

Portland State University

PDXScholar

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on
Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

7-9-1992

Meeting Notes 1992-07-09

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 1992-07-09 " (1992). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. 155.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/155

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.



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Agenda

- R E V I S E D -

Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: July 9, 1992

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:15 a.m.

Place: Metro, Conference Room 440

- * 1. MEETING REPORT OF JUNE 11, 1992 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- * 2. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1627 - ENDORSING ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REGION'S PRIORITY CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY PROGRAM PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN ODOT'S SIX-YEAR PROGRAM - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Mike Hoglund.
- * 3. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1646 - ENDORSING COMMITMENT OF TRI-MET GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS TO EAST PORTLAND/CLACKAMAS COUNTY LRT DEVELOPMENT AND WESTSIDE CREDIT ENHANCEMENT - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Richard Brandman.
- * 4. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1644 - ESTABLISHING ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES BETWEEN METRO AND ODOT FOR USE AND EXCHANGE OF FAU, STP AND STATE FUNDING - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- * 5. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1645 - REVISING THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA'S URBANIZED TRANSPORTATION BOUNDARY TO ESTABLISH THE AREA ELIGIBLE FOR METRO STP FUNDS - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.
- * 6. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1647 - ACCEPTING ODOT'S RECOMMENDED SIX-YEAR PROGRAM REDUCTIONS - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Richard Brandman.
- 7. REPORT OF JPACT FINANCE COMMITTEE - INFORMATIONAL - Councilor Devlin.
- #8. OVERVIEW OF PRE-AA STUDIES CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP - INFORMATIONAL - Richard Brandman.

*Material enclosed.

#Available at meeting.

PLEASE NOTE: Overflow parking is available at the City Center parking locations on the attached map and may be validated at the meeting. Parking on Metro premises in any space other than those marked "Visitors" will result in towing of vehicles.



METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue
Portland, OR 97201-5398
503/221-1646

Agenda

Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: July 9, 1992

Day: Thursday

Time: 7:15 a.m.

Place: Metro, Conference Room 440

- *1. MEETING REPORT OF JUNE 11, 1992 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.
- *2. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1627 - ENDORSING ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REGION'S PRIORITY CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY PROGRAM PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN ODOT'S SIX-YEAR PROGRAM - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Mike Hoglund.
- *3. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1646 - ENDORSING COMMITMENT OF TRI-MET GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS TO EAST PORTLAND/CLACKAMAS COUNTY LRT DEVELOPMENT AND WESTSIDE CREDIT ENHANCEMENT - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Richard Brandman.
- *4. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1644 - ESTABLISHING ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES BETWEEN METRO AND ODOT FOR USE AND EXCHANGE OF FAU, STP AND STATE FUNDING - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Mike Hoglund.
- *5. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1645 - REVISING THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA'S URBANIZED TRANSPORTATION BOUNDARY TO ESTABLISH THE AREA ELIGIBLE FOR METRO STP FUNDS - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Mike Hoglund.
- *6. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1647 - ACCEPTING ODOT'S RECOMMENDED SIX-YEAR PROGRAM REDUCTIONS - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Richard Brandman.
- #7. REPORT OF JPACT FINANCE COMMITTEE - INFORMATIONAL - Councilor Devlin.

*Material enclosed.

#Available at meeting.

PLEASE NOTE: Overflow parking is available at the City Center parking locations on the attached map and may be validated at the meeting. Parking on Metro premises in any space other than those marked "Visitors" will result in towing of vehicle.

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: June 11, 1992

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Chair Richard Devlin, Metro Council; Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland; Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County; Bonnie Hays (alt.), Washington County; Larry Cole, Cities of Washington County; Marjorie Schmunk, Cities of Multnomah County; Don Forbes, ODOT; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Keith Ahola (alt.), WSDOT; Les White, C-TRAN; Fred Hansen, DEQ; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; and Bob Liddell, Cities of Clackamas County

Guests: Ed Washington, Metro Council; Brian Campbell and Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland; Dick Feeney, G.B. Arrington, Bruce Harder, and Laurie Garrett, Tri-Met; Pat Clancy, Public Financial Management; Judy Davis and Leeanne MacColl, League of Women Voters; Kathy Buson, Multnomah County; Ted Spence, ODOT; Francie Royce, City of Portland; Geoff Larkin, The Larkin Group, Inc.; John Block, City of Oregon City; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County; Steve Greenwood (JPACT alt.), DEQ; Jerry Baker, Cities of Clackamas County; Dapo Sobomehin, Citizen; Larry Bissett, Systems Research Group; and Dale Chambers, Washington County Land Use Advisory Commission

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Cathy Thomas, Gail Ryder, Ethan Seltzer, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Richard Devlin.

MEETING REPORT

The May 14 JPACT Meeting Report was approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Andy Cotugno announced that the Western Council of Governments Conference, which covers the three western states, would be held in Bend, Oregon on July 9-11. Andy encouraged attendance and

noted that there would be opportunity to gain insight on each state's perspective with regard to the challenge brought about by ISTEA. In addition, speakers will address the issues of integrating land use with transportation and meeting the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Application forms for the conference were distributed.

Chair Devlin introduced Ed Washington, a newcomer to Metro Council, who was present as an "observer."

Brian Campbell introduced Susie Lahsene as the new Transportation Planner from the Port of Portland.

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1625A - ENDORSING CITY OF PORTLAND AND TRI-MET APPLICATIONS FOR FHWA/FTA URBAN MOBILITY GRANT FUNDS

Andy Cotugno pointed out that a replacement Staff Report/Resolution was distributed reflecting deletion of the proposed demonstration grant for a Travel Allowance to Encourage Employers to Charge for Employee Parking. At the request of the City of Portland, the proposed grant was removed from consideration.

Andy reviewed the remaining proposals for demonstration grants pertaining to a Neighborhood Rideshare Co-op and a Transit Freeway Operations Program.

Fred Hansen asked why the "Employer Charge for Employee Parking" request was dropped, as pricing on parking was one of the issues being discussed by the Governor's Committee on Vehicle Emissions. Commissioner Blumenauer responded that the proposed grant was removed from consideration because it is the City's intent to follow this issue up with the people in the business community, noting that proper groundwork has not been laid and the need for a coalition to first be in place. He noted that the City welcomes reactions and suggestions for this proposal.

Action Taken: Larry Cole moved, seconded by Pauline Anderson, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 92-1625A, endorsing City of Portland and Tri-Met applications for FHWA/FTA urban mobility grant funds. Motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1626 - ESTABLISHING THE REGION'S PRIORITY TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS

Andy Cotugno noted that an initial draft of ODOT's Six-Year Program was reviewed in January. At that time, it was not clear whether the Transportation Enhancement funds would be programmed in the Six-Year Program. The same concern was experienced over the Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality projects, which will be

considered at the July 9 JPACT meeting. We're requesting that any new projects for use of NHS and STP funds be flagged in some fashion.

Andy explained that the Transportation Enhancement account is a new experience for the transportation administration and is intended to fund environmental transportation projects, citing examples. He elaborated on the solicitation process, how the criteria was developed, and the subsequent ranking of projects. Staff is recommending that only two years of Transportation Enhancement funding be programmed by ODOT in the Six-Year Program. All projects considered fall within the Metropolitan Service District boundary. Andy indicated that there is some uncertainty as to what projects will be allowed under this new program.

Fred Hansen expressed concern over funding a lot of distinct but unconnected projects at a time we are trying to learn or promote different strategies in terms of livability of the Transportation Rule. Andy Cotugno responded that such criteria should be applied to the Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality funding projects, noting that this account is more for environmental quality. The question then was raised -- if there is an emphasis for reducing VMT, what would you do with scenic or historic projects? Fred Hansen felt the Rule will only be effective if there is a comprehensive approach to housing densities and land use.

Don Forbes noted that ODOT's approach has been to set up working committees, both internally and for stakeholders, to define the criteria with the intent of ranking the projects statewide. The draft Six-Year Program doesn't include any Transportation Enhancement projects. He felt it should remain unprogrammed until the criteria is developed, pointing out that the funds are not restricted to any one fiscal year. He stated that we have the opportunity to do the right thing as well as the expedient thing.

Mayor Cole expressed the Cities of Washington Counties' support of this resolution but wanted the record to show that Washington County is getting considerably less dollars than the other counties. Washington County Cities support equity and distribution in the next action.

Action Taken: Tom Walsh moved, seconded by Pauline Anderson, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 92-1626, establishing the region's priority Transportation Enhancement Program projects. Motion PASSED unanimously.

Don Forbes commended Andy Cotugno and staff for having done an outstanding job in developing potential criteria for this program.

REGION 2040 UPDATE

Ethan Seltzer briefed the Committee on Region 2040 activities. He spoke of research into values and community attitudes. Reports on existing conditions, demographics and community preferences will be combined into a series of alternatives. There will be three basic alternatives, plus a "Reference Alternative", with a variety of alternatives within each that will be presented to the public.

The Reference Alternative will be arrived at by taking policies in place until the year 2010, assuming no change, and trying to determine what kind of growth pattern will apply toward 2040. He stressed that it is an alternative rather than a trend and noted the intent to develop the Reference Alternative as a reasoned response to the way choices present themselves.

Ethan also commented on the telephone survey that was conducted regarding quality of life. He noted concerns such as traffic, public safety, and the region growing too fast. Two processes are underway to look at growth alternatives: 1) with local governments, in cooperation with local planning staffs; and 2) interest groups (stakeholders). A series of public workshops will be held around the region. Ethan reported there will be a narrowing of alternatives in July, August and September with presentation before the public in October.

Andy Cotugno noted that a kit was developed for group presentations and is available to solicit value tradeoffs.

Ethan noted that the three alternatives and the Reference Alternative will be completed by the end of this calendar year. The second phase of Region 2040 is to quantitatively assess the 2040 alternatives. The project will be complete at the end of '93.

