

Portland State University

PDXScholar

---

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on  
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

3-11-1982

## Meeting Notes 1982-03-11

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact](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 1982-03-11 " (1982). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 33.

[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact/33](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/33)

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](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).



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: March 11, 1982

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:30 a.m.

Place: Metro Conference Room A1/A2

- \*1. ENDORSEMENT OF TIP AMENDMENT TO INCORPORATE ODOT'S SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM OF PROJECTS IN THE URBANIZED AREA - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- \*2. ENDORSEMENT OF FY 81 AND FY 82 UWP AMENDMENT FOR ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF WORK ON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- \*3. REVIEW OF COMMENTS ON THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND APPROVAL OF DOCUMENT WITH NECESSARY CHANGES FOR PUBLIC REVIEW - Andy Cotugno.

\*Material Enclosed.

## MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: February 11, 1982

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Charlie Williamson, Al Myers, Corky Kirkpatrick, Larry Cole, Jim Fisher, Mildred Schwab, Robin Lindquist, Bob Bothman, Dennis Buchanan, John Frewing, Vern Veysey, and Ed Ferguson

Guests: Metro Councilors Bruce Etlinger, Bob Oleson, and Mike Burton; Rick Walker, Cities of Multnomah County; Steve Dotterrer, Vic Rhodes, and Jerry Markesino, City of Portland; John Kowalczyk, DEQ; David Peach, WSDOT; Gilbert Mallery, Regional Planning Council of Clark County; Paul Bay, Tri-Met; Bebe Rucker, Multnomah County; Wayne R. Potter, resident of Washington County; Sarah Salazar, Port of Portland; Ann Batson, DEQ; and Winston Kurth, Clackamas County

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Rick Gustafson, Keith Lawton, James A. Giesecking, Jr., Karen Thackston, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

### SUMMARY:

#### 1. ADOPTION OF CARBON MONOXIDE AND OZONE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Richard Brandman stated that we are recommending adoption of a regional Carbon Monoxide State Implementation Plan to be forwarded to the Environmental Protection Agency. The CO Plan has been developed by the City of Portland because all projected CO violations in this region occur within the City through 1985. The City's Plan continues the Downtown Parking and Circulation Policy (with modifications) and relies heavily on the biennial vehicle inspection program. The Plan projects that the City will be in attainment of the CO standard by 1985. The City Council has adopted the Plan.

In the case of the Ozone SIP, Richard explained that there is a regional issue involved in that the state of Washington differs with Oregon DEQ and Metro staff over the question of whether or not a 1700 kg/day surplus in emissions should be administered as a growth cushion. Because this surplus represents only one percent of the total emissions inventory, Washington feels that the surplus is within modeling error. Inasmuch as Oregon

has followed EPA's mandates and methodologies in projecting attainment of the Ozone standard, Metro and DEQ staff felt that we should take credit for the growth cushion.

Andy Cotugno felt that there are two issues involved with the Clean Air Act: 1) how to meet the Ozone standard; and 2) how to accommodate new growth in the region and stay within the standard. The question of whether or not to proceed with an offset program versus assigning industry that extra offset from the 1700 kg/day growth cushion deals with the second of these two issues.

Andy explained that the staff position is to proceed with adoption of the Ozone State Implementation Plan which recommends proceeding with the growth cushion technique, assigning to the Bi-State Policy Advisory Committee the task of allocating the growth cushion. Metro Councilor Mike Burton indicated that he felt the Bi-State Committee could come to some concurrence on this matter.

In reviewing the timetable for the SIP's, Richard Brandman related that the Ozone and CO SIP's will be considered for adoption by Metro Council on February 25 and will be forwarded on to the State Department of Environmental Quality. Following that, the State will draft a staff report followed by a hearing, a hearing report will be prepared by the State, with final recommendation to the Environmental Quality Commission on July 9.

It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the Resolution taking into consideration Clark County's reservations. Commissioner Cole expressed his concern over the growth cushion. He felt that, if the estimates were correct and conservative, the growth cushion would be reached before 1987 with more than 1700 kg/day below the federal ozone standard. He concurred with some of Washington State's concerns and asked for the allowance of a margin of error. Richard Brandman stated that the 1700 kg/day is the amount available for new industries wishing to locate in the region, but that the demand by new industries would not use the total amount of the cushion available -- in effect, providing more margin of safety.

Commissioner Cole moved to amend the motion to provide some margin for error before use of the growth cushion (suggesting 1000 kg/day as the cushion). Motion was seconded. During discussion on the amendment, Rick Gustafson felt that the economic difficulties relating to air quality for this region should be addressed, that we are one of the few regions that are on the road toward attainment of the federal ozone standard, and cautioned that we should not take any action that would deter the



region from new industrial growth. Bob Bothman also expressed his concern in reducing the growth cushion at the cost of economic growth in the region. In calling for the question on the proposed AMENDMENT, the motion FAILED. Commissioners Cole and Veysey voted in favor; 10 members were opposed.

Action Taken: In calling for the initial MOTION recommending adoption of the Ozone and CO State Implementation Plans for the Oregon portion of the Portland-Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area, the motion CARRIED. Ten members voted in favor; Commissioners Cole and Veysey were opposed.

2. ADOPTION OF FY 82 INTERSTATE "HIGHWAY" FUNDING PRIORITIES

Andy Cotugno related that the Resolution deals with the allocation of the FY 82 Interstate Transfer "highway" funding. This action identifies which of those allocated projects will be allowed to spend that money within this fiscal year (up to the available \$45.5 million). It further identifies which back-up projects could be funded with cost underruns from other priority projects.

Andy explained that two principles were followed in the funding allocation: 1) Priority projects of most importance to the metropolitan area should receive sufficient funding to enable it to be built; and 2) Every jurisdiction should expect to receive enough funding each year to be able to complete their overall program within the next six to eight years.

