

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

9-22-1980

Meeting Notes 1980-09-22

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 1980-09-22 " (1980). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 16.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/16

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

The attached summary of the Air Quality Control Strategy Analysis was discussed at the special September 22 meeting of JPACT and the Regional Planning Committee. The Metro Council will act on measures discussed in this report at their December meeting.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
POLICY ISSUES

- I. The RTP suggests a policy direction calling for efforts to reduce traffic.
 - A. It calls for a policy to not automatically seek a highway solution to a congestion problem because:
 - funding is inadequate
 - highway projects simply induce more traffic
 - B. Rather - a policy to reduce traffic allows the use of available funding more effectively and contributes toward less energy consumption and air pollution.
 - C. Specific components of this policy direction call for:
 - improving transit to carry a greater variety of trip purposes, destinations and times of day
 - increase the use of ridesharing, bicycling and walking
 - provide highway capacity to solve a congestion problem only after it is determined that a transit and rideshare solution won't solve the problem
 - target highway investments primarily to serve economic development and new growth areas
 - encourage transit supportive densities
 - encourage strong suburban nodes to provide a focus for the transit system

Policy Issue: Is this the proper policy direction?

Policy Issue: If yes, to what extent should this direction be implemented?

- What is our transit ridership target? How big do we size our transit system?
 - What is our ridesharing target? How do we induce more carpooling?
 - How much traffic do we plan our highway system to accommodate?
 - How much energy should we consume?
- Specific numbers for these items cannot be set without dealing with the remaining policy issues.

- II. Transit Service - Policy Issues: How big do we size our transit system? How do we fund it? What should be the service concept?
 - A. Short-range (5 years)
 - How big should we size the system for? 235,000 riders per the TDP? 30-40,000 higher with reduced off-peak fares?

- How big should the fleet be? double per the TDP?
- How do we finance the additional \$15 million for the TDP and \$5 million for reduced fares? income tax, property tax, payroll tax, raised farebox recovery to 40%
- What service concept should be implemented to serve more trip purposes, destinations, times of day?
Per the TDP: enhance non-CBD service while maintaining service to the CBD via eastside grid system and timed-transfer south, west, southwest

B. Long-Range

- How big should we size the system? 408,000 or higher with reduced fares?
- What service concept should be implemented? Expand TDP coverage and frequency to cover new development and needed capacity -- and -- consider upgrading regional trunk routes to regional transitways on a corridor-by-corridor basis. (see also Transitway Policy)

III. Transitway Policy - The RTP suggests that specific routes should be protected from right-of-way encroachment to allow for future consideration of constructing LRT or busway.

Policy Issue: What criteria should be used to initiate Phase I and Phase II Alternative Analysis for a Transitway? Possible candidates:

- ridership potential (which is tied directly to land use compatibility)
- right-of-way availability (which is tied directly to local jurisdiction's ability to protect from encroachment)
- new radial versus extension
- ability to relieve highway congestion and capital investment requirements

IV. Transit Functional Classification - The RTP suggests adoption of a transit functional classification system specifying the location of Regional and Sub-regional Trunk Routes. This is intended to provide the mechanism to coordinate local land use planning with regional transit planning.

V. Carpooling - Policy Issue: How much carpooling should there be to achieve our traffic and energy targets?

- A. Which markets should public efforts to increase carpooling be targeted toward?
 - Trip Purpose - work trips only
 - Trip Patterns - CBD? Major employment centers? Regionwide?
 - B. What programs do we use to increase carpooling?
 - Programs to increase the AVAILABILITY of carpooling? regional matching, employer matching programs in office buildings and industrial parks, CARTS
 - Programs to increase the CONVENIENCE of carpooling? reserved carpool parking (CBD/non-CBD), preferential traffic controls
 - Programs to decrease the COST of carpooling? provide free carpool parking, pay mileage subsidy, provide tax credit, provide van financing
 - Programs to increase the COST of driving alone? increase CBD parking cost, impose a non-CBD parking cost, reduce the supply of parking
- VI. Highway Funding - Policy Issue: What new sources of highway funding are available and how much should be sought?
- A. Although the RTP calls for an aggressive shift of travel to alternative modes, the predominant mode of travel will be by auto (90%) of total person trips. Furthermore, the RTP calls for targeting of highway investments to promote economic development and serve areas planned for growth.
 - B. Available sources of funding are either dwindling or are no longer available:
 - Nearly all of the \$400 million of Interstate Transfer funds have been earmarked to projects
 - FAU funds only amount to \$472,000 per year until 1986 and is nearly fully allocated; after 1986, the amount of FAU available is dependent upon federal legislation
 - State gas taxes (7¢ per gallon) don't keep up with inflation and produce less money each year due to lower gasoline consumption
 - C. Additional highway facilities will be identified in the future to serve growing portions of the region and correct outstanding problems.
 - D. The cost and importance of maintaining the highway system is increasing. With an extensive system already in place and a continued high demand for outer travel, it is essential that the system not be allowed to deteriorate.

- E. Adoption of the RTP should recognize the need for additional highway funding for new construction as well as maintenance and should present alternative sources.

VII. Other miscellaneous items that will be adopted into the RTP:

- A. The highway functional classification will be adopted for freeways, principal arterials and possibly major arterials.
- B. The targets set for transit, rideshare and highway traffic volumes will establish what traffic we will accept new highway projects to serve.
- C. Population and employment forecasts by 81 districts will be adopted.
- D. The Policy Framework supports establishment of community-scale transit systems.
- E. Adoption of the RTP will constitute endorsement of several capital improvements that have not previously been adopted by resolution:
- Sunset Highway climbing lane and ramp metering
 - I-5 South ramp metering
 - Add turn lanes on Sylvan ramps
 - Reconstruct B-H/Scholls intersection
 - Widen Murray Boulevard - Jenkins to Sunset
 - Add turn lanes at Murray/T.V. Highway, Farmington/170th, Scholls/Hall, Cedar Hills/T.V. Highway, Cedar Hills/Walker
 - Improve Sunset Highway interchange at Murray & 158th
 - Realign Cornell - 216th to Walker
 - Connect Baseline and Jenkins
 - Widen Scholls Highway - 121st to Hwy. 217
 - Highway 217 ramp metering
 - Otty Road/I-205 interchange
 - 82nd Avenue Boulevard improvement - Otty Road to Harmony
 - 82nd Avenue service road - Causey Road to Clackamas Town Center
 - Exclusive busway - Otty Road to Clackamas Town Center

RTP ADOPTION/INPUT PROCESS

Metro Committees

- September 8, 5:30 p.m. - - - - - Staff presentation of RTP contents, distribution of Draft #2, initial discussion of RTP policy issues
Regional Planning Committee
- September 11, 7:30 a.m.- - - - - Staff presentation of RTP contents, distribution of Draft #2, initial discussion of RTP policy issues
JPACT
- September 22, 5:30 p.m.- - - - - Discussion of policy issues, review of public input, review of local jurisdiction input
Joint JPACT/RPC
(All Councilors Welcome)
- October 2, 7:30 p.m. - - - - - Discussion of policy issues
Metro Council
- October 13, 7:30 p.m.- - - - - Receive testimony on RTP, develop recommendations for Draft #3
Joint JPACT/RPC
Public Hearing
- October 15, 5:30 p.m. (if nec.)- Continue development of recommendations
Joint JPACT/RPC
- November 1 - - - - - Release Draft #3
- November 7 - - - - - Review of Draft #3 and recommend adoption of appropriate Ordinance
TPAC
- November 10, 5:30 p.m. - - - - - Review of Draft #3, public hearing, and recommend adoption of appropriate Ordinance
Joint JPACT/RPC
Public Hearing
- November 13- - - - - Review of Draft #3 and recommend adoption of appropriate Ordinance
JPACT
- November 20- - - - - 1st Reading of Ordinance, Public Hearing
Metro Council
- December 18- - - - - 2nd Reading of Ordinance, Adoption
Metro Council

NOTE 1: TPAC recommendation for adoption on November 7 requires moving normal meeting date from October 31 to November 7.

NOTE 2: If comments at November 20 Council meeting are substantial, RPC and JPACT can consider revisions at their meetings on December 8 and 11.