Mayor Cole asked whether any information was extracted from the poll as to length of time people lived here. The response was in the affirmative.

OVERVIEW OF TRI-MET STRATEGIC PLAN

Tom Walsh, General Manager of Tri-Met, noted that Tri-Met's Draft Strategic Plan is tied very closely to that of land use visions for the region. He indicated that a series of discussions had been held around the region on this document. He cited the Strategic Plan as a provocative, ambitious plan, noting that it was generated internally at Tri-Met.

The Strategic Plan deals with quality of life, a vision for growth and livability, Tri-Met's role in achieving the vision, Tri-Met's mission and goals, and the business plan. Tom noted that, for the next two fiscal years, we have the ability to make substantial strides on the Strategic Plan. By 1995, additional revenues will be needed. He noted that the Strategic Plan is Tri-Met's response to the region and its expectations and, as the operating agency, they are committed to carrying out the plan.

In terms of process, there have been seven sessions planned with jurisdictions. Tri-Met would like an opportunity to review the Strategic Plan in detail with staff. They anticipate a series of hearings to be held over a 90-day period with Discussion Draft 2 followed by final consolidation with each of the regional partners. Tri-Met is cognizant of the fact that the Strategic Plan must fit with developing strategies of Region 2040. Mr. Walsh acknowledged that Tri-Met is not a land use planning agency and will be cooperative with the 2040 planning process. It is Tri-Met's intent that the Strategic Plan be consistent with the Region 2040 planning process.

Tom asked for comments back on the Strategic Plan and asked that Tri-Met have the opportunity to brief other jurisdictions.

LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT BONDS

Bruce Harder explained that \$125 million in General Obligation bonds were authorized by the voters for the Westside LRT project and the East Portland/Clackamas County LRT development. Tri-Met wants to sell those bonds at this particular juncture of the Westside LRT project. He explained that we are beginning to utilize some of the mechanisms the region has put in place over the last years. Tri-Met is going through the credit rating process and General Obligation bonds will be issued shortly. On advice of bond counsel, they are thinking of issuing the full \$125 million of General Obligation bonds. The yield is at an attractive rate and would allow Tri-Met to leverage the investment to a maximum.

From a fiscal perspective, Tri-Met can meet spend-down requirements. There is consensus that this is the way to proceed at this point. In the draft resolution distributed at the meeting, it would direct Tri-Met to hold, account for, and disburse the Clackamas County funds, and Tri-Met would be the agent for the compact. The draft would also make the unused bond procedures available as security if there is need in the interim of security for credit. The details of the resolution will be worked out by staff in the next few weeks for later consideration by JPACT in July.

JPACT

June 11, 1992

Page 6

Andy Cotugno noted that, in July 1990, the overall funding framework was established for the Westside LRT project. As part of that resolution, \$15 million out of the \$125 million was directed toward the East Portland/Clackamas County extension. The Regional Compact provides that \$15 million be committed toward that project. It also provides mechanisms for use of the bond proceeds as Westside LRT costs, if necessary. We are not doing that at this time. The resolution provides that the Clackamas County bond proceeds will be available to the Westside LRT for credit enhancement and to meet CAPRA requirements.

Commissioner Lindquist reported that Clackamas County has worked with Tri-Met on this issue and is comfortable with the way things have been put together. Clackamas County realized that these funds might be needed for the Westside project but understood that funds would be available when the East Portland/Clackamas County project was to begin. Commissioner Lindquist indicated that his only concern was whether right-of-way funds were needed before the five years were up. He concurred in the need to proceed as proposed as he was assured that other funds are available for that purpose.

Commissioner Blumenauer hoped that we could look at ways to accelerate efforts for the southern project while looking at a range of opportunities for long-term cost savings for the region. He felt there may be a component that speaks to doing more in that vital corridor, citing the need to maximize funds and have some flexibility. It was hoped that, in the long term, we could save more money if that component could be accelerated.

Tom Walsh stated that Tri-Met wants to be able to use the \$15 million for credit enhancement for the borrowing for the Westside. He assured the committee that no more than \$944 million will be spent for light rail between Portland and Hillsboro.

COMMENTS ON OREGON TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Andy Cotugno stated that ODOT has two documents in circulation on the Oregon Transportation Plan at this time: a Multimodal System Element and a Policy Element. He reviewed the alternatives as a status-quo funding approach, a "no revenue" increase alternative, and a third alternative that would meet economic and livability needs of the state and develop a multi-modal approach. ODOT is in a public meeting process at the present time, and the region hopes to consider a resolution for endorsement at its July 9 JPACT meeting.

The Oregon Transportation Commission will consider adoption of the OTP documents on September 18 at a transportation symposium. Adoption of a Financing Element is proposed in November. Andy

Cotugno emphasized the fact that it will be appropriate to update other plans, noting the Willamette Valley Transportation Plan, land use plans, and the Oregon Benchmarks as examples.

Andy commented that, while we are growing in VMT per capita, we must also meet the 10 percent reduction required by Rule 12 and emphasized that an aggressive package should be pursued. He indicated there are some significant policy issues to be addressed.

Commissioner Hays indicated that more Washington County comments would be forthcoming on the Oregon Transportation Plan. Mayor Cole also acknowledged that, at the WCTCC meeting, it was discussed that there would be further submittals from the cities of Washington County. With regard to the Willamette Valley Transportation Plan and long-range elements, Mayor Cole hoped that this process doesn't forget that the state's second most populated area is in Washington County and rapid transit service as well.

Action Taken: Commissioner Lindquist moved, seconded by Commissioner Hays, to endorse the comments for forwarding to ODOT with the recognition that there will be further submittals. Motion PASSED unanimously.

Don Forbes commented that he has asked for a transit order analysis by the end of this year. He felt the most helpful and appropriate comments deal with minimum levels of service.

ANNOUNCEMENT

A communication received from the Newberg Area Chamber of Commerce was distributed expressing concern about a potential delay in the Westside Bypass Study. Chair Devlin noted that the matter would be taken up at a future meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
Dick Engstrom
JPACT Members

lmk

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 92-1627 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REGION'S PRIORITY CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY PROGRAM PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN ODOT'S SIX-YEAR PROGRAM

Date: June 17, 1992

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would establish the region's priority Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) Program projects for funding in the 1993-1998 Transportation Improvement Program (Six-Year Program). The region's priorities are consistent with CMAQ Program eligibility standards as listed in Section 149(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991.

Prior to commencing construction, local governments and Metro must demonstrate that these projects are included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Metro's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and are consistent with or conform to local comprehensive plans (transportation elements, public facility plans, and/or transportation system plans), the statewide planning goals, and the interim conformity guidance Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

The TPAC Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Subcommittee assisted in the identification of the project list, the development and application of the ranking criteria, and the provision of criteria-related information. The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) is scheduled to review and take action on the priorities on July 9. The priorities will be forwarded to ODOT staff and to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). ODOT staff will compile all CMAQ-related requests and the OTC is tentatively set to take action in October.

TPAC recommended approval of Resolution No. 92-1627 on June 26. Their comments are included in the following background information.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

In February, as part of its review of Six-Year Program priorities, TPAC charged the TDM Subcommittee to develop a comprehensive regional TDM program for consideration for funding from the CMAQ Program. TPAC requested that recommendations be developed for both the implementation of projects and for the development programs leading to future projects. A process was also established to result in the transmittal of recommendations to the OTC in time for their summer Six-Year Program hearings.

Eligible CMAQ activities in accordance with ISTEA are as follows:

"Eligible Projects. Except as provided in Subsection (c), a State may obligate funds apportioned to it under Section 104(b)(2) for the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality improvement program only for a transportation project or program --

"(1)(A) if the Secretary, after consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, determines, on the basis of information published by the Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Section 108(f)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act (other than clauses xii and xvi of such section), that the project or program is likely to contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard; or

"(B) in any case in which such information is not available, if the Secretary, after such consultation, determines that the project or program is part of a program, method, or strategy described in each section;

"(2) if the project or program is included in a State Implementation Plan that has been approved pursuant to the Clean Air Act and the project will have air quality benefits; or

"(3) the Secretary, after consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, determines that the project or program is likely to contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard, whether through reductions in vehicle miles traveled, fuel consumption, or through other factors.

"No funds may be provided under this section for a project which will result in the construction of new capacity available to single-occupant vehicles unless the project consists of a high-occupancy vehicle facility available to single-occupant vehicles only at other than peak travel times."

Prior Activities

The TPAC TDM Subcommittee met six times between April and June to develop the comprehensive regional TDM program. Essentially, the program was developed through solicitation of projects from the jurisdictions and agencies represented on the subcommittee. Projects were reviewed for eligibility against FHWA CMAQ guidelines, categorized by mode, prioritized by jurisdiction within each mode category, and ranked using criteria developed especially for this particular Six-Year Program.

As a result of their April meetings, the TDM Subcommittee made the following general recommendations to TPAC:

- . That the OTC fund at a maximum two years of the CMAQ Program in order for the region to complete work on the Governor's Task Force on Automobile Emissions in the Portland area and on Metro's TDM Study. The two studies will develop projects which will directly relate to the CMAQ Program objectives.
- . That appropriate project ranking criteria be developed through Metro or additional guidance be received from USDOT for prioritizing CMAQ-related project proposals.
- . That any projects approved for the 1993-1998 Six-Year Program include an evaluation component.
- . That funds be distributed as equitably as possible throughout the region for at least the first two years of the program.
- . That at least three projects be forwarded as the region's CMAQ priorities: Tigard Park-and-Ride; Multnomah County Bridge Accessibility Study; and a Joint Regional Pedestrian Access Study.
- . That TPAC, JPACT and the OTC consider funding for demonstration-type projects within recommended categories (bicycle/pedestrian, TDM, transportation systems management (TSM), and transit).

