	
U/F and Districts	Establishment maintenance at 15th and Prescott and Coe Circle
10,000	
Later we came to a	n agreement to do selected watering and irrigation system maintenance for 44,893; at the same

time it appeared that different arrangements were made which eliminated the need for backflow testing.

I would like to suggest a couple more additions, particularly if the 400,000 funding level is achieved. I think that one of the items missing that would help to "tell the story" is an inventory of the sites which includes location, size, assets, value and replacement cost. Without this information it is very difficult to make a compelling case, and having it would assist in management. Perhaps we could do this inventory and assessment as part of the inspection/hazard correction being done of all the landscaped sites at the 400,000 level. Secondly, it may well be beneficial in the long run to invest in an upgrade at a couple sites, making them stormwater collection and filtration devices. This could provide an example to bureau policy makers, and ultimately promote shifting of o/m costs from your unit.

Would you please send me written agreement confirming that you want us to provide the services listed at the top, and give us a centercode to use. I have this information for watering and irrigation system maintenance at selected locations - but not for the other items. I think it would be a good idea to set aside an additional small budget, about 3,000, for miscellaneous administrative work (preparing costs, program development, making phone calls...). Also, please let me know what you think of these additional suggestions.

#### Kathleen Murrin

Horticultural Services Supervisor Portland Parks and Recreation (503)823-1603; pkkam@ci.portland.or.us

#### BOM SITES TO IRRIGATE

[		TT	
	NUMBER OF		
SITE NAME	METERS	COST	COMMENTS
			•
N Clarendon School	1	\$530.00	Newer
NE Airport Way I	2	\$2,280.00	Stressed trees
NE Airport Way II	4	\$4,290.00	Stressed trees
NE Alameda & 38th	1	\$415.00	
NE Arena Triangle	1	\$1,010.00	New repair
NE Convention Center			
Connection	1	\$770.00	Stressed plants
NE Convention Center River			
Overlook	1	\$1,415.00	Next to Esplanade
NE Hassalo 33rd - 39th	6	\$920.00	Newer
NE Hoyt & 57th	1	\$640.00	Stressed trees
NE Light Rail	5	\$2,150.00	Stressed plants
NE Sandy 102nd - 122nd	1	\$950.00	Newer
SE Foster & 103rd	1	\$640.00	New trees
SE Hawthorne Bridgehead	1	\$950.00	
SE Powell medians	5	\$4,700.00	Stressed trees
SE Stark & 108th	1	\$2,130.00	Park-like
SW Sylvan Climbing Lane	2	\$2,150.00	Newer
SE Water Ave. LID	2	\$890.00	Stressed trees
SE Woodstock 41st - 51st	4	\$850.00	New
Parkway Blocks (Reed,			
Ainsworth, Omaha, etc.)		\$10,213.00	Manually water trees
			Identifying sites, coordinating
Administrative Costs		\$2,000.00	with other work units, etc.
			Other spot watering & future
Contingency		\$5,000.00	additional sites throughout year
Total number of meters	40		
		¢44,000,00	

Total number of meters **Total dollars** 

\$44,893.00

#### **Important Considerations**

Definitions will allow us to speak the same language with understanding regarding SAL, Roadside, Transportation Maintenance etc.

Roadside and Drainage need to be considered in context of each other in of a review of either

History review of SAL, Roadside, Drainage, will put the issues in context to allow us to make educated/conscious decisions regarding our position and our future –

Recommended Options (cost savings/funding/efficiencies) are a menu of choices

Bureau Fit is a short menu of options tied to funding/work load/nature of work

Important that Roadside/Street Cleaning stays together

Prioritize work, Bureau wide = reduce competition for resources

Educate BES staff on nature of Roadside work (ditches, naturescaping, storm drainage relation)

Roadside and Drainage do not re-combine if BES drops all support of Roadside

Identify BOM responsibility for Roadside/Drainage activities

Redefine the inventory – make adj. PO responsible where able

If BES drops Roadside support, develop an add package and try to capture some general fund \$

BOM Vegetation Management Policy is critical to establish (herbicides)

Important issues regarding SAL

Turn whole SAL over to Parks and General Fund

If not able to – need to clean up the inventory and tie specific type of facilities to Parks/General Fund

Tie specific facility type to General Fund = Turn back into Parks

Park Blocks

Forestry Fountains

Park Type Facilities

Forestry work: BOM responsibly – First choice = NONE

Second choice = emergecy work in medians on SAL preferably only NTMP No Mall/Light Rail/Parking Strip work

Types of Facilities BOM will support w/ Gas Tax as able-

NTMP with no irrigation after establishment

Work to be performed by convicts or contract. (Need to ID true costs) on sites BOM accepts

Irrigation

.

Turn it off on all sites that remain BOM resp. unless we can't dump or tie the Park Blocks to Parks (too politically sensitive at this time)

NO Shopping for \$

NO Bouncing Citizens

Do NOT create BOM/PDOT/Commis. as a target- No announcements of cuts to SAL

Putting supporting documentation together in a notebook

Developing the IVM Policy – wait a bit until Liane settles in and comes up to speed

Need to give Parks a work assignment- see memo re: Cost savings opportunities in the SALIA

Waiting on Parks for their inventory, maps, contract, change orders for the contract work and their inventory of street trees that shows the work cost estimates for each site and the inventory's and cost estimates for the work they (parks vs. contractor) perform on each site, hopefully in electronic format.

#### Krieg, Barbara

From: Sent: To: Subject: Murrin, Kathy Monday, January 24, 2000 10:23 AM Krieg, Barbara RE: SAL inventory information

WAITING on Parks -"Document I program"

Barb, I'm sorry to take so long. I have in fact been snowed under with budget, and am just now for the first time in weeks getting to some of the other things that require attention. Thanks for the reminder, I will take a look at your request and what we have that we can send you tomorrow. Kathy

 -----Original Message---- 

 From:
 Krieg, Barbara

 Sent:
 Monday, January 24, 2000 9:33 AM

 To:
 Murrin, Kathy

 Cc:
 McNerney, Brian; Judd, David

 Subject:
 FW: SAL inventory information

Hi Kathy!

I know you must be awfully busy with the budget and all. Could I bother you for a huge favor? Could you email me back with an idea when you may be able to send over the requested information?

Thanks so much for your time.

Barbara

Original M	essage
From:	Krieg, Barbara
Sent:	Friday, January 14, 2000 8:10 AM
To:	Murrin, Kathy
Cc:	McNerney, Brian
Subject:	FW: SAL inventory information

Please let me know when you can drop this information into inner-office mail.

Last years information is fine-

I look forward to hearing from you.

----Original Message-----From: Krieg, Barbara Sent: Thursday, January 06, 2000 9:52 AM To: Murrin, Kathy Cc: Rutis, Cameron; Nyquist, Jeanne Subject: SAL inventory information

Please send over a copy of the inventory/maps/contract/change orders you have with the private contractor who performs work on the SAL sites.

Denise said you do not have maps to illustrate the last five years of "New Sites", but will have them by late spring. Please send them as soon as they are available.

Please also send over the inventory from Street Trees that shows the work/cost estimate for each site. If you do not have this years, please send last years.

Please also send over all inventory's/cost estimates that you do have of work you do plan to perform on each site. (For example the back flow device testing that has to be done on each irrigation system. Again, if you do not have this years, please send last years)

I need the above information as soon as possible. Please drop it in the inner-office mail to: 316/Maint/Krieg, today if possible. It was my hope that you would have it all in electronic format. As only limited information has been sent over to our computer person, in response to our requests, I assume it is not available at this time. Please correct me if I am wrong.

#### Krieg, Barbara

From:	Rutis, Cameron
Sent:	Monday, January 10, 2000 3:38 PM
То:	Krieg, Barbara
Subject:	RE: SAL inventory information

OK

I did contact Patti Norland and she mentioned that her boss told her to hold off. Let me know how the discussions with Kathy go.

Original Message		
From:	Krieg, Barbara	
Sent:	Monday, January 10, 2000 9:27 AM	
To:	Rutis, Cameron	
Subject:	FW: SAL inventory information	

This may help when you talk to Parks...

Denise would not provide it in response to our telephone conversation (she did not think her boss wanted her to spend time on this and recommend I ask Kathy for it) and I have had no response from Kathy.

Original Message		
From:	Krieg, Barbara	
Sent:	Thursday, January 06, 2000 9:52 AM	
To:	Murrin, Kathy	
Cc:	Rutis, Cameron; Nyquist, Jeanne	
Subject:	SAL inventory information	

Please send over a copy of the inventory/maps/contract/change orders you have with the private contractor who performs work on the SAL sites.

Denise said you do not have maps to illustrate the last five years of "New Sites", but will have them by late spring. Please send them as soon as they are available.

Please also send over the inventory from Street Trees that shows the work/cost estimate for each site. If you do not have this years, please send last years.

Please also send over *all inventory's/cost estimates that you do have* of work you do plan to perform on each site. (For example the back flow device testing that has to be done on each irrigation system. Again, if you do not have this years, please send last years)

I need the above information as soon as possible. Please drop it in the inner-office mail to: 316/Maint/Krieg, today if possible. It was my hope that you would have it all in electronic format. As only limited information has been sent over to our computer person, in response to our requests, I assume it is not available at this time. Please correct me if I am wrong.

#### Krieg, Barbara

From:	Rutis, Cameron
Sent:	Monday, January 10, 2000 9:22 AM
То:	Krieg, Barbara
Subject:	RE: electronic format from Parks

Nope, but I didn't contact them last week -- there was just too much to do with it being after Y2K

From:Krieg, BarbaraSent:Monday, January 10, 2000 9:18 AMTo:Rutis, CameronSubject:RE: electronic format from Parks

I'm having a heck of a time trying to get information out of Parks... Have you had any success yet?

----Original Message-----From: Rutis, Cameron Sent: Friday, January 07, 2000 9:35 AM To: Krieg, Barbara Subject: RE: electronic format from Parks

Not yet.

I will try to contact Patti Norland again.

 -----Original Message---- 

 From:
 Krieg, Barbara

 Sent:
 Thursday, January 06, 2000 7:59 AM

 To:
 Rutis, Cameron

 Subject:
 FW: electronic format from Parks

Hi Cameron!

Any word from Parks?

Barb

----Original Message-----From: Krieg, Barbara Sent: Monday, December 27, 1999 12:52 PM To: Rutis, Cameron Subject: electronic format from Parks

Would you check with Patty at Parks and find out what they have in electronic format in regards to the work the Parks actually does and actually has the contractor do on the areas in the SALIA. The information we need from them is:

Map and Inventory of plant material at each site

Work planned/work performed at each site by the Contractor and by Parks

Cost break down at each site irrigation/utility includes (including maintenance of the systems), forestry costs, contractor work and costs, horticultural/Gardner costs, park mowing costs, park pesticide application costs, cost related to administering the contractor contract



Junction

Recommendations

#### **Definitions/Descriptions Roadside** Area Landscape, Transportation

A tei.

Street Area

enance, Storm Drainage, Street Same Speak the Canguage

s charges BOM for

**Street Area Landscape:** 

SAL:

**SAL Inventory:** 

SAL IA:

el created by Parks. (The sites An inventory and s. and identifying number. Ave not remained consistent over the years making it very difficult to track each location)

Council (Blumenaur- Public Works, Lindberg- Parks) agreed to fund Parks SAL inventory with gas tax \$ for "one year only" in 1989, creating the Interagency.

The three elements of Parks SAL include

**Contract Bid Cost:** \$273,000- a figure that appeared in 1991. Is the same • estimate provided by parks in 1998, as well as billed to us by parks in 1998/99. Assumable the cost of the work that parks has the contractor perform on their SAL inventory

**Park Support Cost:** \$333,000, of this \$289,000 went to Forestry through billing. "Park Support Cost" is identified by Parks as only that. Parks identified "Bark" at \$9,000 and "Renovation" at \$30,000 (98/99). Forestry billed BOM \$289,000 98/99. We can deduce parks charged \$44,000 for mowing the park block sites, with "contract administration" either out of this or the "contract bid costs"

Water/Utility Costs: \$85,000 cost that parks claims water charges just for water to irrigate their SAL

**Roadside Maintenance:** A title created to define the work that BOM performed in the Street Cleaning division in the 80's, that was separate from actually cleaning the streets. Became part of Storm Drainage and Roadside Maintenance in '91, and then separated in '98, and combined once again with the Street

#### Definitions/Descriptions Roadside Maintenance, Storm Drainage, Street Area Landscape, Transportation Sites

.0

Street Area Landscape:	A term created by Parks.
SAL:	Street Area Landscape, what Parks charges BOM for
SAL Inventory:	An inventory and service level created by Parks. (The sites and identifying numbers have not remained consistent over the years making it very difficult to track each location)
SAL IA:	Council (Blumenaur- Public Works, Lindberg- Parks) agreed to fund Parks SAL inventory with gas tax \$ for "one year only" in 1989, creating the Interagency.
The three elements of Parks	SAL include
Contract Bid Cost:	\$273,000- a figure that appeared in 1991. Is the same estimate provided by parks in 1998, as well as billed to us by parks in 1998/99. Assumable the cost of the work that parks has the contractor perform on their SAL inventory
Park Support Cost:	\$333,000, of this \$289,000 went to Forestry through billing. "Park Support Cost" is identified by Parks as only that. Parks identified "Bark" at \$9,000 and "Renovation" at \$30,000 (98/99). Forestry billed BOM \$289,000 98/99. We can deduce parks charged \$44,000 for mowing the park block sites, with "contract administration" either out of this or the "contract bid costs"
Water/Utility Costs:	\$85,000 cost that parks claims water charges just for water to irrigate their SAL
Roadside Maintenance:	A title created to define the work that BOM performed in the Street Cleaning division in the 80's, that was separate from actually cleaning the streets. Became part of Storm Drainage and Roadside Maintenance in '91, and then separated in '98, and combined once again with the Street

Cleaning Division. Includes managing all elements of vegetation, that BOM is responsible for, as well as Pedestrian Areas and Off Street Bike Paths

**Transportation Maint:** Approximately 43 sites removed from the SAL IA and turned predominately into wildflower meadows, or dropped completely. Identified as a work activity and funded 100% by Transportation. The cost billed to BOM by Parks in 90/91 was \$78,000. The amount the same sites would cost BOM, if Parks had continued maintenance is \$108,000 FY 00/ 01. (This is the "Direct Costs using the \$78,000 and adding the inflation factor for each year, with the exception of 99/00) The amount allocated to BOM by Transportation 00/01 is \$58,000. This represents an almost 50% cost savings.

Activities originally included in the Roadside Maintenance in the '80's, when Roadside and Street Cleaning were one Division

Pedestrian Areas:	Cleaning and cutting back of vegetation on several hundred stairways/walkways that are maintained by Structures
Subway:	Cleaning pedestrian subway areas, most of which have been closed. This activity was eventually cut. Subways are cleaned on rotation with the pedestrian area activity
Bike Paths:	Off street bike path cleaning
Mall Patrol:	4 mall attendants on 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> and the Light Rail downtown. This activity was eliminated
East side Em. Tr.:	66-type work
West side Em. Tr:	66-type work East/Westside activities were combined into one. This work remained consistently in Street Cleaning
<b>Bushwhacking</b> :	Machine mowing of roadside/ditch vegetation. The inventory was developed as a result of the Intergovernmental Agreements between the City and Multnomah County in 1984. Prior to this the city did not do roadside mowing (bushwhacking). The 1984 recommended interim polices from John Lang (Sewer System Administrator) and Jeff Larkin (Transportation) to the Commissioners included to "mow and brush to eliminate hazards and facilitate drainage. Outside of improvement is property owner responsibility and may be

	referred to Neighborhood Environment for posting." Roads to be considered for roadside mowing were categorized as being non-curbed, asphalt surfaced roads. The recommended interim polices were to be used until July 1, 1986 when permanent policies were to be implemented in conjunction with <b>the resolution for all drainage</b> <b>responsibilities in Transportation and Environmental</b> <b>Services</b> . Unfortunately no definition was made regarding what was "road" vs. "drainage", only that the Transportation Fund would finance roads and the Sewage Disposal Fund finance drainage. No permanent polices were adopted in '86. The bushwacking inventory evolved into predominantly roadsides that had an established storm drainage systems in place. In order for ditch/overgrown vegetation to be added to the inventory, the road had to have been accepted by the City for maintenance, and have an improved storm system in place. The reasoning was that the city was "maintaining the facility" by mowing/spraying the vegetation along the ditch-line. Overgrown vegetation in other areas was referred to the Nuisance Bureau. Sutherland (consultant for BES) determined 50% of this work activity was benefit to Drainage/Sewer maintenance. (Jan.17, 1990 study). BES picked up 100% of the cost and subsequently reduced their support to 36%.
Mowing:	Mowing city property vs. the mowing of roadside/ditches (which is performed under the Bushwacking activity). This activity has become the mowing of wildflower meadows in the fall and also prior to planting. There remains a few mow sites on the inventory. Sutherland, determined that 50% of the mowing activity benefited Drainage/Sewer Maintenance. BES picked up 100% of the costs and subsequently reduced their support to 15%
Weed control:	In 1986 BOM quit spraying the curbline along streets that were swept in response to public concern and lack of funding. With the City/Co agreements and annexations, herbicide application followed the roadside/ditch mowing (bushwhacking). Sutherland determined 50% of this activity benefited Drainage/Sewer Maintenance. In 1986, BOM eliminate the routine ditch/roadside herbicide spraying as the opinion of maintaining a shoulder and ditch line void of vegetation, was no longer a priority. The value of a vegetated ditch was realized. BES picked up 100% of the cost of this activity. With the advent of environmental

÷

concerns and issues, routine spraying of the ditch line was eliminated in favor of targeting specific problem species with a generally publicly accepted herbicide. (Black berries and poison oak with Glyphosate) This activity currently pays for the herbicide application to the wildflower sites, in preparation for planting as well as controlling blackberries in the ditch and poison oak in public areas that BOM is responsible to maintain.

#### Grounds Maintenance: Bill Rice work, ultimately moved out of the division

Activities removed from Street Repair and added to Street Cleaning/Roadside Maintenance, to coordinate the ditch mowing and ditch cleaning work prior to the 1990 section creation of Roadside Maintenance and Storm Drainage in the Sewer Division

Drainage Ditch Maint: The machine cleaning of the ditch line. Prior to the City/County agreements/annexations BOM performed only very minor ditching in problem drainage areas. Ditch maintenance became a work activity with the agreements. A ditcher was purchased in '85 to meet the new responsibilities. The county had ditched all non-curbed roads; BOM developed an inventory similar to the Bushwhacking (ditch/roadside) inventory. Sutherland determined BES as 100% responsible; BES picked up 100% of the costs

#### Storm Drainage and Roadside Maintenance:

The title/name adopted in 1990 by the section created in BOM to manage all activities related to storm drainage. With the goal to develop and implement a program using optimum maintenance practices and responding to the regulations/laws/policies coming on line.

Activities included in the new Roadside Maintenance and Storm Drainage section:

All above listed Roadside Activities from Street Cleaning with the exception of the Emergency Truck

The following activities moved from Sewer Cleaning

Vactor Clean Culverts:	Combined with Jet work into "Machine Clean
	Culverts"

Jet Clean Culverts:

See above

Hand Ditch Maintenance		Activity ultimately eliminated	
Minor Trash Rack Maintenance:		Became the insp./minor cleaning of Trash Racks/Detention/Retention Ponds	
Retention Basin Maintenance:		Became the repair/maintenance activity of Trash Racks and Detention/Retention Ponds	
Sump work was never moved as anticipated			
The following Activities moved from Sewer Repair			
Install new Culvert:		ned Install/Repair- BES funded at 100%, then d to 90%	
Repair Culvert:	Same		
Mjr T.R.Debris Rmval:	Retent	e the major debris removal activity for Trash Racks, on/Detention Ponds BES funded	

#### Sump work was never moved as anticipated

The following Activities moved from Street Repair

Gravel Sh. Main:	Originally PDOT funded shoulder work, Lori Faha (BES)
	pointed out the potential water quality benefits available by
	modifying our maintenance practices, Front Slope Ditch
	Maintenance and Gravel Shoulder were combined into one
	activity, BES picked up 100% of the costs when the new
	section was created- BES then reduced their support to 9%

**Frnt Slope Ditch Maint:** BES funded shoulder work, this work was identical to "gravel shoulder Maint", and was combined into the above activity, all funded was by BES and then reduced to 9%

The following Activities moved from Structures

Trash Rack Maintenance: 100% BES

The following new activities were developed

Hydro-seeding:	Establishing dense, low, slow growing vegetation following routine ditch cleaning, and other maintenance work. 100% BES.
Wildflower:	Establishing wildflower meadows on all sites BOM was responsible to mow, with a few exceptions. 100% BES. They had been mow sites funded 100% by BES. (Sutherland mow recommendation= 50%)
Erosion Control:	Placing erosion control devices following routine maintenance. BES funded at 100%, then reduced to 90%.
Invest/Cust Service:	Responding to concerns, complaints, enquiry's, identifying responsibility, resolving issues. 100% BES
Emergency Response:	Responding to flooding, unplanned, unexpected events compromising the storm system. 100% BES
Restoration:	Test program, restoring work areas to native vegetation, following routine maintenance work. 100% BES under a project numbers. Subsequently eliminated from BOM work when the Roadside Maintenance and Storm Drainage section was eliminated. There is potential to develop this into BES support for many BOM maintained sites. (Aligning with their naturscaping program)
Propagation:	Test program in propagating to ensure available plant material for BOM restoration projects. Subsequently eliminated from BOM with the Roadside/Drainage section elimination.
## SAL IA Cost Containment Options/Recommendations

Maintaining Parks inventory of street area landscape at Parks optimal level is a luxury we cannot afford. The best option for Transportation is to gain the political support to place Park street area landscape work back into the Park Bureau, competing with the rest of Park programs for general funds.

## Annual Cost Savings \$726,000

If we are not successful in moving Parks work back into the general fund it is critical we take an active role in defining the inventory. Tied to defining the inventory is he opportunity to identify what sites/work activities are funded by the general fund. Identifying general fund work/activities as "Park" type work will lay the groundwork for splitting out the inappropriate items in the SAL.

Following are options/recommendations for managing the IA and associated costs. The costs savings are estimates using Parks 98/99 figures, without the 2% overhead on contracted Services, 2% overhead on utilities, and 16.58% overhead on Park's services, nor 3.5% inflation factor FY 00/01.

Reduce "forestry support" to emergency response specifically trees in the medians. The medians are the ONLY possible trees BOM could be considered responsible to maintain. (\$289,000 all forestry work =2/3rds estimated to be in the parking strips, leaving 1/3 as median trees= \$96,000 optimum service level. Allow 10% funding of "optimum maintenance" for emergency attention to hazardous conditions=\$10,000.) It is unlikely anyone will notice this reduced level of service.

#### Annual Cost Savings \$280,000

Direct Parks to enforce the City Code in regards to forestry as well as vegetation in the parking strips and right-of –way.

Annual Cost Savings? Parks is in the process of identifying locations and associated costs

Direct Parks to adhere to the construction agreements/matrix's in regards to the Mall, Light Rail, and the decorative fountains

Annual Cost Savings \$17,000 for fountains only- savings for Mall/Light Rail realized in the above forestry position

Drop the Business District Landscape from the IA, with the expectation the Business Districts/Boosters/Parks will pick up maintenance responsibility as defined and agreed to during construction.

Annual Cost Savings \$19,000

Give the Park Blocks back to the Park Bureau Annual Cost Savings \$120,000

Reduce mowing on the Park Blocks to 6 times per year; turn off the irrigation Annual Cost savings \$90,000

Identify the Park Blocks as Park facilities, funded by the General Fund (out of the \$300,000 from the Commissioners.

Annual Cost Savings \$0, at this time, but will become \$120,000 when we are successful in splitting out the items/activities that truly belong to Parks and not BOM/gas tax

Replace the contractor with convict labor

Parks charges BOM \$273,000 for the contractor that maintains their SAL inventory. It is unknown at this point if this dollar value includes "Contract Administration" or represents the true cost of the contractors work.

Columbia River Corrections Institute charges \$400 per day. This is for 10-12 workers and a supervisor. The city would be responsible to provide the tools, training for all power tools, and safety gear, including TC, if necessary. It may be possible to contract with a "flagging/TC" bussiness, to provide any necessary TC. If a 10-12-person crew worked five days a week all year long, the cost would be \$100,000. If they needed more work for this contract amount, we would add BOM sites to the inventory. A second option is to designate a crew 2-3 days a week at \$50,000, and designate \$50,000 for material, tools, traffic control, and a part time project manager/gardener. **Annual Cost Savings \$170,000** 

#### Turn off all Irrigation

Annual Cost Savings \$85,000 (this identified cost is for water only, per Parks) unidentified savings would be in the elimination of the required annual back-flow device testing, the maintenance on the systems and the upgrade to the systems. It is unlikly the lack of irrigation would be noticed on any, but the park block sites. The cost to irrigate all the Park Blocks is \$17,000

Annual Cost Saving \$68,000 if we ID Park Blocks as General Fund \$ and the responsibility of Parks, and turn off the rest of the irrigation.