Local Jurisdictions

- Sept. - October 15 - - - - - Meet with Tri-Met Board, Oregon Transportation Commission and local jurisdiction Councils to review RTP recommendations and issues
- September 18 - - - - - Local Elected Officials Advisory Committee, Planning Directors, City and County Administrators review of RTP
- November 1 - - - - - Distribute Draft #3 to local jurisdictions and invite comment into adoption process

Public Involvement

- Sept. - October 15 - - - - - Meetings with established community organizations
- September 28 - - - - - Advertisement on the RTP in the newspaper with Survey
- October 1-8 - - - - - Public opinion poll on RTP issues
- October 22 - - - - - General public meeting on recommendations for Draft #3

September 9, 1980
AC:lmk



METRO

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 19, 1980
To: JPACT
From: Richard Brandman, Air Quality Program Manager
Regarding: Air Quality Strategy Analysis

Enclosed is a summary of the Transportation/Air Quality Control Strategy Analysis conducted by Metro for the Portland metropolitan area. The metropolitan area currently violates federal clean air standards for ozone, or smog, and is projected to do so through 1987, the year that the federal ozone standard must be met. Metro is responsible for developing a plan that will demonstrate how the region will meet this clean air standard. Failure to meet the standard will result in a loss to the region of capital improvement funds for many transportation and sewage construction projects.

Because one of the major pollutants that lead to the formation of ozone is generated by automobiles, Metro has integrated the air quality planning process into the development of the Regional Transportation Plan. The policy framework outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan will serve to guide air quality planning efforts by identifying those transportation measures which have the most significant impact on reducing traffic, thereby helping to clean the air.

As part of the air quality planning process, Metro has worked very closely over the past two years with a Citizens Advisory Committee composed of representatives of local jurisdictions, public interest groups, industrial associations, and the general public. Metro is now in the midst of a public involvement campaign for the Regional Transportation Plan, which includes information about air quality improvements gained by increasing the efficiency of our transportation system. For information regarding the time and place of meetings, please call Ellen Duke at Metro, 221-1646.

Copies of the Regional Transportation Plan, the Technical Air Quality Analysis Report, a slide show explaining the plan, and other public education materials are also available from Metro. If you have any questions about the air quality planning program, please contact me at the Metro office.

RB: lmk

Enclosure



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

A G E N D A

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: September 11, 1980

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 a.m.

Place: Metro - Conference Room A1/A2

- * 1. REALLOCATION OF INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS FROM THE HIGHWAY 212 EAST RESERVE AND THE I-505 CITY RESERVE - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- * 2. AUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PROJECTS INCLUDED IN THE MCLOUGHLIN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- * 3. FY 81 TIP AND ANNUAL ELEMENT - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- * 4. ADDING EIGHT TRANSIT STATIONS TO THE TIP - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- * 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF HYDROCARBON REDUCTION TARGETS FOR OREGON AND WASHINGTON - INFORMATION - R. Brandman.
- # 6. OVERVIEW OF RTP SECOND DRAFT - INFORMATION.

* Material Enclosed

Available at Meeting

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: August 14, 1980

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Ernie Bonner, Connie Kearney, Larry Cole, Al Myers, Mike Lindberg, Robert Bothman, John Frewing, Bill Young, Al Manuel, and Richard Carroll.

Guests: Winston Kurth, Clackamas County; Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; John MacGregor, Port of Portland; Bill Greene, DEQ; Anne Sylvester, RPC; Ted Spence, ODOT; Philip Selinger, Tri-Met; and Dean Nichols, Tri-Met - Oregon City.

Staff: Denton Kent, Bill Ockert, Andy Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Janet Gillaspie, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary.

MEDIA: None.

SUMMARY:

1. UPDATE OF THE SOUTHERN CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY

Andy Cotugno reviewed in great detail the refinement to the Southern Corridor Improvement Strategy as presented and approved by TPAC at its July 25 meeting.

Through an analysis of travel forecasts, it was determined that LRT could be viable by the year 2000 because it is projected to carry over 40,000 riders per day, which would economically justify the additional capital costs. However, the 40,000 riders per day does not justify proceeding with LRT at this time because this is a six-fold increase over today's ridership. Andy further reviewed the specific recommendations as contained in the Findings and Recommendations section of the Southern Corridor report.

The objectives of the project north of Highway 224 are to improve transit service, to relieve the neighborhood traffic parallel to McLoughlin Boulevard, and to relieve the McLoughlin Boulevard congestion. Concern was raised about the ability to convert the HOV lanes to LRT in the future.

It was brought out that, if it were possible to reconstruct the Portland Traction Company bridge over the Clackamas River for bus use, it would provide an excellent route for buses for the trunk routes of Oregon City to both Milwaukie and Clackamas Town Center. However, this will need to be coordinated with the proposed sewer plant.

Bill Ockert stressed that the staff has worked with the affected jurisdictions, ODOT, and Tri-Met throughout the entire planning process in a cooperative effort until its findings were presented to TPAC at its July meeting. If approved, this report would provide a basis for future funding decisions for working with Tri-Met, ODOT, and affected jurisdictions in defining the costs of the various projects recommended. It is anticipated that a number of these projects will be initiated shortly to use the remainder of the McLoughlin reserve.

Commissioner Lindberg was concerned that, by increasing traffic along McLoughlin, the impact would be felt as the additional traffic hits Portland. He asked if there was a relationship between the improvement strategy and the proposed ramps for I-5. Andy indicated that they are closely related and that, if the ramps aren't built, Union and Grand Avenues won't handle the additional McLoughlin Boulevard traffic.

Another question raised by the Committee was whether the proposed improvement strategy would have any effect on Amtrak. It was felt that, within the corridor, there would be no impact.

In terms of funding, funding for the project north of Milwaukie has presently appreciated to \$22 million. ODOT is the sponsor of that project, and they have received local matching funds from the Oregon Transportation Commission for preliminary engineering but will have to go back to obtain local match when the actual construction of the project begins. In terms of funding for the project south of Milwaukie, the various affected jurisdictions must provide the local match. Bill Ockert pointed out that we have always asked the sponsoring jurisdictions to commit to the match at the time that we authorize the federal funds. The process of getting that commitment together is being undertaken at this time.

One committee member expressed concern over making a decision at this time inasmuch as the Tri-Met board has not as yet been informed of the recommended strategy, and the decision of placing priority of bus over light-rail over the next twenty-five years seemed a weighty decision. Bill Ockert related that involvement has taken place with various citizen groups, but a more concentrated effort will take place in the development stage, when details that affect citizens in the area are being proposed.

Mr. Bonner related that the overall strategy is basically the same as that decided last December with the exception that, through analysis, it has been determined that LRT is not

justified for the next fifteen to twenty years. The strategy, as proposed, allows ODOT more consideration for busways, preferential treatment at intersections, HOV lane alternatives, busway alternatives, or low-cost preferential treatment for transit. Bob Bothman related that the proposed strategy is not as restrictive as the original proposal submitted by Metro in December. He added that the only thing that might not be highway funded would be the transit stations.

Bill Ockert stated that there are two considerations at hand: a deadline has been placed on Tri-Met to begin negotiations for the Portland Traction Company right-of-way; and, secondly, that this sets the framework for decisions which are going to be coming for the funding of the various projects. He felt it would be very helpful to the jurisdictions if this framework were established. It was pointed out that there are six Tri-Met projects and one ODOT project included for potential funding south of Highway 224.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend adoption of the Resolution as presented by the staff. Motion carried.

2. FINDINGS OF THE AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE CONTROL MEASURES

Richard Brandman reviewed in detail the status of the Air Quality Analysis submitted to the Committee. He related that the staff has worked with DEQ and the Air Quality Advisory Committee in close cooperation, and that the basic analysis is coming to a close. He pointed out that we need to set a split in reductions between emissions from Washington and Oregon. As part of the RTP, we need to lay out some alternative targets for reducing traffic, determining how much to reduce and what controls need to be pursued. Controls on the auto and controls on the businesses need to be set. Once targets and strategies are decided, guidelines are needed for funding commitments. The plan for air quality would probably not be adopted until January of 1982.