Commissioner Buchanan praised ODOT's Six-Year Program for including projects which considered economic impacts, jobs, and accommodating large amounts of traffic. He felt that JPACT should develop similar criteria for future allocations. Andy indicated that the guidelines for development of an 8-year Interstate Transfer program respond to Commissioner Buchanan's request and include priority-setting criteria.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the Resolution endorsing project priorities using Interstate Transfer funds in FY 82. Motion CARRIED.

3. ENDORSEMENT OF MOTION FINALIZING AMENDMENTS TO STAFF REPORT 77

Staff Report 77 was adopted last month with the understanding that an amendment would be considered at this month's JPACT meeting. This amendment details the treatment of cost overruns and underruns.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to Staff Report 77, specifically Problem 5. Motion CARRIED.

4. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN ADOPTION SCHEDULE ENDORSEMENT

The proposed RTP adoption schedule was distributed and discussed. On February 26, comments received on the Plan to date will be reviewed by TPAC with the Metro staff recommendations on necessary changes. The JPACT meeting on March 11 will address the same comments and recommend adjustments to be made before release for public review.

Commissioner Fisher expressed Washington County's concern over the RTP matching the land use plan required by LCDC. Marty Nizlek reported that a memo had been sent to Metro from Larry Rice, Washington County's Public Works Director, expressing some of his concerns. He asked that these issues be taken up -- either at this meeting or at a special meeting. Andy felt the proper approach would be for TPAC to recommend specific adjustments necessary for the RTP document to be adoptable and workable. Unresolved problems should be "flagged" as issues to be dealt with at a later date.

Action Taken: The Committee concurred that they would delay scheduling a special JPACT meeting on the RTP pending comments and recommendations from the February 26 meeting of TPAC. It was suggested by Chairman Williamson that staff prepare a separate memo outlining proposed changes for the RTP for consideration at next month's meeting.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rick Gustafson  
Don Carlson  
JPACT Members

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 2-11-82

NAME

AFFILIATION

G- Rick Walker	CITIES OF MULT CO.
M- AL MYERS	CITIES OF MULT CO.
M- Corly Kirkpatrick	Metro
M- LARRY COLE	CITIES OF WASHINGTON COUNTY
M- Jim Fisher	Washington County
M- Hildred Schwab	CITY OF PORTLAND
G- STEVE DOTTERER	CITY OF PORTLAND
G- JOHN KOWALCZYK	DEPT. ENVIR. QUALITY
M- ROBIN LINDQUIST	GLADSTONE
M- Bob BOTHAMAN	ODOT
M- DENNIS RUCHANAN	MULTNOMAH COUNTY
M- Charlie Wilhoit	Metro
M- JOHN BREWING	TRI-MET
M- Vern Veysey	Clark County
M- ED FERGUSON	WSDOT
S- Rick Gustafson	Metro
G- David Peach	WSDOT
G- Gilbert Mallery	Regional Planning Council of Clark Co.
G- PAUL BAY	TRI-MET
S- Keith Hester	Metro
G- Bruce Ellinger & Oleson	Metro
G- Bebe Rucker	Mult. County
G- Wayne R. Potter	resident - Washington County

(next page)

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 7-11-82

NAME

### AFFILIATION

G Sarah Salazar	Port of Portland
S James G. Gierke	Metro
G Ted Spina	ODOT
S Karen Shackston	Metro
G Vic Rhodes	City of Portland
G Jerry Marcesino	City of Portland
S Andy Cotugno	Metro
G Mike Burton	Metro Councilor
G Ann Butson	DEQ
G Winston Kurth	Clackamas County
G John Price	<del>Flamingo</del>
S Peg Henwood	Metro
G Larry Rice	Wash. 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: JPACT  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to  
Incorporate Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT)  
Six-Year Highway Improvement Program of Projects in the  
Urbanized Area

### I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend adoption of the attached Resolution which amends the TIP by incorporating urbanized area projects from ODOT's Six-Year Highway Improvement Program.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will amend the TIP to reflect the Six-Year Highway Improvement Program adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), January 1982, and enable ODOT to obtain federal match for the noted projects.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: None.

### II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The OTC adopted the Six-Year Highway Improvement Program following a lengthy review process to hear public comments. Meetings were held Statewide to provide citizens the opportunity to voice concerns about the program to members of the Commission.

Continued high inflation and shrinking revenue have reduced the ability to undertake needed modernization. To accommodate this, the program continues to emphasize preservation work as a means of protecting the large investment in Oregon's highways.

The FY 1982 TIP was adopted in September 1981 in advance of the development of the Six-Year Program. The TIP will, therefore, be updated to include those projects and construction amounts set forth in Attachment "A." The Federal Aid systems affected by this amendment to the TIP are the Primary and Interstate systems which call for State match at 12 percent and eight percent, respectively.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: The Commission and staff held hearings for interested individuals and community spokesmen in the urbanized area. The program set forth in Attachment "A" is the result of the information gathered.
- C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution.

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE )  
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM )  
(TIP) TO INCORPORATE OREGON )  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S )  
(ODOT) SIX-YEAR HIGHWAY IMPROVE- )  
MENT PROGRAM OF PROJECTS IN THE )  
URBANIZED AREA )

WHEREAS, Through Resolution No. 81-280, the Metro Council adopted the TIP and its FY 1982 Annual Element September 1981; and

WHEREAS, The State's 1982 Six-Year Highway Improvement Program was adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) in January 1982; and

WHEREAS, These actions were separate in time and precluded the Six-Year Highway Improvement Program being included in the TIP; and

WHEREAS, The ODOT has the responsibility for initiating projects proposed to use Federal Aid Primary and Federal Aid Interstate funds and for other projects in the State's interest; and

WHEREAS, It is necessary that projects utilizing the noted funds be included in the TIP in order to be federally obligated; and

WHEREAS, The ODOT has requested that the TIP be aligned with the Six-Year Highway Improvement Program; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council endorses the projects set forth in Attachment "A";
2. That Metro staff is authorized to update the TIP in order to reflect the Six-Year Highway Program; and
3. That the Metro Council finds the projects in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative, comprehensive planning process and, thereby, gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.