#### **Eliminate Renovation**

Annual Cost Savings \$30,000 It is unknown what this cost truly represents. Assumable upgrade to sites, storm damage or accident repair. It is unlikely many will notice the elimination of the activity. Particularly if Parks bills the responsible insurance companies for work required by accidents.

Eliminate Parks Shopping for Dollars **\$53,000 FY 98/99 Cost** 

Eliminate Bark Annual Cost Saving \$9,000 If it is not possible to move the entire SAL IA into the general fund, it is critical to identify what specific sites are maintained with general fund money (and begin to identify the sites with Parks and Parks money). This is a good avenue to use to move the "Park Block" type facilities, the Forestry work (especially the Mall and trees in the parking strip), the Park type facilities (fountains, Park 51, Coe Circle) and the irrigation back into Parks/General fund permanently. (Thus removing BOM from this part of the equation.) BOM would then be able to focus on the contract work, new development and reducing the associated costs.

It is important to have BOM staff participation in all planning/design/construction phases for potential new sites. This will ensure our interests are represented. Once Parks realizes they no longer will receive more money each year, and that "new sites" will be competing for existing site maintenance funds, they will likely become proactive in representing our interests. Once Parks and BOM are moving in the same direction with the same goals and priorities, BOM participation and involvement should be reduced.

The benefits of this scenario include:

Ensuring adjacent property owners take their own responsibility Business/Neighborhood Associations/Developers will take maintenance responsibility for landscape they desire Base level of landscape design will be adhered to with minimal maintenance committed to, vs. high maintenance landscape designs Irrigation will be eliminated after establishment. Annual Cost Savings will vary with development in coming years

It is also to BOM and Parks advantage to begin a quarterly review process. Parks has been very hesitant in the past to share requested information. The quarterly exchange of information will enhance BOM/Park understanding and partnership and ensure that Park charges are reasonable and appropriate in the IA.

In this process, it is very important to avoid making BOM/PDOT a target for reduced service. To accomplish this we need to make certain that Parks continues to handle citizens concerns (no bouncing), and takes responsibility for the level of service. We need to make certain no announcements are made regarding any potential reduction in service. (Judd's comment that Parks had reduced and eliminated many trash cans in some parks, and experienced little public concern, compared to the year they made a public announcement that trash cans would be eliminated from parks and there was such a public out cry.)

1-6-00

# Rough Break-Down of Park Charges Gleaned From Billing 98/99 and Estimates 97/98

Contractor Work	\$274,000	Identical estimate number and billed number
Water	\$85,000	Estimate number, could not find any billed number
Forestry Work	\$289,000	Never estimated nor identified, this is the number billed (includes \$33,000 for Jonesmore- planting 60 trees McNerney asked TW for OK)
Renovation	\$30,000	Estimate number, could not find any billed number
Bark	\$9,000	Estimate number, could not find any billed number
"Park Support"	\$44,000	Unidentified costs, perhaps mowing or contract administration

Contract
Water
Forestry
Renovation
Bark
Unidentified Park Support Costs

TOTAL \$730,000 Billed FY 98/99

\$726,000 Allocated FY 98/99

## Roadside Maintenance current Logical Bureau Fit to Ensure the Best Management of Work Responsibilities and Funding/Service Level/Additional Revenues/Savings Options

If BES continues on its path of denial of responsibility for the vegetation along the ditches/roadsides, It is logical to keep the Storm Drainage work and the Roadside Maintenance work separate. If BES once again takes on their responsibility, it makes sense to combine Street Cleaning, Roadside and Drainage into one Division. At this point it seems unlikely to occur as Marriot (BES) made the offer FY 00/01 to pick-up all costs associated with the leaf program for two years in exchange for dropping the support of the Roadside Maintenance work.

Practically speaking, Day Street Cleaning and Roadside workload uniquely balance each other, seasonally. The work is not particularly related, but the personnel needs ebb and flow in an almost perfect sequence. It makes sense to keep the two work units together.

Beyond keeping the Street Cleaning/Roadside together, the fit a specific Division in the Bureau is dependent on many other factors beyond the nature of the work.

It is important to clarify the Bureau's priority's in regards to all the work/activities we do, to reduce/eliminate the competition for resources day to day.

Meeting the needs of the work did not occur when Roadside Maintenance/Storm Drainage was a part of the Sewer Division (Environmental Systems), largely and logically due to the fact that Sewers needs takes priority over the needs of Drainage/Roadside and there never was adequate funding for either. There are many associated work activities in Sewers and Drainage, this contributes to a justification for placing the Street Cleaning/Roadside/Drainage into Environmental Systems Division, but only if BES recognizes its responsibility for Roadside.

It is to BOM and BES advantage for BOM staff to provide education for staff at BES, to allow BES to understand the nature and history of the work activities BOM believes are associated with storm drainage. The rub between BES and BOM seems to be that BES truly believes Roadside work is not their responsibility.

If the agreement is made to trade Roadside for Leaf, BOM may want to package Roadside work as an add package, requesting General Fund support. The beauty of this option is the Public/Political support for the Wildflower program. The add package can be developed to high-light the needed fiscal support for the Wildflower program (all the vegetation related work activities.)

Another consideration to the work activity fit is the responsibility and work needs of the Street Preservation Division. Street sweeping is necessary in the Street Preservation

Division. They currently have two sweeper operators on staff. They need two and a half during the paving season and one during the winter. Currently Street Cleaning loans a sweeper operator for half a day during their busy season. During their light season, (fall/winter), they loan personnel and equipment to Street Cleaning for the leaf program. This offers some justification for combining Street Cleaning/Roadside/Drainage into one Division. (Assuming BES maintains support of Roadside, if not, the recommendation is to keep "drainage" in the Environmental Systems Division.) The other justification is that the Recycle program is currently in Street Preservation, and there are many elements of Recycling involved with Street Cleaning/Roadside/Drainage.

#### Activity 99/00 Planned Crew Days 97/98 Actual C.D. \$ 99/00 Brushcut 147 288 \$132,000 Mowing 47 81 \$20,000 Weed Control 19 17 \$25,000 Wildflower 60 44 \$85,000 Hydro Seeding 5 1 \$30,000 Clean Peds 105 165 \$63,000 **Transp Maint** 59 58 \$61,000 Clean Bike Path 38 44 \$35,000

## **Current Service Levels for Roadside Activities**

Transp. Maint. and to a great extent, Mowing and Weed Control support the Wildflower activity. Roadside mowing (Brushcut), exists on a prioritized response to hazardous conditions level, the inventory is not funded at a level that permits the vegetation to be cut even once a year. Hydroseeding is performed at the request of BES.

## **Mandated Service Level**

There are no mandates requiring any of the work that the Roadside Maintenance group does, be preformed. There are requirements/mandates coming on line that define how and when the work can be performed. By City Code, the Bureau could turn over all overgrown vegetation along the roadsides/ditches, as well as the debris on the pedestrian areas and off street bike paths to the Nuisance Division to post to the adjacent property owner. Our biggest concerns would be the safety and risk issues involved with site distance problems with traffic/intersections/curves, that the roadside mowing historically addressed and the unreasonableness of expecting property owners on arterial to get out and cut the vegetation back. It is very reasonable to expect residential property owners to maintain the vegetation along the ditchline/roadside. An informed review of the inventory will need to take place, with guidelines to follow. It is unlikely there will be much code enforcement, considering the Nuisance Divisions past actions and workload. Another concern is the likely vocal out cry from bicyclists, who find the overgrown vegetation a hazard. Another option is to increase the herbicide spray program and eliminate the vegetation along the roadside. This would probably be political suicide.

It is possible the costs to maintain the wildflower, transportation sites, bike paths, and ped areas could be reduced, or the service level increased by having a great deal of the work performed by convict labor. We may also want to consider convict labor to weed-eat the corners for site distance, the challenge would be traffic control. We would have to deal with the issue of contracting out and the Union/Labor Agreement.

### **Reasonable/Logical Service Level**

It is reasonable to restore the service level to 1991/92 level. It is critical to define what it is BOM/PDOT is responsible for in regards to storm drainage as well as vegetation management. I believe we should fund only what we are responsible to maintain, at a level that fits with the whole Bureau's priorities. One option would be to present an add package for Roadside activities in an attempt to garner General Fund support for work that shouldn't reasonably be supported with gas tax funds and competing with other Bureau work programs, in the event that BES drops all support for Roadside.

Jait for trane to come up to speed in Burn

## DRAFT

## **Bureau of Maintenance**

## **Integrated Roadside Vegetation Ma**

#### **Mission Statement**

The Bureau of Maintenance (BOM) manages the vegetation responsibility of the Bureau in an educated, cost effective, ecologically sound, safe, responsible and balanced manner. This work is accomplished through utilizing innovative management practices, monitoring and evaluating conditions, making decisions based on accepted threshold levels, acceptance of natural settings and natural appearances, and using a combination of the most appropriate tools available.

#### Background

BOM is charged with maintaining a variety of vegetated areas. This work includes managing vegetation along storm water ditch lines in partnership with the Bureau of Environmental Services, wildflower meadows on property assigned to BOM for maintenance, vegetation along off street bike paths, pedestrian areas and traffic control devices as well as many other kinds of sites. The vegetation management program has evolved over the years in response to environmental concerns, budget impacts, innovations, legislation, council resolution, and in recognition of the general public's anxiety and concerns revolving around the use of pesticides.

#### Integrated Roadside Vegetation Management (IRVM)

In 1986 concern was expressed to the Commissioner of Public Utilities regarding herbicide use by BOM staff. The Commissioner asked the Director of the BOM to ... "look at alternatives of weed control in residential areas and to work with the Oregon Environmental Council to find safe non-toxic substances..." The Commissioner stated that the Bureau would no longer do residential spraying in the future.

# DRAFT

## **Bureau of Maintenance**

## **Integrated Roadside Vegetation Management Program**

#### **Mission Statement**

The Bureau of Maintenance (BOM) manages the vegetation responsibility of the Bureau in an educated, cost effective, ecologically sound, safe, responsible and balanced manner. This work is accomplished through utilizing innovative management practices, monitoring and evaluating conditions, making decisions based on accepted threshold levels, acceptance of natural settings and natural appearances, and using a combination of the most appropriate tools available.

#### Background

BOM is charged with maintaining a variety of vegetated areas. This work includes managing vegetation along storm water ditch lines in partnership with the Bureau of Environmental Services, wildflower meadows on property assigned to BOM for maintenance, vegetation along off street bike paths, pedestrian areas and traffic control devices as well as many other kinds of sites. The vegetation management program has evolved over the years in response to environmental concerns, budget impacts, innovations, legislation, council resolution, and in recognition of the general public's anxiety and concerns revolving around the use of pesticides.

#### Integrated Roadside Vegetation Management (IRVM)

In 1986 concern was expressed to the Commissioner of Public Utilities regarding herbicide use by BOM staff. The Commissioner asked the Director of the BOM to ... "look at alternatives of weed control in residential areas and to work with the Oregon Environmental Council to find safe non-toxic substances..." The *Commissioner stated that the Bureau would no longer do residential spraying in the future.* 

In 1988 City Council passed a resolution directing the Park Bureau to implement a policy that embodies the principles of Integrated Pest Management (IPM). This coupled with the growing public concern regarding judicious use of herbicides, legal requirements, quality improvement/cost saving measures, public demand/customer expectations led the Bureau into developing and implementing an IRVM program.

The following definition taken from the National Roadside Vegetation Management Associations guide for an IVRM program aptly describes the Bureaus position and is as follows

"Integrated Roadside Vegetation Management (IRVM) is a decision-making and quality management process for maintaining roadside vegetation that integrates the following:

\*Needs of local communities and highway users \*Knowledge of plant ecology (and natural processes) \*Design, construction, and maintenance considerations \*Monitoring and evaluation procedures \*Government statutes and regulations \*Technology

with cultural, biological, mechanical, and chemical pest control methods to economically mange roadsides for safety plus environmental and visual quality.

IRVM uses a coordinated decision-making and action process that uses the most appropriate pest control methods and strategies in an environmentally and economically sound manner to meet pest management objectives. The elements of IPM include prevention, monitoring, establishing density and action thresholds, treating pest problems, and evaluation. These elements and the process of monitoring, treating when necessary and evaluation results are crucial to sustaining and effective IRVM program. An effective IRVMA program must encompass several key natural and human resource core concepts. Natural resource concepts include: ecological restoration and management, biodiversity, sustainability and selective management, Human resource concepts include education/communication, employee empowerment, collaboration, integrity and consensus."

#### Herbicide Use

BOM uses the herbicide tool in a very conservative manner. All options, implications, consequences, and alternate methods of control are weighed before deciding to use this tool. Herbicides are used to target specific problems that have reached an action threshold, after all the other tools/options/implications are weighed. For example, BOM targets poison oak in areas of public access, using Round Up, a generally/commonly-accepted herbicide. Safety to the environment, citizens, and employees are major considerations and concerns.

BOM clearly recognizes the public anxiety and the controversial opinions towards pesticides. Bureau employees are authorized to use only unclassified, general use (over the counter) herbicides. The Bureau does not authorize limited use or restricted use pesticides.

A panel consisting of the Bureaus Environmental Engineer, Safety Officer, and...(WHO).....reviews and considers for approval all pesticides requested for BOM use. The panel contacts NCAP, researches information regarding the proposed herbicide on the web, and studies the label for pertinent information before making an informed decision as to whether or not approve that specific herbicide for a specific use. Possible health effects and toxicity, studies on health/environmental impact, residual effect, decomposition rates and breakdown products, volatility, leachability, specific drainage pattern in area to receive herbicide, short/long term costs both fiscally and environmentally and politically, anticipated effectiveness, public perception and acceptance, action threshold level, available alternative tools to manage the problem, are weighed and considered. Currently the sole herbicide authorized for application by BOM employees is glyphosate. (Round Up/Rodeo)

BOM employees are required to comply with all pesticide label directions, federal, state and local pesticide regulations, safety laws and BOM policies and guidelines. The supervisor is responsible for ensuring the laws, regulations, policies and guidelines are complied with at all times.

The supervisor maintains a Public Pesticide Applicator License for Right of Way and Aquatics.... and....

(NEED FILE WITH ALL Laws etc...)

Annually (February...?) the supervisor reviews the laws, regulation, policies and guidelines regarding herbicides with the Bureau Environmental Engineer and Safety Officer. After a thorough review to ensure compliance with all laws/regulations/policy/guidelines, the supervisor reviews the laws/regulations/policies/guidelines with the licensed applicators. Both supervisor and licensed applicator sign the BOM IRVM Policy, which is then placed in the employees' Bureau personnel file.

Herbicides are applied in a safe and legal manner at all times. Only licensed applicators are permitted to purchase and transport and access the approved herbicides. The volume of herbicide purchased is determined by the Supervisor and limited to the amount planned on being used...(THAT WEEK...THAT MONTH...THAT SEASON...)

Herbicides are stored (WHERE?) in a secure, safe, ventilated and contained location in accordance with existing laws, (need to specify and have a file with the laws/rules /regs). Protected from freezing, photodecomposition, vaporizing and moisture. The storage locker remains locked with a key assigned only to the Supevisor. A separate key is kept in the Dispatch center and can be checked out each day only by licensed applicators..... The agencies that regulate certain aspects of herbicide storage include Oregon Department of Agriculture, DEQ, EPA, State Fire Marshal, and the Portland Fire Bureau.

A spill kit consisting of.....is located in the herbicide locker, and in each vehicle used in the herbicide program. In the unlikely event of a spill, the Bureaus Pesticide Spill Response Policy is followed.

Licensed applicators use the appropriate protective clothing and equipment as outlined on the product label and MSDS.....(Specify the requirements for Round UP and all additional BOM required protective clothing)

An inventory of herbicides in storage is kept on file in the office and in the chemical storage locker. The inventory is updated each day that herbicides are used.

The spray equipment is calibrated each season and .....(ONCE? TWICE? during the season...) The equipment is maintained in a safe and useful condition. Anti siphoning devices are used when filling the spray equipment. The content of the spray tanks is identified on the outside of the tanks. Licensed applicators mix and apply only the specific amount of herbicide needed for use that day, in an effort to eliminate the generation of a waste product. If weather constraints or equipment problems dictate a situation where there is mixed chemical remaining in the tank, the mixed chemical is stored.....(Where/how)...for use the next day. The water that is used at the end of shift to rinse the spray tank is stored in the recycle tank for use the next day in the herbicide mix.

Applicators and Supervisors carry a copy of the herbicide label, the MSDS, list of emergency phone numbers and informational phone numbers (National pesticides Telecommunications Network, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Pesticide Analytical and Response Center), the BOM IRVM program, and other pertinent literature at all times. The same information is on file in the office and in the dispatch center.

Each day that herbicides are applied, the licensed applicator documents a detailed account of the work performed. The documentation includes such information as date, month, day, year, location, address, map of area treated, chemical manufacturer, chemical supplier, product name, product formulation, EPA registration number, adjuvant, mix ratio, temperature, wind, equipment used, total area treated in acres/sq.feet, total amount applied, coverage rate, re-entry interval, time start/finish. The records are kept on file in the office for a period of ...(How many years...need to attach a sample documentation form)

Empty herbicide containers are disposed of as directed by the label, and compliance with all applicable State and Federal regulations. This includes ...(Specify what the requirements for Round-Up are and what BOM expectations are >>>triple rinsed, holes are punched into the containers which are then flattened and stored

(WHERE) until there is sufficient quantity (when? what volume?) to take to ...where? ....park bureau.... recycle business.....Specified landfill... )by a licensed applicator. The applicator keeps a record on file in the office and spray locker, of the accumulation of empty herbicide containers.

In the unlikely event of an emergency accidental pesticide exposure the Bureaus policy is followed. (Attach)

#### **Public Notification**

Part of the IRVM program insures the least toxic, cost-effective vegetation control method is selected. When a herbicide is selected, the area to be treated is posted with "Caution" signs. These signs include information about the herbicide being applied as well as the phone number of the Supervisor of the crew where additional information can be obtained. The signs are placed the day before the herbicide application is scheduled and removed..... when the spray has dried....the day after..... (Do we want to post roadsides? Permanent?)

#### Laws and Safety

The Bureau of Maintenance conforms to all pesticide laws and regulations. In many instances, the Bureaus policy regarding herbicide use is more stringent than existing laws and regulations.

The Bureau requires all herbicide applicators as well as the supervisors overseeing the work, to obtain and maintain a State Public Pesticide Applicators license with the following endorsements ...(R-o-W, Aquatics...Ornamental and Turf....<ORN-Insect/Fungi, ORN-Herbicide> ...License holders must participate in a minimum of sixteen hours of continual education training each year. The Oregon State Department of Agriculture must have approved the training. This training could include information on laws and safety, new regulations, vegetation control, innovations, and IRVM.

Do we want a packet of BOM policies regarding herbicides .... Parks has a good group that would apply to us with minor changes/editing.

# PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION

URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION

10910 N. Denver, Portland, Oregon 97217

Telephone (503) 823-4489

FACSIMILE (503) 823-4493

JIM FRANCESCONI, COMMISSIONER

CHARLES JORDAN, DIRECTOR

## MEMORANDUM

TO:	Vic Rhodes, Director of Transportation John Widmer, Director of the Bureau of Maintenance
FROM:	Brian M. McNerney, Urban Forestry Manager
DATE:	May 26, 1998
Subject:	1998-99 Interagency Service Reduction

Portland Parks is preparing to implement the 18% service reduction reflected in our interagency budget agreement and approved by City Council in the recommended budget. We appreciate the tough decisions that have to be made when there is a major shortage in funding. Parks experienced similar reductions when the General Fund was pressured by Ballot Measures 5, 47, and 50. The most important lesson we learned from these painful experiences is that it is wise for everyone to know the consequences before the service reduction takes place. No one likes surprises. The reading I am getting now is that nearly everyone, including the City Council, believes that the problem, (caring for the Transportation landscapes), has been fixed by the \$4.5 million of General Fund dollars allocated to Transportation.

While I do not know the intricacies of the Transportation budget, I have extensive experience with Park's budget, including the many reduction budgets that I had to prepare and implement. There are definitely parallels between Park's past experiences and Transportation's current situation that I want to share with you so that you can be prepared and prepare others for the implementation. Here are some issues we considered, lessons we learned, and other information you should be aware of:

Infrastructure: Infrastructure should be preserved because of the public investment and the cost of recreating infrastructure. In previous reductions, Parks placed a higher value on trees, woody shrubs, and formal landscapes because of the public investment of time and money. We dramatically reduced or eliminated services to rough/informal landscapes, flowerbeds, and turf, which could be recreated later with less investment. All of the landscapes that Parks currently services for Transportation were formally designed and built, have a public investment, (city, state, federal), and involve public infrastructure. The 18% reduction in services to the Transportation landscapes dramatically exceeds the 5%-8% reductions made to Parks landscapes and consequently will impact Transportation's plant infrastructure investment.

• Dedicated to enriching the lives of citizens and enhancing Portland's natural beauty •

- Litter & Trash: Reason would suggest that this is one of the better places to achieve savings without impacting infrastructure or safety. We tried this strategy to deal with the Ballot Measure # 47 impact by removing trashcans from parks and asking the community to pick up after themselves. We are still reeling from the negative public reaction and no longer have this program in place. The Transportation landscapes will be policed for litter less frequently and some areas will receive no service. The change in service will be very noticeable. These landscapes are not remote roadsides but are located in prominent business districts, neighborhoods and transportation corridors. Transportation will likely experience a similar public reaction.
- <u>Capital Improvements:</u> Infrastructure declines over time and needs an infusion of capital dollars to return it to a functional level. Parks was heavily criticized for the condition of its infrastructure in the findings of a review committee and is currently achieving some repairs through the GOBI bond measure. *Similarly, there is a long list of infrastructural major repair needs on the Transportation landscapes that have accumulated over the years, (over \$500,000). These repairs should be addressed in Transportation's Capital Plan to return them to a satisfactory condition. Although we have tried to nibble at some of these repairs, there is no room to address any of these needs in the current operating/service budget. Some repairs, (Transit Mall tree grates), are urgent and may be posted as a nuisance for trip hazards, tree girdling, etc. if not corrected soon. I am attaching a list, (which needs updating), that identifies many of the needed repairs.*

I hope this gives you a good idea of what has and hasn't worked well for Parks in similar situations and of the stewardship needs. We will do the best we can with the budget you have provided us but I need you to know that the 18% reduction is three times the size of any service reductions Parks has made to their designed landscapes. I feel we have put together the best service plan possible at this funding level and we will do everything we can to make it work.

We all hope that the Legislature will come through with a gas tax fix and that we can cope until then. Right now, I am not comfortable that we can cope or be responsive to community needs and hope that Transportation has some contingency fund or flexibility to internally adjust the budget. In lieu of any adjustment, my recommendation is that we stick to the plan we have agreed on to maximize the effectiveness of our stewardship services. There will be pressure to provide services not included in the maintenance plan or for Parks to provide service to sites not included in our interagency agreement, (like the Transit Mall tree grates). We cannot accommodate these needs without seriously compromising the service plan.

In addition to the list of necessary infrastructure repairs, I am attaching for your review, a short list of areas where you might expect citizen comments from changes in service level. I hope this communication is informative and helps you better understand the situation so that you are prepared and can better prepare others for the service level change. As always, we will look for creative service strategies and opportunities to get the most mileage from the Transportation dollar.

Thank you.

this program in place. The Transportation landscapes will be policed for litter less frequently and some areas will receive no service. The change in service will be very noticeable. These landscapes are not remote roadsides but are located in prominent business districts, neighborhoods and transportation corridors. Transportation will likely experience a similar public reaction.

Capital Improvements: Infrastructure declines over time and needs an infusion of capital dollars to return it to a functional level. Parks was heavily criticized for the condition of its infrastructure in the findings of a review committee and is currently achieving some repairs through the GOBI bond measure. Similarly, there is a long list of infrastructural major repair needs on the Transportation landscapes that have accumulated over the years, (over \$500,000). These repairs should be addressed in Transportation's Capital Plan to return them to a satisfactory condition. Although we have tried to nibble at some of these repairs, there is no room to address any of these needs in the current operating/service budget. Some repairs, (Transit Mall tree grates), are urgent and may be posted as a nuisance for trip hazards, tree girdling, etc. if not corrected soon. I am attaching a list, (which needs updating), that identifies many of the needed repairs.

I hope this gives you a good idea of what has and hasn't worked well for Parks in similar situations and of the stewardship needs. We will do the best we can with the budget you have provided us but I need you to know that the 18% reduction is three times the size of any service reductions Parks has made to their designed landscapes. I feel we have put together the best service plan possible at this funding level and we will do everything we can to make it work.

We all hope that the Legislature will come through with a gas tax fix and that we can cope until then. Right now, I am not comfortable that we can cope or be responsive to community needs and hope that Transportation has some contingency fund or flexibility to internally adjust the budget. In lieu of any adjustment, my recommendation is that we stick to the plan we have agreed on to maximize the effectiveness of our stewardship services. There will be pressure to provide services not included in the maintenance plan or for Parks to provide service to sites not included in our interagency agreement, (like the Transit Mall tree grates). We cannot accommodate these needs without seriously compromising the service plan.