Committee members questioned whether the staff had addressed the economics of the various strategies, particularly in reference to the need for Tri-Met to double its bus load. They further expressed the need for an overall evaluation of benefits derived from the various strategies besides air quality in weighing cost-effectiveness.

Richard Brandman reported that this analysis is an attempt to reach the federal ozone standards by 1987 -- by utilizing these strategies plus DEQ's stationary source strategies. A public

involvement process is being undertaken at the present time to find out what kinds of programs the public will support.

If we don't meet the federal standards, sanctions can be applied by EPA such as cutting off all transportation capital improvement funds except for safety and transit projects. In addition, they could deny sewerage and 208 planning funds to the region.

The Environmental Protection Agency has a list of nineteen control strategies. Metro had an obligation to look at the sensitivities of all the strategies, but not to implement them -- unless by mandate of the people.

No action was taken on this matter as it was submitted for information purposes only.

3. FUNDING AUTHORIZATION FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS

Bill Ockert reported that we were just notified this week that Tri-Met had negotiated out with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration some early funding on a number of projects which, in some cases, we had proposed for next year and, in some cases, were new projects. He reported that holding off action on this matter until September would not give enough time to obligate the funds that are needed.

The three types of projects to be covered by the funding authorization include (1) the purchase of 30 articulated buses, marketing communications and information facilities, and the purchase and installation of the Powell Garage emergency power system; (2) moving funds in Interstate Transfer, previously authorized for FY 1981, to FY 1980 for the Banfield LRT; and (3) the provision of self-service fare equipment, a new item to be added to the annual element.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend adoption of the Resolution as presented by the staff. Under discussion on the motion, it was agreed that, with reference to item (2) under "Analysis" of the Agenda Management Summary, it would be wise to amend it to read: "2) Banfield LRT - as much as \$14.5 million in Interstate Transfer funds, previously authorized for FY 1981 and FY 1982, would be moved to FY 1980." The motion was approved with the change intended above.

4. TOUR OF I-205 BRIDGE

Bob Bothman of ODOT extended an invitation to the Committee to take part in a tour by boat of the I-205 Bridge. The Committee

members expressed interest in such a tour, and arrangements by ODOT would follow.

5. UPCOMING PROJECTS

In response to an inquiry concerning upcoming decisions, Bill Ockert related that the split between Oregon and Washington would be taken up next month and, in December, the Regional Transportation Plan would be recommended for adoption. The RTP will deal with targets for transit, carpooling and auto travel; the split between mobile and stationary air pollution sources; and some of the controls to be pursued. The second draft of the RTP will soon be released.

6. LEAVE OF TRANSPORTATION DIRECTOR

Bill Ockert related that this would be his final JPACT meeting before taking leave to assume his new position in Miami, Florida. He thanked the Committee for their overall support and effectiveness. In return, a round of applause from Committee members expressed their appreciation to a dedicated Transportation Director.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: JPACT Members
Denton Kent
Rick Gustafson

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT Meeting

DATE 8-14-80 - 7:30 am. The Dunes Oregon City

NAME

AFFILIATION

	NAME	AFFILIATION
✓ G	<u>Winston Keith</u>	<u>Clackamas Co.</u>
✓ G	<u>STEVE DOTTERER</u>	<u>CITY OF PORTLAND</u>
✓ G	<u>Dean Nichols-</u>	<u>Tri-met - Ore-city - Ore</u>
✓ G	<u>Philip Selinger</u>	<u>Tri-Met</u>
✓ G	<u>Zel Spence</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
✓ G	<u>Asinel Sylvester</u>	<u>RPC</u>
✓ S	<u>Newton U. Ford</u>	<u>Metro</u>
✓ S	<u>Andy Cotugno</u>	<u>Metro</u>
✓ C	<u>Emie Bunnor</u>	<u>METRO</u>
✓ C	<u>Connie Kearney</u>	<u>Clark Co</u>
✓ C	<u>LARRY D. COLE</u>	<u>CITY OF BEAVERTON</u>
✓ C	<u>HL MYERS</u>	<u>CITY OF GRESHAM</u>
✓ G	<u>DICK CARROLL</u>	<u>WSDOT</u>
✓ C	<u>JOHN FREMING</u>	<u>TRI-MET</u>
✓ C	<u>Mike Lundberg</u>	<u>City of Portland</u>
✓ C	<u>Robert Bothman</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
✓ G	<u>JOHN MACGREGOR</u>	<u>PORT OF PORTLAND</u>
✓ S	<u>Richard Barber</u>	<u>Metro</u>
✓ S	<u>Janet Sillaspine</u>	<u>DEQ / METRO</u>
✓ C	<u>Bill Young</u>	<u>DEQ</u>
✓ G	<u>BILL GREENE</u>	<u>DEQ</u>
✓ C	<u>Al Manuel</u>	



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 10, 1980
To: JPACT
From: Andrew Cotugno
Regarding: Highway 212 Reallocation

The Metro Regional Planning Committee raised several questions regarding the proposed reallocation of \$5.66 million of Highway 212 funding east of Carver Junction. They requested a response from JPACT to the Council before action on the Resolution at their September 25 meeting.

Presented below are the questions and potential responses. These should be finalized by JPACT and forwarded with the recommendation on the Resolution in the Council agenda mailing.

1. Is it appropriate to drop the Highway 212 project? The Council felt that it is an important project since Highway 212 is a hazardous road and is intended to provide a principal arterial connection to U.S. 26 from Clackamas County and Southeastern Washington County.

Yes. In April, 1979, ODOT estimated that to adequately upgrade Highway 212 would cost approximately \$20 million to provide full lane widths, turning lanes and climbing lanes and eliminate hazardous locations and bypasses of Damascus and Boring (this cost has likely inflated). However, ODOT estimated that 1990 average daily traffic would be far less than the current capacity of 12,000 vehicles per day and the improvement would do little to relieve traffic problems through Gresham to U.S. 26. The \$5.66 million available would not adequately correct the problems and, therefore, only a partial benefit would be realized. Finally, Highway 212 is outside the Urban Growth Boundary and therefore may conflict with Metro's urban containment goals.

While it is recognized that Highway 212 is an important connection to the region, the need for improvement is primarily to serve long-range travel demands. Therefore, it is of

lower priority than Metro planned regional improvements. This is reflected by the lack of local matching funds from either ODOT or Clackamas County. In order to advance other priority projects to construction, additional funding should be reallocated from Highway 212.

2. Is it appropriate to transfer part of the Highway 212 funding to the Banfield Freeway project (\$2,374,809)? The Committee felt that the funding was primarily intended for Clackamas County improvements and should be reallocated to other Clackamas County projects.

Yes. Highway 212 should be viewed as primarily serving an east-west travel demand to solve traffic problems in the eastside of the region. The Banfield Freeway also serves this need.

Secondly, I-205 and the Banfield Freeway are essential links for Clackamas County trips to relieve the traffic burden on McLoughlin Boulevard north of Highway 224.

Finally, the allocation of funding to Highway 212 was originally from a regional source and therefore should be considered for transfer to solve the highest regional priority.

3. Is Clackamas County receiving other transportation improvements in exchange for these funds?

Yes. In conjunction with Metro's McLoughlin Boulevard Improvement Strategy and Tri-Met's Transit Development Program, a major transit service expansion is planned for Clackamas County.

A G E N D A M A N A G E M E N T S U M M A R Y

TO: JPACK *Changes made from this on 9/11*
FROM: Metro Staff
SUBJECT: Adoption of the FY 1981-1984 Transportation Improvement
Program (TIP) and FY 1981 Annual Element

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Adopt the TIP and Annual Element and accompanying Air Quality Consistency Statement to serve as the basis for receipt of federal transportation funds by local jurisdictions, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Tri-Met.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: Adoption of the TIP continues past policy actions in support of federal funding for numerous transportation improvements throughout the region. Updates to the funding schedule for individual projects reflect most recent cost estimates, funding availability and implementation schedules. In addition, this action represents policy support for funding several new improvements in the TIP:

. Tri-Met

1. Adds six transit stations to the TIP to complete the transit network set forth in the Transit Development Program (TDP).
2. Adds 30 articulated buses, 147 standard buses and repowering of 165 older buses to accommodate service expansion programs called for in the TDP.