At its meeting on May 1, TPAC generally agreed with the subcommittee recommendations with the following stipulations:

- . To the degree possible, funds should be used to implement projects. System planning and program development related to CMAQ funding is necessary but should be done using regular planning funds (PL, HPR, etc.) and addressed through the UWP process. The Regional Pedestrian Access Study would fall under this recommendation and was therefore not generally supported for funding by TPAC.
- . The TDM Subcommittee should identify suitable "demonstration" type projects within the identified categories for funding, implementation, and evaluation.

Portland Area CMAQ Priorities

The TDM Subcommittee met twice in early May to incorporate TPAC comments and to rank the projects. An original list of 56 proposed CMAQ projects was first reduced to 14 based on local priorities as determined by subcommittee members. The projects were screened to ensure their eligibility with CMAQ funding guidelines and for their ability to begin within two years.

The 14 projects were then consolidated into four categories consistent with CMAQ eligibility guidelines as provided by FHWA: 1) bicycle/pedestrian; 2) TDM; 3) transit; and 4) TSM/signals/channelization. The subcommittee then ranked the 14 projects

using the evaluation criteria included as Attachment A. Generally, the criteria were oriented towards identifying projects which will contribute to attainment of the national ambient air quality standards, will reduce congestion, have a high degree of commitment, and for which CMAQ funds are likely to be critical.

As a result of the ranking process, the subcommittee recommended that 13 of the 14 projects, plus four unranked projects be forwarded for OTC funding consideration. Of the 14 priority projects, it was determined that an ODOT's Motorist Information Signing project be dropped from consideration. The project was considered to provide little, if any, ongoing air quality or congestion benefits. In addition, the subcommittee recommended that four unranked projects be added to the list for funding consideration. The committee did not initially have time to rank the projects but felt they generally meet the intent and spirit of the CMAQ Program.

TPAC reviewed the initial subcommittee recommendations at its May 29 meeting. A resolution to endorse the recommendations was tabled with the following TPAC comments:

- . At the request of DEQ, the subcommittee should identify a short list of immediate-need projects. DEQ was hesitant to support two or six-year allocations of CMAQ funds without a detailed, quantitative emissions analysis.
- . The subcommittee should re-examine all submitted projects specifically for air quality benefits consistent with CMAQ Program eligibility requirements. Projects with substantial air quality benefits should then be ranked accordingly.
- . The subcommittee should rank the four unranked priority projects as found in Exhibit A to the resolution.

The TDM Subcommittee met again on June 11 to address the TPAC directives. The subcommittee was unable to identify any new priority projects which have promise for substantial air quality benefits. As a result, the previous unranked priority projects were reviewed and the following short list of immediate need priority projects was developed:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Points</u>
1. Tigard Park- and Ride	Tri-Met	\$ 720,000	19
2. Willamette Bridge Access Study	Multnomah Co.	100,000	18
3. Courtney Avenue Bike/Pedes. Link	Clackamas Co.	100,000	17
4. Pedestrian to transit study	Tri-Met/City of Portland	200,000	16

5. Neighborhood Ride-share Co-op	City of Portland	80,000	16
6. Bikes on transit	Tri-Met	<u>110,000</u>	16
TOTAL		\$1,310,000	

The subcommittee noted that the Willamette Bridge Study must be sensitive to the air quality impacts of bicycle/pedestrian improvements and to changes in traffic patterns.

Summary

Exhibit A to Resolution No. 92-1627 shows the results of the ranking process and identifies the TDM Subcommittee's recommended CMAQ priorities. The immediate-need short list, as identified above, is shown as Table 1, Projects 1 and 2; Table 2, Project 1; and Table 3, Projects 1, 2, and 3 in Exhibit A to the Resolution. Those projects reflect a recommended allocation for the Portland region in the event the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) decides to defer programming of CMAQ funds to a minimum level.

In the event a decision is made to program two years of CMAQ funds, the TDM Subcommittee originally recommended the OTC consider all the projects identified as Tables 1 through 4 of Exhibit A to Resolution No. 92-1627 as the Portland area priorities. The total estimated cost of those 17 projects is \$6.821 million, with a high of \$1.5 million for Tri-Met's clean air buses and a low of \$20,000 for SW Greenburg Road signal interties. The TDM Subcommittee further recommended that Exhibits A and B should be considered as the region's six-year priorities in the event the decision is made to allocate CMAQ funds for the full Six-Year Program period. Total estimated costs for all projects in Exhibits A and B are \$28,808,800.

The Oregon allocation for CMAQ funds is estimated at \$9.7 million for the first two years and up to a potential of almost \$31 million of the full six years of ISTEA.

In response to previous TPAC discussion, the TDM Subcommittee recommended the immediate-need short list be considered as the region's priority CMAQ projects and that, prior to the next Six-Year Program update, Metro and DEQ staff and the subcommittee should develop a method to evaluate the benefits of proposed CMAQ projects with an emphasis towards emissions reductions. Resolution No. 92-1627 reflects that recommendation.

TPAC recommended approval of Resolution No. 92-1627 at its June 26 meeting, adopting the six projects listed above as the region's CMAQ priorities. However, recognizing the need for more consideration in developing regional CMAQ priorities, TPAC also recommends that the TDM Subcommittee further examine potential CMAQ projects over the next few months consistent with ODOT's schedule. ODOT is beginning a process designed to determine statewide CMAQ priorities. The process, as tentatively proposed,

will be similar to the region's and include identified "stakeholders" consisting of representatives of appropriate state agencies (ODOT, DEQ) and carbon monoxide and ozone non-attainment areas (including the Portland metropolitan area). That process is scheduled to be completed in October.

As such, TPAC recommends utilizing the extra time to review regional CMAQ priorities beyond the recommended six projects. TPAC recommends soliciting and/or developing additional CMAQ eligible projects, particularly those that have potentially strong air quality benefits. Those projects would be prioritized and ranked along with the remaining projects listed in Exhibits A and B. The reprioritization would utilize any state-developed criteria, as available, or revised regional criteria which would account for more stringent air quality benefits. TPAC recognized that the total dollar amount of the six priority projects will likely total significantly less than what the Portland region could anticipate in programmed CMAQ funds. Consistent with their earlier recommendations, TPAC felt that it is important to provide two and six-year CMAQ priorities in addition to the priority six projects. TPAC also felt that more time is necessary to adequately evaluate projects for their specific congestion and, more importantly, air quality benefits.

Consequently, staff will be working through October to further supplement their CMAQ priorities. In the meantime, TPAC suggested working with ODOT staff to accelerate funding approval of the region's short list of six projects, preferably in FY 92.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1627.

MH:lmk
92-1627.RES
6-30-92

Attachment A:
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality: Project Score Sheet
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN

Legend

- 0= Does Not Meet Criteria
1= Minimally Addresses Criteria
2= Moderately Addresses Criteria
3= Fully Addresses Criteria

Bike/Ped	Score
1. Does the project provide for a critical link or access; or does the program fill a critical void?	_____
2. Are CMAQ Funds Critical? -- other dollars available -- restricted by state constitution -- cannot be integrated with other CIP/TIP project	_____
3. Size of Need/Market -- number of potential users -- large geographic or multi-jurisdictional -- high certainty for use (existing counts, etc.)	_____
4. Multi- or Inter-Modal -- access to transit -- service for bike and ped. and ADA	_____
5. Local Commitment -- past dollars spent -- private dollars spent -- community support -- planned future phases	_____
6. Air Quality Benefit -- carbon monoxide hot spot -- ozone	_____
7. Reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled or reduces VHD?	_____
Total Score	_____

Metro
5/19/92

Attachment A

Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality: Project Score Sheet
TSM/SIGNAL/CHANNELIZATION

Legend

- 0= Does Not Meet Criteria
- 1= Minimally Addresses Criteria
- 2= Moderately Addresses Criteria
- 3= Fully Addresses Criteria

TSM/Sig/Chan.

Score

1. Is the project on a designated RTP arterial of regional significance? _____
2. Are CMAQ Funds Critical? _____
 - other dollars available
 - restricted by state constitution
 - cannot be integrated with other CIP/TIP project
3. Size of Need/Market _____
 - number of potential users
 - large geographic or multi-jurisdictional
 - high certainty for use (existing counts, etc.)
4. Multi- or Inter-Modal _____
 - access to transit
 - service for bike and ped. and ADA
5. Local Commitment _____
 - past dollars spent
 - private dollars spent
 - community support
 - planned future phases
6. Air Quality Benefit _____
 - carbon monoxide hot spot
 - ozone
7. Reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled or reduces VHD? _____

Total Score _____

Metro
5/19/92

Attachment A

Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality: Project Score Sheet
TRANSIT

Legend

- 0= Does Not Meet Criteria
- 1= Minimally Addresses Criteria
- 2= Moderately Addresses Criteria
- 3= Fully Addresses Criteria

Transit

Score

1. Is the project a Tri-Met critical need? _____
2. Are CMAQ Funds Critical? _____
 - other dollars available
 - restricted by state constitution
 - cannot be integrated with other CIP/TIP project
3. Size of Need/Market _____
 - number of potential users
 - large geographic or multi-jurisdictional
 - high certainty for use (existing counts, etc.)
4. Multi- or Inter-Modal _____
 - access to transit
 - service for bike and ped. and ADA
5. Local Commitment _____
 - In Tri-Met 5-year plan
 - past dollars spent
 - private dollars spent
 - community support
 - planned future phases
6. Air Quality Benefit _____
 - carbon monoxide hot spot
 - ozone
7. Reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled or reduces VHD? _____

Total Score _____

Metro
5/19/92

Attachment A:

Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality: Project Score Sheet
DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Legend

- 0= Does Not Meet Criteria
- 1= Minimally Addresses Criteria
- 2= Moderately Addresses Criteria
- 3= Fully Addresses Criteria

