Chapter V: Transportation Improvement Program

BACKGROUND

This chapter describes the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the City of Lakeside. The TIP identifies and prioritizes projects for a five year period beginning in Fiscal Year 1995-96. The TIP also provides cost estimates and potential funding sources for each project.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

The proposed improvements in the TIP includes some projects that were in the 1986 TIP but not completed. Other projects were identified based on the combined assessment of traffic flow, pedestrian and bicycle needs, existing conditions and deficiencies, priorities identified in the Lakeside Transportation Workshop (see Appendix), and input from City staff. Table 18 shows proposed transportation improvements for the City of Lakeside.

In reviewing the proposed improvements, consideration should be given to the justification for gravel street improvements. It is recognized that gravel surfacing will require significant maintenance. However, the City of Lakeside cannot afford the luxury of paving every street that needs improvement. In some cases the overall need may be better addressed by gravel surfacing several streets than paving only one. The City should establish a goal of paving all unpaved streets by the year 2010.

Prior to proceeding with the design of any of the recommended street improvements, reference should be made to the storm drainage improvements made in the storm drainage/flood control plan prepared in 1986. Major storm drainage should be constructed in conjunction with the street and/or bicycle/pedestrian path work.

Cost Estimates and Funding Sources

Cost estimates and funding sources for the proposed improvements are also listed in Table 18. All of the estimates are based on cost information developed by the Lakeside Public Works Director. These costs represent total project cost and include construction, engineering, legal, and contingencies. Actual project costs may vary depending on specific site conditions. Additional costs will also be incurred if storm drainage facilities are also needed.

The cost estimates presented in Table 18 should only be used for preliminary financial planning. More accurate, up-to-date estimates should be prepared after detailed plans are completed for each project.

Transportation Improvement Priorities

Transportation improvement priorities depend on many factors including funding, public sentiment, transportation needs, safety, etc. Due to the many elements in the Lakeside transportation system, it is not possible to devise a priority ranking system for determining transportation priorities. Some of the more important factors over which the City has no control or are unpredictable include:

1. Some of the proposed improvements may be eligible for grant funding which can reduce the local cost obligation
2. Many of the proposed improvements may be politically more desirable. The degree to which adjacent property owners need the improvement and are willing to pay for it is a consideration.
3. Many of the proposed improvements are within County or State jurisdiction.
4. Traffic volume should be a significant criteria in determining improvement priorities. For a variety of reasons, the City does not have complete traffic flow data. Further, traffic patterns within the community exhibit seasonal changes.

Priorities shown in Table 18 were established by meetings with City staff, analysis of need, and costs and benefits of each proposed improvement. To update priority rankings, the City may use the following formula:

$$\text{Benefit/Cost Index} = \frac{S \times V \times R}{C}$$

where:

S = Existing road surface condition, ranging from 5 (very poor) to 1 (very good)

V = Average Daily Traffic, ADT actual count

R = Road Class (3 - arterial, 2 - collector, 1 - local)

C = Cost of improvement per linear foot

Project having a higher benefit/cost index should be improved first. However, there are other factors that need to be considered. These include accident rates, complaints, and the extent to which a given solution solves the problem. The benefit/cost index is only an approximate indicator of a project's relative ranking.

Table 18. Proposed Transportation Improvements

Improvement Number	Location	Description	Estimated Cost	Funding Source(s)
Street Improvements				
1.(A)	Tiara Street from Queens Avenue to Woodland	Paving	$25,000	SCA Paving Grant
1.(B)	Tiara Street from Woodland to end	Paving	$26,000	Grant
2.	Robinhood from 8th Avenue to Kings Way	Paving	$37,000	Grant
3.	South 7th from Park to North Lake	Paving	$11,550	Grant
4.	South 6th from Park to North Lake	Paving	$12,000	Grant
5.	Park from 4th to Sewer Plant	Paving	$24,000	OEDD Grant
6.	10th Avenue from North Lake to Railroad	Paving	$17,500	Grant
7.	Stanley from Bowron to North End	Paving	$35,000	Grant
8.	Rainbow from Stanley to Jacobson	Paving	$33,000	Grant
Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements				
1.(A)	North Lake from 8th Avenue to Canal	Bike/Pedestrian Path	$80,000	County/Grant
1.(B)	11th Avenue from Park to North Lake	Bike/Pedestrian Path	$20,000	County/Grant
2.	Airport Way from Highway 101 to 8th	Bike/Pedestrian Path	$100,000	Grant
3.	Park Avenue from 8th Avenue to 11th Avenue	Bike/Pedestrian Path	$9,600	Grant
4.	Bowron from Lakeland Drive to 8th	Bike/Pedestrian Path	$35,000	County
5.	Park from 5th to 8th	Bike/Pedestrian Path	$16,400	Grant
Other Improvements				
1.	Right Hand Turning Lane on Highway 101 North Entrance	Lane Widening	$50,000	ODOT
2.	Caution lights at entrances to the city	Installation	$18,000	ODOT