. City of Portland

Adds a new TSM project on 82nd Ave. consisting of preliminary engineering (PE) and right of way (R/W). This action will initiate short-term improvements resulting from a land use study for 82nd Ave. recently adopted by the City Council. Long-term improvement strategies in the study will be developed at a later date.

. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

Adds a new ramp metering project to the TIP which fulfills recommendations of the I-5 Freeway Management Report for a balanced freeway system from downtown Portland to Haines Road.

- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The existing Metro budget provides for development of the TIP.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The Metro Transportation Improvement Program describes how federal transportation funds for highway and transit projects in the Metro region are to be obligated during the period October 1, 1980, through September 30, 1981. Additionally, in order to maintain continuity, funds are estimated for years before and after the annual element year.

Projects have been developed through cooperative participation of the cities and counties in the region, the states and special districts such as Tri-Met. The TIP Subcommittee has prepared the recommended TIP for FY 1981.

Description of the projects to be added to this year's TIP are as follows:

. Tri-Met

1. Six transit stations in the TDP and not in the TIP are to be added to the TIP to complete the transit network on which the TDP was based.

- . Burlingame
- . Sylvan
- . Raleigh Hills
- . Lents
- . Hillsboro
- . Tannasbourne

The TIP already contains the remaining 12 transit stations and the Banfield LRT stations:

- . Tualatin
- . Tigard
- . Washington Square
- . Lake Oswego
- . Oregon City
- . Clackamas Town Center
- . Milwaukie
- . Lents
- . Columbia/Sandy
- . Mall 205
- . Jantzen Beach
- . Kenton
- . St. Johns

Their function is to connect several bus routes or

trunklines and to facilitate transfers from one route to another. They allow for layover of buses operating on a timed transfer basis. They provide shelters and display schedule information and maps of inter-connecting routes. They will facilitate use of the transit system in the surrounding areas without being forced to travel into downtown Portland.

Federal share - \$1,216,000 (The first three are scheduled for FY 81, the final three for FY 82)

2. The TDP calls for 30 articulated buses, 147 standard buses and the repowering of 165 older buses that are not currently in the TIP.

Tri-Met's capital development program must, at the very least, provide for the maintenance of the current level of transit service with some required service improvements. In order to meet this need, new bus procurements will be necessary to provide replacements for old buses or for additional support to the existing fleet. A mix of standard and articulated buses and light rail vehicles is planned to contribute to a flexible cost-effective program. This will allow Tri-Met to allocate various types of equipment to routes to which they are best suited and will alleviate the service demands placed on the balance of Tri-Met's fleet.

Procurement of new buses (including those noted above) will increase the fleet size to 867 (a 53 percent increase). This growth will accommodate an 11 percent annual rate of service expansion. This bus fleet, plus the LRT system, will almost double transit capacity by 1985, and will serve about 232,000 average weekday riders. The TIP already incorporates the remainder of the necessary bus purchases.

As a cost-effective alternative to replacing retired buses with new buses (\$30,000 vs. \$150,000), Tri-Met plans to repower 165 buses to extend the lifespan. This will be accomplished on a regular basis over a four-year period.

Federal share - \$38,864,807 (bus purchase slated for 1983 and later)

City of Portland

1. 82nd Ave. improvements -- The City of Portland has recently completed an 82nd Ave. land use study aimed at defining a series of improvements on 82nd Ave. This study has been adopted by the City Council.

The study recommends specific corrective actions consisting of the reduction of water ponding; purchase of right of way to complete sidewalks (full length, both sides); left-turn bays at selected intersections with left-turn signals; transit shelter pads; bus turnouts downstream of signals; ramps for the handicapped; continuous left-turn medians where possible; new drainage facilities where necessary; and widening at necessary locations to maintain a full-length, constant width facility.

The action to include this project in the TIP initiates PE and a minor amount of R/W acquisition.

Federal share - \$105,000

. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

1. Ramp metering on I-5 from Haines Rd. to Marquam Bridge is not currently in the TIP.

Previous Council action approved ramp metering projects from Marquam Bridge to the Columbia River. This added project to the TIP will fulfill recommendations of the I-5 Freeway Management Report for a balanced and operationally efficient freeway system from Haines Rd. to the Columbia River. It would improve traffic flow and eliminate breakdown by ensuring that traffic demands do not exceed the capacity of the roadway.

Federal share - \$433,000

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Tri-Met

1. Transit Stations -- Subregional routes depend on transit centers which provide an interface between trunklines of high capacity and local routes. Transfers at these sites are timed to minimize passenger waiting.

Transit stations allow for a multi-destinational transit system, providing an alternative to a radial system through downtown Portland.

2. Bus Purchase and Repowering -- Alternatives include less buses to service the region; increased maintenance of vehicles, breakdowns and road calls; and marginal service to outlying areas.

City of Portland

1. 82nd Ave. -- The City Council adopted the 82nd Ave. Land Use Study. The study calls for selected TSM improvements and was coordinated with the 82nd Ave. Business Men's Association.

The alternative of not building the project would result in congestion due to left turns into residential and business areas; varying width of facility; disincentives for pedestrian use; and continued drainage problems.

Oregon Department of Transportation

1. Ramp Metering on I-5 -- Haines Rd. to Marquam Bridge -- This project will improve safety and traffic flow and will augment existing ramp metering projects from Marquam Bridge to the Columbia River.

The alternative of not metering the freeway would result in an unbalanced and operationally inefficient system south of Marquam Bridge because of the system improvements slated for I-5 north of Marquam Bridge; safety; and reduced traffic flow.

- C. CONCLUSION: Adoption of the resolution will incorporate the noted projects into the TIP and will allow timely flow of federal funds into the region. Additionally, it will support the previous study results documented by Tri-Met in its Transit Development Program, by the City of Portland in its 82nd Avenue Land Use Study, and by the Oregon Department of Transportation in its I-5 South Freeway Management Report

BP:bb
290B/33

Note changes incor on next one to Council

A G E N D A M A N A G E M E N T S U M M A R Y

TO: JPACT and RPC
FROM: Metro Staff
SUBJECT: Reallocating Interstate Transfer Funds From the Highway 212 East Reserve and the I-505 City Reserve

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution No. _____ for the following purposes:
 - 1. Reallocating \$5.66 million previously reserved for the Highway 212 project (east of Highway 224) in Clackamas County to five projects and the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve;
 - 2. Reallocating \$816,000 from the I-505 City Reserve to the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve.

- B. POLICY IMPACT: The action requesting reallocation of \$5.66 million from the Highway 212 project (east of Highway 224) was initiated by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) in cooperation with Metro and local jurisdictions pursuant to the Metro funding guidelines. The funds reallocated from this reserve will cover cost increases on higher priority projects including the Banfield Corridor Project (highway portion), Highway 212/224 (east of I-205), Lake Oswego Bridge (Highway 43), Oregon City Bypass, and the Boones Ferry Road projects. Reallocation of funding from the Highway 212 (east of Highway 224) improvement will delete this project from the region's Transportation Improvement Program as a near term project. Due to lack of local match commitments, it is not possible to advance the project. The reallocation will advance the higher priority projects which are currently experiencing funding shortfalls. Improvements to Highway 212 east of Highway 224 will be identified in conjunction with future refinements of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

In addition, funds from the Highway 212 Reserve and the I-505 City of Portland Reserve will supplement the McLoughlin Corridor Reserve allowing additional transit improvements (including possible bus purchases) and neighborhood traffic controls.

- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget includes funds to monitor federal funding commitments and coordinating project reallocation proposals.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: In December 1978, the CRAG Board of Directors established as part of the I-505 Withdrawal process, a Reserve fund to improve a section of Highway 212 east of Highway 224 in Clackamas County. This account has since escalated to some \$5.66 million (in March 1980 dollars).

The Banfield Corridor, Highway 212 (I-205 to Highway 224), Oregon City Bypass, McLoughlin Corridor, Lake Oswego Bridge, and Boones Ferry Road in Lake Oswego were established by the CRAG Board of Directors/Metro Council as priority projects.