PROJECTS TO BE ADDED TO THE TIP  
In Federal Dollars

	1982	1983	1984	1985	Post 1985
FEDERAL AID INTERSTATE FUNDING:					
101	I-5/FREMONT VIADUCT OVERLAY				
	PE	\$ 50,000			
	CON	810,000			
	TOTAL	860,000			
151	TUALATIN PARK AND RIDE				
	CON				\$386,000
152	I-5/MARQUAM BRIDGE TO HAINES RD. RAMP METERING				
	PE	\$ 46,000			--
	CON	--			\$432,000
	TOTAL	46,000			432,000
155	OREGON CITY PARK AND RIDE				
	CON				322,000
156	LENTS PARK AND RIDE				
	CON				322,000
157	COLUMBIA BLVD./SANDY PARK AND RIDE				
	CON				322,000
FEDERAL AID PRIMARY FUNDING:					
122	PACIFIC HWY. EAST - UXING SPRR TO HEDGES STREET				
	PE	\$ 22,000			
	CON	220,000			
	TOTAL	242,000			
134	TV @ MURRAY BLVD. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT				
	PE	\$ 45,000	--		
	R/W	--	\$ 30,000		
	CON	--	449,000		
	TOTAL	45,000	479,000		
136	LOWER BOONES FERRY RD. INTCHG. SIGNALS				
	PE	\$ 15,000		--	
	CON	--		\$ 147,000	
	TOTAL	15,000		147,000	
141	ROSS ISLAND BRIDGE OVERLAY				
	PE	\$ 88,000		--	
	CON	--		\$1,206,000	
	TOTAL	88,000		1,206,000	

PROJECT CHANGES

EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1981

IN FEDERAL DOLLARS

ALL OTHER PROJECTS  
FEDERAL AID INTERSTATE SYSTEM

PROJECT DESCRIPTION		ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES BY FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR	OBLIGATED	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	POST 1985	AUTHORIZED	FEDERAL AID #
<i>South Banfield Intchg.</i>											
***1	<del>1205 SE YAMHILL ST TO SE POWELL BLVD</del>										FAI205
CONST	0	<del>6,440,000</del>	3,487,000	0	0	9,982,000	0	0	13,469,000	<del>6,440,000</del>	
<i>Columbia River Brg. to Powell Blvd.</i>											
***2	<del>1205 NE FALLING ST TO SE YAMHILL ST</del>										FAI205
CONST	0	<del>29,920,000</del>	24,326,000	0	0	0	0	24,326,000	<del>29,920,000</del>		
<i>Burnside St to Harold St.</i>											
***3	<del>1205 NE MARINE DR TO NE FALLING ST</del>										FAI205
CONST	0	<del>21,270,000</del>	0	0	92,000	0	0	92,000	<del>21,270,000</del>		
***4	1205-COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE										FAI205
CONST	0	0	9,200,000	0	0	0	0	9,200,000	<del>4,140,000</del>		
***5	15-EAST MARQUAM INTERCHANGE RAMPS										FAI5
R/W	0	<del>2,870,000</del>	3,984,000	0	0	0	0	3,984,000	<del>2,870,000</del>		
CONST	0	0	0	0	11,040,000	0	0	11,040,000	<del>42,320,000</del>	42,320,000	
TOTAL	0	<del>2,870,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	46,304,000	<del>45,150,000</del>	46,304,000	
***6	15-N TIGARD INTERCHANGE TO S TIGARD INTERCHANGE										FAI5
CONST	0	0	0	0	16,836,000	0	0	16,836,000	<del>19,720,000</del>		
***7	15-JANTZEN BEACH TO DELTA PARK INTERCHANGE										FAI5
R/W	0	<del>1,122,000</del>	1,122,000	0	0	0	0	1,122,000	<del>30,180,000</del>	42,864,000	
CONST	0	0	0	0	16,707,000	0	0	16,707,000	<del>30,180,000</del>	43,986,000	
TOTAL	0	<del>1,122,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	17,833,000	<del>60,360,000</del>	86,850,000	
***8	184 IMPROVEMENTS-NE 117TH AVE TO NE 181ST AVE										FAI84
R/W	0	<del>1,090,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	1,090,000	<del>23,000,000</del>	24,090,000	
CONST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23,000,000	<del>23,000,000</del>		
TOTAL	0	<del>1,090,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	24,090,000	<del>46,000,000</del>	24,090,000	



EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1981

IN FEDERAL DOLLARS

ALL OTHER PROJECTS  
FEDERAL AID INTERSTATE SYSTEM  
(CONTINUED)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES BY FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	POST 1985	AUTHORIZED	FEDERAL AID #
***9 IB4 IMPROVEMENTS-NE 181ST AVE TO SUNDIAL RD*****									FA184
	<i>DELETED</i>								
CONST	0	0	0	0	0	0	<del>25,900,000</del>	25,900,000	
***10 IB4-INTERCHANGE AT NE 181ST AVENUE...EAST BOUND OFF-RAMP*****									FA184
								<i>234,000</i>	
R/W	0	<del>145,000</del>	<i>234,000</i>	0	0	0	0	<del>145,000</del>	
CONST	0	<del>600,000</del>	0	0	<i>488,000</i>	0	0	<del>600,000</del>	<i>488,000</i>
TOTAL	0	<del>745,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>745,000</del>	
								<i>722,000</i>	
***11 I5 IMPROVEMENT AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM-PHASE I-BROADWAY TO HAYDEN*****									FA15
	<i>COMPLETE</i>								
PE	0	<del>23,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	23,000	
CONST	0	<del>865,322</del>	0	0	0	0	0	865,322	
TOTAL	0	<del>888,322</del>	0	0	0	0	0	888,322	
***12 NW NICOLAI/WEST FREMONT INTERCHANGE*****									TBD
								<i>8,587,000</i>	
R/W	0	<del>9,200,000</del>	<i>1,932,000</i>	<i>6,655,000</i>	0	0	0	<del>9,200,000</del>	
CONST	0	0	0	0	0	<i>20,608,000</i>	<del>22,100,000</del>	<del>22,100,000</del>	<i>20,608,000</i>
TOTAL	0	<del>9,200,000</del>	0	0	0	0	<del>22,100,000</del>	<del>31,300,000</del>	
								<i>29,195,000</i>	
***13 WEST PORTLAND PARK AND RIDE ILLUMINATION REVISION*****									FA15
	<i>COMPLETE</i>								
CONST	0	<del>23,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>23,000</del>	
***14 I5 IMPROVEMENT AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM-PHASE II-MARQUAM BR TO INT*****									FA15
	<i>DELETED</i>								
PE	0	<del>1,840,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>1,840,000</del>	
R/W	0	0	0	<del>1,840,000</del>	0	0	0	<del>1,840,000</del>	
CONST	0	0	0	0	0	0	<del>68,000,000</del>	<del>68,000,000</del>	
TOTAL	0	<del>1,840,000</del>	0	<del>1,840,000</del>	0	0	<del>68,000,000</del>	<del>71,760,000</del>	

EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1981

IN FEDERAL DOLLARS

ALL OTHER PROJECTS  
FEDERAL AID INTERSTATE SYSTEM  
(CONTINUED)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES BY FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	POST 1985	AUTHORIZED	FEDERAL AID #
**15 I84-3R PROGRAM FOR SIX BRIDGES--SUNDIAL RD TO SANDY RIVER*****									FAI84
CONST	0	<del>1,125,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	1,125,000	
COMPLETE									
**16 I5-NORTH GREELEY AVE TO I5 CONNECTION*****									FAI5
R/W	0	<del>413,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>413,000</del>	
CONST	0	0	<del>9,750,000</del>	11,224,000	0	0	0	<del>9,750,000</del>	11,224,000
TOTAL	0	<del>413,000</del>	<del>9,750,000</del>	0	0	0	0	<del>10,163,000</del>	11,224,000
**17 I84-SUNDIAL ROAD TO SANDY RIVER OVERLAY*****									FAI84
CONST	0	0	0	0	0	699,000	<del>1,150,000</del>	<del>1,150,000</del>	
COMPLETE									
**18 I205 AIR MONITORING SHELTERS & EQUIPMENT-COLUMBIA RIV TO LAKE RD*****									FAI205
CONST	0	<del>444,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>444,000</del>	
**19 I205-PORTLAND AND MULTNOMAH COUNTY JUSTICE CENTER*****									FAI205
CONST	0	<del>42,964,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>42,964,000</del>	
UNDER CONSTRUCTION									
**20 I205-MULTNOMAH COUNTY OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FACILITY*****									FAI205
CONST	0	<del>9,752,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>9,752,000</del>	
COMPLETE									
**21 I205-WILLAMETTE FALLS SAFETY REST AREA*****									FAI205
PE	0	<del>2,760</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>2,760</del>	
CONST	0	<del>33,120</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>33,120</del>	
TOTAL	0	<del>35,880</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>35,880</del>	
COMPLETE									
**22 I5-PAVEMENT OVERLAY ON THE MARQUAM BRIDGE AND APPROACHES(RRR)*****									FAI5
PE	0	<del>7,500</del>	5,566,000	0	0	0	0	<del>7,500</del>	
CONST	0	0	<del>1,800,000</del>	0	0	0	0	<del>1,800,000</del>	5,566,000
TOTAL	0	<del>7,500</del>	<del>1,800,000</del>	0	0	0	0	<del>1,807,500</del>	5,566,000

EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1981

IN FEDERAL DOLLARS

ALL OTHER PROJECTS  
FEDERAL AID INTERSTATE SYSTEM  
(CONTINUED)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES BY FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR

OBLIGATED

1981

1982

1983

1984

1985

POST 1985

AUTHORIZED

FEDERAL  
AID #

\*\*23 I405--FREMONT BRIDGE ICE DETECTION SYSTEM\*\*\*\*\*

FAI405

COMPLETE

PE	0	<del>4,600</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>4,600</del>
CONST	0	<del>133,400</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>133,400</del>
TOTAL	0	<del>138,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>138,000</del>

\*\*\*\*\*

EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1981

IN FEDERAL DOLLARS

ALL OTHER PROJECTS  
OTHER PROJECTS

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES BY FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR								FEDERAL AID #
OBLIGATED	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	POST 1985	AUTHORIZED		
**40 PETITION ST IMPROVEMENT MULTNOMAH COUNTY*****									LOCAL ST
CONST	0	1,800,000	300,000	0	0	0	0	2,100,000	
**41 RECONSTRUCTION OF HIGH MAINTENANCE RDS*****									LOCAL ST
CONST	0	3,050,000	700,000	0	0	0	0	3,750,000	
**42 MARINE DRIVE - 105TH TO BLUE LAKE RD -- MULTNOMAH*****									FASA662
CONST	0	2,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	2,000,000	
**43 SIGNAL--SANDY BLVD @ NE 122ND AVE RAMP--STATE TRM FUNDS*****									FAU9966
CONST	0	<del>36,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>36,000</del>	
COMPLETE									
**44 SIGNAL--PACIFIC HWY(OR99W) AT BEEF BEND RD--STATE TRP FUNDS*****									FAP9
CONST	0	<del>30,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>30,000</del>	
COMPLETE									
**45 FANNO CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT ON SCHOLLS HWY(STATE TRX FUNDS)*****									FAU9234
R/W	0	<del>34,520</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>34,520</del>	
CONST	0	<del>476,000</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>476,000</del>	
TOTAL	0	<del>510,520</del>	0	0	0	0	0	<del>510,520</del>	
UNDER CONSTRUCTION									
**46 SUNSET HWY OVERLAY--SYLVAN INTCHG TO VISTA RIDGE TUNNEL--STATE FAP*****									FAP27
PE	0	19,000	2,248,000	0	0	0	0	19,000	
CONST	0	0	1,031,000	0	0	0	0	1,031,000	
TOTAL	0	19,000	1,031,000	0	0	0	0	1,050,000	
									2,248,000
**47 MT HOOD HIGHWAY AT BIRSDALE--SIGNAL*****									FAP24
USING HIGHWAY SAFETY FUNDS									
PE	0	10,560	0	0	0	0	0	10,560	
R/W	0	8,800	0	0	0	0	0	8,800	
CONST	0	88,000	0	0	0	0	0	88,000	
TOTAL	0	107,360	0	0	0	0	0	107,360	



EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1, 1981

IN FEDERAL DOLLARS

ALL OTHER PROJECTS  
OTHER PROJECTS  
(CONTINUED)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES BY FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR

OBLIGATED

1981

1982

1983

1984

1985

POST 1985

AUTHORIZED

FEDERAL  
AID #

\*\*48 TUALATIN VALLEY HIGHWAY--SE 21ST AVE TO SE OAK ST\*\*\*\*\*

FAP32

	0	118,800	100,000	0	0	0	0	100,000
PE	0	118,800	100,000	0	0	0	0	100,000
R/W	0	0	880,000	0	0	0	880,000	880,000
CONST	0	0	0	792,000	0	0	792,000	792,000
TOTAL	0	118,800	880,000	792,000	0	0	0	1,772,000

DEFERRED

\*\*49 HWY 217 SB ON-RAMP @ BURTN/HILLSDALE HWY-SLOPE REPAIR-FAP\*\*\*\*\*

FAP79

	0	7,920	0	0	0	0	0	7,920
PE	0	7,920	0	0	0	0	0	7,920
CONST	0	119,680	76,560	0	0	0	0	119,680
TOTAL	0	127,600	76,560	0	0	0	0	127,600

\*\*50 82ND AVE UPGRADING--OTTY RD TO HARMONY\*\*\*\*\*

FAU9713

	0	0	350,000	0	0	0	0	350,000
R/W	0	0	350,000	0	0	0	0	350,000
CONST	0	0	300,000	4,700,000	0	0	0	5,000,000
TOTAL	0	0	650,000	4,700,000	0	0	0	5,350,000

\*\*51 82ND AVE SERVICE RD-CAUSEY TO THE TOWN CENTER\*\*\*\*\*

FAU9713

	0	0	450,000	0	0	0	0	450,000
R/W	0	0	450,000	0	0	0	0	450,000
CONST	0	0	0	412,500	0	0	0	412,500
TOTAL	0	0	450,000	412,500	0	0	0	862,500

\*\*52 I205 INTERCHANGE--AT OTTY RD OR LESTER ST--TO BE DETERMINED\*\*\*\*\*

I205

	0	0	200,000	0	0	0	0	200,000
R/W	0	0	200,000	0	0	0	0	200,000
CONST	0	0	0	780,000	0	0	0	780,000
TOTAL	0	0	200,000	780,000	0	0	0	980,000

\*\*53 EXCLUSIVE TRANSITWAY--WEST OF I205 &amp; BETWEEN NEW INTCHG &amp; CENTER\*\*\*\*\*

TBD

	0	0	450,000	0	0	0	0	450,000
R/W	0	0	450,000	0	0	0	0	450,000
CONST	0	0	0	525,000	0	0	0	525,000
TOTAL	0	0	450,000	525,000	0	0	0	975,000

## 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  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Amending the FY 82 Unified Work Program

### I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution amending the FY 82 Unified Work Program (UWP) to reflect:
1. Revision of grant amounts to reflect the amount of actual grant received.
  2. Programming of FY 81 carryover funding on FY 82 projects.
  3. Additional work effort to complete the RTP, set up the RTP monitoring program and evaluate the impact of proposed transit improvements in the McLoughlin Boulevard/Oregon City area.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will recognize the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as the top priority project including the effort necessary to complete the document and obtain adoption as well as the effort to establish the on-going monitoring process. Funding programmed for Goods Movement, Model Refinement, Technical Assistance and Energy Contingency Planning will be reduced accordingly.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: This amendment represents a reprioritization of available resources within the Transportation Department budget and not an increase or decrease of grant revenue.

### II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: This amendment includes the following increases in project scope relative to that specified in the adopted UWP:
- RTP - The increase in funding is sufficient to complete the RTP document, ensure it meets the needs of affected parties and obtain adoption.
  - Population/Employment Forecasts - In addition to fully revising the year 2000 forecasts as originally planned, the increase will allow Metro to establish the necessary monitoring system called for in the RTP and conduct research and development work on Oregon Employment Services data files to improve existing employment monitoring data.
  - McLoughlin Improvements - The additional funding will provide sufficient resources for Metro to evaluate the transit ridership and traffic impacts of proposed

improvements along McLoughlin Boulevard in the Oregon City area being examined by Clackamas County.

In conjunction with these increases, the Scope of Work is being reduced for Model Refinement, Energy Contingency and TIP programs and eliminated for the Goods Movement program.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

- Delay RTP completion to FY 83.
- Defer establishment of the RTP monitoring system to FY 83.

C. CONCLUSION: Recommend adoption of the UWP amendment.

AC/srb  
5357B/107  
02/19/82

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE       )  
FY 82 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM            )

WHEREAS, The FY 82 Unified Work Program (UWP) was adopted  
in May 1981 by Resolution No. 81-248; and

WHEREAS, Changes to the UWP must be approved by the Metro  
Council and the Intermodal Planning Group; and

WHEREAS, The FY 82 UWP must be revised to accurately  
reflect revised task priorities and actual funding availability;  
now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council hereby approves the amendments  
to the FY 82 UWP as shown in Exhibit "A."