In addition to the list of necessary infrastructure repairs, I am attaching for your review, a short list of areas where you might expect citizen comments from changes in service level. I hope this communication is informative and helps you better understand the situation so that you are prepared and can better prepare others for the service level change. As always, we will look for creative service strategies and opportunities to get the most mileage from the Transportation dollar.

Thank you.

# PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION

**URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION** 

10910 N. Denver, Portland, Oregon 97217

Telephone (503) 823-4489

FACSIMILE (503) 823-4493

JIM FRANCESCONI, COMMISSIONER

CHARLES JORDAN, DIRECTOR

## MEMORANDUM

TO:	Jeanne Nyquist and Dennis Campbell, Bureau of Maintenance
FROM:	Brian McNerney and Kathy Murrin, Portland Parks and Recreation
DATE:	January 13, 1997
SUBJECT:	Street Site Infrastructure Repairs

We have worked together for a number of years to provide the public with landscapes that have both function and beauty, and that are cared for efficiently and effectively. However, there are problems on the horizon which need to be addressed that cannot be done through our routine maintenance budget. The infrastructure of a number of the BOM sites has aged and deteriorated to the point where an infusion of capital funds is required to preserve the asset and provide maintenance efficiencies. Currently on a number of sites, significant resources are used to patch problems, a costly and ineffective approach which leaves the basic problem untouched. Many of these sites were designed as traffic management devices, and it is important that they retain their integrity of function. It makes sense not to allow them to fall into serious disrepair, ultimately requiring an even larger infusion of funds. We have identified many of the problems and have estimated the cost of repairing them.

Portland has exhibited its determination to maintain a liveable city time and time again. Evidence of this determination is present in a number of planning documents, including the Street Beautification Plan, Portland Multnomah benchmarks for preserving and expanding Portland's greenspaces, and many of the neighborhood community plans. Traffic management sites tend to be very visible, and in large part make our city the liveable place that it is. As the city grows and becomes even more congested the importance of these traffic devices is even more apparent and crucial.

The city agencies share a responsibility to be good stewards of the infrastructure they have been entrusted to maintain. Unlike the state's Department of Transportation, PDOT enjoys a good reputation for maintaining and preserving its sites. The mood of the public today is concern over the prudent use of resources by governmental agencies. At the same time, many people share an increased awareness of water conservation, and of the environmental importance of trees. They wish to see landscapes maintained with these values in mind. The aging landscapes do not adequately meet goals of efficient water use, improvement in the tree canopy, and beautification of the city.

It is not surprising that the street sites need periodic upgrading. They are by their nature very exposed to traffic, heat, fumes, and subject to battering. The problems that exist are due to wear and tear from long-time use in a stressful environment. The repairs needed address deteriorating irrigation systems, aging landscapes, trees replacements and hazard repairs. A comprehensive listing of these items with a cost estimate for the work needed is attached.

It is important to start addressing these desperately needed repairs. This may be done through Transportation's capital improvement program, through a systems development fee, or other capital funding source. Please feel free to call either Brian (823-4484) or Kathy (823-1603) if you have questions or need additional information concerning this proposal.

#### **Irrigation Repair/Landscape Renovation**

#### SW Macadam Ave.

The irrigation system is antiquated and starting to wear out. Because of the narrowness of the medians and the hot concrete at this site, the plants are very reliant on a functional system. The valves are leaking badly. A replacement with the UNIK system, which involves remote controlled valves, would solve the leaking valve problem, and address low water pressure and difficult and dangerous work conditions. Cost \$14,500.

#### Airport Way Phase I

The irrigation system was originally designed to be a loop system. Because of later construction, it no longer is a loop, but has been broken up into several smaller systems. Most of these smaller segments cannot be turned on automatically, requiring manual control. Replacement of valves and solenoids with the UNIK system will allow for them to once again be automatic. Cost \$1000.

#### Ainsworth Blocks

The irrigation system is leaking, and many valves need to be replaced. Currently water must be turned on at the curb, which is dangerous for workers. Because of water run-off there is a need to control water times, so that there are several short water intervals/day, allowing the soil to take in the water. Because it would be costly to run wire under the streets connecting the islands, all 33 islands have a separate system. A UNIK system would allow for multiple start times, watering in the early morning, and shorter watering intervals, resulting in better water conservation and less water run-off. Cost \$52,000 for irrigation work

In addition, the blocks need renovation of soil and turf. The soil is compacted, material from winter storms has been thrown up along the curbs year after year, and needs to be removed. Renovation will help to increase soil permeability, reducing water run-off. Cost 1,500/block, 33 blocks \$49,500.

#### Miscellaneous Sites - controller replacement.

Includes Banfield and adjacent sites, Front Ave., Powell Blvd., and MLK Irrigation controllers are reaching the end of their life expectancy, several need immediate replacement. Cost \$38,000.

#### NW Everett and Front Ave.

Bed renovation and irrigation repair is needed around TRIMET's brick building. The landscape was damaged during flood control staging. Cost \$3,500.

#### SE Reedway Blocks

Many valves are leaking and need to be replaced. There is a need to control water times, so that there are several short water intervals/day. Each of the seven islands has a separate system, composed of 2 valves. A UNIK system would allow for multiple start times, watering in the early morning, and shorter watering intervals, resulting in better water conservation and less water run-

off. Cost \$28,000.



## Total Irrigation Repair/Landscape Renovation: \$186,500

**Tree Replacement and Maintenance** *Trees which pose an immediate hazard are marked with a* \*

#### Sites Maintained by Parks

#### SW Macadam Ave.

Because of general long term weakness in these trees, and ongoing and frequent tree damage, 100 trees need to be removed and replaced along Macadam over the next 5 years. Cost for removal and replanting \$73,000. Cost for 2 year establishment care \$46,500.

#### Ainsworth Blocks

Because of long-term deterioration of trees along the Ainsworth Blocks, 50 trees need to be removed and replaced over the next 5 years. Cost for removal and replacement \$36,000. Cost for 2 year establishment care \$23,000.

#### Site # 98 - NW Front and Everett

3 of the trees on site need to be removed and replaced. Cost for removal and replanting \$1,350. Cost for 2 year establishment care (including pest management) \$1,400.

#### Sites Maintained by BOM

Site #14 - N Greeley and Interstate

Remove and replace all 7 trees. Cost for removal and replacement \$2,400. Cost for 2 year establishment care \$3,250.

Site #23 - N Willamette Blvd. and N Wall Ave.

1 tree is missing, and needs to be replaced. Cost for replacement \$550. Cost for 2 year establishment care \$475.

#### \*Site # 74 - Jonesmore and Broadway, NE68th and 77th

Of the 50 trees at this site, 45 have root rot disease. All trees should be removed and replanted, and the stumps ground 18" below the surface. There are an additional 50 trees which have already been removed, these should be replanted as well. Cost for removal of 50 trees \$18,000. Cost for replanting 100 trees \$32,000. Cost for 2 year establishment care \$46,500.

Sites # 80 and 81 NE Lombard and 33rd, 42nd Each site needs 6 trees. Cost for planting 12 trees \$8,800. Cost for 2 year establishment \$5,600. Site # 84 - NE Prescott and 15th

Remove and replace 2 trees, prune others for balance. Cost for removal, replacement and pruning \$1,000. Cost for 2 year establishment care \$950.

\*Site # 98E - SE Waverleigh and 33rd

16 trees are needed for replacement. Currently 9 are missing, 4 are leaning and 2 have included bark. Cost for removal and replanting \$4,700. Cost for 2 year establishment care \$7,450.

Site #100E - E Burnside - 90th to 94th Trees need to be pruned for balance. 3 trees are missing and need to be replaced. Cost for pruning and tree replacement \$2,100. Cost for 2 year establishment care \$1,400.

Site #148 - SW Alder and 15th 30 trees need Class II pruning. Cost \$1,850.

Site # - N Prescott and Albina 1 tree is missing, and needs to be replaced. Cost for replacement \$550. Cost for 2 year establishment care \$475.

Miscellaneous - 13 sites Light pruning, pest management and inspection required to bring trees up to standard. Cost \$1,700.

Total Tree Replacement and Maintenance: \$321,000

#### Subtotal

Irrigation Repair/Landscape Renovation: \$186,500 . Tree Replacement and Maintenance: \$321,000

#### **Grand Total Infrastructural Repairs**

\$507,500

#### Service Reduction Impacts

<u>Current Service Level</u>: Collectively, the large and small sites total over 240 sites. Parks maintains these site by using multiple providers of services. We have found this management method to be very effective. Service providers include a contractor - Portland Habilitation Center (PHC) who is a "Qualified Rehabilitation Organization" as defined by the State. We are required by State law to award contract work to a Qualified Rehabilitation Organization when one is available. We use the contractor to provide services which are predictable and occur at a regular frequency. Other providers include: Park Districts, Horticultural Services, Urban Forestry, Mowing, and Equipment.

Task work includes litter & leaf removal, irrigation operation and repair, weed control, insect and disease control, mulching & grooming, shrub pruning and replacement, tree pruning and replacement, tree grate expansion and repair, debris removal, etc. Often there are special projects like homeless camp cleanup or vehicular damage repair. Service level varies at different sites. All of these services are currently provided at the minimal level the community will accept and at a level lower than what is adisable to preserve City assets. We currently provide these services at the level described above for \$879,638 in fiscal year 1998-99 to the 240 + sites. Even at this funding level, we have seen a continual decline in infrastructure.

<u>Service Plan 1998-99</u>: TheTransportation's budget plan for 98-99 provides Park's 18% less funding to care for the built Transportation landscapes. This is a reduction of \$154,090 and will result in the loss of approximately 1 FTE Park employee (49-50K), \$5,000 in M&S, and reduction of contractor services by \$100,000.

Other impacts to the City include:

- The City relies heavily on voluntary compliance in the care of landscapes in the rights-of-way by the adjacent property owner. If the City does not show leadership in caring for the infrastructure assigned to it, the result will be a lower level of care provided by private property owners ultimately resulting in loss of public infrastructure. The City's Urban Forestry Management Plan seeks to engage the community in good stewardship of street trees and the urban forest through education and example, rather than by regulation. The neglect of the City's street landscapes, (which are viewed by thousands of motorists daily), will send a poor message and make enforcement of City Code difficult.
- Parks, Transportation, Neighborhood Offices, and points of call intake will spend substantial time responding to complaints.

#### Impacts to the Community:

• Services to 14 sites will be eliminated completely. These sites are scattered and

the lowest visibility. An example are the landscapes along Going Street and Greely St. at Interstate. Vegetation growth may cause safety problems, litter will collect at bus stops. Street trees will decline overtime and bike pathes will be less valuable. (Savings = \$30,500)

- Reduction of mulch applications and renovation. There will not be enough funds to maintain the integrity of landscapes. Plantings will become sparse and there will be numerous bare spots. Mulch will be applied infrequently. Visual appearance will be significantly reduced. (Savings = \$24,627)
- Contractor services will be reduced to Arterials, Bridgehead, and Other sites by 50%. There will be no litter pickup, no groundcover trimming, no leaf pickup, no tree well care, and only infrequent response to irrigation repair needs. These include sites like the downtown bridgeheads, Powell, Macadam, Front, M.L.K. Jr., Yeon and the other arterials. (Savings = \$80,000).
- Services to all Greenblocks like Ainsworth and Reed College are reduced. Grass will brown out seasonally, trees will decline. (Savings = \$20,000).
- Rehabilitation Contractor will loose some opportunity.



# CITY OF PORTLAND BUREAU OF PARKS AND RECREATION

OPERATIONS—HORTICULTURAL SERVICES 6437 S.E. DIVISION AVE. PORTLAND, OREGON 97206 (503) 823-1636

MIKE LINDBERG, Commissioner

CHARLES JORDAN, Director

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Dennis Campbell, Bureau of Maintenance

FROM: Brian McNerney, Parks - Horticultural Services

DATE: November 9, 1992

SUBJECT: Estimate for New Sites

Attached is a list of Transportation sites that have ornamental landscapes as a component. This list identifies new sites that were not on the F.Y. 92-93 BOM - Parks Interagency. The costs are estimates that are pro-rated to reflect the portion of the year that the site is serviced.

I apologize for the delay in providing you with this information. I felt it important that the information be accurate and complete. The process of collecting the necessary information was intense and time consuming, requiring that my staff interview numerous project managers from the various transportation departments. We believe the list is comprehensive and the numbers are accurate. The costs are based on the current level of service delivered to similar sites.

We are now working on the list of F.Y. 92-93 current sites to arrive at adjusted costs for F.Y. 93-94. I will get these numbers to you as soon as they are finalized.

Thanks for your patience.

THIS COULD BE INTERESTING! IF They don't "get it" I'm getting my gun ...

Page 1

#### CITY OF PORTLAND/BUREAU OF PARKS HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT ESTIMATE FOR FY 93-94 FULL YEAR AND PRO-RATED COSTS FOR \*\*\*\*\* NEW SITES \*\*\*\*\*

in

REC NO.	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	¦CURRENTLY  MAINTAINED   BY	ESTABLISH. PERIOD ENDS	CONTRACT. BID COST			EST.PARK     SUPPORT     COST	EST.TOTAL    MAINT.    COST
186 188 196-	2¦E. Light Rail Williams-Sandy, Holladay Renovation ¦#6D NTMP- NE Wistaria & 42nd ¦#7A NTMP-SW Taylors Ferry & Terwilliger 1¦N Marine Drive, I-5 to Rivergate - Phase I 1¦SW Terwilliger, Sam Jackson to Homestead, Phase I	¦Unknown ¦Design ¦Estab/finish	Contractor	1993?		N M? N	0 0 80 0	0 0 472 387	0    0    1,284    387
276- 2	¦Transit Mall Rehabilitation ¦N.E. Hollywood - New Hollywood Fred Meyers l¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 24th/Weidler 2¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Schuyler 3¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 30th/Broadway	¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen	Contractor	11/93	0 90	M M M N	120 70	0 0 110 520 0	0 0 230 680 0
276- 5 276- 6 276- 7	N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 32nd/Schuyler N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Weidler N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Halsey N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Clackamas N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Wasco	¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen	Contractor Contractor Contractor	11/93 11/93 11/93	90 90 135 90 90	M M M	70 70 70 70	520    520    1,159    520    520	680    680    1,364    680    610
279- 2 279- 3 279- 4	#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Tillamook #5 NTMP - NE 7th & Sacramento #5 NTMP - NE 7th & Russell #5 NTMP - NE 7th & Graham #5 NTMP - NE 7th & Morris	Est-Complete Est-Complete Est-Complete Est-Complete Est-Complete	Contractor Contractor Contractor	3-15-93 3-15-93 3-15-93	80 80 80 80 80	M     M     M	60 60 60 60 60	345    345    345    345    345	484    484    484    484    484
280 280- 1 282- 1	<pre>#5 NTMP - NE 7th, Hancock - Fremont (Curb Ext) #5 NTMP - NE 7th &amp; Fremont - Curb Ext - NW corner #6A NTMP-SE Eastmoreland B, 37 &amp; Bybee</pre>	Est-Complete Est-Complete Estab comple Establishmen Establishmen	Adj.Prop. Contractor Contractor	3-15-93 3-15-93 1/94	80 0 101 303	N N M	60 0 60 120	345    0    345    490    490	484    0    345    651    913
288 289 290	#6C NTMP-NE 24th & Wiedler A #6C NTMP-NE 24th & Wiedler B Airport Way Phase I		Const.by ? Const.by ? Contractor	93/94 ? 93/94 ? 10-31-93	4,862	M M A	800 ¦	0    0    4,183    4,423	0    0    9,845    4,543
	rinted: 11/09/92 file: cl_acc\93-94.r13								
				TOTALS: ¦					
			CENTRAL O	VERHEAD					2,365

GRAND TOTAL

28,165

Page 1(B)

4- 2¦ 186 188 196- 1¦ 201- 1¦		Only trees & wells on side. Summer of 94-95 const. contractor waters only. No landscaping. No more info-continuous planning stage-Transp. construct. FY 91/92 Minor seeding? Verify with Trans. Eng. 97 trees, 15000 sq ft shrub bed. \$4200 summer 94 manual watering trees. Irrig- quick cplr only Park Bureau maintains curb extensions, BOM maintains 3 islands.
205 276 276- 1 276- 2 276- 3	P P P	No impact. 7 sites-street closures-trees & irrigation, shrubs - Fred Meyer. Semi-Diverter (Adjacent property owner). Channelization. Median. No landscaping - concrete only.
276- 4 276- 5 276- 6 276- 7 276- 8	P	Cul-de-sac. For 93-94 multiply Contractor Bid Cost by .45 Cul-de-sac. Cul-de-sac. Cul-de-sac. Cul-de-sac. Cul-de-sac.
279- 1 279- 2 279- 3 279- 4 279- 5	P   P   P   P	Landscaped traffic circles. Landscaped traffic circles. Landscaped traffic circles. Landscaped traffic circles. Landscaped traffic circles.
279- 6 280   280- 1 282- 1 282- 2	P   P   P   P	Landscaped traffic circles. @27 curb extensions. Property owner maintained. *On contract for one year, then re-evaluate. 3 trees and bark dust. Circle approx 100 sq ft. Circle approx 650 - 800 sq ft.
285 288 289 290 292	P   P   F	@7 curb extentions. Lost in limbo??? Verify with Traffic Management. This may be Fred Meyer REC# 276-1. Lost in limbo??? Verify with Traffic Management. This may be Fred Meyer REC# 276-1. Medians only. 93-94 mult Contr Bid by .72. Large pruning & bark costs in 2-3 years. Trees and grates. Will need to be hand watered summer of 93. (July, August, Sept).

at a second s



Page 1

#### CITY OF PORTLAND HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: FY 1992-1993 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT: CURRENT SITES

10   ). }-	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY		CONTRA	¦IRR.	SEWER	SUPPORT	
3  W. Light Rail 4  E. Light Rail	e (Oregon to Wheeler) SW 500 (tree wells & trees)	4310	BOM  Contractor  Contractor  Contractor  DELETE	1	531	92 M 92 92 A	0 1883 213 752 0	0 5670 906 1363 0	15220    1652    4238
<ul> <li>N. Beech &amp; Bor</li> <li>N. Columbia Bl</li> <li>N. Columbia &amp;</li> <li>N. Concord &amp; G</li> <li>N. Emanuel Cir</li> </ul>	vd, Buchanan to Oswego Oswego oing	596 2826 941	¦BOM ¦BOM ¦Contractor ¦BOM ¦Contractor	1	0 0 6281 0 6281	92 N 92	0 0 0 0	0    0    2466    0    3905	0 8747 0
12-1¦N. Going St. I	nterstate Noise Barrier nterstate Noise Barrier – Rough M nterstate Cul-De-Sacs	16,065 38	Contractor  Contractor  BOM  BOM  Contractor		2094 0 0	92 A 92 92 92 N	0	278 4916 0 721	7010    0    0
16 N. Mason & Gan 17 N. Nocks Crest	Triangle iangle (@ Shaver)	L 11 725 1538 823	BOM BOM BOM BOM BOM	10-31-89	0 0 0 0	A	0   0   0   0   0	0 0 0 0	0
<ol> <li>N. St. Johns B</li> <li>N. Vancouver W</li> <li>N. Wall &amp; Will</li> </ol>		1096	Contractor Contractor BOM BOM Adj. Prop.	- E 2 2 4 1		92 M 92 M	220 220 0 0	954 558 0	1367
	4th & Brazee		Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor	11-15-90 11-15-90 11-15-90	177 177 177	92   M*   92   M 92   M 92   M 92   M	84 84 84	1920 295 376 295 295	2564 556 637 556 556
30  UNIT 4 - N.E.2 31  UNIT 4 - N.E.31 32  UNIT 4 - N.E.31 33  N.E. 37th Ave. 34  N.E. 37th Ave.	5th & Grant Pl. 5th & Grant Pl. @ Thompson		Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor	11-15-90 11-15-90	206 206 147	92   M   92   M   92   M   92   M   92   M   92   M	84   84   84   88   86	295    416    295    115    156	556 706 585 350 450
<ul> <li>35 N.E. 37th Ave.</li> <li>36 N.E. 53rd &amp; Has</li> <li>37 N.E. 53rd &amp; Cla</li> <li>38 N.E. Alameda &amp;</li> <li>39 N.E. Alameda &amp;</li> </ul>	ssalo ackamas 38th		Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor	12-29-89 12-29-89	147 147 560	92   M   92   M   92   M   92   M   92   M	99 80 80 260 105	115 426 426 278 278	361    653   653    1097    619

ate printed: 1/09/92 file: sal\_acc\92-93.r4

9 S

4

,		EA LANDSCAP	ULTURAL SERVICES DE MAINTENANCE: FY 1992 REEMENT: CURRENT SITES	-1993	Page	2
EC	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY ESTABLISH. MAINTAINED PERIOD BY ENDS		WATER/EST.PARK SEWER SUPPORT COST	
40 41 42 43 44	N.E. Senate & Hassalo N.E. 39th & Halsey N.E. 57th & Hoyt N.E. 68th & Halsey N.E. 69th & Halsey		Contractor 10-31-89 Contractor 10-31-89 Contractor 10-31-89 Contractor 10-31-89 BOM 10-31-89	265 92 N 354 92 N 354 92 A 472 92 A 0 N	0 764 0 1140 110 1159 220 989 0 0	1494 1623 1681
45 46 47 48 49	N.E. 80th & Halsey N.E. 81st & Halsey N.E. Coe Circle (39th & Glisan) N.E. Grand & Everett N.E. 21st & Pacific		Contractor 10-31-89 Contractor 10-31-89 Contractor Contractor 4-01-90 Contractor 10-31-89	339 92 A 339 92 A 2035 92 A 2388 92 A 118 92 N	220 762 220 800 1460 4483 220 769 0 913	1359 7978 3377
50 51 52 53 54	N.E. 22nd & Pacific N.E. 33rd & Clackamas (Shrubs) N.E. 33rd & Clackamas (Turf) N.E. Senate & Sandy N.E. East end of Steel Bridge (Light Rail)		Contractor 10-31-89 Contractor 10-31-89 Contractor 10-31-89 Contractor 10-31-89 Contractor 10-31-89	118 92 N 1077 92 N 1077 92 A 1077 92 A 147 92 N 2035 92 A	0 773 0 1009 330 1104 0 764 440 1107	2085    2510    911
55 56 57 58 59	N.E. Fargo Court & 162nd N.E. Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - Duddleson N.E. Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - Dyer N.E. Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - 86th N.E. Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - Siskiyou		Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor	1799 92 N 206 92 M 206 92 M 265 92 M 118 92 M	0  2388 77  162 77  162 77  162 77  162 77  137	445 445 504
60 61 62 63 64	N.E. Grant Place - 35th & 36th SU #31839 N.E. Halsey & 102nd N.E. Weidler at 102nd N.E. Halsey & 112th N.E. Hollywood District - NE 42nd & Sandy	1791 2061	DELETE DELETE BOM BOM Contractor	0 M 0 M 0 M 0 M 0 118 92 A		0
65 66 67 68 69	N.E. Hollywood District - NE 45th & Sandy N.E. Hollywood District - NE Halsey & 42nd N.E. Hollywood District - NE Broadway, 41 Pl, 4 N.E. Hollywood District - NE 39th & Sandy N.E. Hollywood District - Str. Trees, Rest of P		Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor	295 92 A 206 92 A 177 92 A 88 92 N 265 92 N	204   185 110   38 83   227 0   220 0   5654	354 486 308
70 71 72 73 74	N.E. Holman & 13th N.E. 34th & Holman N.E. 37th & Holman N.E. 41st & Holman N.E. Jonesmore/Broadway @ 68th to 77th	2615	DELETE-Par Contractor 12-29-89 Contractor 12-29-89 Contractor 12-29-89 BOM	0 147 92 M 177 92 M 177 92 M 0	0 0 80 428 80 428 80 428 80 428 0 0	655 665 685
76 77 78	N.E. Killingsworth & Lombard (Portland Hwy) N.E. Klickitat Mall - Entrance to 11th N.E. Klickitat Mall - 11th to 12th N.E. Klickitat Mall - 12th to 13th N.E. Klickitat Mall - 13th to 14th		ODOT-DELET   Contractor   Contractor   Contractor   Contractor	0 509 92 N 509 92 N 509 92 N 509 92 N	0 0 0 161 0 477 0 768 0 1126	670 986 1277

Date printed: 1/09/92 file: sal\_acc\92-93.r4

.