TDM	Score
1. Does the program fill a critical void/need?	_____
2. Are CMAQ Funds Critical?	_____
-- other dollars available	
-- restricted by state constitution	
-- cannot be integrated with other CIP/TIP project	
3. Size of Need/Market	_____
-- number of potential users	
-- large geographic or multi-jurisdictional	
-- high certainty for use (existing counts, etc.)	
4. Multi- or Inter-Modal	_____
-- access to transit	
-- service for bike and ped. and ADA	
5. Local Commitment	_____
-- past dollars spent	
-- private dollars spent	
-- community support	
-- previously proposed and endorsed; contained	
within a plan or program	
-- other benefits (access to jobs, etc.)	
6. Air Quality Benefit	_____
-- carbon monoxide hot spot	
-- ozone	
7. Reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled or reduces VHD?	_____
Total Score	_____

Metro
5/19/92

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING)	RESOLUTION NO. 92-1627
THE REGION'S PRIORITY CONGESTION)	
MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY PROGRAM)	Introduced by
PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN ODOT'S)	Councilor Richard Devlin
SIX-YEAR PROGRAM)	

WHEREAS, The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 included a new Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) Program for funding clean air and congestion-related projects in carbon monoxide and ozone non-attainment areas; and

WHEREAS, The Portland metropolitan area is designated as non-attainment for both pollutants; and

WHEREAS, The ISTEA stipulates that states shall allocate CMAQ funds in cooperation with the designated Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs); and

WHEREAS, Metro is the designated MPO for the Portland metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, The state is currently programming funds, including for the first time the new CMAQ Program funds, through the update of the Oregon Department of Transportation's 1993-1998 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, In the absence of established ranking criteria and guidance from the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation has used interim criteria to develop a consensus as to the region's immediate-need priority CMAQ projects for inclusion in the Six-Year Program update; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District recommends the state program only immediately needed CMAQ funds for the 1993-1998 Six-Year Program update.

2. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District adopts the six CMAQ projects identified in Exhibit A as Table 1, Projects 1 and 2; Table 2, Project 1; and Table 3, Projects 1, 2 and 3 as the region's immediate-need priorities for inclusion in the 1993-1998 ODOT Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program.

3. That staff be directed to forward these priorities in testimony during the appropriate hearings on the Six-Year Program update by the Oregon Transportation Commission.

4. That prior to establishing the Portland metropolitan area CMAQ-related priorities for the next update of ODOT's Six-Year Program, TPAC shall coordinate the development of a regional CMAQ Program for inclusion in Metro's Transportation Improvement Program and that ranking criteria be developed to evaluate CMAQ proposals, with particular emphasis to be given to emission reductions.

5. That staff be directed to work with the state and local jurisdictions and agencies to identify and incorporate into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) appropriate CMAQ-related implementation measures which result from the Governor's Task Force on Automobile Emissions in the Portland Area, Metro's Transportation Demand Management Study, the Region 2040 Study, regular updates to the RTP and State Implementation Plan, and other system planning activities, as necessary.

6. That ODOT be encouraged to incorporate a public review

phase into its statewide CMAQ prioritization and selection process.

7. That Metro staff work with the state through their CMAQ prioritization and selection process and with the TDM Subcommittee to develop the region's two and six-year CMAQ priorities beyond the priority six projects identified above. The additional priorities should emphasize air quality benefits and incorporate state evaluation criteria as it becomes available. Any new projects identified should then be prioritized with those already developed and listed as the remaining projects in Exhibit A and all projects in Exhibit B.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this _____ day of _____, 1992.

Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

MH:lmk
92-1627.RES
6-30-92

EXHIBIT A

Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Priority Projects

Table 1. Transit			
Name	Jurisdiction	\$Cost	Rank (Score)
1. Tigard Park&Ride Lot	Tri-Met	720,000	1 (19)
2. Bikes on Transit	Tri-Met	110,000	2 (16)
3. Purchase of Clean Air Buses*	Tri-Met	1,500,000	3 (15)
4. Rideshare Study	Tri-Met	100,000	4 (15)
5. Transit Signal Priority Demo Project	Tri-Met; COP	100,000	5 (14)
Total		2,530,000	

* The high ranking (15) of clean air buses is predicated on the assumption that these buses would be used to provide express service to designated park and ride lots or to directly address an air quality "hot spot."

Table 2. Transportation Demand Management			
Name	Jurisdiction	\$Cost	Rank (Score)
1. Neighborhood Rideshare	COP	80,000	1 (16)
2. Downtown Park&Ride Shuttle	Oregon City	580,000	2 (15)
Total		660,000	

EXHIBIT A

Table 3. Bicycle/Pedestrian			
Name	Jurisdiction	\$Cost	Rank (Score)
1. Willamette Bridge Study	Mult. Co.	100,000	1 (18)
2. Courtney Ave. Bike/Ped Link	Clack. Co.	100,000	2 (17)
3. Ped Access Study	Mult. Co. Wash. Co. Clack. Co. COP, Metro	200,000	3 (16)
4. Garden Home Oleson Rd. Ped Network	Wash. Co.	120,000	4 (15)
5. Blue Lake Bike Path	Mult. Co.	91,000	5 (13)
Total		611,000	

EXHIBIT A

Table 4. TSM/Signal/Channelization			
Name	Jurisdiction	\$Cost	Rank (Score)
1. Hwy 217 Ramp Meters**	ODOT	600,000	1 (15)
2. Greewburg Rd. Full Interconnect & Signal Phasing to Hwy 217	Wash. Co.	20,000	2 (14)
3. Burnside/ 242nd Ave.	Mult. Co.	400,000	3 (13)
4. SW Oleson/ Scholls Ferry/ B.H. Hwy Turn Lanes	Wash. Co.	1,000,000	3 (13)
5. Johnson Creek/Linwood Signal	Clack. Co.	1,000,000	3 (13)
Total		3,020,000	

** The high ranking (15) of the Highway 217 ramp meters is based on the assumption that installation of ramp meters will include bus bypass lanes.

Overall CMAQ & Priority Project Total Cost - \$6,821,000

EXHIBIT B

Additional CMAQ Six Year Priority Projects

Table 1. Ranked Project			
Name	Jurisdiction	\$Cost	Rank (Score)
1. Motor Vehicle Information System	ODOT	200,000	1 (9)

Table 2. Unranked Projects		
Name	Jurisdiction	Cost
TRANSIT PROJECTS		
1. Automatic Vehicle Locators	Tri-Met	3,000,000
2. Park&Ride Expansion	Tri-Met	1,200,000
3. Westside/Rideshare	Tri-Met	100,000
4. Trip Planning Computer	Tri-Met	450,000
5. 82nd Ave. Signal Improvements	Tri-Met	112,000
Total Transit		4,862,000
TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM)		
6. Travel Allowance/Paid Parking Demo	COP	115,600
7. Parking Fee Joint Strategies/Wash. Co.	COP; Wash. Co.	61,200
Total TDM		176,800

BIKE/PEDESTRIAN		
8. Strawberry Lane Connection/I-205 to Webster	Clack. Co.	100,000
9. Clack. Co./Willamette River Ped/Bike Paths	Clack. Co.; Oregon City	1,175,000
10. Cornell Rd. Bike/Ped Path	Mult. Co.	35,000
11. Cedar Hills: Parkway to Sunset Bike Path	Wash. Co.	103,000
12. Murray Blvd: T.V. Hwy Terman Rd.	Wash. Co.	180,000
13. Cornell Rd: Stucki Ave. - 158th Ave.	Wash. Co.	868,000
14. Oleson Rd.: B.H. Hwy - Hall Blvd.	Wash. Co.	600,000
15. 185th Ave: Sunset Hwy - Springville Rd.	Wash. Co.	316,000
Total Bike/Ped		3,377,000
TSM/SIGNAL/ CHANNELIZATION		
16. Expansion of Central Traffic System	COP	482,000
17. Barbur Blvd. Integrated Traffic Control	COP	270,000
18. West Union Rd. and SW 185th Ave. Widening and Signalization	COP	400,000
19. Borland/Stafford	Clack. Co.	980,000
20. NW Cornell Rd. Interconnection of Signals	Wash. Co.	100,000
21. NW Barnes Rd. Needs System Analysis	Wash. Co.	10,000

22. SW Murray Rd./ Cornell Rd. Widening	Wash. Co.	500,000
23. SW Front Ave./ Columbia/Jefferson	COP	340,000
24. Motor Advisory System	ODOT	1,100,000
25. I-84 Message Signs	ODOT	300,000
26. U.S. 26 Warning Signs	ODOT	1,500,000
27. I-205 Ramp Meters	ODOT	540,000
28. Help Signs	ODOT	100,000
29. Warning Signes	ODOT	1,300,000
30. Variable Message Signes	ODOT	1,500,000
31. Surveillance System Phase I and II	ODOT	1,250,000
32. I-5 Ramp Meters	ODOT	400,000
33. Freeway Monitoring	ODOT	1,200,000
34. Stafford Ramp Meter	ODOT	500,000
Total TSM/Signal/Chan		12,792,000
TOTAL ADDITIONAL SIX YEAR PRIORITIES		21,207,800

TOTAL SIX YEAR PRIORITIES (EXHIBIT A + EXHIBIT B) = \$27,808,800

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 92-1646 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORISING COMMITMENT OF TRI-MET GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS TO EAST PORTLAND/CLACKAMAS COUNTY LRT DEVELOPMENT AND WESTSIDE CREDIT ENHANCEMENT

Date: June 18, 1992

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

Adopt Resolution No. 92-1646 endorsing the issuance by Tri-Met of \$125 million in General Obligation bonds of which \$15 million is designated for the Clackamas County Extension. Proceeds will be available for:

1. Approximately \$4 million in costs of the preliminary planning and land acquisition and rights-of-way needed for the Clackamas County Extension from earned interest of the total bond sale.
2. Interim borrowing obligations and federal share obligations of the Westside Project.
3. To meet Capital Reserve Account requirements of the Westside Project.