By Resolution No. 79-103, the Metro Council established funding guidelines describing a process for reallocating Interstate Transfer funds. Pursuant to this process, ODOT in cooperation with Metro, Clackamas County, Tri-Met and the City of Portland staffs, have requested the funds reserved for the Highway 212 (east of Highway 224) be reallocated based on several considerations:

1. At this time, it does not appear that sufficient local matching funds will be available to implement the project.
2. Preliminary engineering has not yet started on the Highway 212 east project.
3. Preliminary engineering has been completed for the five highway projects and funding shortfalls have developed.
4. The other five committed regional projects to receive the funds have higher priorities.
5. Funds are needed to supplement the Metro Corridor Improvement Strategy as it affects the McLoughlin Corridor for transit improvements and neighborhood traffic controls.

The Highway 212 reserve is proposed to be reallocated as follows:

. Banfield Transitway	\$2,374,809
. Oregon City Bypass	1,358,391
. Hwy. 212/I-224 East to I-205	406,567
. Oswego Creek Bridge	289,727
. Boones Ferry Rd.	415,774
. McLoughlin Corridor Reserve	816,000
Total	<u>\$5,661,268</u>

The preliminary engineering has been completed on the

first four projects listed above and are scheduled to enter right-of-way acquisition in calendar year 1980. Preliminary engineering has been completed on the fifth project; however, the project cannot proceed until these additional funds are provided.

It is also proposed that this reallocation of Highway 212 reserve be supplemented by \$816,000 reallocated from the I-505 City Reserve to the McLoughlin Corridor Reserve. A recommendation for authorizing these funds to a specific set of improvements (including bus purchases) is included as the following agenda item.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Selection of the above projects were predicated upon Metro funding guidelines, the immediacy of implementation of priority projects, regional priorities and amount of funding shortfall. Other projects were reviewed as candidates for these funds.
- C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends that the attached resolution redistributing the noted funds be approved based on (1) the progressing of the priority projects identified, and (2) the benefit gained by supplementing the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve.

BP/gl
9372/92

FOR THE PURPOSE OF REALLOCATING)
INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS FROM)
THE HIGHWAY 212 EAST RESERVE)
AND THE I-505 CITY RESERVE)

WHEREAS, The CRAG Board of Directors in December, 1978, established a reserve fund for improvements on Highway 212 East of Highway 224 and the I-505 City Reserve; and

WHEREAS, Over time the Highway 212 East Reserve account has escalated to some \$5.66 million (in March, 1980 dollars); and

WHEREAS, Clackamas County and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has recommended that the reserved funds be reallocated because local matching funds will not be available for the Highway 212 East project; and

WHEREAS, Clackamas County, in reviewing alternatives with the Oregon Department of Transportation, the City of Portland, Tri-Met and Metro staff, has formulated a plan for use of these funds; and

WHEREAS, The Reserve funds can be reallocated to the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve and other worthwhile projects with implementation imminent; and

WHEREAS, The City of Portland has recommended that a portion of the I-505 City Reserve be reallocated to the McLoughlin Corridor Reserve; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the project known as Highway 212 East be dropped from the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

2. That the reserve funds for the Highway 212 East project be reallocated as follows:

. Banfield Transitway	\$2,374,809
. Oregon City Bypass	1,358,391
. Hwy. 212/I-224 East to I-205	406,567
. Oswego Creek Bridge	289,727
. Boones Ferry Rd.	415,774
. McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve	<u>816,000</u>
Total	\$5,661,268

3. That \$816,000 of the I-505 City Reserve be reallocated to the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve.

4. That the TIP and its annual element be amended to reflect these reallocations.

5. That the Metro Council finds these actions to be in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative, comprehensive planning process and hereby gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.

BP:gl
8983/33

A G E N D A M A N A G E M E N T S U M M A R Y

TO: Metro Council
FROM: Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Reallocating Interstate Transfer Funds From the Highway
212 East Reserve and the I-505 City Reserve

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution No. _____ for the following purposes:
1. Reallocating \$5.66 million previously reserved for the Highway 212 project (east of Highway 224) in Clackamas County to five projects and the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve;
 2. Reallocating \$816,000 from the I-505 City Reserve to the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: The action requesting reallocation of \$5.66 million from the Highway 212 project (east of Highway 224) was initiated by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) in cooperation with Metro and local jurisdictions pursuant to the Metro funding guidelines. The funds reallocated from this reserve will cover cost increases on higher priority projects including the Banfield Corridor Project (highway portion), Highway 212/224 (east of I-205), Lake Oswego Bridge (Highway 43), Oregon City Bypass, and the Boones Ferry Road projects. Reallocation of funding from the Highway 212 (east of Highway 224) improvement will delete this project from the region's Transportation Improvement Program as a near term project. Due to lack of local match commitments, it is not possible to advance the project. The reallocation will advance the higher priority projects which are currently experiencing funding shortfalls. Improvements to Highway 212 east of Highway 224 will be identified in conjunction with future refinements of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

In addition, funds from the Highway 212 Reserve and the I-505 City of Portland Reserve will supplement the McLoughlin Corridor Reserve allowing additional transit improvements (including possible bus purchases) and neighborhood traffic controls..

The Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) have reviewed and approved this project.

- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget includes funds to monitor federal funding commitments and coordinating project reallocation proposals.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: In December 1978, the CRAG Board of Directors established as part of the I-505 Withdrawal process, a Reserve fund to improve a section of Highway 212 east of Highway 224 in Clackamas County. This account has since escalated to some \$5.66 million (in March 1980 dollars).

The Banfield Corridor, Highway 212 (I-205 to Highway 224), Oregon City Bypass, McLoughlin Corridor, Lake Oswego Bridge, and Boones Ferry Road in Lake Oswego were established by the CRAG Board of Directors/Metro Council as priority projects.

By Resolution No. 79-103, the Metro Council established funding guidelines describing a process for reallocating Interstate Transfer funds. Pursuant to this process, ODOT in cooperation with Metro, Clackamas County, Tri-Met and the City of Portland staffs, have requested the funds reserved for the Highway 212 (east of Highway 224) be reallocated based on several considerations:

1. At this time, it does not appear that sufficient local matching funds will be available to implement the project.
2. Preliminary engineering has not yet started on the Highway 212 east project.
3. Preliminary engineering has been completed for the five highway projects and funding shortfalls have developed.
4. The other five committed regional projects to receive the funds have higher priorities.
5. Funds are needed to supplement the Metro Corridor Improvement Strategy as it affects the McLoughlin Corridor for transit improvements and neighborhood traffic controls.

The Highway 212 Reserve is proposed to be reallocated as follows:

. Banfield Freeway	\$2,374,809
. Oregon City Bypass	1,358,391
. Hwy. 212/I-224 East to I-205	406,567
. Oswego Creek Bridge	289,727
. Boones Ferry Rd.	415,774
. McLoughlin Corridor Reserve	816,000
Total	<u>\$5,661,268</u>

The preliminary engineering has been completed on the first four projects listed above and are scheduled to enter right-of-way acquisition in calendar year 1980. Preliminary engineering has been completed on the fifth project, however, the project cannot proceed until these additional funds are provided.

It is also proposed that this reallocation of Highway 212 reserve be supplemented by \$816,000 reallocated from the I-505 City Reserve to the McLoughlin Corridor Reserve. A recommendation for authorizing these funds to a specific set of improvements (including bus purchases) is included as the following agenda item.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Selection of the above projects were predicated upon Metro funding guidelines, the immediacy of implementation of priority projects, regional priorities and amount of funding shortfall. Other projects were reviewed as candidates for these funds.

At the September 8 Regional Planning Committee meeting, JPACT was requested to provide additional clarification of three issues relating to alternate use of the funding:

- Is it appropriate to drop the Hwy. 212 project?
- Is it appropriate to transfer part of the funding to the Banfield Freeway project?
- Is Clackamas County receiving sufficient other improvements in exchange for these funds?

Responses to these questions are included in the attached memo from JPACT.

- C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends that the attached resolution redistributing the noted funds be approved based on (1) the progressing of the priority projects identified, and (2) the benefit gained by supplementing the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve.

BP/gl
9372/92
9/25/80



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 11, 1980
To: Metro Council
From: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on
Transportation (JPACT)
Regarding: Highway 212 Reallocation

The Metro Regional Planning Committee raised several questions regarding the proposed reallocation of \$5.66 million of Highway 212 funding east of Carver Junction. They requested a response from JPACT to the Council before action on the Resolution at the September 25 meeting. Presented below are the questions and responses. Based upon these considerations, the Resolution is recommended for adoption.