C   SITE ADDRESS, .   DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY	ESTABLISH. PERIOD ENDS	CONTRAC BID COST			SUPPORT	EST.TOTAL     MAINT.      COST
<ul> <li>N.E. Lombard &amp; 33rd</li> <li>N.E. Lombard &amp; 42nd</li> <li>N.E. Mason &amp; 19th - Landscape &amp; triangle @ base</li> <li>2-1 N.E. Mason &amp; 19th - West of 19th</li> <li>3 N.E. Multnomah St. &amp; Imperial</li> </ul>	2258 2136 771	BOM BOM Contractor BOM Contractor	1 1	0 0 383 0 147	92   92   M	0 0 0 83	0 1271 81	0    1654    81
<ul> <li>4 N.E. Prescott &amp; 15th</li> <li>5 N.E. Shaver &amp; 17th</li> <li>6 N.E. Thompson &amp; 17th</li> <li>7 N.E. Tillamook &amp; 16th</li> <li>8 N.E. Union-Broadway to San Rafael</li> </ul>	1322 638 762 611	¦BOM  BOM  BOM  BOM  Contractor		0 0 0 4276	92: A	0 0 0 383	0 0 0 141	0
<ul> <li>N.E. Union-San Rafael to Lombard</li> <li>N.E. Williams &amp; Jessup</li> <li>N.E. Wistaria &amp; 41st</li> <li>N.E. Wistaria &amp; 49th</li> <li>N.W. 25th &amp; Marshall</li> </ul>		Contractor  Contractor  Contractor  Contractor  Contractor	P 7 7 1	265 177 413	92 M 92 N 92 M 92 M 92 M	0 220 0	278 379 557	543 776 970
<ul> <li>4 ¦N.W. 25th &amp; Overton</li> <li>5 ¦N.W. 25th &amp; Quimby</li> <li>6 ¦N.W. 29th &amp; Wilson</li> <li>7 ¦N.W. Couch &amp; I-405 @ 15th &amp; 16th</li> <li>8 ¦N.W. Everett &amp; Front (Steel Bridge Interchange)</li> </ul>		Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor	11-15-89 11-15-89	80 295 767	92   M 92   M 92   M 92   M 92   A	80 80 110	280 607 980	440 982 1857
<ul> <li>9 N.W. Front &amp; Nicolai (trees &amp; wells)</li> <li>0 N.W. Luray Terrace Circle</li> <li>1 N.W. Quimby &amp; 29th</li> <li>2 N.W. Raleigh &amp; 26th</li> <li>3 N.W. Raleigh &amp; 27th</li> </ul>	Completed 291 589	¦Contr./Par  BOM  BOM  Contractor  Contractor	11-15-89	0 0 132	92 N 92 M 92 M	0 0 80	0 0 319	0    0    530
5 ¦N.W. Yeon & Front (Overpass) 6 ¦N.W. Yeon & Nicholai to St. Helens 7 ¦S.E. 82nd Div Schiller	Past Est. Completed		10-31-90	270 6482	92 A 92 N	0 2750 0	278 7177 4137	548 16409 4402
<ul> <li>9 S.E. 90th @ Foster</li> <li>0 S.E. 90th @ Woodstock</li> <li>1 S.E. 97th @ Woodstock</li> <li>2 S.E. Foster Rd Woodstock &amp; Henry Str.</li> <li>3 S.E. 97th &amp; Henry</li> </ul>	1884 38 1870 31 Planning	¦BOM  BOM  BOM  BOM  Contractor	2-1-91	0	н м 92 А	0 0 0 110	0	0
<ul> <li>4 S.E. 103rd &amp; Morrison</li> <li>5 S.E. 103rd &amp; Stark</li> <li>6 S.E. Ankeny &amp; 32nd</li> <li>7 S.E. Division - 8th &amp; 9th (tree wells)</li> <li>8 S.E. Henderson 42nd to 45th</li> </ul>	3 306 38 361 245	BOM  BOM  BOM  Contractor  BOM		0 0 29. 0	92	0	0 0 600	0    0    629

te printed: 1/09/92 file: sal\_acc\92-93.r4

EC 0.	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY ESTAB		¦IRR.		SUPPORT :	EST.TOTAL MAINT. COST
20 21 22	S.E. Ladd Circle S.E. Ladd Traffic Diverters @ Ladd & Palm S.E. Ladd Traffic Diverters @ Ladd & Lavender S.E. McLoughlin & Milwaukee S.E. McLoughlin & 17th		DELETE Contractor Contractor ODOT-DELET ODOT-DELET	14	0 5 92 0 92 0	75 30 0	0 152 152 0	372    382    0
25 26 27	S.E. Park 51 (@ 108th & Stark) S.E. Powell, Trees & Wells, Ross Is. Br. to 50t S.E. Powell & 28th S.E. Powell & 7th S.E. Powell & 9th - North	658	Contractor Contractor BOM Contractor Contractor	20	6 92 8 92 0 6 92 1 92	3725 0 0 0	900 6451 0 278 237	7159 0 484
30 31 32	S.E. Powell & 9th - South S.E. Powell & Milwaukie S.E. Powell - 50th to 92nd S.E. Salmon & 16th S.E. Salmon & 27th		Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor	50 1394 2	1 92 1 92 7 92 9 92 9 92	0 0 3913 0 0	220 415 10112 352 311	916 27972 381
35 36 37	S.E. Scott Dr. & 65th - Greenleaf S.E. Waverleigh & 33rd S.E. 12th & Ash S.E. 16th & Ash S.E. 14th & Pine	2293	Contractor BOM Contractor 2-10 Contractor 2-10 Contractor 2-10	)-90 11	2 92 0 8 92 M 8 92 H 8 92 M	0 0 80 80 80	188 0 712 712 712	0 910 910
40 41 42	S.E. 15th & Alder S.E. 14th & Taylor S.E. 13th & Salmon S.E. 13th & Madison S.E. 14th & Main		Contractor¦ 2-10 Contractor¦ 2-10 Contractor¦ 2-10 Contractor¦ 2-10 Contractor¦ 2-10	)-90   11 )-90   11 )-90   11	8 92   M 8 92   M 8 92   M 8 92   M 8 92   M 8 92   M	80 80 80 80 80 80	712 670 670 670 670	867 867 867
45 46 47	S.E. 15th & Oak S.E. Woodstock & 72nd S.E. 56th & Woodward S.E. 58th & Woodward S.W. Alder & 15th	-132	Contractor 2-10 BOM Contractor 12-29 Contractor 12-29 Parks	9-89	8 92   M 0   N 4 92   M 4 92   M 0	80 0 80 80	832   0 191   	0    315    305
50 51 52	S.W. Arthur St Median - First to 4th S.W. Barbur Blvd. Hamilton to Bancroft S.W. Boones Ferry & Terwilliger S.W. Broadway - 4th to 6th S.W. Burnside & Tichner	525	Contractor   DELETE  BOM  Contractor   Contractor	79	8 92   0   6 92   M 5 92	0 0 0 440	927   0   0   278   170	0    0    1514
55 56 57	S.W. Capitol Highway / Terwilliger  S.W. Car Wash FtnTransit Mall  S.W. Carl Place  S.W. Clifton & Park  S.W. Collins Circle (18th & Jefferson)	993	Contr./Par 10-31  Parks  BOM  Contractor   Contractor	395	5 92 H 0 A/ 0 1 92 4 4 92 M	165 0 1760	879   3771   0   479   664	3936 0 6189

ate printed: 1/09/92 file: sal\_acc\92-93.r4

,

.

#### HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: FY 1992-1993 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT: CURRENT SITES

		HORTICU REA LANDSCAP	LTURAL SERVIO E MAINTENANCE REEMENT: CURF	: FY 1992-1	993			Page	5
C ==	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY		CONTRACT BID COST				MAINT. !!
0	S.W. Dosch & Beaverton-Hillsdale S.W. First - Harrison to Arthur N.W. Front Avenue - Steel Brdg. to North S.W. Front Avenue - Steel Brdg. to Harrison S.W. Harbor Drive		Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor Parks		4718 9 1769 9 6723 9	2¦ A	0 173 600	8254 3469 2310	12972    5411    9633
5 .6	S.W. Harbor Dr. & Clay Triangle S.W. Hall & 14th S.W. Harrison St. Median - Front to 4th S.W. Hawthorne Br. (@ Madison, Jefferson & Main S.W. Highland & U.S. 26 (Zoo)		Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor Contractor		855 9 5337 9 1887 9 1297 9 2536 9	2   M 2   2   M	220 0		7451    3376    3068
0	S.W. Jackson & 6th (Bike Path) S.W. Kelly Fountain -Transit Mall S.W. Lincoln Median - First to 4th S.W. Macadam - West end of Sellwood Bridge S.W. Macadam - Bancroft to Willam. Moorage Blvd	5 L	BOM Parks Contractor Contractor Contractor		0 0 1769 9 2064 9 5661 9	2:	0 0 0 4732	0 5889 886 2215 5091	5889    2655    4279
'5 '6 '7	S.W. Macadam-Tay.Fer.Rd.Pt.,B/S Islands, Virg.S S.W. Madison - 5th to 6th S.W. Patrick Place S.W. Patton Place S.W. Portland Ctr. (Front, Market & Harbor Dr.)	516	Contractor Contractor BOM Contractor Contractor		1681 9 147 9 0 649 9 2418 9	2¦ A 2¦	200 0 32	1380 339 C 349 5116	686 0 1030
30 31	S.W. Ross Island Bridge Interchange (@ Hood) S.W. Sherwood Place (on Fairmont) S.W. Tyrol Circle S.W. Vermont 45th to 50th S.W. Vista & Spring	זרר	Contractor Contractor Contractor BOM Contractor		9760 9. 1179 9. 177 9. 0 649 9.	2:	7343 0 32 0 0		1478    486    0
34 35 .6 .7	S.W. Vista Avenue Bridge W. Burnside Median 1st to Park N. Kerby & Failing Traffic Div (near Unthank Pk N. Omaha Parkway N.E. Ainsworth Blocks	Ç	DELETE Contractor DELETE Parks Parks		0 826 9 0 0	2    M   M	0 192 0 6147 9740	0 724 0 6206 30247	1741 0 12353
.9 10 21 22 23	N.E. Roseway Blocks Parkway N.W. Light Rail 700 S.E. Firland Parkway (72nd & Foster) S.E. Laurelwood Triangle S.E. Reed College Parkway (Reedway Blocks)		Parks  Parks  Parks  DELETE  Parks		0 0 0 0	H A M	1540 1644 0 5928	11835 0 6163 0 18008	0    7807    0
24 25 26 27 28	S.W. Campbell Fountain, 18th & Burnside  S.W. Light Rail 600 (Pots)  S.W. Terwilliger Blvd. Parkway  S.W. Thomas & 53rd  S.W. Transit Mall (Madison-Burnside, 5th & 6th)		Parks Parks DELETE DELETE Parks		0 0 0 0	M	132 0 0 0	4085 6110 0 0 63069	6110    0    0

ate printed: 1/09/92 file: sal\_acc\92-93.r4

REC	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY ESTABLISH. MAINTAINED PERIOD BY ENDS	CONTRACT. BID IRR COST	WATER/	SUPPORT	EST.TOTAL MAINT. COST
29 30 31 32 33	Convention Center-South side of Lloyd WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.16th & Stark WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.13th & Belmont WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.12th & Clay WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.12th/Mulberry/Market	Completed Completed Completed Completed	BOM  1960  Adj. Prop.  3-31-89  Adj. Prop.  3-31-89  Adj. Prop.  3-31-89  Adj. Prop.  3-31-89	0 N 0 N 0 N 0 N		0	0
34 35 36 37 38	WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.12th & Mill WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.12th & Stephans WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.12th & Harrison WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.11th & Grant WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.12th & Grant	Completed Completed Completed Completed Completed	Adj. Prop.  3-31-89  Adj. Prop.  3-31-89	0 N 0 N 0 N 0 N 0 N	0	0	0    0    0
39 40 41 42 43	WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.11th & Carruthers WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.12th & Carruthers WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.12th & Elliot WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.Elliot & Birch WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.15th & Stark	Completed Completed Completed Completed Completed	Adj. Prop.  3-31-89  Adj. Prop.  2-10-90	0 N 0 N 0 N 0 N 0 N	0		0
44 45 46 47 48	WEST. EDGE-CURB EXT S.E.14th & Belmont N.E. Hayden Island Drive - Medians N.E. Hayden Island - Tomahawk Drive Medians Convention Center-Lloyd Ext. West side Convention Center-Lloyd Ext.@ 9th & Oregon, Nor	Completed	Adj. Prop.¦ 2-10-90 Adj. Prop.¦10-31-90 Contractor¦10-31-90 BOM 10-31-90 Adj. Prop.¦10-31-90	0 N 0 1062 92 M 0 A? 0 A?	0 2000 0	0 3034 0	0 6096 0
49 50 51 52 53	Convention Center-Lloyd Ext.@ 11th, North Convention Center-Holladay Off Ramp I-84 Minnesota & I-5 S.W. Bertha/Barber - Vermont DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 32nd		Adj. Prop. 10-31-90  Contractor 10-31-90  ODOT-MNTC. 10-31-90  Contractor 10-31-90  Contractor  6-30-91	0 A? 3686 92 A 0 A 531 92 N 72 92 M	176 0 0	832 0 2298	4694    0    2829
256 257	DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 37th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 43rd DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 46th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 51st DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 55th A		Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91	72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M	88 88 88	290 290 290	450 450 450
60 61 62	DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 55th B DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 58th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Harrison & 37th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Harrison & 41st DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 23rd		Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91	72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M	88 88 88	411 290 290	571    450    450
:65 :66 :67	DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 31st DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 36th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 45th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 47th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.30th & Carruthers		Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91  Contractor  6-30-91	72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M 72 92 M	88 88 88		450 450 450

late printed: 1/09/92 file: sal\_acc\92-93.r4

. . .

.

### Page 7

#### HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: FY 1992-1993 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT: CURRENT SITES

A REPORT OF STREET

• • •

, · .

•

INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT: CURRENT SITES											
.C	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY EST MAINTAINED PI BY		CONTRAC BID COST			VER   SUP	PORT	EST.TOT MAINT. COST	
,9 '0 '1 '2 '3	DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.30th & Grant A (North) DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.30th & Grant B (South) DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Hawthorne & 12th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.26th & Harrison DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.39th & Lincoln		Contractor 6- Contractor 6- Cont-Ad.Pr 6- Contractor 6- Contractor 6-	30-91 30-91 30-91	72 72 72	92  M 92  M 92  A 92  A 92  M 92  M	1 8 1 8 8	68 88 88 88 88 88	290 290 311 361 290	45 47 52	0     0     1     1
74 75 77 78 31	DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.39th & Clinton N.E. 47th Thompson & Brazee Convention Center-Overlook S.W. Terwilliger & Taylor Ferry S.W. Burnside & Tichner	Pre-Const	Contractor 6- Contractor 10- Contractor 6-3 Contractor 10- DELETE 6-	8-91 0-92 31-91	236 2123 236	92   M 92   M 92   A 92   A 92   N   N		88¦ 176¦ 330¦ 0¦ 0¦	290 430 1287 1032 0	84 374 126	0    0    8    0
)0 10	¦Bark ¦Renovation	1 1 1		   	7500 28000		   	   	0		0
ste printed: 1/09/92 file: sal_acc\92-93.r4											
:22				TALS:	198074	1	; 7	1910¦ 34	3026	61301 ===	0

3

TOTAL COST

÷

the second se

McNerney/Campbell Meeting - January 5, 1994

Our reduction package is a serious reduction and will have a negative impact on the program especially over a long period of time.

- <u>Water</u> was cut beyond our comfort zone, we are gambling on the weather (7-8 year drought). If we lose we will be reducing direct services to cover water costs.
- Tree Grates The tree grate monies in the 93-94 budget are a necessary annual expenditure. Tree grate work is not needed on the Malls at this time, but is necessary elsewhere on the Transportation Landscapes. My recommendation is to defer necessary tree grate work into the future.
- <u>Root Pruning</u> The trees identified for root pruning are maturing to a size that will prohibit pruning. Deferring the pruning project is not a good long term decision.

Parks is doing good work and is providing a good value in the service it provides.

- Landscape Maintenance is our core business, we do it well and have an excellent reputation locally and nationally.
- We have fine-tuned our maintenance practices and over the past few years have provided more service for less dollars. Comparisons between service years will show a continuous trend of savings.
- A recent independent study found that Horticultural Services and Forestry are cost competitive and provide value in their areas of service delivery.
- Billings for services provided are based on actual hours, equipment and materials expended rather than estimates. Errors in billings are more likely to be in the favor of the B.O.M. due to omissions in billings.

The current service level funding is a basic level of funding resulting from several years of reductions and refinements.

- Our experience shows that any further reduction in basic services (litter removal, weed control, pruning, watering, pest management) will have several negative outcomes.
  - 1. Complaints from neighbors, viewers and users.

- Safety/law suits need to provide visibility for traffic, lighting, pedestrians.
- 3. Infrastructure decline reduction of basic plant services will result in plant loss. A short term savings will result in a much greater long term cost.

Parks feels a strong responsibility for the care of the Transportation Landscapes.

- We understand the need to cut costs as we have been continually providing more for less to Park and Transportation Landscapes. We also know the value and replacement costs of landscapes and are concerned that the landscapes don't decline in value on our watch. Stewardship is very important to Parks, it is our main purpose of participation.
- We provide landscape services to numerous pubic agencies and value their confidence in our services, expertise and property management abilities.


>\_ CUNTAIL DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SITES. SUPERVISION LOOK NEQUCING. 12,507 1/2-BANK 607,933 - NENO VATION 30,155 93-94 94-95 51,769 - revense 42,662 659,702 687,991 652,08 Censmonton BIUS 588,915 71 331 + 11,875 + 11 875 + 51290 698866 652, INCLUPED 698,866 + TREES (BARD) 7,000 Mollywood ST. Trees) 652,080 + INCREASE INT -46,786 UPCOMING SITES 331 TCAMPBELL FOUNTAIN 3,057 -FIRE BUNCAU 68,117 PANK 51 (STANK \$ 105th) 14,800 \* OMAHA 15,683 AINSWOND GANG NOSEWAY 11,989 652,080 67,699 -21,331 0045 FINLAND PRWAY 8,260 (630,749)75,959 Leed PARKWAY 28,921 Some timber 652,080 \$104,880 The seal 65,208 46786 26,007 INY 687,991 72793 699 \$66 thees + 699866 652,080 47.78-6



## CITY OF PORTLAND BUREAU OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Dennis

OPERATIONS-HORTICULTURAL SERVICES 6437 S.E. DIVISION AVE. PORTLAND, OREGON 97206 (503) 823-1636



MIKE LINDBERG, Commissioner

CHARLES JORDAN, Director

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Dennis Campbell, Bureau of Maintenance Brian McNerney, Horticultural Services Supervisor FROM: DATE: December 14, 1992 SUBJECT: F.Y. 93-94 Interagency Cost Estimate \_\_\_\_\_ Following are costs for next year's interagency agreement. I believe the costs are accurate, please review the numbers and let me know what you think. Landscape services to all sites on the "Current" List \$607,933 Landscape services to all sites on the "New" List \$ 25,801 Transit Mall/Lt Rail Flower Pot costs are excluded from this package and are proposed for inclusion in the Downtown Special Appropriation. Total Direct Service Costs: \$633,734 2% Overhead on Contracted Services \$ 4,008 2% Overhead on Utilities 1,612 13.79% Overhead on Park Services 48,637 93-94 TOTAL COSTS \$687,991 Decision Packages Additional Ivy Pruning for Traffic Safety \$ 26,007 Root Pruning to prevent hard surface deterioration (sidewalks, etc.) \$ 64,557

# PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION

HORTICULTURAL SERVICES

6437 SE DIVISION, PORTLAND, OR 97206



Telephone (503) 823-1636

CHARLIE HALES, COMMISSIONER

Facsimile (503) 823-2246

CHARLES JORDAN, DIRECTOR

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Dennis Campbell, Bureau of Maintenance Brian FROM: Brian McNerney, Horticultural Services DATE: December 23, 1993 SUBJECT: F.Y. 94-95 Interagency Cost Estimate Following are preliminary costs for next years interagency agreement. I believe the costs are accurate, please review the numbers and let me know what you think. Landscape Services to all sites on the \$588,915 "Current List" Landscape Services to all sites on the \$ 11,875 "New List" Transit Mall/LRT Flower Pot Costs are excluded from this package and are proposed for inclusion in the Downtown Special Appropriation. Total Direct Service Costs: \$600,790 Overhead 2% Overhead on Contracted Services: 4,313 2% Overhead on Utilities 1,040 13.79% Overhead on Park Services 45,937 \$ 51,290 94-95 TOTAL PROJECTED COSTS \$652,080

Comparing the projected costs for next fiscal year with the 93-94 estimated costs (\$687,991) shows a significant reduction in funding requested to maintain the sites. When factoring in service to new sites and increased costs of providing services, the reduction becomes even more significant.

Page 1 of 2

Community Gardens • Floral Displays • Japanese Gardens • Transportation Landscapes Public Rose Gardens • Plant Materials • Environmental Education • Park Support Services

• Dedicated to enriching the lives of citizens and enhancing Portland's natural beauty •

I hope you find the numbers acceptable. What may please you more is that we anticipate no reduction in service if funded at this level. The savings identified come from refinement of our irrigation practices, general efficiencies, and better data collection. In 93-94 we also budgeted \$30,000 for tree grate repair on the Transit Malls which will not be necessary in 94-95, but may be needed again sometime in the future.

When we last talked you mentioned that a 10% reduction may be needed to offset revenue shortfalls. It is my hope that the reduction is not necessary and that current funding won't be diverted from the street landscape program. My recommendation is to curtail development of new sites rather than reduce the minimal services we are now providing to existing sites. Further reduction in service will result in deterioration of the sites and related citizen complaints and require significant funds for future site restoration.

The savings we identified for next fiscal year are very near the 10% level. My recommendation is to use these savings to implement the root pruning program that I introduced last year. The root pruning program is estimated to cost \$65,000. This program (proposed for the Macadam and other areas), will prevent damage from tree roots to sidewalks and other hard surfaces. While the program costs are substantial, they should be measured against liability and future sidewalk repair costs. The City Forester feels root pruning should be done soon, before the young trees grow to a size that prohibits pruning.

A list of "Upcoming Sites" has been developed for your information and future planning. Please give little value to the dollar amounts assigned to each site. The costs are wild guesses and should indicate whether a site will be a big cost item or a minor item. The cost estimates will be refined as the site plans become better developed.

I hope this budget plan meets your needs. Please call me at 823-1635 with any questions. Our goal for 94-95 will be to continue to provide quality service to the sites at a competitive cost.

Thanks.