TPAC has reviewed the proposed endorsement and unanimously recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1646.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Tri-Met is currently finalizing its plans to undertake the construction of the Westside Corridor Extension. Negotiations are underway with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to complete a Full-Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA). In order for federal funds to be made available for the project, the FFGA must be in place.

As part of the FFGA negotiations, FTA will require Tri-Met to demonstrate its capability to financially meet both the interim borrowing requirements of the project and the Capital Reserve Account (CAPRA).

Since the filing of the federal grant application in August of 1991, Tri-Met proposed to meet the construction schedule of the Project partially with borrowed funds. In order for Tri-Met to obtain short-term borrowing capacity, it must first acquire a Letter of Credit (LC) from a large well-known banking institution. The LC bank will require Tri-Met to provide local sources of funds which will be available to pay for the short-term borrowing at the time it becomes due. Tri-Met intends to use a variety of sources of funds to meet this obligation.

Tri-Met intends to issue the full \$125 million General Obligation bonds authorized by the voters for the Westside Project. Of the bond proceeds, \$15 million has been designated for the Clackamas County Extension. Over the next five years, approximately \$4 million of interest earnings from the total \$125 million bond issuance will be available to support preliminary planning, land acquisition and related costs for a Clackamas County Light Rail Extension. Tri-Met intends to use the remaining Clackamas County bond proceeds to help meet the interim borrowing and CAPRA obligations of the Westside Project. As the interim borrowing obligations and CAPRA requirements decline, these bond proceeds will be the first moneys to be unencumbered, resulting in the availability of the \$15 million plus interest (less any previous expenditures from bond proceeds) to the Clackamas County Extension.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1646.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING)	RESOLUTION NO. 92-1646
COMMITMENT OF TRI-MET GENERAL)	
OBLIGATION BONDS TO EAST)	Introduced by
PORTLAND/CLACKAMAS COUNTY LRT)	Councilor Richard Devlin
DEVELOPMENT AND WESTSIDE CREDIT)	
ENHANCEMENT)	

WHEREAS, Tri-Met is currently finalizing its plans to undertake the acquisition, construction and installation of the Westside Corridor Extension to its existing system (the Westside Project); and

WHEREAS, The region intends to undertake preliminary planning, engineering, and acquisition of land pertaining to a future extension of the Light Rail System into Clackamas County; and

WHEREAS, The Westside Corridor Extension is currently estimated to have a total cost of \$944 million; and

WHEREAS, The Project will be built with funds from i) grant moneys from the Federal Transit Administration pursuant to a Full-Funding Grant Agreement; (ii) state grant moneys from the Oregon Department of Transportation; (iii) contributions by Tri-Met and the other regional participants; and (iv) the proceeds of the \$125 million in General Obligation bonds Tri-Met have been authorized by the voters to issue for the purpose of financing part of the Project costs; and

WHEREAS, Past actions have allocated \$15 million ("Bond Proceeds") of the \$125 million General Obligation bond issue to the proposed Light Rail System Expansion into Clackamas County; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met intends to issue the total of \$125 million in General Obligation bonds in July of 1992; and

WHEREAS, Because the FTA funds may not be made available as needed to fund the federal share of the Project as the most efficient construction schedule may allow, it may be necessary to use other available sources of funds as well as the proceeds of interim borrowing by Tri-Met (the "Interim Obligation") to pay such federal share pending receipt of the FTA funds in order to proceed with the Project in the most efficient and cost-effective manner; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met is required to establish a Capital Reserve Account (CAPRA) for the Project which funds must be held available and not otherwise be committed to the Project; and

WHEREAS, Tri-Met intends to fund all portions of the Project with moneys available at the time each portion requires funding; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District:

1. Endorses the sale of General Obligation bonds for the extension of the Light Rail System into Clackamas County in the amount of \$15 million ("Bond Proceeds") as a component of a single \$125 million bond sale.

2. Endorses the availability of approximately \$4 million in earned interest from the total \$125 million of bond proceeds over the next five years to pay for the costs of performing the Preliminary Engineering, Alternatives Analysis, Preliminary and Final Environmental Impact Statement and, if appropriate,

acquisition of land and rights-of-way needed for the East Portland/Clackamas County Corridor.

3. Endorses the use of the bond proceeds, pledged simultaneously with other regional Light Rail Bond Proceeds, if needed to meet interim borrowing obligations and CAPRA requirements of the Westside Project with the understanding that the bond proceeds will be the first moneys to be unencumbered when the Interim Obligations and CAPRA requirements have been satisfied. This will result in the availability of \$15 million plus interest (less any previous expenditures from bond proceeds) to the East Portland/Clackamas County Corridor.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this _____ day of _____, 1992.

Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

NM:lmk
92-1646.RES
7-2-92

STOP



Sensible Transportation Options for People

June 19, 1992
TRANSPORTATION DEPT.

Michal Wert
Project Development Manager
ODOT
9002 SE McLoughlin
Milwaukie, OR 97222

JUN 22 1992

Dear Michal,

Thank you for your letter of May 29, regarding our request for transportation modelling of the Bypass Alternative without the rural segment of the Bypass.

We know, from our discussions at the Western Bypass Study Committee meetings, that you felt our request was irrelevant, because the requested information could be determined from the Arterial Expansion/HOV Alternative, and impossible to honor, due to the time frame needed to complete the modelling.

We continue to believe that neither of your arguments are valid. First of all, the Arterial Expansion/HOV Alternative includes two significant road projects that are not included in the Bypass Alternative: the widening of Hwy 217 to 4 lanes in each direction between the Sunset Hwy and I-5, and the extension of Murray Blvd. as a 4-lane collector from SW Scholls Ferry Rd. to I-5.

Secondly, we have learned that a private individual has already obtained the modelling results we have requested, disproving your claim that they could not be produced in such a short period of time. And these results are in a format that can be easily understood by non-technical people; i.e., the same traffic volume maps ODOT has presented at Western Bypass Study committee meetings and public Open Houses.


You also requested that STOP discuss our proposals with your staff prior to presenting them at committee meetings. We did, in fact, just that. Dave Stewart, our representative on the CAC, presented our request to Bill Ciz prior to the committee meetings last month, but was told to present the request directly to the committees. Imagine my surprise when I presented our request to the TAC and was chastised for not talking with ODOT staff first. Such mixed signals are confusing, and make it extremely difficult to comply with your requests.

In discussing this matter with Bill Ciz on June 17, he assured me that our modelling request was "perfectly in line with the intent of the May committee meetings", and that it sparked constructive discussion between Bypass supporters and opponents at the Citizens Advisory Committee. He went on to say that the idea of removing the rural segment of the Bypass from the Bypass Alternative was "eye-opening" to both ODOT and the Study Team, and that ODOT intends to present the requested modelling results at the August committee meetings. This is certainly good news.

STOP's objective has always been to contribute to a process that will solve Washington County's significant traffic problems. So I am pleased that we have been able to promote hearty discussion and initiate additional analysis that may help to define better alternatives. Our contributions, however, are severely hampered when we are expected to meet conflicting demands. Your attention to this problem will help us communicate, and participate, more effectively.

Be sure to give me a call if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,



Meeky Blizzard
Executive Coordinator

cc: Western Bypass Study Committee members
Don Forbes, Director, ODOT
Michael Hollern, Chair, Oregon Transportation Commission
Steve Korson, Governor's Office
Metro Council
TPAC Members
JPACT Members
Washington County Board of Commissioners
CPO Chairs, Washington County
Senator Bob Shoemaker
Senator Dick Springer
STOP Board Members

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 92-1644 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES BETWEEN METRO AND ODOT FOR USE AND EXCHANGE OF FAU, STP AND STATE FUNDING

Date: June 17, 1992

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

Adopt Resolution No. 92-1644 establishing administrative procedures between Metro and ODOT for use and exchange of FAU, STP and state funding.

TPAC reviewed and approved Resolution No. 92-1644 on June 26. Their comments have been included into the Staff Report and Resolution. Their emphasis was that the proposal is essentially a one-time transfer for the use of STP funds and that future transfers be reviewed individually through the regular JPACT process. They also emphasized that state funds made available to local jurisdictions must provide for flexible programming consistent with STP funds.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

A meeting between the TIP Subcommittee and the ODOT Program Section was held June 10, 1992 to discuss and propose administrative procedures to exchange FAU funds for STP funds. The state obligation ceiling will not be met if it cannot develop a strategy to utilize the funds available through ISTEA.

Exhibit A has been prepared and incorporates the following strategies:

1. The FAU Program currently in the TIP could be eliminated and transferred into STP, thereby giving a new four-year expiration date.
2. The state could use all our remaining FAU and '92 STP funds in the TIP for use throughout the rest of the state in FY 1992.
3. In exchange for the FAU and STP funds, the state would provide the Metro region with an equivalent amount of STP funds for use in FY 1993 (or thereafter) and avoid potential lapse of funds.
4. The FAU projects with balances now in the TIP to be shifted to STP would be transferred to an STP account and would be programmed in the TIP similar to that under the FAU Program.

5. FY 1992 STP funds currently in the TIP have been reserved in the amount of \$8.3 million; these funds will be moved to FY 1993 because of lack of timely candidate projects. The state will use these STP funds elsewhere in the state in return for funds in FY 93.
6. To alleviate future problems of a similar nature, the state proposes to buy local federal funds at the rate of \$.94 (state) on the federal dollar.
7. All transactions will be thoroughly documented and subject to agreement by all participants.
8. Future transfers of regional and state funds, regardless of category, will follow the established JPACT review procedure.

To date, new STP funds have not been allocated because of the uncertainty of what types of projects have the greatest need pending the outcome of state and regional funding efforts. Despite this uncertainty, it is recommended that we proceed with an FY 92 allocation to ensure needed planning and project development activities are proceeding and eligible projects are advancing for future allocation.