2. That staff is directed to submit this Resolution with  
its exhibits and necessary grant amendments to the Intermodal  
Planning Group for approval.

AC/srb

5357B/107

02/19/82



## PROPOSED FY 81 AND FY 82 UWP AMENDMENT

Project	FY 81 UWP Amendment		FY 82 UWP Amendment			Total Project Budget
	FY 81 e(4) Carryover	FY 81 Sec. 8 Carryover	FY 82 e(4)	FY 82 Sec. 8	FY 82 PL	
Regional Trans. Plan						
Budget	\$ 0	\$ 0		\$ 97,500	\$ 78,500	\$176,000
Proposed Change	+11,918	+5,363		+54,500	+13,500	+85,281
Revised	\$11,918	\$5,363		\$152,000	\$ 92,000	\$261,281
Bi-State						
Budget			\$ 85,000			\$ 85,000
Proposed Change			+ 72			+ 72
Revised			\$ 85,072			\$ 85,072
Goods Movement						
Budget					\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
Proposed Change					-20,000	-20,000
Revised					\$ 0	\$ 0
Pop./Emp. Forecasts						
Budget				\$ 70,000	\$ 0	\$ 70,000
Proposed Change				0	+29,000	+29,000
Revised				\$ 70,000	\$ 29,000	\$ 99,000
Model Refinement						
Budget				\$ 61,750	\$ 13,250	\$ 75,000
Proposed Change				-47,000	0	-47,000
Revised				\$ 14,750	\$ 13,250	\$ 28,000
Energy Contingency						
Budget				\$ 17,500	\$ 12,500	\$ 30,000
Proposed Change				- 5,000	- 5,000	-10,000
Revised				\$ 12,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 20,000
Project Imp. Program						
Budget			\$117,941			\$117,941
Proposed Change			0			0
Revised			\$117,941			\$117,941
McLoughlin Blvd. Imp.						
Budget			\$117,647			\$117,647
Proposed Change			+21,500			+21,500
Revised			\$139,147			\$139,147
TIP						
Budget			\$150,000			\$150,000
Proposed Change			-21,500			-21,500
Revised			\$128,500			\$128,500
Technical Assistance						
Budget				\$ 30,000		\$ 30,000
Proposed Change				-20,000		-20,000
Revised				\$ 10,000		\$ 10,000
Coord. & Mgmt.						
Budget				\$ 73,250	\$ 18,750	\$ 92,000
Proposed Change				- 2,500	+ 2,646	+ 146
Revised				\$ 70,750	\$ 21,396	\$ 92,146
GRAND TOTAL						
Budget	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$470,588	\$350,000	\$143,000	\$963,588
Proposed Change	+11,918	+5,363	+ 72	-20,000	+20,146	+17,499
Revised	\$11,918	\$5,363	\$470,660	\$330,000	\$163,146	\$981,087



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

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** March 2, 1982  
**To:** JPACT  
**From:** James A. Giesecking, Jr., RTP Project Manager  
**Regarding:** Local Comments on RTP and TPAC Recommendations  
for Changes to the Draft

Meetings have been held with agency and jurisdictional planning and technical staff to receive and discuss comments on the draft RTP released in January. In addition, a special meeting was held for the Metro Regional Development Committee (RDC) to discuss the document.

The attached material represents the discussion of the comments and recommendations for changes to the document forwarded by TPAC as the result of two meetings (February 26, 1982 and March 1, 1982). An errata sheet is also included.

JAG:lmk

Enclosures

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN:  
LOCAL COMMENTS AND TPAC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Planning Horizon

The Draft RTP: Calls for the designation of the regional (principal and major arterial) and local (minor arterial and below) highway systems for build-out, and capacity improvements to support 20 years' worth of growth (to the year 2000), recognizing the significant difference in development for some parts of the region between build-out and the year 2000 (pp. 8-2 and 8-3).

TPAC Discussion: The Functional Classification designation is tied to legal requirements (in terms of right-of-way, etc.) in some jurisdictions. Therefore, the highway system designation for build-out required in the Draft RTP is inappropriate because of:

- 1) the impractical nature of planning for a time-frame beyond 20 years; and
- 2) the difficult legal position of attempting to require developer participation in transportation improvements designed for more than a 20-year time-frame.

TPAC Recommendation: That both the highway system designation and capacity in the RTP (pp. 8-2 and 8-3) be associated with a 20-year horizon.

2. Economic Development Impacts

The Draft RTP: Describes, in the Summary (pp. 1, 5 and 6), the implications of not investing in transportation capacity and the negative impacts on the region's economic development.

TPAC Discussion: The negative tone at the beginning of the document tends to produce a "down" attitude, and may be misleading. It would be more satisfying if transportation investments were cast as providing benefits to economic development efforts in the region.

TPAC Recommendation: The description of economic development impacts in the RTP Summary (pp. 1, 5 and 6) should be recast to indicate benefits associated with the recommended transportation improvements, in terms of allowing additional growth, etc.

3. LRT Right-of-Way Preservation

The Draft RTP: Calls for the reservation of specific Transitway alignments (as defined and agreed upon by Metro, Tri-Met and the local jurisdictions) for future construction (p. 8-4).

TPAC Discussion: Until there is a Phase II decision regarding transitway implementation, the financial justification for proceeding with transitway construction and right-of-way acquisition does not exist. This situation puts the local jurisdictions in a difficult position when dealing with development proposals that might encroach on a potential LRT alignment.

TPAC Recommendation: The RTP (in a new section on p. 8-5) should encourage local jurisdictions to work with developers to protect logical right-of-way opportunities from encroachment. Parcels that cannot be protected should be identified to Tri-Met and evaluated for acquisition on a case-by-case basis.