Page 2 of 2

#### Page 1

#### CITY OF PORTLAND HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: FY 1994-1995 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT: CURRENT SITES

RECEIVER BUREAU: BOM

=====									
		1	CURRENTLY		CONTRACT	.1 1	WATER/	EST.PARK	EST.TOTAL !!
REC	SITE ADDRESS,	PROJECT	MAINTAINED		BID	IRR!	SEWER	SUPPORT !	
NO.	DESCRIPTION	STATUS	BY	ENDS	COST			COST	COST
=====		***********							
0	Street Area Landscapes Locations				0		0		
2	E Harbor Drive (Oregon to Wheeler)	Constr/Main	t CONTRACTOR		5,305		900		
3	W Light Rail SW 500 (tree wells & trees)	1	CONTRACTOR		563		0		
4-	1¦E Light Rail Williams - Sandy	Maintenance	CONTRACTOR		3,183		600		
8	N Columbia & Oswego		CONTRACTOR		6,664	I N I	0	2,944	9,607
10	N Emanuel Circle	1	CONTRACTOR			1 0 1	50	2 0 17 1	0 720
11	NE Gertz @ 4800	1	CONTRACTOR		6,664		50 140		
12	N Going St Interstate Noise Barrier	8	CONTRACTOR						
14	N Greely & Interstate	1	CONTRACTOR		2,222 2,628		0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
20	N St. Johns Bus.DistrBurlington Av. & Philade	1	CONTRACTOR				0		a second a second se
	IN SC. Johns Bus. Disti. Builington Av. & Initade			• •	020		285	559	1,470
21	N St. Johns Bus.DistrLombard & Richmond	1	CONTRACTOR	1	625	A	497	847	1,969
25	N Willamette & Portland Blvd - NTMP #4	1	CONTRACTOR			MI	92		
26	NE Thompson & 24th - NTMP #4		CONTRACTOR	1983-04 30 0 arbidd		MI	92		
27	NE Tillamook & 24th - NTMP #4	1	CONTRACTOR			M	92		
28	NE Brazee & 24th - NTMP \$4		CONTRACTOR				92		
29	NE Thompson & 21st - NTMP #4		CONTRACTOR:	11-15-90 ¦	188	MI	92 ¦	312	592
30	NE Brazee & 21st - NTMP #4		CONTRACTOR!	11-15-90	188	M	92	245	525
31	NE Grant P1 & 35th - NTMP \$4		CONTRACTOR:	11-15-90	219	M	92	255	566
32	NE Grant Pl & 36th - NTMP #4		CONTRACTOR:	11-15-90 ¦	219	M	92	255	566
33	NE 37th Ave. @ Thompson		CONTRACTOR:		156	M	103	201	
34	NE 37th Ave. @ Brazee		CONTRACTOR:		219		106		525
35	NE 37th Ave. @ Wistaria		CONTRACTOR		158		73	201	430
	NE Hassalo & 53rd		CONTRACTOR		156		75	240	471
37	NE Clackamas & 53rd		CONTRACTOR	12-29-89	156		99	240	494
38	¦NE Alameda & 38th		CONTRACTOR!	i	594	Mi	100	310	1,004
39	NE Alameda & Regents		CONTRACTOR	!	250	м!	106 ¦	310	666
40	NE Senate & Hassalo		CONTRACTOR	10-31-89	281		0	534	815
41	NE Halsey & 39th		CONTRACTOR		376	200	0	1,002	1,377
42	NE Hoyt & 57th		CONTRACTOR		376		257	685	1,317
43	NE Halsey & 68th		CONTRACTOR		501		160	685	1,345
45	NE Halsey & 80th		CONTRACTOR!	Notes and a second	360		242	579	1,181
46	NE Halsey & 81st		CONTRACTOR:	10-31-89	360	A	242	436	1,038
47	NE Coe Circle (39th & Glisan)		CONTRACTOR	1	2,159	A	422	4,034	6,615
48	NE Grand & Everett		CONTRACTOR:	4-01-90	2,533	A ¦	242	999	3,774
49	NE Pacific & 21st		CONTRACTOR	10-31-89	125	N	0	375	500
	INE Desifie & Dord							ARE 11	
50	NE Pacific & 22nd		CONTRACTOR		125		0	375	500
51	NE Clackamas & 33rd (Shrubs)		CONTRACTOR	1000 U 14 1 100040 .	1,142		0	504	1,646
52	NE Clackamas & 33rd (Turf)		CONTRACTOR!		1,142		300	1,022	2,464
53	NE Senate & Sandy		CONTRACTOR		156		0	548	704
54	NE East end of Steel Bridge (Light Rail)	Maint/Const	CONTRACTOR	0-31-89	477 ¦	N	0	3,079	3,557
									*********

RECEIVER BUREAU: BOM

· •

\* 2

=====						======				::::
		!	CURRENTLY ESTA	BLISH. 10	CONTRACT.	1 1	WATER/	EST.PARK	LEST TOT	AI !!
REC	SITE ADDRESS,	PROJECT		ERIOD	BID	IRR	SEWER		HAINT.	
	DESCRIPTION	STATUS		ENDS	COST	1 1	JEWEN			
NO.		1 31A103		103 1	0031	1 1		COST	COST	11
						1 1 1				
55	NE Fargo Court & 162nd	i	CONTRACTOR	i	2,419		0			
56	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Duddleson	1	CONTRACTOR	i		M	74			5
57	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Dyer	i .	CONTRACTOR	1	219	M	82		66	7 11
58	NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - 86th	1	CONTRACTOR	1	281	M	80	333	694	4
59	¦NE Fremont Dr & 85th Diverters - Siskiyou	1	CONTRACTOR	1	125	M	80	199	404	4 11
64	NE Hollywood District - NE 42nd & Sandy		CONTRACTOR:		125	A	150	148	423	3
65	NE Hollywood District - NE 45th & Sandy	1	CONTRACTOR	i		A	91			8
66	NE Hollywood District - NE Halsey & 42nd	1	CONTRACTOR	1		A	50			1
67	<ul> <li>Control description of a state of the state</li></ul>	1	CONTRACTOR	1		A	78			
	NE Hollywood District - NE Broadway, 41 Pl, 42n	1		1						8
68	NE Hollywood District - NE 39th & Sandy		CONTRACTOR	i	93	N	0	221	ii 314	·
69	NE Hollywood District - Street Trees, Rest of P	8	CONTRACTOR!	1	281	N I	0	6,806		
71	NE Holman & 34th	1	CONTRACTOR 12-29	9-89 ¦	156	M	94		604	111
72	NE Holman & 37th	1	CONTRACTOR 12-29	9-89	188	MI	94	220	502	2 11
73	NE Holman & 41st	1	CONTRACTOR 12-29			M	108			
76	NE Klickitat Mall - Entrance to 11th		CONTRACTOR		540		0			
77	NE Klickitat Mall - 11th to 12th		CONTRACTOR	1	540	N	0	163	703	
78	NE Klickitat Mall - 12th to 13th	8	CONTRACTOR	1	540	N	0	232	771	
79	NE Klickitat Mall - 13th to 14th		CONTRACTOR	Í	540		0			
82	¦NE Mason & 19th - Landscape & triangle @ base		CONTRACTOR		406		0			
83	NE Multnomah St. & Imperial		CONTRACTOR		156		90			
						н ( 		200	1 500	
88	NE Union-Broadway to San Rafael		CONTRACTOR	1	563		338			
89	NE Union-San Rafael to Lombard		CONTRACTOR		5,529	Ρ¦	512 }	8,726	14,767	
90	NE Williams & Jessup		CONTRACTOR		281	Nł	0	322	603	
91 .	NE Wistaria & 41st		CONTRACTOR	1	188	M	100	442		
92	NE Wistaria & 49th		CONTRACTOR	1	438		0			
93			CONTRACTOR 11-15		 g2	M	94	194	370	
1.1					S. 10. 18	10000				
94	NW Overton & 25th		CONTRACTOR 11-15			M	93	194		
95	NW Quimby & 25th		CONTRACTOR: 11-15		85		93	201		
96	NW Wilson & 29th		CONTRACTOR 11-15	5-89	313		107	558		
97	NW Couch & I-405 @ 15th & 16th	-	CONTRACTOR	i	814	M	152	783	1,749	!!
98	<pre>{NW Everett &amp; Front (Steel Bridge Interchange) {</pre>		CONTRACTOR		5,256	A	600 ¦	790 ¦	6,645	
99	The second s	Completed	CONTR/PARK 87				0	523		
102	NW Raleigh & 26th		CONTRACTOR 11-15				95	307		
102	NW Raleigh & 27th		CONTRACTOR 11-15				79	307		
	· ·	Deat Cat								
104	NW Vaughan Trees/Wells	Past Est.	CONTR/PARK 10-31	-09	188	N ;	0	1,488 ¦	1,676	ii 
105	NW Yeon & Front (Overpass)		CONTRACTOR:		286	N	0	140		
106	NW Yeon & Nicholai to St. Helens		CONTRACTOR		6,877	A	2,827	8,424 ¦	18,128	11
107	SE Division - Schiller on 82nd		CONTRACTOR 10-31	-90	281		0	4,554		
108	SE Division & 82nd Tree Wells	Completed	CONTR/PARK 10-31				0	179		
113	SE Henry & 97th	Planning					150	552		
	SE Henry & 97th									

RECEIVER BUREAU: BOM

, ,

.

=====								===========		
		1	CURRENTLY	ESTARI TOU	CONTRACT	1 1	WATER/	EST.PARK	LIEST TOTAL	
REC	SITE ADDRESS,	PROJECT	MAINTAINED		BID	'IRR		SUPPORT		
NO.	DESCRIPTION	STATUS	BY	ENDS	COST	1 1		COST	II CUSI	11
										===
117	SE Division - 8th & 9th (tree wells)	i	CONTRACTOR			N	0			
120	¦SE Ladd Traffic Diverters 🖲 Ladd & Palm	1	CONTRACTOR			I M I	65			
121	¦SE Ladd Traffic Diverters @ Ladd & Lavender		CONTRACTOR		159	M	37	205	402	4
124	¦SE Stark & 108th (Park 51)		CONTRACTOR		3,879	A	3,500	7,106	11 14,485	
125	SE Powell, Trees & Wells, Ross Is. Bridge to 50		CONTRACTOR!			N	0			
127	SE Powell & 7th		CONTRACTOR;		219	N	0	207	425	
128	SE Powell & 9th - North		CONTRACTOR:		234	N	0	274	508	11
129	SE Powell & 9th - South		CONTRACTOR!		234	IN I	0			
130	SE Powell & Milwaukie		CONTRACTOR!			MI	82			
131	SE Powell - 50th to 92nd		CONTRACTOR		14,796			10,299		
132	¦SE Salmon & 16th		CONTRACTOR!		31	N	0	659	690	11
133	SE Salmon & 27th		CONTRACTOR			N	Ő			
134	SE Scott Dr & 65th - Greenleaf		CONTRACTOR				0			
136	SE Ash & 12th		CONTRACTOR			M	96			
137	SE Ash & 16th		CONTRACTOR							
				2-10-90	123	IN I	99	499	724	11
138	SE Pine & 14th		CONTRACTOR!	2-10-90	125	MI	99	499	1 723	11
139	SE Alder & 15th		CONTRACTOR			M	101			
140										
	SE Taylor & 14th		CONTRACTOR				97			
141	SE Salmon & 13th		CONTRACTOR				102			
142	SE Madison & 13th		CONTRACTOR	2-10-90	125	i M i	98	571	794	11
143	SE Main & 14th		CONTRACTOR	2-10-00 !	125	M	98	499	722	
	SE Oak & 15th		CONTRACTOR			M	99			
146	SE Woodward & 56th		CONTRACTOR 1							
						[ N ]	119			
	SE Woodward & 58th		CONTRACTOR	12-29-09 1		I M I	75			
148	SW Alder & 15th		PARKS	i	U	A	175	6,014 ¦	6,189	11
149	SW Arthur St Median - First to 4th		{CONTRACTOR}	1	1,939	0	50	701	2,780	
1 .				1						
	SW Broadway - 4th to 6th		CONTRACTOR	1		P	350		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	SW Capitol Highway / Terwilliger		CONTR/PARK 1	0-31-90	,		250	1,145		
	SW Car Wash Fountain - Transit Mall		PARKS			A/	200	3,080		
157	SW Clifton & Park		CONTRACTOR		4,192	M	637	382	5,211	
450	SW Dosch & Beaverton-Hillsdale ;									
			CONTRACTOR!		313		0			
	SW First - Harrison to Arthur		CONTRACTOR		5,005		50	7,661		
	NW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to North		CONTRACTOR		1,877		190	2,501	•	
	SW Front Avenue - Steel Bridge to Harrison		CONTRACTOR	1			660	4,549	12,341	
163	SW Harbor Drive		PARKS 1	0-31-90 ¦	0	M	200	5,357	5,557	
	SW Harbor Dr & Clay Triangle		CONTRACTOR		1,077		800	1,012		
	SW Harrison St Median - Front to 4th		CONTRACTOR		2,002		50	1,201	•	
	SW Hawthorne Bridge (@ Madison, Jefferson & Mai		CONTRACTOR	1	1,376	M	205	2,375		1
	SW Highland & US 26 (Zoo)		CONTRACTOR	1	2,690	P¦	50	276	3,017	1
170	SW Kelly Fountain -Transit Mall		PARKS		0	M	112	4,785		

RECEIVER BUREAU: BOM

,

	RECEIVER BUREAU: BUM						
			CURRENTLY ESTABLISH	. CONTRACT.	WATER/	EST.PARK	EST. TOTAL !
EC	SITE ADDRESS,	PROJECT	MAINTAINED: PERIOD	BID IF			MAINT.
0.	DESCRIPTION	STATUS	BY ENDS	COST	1	COST	
====							
71	SW Lincoln Median - First to 4th	i	CONTRACTOR	1,877   M		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
72	SW Macadam - West end of Sellwood Bridge	i	CONTRACTOR	2,190   P			
73	SW Macadam - Bancroft to Willamette Moorage Bl		CONTRACTOR	6,006   M			
74 75	¦SW Macadam-Tay.Fer.Rd.Pt.,B/S Islands, Virg.St ¦SW Madison - 5th to 6th	ri 1	CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR	1,783   M   156   A			
				1 130   A	1 IZJ	1 200 11	567 ¦
17	SW Patton Place		CONTRACTOR	668   M			
78	SW Portland Center (Front, Market & Harbor Dr)	į	CONTRACTOR	2,491 A			
79	SW Ross Island Bridge Interchange (@ Hood)	i	CONTRACTOR	10,053 M			
80	SW Sherwood Place (on Fairmont)	i	CONTRACTOR		0		,
31	SW Tyrol Circle	i	CONTRACTOR:	182   P	52	462	696
35	W Burnside Median 1st to Park	1	CONTRACTOR	851 M			
	1¦SW Terwilliger, Sam Jackson to Homestead, Phase	e¦Est Per	CONTRACTOR 5/94	309 N			605
7	N Omaha Parkway		PARKS	0   M		•	15,683 🗍
8	NE Ainsworth Blocks	1	PARKS	0   M			
9	¦NE Roseway Blocks Parkway		PARKS	0   M	1,500		11,989
0	NW Light Rail 700		¦PARKS ¦	0   N	0	0 11	57,699
1	SE Firland Parkway (72nd & Foster)	1	PARKS	0   A			8,260
3	SE Reed College Parkway (Reedway Blocks)	1	PARKS	ON			28,921
4	SW Campbell Fountain, 18th & Burnside	1	PARKS	0 1			3,057
6	¦NE Hayden Island - Tomahawk Drive Medians	1	CONTRACTOR 10-31-90	1,127 ¦ A	2,200	1,959	5,286 11
0	Convention Center-Holladay Off Ramp I-84		CONTRACTOR   10-31-90	3,910   A	378	507	4,795
2	SW Bertha/Barber - Vermont	1	CONTRACTOR 10-31-90	563   N			5,586
3	SE Lincoln & 32nd	1	CONTRACTOR: 8-30-91	76   M	97		547 H
	"¦SE Lincoln & 37th	1	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91	76   M		374	547
5	¦SE Lincoln & 43rd	1	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91	76 M	97	374	547
3	¦SE Lincoln & 46th	! !	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91	76   M	97	326	499
7	SE Lincoln & 51st	1	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91	1 76   M			547
	SE Lincoln & 55th A	1	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91	76 M	97	362	535
	SE Lincoln & 55th B	1	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91			340	514
)	SE Lincoln & 58th	1	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91	76 M	97	374	547
	 ¦SE Harrison & 37th		CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91	76   M	   97	374	547
	¦SE Harrison & 41st	1	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91				514
	¦SE Clinton & 23rd	1	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91				547
	SE Clinton & 31st	1	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91		97	326	499
5	¦SE Clinton & 36th		CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91	76 ¦ M	97	374	547
	¦SE Clinton & 45th		CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91	76 ¦ M	97	374	547
	SE Clinton & 47th		CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91				547
	SE 30th & Carruthers		CONTRACTOR: 8-30-91				547
	SE 30th & Grant A (North)	ſ	CONTRACTOR: 6-30-91				533
9		1		10 1 11		000 []	000 11

RECEIVER BUREAU: BOM

.

а то<sup>с</sup>а

с. 8

RECEIVER BUREAU: BOW								
		CURRENTLY		contract of the second s			EST.PARK !!	
REC   SITE ADDRESS,	PROJECT	MAINTAINED		BID	IRR	SEWER		MAINT. !!
NO. { DESCRIPTION	STATUS	¦ BY	ENDS	COST	i i	i	COST	COST
			0 00 04					
271  SE Hawthorne & 12th		Cont-Ad.Pr				97		10 In 1997 IN 1997
272  SE 26th & Harrison		CONTRACTOR			IN I	97		
273   SE 39th & Lincoln	i	CONTRACTOR			M	97		547
274  SE 39th & Clinton	i	CONTRACTOR			M	97		703
275 ¦NE Thompson & Brazee @ 47th	i	CONTRACTOR!	10-8-81	i 250	M	194 ¦	340	784
	15.1.1.1.1.1.		44/00		1 14 1			
276- 2¦NE Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Schuyler	Establishmen				I M I	132		750
276 - 4¦NE Hollywood - New FM - NE 32nd/Schuyler	Establishmen				M	132	384	750
276- 5¦NE Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Weidler	Establishmen				H H	132	384	750
276- 6¦NE Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Halsey	Establishmen				M	132	384	750
276- 7¦NE Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Clackamas	Establishmen	CUNTRACTOR;	11/93	233	M	132	384	750
270 OLNE Hallinged New EM NE 2016 /Wasse	IC. h. h 1 i . h		44/00			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
276- 8¦NE Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Wasco	Establishmen				N	0	348	581
277 Convention Center-River Overlook	i	CONTRACTOR!		2,252		466	934	3,652
278  SW Terwilliger & Taylor Ferry		CONTRACTOR			N	0	166	417
279- 1¦NE Tillamook & 7th - NTMP #5	Est-Complete				I M I	132	250	572
279- 2¦NE Sacramento & 7th - NTMP ≇5	Est-Complete	CUNIRACIUR	3-13-93	190		132	250	572
	Eat-Complete	LCONTRACTOR	2 15 02	100		+00 1	100 II	670 []
279- 3¦NE Russell & 7th - NTMP #5	Est-Complete			190		132	250	572
279- 4¦NE Graham & 7th - NTMP ≸5	Est-Complete					132	250	572
279- 5¦NE Morris & 7th - NTMP \$5	Est-Complete			190		132	250	572
279- 6¦NE Cook & 7th - NTMP #5	Est-Complete					132	250	572 11
280- 1¦NE Fremont & 7th - Curb Ext - NW corner - NTMP	Estab comple	CUNTRACTOR	3-10-93	149	i N i	0	113	262 (   )
202 11CC Eastmand D 27 8 Dubas NTMD #84			1/0/	200		+00 I	050 11	740 11
282- 1;SE Eastmoreland B, 37 & Bybee - NTMP #6A	Establishmen			330		132	250	712
282- 2¦SE Eastmoreland C, 34th & Bybee - NTMP #6A	Establishmen			989		398	250	1,635
290  Airport Way Phase I	Maintenance		10-31-83 1	6,108		1,650	2,422	10,179
292 "INW Hoyt & 9th		CONTRACTOR	i	188		0	2,403	2,591
294 NW Nicolai/Yeon Intersection - 3 trees	I	CONTRACTOR	i	13	N	0	159	232(  )
400 ¦Bark	I	· · ·		7 057	1	Λ I		10 507
410 Renovation	1		1	7,957		0	4,550	12,507
	1			29,705	1	0	450	30,155 🌘
Date printed: 12/21/93 file: h:\homes\hort\94-95n.r4						)		
2000 printed: 12/21/00 1116: 11/10003/1010/04-301.14							V	
			TOTALS:	210 8	18 !	51,145 ¦	326 952 !!	588 915 !!
			TOTALOT			ן עדו ניס	010,002 []	000,010 11
			CENTRAL O	VERHEAD:				50,326
			GRAND TOT	AL:			1	639,241

#### CITY OF PORTLAND/BUREAU OF PARKS HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: FY 94-95 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT: PARTIAL SITES PRO-RATED COSTS \*\*\*\*\* NEW SITES \*\*\*\*\*

RECEIVER BUREAU: BOM

REC NO.	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	CURRENTLY ESTABLISH PROJECT MAINTAINED PERIOD STATUS BY ENDS	.  CONTRACT.    WATER/ EST.PARK  EST.TOTAL      BID  IRR.  SEWER   SUPPORT   MAINT.      COST       COST    COST
153 187 196- 205 209	SW Burnside & Tichner  SW Boones Ferry/Taylors Fry-Primrose - NTMP #7A 1¦N Marine Drive Grnwy, I-5 to Rivergate - Phase I  Transit Mall Rehabilitation  NE Convention Center - Hassalo/Multnomah Connect		150       0       667       817         150       M       90       1,486       1,726         200       M       90       858       1,148         0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0         0       N       0       0       0
291 300	¦Airport Way Phase II ¦N Ivy Court/Sumner/Haight St Closure	¦Establishmen¦CONTRACTOR¦11/94 ¦Estab/Maint ¦CONTRACTOR¦4/95	4,000   A   600   2,284    6,884      338   M   90   872    1,300

Date printed: 12/21/93 file: h:\homes\hort\94-95n.r13

DIRECT COST TOTALS: | 4,838 | 870 | 6,167 || 11,875 ||

CENTRAL OVERHEAD: 965 GRAND TOTAL: 12,840

......

Page 1

#### CITY OF PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: FY 1994-1995 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT: UPCOMING SITES

RECEIVER BUREAU: BOM

-

	KECEIVEK ROKEAN: ROW								
REC	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	   PROJECT   STATUS	¦CURRENTLY ¦MAINTAINED ¦ BY		¦ CONTRACT.   BID   COST			¦EST.PARK     SUPPORT     COST	
186 188 189 190 191	NE Wistaria & 42nd - NTMP \$6D SW Taylors Ferry & Terwilliger - NTMP \$7A SE Harold/Foster-52nd to 72nd, A - NTMP SE Harold/Foster-52nd to 72nd, B - NTMP N Smith-Columbia Way/Fessenden-A-NTMP \$7C Curb	¦Unknown ¦Unknown ¦Design/Plan ¦Plan/Design ¦Plng/Const	ADJ. PROP.		0	   M?     N     N	0 0 97 0 0	0 302 0	0    491    0
	¦N Smith-Others - B - NTMP ≸7C Medians  SW Virginia north of Taylors Ferry - NTMP  N Ida - Willamette to Lombard - NTMP 1¦NE 21st/ Knott to Alameda 2¦NE 24th / Knott - Fremont		COP	Spr 96  95-96  95-96		M	0 100 0 200 200	402 0 818	595    0    1,200
197 199 200-		Plng/Design  Design/Const  Construction	?  CONTRACTOR  CONTRACTOR	10/95?	0 182 200 0 600	?	0 200 100 0 500	775   748   101	1,157    1,048    101
201- 202 203 204 206	SW Barbur/Terwilliger  SE Tacoma/McLoughlin Interchange  SE Brookside Dr/SE 117th Pl	Plng/Const  Construction  Construction  Plng/Design  Constr/estab	ODOT ODOT ADJ. PROP.	95/96 94-95? 95-96	150 0 0 0		0 0 250 0 0	666	0    916    0
(E) 2 (B) 2 (B) 2 (B)	INE Convention Center - Multnomah, 13th-16th INE Convention Center - 15th/16th - Mult & Broad		ADJ.PROP.   CONTR/CITY	95/96 96/97	0 0 350 0		0 0 400 0	0    718    0    1,448    338	718    0    2,198
13 14 15 83 84	NW Cornell Rd Collector East Riverbank NE Convention Center-MLK NW I-405 Nicoli-Vaughan	Planning??	ADJ.PROP/C	95/96   94/95 ?	0   0   400		0   0   0   400   0		0    0    1,989
286 287 288 293 293 295	¦NE Wistaria & 47th A - NTMP ≇6B ¦NE Wistaria & 47th B - NTMP ≇6B ¦NE Wiedler & 24th A - NTMP ≇6C ¦West Side Corridor Lt. Rail Extension ¦NE Wistaria @ 43rd	Planning?  Planning?	CONST. BY? CONST. BY? CONTRACTOR ADJ. PROP.	95/96   95/96   95/6   95/96	0	M   M   M   N	0	0    0	0    0
97 98 99 01 02		Constr	CONTRACTOR!	7/05	2,000   0   0   0   0		500   0   0   0   0	1,428    0    0    0    0	0    0

#### CITY OF PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: FY 1994-1995 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT: UPCOMING SITES

Last Update: 12/21/93 Page 2

. \*

RECEIVER BUREAU: BOM

9- 00010<sup>#</sup>

REC	~ 	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	   PROJECT   STATUS	CURRENTLY	¦ESTABLISH. )¦ PERIOD ¦ ENDS	(	CONTRACT. BID COST			WATER/ SEWER	¦EST.PARK ¦SUPPORT ¦COST		
304 305 306	NE NW	River Overlook to Steel Bridge - Pedest. Br Arena Project Transit Mall Extension 14th Place 148th/ Sandy-Marine Dr.	Construction  Construction  Planning  Plng/Design	Contractor  CONTR/PARK  ?  COP?	9/95  96  95-96  96?		500 0	A N M		200 2,000 0 250 0	9,290 4,027 1,451 2,016	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2,213    14,290    4,027    2,201    2,016
308	¦SE	Bybee & 17th	¦Plng/Design	?	¦95-96	 	200	   	1	160	469		829
				DIRECT CO	ST TOTALS:		12,9	32	;	8,557	36,048		57,537  }
		<i>,</i>		CENTRAL O	VERHEAD:								5,401
				GRAND TOT	AL:								62,938