In the meantime, Metro recommends the following actions:

Initiate planning and project development-type activities to ensure projects are in the pipeline for future year allocations. This would not be a construction commitment of dollars -- that will come later, but we need a good cross-section of activities, such as:

- . PE for various arterial projects that may be STP or Arterial Fund implemented.
- . PE or project development for transit which may be STP-fund or other-fund implemented.
- . Comprehensive regional Bike/Pedestrian Program.
- . TDM funds.
- . Meeting planning requirements of ISTEA and Rule 12. Possibilities include:
 - New Travel Behavior Survey
 - Region 2040
 - Development of management systems required by ISTEA:
 - * Pavement
 - * Bridge
 - * Safety
 - * Congestion
 - * Public Transit

- * Intermodal
- High-Speed Rail
- High-Capacity Transit

A TIP Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for July 14, 1:30 p.m., for the purpose of initiating the programming process for FY 93 and for the TIP update.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1644.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISH-)	RESOLUTION NO. 92-1644
ING ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES)	
BETWEEN METRO AND ODOT FOR)	Introduced by
USE AND EXCHANGE OF FAU, STP)	Councilor Richard Devlin
AND STATE FUNDING)	

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) have jointly developed administrative procedures to reduce the possibility of lapsing funds under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA); and

WHEREAS, The region receives annual Surface Transportation Program (STP) allocations and obligation authority over the life of ISTEA; and

WHEREAS, Metro will request of ODOT that FAU fund balances be exchanged for STP funds and that any remaining amounts currently programmed for FAU projects in the TIP be allocated to corresponding projects under the STP Program; and

WHEREAS, Metro and ODOT's Salem Program Section will establish the Metro area's annual authority and six-year obligation authority in order to assure compatibility between Metro and statewide program ceiling limitations; and

WHEREAS, State funds, by agreement, may be made available to Metro's local jurisdictions on individual projects by way of exchanging the jurisdictions' federal funds for state funds (\$.94 of state funds for one dollar of federal funds); now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District:

1. Establishes the administrative procedures for use and exchange of FAU, STP and state funding described in Exhibit A.

2. Recognizes that administration of dollars is to be closely controlled and documented by Metro and the state to account for overall authority, obligational ceiling levels, program shifts between years, and funding exchanges.

3. Requires that any regional flexible funds which are exchanged with the State of Oregon must be exchanged for flexible funds from the state.

4. Amends the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to reflect these actions.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this _____ day of _____, 1992.

Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

BP:lmk
92-1644.RES
6-29-92

EXHIBIT A

Administrative Procedures Between Metro and ODOT for Use and Exchange of FAU, STP and State Funding

1. Through ISTEA, the region receives annual STP allocation and obligation authority over the life of ISTEA. Metro may request of ODOT that FAU fund balances be exchanged for STP funds and that any remaining amounts currently programmed for FAU projects in the TIP be allocated to corresponding projects under the STP Program.
2. Metro and ODOT's Salem Program Section will mutually establish the Metro area's annual authority and six-year obligation authority in order to assure compatibility between Metro and statewide program ceiling limitations.
3. Annual programmed amounts may vary from annual allocations by mutual agreement of ODOT and Metro subject to:
 - ODOT's ability to accommodate shifts relative to the statewide program.
 - Region's assurance that future authority will be available on a one-for-one basis.
4. State funds may be made available to local jurisdictions and agencies on individual projects in exchange for federal funds (\$.94 of state funds for one dollar of federal funds). Metro must notify release of federal dollars to ODOT and carry state-funded projects in the TIP. The state is to routinely supply Metro with accountability of state expenditures similar to that currently provided for federal obligations.
5. Administration of dollars is to be closely controlled and documented by Metro and the state to account for overall authority, obligational ceiling levels, and program shifts between years. Metro and ODOT will identify annual shifts and local fund exchanges in Metro and state TIPs. Annual allocations will specify annual amounts for current year, cumulative allocations over duration of ISTEA, and effect on past and future years. State funds made available to local jurisdictions and agencies will provide flexibility consistent with STP funds. These actions must be jointly approved by Metro and ODOT.
6. Future transfers of regional and state funds should continue to be reviewed through the established JPACT process.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 92-1645 FOR THE PURPOSE OF REVISING THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA'S URBANIZED TRANS- PORTATION BOUNDARY TO ESTABLISH THE AREA ELIGIBLE FOR METRO STP FUNDS

Date: June 18, 1992

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

Resolution No. 92-1645 replaces the existing Federal-Aid Urban (FAU) boundary with a new and amended Urbanized Area Boundary (UAB) consistent with requirements of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. The boundary will establish an area for which the region will program Metro Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. Resolution No. 92-1645 also recommends that negotiations with the City of Wilsonville continue with the objective of adding their urban area to the UAB. Such an agreement must be completed by August. Adoption of Resolution No. 92-1645 enables the region to meet FHWA guidelines for the establishment of a "preliminary" UAB.

TPAC recommended approval of Resolution No. 92-1645 at its June 26 meeting and recommended discussions continue with the City of Wilsonville, ODOT, and FHWA for including the Wilsonville urban area within the Metro UAB.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Requirements

With enactment of the new ISTEA, states and MPOs are now required to take appropriate steps to adjust the Census-designated urban area boundary, if necessary, and complete the functional re-classification of all public roads and streets. Resolution No. 92-1645 provides the region's recommended UAB. The functional classification effort will begin later this summer with initial submittals required by the end of the year. FHWA offers the following background and guidance on the UAB:

1. Section 101(a) of Title 23 U.S.C. defines urban areas as urban places of 5,000 or more population and urbanized areas as designated by the Bureau of the Census. This section also allows the states, in cooperation with local officials, to expand the urban area boundaries, subject to approval by the Secretary. Prior to enactment of ISTEA, the locations of urban area boundaries had a number of significant program implications. Specifically, the urban area boundaries 1) defined the eligibility of routes for the use of urban system and secondary system funds; 2) defined the application of urban transportation planning requirements under 23 U.S.C.

134; and 3) defined the urban and rural limits for administering 23 U.S.C. 131 -- control of outdoor advertising. Although ISTEA has resulted in some major changes in the Federal-Aid highway program, the locations of urban area boundaries continue to have significant program implications. Therefore, an urban area boundary as defined under 23 U.S.C. 101(a) is required for each urban area.

2. For capital spending, urban area boundaries continue to determine the limits for urban system and secondary system funds until unobligated balances are exhausted. In addition, ISTEA requires that a portion of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds (including any additions from Donor State Bonus funds) and any minimum allocation funds be expended in areas of the state outside of urbanized areas with an urbanized population of over 200,000 and that a portion (110 percent of the amount of funds apportioned to the states for the secondary system for FY 1991) be expended outside of urban areas with a population greater than 5,000. Therefore, the urban area boundaries for urbanized areas with a population greater than 200,000 will define the limits of eligibility for funds that must be expended outside of such areas, and urban area boundaries for all urban and urbanized areas will define the limits of eligibility for funds that must be expended outside of urban areas with a population greater than 5,000. Although a portion of the STP funds are also allocated to urbanized areas with a population of over 200,000, the urban area boundaries for these areas are not controlling for these funds since they may be used anywhere within the metropolitan area boundary required by Section 1024 of ISTEA.
3. The urban area boundaries are also important in defining the eligibility of specific routes for the use of STP funds. Section 1007 of ISTEA specifies that projects may not be undertaken on roads functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors. Because the minor collector category only applies to rural areas, the urban area boundary defines the eligibility of specific routes for the use of STP funds.
4. Section 1024 of ISTEA establishes that metropolitan area boundaries must cover at least the existing urbanized area and the contiguous area expected to become urbanized within the 20-year forecast period and may encompass the entire metropolitan statistical area or consolidated metropolitan statistical area. This section further specifies that for areas designated as non-attainment areas for ozone or carbon monoxide under the Clean Air Act, the boundaries of the metropolitan area shall at least include the boundaries of the non-attainment area (except as otherwise provided by agreement between the MPO and the Governor).
5. In addition to the program requirements discussed in the above numbered paragraphs, urban area boundaries defined

under 23 U.S.C. 101(a) are used for statistical reporting, including the Highway Performance Monitoring System, needed to support national studies such as the report on "The Status of the Nation's Highways and Bridges: Conditions and Performance" and highway safety studies required by the Congress.

6. Adjustments to the Census-designated boundaries, where appropriate, are a necessary first step in the process of completing a functional reclassification of public roads and streets and then proposing routes for the NHS. To meet the December 18, 1993 date established by ISTEA for submitting the proposed NHS to the Congress, the states and MPOs must functionally classify streets and then identify a National Highway System.

Metro Urban Area Boundary

The FAU boundary was last changed in 1983 as a result of the 1980 census. At that time, the boundary was expanded to roughly approximate the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). In addition, Forest Grove, already within the Metro UGB, was added for consistency purposes. To transition Forest Grove into the FAU boundary, JPACT and the Metro Council agreed to allocate FAU funds to Forest Grove at an amount they would have received under state-allocated Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) funds. The transition period was through 1986.

For the current exercise, the state has developed for Metro review a series of maps encompassing the region which show differences between the existing FAU boundary and the designated census urbanized area. For the most part, the FAU boundary is either the same or exceeds in size the designated census urbanized areas. In those instances, it is recommended there be no changes to the UAB. Two instances occur where it is recommended to expand the UAB:

1. Where the designated census urbanized area exceeds the existing FAU boundary; and
2. Wilsonville and an I-5 connection with the rest of the UAB.

Exhibit A to Resolution No. 92-1645 maps and describes both instances. As can be seen, the census urbanized areas which exceed the FAU boundary are relatively small (identified as Nos. 1 through 6 on the Exhibit A map). Those areas are recommended for inclusion in Metro's UAB consistent with FHWA guidelines.