Question: Is it appropriate to drop the Highway 212 project? The Council felt that it is an important project since Highway 212 is a hazardous road and is intended to provide a principal arterial connection to U.S. 26 from Clackamas County and southeastern Washington County.

Response: Yes. In April, 1979, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) estimated that to adequately upgrade Highway 212 would cost approximately \$20 million to provide full lane widths, turning lanes and climbing lanes and eliminate hazardous locations and bypasses of Damascus and Boring (this cost has likely inflated). However, ODOT estimated that 1990 average daily traffic would be far less than the current capacity of 12,000 vehicles per day and the improvement would do little to relieve traffic problems through Gresham to U.S. 26. The \$5.66 million available would not adequately correct the problems and only a partial benefit would be realized. Finally, Highway 212 is outside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and may conflict with Metro's urban containment goals.

While it is recognized that Highway 212 is an important connection to the region, the need for improvement is primarily to serve long-range travel demands. Therefore, it is of lower

priority than Metro planned regional improvements. This is reflected by the lack of local matching funds from either ODOT Or Clackamas County. In order to advance other priority projects to construction, additional funding should be reallocated from Highway 212.

ODOT should be encouraged to clearly specify the required improvement to Highway 212 for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan and consider alternate funding sources for the improvement in development of the six-year Highway Improvement Program.

Question: Is it appropriate to transfer part of the Highway 212 funding to the Banfield Freeway project (\$2,374,809)? The Committee felt that the funding was primarily intended for Clackamas County improvements and should be reallocated to other Clackamas County projects.

Response: Yes. Highway 212 should be viewed as primarily serving an east/west travel demand to solve traffic problems in the eastside of the region. The Banfield Freeway also serves this need.

Secondly, I-205 and the Banfield Freeway are essential links for Clackamas County trips to relieve the traffic burden on McLoughlin Boulevard north of Highway 224.

Finally, the allocation of funding to Highway 212 was originally from a regional source and, therefore, should be considered for transfer to solve the highest regional priority.

Question: Is Clackamas County receiving sufficient other transportation improvements in exchange for these funds?

Response: Yes. In conjunction with Metro's McLoughlin Boulevard Improvement Strategy and Tri-Met's Transit Development Program, a major transit service expansion is planned for Clackamas County.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF REALLOCATING)	RESOLUTION NO.
INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS FROM)	
THE HIGHWAY 212 EAST RESERVE)	Introduced by the Joint
AND THE I-505 CITY RESERVE)	Policy Advisory Committee on
)	Transportation

WHEREAS, The CRAG Board of Directors in December, 1978, established a reserve fund for improvements on Highway 212 East of Highway 224 and the I-505 City Reserve; and

WHEREAS, Over time the Highway 212 East Reserve account has escalated to some \$5.66 million (in March, 1980 dollars); and

WHEREAS, Clackamas County and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has recommended that the reserved funds be reallocated because local matching funds will not be available for the Highway 212 East project; and

WHEREAS, Clackamas County, in reviewing alternatives with ODOT, the City of Portland, Tri-Met and Metro staff, has formulated a plan for use of these funds; and

WHEREAS, The Reserve funds can be reallocated to the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve and other worthwhile projects with implementation imminent; and

WHEREAS, The City of Portland has recommended that a portion of the I-505 City Reserve be reallocated to the McLoughlin Corridor Reserve; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the project known as Highway 212 East be dropped from the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

2. That the Reserve funds for the Highway 212 East project be reallocated as follows:

. Banfield Freeway	\$2,374,809
. Oregon City Bypass	1,358,391
. Hwy. 212/I-224 East to I-205	406,567
. Oswego Creek Bridge	289,727
. Boones Ferry Rd.	415,774
. McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve	<u>816,000</u>
Total	\$5,661,268

3. That \$816,000 of the I-505 City Reserve be reallocated to the McLoughlin Blvd. Reserve.

4. That the TIP and its annual element be amended to reflect these reallocations.

5. That the Metro Council requests ODOT to clearly specify the required improvements to Highway 212 for inclusion in the RTP and consider alternate funding sources for the improvement in development of the six-year Highway Improvement Program.

6. That the Metro Council finds these actions to be in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative, comprehensive planning process and hereby gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this ____ day of September, 1980.

Presiding Officer

BP:gl
8983/33

A G E N D A M A N A G E M E N T S U M M A R Y

TO: Metro Council
FROM: Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Authorizing funding for eight transit stations

I. RECOMMENDATION:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Adoption of attached Resolution No. 80-179 which adds eight transit stations to the Transportation Systems Management Element (TSME) and authorizes funding (UMTA discretionary Section 3 funds) for the stations. These authorizations would be as follows:

Tigard Transit Center	\$320,000
Tualatin Transit Center	160,000
Washington Square Transit Center	120,000
Columbia/Sandy Transfer Station	80,000
Mall 205 Transfer Station	60,000
Kenton Transfer Station	80,000
Jantzen Beach Transfer Station	80,000
St. Johns Transfer Station	80,000

- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action endorses the proposed service expansion and timed-transfer concept included in Tri-Met's Transit Development Program. In addition, it allows Tri-Met to take advantage of supplemental appropriations to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) discretionary funds. Endorsement of the service concept constitutes advanced endorsement of part of Tri-Met's recently adopted five-year Transit Development Program (TDP). The full TDP is incorporated into the second draft of the Regional Transportation Plan.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget funds staff involvement in preparing funding authorizations.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: Recent Congressional action has provided supplementary FY 1980 appropriations for transit. These funds must be obligated by UMTA before September 30, 1980 or be lost. In order to receive these funds, Metro must authorize funds for the proposed improvements in the FY 1980 element of the Transportation Improvement Program.

The transit stations are intended to allow implementation of a timed-transfer service concept, thereby allowing development of a multi-destinational service pattern. Transit Centers include bus bays, passenger shelters, schedule information, lighting and telephones. Transfer Stations are generally smaller and include bus turnouts, shelters and schedule information.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: If funds are not authorized for these projects, Tri-Met must compete for limited available federal funds in future years.
- C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends inclusion of the projects in the TSME and authorization of the funds in the FY 1980 element of the TIP. Tri-Met has committed to provide the 20 percent local match in the amount of \$245,000.

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING)
EIGHT TRANSIT STATIONS TO THE)
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT)
PROGRAM)

RESOLUTION NO. 80-179
Introduced by JPACT

WHEREAS, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 79-80 which endorsed the FY 1980 Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, a supplementary Congressional appropriation for FY 1980 has recently provided additional Urban Mass Transportation funds; and

WHEREAS, in order to take advantage of these changes in funding levels and timing, Tri-Met has requested that the FY 1980 element of the Transportation Improvement Program be adjusted by the addition of eight transit stations; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Systems Management Element previously approved by Metro must be amended to incorporate the timed-transfer service concept with the new transit stations; and

WHEREAS, federal obligation of the supplementary appropriation must take place prior to September 30, 1980 or be lost; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council amends the Transportation System Management Element to incorporate the timed-transfer concept with eight transit stations.

2. That the Metro Council authorizes the use of UMTA Section 3 funds for the eight transit stations described in Attachment "A" by amending the FY 1980 annual element of the Transportation Improvement Program.

EXHIBIT A

ADDITIONS TO FY 1980 TIP

	<u>Federal Share</u>	<u>Total</u>
Tigard Transit Center	\$320,000	\$ 400,000
Tualatin Transit Center	160,000	200,000
Washington Square Transit Center	120,000	150,000
Columbia/Sandy Transfer Station	80,000	100,000
Mall 205 Transfer Station	60,000	75,000
Kenton Transfer Station	80,000	100,000
Jantzen Beach Transfer Station	80,000	100,000
St. Johns Transfer Station	<u>80,000</u>	<u>100,000</u>
	\$980,000	\$1,225,000



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 12, 1980
To: Metro Councilors
From: Charlie Williamson *CW*
Regarding: Transportation Improvement Program

The attached Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) must be adopted annually before the beginning of the federal fiscal year - October 1, 1980. Any projects that use federal funds in the upcoming fiscal year must be included in an adopted TIP. Please be prepared to vote on the TIP so that project funding is not jeopardized.