-----





Page 1

#### CITY OF PORTLAND/BUREAU OF PARKS HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT ESTIMATE FOR FY 93-94 FULL YEAR AND PRO-RATED COSTS FOR \*\*\*\*\* NEW SITES \*\*\*\*\*

e . 1

REC SITE ADDRESS, NO. DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY  MAINTAINED   BY		CONTRACT. BID COST			EST.PARK  E   SUPPORT     COST	MAINT. COST
4- 2¦E. Light Rail Williams-Sandy, Holladay Renovation 186  #6D NTMP- NE Wistaria & 42nd 188  #7A NTMP-SW Taylors Ferry & Terwilliger 196- 1¦N Marine Drive, I-5 to Rivergate - Phase I 201- 1¦SW Terwilliger, Sam Jackson to Homestead, Phase I	Unknown Design Estab/finish	CONTRACTOR	1993?	732	N M? N	80	0    0    467    411	0 0 1,279 411
205 ¦Transit Mall Rehabilitation 276 ¦N.E. Hollywood - New Hollywood Fred Meyers 276- 1¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 24th/Weidler 276- 2¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Schuyler 276- 3¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 30th/Broadway	Establishmen Establishmen Establishmen	CONTRACTOR	11/93	90	M M M N	120 70	0    0    110    477    0	0 0 230 637 0
276- 4¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 32nd/Schuyler 276- 5¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Weidler 276- 6¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Halsey 276- 7¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Clackamas 276- 8¦N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Wasco	¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen	CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	11/93 11/93 11/93	90 90 135 90 90	M M	70 70 70 70	477    477    1,053    477    477	637 637 1,258 637 567
279- 1¦#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Tillamook 279- 2¦#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Sacramento 279- 3¦#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Russell 279- 4¦#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Graham 279- 5¦#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Morris	¦Est-Complete ¦Est-Complete ¦Est-Complete ¦Est-Complete ¦Est-Complete	CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	3-15-93 3-15-93 3-15-93	80 80 80 80 80	M   M	60 60 60 60 60	304    304    304    304    304	444 444 444 444 444
279- 6¦#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Cook 280  #5 NTMP - NE 7th, Hancock - Fremont (Curb Ext) 280- 1¦#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Fremont - Curb Ext - NW corner 282- 1¦#6A NTMP-SE Eastmoreland B, 37 & Bybee 282- 2¦#6A NTMP-SE Eastmoreland C, 34th & Bybee	¦Est-Complete ¦Est-Complete ¦Estab comple ¦Establishmen ¦Establishmen	ADJ. PROP. CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	3-15-93 3-15-93 1/94	80 101 303	N N M	60 60 120	304    0    304    447    447	444 0 304 608 870
<pre>285</pre>		CONST. BY? CONST. BY? CONTRACTOR	93/94 ? 93/94 ?	4,862		800	0    0    2,953    4,830	0 0 8,615 4,950
Date printed: 12/08/92 file: cl_acc\93-94.r13								
	D	IRECT COST 1	TOTALS: {	7,1	81 ¦	1,890 ¦	15,229	24,300 ¦
		CENTRAL OV	/ERHEAD					2,281

GRAND TOTAL

26,581

REC COMMENTS NO. 4- 2! Only trees & wells on side. Summer of 94-95 const. contractor waters only. 186 | No landscaping. No more info-continuous planning stage-Transp. construct. FY 91/92 188 | Minor seeding? Verify with Trans. Eng. 196-1¦ 97 trees, 15000 sq ft shrub bed. \$4200 summer 94 manual watering trees. Irrig- quick cplr only. 201- 1! Park Bureau maintains curb extensions, BOM maintains 3 islands. 205 No impact. 276 7 sites-street closures-trees & irrigation, shrubs - Fred Meyer. 276-1¦ Semi-Diverter (Adjacent property owner). 276-2; Channelization. 276-3; Median. No landscaping - concrete only. 276- 4; Cul-de-sac. 276- 5! Cul-de-sac. 276- 6¦ Cul-de-sac. 276- 7¦ Cul-de-sac. 276- 8; Cul-de-sac. ------279-1! Landscaped traffic circles. 279- 2¦ Landscaped traffic circles. 279-3! Landscaped traffic circles. 279- 4: Landscaped traffic circles. 279- 5¦ Landscaped traffic circles. \_\_\_\_\_ 279- 6! Landscaped traffic circles. 27 curb extensions. Property owner maintained. 280 280-1¦ \*On contract for one year, then re-evaluate. 3 trees and bark dust. 282-1¦ Circle approx 100 sq ft. 282- 2¦ Circle approx 650 - 800 sq ft. ----285 | 7 curb extentions. 288 | Lost in limbo??? Verify with Traffic Management. This may be Fred Meyer REC# 276-1. Lost in limbo??? Verify with Traffic Management. This may be Fred Meyer REC# 276-1. 289 290 Medians only. Large pruning & bark costs in 2-3 years. 292 ¦ Trees and grates. Will need to be hand watered summer of 93. (July, August, Sept). 

Date printed: 12/08/92 file: cl\_acc\93-94.r6

REC NO.	SITE ADDRESS, Description	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY  ESTABLISH.  MAINTAINED  PERIOD   BY   ENDS	BID		EST.PARK   EST.TOTAL     SUPPORT    MAINT.      COST    COST
3 4-	Street Area Landscapes Locations  E. Harbor Drive (Oregon to Wheeler)  W. Light Rail SW 500 (tree wells & trees) 1 E. Light Rail Williams - Sandy  N. Columbia & Oswego	         	CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	7,666 M 531 3,000 A 6,281 N	0 2,072 827 0	5,042    14,779    7,835    8,366    1,621    5,448
10 11 12 14 20	N. Emanuel Circle N.E. Gertz @ 4800 N. Going St. Interstate Noise Barrier N. Greely & Interstate N. St. Johns Bus.DistrBurlington Av. & Philad		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	6,281 P 413 A 2,094 2,477 N 590 M	0 132 0 0 242	452 997 3,700 5,794 1,205 3,682
21 25 26 27 28	N. St. Johns Bus.DistrLombard & Richmond UNIT 4 - N. Willamette & Portland Blvd UNIT 4 - N.E.24th & Thompson UNIT 4 - N.E.24th & Tillamook UNIT 4 - N.E.24th & Brazee		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR 11-15-90 CONTRACTOR 11-15-90 CONTRACTOR 11-15-90 CONTRACTOR 11-15-90	177   M   177   M	242   92   92   92   92   92	1,382    2,034    296    565    296    565
29 30 31 32 33	UNIT 4 - N.E.21st & Thompson UNIT 4 - N.E.21st & Brazee UNIT 4 - N.E.35th & Grant Pl. UNIT 4 - N.E.36th & Grant Pl. N.E. 37th Ave. @ Thompson		CONTRACTOR 11-15-90 CONTRACTOR 11-15-90 CONTRACTOR 11-15-90 CONTRACTOR 11-15-90 CONTRACTOR	177 M 177 M 206 M 206 M 147 M	92 92 92 92 92 97	342    612    296    594
34 35 36 37 38	N.E. 37th Ave. @ Brazee N.E. 37th Ave. @ Wistaria N.E. 53rd & Hassalo N.E. 53rd & Clackamas N.E. Alameda & 38th		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR 12-29-89 CONTRACTOR 12-29-89 CONTRACTOR	206 M 147 M 147 M 147 M 147 M 560 M	97 109 88 88 285	207       509         160       416         455       689         620       855         363       1,209
· 39 40 41 42 43	N.E. Alameda & Regents N.E. Senate & Hassalo N.E. 39th & Halsey N.E. 57th & Hoyt N.E. 60th & Halsey		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89	354 N 354 A	121	
45 46 47 48 49	N.E. 80th & Halsey N.E. 81st & Halsey N.E. Coe Circle (39th & Glisan) N.E. Grand & Everett N.E. 21st & Pacific		CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR 4-01-90 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89	339   A   2,035   A   2,388   A	1,606	
50 51 52 53 54	N.E. 22nd & Pacific N.E. 33rd & Clackamas (Shrubs) N.E. 33rd & Clackamas (Turf) N.E. Senate & Sandy N.E. East end of Steel Bridge (Light Rail)		CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89 CONTRACTOR 10-31-89	1,077   N   1,077   A   147   N		708       056         954       2,031         1,006       2,535         890       1,037         1,197       3,716

Date printed: 12/04/92 file: cl\_acc\93-94.r4

1

8

Page 1

REC NO.	COMMENTS
0 2 3 4- 1 8	Trees only, all tree work for Light Rail. 2 new islands added. Constr incr orig islands sizes. No City respons. for side well trees. John's Wood has been removed.
10 11 12 14 20	Replaced trees. Large Site
21 25 26 27 28	3 irrigation zones-cannot be simultaneously operated. High traffic damage here.
29 30 31 32 33	Next to Grant High-litter, vandalism, auto damage Next to Grant High-litter, vandalism, auto damage Water on site.
34 35 36 37 38	Water on site. Water on site.
39 40 41 42 43	At 44th Water on site. Landscaped Island
45 46 47 40 49	Water on site. By Elmers, water on site.
50 51 52 53 54	Shrub Site Turf & Shrubs Six Individual Sites, has water on sites.

Date printed: 12/04/92 file: cl\_acc\93-94.r6

ŧ 1

REC NO.	SITE ADDRESS, Description	PROJECT	CURRENTLY  ESTABLISH.  MAINTAINED  PERIOD   BY   ENDS	CONTRACT.  BID  IRR   COST	WATER/ SEWER	EST.PARK   EST.TOTAL     SUPPORT    MAINT.   COST    COST
55 56 57 58 59	N.E. Fargo Court & 162nd  N.E. Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - Duddleson  N.E. Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - Dyer  N.E. Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - 86th  N.E. Fremont Dr. & 85th Diverters - Siskiyou		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	1,799   N 206   M 206   M 265   M 118   Y	0 85 85 85 85	286    577    346    637    286    636
64 65 66 67 68	N.E. Hollywood District - NE 42nd & Sandy N.E. Hollywood District - NE 45th & Sandy N.E. Hollywood District - NE Halsey & 42nd N.E. Hollywood District - NE Broadway, 41 Pl, 4 N.E. Hollywood District - NE 39th & Sandy	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	118   A 295   A 206   A 177   A 88   N	224 224 121 91 0	73   592   162   489   274   542
69 71 72 73 76	N.E. Hollywood District - Str. Trees, Rest of P  N.E. 34th & Holman  N.E. 37th & Holman  N.E. 41st & Holman  N.E. Klickitat Mall - Entrance to 11th	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR 12-29-89  CONTRACTOR 12-29-89  CONTRACTOR 12-29-89  CONTRACTOR	265   N   147   M   177   N   177   M   509   N	0 88 88 88 0	531    766    374    639    696    961
77 78 79 82 83	N.E. Klickitat Mall - 11th to 12th  N.E. Klickitat Mall - 12th to 13th  N.E. Klickitat Mall - 13th to 14th  N.E. Mason & 19th - Landscape & triangle @ base  N.E. Multnomah St. & Imperial		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	509 N 509 N 509 N 383 147 M	0 0 0 91	576    1,084    921    1,430    1,418    1,927    1,281    1,664    401    639
88 89 90 91 92	N.E. Union-Broadway to San Rafael N.E. Union-San Rafael to Lombard N.E. Williams & Jessup N.E. Wistaria & 41st N.E. Wistaria & 49th		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	4,276   A 531   M 265   N 177   M 413	422   242   0   242   0	162       4,860       1         6,298       7,071       1         410       675       1         530       949       1         359       772       1
93 94 95 96 97	N.W. 25th & Marshall N.W. 25th & Overton N.W. 25th & Quimby N.W. 29th & Wilson N.W. Couch & I-405 @ 15th & 16th		CONTRACTOR 11-15-89 CONTRACTOR 11-15-89 CONTRACTOR 11-15-89 CONTRACTOR 11-15-89 CONTRACTOR 11-15-89	78 M	88   88   88   88   121	345       511         317       483         324       492         697       1,080         746       1,634
98 99 102 103 104	N.W. Raleigh & 26th N.W. Raleigh & 27th	Completed Past Est.	CONTRACTOR CONTR/PARK 87 CONTRACTOR 11-15-89 CONTRACTOR 11-15-89 CONTR/PARK 10-31-89	4,954   A   59   N   132   M   133   M   177   N	1,233   0   88   88   0	529       6,715         541       600         390       609         362       583         2,049       2,226
105 106 107 100 113		Completed Planning	CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR 10-01-90  CONTR/PARK 10-31-90  CONTRACTOR  2-1-91	270   N   6,482   A   265   N   29   N   177   A	0 3,025 0 0 121	267       537         8,083       17,590         4,677       4,942         207       236         518       816

Date printed: 12/04/92 file: cl\_ace/93 94.r4

e 7

Page 2

REC COMMENTS NO. ----------| Water on site. ----| Water on site. Water on site. -----Water on site. 4 trees with wells. Next to grade school-vandalism prevalent Next to grade school-vandalism prevalent Trees -24th to 28th, both sides of Vaughan Water on site. 82nd & Division Bus Stops. New Island at Woodstock-no turf-may be subject to car damage-vandalism

Date printed: 12/04/92 file: cl\_acc\93-94.r6

REC NO.	SITE ADDRESS, Description	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY MAINTAINED BY			IRR	SEWER	EST.PARK    SUPPORT    COST	MAINT. !!
117 120 121 124 125	S.E. Division - 8th & 9th (tree wells)  S.E. Ladd Traffic Diverters @ Ladd & Palm  S.E. Ladd Traffic Diverters @ Ladd & Lavender  S.E. Park 51 (@ 108th & Stark)  S.E. Powell, Trees & Wells, Ross Is. Br. to 50t		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	1		A	0 83 88 4,098 0	225    197    613	667    452    435    8,367    6,320
127 128 129 130 131	S.E. Powell & 7th  S.E. Powell & 9th - North  S.E. Powell & 9th - South  S.E. Powell & Milwaukie  S.E. Powell - 50th to 92nd		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR		206 221 221 501 13,947		0 0 0 4,304	234 217 370	473    455    438    871    26,642
132 133 134 136 137	S.E. Salmon & 16th S.E. Salmon & 27th S.E. Scott Dr. & 65th - Greenleaf S.E. 12th & Ash S.E. 16th & Ash		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	2-10-90		M	0 0 88 88	313    189    726	342    342    661    932    978
138 139 140 141 142	S.E. 14th & Pine S.E. 15th & Alder S.E. 14th & Taylor S.E. 13th & Salmon S.E. 13th & Madison		CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR	2-10-90 2-10-90 2-10-90	118 118 118 118 118	M   M   M	88 88 88 88	772	978    978    913    913    969
143 144 146 147 148	S.E. 14th & Main S.E. 15th & Oak S.E. 56th & Woodward S.E. 58th & Woodward S.W. Alder & 15th		CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   PARKS	2-10-90 12-29-89	44		88 88 88 88 0	707    707    780    258    6,101	913    913    912    390    6,101
153 154	S.W. Arthur St Median - First to 4th S.W. Broadway - 4th to 6th S.W. Burnside & Tichner S.W. Capitol Highway / Terwilliger S.W. Car Wash FtnTransit Mall		CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTR/PARK 1  PARKS		1,828   796   295   1,415	M I I	0   484   0   145   162	916	2,559    1,574    464    2,476    3,193
	S.W. Clifton & Park S.W. Collins Circle (18th & Jefferson) S.W. Dosch & Beaverton-Hillsdale S.W. First - Harrison to Arthur N.W. Front Avenue - Steel Brdg. to North		CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR  CONTRACTOR  CONTRACTOR  CONTRACTOR		3,951   914   295   4,710   1,769	M I M I	1,936   85   0   190	9,404	6,473    2,286    658    14,122    4,369
162 163 164 166 167	S.W. Front Avenue - Steel Brdg. to Harrison S.W. Harbor Drive S.W. Harbor Dr. & Clay Triangle S.W. Harrison St. Median - Front to 4th S.W. Hawthorne Br. (@ Madison, Jefferson & Main)		CONTRACTOR   PARKS 1  CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR	0-31-90	6,723   855   1,807   1,297	A   A   N	660   194   851   0   242	981    1,689	10,464    4,156    2,686    3,576    3,866

Date printed: 12/04/02 file: cl\_aceV93-94.r4

t r

Page 3

REC NO.	COMMENTS
117 120 121 124 125	Fountain included, but still seems a high water cost!
127 128 129 130 131	
132 133 134 136 137	
138 139 140 141 142	
143 144 146 147 148	Next to Franklin High-litter, vandalism
149 152 153 154 155	Disturbed by sewer/street construction-total renovation. This may have some handmowing, irrigation repair, litter - fountain.
157 158 159 160 161	Seems like a high water cost!
162 163 164 166 167	Turf, regular mow, and shrub beds. South of Harrison St along front. Not strong data on water costs.

Date printed: 12/04/92 file: cl\_acc\93-94.r6

e 3

REC NC.	SITE ADDRESS, Description	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY MAINTAINED BY			IRR	WATER/ SEWER		EST.TOTAL MAINT. COST
168 170 171 172 173	S.W. Highland & U.S. 26 (Zoo)  S.W. Kelly Fountain -Transit Mall  S.W. Lincoln Median - First to 4th  S.W. Macadam - West end of Sellwood Bridge  S.W. Macadam - Bancroft to Willam. Moorage Blvd	)                 	CONTRACTOR PARKS CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR		2,536 1,769 2,064 5,661	' M     M     N	0 0 0 5,205	2,082	4,513    3,458    4,146
174 175 177 178 179	S.W. Macadam-Tay.Fer.Rd.Pt.,B/S Islands, Virg.S  S.W. Madison - 5th to 6th  S.W. Patton Place  S.W. Portland Ctr. (Front, Market & Harbor Dr.)  S.W. Ross Island Bridge Interchange (@ Hood)	1 1 1	CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR		1,681 147 649 2,418 9,760	A	0 220 35 1,650 8,077	434    449    1,964	
180 181 185 198 217	S.W. Sherwood Place (on Fairmont)  S.W. Tyrol Circle  W. Burnside Median 1st to Park  N Delta Park Interchange  N. Omaha Parkway	Completed	CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR ODOT PARKS	1		? P M	0 35 211 0 6,762	281    489    1,246    0    12,214	1,460 701 2,283 0 18,976
218 219 220 221 223	N.E. Ainsworth Blocks  N.E. Roseway Blocks Parkway  N.W. Light Rail 700  S.E. Firland Parkway (72nd & Foster)  S.E. Reed College Parkway (Reedway Blocks)		PARKS PARKS PARKS PARKS PARKS			M   N   A   M	10,714 1,694 0 1,808 6,521	29,343    9,459    7,696    22,288	40,057 11,153 0 9,505 28,808
224 225 228 246 250	S.W. Campbell Fountain, 18th & Burnside  S.W. Light Rail 600 (Pots)  S.W. Transit Mall (Madison-Burnside, 5th & 6th)  N.E. Hayden Island - Tomahawk Drive Medians  Convention Center-Holladay Off Ramp I-84		PARKS  PARKS  PARKS  CONTRACTOR  CONTRACTOR		1,062 3,686		145 0 2,200 300	2,842    1,136    48,234    1,721    643	2,987    1,136    48,234    4,983    4,629
252 253 254 255 256	S.W. Bertha/Barber - Vermont  DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 32nd  DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 37th  DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 43rd  DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 46th		CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR	6-30-91 6-30-91 6-30-91	72	M   M   M	0 97 97 97 97 97		5,406    523    496    496    477
257 258 259 260 261	DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 51st DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 55th A DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 55th B DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Lincoln & 58th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Harrison & 37th		CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR	6-30-91 6-30-91 6-30-91	72   72   72   72	N   N   N	97   97   97   97   97	327    336    295    355    327	496    505    463    523    496
262 263 264 265 266	DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Harrison & 41st DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 23rd DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 31st DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 36th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 45th		CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR   CONTRACTOR	6-30-91 8-30-91 6-30-91	72   72   72	М   М	97   97   97   97   97	295    355    355    355    178	463    523    440    523    367

Date printed: 12/04/02 file: cl\_acc/06-96.14

e

Page 4

Page 4(B)

REC NO.	COMMENTS
168 170 171 172 173	This may have some handmowing, litter - fountain. Along Macadam.
174 175 177 178 179	
180 181 185 198 217	Possible est. period end 92/93? Mostly ODOT maintained? Forestry hours for spraying, storm damage.
218 219 220 221 223	All data in Light Rail 500, see #3. Parks fiscal responsibility.
224 225 228 246 250	Manual tank truck. All data in Light Rail 500, see #3. Trees only. Irrigate turf and shrubs - street trees.
252 253 254 255 256	No irrigation. Trees and tree wells only. DC - Division Corridor sites will need tree work, tree replacement,and some landscaping repair. DC DC DC DC
257 258 259 260 261	DC DC (These three sites are hit DC regularly, they will need more DC damage repair than other sites.) DC
262 263 264 265 266	DC DC DC DC DC

Date printed: 12/04/92 file: cl\_acc\93-94.r6

x 7

Page 5

#### CITY OF PORTLAND HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE: FY 1993-1994 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT: CURRENT SITES

1 I F

REC NO.	SITE ADDRESS, Description	PROJECT Status	CURRENTLY		CONTRACT BID COST	IRR	WATER/ SEWER	EST.PARK   SUPPORT   COST	
267 268 269 270 271	DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Clinton & 47th DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.30th & Carruthers DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.30th & Grant A (North) DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.30th & Grant B (South) DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.Hawthorne & 12th		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	6-30-91 6-30-91 6-30-91	72 72 72 72	M     M     M     M     A	97 97 97 97 97 97	355 312 308	523    481    477
272 273 274 275 277	DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.26th & Harrison DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.39th & Lincoln DIVISION CORRIDOR - S.E.39th & Clinton N.E. 47th Thompson & Brazee Convention Center-Overlook		CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR	6-30-91 6-30-91 10-8-91	72 72	M     M     M     A?	97 97 97 194 363	327 485 295	496    653    724
278 294 400 410	S.W. Terwilliger & Taylor Ferry  NW Nicolai/Yeon Intersection - 3 trees  Bark  Renovation		CONTRACTOR	10-31-91			0 0 0 0	292 187 3,847 97	457    11,347
Date =====	printed: 12/04/92								
				TOTALS:	193,	235 ¦	78,731	335,967	607,933
				CENTRAL (	OVERHEAD				51,769
				GRAND TOT	TAL				659,702

REC COMMENTS NO. 267 | DC 1 DC 268 269 | DC No trees here. 270 | DC No trees here. 271 | DC 6 trees, solar irrigation system, hand mowing. Also non-irrigated section here. 272 DC Manual irrigation, trees, some car damage. DC Manual irrigation-litter-vandalism. 273 | DC Manual irrigation-litter-vandalism. 274 2 circles - irrigated, no turf. 1 curb extension - not irrigated, planted. 275 277 | Irrigate turf, hard surface cleaning, potential homeless camping and vandalism at this site. \_\_\_\_\_ { Grates, no irrigation, grass. Possible 1 rough mow-hillside. 278 294 400 | \$150/Unit; 50 total units to spread, City buys bark. 410 Date printed: 12/04/92 file: cl\_acc\93-94.r6 



Recently our accounting department discovered that water meter and electric bills related to the Holladay Street Phase III project were being billed to one of my center codes. I also found that the new service hook-up fees were charged to my center code. These costs are to be paid by the project budget. Since this project is still in the development stage, (establishment period), I have no budget to pay the bills. The interagency monies supplied to Parks are strictly for maintenance of the sites after the establishment period. The standard operating procedure is for the project construction budget to cover all costs, including utility bills, until the establishment period is over and the property is turned over to the city for maintenance.

I have never authorized any bills from the Holladay III project to be charged against my center codes; this is why the bills are being returned to you for payment by the project. I expect that in the future my center code number will not be used without my authorization. Following is information that adds perspective to our discussion.

Portland Parks pays water meter bills for specific landscaped sites. The funding source to pay the bills is provided through an interagency agreement between Parks and Maintenance. The Parks - Bureau of Maintenance budget agreement is reworked each fiscal year on a site by site basis. No money is provided to Parks by the Bureau of Maintenance for maintenance of sites that are under construction as these costs are expected to be covered by the project. Diverting the funding from maintenance efforts to project work harms the Bureau of Maintenance sites. Deleted or deferred maintenance results in deterioration of infrastructure, safety problems, and citizen complaints.

#### Page 1 of 3

• Dedicated to enriching the lives of citizens and enhancing Portland's natural beauty •

I feel that I clearly explained the budget relationship, (including the split between development and maintenance), and the establishment period standard operating procedures to you when we worked with you on the initial phase of the Oregon Convention Center and again in the planning phase of Holladay Street III, and again when we talked last April. Please keep the following establishment period notes handy as a reference for future projects.

Portland Parks and Recreation has been in the business of landscape development for many years. During these years, we have worked with the Oregon Department of Transportation, Portland Office of Transportation, Portland Development Commission, Portland Parks and Recreation Planning, and with many other public and private development efforts. We have seen many successful projects but also many projects that end up in litigation or need remedial work after they are turned over to the city. Our goal has been to maximize successes and reduce overall costs to the taxpayer related to the landscaped portion of the project.

We have found that the establishment period plays a key role in assuring the success of a project and have fine tuned and standardized establishment period requirements. The establishment period, if implemented as designed, has proven to be fair and works as a good tool for the design team, project manager, contractor, and the city. Assignment of irrigation costs are part of the establishment period design. Let me share with you why utility bills and operation of the systems are assigned to the contractor during the establishment period.

1. <u>Clear Responsibility:</u> The contractor is responsible for establishing the plant material. At the end of the establishment period, the city expects the contractor to turn over a landscape consisting of healthy plants that have established roots and top growth, demonstrating that they have adapted to the planting site and are no longer in danger of death from transplant shock.

We expect a sole contractor to provide all items, (labor, equipment, and materials), necessary to provide this healthy landscape. When some responsibilities are assigned to others, (city forces or another contractor), it is difficult to achieve accountability for failures.