Wilsonville is recommended as the major addition to the UAB (No. 7 on the map). Although now qualifying as an independent urban area (by reaching 5,000 in population), Wilsonville should be included within the Metro UAB for the following reasons:

1. Wilsonville is within the Portland area UGB and was the only major urban area excluded from the FAU boundary in 1983.
2. Wilsonville is included in Metro's MPO boundary and is subject to planning requirements or objectives as identified in the RTP, the annual TIP, and RUGGOs. As such, Wilsonville is included in the Region 2040 study area boundary as urban.
3. Wilsonville is within the Portland area non-attainment boundaries for ozone and carbon monoxide.
4. Inclusion in the Metro UAB will facilitate consistency between regional policy and finance in Wilsonville, and will provide consistency in the eyes of the state and the region as Transportation System Plans are developed in response to state Transportation Rule 12.

TPAC discussion focused on providing a transition period for Wilsonville similar to the one provided Forest Grove. However, the new ISTEA does not allow for suballocations of STP funds to areas. As such, TPAC suggested that Metro, ODOT and the City of Wilsonville continue discussions towards including the Wilsonville urban area within the Metro UAB. TPAC's intent is to provide, during a transition period, continuity for Wilsonville in their transportation capital planning while maintaining an equitable share of Metro STP funds for the region. Discussions will focus on the change in the amount of Metro STP funds which could be expected with addition of Wilsonville and on the inclusion of Wilsonville projects in the TIP eligible for Metro STP funds. A separate resolution will be forwarded for JPACT review, as necessary, in August.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1645.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF REVISING)	RESOLUTION NO. 92-1645
THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN)	
AREA'S URBANIZED TRANSPORTATION)	Introduced by
BOUNDARY TO ESTABLISH THE AREA)	Councilor Richard Devlin
ELIGIBLE FOR METRO STP FUNDS)	

WHEREAS, The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 allows the states, in cooperation with local officials, to expand their transportation Urban Area Boundary (formerly Federal-Aid Urban boundary); and

WHEREAS, The placement of the boundary identifies the limits for capital spending and defines the eligibility of specific routes for Metro Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding under ISTEA; and

WHEREAS, The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) representing the state, the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) representing appropriate local officials have reviewed that boundary; and

WHEREAS, Review of that boundary has identified necessary changes; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District recommends that ODOT submit to the United States Department of Transportation appropriate documentation to reflect changes to the Metropolitan Service District transportation Urban Area Boundary consistent with those changes described and mapped in Exhibit A, Nos. 1-6.

2. That staff be directed to work with ODOT and City of

Wilsonville officials to develop an agreement to include the Wilsonville urban area within the Metro UAB and that the agreement provide for a transition period to continue Wilsonville's current level of transportation capital programming while maintaining an equitable ratio of Metro STP funds to other statewide STP funds as a result of the UAB expansion.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this ____ day of _____, 1992.

Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

92-1645.RES
MH:lmk
6-29-92

EXHIBIT A

FEDERAL-AID URBAN (FAU) BOUNDARY CHANGES
CONSISTENT WITH THE CENSUS URBANIZED AREA (CUA) DESIGNATION

(Changes are identified by the 7.5 minute quad map)

1. Linnton Quad

- The CUA designation is slightly north of the FAU boundary in the vicinity of the Newberry Rd. and Skyline Rd. intersection. This will bring **Skyline Rd. from Portland city limit to Newberry Rd. and Newberry Rd. from Skyline Rd. to Portland city limit** into the FAU system.

2. Damascus Quad

- **Butler Road between Gresham city limit and 190th Drive** will be added to FAU system with boundary shift to include CUA within FAU boundary.

3. Camas Quad and Mt. Tabor Quad

- The CUA designation is north of Marine Drive between I-205 and Troutdale, while the FAU boundary is south of Marine Drive. Shifting the FAU boundary north of Marine Drive will bring **Marine Drive between I-205 and Arata Creek (east of Sundial Road)** into the FAU system. There is one small exception to this, for the **segment of Marine Drive between 185th and the Gresham city limit (approximately 1,000' to the east)** both the FAU and CUA designations remain south of Marine Drive.

4. Gales Creek Quad

- The CUA designation extends west of the FAU boundary along and north of Gales Creek Road. A short segment of **Gales Creek Road between the existing FAU boundary and the west city limit of Forest Grove** will be brought into the FAU system.


5. Sandy Quad

- The CUA is east of the FAU boundary along 282nd Avenue. Shifting the FAU boundary will bring **282nd Avenue between the Gresham city limit (north of Lusted Rd.) and the Gresham city limit (north of Orient Drive)** into the FAU system.

6. Hillsboro Quad

- The CUA designation is outside of the FAU boundary including a portion of U.S. 26 and Shute Road. Incorporating this into the FAU will add U.S. 26 between Shute Road and Hillsboro city limit (just east of powerlines) and will add Shute Road between Jacobson Road and Evergreen Road.
- A segment of Evergreen Road between 268th and 278th was realigned and should be re-designated as the FAU boundary.

EXHIBIT A



FAU Boundary
Portland Metropolitan Area

--- Proposed boundary changes
— FAU Boundary

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 92-1647 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING ODOT'S RECOMMENDED SIX-YEAR PROGRAM REDUCTIONS

Date: June 19, 1992

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would accept ODOT's proposed reductions in projects proposed for funding in the 1993-1998 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (Six-Year Program). The resolution reflects the projects which are necessary to be removed from the Six-Year Program in order to have a balanced program of projects and funding.

At the June 26 TPAC meeting, there was considerable discussion regarding ODOT's proposed revisions to the Six-Year Program. The discussion centered on the process which ODOT used to develop the list, specific projects which were revised, and the need to develop a new process for addressing new flexible funding opportunities afforded by ISTEA. Specific comments resulting from this discussion are found in Resolve No. 2 in the attached Resolution.

TPAC has reviewed the proposed reductions and recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1647.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

At the February JPACT meeting, there was a brief presentation and discussion of ODOT's Draft Six-Year Program. Metro and ODOT staff explained at the meeting that the initial draft of the Six-Year Program was overprogrammed by \$173 million and that project deferrals would be necessary. Direction was then given to ODOT by JPACT to bring a recommended balanced program to a subsequent JPACT meeting.

In a related issue, at the April JPACT meeting, a resolution was adopted which recommended that ODOT program \$22 million of flexible Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to the Westside Corridor LRT project. There was an understanding reached when this resolution was adopted that this transfer of funds would require an additional \$22 million reduction in highway projects from this region over the life of the Six-Year Program. This reduction was considered acceptable in light of the increased funding level coming to the region as a result of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

At the June meeting of the Oregon Transportation Commission, the Commission adopted the allocation of \$22 million of STP funds to the Westside project and noted that some projects must be deferred as a result. Therefore, the revised Six-Year Program is

a balanced program which includes the \$22 million STP allocation to the Westside Corridor project. Exhibit A is ODOT's recommended list of deferred projects to balance the Six-Year Program. The list includes projects from both the construction and developmental sections of the program. The OTC has requested the Metro region to provide comments on this list.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING) RESOLUTION NO. 92-1647
ODOT'S RECOMMENDED SIX-YEAR)
PROGRAM REDUCTIONS) Introduced by
Councilor Richard Devlin

WHEREAS, The Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT's) Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program will be adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) on July 21, 1992; and

WHEREAS, The Six-Year Program must demonstrate a balance of projects and resources; and

WHEREAS, It was necessary to defer numerous projects from the first draft of the Six-Year Program in order to result in a balanced program; and

WHEREAS, ODOT has requested that the region have the opportunity to comment on the list of projects that would be deferred and/or reduced; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District has:

1. Reviewed the list of projects recommended by ODOT to be deleted from the current Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program.

2. Accepts the recommended deferrals (Exhibit A) as necessary to achieve a balanced program with the following comments:

a. The status of the project on NE Columbia Boulevard - Lombard at 60th should be changed from "request" to "developmental."

- b. The entire I-5/Greeley to Banfield project should continue to move forward and complete conceptual engineering during Phase II engineering.
- c. The Lake Oswego park-and-ride lot should be included as a reconnaissance project.
- d. Projects which improve urban mobility, such as the Columbia Boulevard, Troutdale interchange and Stafford Road projects, should be given more emphasis in this and future updates of the Six-Year Program.
- e. ODOT should meet with local jurisdictions and explain the process that was used to develop the revisions to the proposed Six-Year Program as outlined in June correspondence to Metro.
- f. The region acknowledges that this Six-Year Program is the last to be developed under old planning regulations and is eager to work cooperatively with ODOT to define a process for implementing new flexible funding opportunities afforded by ISTEA.
- g. The region wishes to thank ODOT for being a progressive and cooperative partner in its historic allocation of \$22 million of flexible STP funds to the Westside LRT project.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this ____ day of _____, 1992.

Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

RB:lmk
92-1647.RES
6-29-92

EXHIBIT A

Oregon

June 19, 1992

DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

HIGHWAY DIVISION

Region 1

FILE CODE:

Richard Brandman
Transportation Planning Manager
Metropolitan Service District
2000 SW First Ave.
Portland, OR 97201

Subject: Revisions to Proposed 1993-1998 Six-Year Transportation
Improvement Program

Pursuant to recommendations from the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, we have identified a balanced Six-Year Program. This includes \$22 million of state STP funds for support of the Westside Light Rail Transit Project.

In order to reduce the overprogramming and identify the \$22 million for the Westside LRT, ODOT staff reviewed comments and recommendations made on the proposed transportation improvement program dated May 1992. The attachments summarize the list of projects that have been reduced in scope or deleted from the previous draft. Also listed are the projects that were initially incorporated as new projects in the preliminary draft from the previous 1991-1996 program.

As noted in the attached, two major highway projects were added based on comments on the January 1992 preliminary draft. These include the Sunnybrook interchange and seismic retrofitting of the Marquam Bridge. The other major project added was the \$22 million for lightrail transit.