#### 4. Local Comprehensive Plan Compliance

The Draft RTP: Contains provisions that require certain actions on the part of local jurisdictions for comprehensive plan compliance (p. 8-6) and only encourages certain others.

TPAC Discussion: The specific requirements and encouragements in the RTP should be more clearly defined and presented to avoid any misconceptions regarding the impact of RTP adoption on the local comprehensive planning process.

TPAC Recommendation: The RTP should clearly state required and encouraged actions on p. 8-6 as follows:

"Specific items in the RTP that require local comprehensive plan compliance are as follows:

- . Highway System Design criteria described on p. 8-2;
- . Highway Capacity and Project criteria described on pp. 8-3 and 8-4;
- . Transit System Designation criteria described on p. 8-4; and
- . Transitway Implementation criteria described on pp. 8-4 and 8-5.

Activities described in the RTP that local jurisdictions are encouraged to pursue are:

- . The 35 percent rideshare target for work trips;
- . Demand Management Program Design criteria described on pp. 1-13 through 1-16;
- . The rideshare, parking, land use controls and related activities described on pp. 4-19 through 4-21; and
- . The protection of transitway right-of-way opportunities as described on p. 8-5."

5. Minor Arterial and Collector System

The Draft RTP: Recognizes the fact that additional study is required on the minor arterial and collector system to identify projects required to make that system work for the next 20 years.

TPAC Discussion: Although many committed minor arterial/collector improvements are shown in the RTP, these projects are not intended to be the definitive capital improvement program on the local infrastructure system for the next 20 years. Rather, the RTP is intended to emphasize the local system projects necessary to make the regional system work. Major developments located on the minor arterial and collector system may require additional improvements to provide an acceptable level of service.

TPAC Recommendation: Additional language should be added to the RTP in Chapter 8, Section E (Plan Update, Refinement and Amendment) to reflect this need.

6. Supporting Documents to the RTP

a. Minor Arterial and Collector System

The Draft RTP: Specifies the development of a Minor Arterial and Collector system by the local jurisdictions should be approved by Metro (subject to the criteria detailed in the RTP) for "inclusion in the RTP" (p. 8-8).

TPAC Discussion: The Minor Arterial and Collector system developed by the local jurisdictions and approved by Metro will be a supporting document to the RTP and adopted separately to submit the Federal-Aid system to FHWA.

TPAC Recommendation: Change the phrase on p. 8-8 to read "as a supporting document to the RTP" to reflect this intent.

b. Executive Summary

The Draft RTP: Contains a summary at the beginning of the document.

TPAC Discussion: There could be the need for two executive summaries, one for local policy-makers and one for public consumption. Current resources, however, do not allow for the development of either document prior to FY 83.

TPAC Recommendation: Clarifying language (see item #4) has already been developed for local jurisdiction focus. Important aspects of the RTP should be printed on colored pages. After the adoption of the RTP (FY 83), an executive



summary should be prepared for widespread public dissemination.

c. Map of Vehicle Capacity Restrictive Points

The Draft RTP: Does not quantify vehicle capacity restrictions on the regional highway system with the recommended improvements.

TPAC Discussion: A map showing these "control points" might prove useful to local jurisdictions in local planning efforts.

TPAC Recommendation: Prepare such a map as a supporting document to the RTP available to local jurisdictional planning staffs.

7. Arterial Function

a. Highway 224 (Clackamas Expressway)

The Draft RTP: Requires grade separation of freeways and states that the upgrading of Highway 224 to freeway status is desirable (p. 1-7).

TPAC Discussion: The intent to pursue grade separation as an option to improve levels of service on Highway 224 should be strengthened.

TPAC Recommendation: Include specific language in Chapter 5, p. 5-6, to reflect this intent.

b. Sunnyside Road (I-205 to Highway 212)

The Draft RTP: Designates Sunnyside Road as a minor arterial.

TPAC Discussion: Sunnyside Road serves a regional function for longer distance rural and urban intraregional travel from North Clackamas County to I-205 and then to the rest of the region.

TPAC Recommendation: The RTP should designate Sunnyside Road from I-205 to Highway 212 as a major arterial in Chapters 1 and 4.

c. Johnson Creek Boulevard and King/Harrison Roads

The Draft RTP: Designates these roads as minor arterials.

TPAC Discussion: Due to the impact on these facilities as a result of the new I-205 interchange in the Otty/Lester Road area of North Clackamas County, further examination of

the Functional Classification of these facilities is warranted.

TPAC Recommendation: Replace "Arterial Access to CTC Area" statement in "further project review" section of the RTP (p. 8-12) with "New I-205 Interchange: Location and Arterial Access Improvements and Function."

d. Additional Clackamas River Automobile Crossing

The Draft RTP: Includes the recommendation to examine the feasibility of using the abandoned PTC Bridge as a bus-only facility for the trunk route connecting Oregon City to Milwaukie via Gladstone, recognizing the importance of the Tri-Cities sewerage plant as a priority consideration.

TPAC Discussion: Consideration should be given to automobile use of the PTC Bridge as an additional Oregon City-Gladstone traffic connection.

TPAC Recommendation: Replace "Park Place Bridge" statement in "further project review" section of the RTP (p. 8-12) with "Gladstone-Oregon City Automobile Connection via Additional Clackamas River Crossing."

e. Impact of Oregon City Bypass on Gladstone Streets

The Draft RTP: Does not include specific references to the need for further analysis of the impact of Oregon City Bypass traffic on Gladstone.

TPAC Discussion: As part of the South McLoughlin project study, the impact of bypass traffic on Gladstone should be defined and mitigation measures and/or arterial improvements recommended, as necessary.

TPAC Recommendation: Add following statement to "further project review" section of the RTP (p. 8-12): "Arterial Connection from Oregon City Bypass to McLoughlin Boulevard."

f. 219th/216th Avenues

The Draft RTP: Designates 219th/216th Avenues as a minor arterial from T.V. Highway to Cornell.