All of the projects in the listing have been reviewed by the Council in the past. Several project additions were questioned by the Regional Planning Committee and have been deleted at the recommendation of staff and JPACT.

If you have any questions before the meeting, call me or Andy Cotugno.

CW:AC:lmk

Enclosure

A G E N D A M A N A G E M E N T S U M M A R Y

TO: Metro Council
FROM: Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Adopting the FY 1981-1984 Transportation Improvement Program and the FY 1981 Annual Element

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Adopt the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Annual Element and accompanying Air Quality Consistency Statement to serve as the basis for receipt of federal transportation funds by local jurisdictions, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Tri-Met. The Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) have reviewed and approved the Annual Element.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: Adoption of the TIP continues past policy actions in support of federal funding for numerous transportation improvements throughout the region. Updates to the funding schedule for individual projects reflect most recent cost estimates, funding availability and implementation schedules. In addition, this action represents policy support for funding several new improvements in the TIP.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The existing Metro budget provides for development of the TIP.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The Metro TIP describes how federal transportation funds for highway and transit projects in the Metro region are to be obligated during the period October 1, 1980, through September 30, 1981. Additionally, in order to maintain continuity, funds are estimated for years before and after the Annual Element year.

Projects have been developed through cooperative participation of the cities and counties in the region, the states and special districts such as Tri-Met. The TIP Subcommittee has prepared the recommended TIP for FY 1981.

TPAC had additionally recommended several new projects be added to the TIP consisting of:

- transit stations at Burlingame, Sylvan, Raleigh Hills, Lents, Hillsboro and Tannasbourne
- park and ride lots at Lake Oswego and Hillsboro
- purchase of an additional 30 articulated buses and 147 standard buses for service expansion.

- repowering of 165 buses
- preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition for an upgrading to 82nd Avenue in Portland
- ramp metering on I-5 South

JPACT, in its review, felt that the lack of sufficient and detailed information on the above projects did not warrant inclusion in the TIP at this time. JPACT recommended that these projects be included at a later date when their role in the RTP can be better defined.

The projects appear in the attached listing but adoption of the TIP will specifically exclude them.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: If the TIP is not adopted, projects will not be eligible to receive federal funds with the start of federal fiscal year 1981 on October 1, 1980. Future amendments to reflect changing priorities and funding availability can be adopted at a later date.
- C. CONCLUSION: Adoption of the resolution, will allow timely flow of federal funds into the region.

KT/gl
88B/135

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE FY)	RESOLUTION NO.
1981-1984 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVE-)	
MENT PROGRAM AND THE FY 1981)	Introduced by the Joint
ANNUAL ELEMENT)	Policy Advisory Committee
)	on Transportation

WHEREAS, Metro staff and the Transportation Improvement Program Subcommittee have prepared a final draft of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Metro urban area which implements the adopted Interim Transportation Plan and complies with federal guidelines as set forth in 23 CFR--Part 450; and

WHEREAS, Such a program was prepared and released for review; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with the Metro/RPC (Clark County) Memorandum of Agreement, the TIP has been submitted to the RPC for review and comment; and

WHEREAS, Projects using federal funds must be specified in the TIP by the fiscal year in which obligation of funds is to take place; and

WHEREAS, A determination of the consistency of the TIP with Air Quality Plans has been prepared; and

WHEREAS, Some 1980 Annual Element projects may not be obligated in FY 1980 because the exact point in time for obligation is indeterminant; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council adopt the Transportation Improvement Program for the urban area and the accompanying Air

Quality Consistency Statement as contained in the attachment to this Resolution marked Exhibit "A," which by reference is made an integral part of this Resolution.

2. That projects that are not obligated by September 30, 1980, be automatically reprogrammed for FY 1981 for all funding sources.

3. That the TIP is in conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan.

4. That the Metro Council allows the use of funds to be transferred among the particular phases (PE, ROW or Construction) of a given project.

5. That the Metro Council hereby finds the projects in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative, comprehensive planning process and, hereby, gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this _____ day of September, 1980.

Presiding Officer

KT/gl
87B/135

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING)
HYDROCARBON REDUCTION TARGETS)
FOR OREGON AND WASHINGTON)

WHEREAS, Metro has been designated by the Governor of the State of Oregon as lead agency for air quality planning in the Oregon portion of the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area pursuant to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Council of Clark County has been designated by the Governor of Washington as lead agency for the Washington portion of the metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, Metro and the Regional Planning Council of Clark County must develop transportation control strategies to reduce hydrocarbon emissions in their respective jurisdictions as part of the 1982 State Implementation Plan revisions; and

WHEREAS, the Environmental Protection Agency and Urban Mass Transportation Administration require the establishment of an equitable method (formula) for dividing between the two jurisdictions the necessary total reduction in hydrocarbon emissions needed to reach federal ozone standards by December 31, 1987; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council endorses using the projected 1987 population in the Oregon and Washington portions of the Air Quality Maintenance Area as the basis for distributing the required reduction in hydrocarbon emissions necessary to meet the Federal ozone standard; and that the regional reduction target shall be based upon the Hydrocarbon Emissions Inventory

developed cooperatively by Metro, the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and the Southwest Air Pollution Control Authority.

2. That the reduction targets should be based upon comparable committed hydrocarbon control strategies of the two states.

3. That the Metro Council recognizes that the 1987 population forecast will be updated after receipt of the 1980 census and periodically thereafter, and that the Emission Inventory will be updated as studies progress resulting in revisions to specific hydrocarbon reduction targets.

4. That Metro agrees to work cooperatively with the Regional Planning Council of Clark County in the event either party is unable to fully achieve their portion of the emission reduction.

5. That the Metro Council authorizes the Executive Officer to execute a Planning Agreement between Metro and the Regional Planning Council of Clark County to establish the required reduction in hydrocarbon emissions in Oregon and Washington necessary to meet the Federal ozone standard.

AC:RB:lmk

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING)
HYDROCARBON REDUCTION TARGETS)
FOR OREGON AND WASHINGTON)

WHEREAS, Metro has been designated by the Governor of the State of Oregon as lead agency for air quality planning in the Oregon portion of the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area pursuant to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Council of Clark County has been designated by the Governor of Washington as lead agency for the Washington portion of the metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, Metro and the Regional Planning Council of Clark County must develop transportation control strategies to reduce hydrocarbon emissions in their respective jurisdictions as part of the 1982 State Implementation Plan revisions; and

WHEREAS, the Environmental Protection Agency and Urban Mass Transportation Administration require the establishment of an equitable method (formula) for dividing between the two jurisdictions the necessary total reduction in hydrocarbon emissions needed to reach federal ozone standards by December 31, 1987; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council recognizes the hydrocarbon emissions inventory as the source for:

a) estimating 1987 hydrocarbon emissions
(150,000 kg/day), and

b) establishing the total reduction in hydrocarbon emissions necessary for the Portland-

Vancouver metropolitan area to meet
federal ozone standards (31,500 kg/day).

2. That the Metro Council endorses as the basis for distributing the needed emission reduction between Oregon and Washington the projected 1987 population of each state's portion of the metropolitan area; and that the reduction targets should be based upon comparable committed hydrocarbon control strategies. Application of the formula is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

3. That the Metro Council recognizes that the 1987 population forecast will be updated after receipt of the 1980 census and periodically thereafter, and that the emission inventory will be updated as studies progress resulting in revisions to specific hydrocarbon reduction targets.

4. That Metro agrees to work cooperatively with the Regional Planning Council of Clark County in the event either party is unable to fully achieve their portion of the emission reduction.