- Example 1. Plants are dead. Did the plants die because the establishment contractor failed to irrigate or because the city's system failed?
- Example 2. A break in the irrigation system damages the landscape by washing away plants and soil. Who is responsible? Did the contractor cause the break?

Example 3. Plants are found dead near the site of an irrigation repair. Who is the responsible party? did the plants die of transplant shock or were they damaged by staff making the repair?

The only way to avoid these real situations is to have a sole party responsible for all work.

2. <u>Fair Costing</u>: The establishment period is part of the development phase and related costs are assigned to the project construction budget. Landscapes require significantly more water during establishment periods until the plants can extend roots down deeper into the soil. When existing landscapes are re-developed, most often a mature landscape is replaced with a juvenile landscape, requiring more water and special maintenance care.

If the establishment period provision is used effectively, the landscape maintenance needs should stabilize to a routine condition at the end of the period, (usually 1 year after final acceptance). At this time the maintenance responsibility and costs become the responsibility of the eventual owner. This model has been developed by the City and has been used effectively for the past six years on projects managed by Dave Hill, Karen Rabiner, Don Coville, Brett Kesterson, Teresa Culp, and others. The model is also employed by O.D.O.T. and P.D.C. and is regarded as a fair, equitable means of assigning costs. I have also discussed this business practice with Dennis Campbell, Bureau of Maintenance, and received his endorsement.

I strongly suggest that you try using the standard establishment procedures on your next project,(15th/16th Project). I think you will find the benefits to the project far outweigh the costs, and I will then not be put in the uncomfortable position of asking the Bureau of Maintenance for money to subsidize the construction costs.

I feel that the establishment period standard operating procedures work very well but I am always interested in making improvements. If you have suggestions for change in the standards, please send them to me and I'll distribute them to other project managers for review. I firmly believe the best management strategy is to adjust the standard operating procedures, if necessary, rather than manage each project differently.

c. Tom Burke Toby Widmer Ron Maynard



### CITY OF PORTLAND BUREAU OF PARKS AND RECREATION

OPERATIONS—HORTICULTURAL SERVICES 6437 S.E. DIVISION AVE. PORTLAND, OREGON 97206 (503) 823-1636



MIKE LINDBERG, Commissioner

CHARLES JORDAN, Director

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Dennis Campbell, Bureau of Maintenance

FROM: 'Ə 'Brian McNerney, Parks - Horticultural Services

DATE: November 9, 1992

SUBJECT: Estimate for New Sites

Attached is a list of Transportation sites that have ornamental landscapes as a component. This list identifies new sites that were not on the F.Y. 92-93 BOM - Parks Interagency. The costs are estimates that are pro-rated to reflect the portion of the year that the site is serviced.

I apologize for the delay in providing you with this information. I felt it important that the information be accurate and complete. The process of collecting the necessary information was intense and time consuming, requiring that my staff interview numerous project managers from the various transportation departments. We believe the list is comprehensive and the numbers are accurate. The costs are based on the current level of service delivered to similar sites.

We are now working on the list of F.Y. 92-93 current sites to arrive at adjusted costs for F.Y. 93-94. I will get these numbers to you as soon as they are finalized.

Thanks for your patience.

#### CITY OF PORTLAND/BUREAU OF PARKS HORTICULTURAL SERVICES STREET AREA LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT ESTIMATE FOR FY 93-94 FULL YEAR AND PRO-RATED COSTS FOR \*\*\*\*\* NEW SITES \*\*\*\*\*

n . g

REC NO.	SITE ADDRESS, DESCRIPTION	PROJECT STATUS	CURRENTLY MAINTAINED BY	ESTABLISH.   PERIOD   ENDS	CONTRACT. BID COST			EST.PARK SUPPORT COST	
186 188 196-	2¦E. Light Rail Williams-Sandy, Holladay Renovation ¦#6D NTMP- NE Wistaria & 42nd ¦#7A NTMP-SW Taylors Ferry & Terwilliger 1¦N Marine Drive, I-5 to Rivergate - Phase I 1¦SW Terwilliger, Sam Jackson to Homestead, Phase I	¦Unknown ¦Design ¦Estab/finish	Contractor	1993?	0 0 732 0	N 	0 0 80	0 0 472 387	0    1,284
276- 2	Transit Mall Rehabilitation  N.E. Hollywood - New Hollywood Fred Meyers 1.N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 24th/Weidler 2.N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Schuyler 3.N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 30th/Broadway	Establishmen Establishmen Establishmen	Contractor	11/93	0 0 90 0	M M M N	120 70	0 0 110 520 0	0 0 230 680 0
276- 3 276- 6 276- 7	N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 32nd/Schuyler N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Weidler N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Halsey N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Clackamas N.E. Hollywood - New FM - NE 28th/Wasco	¦Establishmen  Establishmen  Establishmen  Establishmen  Establishmen	Contractor Contractor Contractor	11/93 11/93 11/93	90 90 135 90 90	I M I M I M I M I N	70 70 70 70	520    520    1,159    520    520	680    680    1,364    680    610
279- 2 279- 3 279- 4	#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Tillamook 2 #5 NTMP - NE 7th & Sacramento 3 #5 NTMP - NE 7th & Russell 4 #5 NTMP - NE 7th & Graham 5 #5 NTMP - NE 7th & Morris	Est-Complete Est-Complete Est-Complete Est-Complete Est-Complete	Contractor Contractor Contractor	3-15-93 3-15-93 3-15-93	80 80 80 80 80	M   M   M   M	60   60   60   60	345    345    345    345    345	484    484    484    484    484
280 280- 1 282- 1	#5 NTMP - NE 7th & Cook #5 NTMP - NE 7th, Hancock - Fremont (Curb Ext) #5 NTMP - NE 7th & Fremont - Curb Ext - NW corner #6A NTMP-SE Eastmoreland B, 37 & Bybee #6A NTMP-SE Eastmoreland C, 34th & Bybee	Est-Complete Est-Complete Estab comple Establishmen Establishmen	Adj.Prop. Contractor Contractor	3-15-93 3-15-93 1/94	80 0 101 303	N N M	60   0   60   120	345    0    345    490    490	484    0    345    651    913
285 288 289 290 292	#6A NTMP-SE Eastmoreland A, Curb Extensions  #6C NTMP-NE 24th & Wiedler A  #6C NTMP-NE 24th & Wiedler B  Airport Way Phase I  NE Hoyt & 9th	Design Estab/Comple	Const.by ? Const.by ?	93/94 ? 93/94 ? 10-31-93	0 0 4,862 120	M	800	0    0    4,183    4,423	0    0    9,845    4,543
Date p	vrinted: 11/09/92 file: cl_acc\93-94.r13								

DIRECT COST TOTALS: | 7,181 | 1,890 | 16,730 || 25,801 ||

CENTRAL OVERHEAD

OVERHEAD

2,365

GRAND TOTAL

28,165

Page 1

	PART YR¦ COSTS ¦	COMMENTS
4- 2 186 188 196- 1 201- 1	P	Only trees & wells on side. Summer of 94-95 const. contractor waters only. No landscaping. No more info-continuous planning stage-Transp. construct. FY 91/92 Minor seeding? Verify with Trans. Eng. 97 trees, 15000 sq ft shrub bed. \$4200 summer 94 manual watering trees. Irrig- quick cplr or Park Bureau maintains curb extensions, BOM maintains 3 islands.
205   276   276- 1  276- 2  276- 3	р   р   р	No impact. 7 sites-street closures-trees & irrigation, shrubs - Fred Meyer. Semi-Diverter (Adjacent property owner). Channelization. Median. No landscaping - concrete only.
276- 4¦ 276- 5¦ 276- 6¦ 276- 7¦ 276- 8¦	р   Р   Р   Р	Cul-de-sac. For 93-94 multiply Contractor Bid Cost by .45 Cul-de-sac. Cul-de-sac. Cul-de-sac. Cul-de-sac. Cul-de-sac.
279- 1  279- 2  279- 3  279- 4  279- 5	р р р р	Landscaped traffic circles. Landscaped traffic circles. Landscaped traffic circles. Landscaped traffic circles. Landscaped traffic circles.
279- 6 280 280- 1 282- 1 282- 2	P   P   P   P	Landscaped traffic circles. @27 curb extensions. Property owner maintained. *On contract for one year, then re-evaluate. 3 trees and bark dust. Circle approx 100 sq ft. Circle approx 650 - 800 sq ft.
285   288   289   290   292	P   P   F	@7 curb extentions. Lost in limbo??? Verify with Traffic Management. This may be Fred Meyer REC# 276-1. Lost in limbo??? Verify with Traffic Management. This may be Fred Meyer REC# 276-1. Medians only. 93-94 mult Contr Bid by .72. Large pruning & bark costs in 2-3 years. Trees and grates. Will need to be hand watered summer of 93. (July, August, Sept).

e 4 - 6



### CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION

Earl Blumenauer, Commissioner Bureau of Maintenance John D. Widmer, Director 2929 N. Kerby Ave. Portland, Oregon 97227 (503) 823-1700 FAX (503) 823-4043

Brian McNerney Bureau of Parks Building 106 Room 1302

Dear Brian,

As our Budget preparation draws to a close I want to express my appreciation for the time and effort you devoted to the development of our New Interagency. I know we all spent a great deal of time reviewing the documentation, visiting sites and reaching agreements and I think its' paid dividends. Although initially I had hoped to reduce the overall costs involved with the Interagency, I am still pleased with the results we've reached and the processes we've put into place.

Our efforts in transferring certain sites to Maintenance & adjacent property owners, reducing the existing inventory, and settling ownership and responsibility issues involving the "other sites" has helped to keep the costs down. I am really pleased that we've established the 92-93 Interagency as our base. This will allow us to simply add new sites, add an inflation factor and reach agreement much sooner than in the past. I would anticipate that using this formula will allow us a real opportunity to focus on particular problems or issues and get them settled in a timely manner. I look forward to building and strengthening the relationship between our Bureaus and I hope we can set a quarterly meeting schedule as soon as possible.

Thanks Again!

Sincerely

Dennis Campbell Operations Manager Sanitary Systems Division

cc: J. Widmer D. Judd R. Maynard M. Harris

DC/trr

Agreements Hollywood C

DENTHIS FYL

HOLLYWOOD TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

#### MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

FEB 7 1984

THIS AGREEMENT, entered into this day of <u>MARCH</u>., 1984 by and between the <u>City of Portland</u>, hereinafter referred to as "City", and the <u>Hollywood Boosters</u>, hereinafter referred to as "Boosters", is for the purpose of providing continued maintenance of certain identified improvements to be installed in and around the Hollywood Business District, in the City of Portland, under the Hollywood Transportation Improvements project.

WHEREAS, City Council adopted Resolution No. 32460 on June 28, 1979, adopting "Plan D", which describes proposed transportation improvements for the Hollywood Business District, and

WHEREAS, "Plan D" is the result of joint planning efforts by City staff, the Boosters, and the Hollywood Neighborhood, and

WHEREAS, final plans and specifications are being prepared by City staff for construction, and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to provide for continuous maintenance of the improvements to be constructed in the Hollywood Business District;

NOW, THEREFORE, the City, through its appropriate bureaus, and the Hollywood Boosters do mutually agree to assume maintenance responsibility for improvements to be constructed and installed in the Hollywood Business District under the Hollywood Transportation Improvements Project in accordance with Exhibit A, dated January 19, 1984, attached hereto, and

Pursuant to assuming maintenance responsibility herein, the Boosters shall provide Public Liability insurance protecting the City and the Boosters from claims relating in any way to the existence or maintenance of improvements, and performance of work described in Exhibit A as being the responsibility of the Boosters. Such insurance shall be in sums not less than \$100,000/300,000 for bodily injury, and \$300,000 for property damage per occurrence, OR a single limit policy in the minimum amount of \$300,000, covering all claims per occurrence, and,

Maintenance services and responsibility described herein shall commence upon acceptance by the City of the contractor's work as satisfactory and complete, and

\_ If any improvement identified herein is not properly maintained, and/or poses a hazard to public safety, or becomes an eyesore, as determined by the City Engineer, the City reserves the right to remove the improvement(s). Prior to removal, the City shall provide ninety (90) calendar days notice to the Boosters to correct deficiencies. However, if the defect poses a safety hazard as determined by the City Engineer, notification time shall be twenty (20) calendar days. Removal of the improvement(s) shall be the only recourse to the Boosters for failure to properly maintain improvements herein.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City and the Hollywood Boosters have executed this Agreement as of the  $\underline{}$  day of  $\underline{}$  MArch  $\underline{}$ , 1984.

CITY OF PORTLAN Lindberg ommissioner of Public Works jel la Jewe Lans City Audito

APPROVED AS TO FORM APPROVED AS TO FORM

HOLLYWOOD BOOSTERS

Thistophen P. Thomas ING

City Attorney

President

#### EXHIBIT A January 19, 1984

#### HOLLYWOOD TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITIES

Responsibility for continued maintenance of improvements in the Hollywood Business District shall be as follows:

#### 1. City of Portland

- A. Maintenance Bureau
  - Pavement on island at NE 39th and Sandy
  - Street pavement
  - Sidewalk corners
  - Trash receptacles
  - Island at NE 40th and Sandy
  - Pavement in the public right-of-way section of the "Hancock Plaza," located at NE Sandy Boulevard and NE Hancock Street
  - Traffic signals
  - Crosswalk striping
  - Traffic & parking signs
  - Street markings

#### B. Park Bureau

- Tree pruning and replacement
- Tree well grate covers, and bricks
- Plants and ground cover maintenance and replacement
- Irrigation system at ground cover areas
- C. Street Lighting Bureau
  - Street lights and poles owned by City of Portland
  - Pedestrian lights at Hancock Plaza, and on island at 39th & Sandy
- D. Bicycle Program
  - Bike racks
- E. Water Bureau

- Drinking fountains

2. (Hollywood Boosters

Maintenance and repair of all the following items in the project area: - Benches

- ---- Planter tubs
- B. Performance of the following work on the island at NE 45th and Sandy, at the "Hancock Plaza," and on the island at NE 39th and Sandy:
  - Weed and water ground cover, plants and trees
  - Clean planter tubs and tree wells of debris
  - Snow removal, cleaning, and washing at Hancock Plaza

### ORDINANCE No. 155564

An Ordinance authorizing the City to enter into an agreement with the Hollywood Boosters providing for on-going maintenance of improvements to be installed in the Hollywood Business District under the Hollywood Transportation Improvements Project, and declaring an emergency.

The City of Portland ordains:

Section 1. The Council finds:

- City Council adopted Resolution No. 33570 on December 14, 1983 approving final plans and construction of the Hollywood Transportation Improvements Project.
- 2. Federal Aid Interstate Transfer (FAIX) funds have been allocated by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to finance project improvements.
- 3. The Hollywood Boosters and appropriate City bureaus have agreed to undertake maintenance responsibility for the various improvements to be installed under the project.
- NOW, THEREFORE, the Council directs:

That the Commissioner of Public Works and the Auditor are authorized to execute, on behalf of the City, a maintenance agreement similar in form to the agreement attached hereto, and by this reference made a part hereof.

Section 2. The Council declares that an emergency exists because maintenance responsibility should be determined for improvements prior to construction to avoid future confusion and misunderstanding as to such responsibility; therefore, this Ordinance shall be in force and effect after its passage by the Council.

Passed by the Council, FEB 1 1984 Commissioner Mike Lindberg ELY:am

#### JEWEL LANSING

Auditor of the City of Portland

By Corra Cervera

Deputy

Page No.


7/28/92

Toby:

Received a phone call from a Scott Forester who is interested in getting information about herbicide usage in the tri-county area. He specifically wants information about what herbicides Maintenance uses and how much (ie how mixed or total amount used). He would like this information for this year and the last two if we can pull it together.

He is making a similiar request of the Parks bureau. I told him I thought you guys and Parks were the only ones who used it.

I'd appreciate it if you could have someone pull this together. It doesn't have to be incredibly detailed and take tons of time to do. I'd be curous myself about what we are actually using. My sense is that the city, during the past several years, has gradually reduced the toxic stuff but that's only a gut feeling. If this is a problem or if you have any questions, let me know. Thanks for your help.

Julia

Barb, Could you pull this together and get info to Jalia . Probably need to check with Bill Long to see if his crews use anything. Thanks Foly

7/23/92

Laurie Wall 7904 SW 4th Portland, OR 97219

Ms. Barbara Krieg Maintenance Bureau City Of Portland 1120 SW 5th, Room 316 Portland, Or 97204

Dear Barbara:

Thank you for the information you offered today on the phone.

Please plant the roadside wildflowers at the southwest corner of the intersection of SW Troy and SW 5th (see diagram below). This area was created by the city fairly recently when the intersection was reconstructed and a traffic light was installed at SW Terwilliger and Troy. It is presently filled with weeds and an eyesore for the neighborhood.

It would be wonderful to have the flowers at this location as soon as possible. I understand that the earliest appropriate planting time may be this coming spring. The wildflower program is a lovely and sensible way to treat certain city-owned land. The location I propose is in need of such upgrading due to the existing traffic congestion and the increase in traffic congestion which will occur with the rebuilding of the Terwilliger Bridge.

Many residents of this area support the planting I propose. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely, Laurie Wall location

Earl Blumenaur am writing to tell you of the wonderful job, that Jony Reynider ded in front of my house, her even did a very good job "represence " the street I had so many halve and the Water was bad en front of my huse Thank you M.H. M. Buskek .eceiveu 6423 D.E. Franklin & JUL 0 8 1992 Forl Blumenauer Portland Or. 97206 I called Brack Wall whe was very nier and he arrange it for me - Thank you again "

07.23.92 04:15 PM P01

tyreenients File Holly wood





Mike Lindberg, Commissioner Bureau of Maintenance 2929 N. Kerby Ave. Portland, Oregon 97227 248-5546 — Sanitary Section 248-5545 — Street Section

OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION

Memorandum

November 27, 1984

T0:

FROM:

Ernie Yuzon, Transportation Engineering Bill Marker, Director, Bureau of Maintenance Hollywood Maintenance Agreement Amendment.

SUBJECT:

The attached amendment to the Hollywood Transportation Improvement Project Maintenance Agreement has been reviewed by this Bureau, and is approved with the following understanding:

- Sidewalks to be maintained by the Maintenance Bureau include only those fronting N. E. Broadway and N. E. Sandy Blvd. between the easterly and westerly property lines of N. E. 41st Avenue extended. Any sidewalks constructed along N. E. 41st Avenue between N. E. Broadway and N. E. Sandy Blvd. would become the responsibility of the abutting property owner.
- 2. The parking area covered by this agreement is a non-revenue generating facility. Should, in the future, parking meters or some other type of revenue collection system be installed at this location then the maintenance responsibilities of the facility should again be reviewed and a new agreement drawn up.

Should you have further questions about this issue, please contact me at 248-5500, or Dick Godfrey at 248-5531.

cc: Dick Godfrey





والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع

File Hollywood Please Comment! Dick G.

Maslen

The attached agreement revision for the Hollywood District was sent to me from Transportation Engineering. I covers maintenance of the proposed parking area for NE 41st between Broadway and Sandy. This appears to break new ground for us in that it assigns this bureau maintenance responsibility from property line to property line of a parking lot. I belive this will operate with parking meters in lieu of tickets Our original comments on this proposal were that if the access to 41st were to be changed to a sidewalk and driveway in lieu of standard curb radiuses we would not maintain the area. This proposal calls for us to maintain the pavement, sidewalk, driveway aprons, curb and gutter. Hollywood boosters would maintain striping, wheel stops and cleaning. There are no provisions for site drainage, but I assume this would be ours also. My inclination would be to assign maintenance to Trattic with meter revenues. We could maintain Through Interagence. No Meters 1. 184 Per Ernie 1. 11/26/84

### AMENDMENT TO MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT FOR THE HOLLYWOOD TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

This Amendment to Maintenance Agreement, entered into this \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 1984 by and between the City of Portland, hereinafter referred to as "City", and the Hollywood Boosters, hereinafter referred to as "Boosters" is for the purpose of providing continued maintenance and operation of a parking lot and appurtenances on NE 41st Avenue between NE Sandy Blvd. and NE Broadway to be constructed under the Hollywood Transportation Improvements Project.

WHEREAS, business operators on NE Sandy Blvd. in the Hollywood District petitioned City Council to reconsider its decision to remove on-street parking from NE Sandy Blvd. between NE 40th and 42nd Avenues under the Hollywood Transportation Improvement Project, and

WHEREAS, a consultant was commissioned to work with City staff to investigate and analyze the matter in response to the petitioners, and

WHEREAS, City Council adopted recommendations of the Consultant to amend project plans, including a recommendation to construct a parking lot on NE 41st Avenue between NE Sandy Blvd. and NE Broadway, and

WHEREAS, Council specified that the parking lot be maintained and operated by someone or some organization other than the City as a condition for it to be constructed, and

WHEREAS, the City and the Boosters have previously entered into a Maintenance Agreement Number 21226, dated March 6, 1984, and now wish to amend said Agreement to provide for continuous maintenance and operation of the parking lot and its appurtenances to be constructed on NE 41st Avenue between NE Sandy Blvd. and NE Broadway;

NOW, THEREFORE, the City and the Boosters do mutually agree to the following:

- I. Section 1. City of Portland, of Exhibit A, of the Agreement is amended by addition of the following:
  - 1. <u>City of Portland</u>
    - A. Maintenance Bureau
      - Pavement in parking lot and adjoining sidewalks and driveway aprons on NE 41st Avenue between the south curb line on NE Sandy and the north curb line on NE Broadway.

- II. Section 2. <u>Hollywood Boosters</u>, of Exhibit A, of the Agreement is amended by addition of the following:
  - 2. Hollywood Boosters
    - C. Performance of the following work on the parking lot and adjoining sidewalks and driveway aprons 4 on NE 41st Avenue between the south curb line on NE Sandy and the north curb line on NE Broadway:
      - Maintenance and operation of parking lot and all appurtenances thereon, including wheel stops, and striping.
      - Snow/ice removal, cleaning and washing.
    - D. Conditions of Parking Lot Operation:
      - The parking lot shall be operated in a lawful manner open to all the public at all times without discrimination with regard to age, sex, race, religion, or national origin.
      - If the parking lot is not properly maintained and/or poses a hazard to public safety, or becomes an eyesore, as determined by the City Engineer, the City reserves the right to remove the improvements and make modifications it deems appropriate.
- III. All other terms and conditions of the original Agreement shall remain in effect except as modified by this Amendment.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City and the Hollywood Boosters have executed this Amendment to Maintenance Agreement as of the \_\_\_\_\_day of\_\_\_\_\_1984.

CITY OF PORTLAND

Mike Lindberg Commissioner of Public Works

Jewel Lansing City Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM

HOLLYWOOD BOOSTERS

City Attorney

President

BUIL 2 -YWOOD DING IST 84 5 ō AVE SANDY FEET DISTRICT PARKING ONEL TRANSPORTATION BLND. ГОТ DRIVEWAY E. IST AV/E PROJECT Z THO LONGHE BROADWAY S DÓÓR Hollywood Boosters to be responsible for maintenance of striping, g wheel stops, appurtenances and cleaning. Proposed Bureau A Pavement and Sidewall C. 7111 Maintenance Rosponsibility



May 22, 2000

To: Brian Mc Nerney Parks Operations 370/UF

From: Russ Gilbert Transportation Operations Maintenance / 316/ Maint.

RE: SERVICE REQUEST'S #30767, #33635, #30754, #30967, #30755, #30780

After my review of the ordinance's passed by council it appears clear to me that the maintenance of the tree grates is that of the Parks Bureau. I have no reason to believe that it is ours, therefore, I am returning the service requests to you. It should be noted that these areas have been identified as potential hazards and represent a risk to the city. The ordinance's I reviewed are No. 141569 dated April 7, 1976, in regards to the maintenance of the transit malls SW. 5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup>, as well as No.157073 dated February 20, 1985 which relates to the maintenance responsibilities along the light rail. Mr. Gary Hill has informed us that the Parks Bureau has in the past performed this work and billed the IA. I will be sharing this information with those of us here at maintenance that are responsible for the IA with Parks.

Thanks in advance for your attention to this matter.

If you have any questions or concerns please give me a call at 823-1713.

THANKS

cc: Steve Herboth George Bean Mark Stairiker Gary Hill Kathy Murrin David Judd Vic Rhodes Jeanne Nyquist Roger Talley Urban Forestry Division 10910 N Denver Portland, Oregon 97217 Phone (503) 823-4489 Eax (503) 823-4493



Ensuring access to leisure opportunities and enhancing Portland's natural beauty

# PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION

- DATE: May 11, 2000
- TO: Steve Herboth Sidewalk Inspector 316/Sidewalks
- FROM: Gary Hill Urban Forestry Program Supervisor 370/UF
- RE: SERVICE REQUEST'S #30767, #33635, #30754, #30967, #30755, #30780.

I am returning the service requests, for grate maintenance, you sent to Urban Forestry. Urban Forestry is a division of Parks & Recreation and is not responsible for the maintenance of tree grates unless Parks & Recreation is the adjoining property owner.