TPAC Discussion: As growth occurs in Western Washington County, this facility may need to be designated as a major arterial to carry regional travel from the area south and east of Hillsboro to the Sunset Highway.

TPAC Recommendation: This issue requires further study and should be included as an Outstanding Issue on p. 8-11 of the RTP.

g. Cornell and West Burnside Roads

The Draft RTP: Designates Cornell and W. Burnside Roads as minor arterials and indicates that "further project review" is needed for improvements to these facilities.

TPAC Discussion: This situation represents an outstanding issue that goes beyond "project review" status.

TPAC Recommendation: That the designation of Functional Class and sizing of these facilities be included as an outstanding issue in the RTP (p. 8-11).

h. Terwilliger Boulevard and Terwilliger/Barbur Project

The Draft RTP: Includes the effort to resolve issues involved in the function and size of Terwilliger Boulevard (a minor arterial in the RTP) as part of the "further project review" section (p. 8-12).

TPAC Discussion: The situation represents an outstanding issue that goes beyond "project review" status.

TPAC Recommendation: The designation of Functional Class and sizing of Terwilliger Boulevard and impact of the Terwilliger/Barbur project be included on p. 8-11 of the RTP as an outstanding issue.

8. Errata

p. 2 and p. 4-6: Connect Cornelius Pass Road to U.S. 30.

p. 2 and p. 4-6: Erase dark line on Columbia from 60th to 82nd.

p. 2 and p. 4-6: Include 185th from T.V. to Farmington.

p. 2 and p. 4-6: Include dotted line on Cornell from 185th to 158th.

p. 3 and p. 4-12: Add transit station and park-and-ride in Tualatin.

p. 1-5: Goal #3, Objective #1: Should be clarified to specify transportation-related energy consumption.

pp. 2-14 and 2-15: Tables 2-2, 2-3: Delete vehicular from title. Translate Commercial and External Trips (Table 2-2) into person trips.

p. 4-16, Fig. 4-5: Add "Alternative Sunset Connection to Morrison/Yamhill LRT Route" and arrows in area of SW 12th Avenue between Columbia and Yamhill Streets. Delete 4th Avenue primary LRT street designation.

- pp. 4-20 and 4-21: Add trunk route stops.
- p. 5-2, 2nd bullet: Change Lombard Street to Killingsworth.
- p. 7-36, Fig. 7-13: Change title to TRANSIT SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS: RTP COMPARED TO 1980; add line at bottom of top graph to indicate Operating Subsidy at a 1.4 x slope.
- p. 7-37, Fig. 7-14: Change title to TRANSIT OPERATING COST/REVENUE COMPARISON: RTP VS. 1980.
- p. 8-4: Add the phrase "to choose from" after the word "Tri-Met" in line 14.
- p. 8-11: Identify 1st project in list as East Burnside.
- p. 8-12: Add "219th/216th widening (Cornell-T.V. Highway).
- p. 5-10, 1st bullet: Add "and widening Murray Boulevard and Scholls Ferry Roads."
- p. 5-11, Fig. 5-5: Widening projects should be added to Murray Road from Allen to Scholls Ferry; and on Scholls Ferry Road from 121st to Murray.
- p. 5-14: Add ". various TSM improvements in downtown Portland to increase transit operating capacity, maintain existing traffic volumes, provide increased transit connectivity and reduce conflicts between transit vehicles, automobiles and pedestrians. (Specific projects to be determined as part of the Westside transitway decision process.)"
- p. 8-8: Add as Outstanding Issue #1: "Funding: Alternative financing techniques and a complete funding strategy to implement the highway, transit and demand management improvements identified in the Plan should be developed."
- p. 4-1: Replace last paragraph with "A lack of urban services has been an effective constraint on past development in specific areas of the region. Problems exist with government's ability to fund necessary transportation, sewer, water, school and other public services to support future development. This Plan is intended to establish the transportation investments and funding level required to support the development anticipated in local comprehensive plans.
- p. 10: Reformat chart to indicate 20-year composite of transit costs and revenues.
- p. 1-10: Drop "crush load" reference. Insert "averaged" in text and table relating to capacity. Change articulated LRV capacities to 76, 22, 79, 180, 98, 155 and 156.

- p. 4-17: Delete 1st sentence of transition paragraph.
- p. 8-2: Insert "(Figure 4-1, p. 4-6)" after the word "map" in the 5th line in the Highway System Design paragraph.
- p. 8-3: Insert "(Table 2-1, p. 2-11)" after the word "forecast" in the 9th line of the second paragraph.
- p. 8-4: Insert "(Figure 4-2, p. 4-12)" after the word "stations" in the 11th line of the Transit System Designation paragraph.
- p. 8-4: Insert "(Figure 4-4, p. 4-14)" after the word "corridors" in the 3rd line of the Transitway Implementation paragraph.
- p. 8-6: Add the phrase "in Chapter 1 and 4 of" after the word "identified" in the 9th line of the top paragraph. Delete the word "in" at the start of the 10th line.
- p. 8-3: Add "(p. 1-6)" after the word "RTP" in the 11th line of the second paragraph.



## RTP ADOPTION SCHEDULE

- February 11 - JPACT - Status report & approval of adoption schedule
- February 26 - TPAC - Review & discussion of comments; recommendation to JPACT for release for public review with amendments deemed necessary
- March 8 - Regional Development Committee - recommend release for public review
- March 11 - JPACT - Recommend release for public review
- March 11 -  
April 30 - Local jurisdiction endorsement
- Week of  
April 5 - Public meeting to review RTP
- April 30 - TPAC - Recommend adoption
- May 9 - Regional Development Committee - Public hearing & recommend adoption
- May 13 - JPACT - Recommend adoption
- May 27 - Metro Council - First reading & public hearing
- June 4 - Metro Council - Second reading & ADOPTION