AC:lmk

Exhibit A

Application of formula to derive Oregon/Washington hydrocarbon emission reduction

Step 1 -- Determine 1987 total emission reduction necessary 31,500 kg/day

Step 2 -- Adjust emission inventory to reflect comparable committed hydrocarbon control strategies

- a. Credit for Oregon 6,660 kg/day
Bi-annual Inspection Program
- b. Credit for Washington 2,090 kg/day
Annual Inspection Program

Adjusted 1987 Total Emission Reduction Necessary 40,250 kg/day

Step 3 -- Determine Oregon/Washington split based upon projected 1987 population

Oregon	1,109,339 = 84.5%	USE	85%
Washington	<u>202,778 = 15.5%</u>		15%
	1,312,117		

Step 4 -- Apply Oregon/Washington split to total emission reduction

Oregon	85% of 40,250 =	34,000 kg/day
Washington	15% of 40,250 =	6,000 kg/day

AGENDA MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

TO: Metro Council
FROM: Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Establishing Hydrocarbon Reduction Targets for Oregon and Washington

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Council adoption of the attached Resolution No. _____ establishing a policy for setting hydrocarbon emission reduction targets for Oregon and Washington.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will establish hydrocarbon emission reduction targets for Oregon and Washington necessary to attain the federal ozone standard. This will allow development of the appropriate package of control strategies from each jurisdiction necessary to meet the regional emission reduction target. Two important policy considerations provide the basis for dividing the necessary emission reduction between jurisdictions:
1. The total emission reduction necessary will be pro-rated between the two jurisdictions based upon the projected 1987 population. This establishes the policy that per capita hydrocarbon reduction should be uniform in both jurisdictions; and
 2. Calculation of the total regional emission reduction will not penalize either jurisdiction for having already imposed more stringent controls than the other jurisdiction; specifically, Oregon's biannual vehicle inspection program and Washington's annual inspection program will be taken into account in calculating the needed reduction.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget funds staff involvement for establishing hydrocarbon reduction targets.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: To ensure a coordinated planning effort in the Portland/Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA) to attain the federal ozone standard, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has required that Metro and the Regional Planning Council of Clark County (RPC) establish hydrocarbon emission reduction targets for each jurisdiction. Metro and the RPC will enter into an Interstate Working Agreement (Exhibit "A") which will establish the required reduction by each state. Exhibit "B" illustrates calculation of the targets based upon currently available data.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Division of total emission reductions between jurisdictions could be established on some form of proration or could result from adoption of uniform control measures in both jurisdiction. Since the two jurisdictions are governed by separate metropolitan planning organizations and state legislatures, establishment of uniform controls is very unlikely. Prorating the total emission reduction between jurisdictions allows each to adopt the most suitable package of control strategies to suit individual conditions.

Prorating emissions between jurisdictions could be based upon 1977 or 1987 population or 1977 or 1987 hydrocarbon emissions. 1987 provides a more logical basis than 1977 since that is the required date for meeting the federal ozone standard. Population provides a more reliable basis than emissions because emissions estimating techniques are continuously being refined and improved.

The failure to establish targets would result in no definitive level of commitment by each state to reduce hydrocarbon emissions sufficiently to attain the federal ozone standard. This could result in a loss of transportation and sewerage capitol improvement funds to the region. Not establishing targets would also result in the loss of additional air quality planning funds available to Metro and the RPC.

- C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends approval of the attached resolution.

RB:ss
308B/135

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING) RESOLUTION NO.
HYDROCARBON REDUCTION TARGETS)
FOR OREGON AND WASHINGTON) Introduced by the
) Air Quality Advisory Committee

WHEREAS, Metro has been designated by the Governor of the state of Oregon as lead agency for air quality planning in the Oregon portion of the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area pursuant to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977; and

WHEREAS, The Regional Planning Council of Clark County (RPC) has been designated by the Governor of the state of Washington as lead agency for the Washington portion of the metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, Metro and the RPC must develop transportation control strategies to reduce hydrocarbon emissions in their respective jurisdictions as part of the 1982 State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions; and

WHEREAS, The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) require the establishment of an equitable method (formula) for dividing between the two jurisdictions the necessary total reduction in hydrocarbon emissions needed to reach federal ozone standards by December 31, 1987; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council endorses using the projected 1987 population in the Oregon and Washington portions of the Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA) as the basis for distributing the

required reduction in hydrocarbon emissions necessary to meet the federal ozone standard; and that the regional reduction target shall be based upon the Hydrocarbon Emissions Inventory developed cooperatively by Metro, the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the Southwest Air Pollution Control Authority.

2. That the reduction targets should be based upon comparable committed hydrocarbon control strategies of the two states.

3. That the Metro Council recognizes that the 1987 population forecast will be updated after receipt of the 1980 census and periodically thereafter, and that the Emission Inventory will be updated as studies progress resulting in revisions to specific hydrocarbon reduction targets.

4. That Metro agrees to work cooperatively with the RPC in the event either party is unable to fully achieve their portion of the emission reduction.

5. That the Metro Council authorizes the Executive Officer to execute a Planning Agreement between Metro and the RPC to establish the required reduction in hydrocarbon emissions in Oregon and Washington necessary to meet the federal ozone standard.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this _____ day of _____, 1980.

Presiding Officer

RB:ss
307B/135

EXHIBIT "A"
INTERSTATE WORKING AGREEMENT FOR AIR QUALITY PLANNING
BETWEEN
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
AND
REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL OF CLARK COUNTY

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into as of the _____ day of _____, 1980, by and between the Metropolitan Service District (hereinafter referred to as "METRO"), and the Regional Planning Council of Clark County (hereinafter referred to as the "COUNCIL").

WHEREAS, METRO has been designated by the Governor of the state of Oregon as lead agency for air quality planning in the Oregon portion of the Portland/Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area (AQMA) pursuant to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977; and

WHEREAS, The COUNCIL has been designated by the Governor of the state of Washington as lead agency for air quality planning in the Washington portion of the Portland/Vancouver AQMA pursuant to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977; and

WHEREAS, METRO and the COUNCIL must develop transportation control strategies to reduce hydrocarbon emissions in their respective jurisdictions as part of the 1982 State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions; and

WHEREAS, The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) require the establishment of an equitable method for dividing, between the two jurisdictions, the necessary total reduction in hydrocarbon emissions needed to reach federal ozone standards by December 31, 1987;

NOW, THEREFORE, METRO and the COUNCIL agree to use the SIP hydrocarbon emissions inventory as the source for establishing the total reduction in hydrocarbon emissions necessary for the Portland/Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area to meet the federal ozone standard.

FURTHER, METRO and the COUNCIL endorse as a basis for distributing the needed emission reduction between Oregon and Washington, the projected 1987 AQMA population for each state's portion (85 percent Oregon, 15 percent Washington); and that the reduction targets should be based upon comparable committed hydrocarbon control strategies of the two states.

FURTHER, METRO and the COUNCIL recognize that the 1987 population forecast will be updated after receipt of the 1980 census and periodically thereafter; and that the emission inventory will be updated as studies progress resulting in revisions to specific hydrocarbon reduction targets.

FURTHER, METRO and the COUNCIL agree to work cooperatively toward achieving the ozone standard in the event either party is unable to fully achieve their portion of the hydrocarbon emission reduction.

EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION

THIS AGREEMENT may be modified at any time, in writing, with the mutual consent of the parties.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed in their respective names by their authorized representatives.

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL OF
CLARK COUNTY

By: _____
Rick Gustafson
Executive Officer

By: _____
Mike Langsdorf
Chairman

By: _____
Denton U. Kent
Chief Administrative Officer

By: _____
Richard T. Howsley
Executive Director

Approved as to form:

Approved as to form:

Metro General Counsel

RPC General Counsel

RB:ss
312B/135

Exhibit B

Application of formula to derive Oregon/Washington hydrocarbon emission reduction

Step 1 -- Determine 1987 total emission reduction necessary 31,500 kg/day

Step 2 -- Adjust emission inventory to reflect comparable committed hydrocarbon control strategies

- a. Credit for Oregon 6,660 kg/day
Bi-annual Inspection Program
- b. Credit for Washington 2,090 kg/day
Annual Inspection Program

Adjusted 1987 Total Emission Reduction Necessary 40,250 kg/day

Step 3 -- Determine Oregon/Washington split based upon projected 1987 population

Oregon	1,109,339 = 84.5%		USE 85%
Washington	<u>202,778 = 15.5%</u>		15%
	1,312,117		

Step 4 -- Apply Oregon/Washington split to total emission reduction

- Oregon 85% of 40,250 = 34,000 kg/day
- Washington 15% of 40,250 = 6,000 kg/day