Historically, Urban Forestry has provided occasional grate maintenance to these sites through an interagency agreement with the Bureau of Maintenance. The problem has become more extensive over time and has been identified as a capital need to the Bureau of Maintenance. The response from P.D.O.T. was to wait on the repairs and that they would be looking into funding options as well as other options. However, that has not yet happened and with B.O.M. budgetary shortages and more sites being added for service, there is not funding available to Urban Forestry to repair tree grates. If any work is to be done by Urban Forestry, funding must be provided by Transportation.

If you need any further information or have concerns I can be reached at 823-4002.

CT: George Bean, Sidewalk Supervisor, Bureau of Maintenance Mark Stairiker, Liability Claims Manager, Risk Management Brian McNerney, Urban Forest Manager, Portland Parks & Recreation Kathy Murrin, Horticultural Supervisor, Portland Parks & Recreation David Judd, Deputy Director, Portland Parks & Recreation Vic Rhodes, Director, Office of Transportation Jeanne Nyquist, Bureau of Maintenance Director



Charlie Hales, Commissioner 2929 N. Kerby Avenue Portland, Oregon 97227 (503) 823-1700 FAX (503) 823-4043 TDD 823-6868

Victor F. Rhodes Director

ę

Eileen Argentina Information Technology

Elsa Coleman Finance

Steve Dotterrer Planning

Jeanne Nyquist Maintenance

**Toby Widmer** System Management

Brant Williams Engineering & Development 6/26/00

David Judd Bureau of Parks and Recreation Jeanne Nyquist Transportation Maintenance

**Budget Priorities** 

Subject:

Date:

To:

From:

Roger Talley reported to me that he and Barbara Krieg had a very productive meeting with Brian McNerney and Kathy Murrin last week to begin talking about the potential reductions in the interagency agreement. Roger really appreciated the advance work that Brian and Kathy did to prepare some options for consideration.

Attached is the information you requested summarizing the priorities and issues we presented to Council this year as they considered our budget request. Page three of the "Bureau Summary" outlines the principles that we used to guide development of priorities and recommendations. Also attached is a large spread sheet that summarizes our recommended cuts and outlined options for Council to consider.

You'll notice that we recommended that \$300,000 of General Transportation Revenue be reduced from funding the Parks/Transportation Interagency Agreement, to be replaced by General Fund revenue. Council ultimately decided to provide only \$125,000 in General Fund and directed us to reduce the Interagency Agreement by \$175,000. As you suggested, I agree it is a good idea to look at the rationale behind our recommended cuts and apply the same principles to the decisions we make about landscape maintenance services.

I contacted Martha Bueche to assist the Parks/Transportation team in identifying and resolving policy and management issues. She is out of the country until July 5. She'll be back in touch with me at that time.

On a related matter, Brian and Russ Gilbert have been trading memos in an attempt to figure out who is ultimately responsible for funding maintenance of tree grates in the Central Business District. It looks like this has been a question that has been unresolved

for some time. Russ very recently sent Brian a memo outlining the Transportation perspective on this issue. If this memo doesn't resolve the issue, then I think we should refer it to our Parks/Transportation team to consider as they discuss other policy issues that need resolution.

Give me a call if you have any thoughts or questions after reviewing the budget information I've attached. As always, it is a pleasure working with you and your staff.

Cc: Roger Talley Barbara Krieg

9

# **Bureau Summary**

### BUREAU MISSION

The Portland Office of Transportation is a community partner in shaping a livable city. We plan, build, manage and maintain an effective and safe transportation system that provides access and mobility.

# BUREAU HIGHLIGHTS

Summary

This year's bi-annual budget submittal once again highlights the need to secure a stable and on-going funding base for the City's transportation services. PDOT faces resource shortfalls which will make it impossible for us to continue current service provisions. We have been in this position for the last three years and over that period of time the shortfall in discretionary revenue has resulted in service reductions totaling approximately \$8 million. Contributing factors to this decline are the failure to raise the gas tax at a state level since 1993, concurrent loss of purchasing power resulting from inflation, expansion in the asset base which we maintain, increased use of the system resulting in more wear and tear and finally the aging of the community's transportation infrastructure.

Since the measure has been referred to the voters, this budget request does not assume revenue from HB 2082. During the 1999 legislative session, House Bill 2082 increased the state gas tax by 5 cents/ gallon, and increased bi-annual vehicle registration fees by \$10. The registration fee plus one cent of the gas tax is dedicated to bonding \$600 million of improvements to the state system. One cent goes directly to the Oregon Department of Transportation and the remaining three cents is apportioned to counties and cities. Additionally, the legislature authorized counties to levy another \$10 per year in vehicle registration fees to help meet local transportation requirements.

Subsequently this measure was referred to the voters by initiative petition and will appear on the May 2000 ballot. Had the measure been implemented as legislated in November, PDOT would have been able to balance this two year budget. Since the measure has been referred to the voters, this budget request does not assume revenue from HB 2082.

### FY 2000-01 Budget Request

Resources for FY 2000-01 will fall \$4.4 M short of meeting current service level requirements. An additional shortfall of \$2.3 M is projected for FY 2001-02.

Resources for FY 2000-01 will fall \$4.4 million short of meeting current service level requirements. An additional shortfall of \$2.3 million is projected for FY 2001-02 for a combined two year total of \$6.7 million or 12% of discretionary revenues.
Because the outcome of the gas tax measure remains unknown and reductions of \$4.4

Because the outcome of the gas tax measure remains unknown and reductions of \$4.4 million in the first year would significantly impact the community, PDOT proposes to use one-time funds and interagency revenues to buy down the size of the reduction package required to balance the first year. It must be pointed out that in doing so we increase the shortfall in year two by a like amount.

Transportation and Parking Service Area

#### **One-Time Funds**

Ending Fund Balance: We are projecting a positive ending fund balance of \$1.2 million, significantly above earlier projections. The majority of the increase is due to the garnishing of state income tax refunds for the payment of outstanding parking citations. The large backlog in unpaid parking fines has created a significant one-time increase in revenue from this source. While we expect a continued increment of growth in collections, the historical backlog has been largely eliminated. These funds could be used to rebuild PDOT reserves which were drawn down by the Council to fund the removal of the Lovejoy Ramp. However, with the results of the May election unknown, we recommend these funds be used to offset the year one shortfall.

**Contingency Appropriation:** We have examined the past five years of spending from our \$2.5 million contingency appropriation and found the highest spending level to be \$1.5 million. Therefore, we are recommending that the contingency appropriation be reduced to \$1.5 million. The Office of Finance and Administration has reviewed this recommendation and granted preliminary concurrence.

#### Revenues

Solid Waste Funding: The Bureau of Environmental Services has agreed to provide \$600,000 in solid waste funds for recycling and leaf removal activities in each year of the budget. In the first year this is reduced by \$50,000 to jointly fund a work process and efficiency study between BES and PDOT. Additionally, a reduction of \$132,000 in the drainage interagency agreement from BES will be made in both years to provide rate relief. This results in net revenue increases of \$418,000 in FY 2000-01 and \$468,000 in FY 2001-02 which work to offset the deficits.

#### FY 2000 - 01 Balancing

PDOT's financial forecast, adjusted by the above mitigation strategies, results in a FY 2000-01 shortfall of \$1.8 million and \$4.4 in FY 2001-02. In dealing with budget reductions last year, PDOT crafted some guiding principles based on our mission to provide a safe and well maintained transportation system that accommodates the increasing access and mobility needs created by growth in the community. Recognizing that not all decisions can be based solely on these principles, they are intended to help weigh choices based on the core business strategies of the organization. The balancing principles are to;

- Identify and honor prior commitments
- Stop "accelerated cost" maintenance backlog growth
- Reduce/manage inventory growth
- Reduce travel demand through multi-modal efforts focused on main streets and town centers.
- Work toward a sustainable level of service.

**Bureau Summary** 

Transportation and Parking Service Area

Before beginning to craft the budget, the PDOT Directors Team made two key decisions largely based on these principles:

- 1. Declare off limits any reductions affecting maintenance and operation of the arterial and collector systems since these systems provide the backbone of urban mobility. Prior year reductions lead us to believe that any additional reductions would have an adverse affect on all modes of travel. Operational reductions, such as signal re-timing, would impact the competitiveness of the transit system.
- 2. Hold harmless operating programs and capital projects which leverage external resources. The average leverage in the Capital Improvement Program is approximately eight to one. Saving one dollar in PDOT discretionary funds would therefore result in the loss of eight external dollars.

The PDOT Directors Team then undertook the task of separating the remainder of purely discretionary spending into three tiers in an effort to clearly articulate the community's priorities:

- 1. Tier 1: These are services which, if reduced, would generally have no effect on the value of the community's transportation assets. Assets are of two types: Physical infrastructure, and Operational assets or level of service provided by the system. These assets go hand in hand; a computer (physical asset) is dysfunctional without software (operational asset) and vice versa. While many of these services have significant livability and economic returns, reductions in this tier will not impact the integrity of the transportation system.
- 2. Tier 2: These are services, which, if reduced, would have an impact on the serviceability of these assets. However, reductions in these services are recoverable in the future without substantial added cost. For example a capital project can be deferred with the only added cost being that of inflation. On the operational side we could eliminate our signal re-timing efforts resulting in increased congestion but there would not be a fiscal cost in reinstating this work in a future year.
- 3. Tier 3: These are services, which if reduced, would result in substantial down stream costs to recover. For example, pavement maintenance if we defer routine overlays we end up with the need to fully reconstruct the streets. These services fall into the category of "pay now, or pay more later."

Tier 1, 2 and 3 services are identified in Attachment 'A' together with recommendations on what services should be reduced and in many cases eliminated.

**General Fund** Support In FY 2000-01 we have included on the reduction side the three services which have been supported by the General Fund for the past two years. These are downtown sidewalk scrubbing, the abandoned auto program and landscape maintenance. The cost of these programs for FY 2000-01 is \$892,000 and we request Council consideration of continuing General Fund support of these services over the next two years. No other General Fund support of CSL is being requested for FY 2000-01, except restoration of the 2.5% reduction in General Fund cash transfers supporting street lighting and downtown street sweeping in the amount of \$134,000.

FY 2001-02Attachment 'A' also identifies Tier 1, 2 and 3 services for FY 2001-02, together with<br/>recommendations on what services might be reduced or eliminated.

Transportation and Parking Service Area

Regardless of how the Council finally decides to balance the second year, the impact on the community is enormous. Cutting an additional \$4.2 million in services means simply that we must quit doing some things. There is no way to reduce PDOT's discretionary spending by this amount by simply adjusting materials and services, becoming more efficient or continuing to "thin the soup".

The service reductions we have laid out to balance FY 2001-02 result in a budget which is not indicative of a full service city. Simply put, if we are to maintain some level of capacity to deal with growth, address neighborhood concerns regarding traffic speed and congestion and implement the Regional 2040 agenda, then these reductions are unacceptable.

The one outstanding issue is the result of the May election on the gas tax increase. We recommend that the Council acknowledge that these levels of reductions are not acceptable but defer final decisions on FY 2001-02 until the result is known. Should the ballot measure fail at the polls, then, PDOT and the Council will need to come back to the table and make decisions about next steps.

# **General Description**

## BUREAU OVERVIEW

PDOT includes four bureaus: the Bureau of Maintenance, the Bureau of Traffic Management, the Bureau of Transportation Engineering & Development, and the Office of the Director. PDOT's FY 2000-01 Budget Request includes \$76,174,617 in operating appropriation and \$49,776,571 in CIP appropriation for a total of \$125,951,188 appropriations. PDOT has a budgeted staff of 717 FTE.

# MAJOR ISSUES

This year's bi-annual budget submittal once again highlights the need to secure a stable and on-going funding base for the City's transportation services. PDOT faces resource shortfalls which will make it impossible for us to continue current service provisions. We have been in this position for the last three years and over that period of time the shortfall in discretionary revenue has resulted in service reductions totaling approximately \$8 million. Contributing factors to this decline are the failure to raise the gas tax at a state level since 1993, concurrent loss of purchasing power resulting from inflation, expansion in the asset base which we maintain, increased use of the system resulting in more wear and tear and finally the aging of the community's transportation infrastructure.

These issues are discussed in depth in the Office of Transportation Summary.

# **RECENT TRENDS**

PDOT is facing increasingly severe financial strains. The combined effects of age, usage, increasing size, decreasing purchasing power, and declining revenues have resulted in repeated funding shortfalls.

Age: Portland in no longer a young city: in fact, much of its infrastructure is well beyond middle age. Things are simply beginning to wear out at an accelerated rate as backlogs in maintenance continue to grow.

Use: The transportation system is being used in ways it was not built to accommodate. In the past twenty years Oregon's population has grown 20%, an the vehicle miles traveled on the system at the same period have increased by 40%. Traffic continually causes our roads to bend, and, just like a paper clip, bent enough times, they break.

Size: As the City has grown, so has the inventory of things to maintain. In 1979 Portland had 695 traffic signals; today it has 959, a 38% growth. Since 1985 the City has added 417 lane miles to its pavement inventory. Adding bike lanes, parking signs, traffic calming devices, and signs such as Fines Double in School Zones, has increased the demand for maintenance dollars.

Purchasing Power: Due to inflation, transportation dollars have lost 16% of their purchasing power since 1993. In fact, it would require a 30 cent Oregon state gas tax in 2000 to equal the purchasing power of the 1968 gas tax. Oregon's current tax in 24 cents. Revenue from gas taxes is also in decline as vehicle efficiency has nearly doubled since 1970. In addition, Oregon has one of the lowest vehicle registration fees in the country.

Transportation and Parking Service Area

### **CHANGES FROM PRIOR YEAR**

As in previous years, PDOT faces a deficit in meeting current service levels (CSL). Financial difficulties are resulting in reductions in services that significantly impact neighborhoods, businesses, and the citizens' investment in a \$5.3 billion transportation system.

Mitigation Strategies PDOT proposed to use one-time funds and interagency funding to buy down the size of the reduction package required to balance;

- Ending Fund Balance \$1,162,541
- Contingency Appropriation \$1,000,000
- Solid Waste Funding \$418,0000

Decision Packages In FY 2000-01, PDOT is presenting multiple budgetary cut scenarios for Council consideration. These proposals are discussed in depth in the budget request transmittal letter at the beginning of this document. The packages include:

**General Fund Decision Packages** 

- CBD Sidewalk Scrubbing \$212,000
- Abandoned Auto Program \$380,493
- Landscape Maintenance \$300,000
- Endangered Species Act \$225,289
- Street Lighting (Restore 2.5%) \$123,922
- Downtown Street Cleaning (Restore 2.5%) \$10,420

#### **Reduction Packages**

- River District (\$10,000)
- OCC/Lloyd/N. Macadam (\$10,000)
- Neighborhood Development (\$50,000)
- Lloyd District/ Rose Quarter (\$30,000)
- NE Cornfoot at 47th (\$6,875)
- Curb Ramps/ Corner Repair (\$150,000)
- Overhead and Management Reduction (\$400,000)
- Willamette Blvd. Landslides (\$79,620)
- SE 41st Woodstock/Steele (\$100,000)
- N. Wall (\$50,000)
- Signal Communication System (\$50,000)

#### Reorganization

During FY 1999-2000, PDOT reorganized its organizational structure to more efficiently provide transportation services. Most Capital Improvement Program projects were combined into the Project Management Division. Traffic Signals, Street Lighting, and Electrical Maintenance were combined into the Signals/Street Lighting Program. Transportation Operating and Project Support activities were assigned to the Traffic Office of Transportation

Transportation and Parking Service Area

Investigations and Transportation Options Programs. The Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Parking Management Program activities were assigned to planning, construction, and operating sections. Technology management, analysis and support services were centralized in the Information Technology Program. This reorganization has resulted in the restatement of selected historical program expenditures.

Transportation and Parking Service Area

# **Strategic Direction**

### VISION AND VALUES

#### Vision

Portland will continue to be a national model for managing growth. The livability and economic health of the City will be maintained because of decisions made by community leaders and residents. Portland's downtown will continue to be the center of a safe, attractive, and vital City. Neighborhoods and community business districts will be thriving. Housing will be affordable and family-wage jobs will be available. Residents will have a broad range of safe and convenient transportation options and will frequently walk, bicycle, carpool, or ride public transit as their first choice of transportation. The community as a whole will have an attitude of stewardship in making transportation decisions, and will understand the relationship between transportation, the environment, and livability. Portland will have a competitive economic advantage because congestion is managed and air quality is good.

#### Values

In the Portland Office of Transportation We Value:

- Serving public to the best of our collective ability, working cooperatively with the community, other jurisdictions and city bureaus, and contributing to a higher quality of life for future generations.
- A balanced, multi-modal transportation system that supports a healthy economy and a livable compact community.
- A well-maintained and safe transportation system.
- Respect for the natural environment as we plan, build, operate and maintain the transportation system.
- Using the public right of way to create a quality community by designing and constructing streetscapes that people are proud of and will use.
- A safe and supportive work environment for all employees; one that encourages innovation, efficiency, responsiveness, stewardship, independent thinking, respect, flexibility, professional growth, teamwork, and reasonable risk-taking.
- A work force that is diverse, efficient, hard-working, dedicated, productive, welltrained, and one that effectively responds to the unexpected.
- Efficient and effective use of our financial, capital and human resources.

# **MANAGEMENT GOALS & OBJECTIVES**

Long-Term Goals

The Portland Office of Transportation Strategic Plan 1996-00 outlines the office's vision, mission, values and priority issues. To achieve Portland's vision of the future, PDOT will address the following five priority issues:

#### Growth and Livability

*Goal:* Ensure that the City's transportation system becomes more multi-modal, supports growth, enhances livability, and improves public safety.

#### Maintenance and Preservation of the Transportation System

Goal: Maintain and preserve the investment in the transportation infrastructure.

#### **External Communication**

**Goal**: Build effective working relationships with the public, customers, and other partners, and create awareness and understanding of transportation issues among City residents and City employees.

## Staff Development and Organizational Efficiency and Effectiveness

Goal: Make PDOT and exemplary organization.

#### Funding

**Goal**: Ensure that the Office of Transportation has financial resources to maintain the public investment in the infrastructure, and to improve the transportation system to accommodate and manage growth and maintain regional accessibility.

## **COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

#### Council Issues and Priorities

PDOT continues to work toward the City's policy goals and meet major growth and livability objectives. The office invests in the Central City and adjacent neighborhoods with significant housing and job opportunities. It maintains the citizens' investment in the transportation infrastructure. The office also develops transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements to provide the public with transportation choices. These efforts are important to reduce congestion, increase safety, maintain quality of life, and ensure mobility for all citizens and commerce.

PDOT's activities support all of Council's priorities, either directly or indirectly. The office has the most significant impact on the following priorities:

- Ensure Decent, Affordable Housing.
- Build a Livable City Through Good Planning and Well-Managed Growth.
- Promote Economic Vitality and Access to Quality Jobs For All.
- Maintain a Financially Stable City of Portland.
- Promote the Inclusion of Under-Represented Neighborhoods and Groups in Participation in City Activities and Services.
- Keep the Central City Vital.
- Build a Multi-Modal Transportation System.
- Grow as an International City.
- Become a More Effective Partner in the Region.
- Build a sense of Community by Promoting Participation, Connectedness, and Partnerships.
- Continuously Improve the Delivery of Quality Public Services.

### **Future Focus**

PDOT addresses a number of strategic goals articulated in Portland Future Focus, primarily the following;

- Manage regional growth to provide effective public services at the lowest possible cost, to improve environmental quality, and to enhance the quality of life.
- Ensure that each neighborhood is healthy and vigorous.
- Retain and continue to develop the unique character of Portland as a major metropolitan area.

Office of Transportation

Transportation and Parking Service Area

- Maintain Portland as the vibrant core of the region's commercial and cultural life.
- Implement alternatives to the automobile in the region.
- Encourage the conservation of resources and energy.

Benchmarks PDOT addresses a number of Portland-Multnomah County Benchmarks, including but not limited to the following;

- Percentage of people who rate their neighborhood livability high.
- Percentage of citizens who feel safe and secure.
- Percentage of streets rated acceptably clean and percentage of citizens who rate their streets acceptably clean.
- Percentage of population that lives within one-half mile walk of transit service or bike path.
- Percentage of people who commute (one-way) within 30 minutes between where they live and work & percentage who commute to and from work and use multiple modes of transportation for commuting.
- Number of days per year the community meets government ambient air quality standards/carbon dioxide emissions as a percentage of 1990 emissions.
- Percentage of emergency service agencies with emergency plans and emergency response plans in place that are regularly exercised and updated.



<u>Decision 1:</u> Declare off-limits any reductions affecting maintenance and operation of the arterial and collector systems since these systems provide the backbone of urban mobility. Prior year reductions lead us to believe that any additional reductions would have an adverse affect on all modes of travel. Operational reductions, such as signal retiming, would impact the competitiveness of the transit system.

<u>Decision 2:</u> Hold Harmless operating programs and capital projects which leverage external resources. The average leverage in the Capital Improvement Program is approximately 8 to 1. Saving one dollar in PDOT discretionary funds would therefore result in the loss of eight external dollars.

TIER 1 SCENARIO: SERVICE CATEGORY	FY 2000-01		FY 2001-02		
	CUT	FUNDED	CUT	FUNDED	
CBD CLEANING					
FLUSHING MALL/LRT SIDEWALKS	-	265,000		265,000	TIER 1 SERVICES
STREET SWEEPING 6 NIGHTS TO 1	-	450,000		450,000	
SIDEWALK SCRUBBING-APP DEVELOPMENT PARTNERING	212,000	-		430,000	These are services which, if reduced
RIVER DISTRICT (CIP)					
	10,000	40,000	150,000		would generally have no effect on the
OCC/LLOYD DISTRICT/N. MACADAM (CIP) NW 12TH AVENUE RECONSTRUCTION (CIP)	10,000	65,000	75,000		value of the community's
NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT (CIP)	•	•	100,000		transportation assets.
SE FOSTER AT 162ND (CIP)	50,000	46,520	100,000		Assets are of two types: Physical
LID ASSISTANCE (CIP)	•	1,000,000			information in the types. Physical
FREIGHT ACCESS	-	100,000	100,000		infrastructure, and Operational asse
					or level of service provided by the
IER 3 SCENARIO:		FY 2000-01			
ERVICE CATEGORY	CUT	FUNDED	FY 2001-	-02	TIER 3 SERVICES
		FONDED	CUT	FUNDED	TIER 3 SERVICES
BACKLOG GROWTH PREVENTION					
LOCAL STREETS	•	1,500,000	-	1,500,000	These are services which, if reduced,
ROAD RECONSTRUCTION (CIP)	•	2,700,000		2,700,000	would result in substantial down
DEFICIENCY CORRECTIONS (CIP)	-	500,000	913,000		
RUCTURAL MAINTENANCE	-	100,000	-	100,000	stream costs to recover. For example,
STAIRS, FENCES, & FURNITURE					pavement maintenance - if we defer
NE 21ST SLOUGH BRIDGE (CIP)	-	72,000		72,000	routine overlays we end up with the
NGESTION MANAGEMENT	-	145,303	-		need to fully reconstruct the streets.
SIGNAL OPERATIONS 20%		05.000		I.	These services fall into the category
TRANSIT SIGNAL PRIORITY (CIP)		65,000		65,000	f "man non
ITS SIGNAL SYSTEM UPGRADES (CIP)		100,000		100,000	of "pay now, or pay more later."
INAL RECONSTRUCTION (CIP)		570.000		200,000	
TOTALS	\$0	570,000 <b>\$5,752,303</b>	130,000	570,000	
101760			\$1,043,000		

GRAND TOTALS

\$1,828,988 \$16,273,423

行着中央的二方和同时并不行在大利的名词复数的自然的

\$4,442,674 \$12,325,600

「教育ならになるのなどなる本がになるのは教育「教育会会」になるなどのななななななないです。そうに、おもうなない」

CONCRETE AND AND

Attachment A Page 2

## Landscape Maintenance Office of Transportation-Bureau of Maintenance Tracking Number 159-01-003

### Service and Activity Descriptions

This is an interagency agreement with the Bureau of Parks for maintenance of street area landscaping, such as median islands, traffic circles, fountains, parkways, etc. Landscape maintenance provided by the Bureau of Maintenance to transportation sites, such as traffic islands, diverters and roadside rights of way.

Much of this work had been the formal responsibility of the Park Bureau. A one-year subsidy was picked up by the Transportation Fund, which has continued for several years. The cost and contribution has increased annually due to inflation and increases in the inventory of sites to be maintained.

### Work Plan Information

The work plan varies by site; it consists of controlling and caring for vegetation growth, such as irrigation, mowing, litter control, pruning and tree care.

### Options

Service level could be reduced or funding could be provided via the General Fund.

Maintenance reductions would result in overgrowth and potential loss of plant materials. Overgrowth could affect site clearance and become a safety hazard to motorists, bicyclist and pedestrians, as well as reducing neighborhood livability.

### **Budget** information

There will be no changes in positions. If the work is not done there may be some impact in the Park Bureau to their staff or contract expense.

The source of funding is General Fund discretionary.