The Oregon Transportation Commission is requesting the Metro Region's recommendations on accepting the program reduction and adjustments to the developmental section.


Theodore A. Spence
Plan and Program Manager

TS:smc:6-YRTIP.REV



9002 SE McLoughlin
Milwaukie, OR 97222
(503) 653-3090
FAX (503) 653-3267

June 18, 1992

Changes to the 1993-1998 Transportation Improvement Program - As reflected in the Proposed Program

The Region requested the State to provide the detail of the "Balanced" Six Year Program for its information and review. The balanced program was developed in order to match programmed amounts to projected revenues. Projects shown in the Preliminary program were modified to achieve the required "balance".

The following projects were deleted from the construction program.

<u>Highway</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Status</u>
US-30 BUS.	97	NE COLUMBIA - LOMBARD @ 60TH	6,904	Request
I-5	98	SW HOOD - TERWILLIGER	41,563	Request
99E	96	HAROLD - TACOMA	6,440	Dev.R/W
99E	97	MLK JR./GRAND VIA-SE HAROLD	6,420	Dev.R/W
I-5	93	TUALATIN PARK & RIDE	400	Tri-Met build
OR-43	96	WEST LINN PARK & RIDE	462	Tri-Met Lease
99E	96	MILWAUKIE PARK & RIDE	2,500	Tri-Met Build

Total deleted \$ 64,689,000

The following projects were reduced in scope to help balance the program:

<u>Highway</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Orig. Cost</u>	<u>Prop. Cost</u>	<u>Reduction</u>
Columbia	94	223RD - TROUTDALE	50,320	40,078	10,242

(Troutdale Interchange has been removed as part of this unit and placed in development. This project was a discretionary project in the Preliminary Draft. It is now funded with NHS/FAI funds in the Proposed Draft. It does not qualify for Discretionary Funds under the new Surface Transportation Act.)

<u>Highway</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Orig. Cost</u>	<u>Prop. Cost</u>	<u>Reduction</u>
US-26	98	185TH-CEDAR HILLS	40,119	26,351	13,768

(The limits of this project have been reduced to a section called Murray - 217 to be constructed in 1997.)

<u>Highway</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Orig. Cost</u>	<u>Prop. Cost</u>	<u>Reduction</u>
OR-208	96	209TH - MURRAY	26,273 (State & Local)		
	96	Unit 1		6,999	
	Dev.	Unit 2		1,050 R/W	9,000

(This project is being split into two units. County will be funding half of Unit 1 for \$3.5M. Unit 2 is in the development section of the program with \$1M for R/W. The remaining construction costs are being deferred at this time with State's share (50 percent) being \$9M.)

Total Reductions \$33,010,000

Grand Total Reduced \$ 97,699,000

The New Proposed Program will identify the additional \$22M for Westside LRT.

**MAJOR PROJECT MODIFICATIONS TO THE 1993-1998 PRELIMINARY
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>HIGHWAY</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PRELIMINARY TOTAL COST R/W, PE, CONST. (Million)</u>	<u>ADJUSTED PROGRAM TOTAL COST</u>	<u>LOCAL SHARE</u>
*	93	Pacific	Tualatin Park & Ride	.4	---	
	93	Sunset	S.W. Center-S.W. 76th LRT	46	65.8	27
	93	Columbia	I-84 @ 82nd Park & Ride	.3	.3	
**	93	Pacific	W.Marquam Intch-Marquam Br.	---	9	
**	93	Pacific	I-5 Seismic Retrofit	---	1	
**	94	Pacific	Boones Ferry-Commerce Cir.	---	1.6	
	94	Oswego	Taylor's Ferry-I205 (MAC)	1.7	1.7	
	94	Columbia	Gateway Park & Ride	2.3	2.3	
***/*	94	Columbia	223rd-Troutdale	50.3	40.0	
*	96	Pacific E	MLK/Grand - SE Harold	13.0	6.6	
*	96	Farmington	209th - Murray	26.3	8.0	3.5
*	96	Pacific E.	Milwaukie Park & Ride	2.5	---	
**	96		LRT	---	22.0	
*	96	Oswego	West Linn Park & Ride	.5	---	
	96	L.Colum.R.	Sandy Macs Projects	5.1	5.1	
	96	Tualatin V.	Beav/Tigard/117th	4.6	4.6	
*	96	Pacific E.	Harold - Tacoma	13	6.6	
	97	47 Bypass	Council Creek-Quince	9	9.0	4.5
*	97	L.Colum.R.	N. Colum.-Lombard @ 60th	6.9	---	
	97	Various	Priority Macs Project	3.9	3.9	
*	98	Pacific	Hood - Terwilliger	41.6	---	
	98	Various	Priority Macs Project	3.8	3.8	
	98	Sunset	185th - Cedar Hills	40.1	26.3	
**	98	E.Port.	Sunnybrook Interchange	---	23.6	6.8
Total				\$ 272.9	241.2	41.8

* Reduced or deferred in order to balance program (see attached)

** Added to Proposed (May 1993) Six Year Program

*** Moved from Discretionary funding to NHS/FAI in May 1993 Proposed Program

Pre-AA CAC Membership - Summary Table

July 8, 1992

Name	Area of Representation		Local Jurisdiction Appointment
Tony Bacon	I-5 North	Clark Co.	Clark County
Karen Ciocia			
Jane Floyd			Vancouver
Joyce Goetze		Portland	
Julie Green			
Lynn Bonner			
Fred Stewart			
Bob Wise	Downtown Portland	Portland	
Pam Crownover			
Dave Austin			
Rick Williams			
Betsy Lindsey	Milwaukie Corridor	S.W. Portland	
Greg Parker			
Dorothy Hall		S.E. Portland	
Bob Elliot			
Champ Husted		Milwaukie	Milwaukie
Darlene Weil		Clackamas Co.	
Bill Miller	I-205 and Milwaukie Corridors	Molalla	
Hank Rice		Oregon City	Oregon City
Doug O’Brien		Clackamas Town Center	
Irene Park			
Bob Hennesey			Clackamas Co.
Pat Beyer	I-205 South	Lents	
Steve Anderson	I-205 North Corridor	Multnomah Co.	Multnomah Co.
Dennis Olson			Port of Portland
Barbara Yasson		Clark Co.	
Craig Walker			
Mark Fisher	Westside		Washington Co.

Bill Miller: Member of the Molalla Transportation District Board. Member and past chairman of the Tri-Met Advisory Board on Accessible Transportation. Past member of the Clackamas County Commissioner's Advisory Board for Area Agency on Aging. Customer Representative Office Support Trainer, Portland General Electric.

Doug O'Brien: Works for the Hahn Corporation, new property managers of Clackamas Town Center. Has indicated an interest in incorporating light rail and a transfer station into the Town Center complex.

Irene Park: Resident of the area just north of Clackamas Town Center. Small business owner in the Milwaukie area.

Greg Parker: Has represented the North Macadam Business Association in discussions with the City of Portland on plans for the Jefferson St. rail right-of-way. Vice President with Schnitzer-Zidell Development Corp., a major land owner in the John's Landing area.

Fred Stewart: Chair of the King Improvement Association. Active in neighborhood issues. Real estate agent.

Craig Walker: Active in transportation issues and the Fisher Mill Neighborhood Association.

Darlene Weil: Vice President of the Marketing and Tourism Committee of the North Clackamas Chamber. Member of the Small Business Development Advisory Board for Clackamas Community College. Works as a Designated Broker for Public Storage, Inc., at the Public Storage Business Park.

Rick Williams: Vice President of Association for Portland Progress, a non-profit agency representing Portland downtown business interests.

Barbara Yasson: A citizen at-large member of the Citizen Task Force on I-5/I-205 High Capacity Transit study for Clark County. Active member of the Salmon Creek Neighborhood Association.

**I-5/I-205/Milwaukie Pre-AA
Citizens Advisory Committee
Local Jurisdictions Nominations**

City of Portland

Bob Wise:

Director of Planning at Portland State University, liaison to the State Board of Education. Member of the Downtown Rail Advisory Committee and is a member of the City's Environmental Commission.

City of Milwaukie

Champ Husted:

Owner of Milwaukie Bowl. Involved with the North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce and the Milwaukie Downtown Development Association.

Washington County

Mark Fisher:

Manager of Development for Standard Insurance, specifically of the Tanasbourne development and Standard Plaza (1000 employees in downtown). Member of CPO 7 (Rock Creek). Member of Sunset Corridor Association. Commutes daily from Rock Creek to downtown.

Clark County

Tony Bacon:

Founder and former President of Bacon & Hunt Inc., a public relations consulting firm. Long-time Vancouver resident. Former journalist for the Oregonian who now publishes his own weekly newsletter, "The Insider"; reporting on various government issues in the Clark County region.

City of Vancouver

Jane Floyd:

Recently retired chair of the Vancouver Planning Commission. Served the commission for eight years, dealing with a wide range of environmental, transportation and land use issues in both a regulatory and policy capacity.

Clackamas County

Bob Hennesey:

A realtor with substantial knowledge of the Clackamas Town Center area. He currently serves on the Marketing Subcommittee of Clackamas County's Economic Development Commission.

Port of Portland

Dennis Olson:

Director of Properties for Alaska Airlines, a major employer at the airport.

Multnomah County

Steve Anderson:

Active member of both the Parkrose Community Group and the Sandy Boulevard Business Association. Works as a realtor. Member of the Rotary. TPAC alternate.

City of Oregon City

Hank Rice:

President of Buck Ambulance. Incoming President of the Oregon City Chamber of Commerce and current Chair of the Government Affairs Committee.

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE SPACT

DATE 7-9-92

NAME

AFFILIATION

Mike Roglund	Metro
Andy Cofredo	Metro
RICHARD DEWYN	"
Les White	C-TRAN
STEVE LARRANCE	WA. CO.
TOM WALSH	TRI-MET
MIKE THORNE	PORT
CRAIG J Lomnicki	CITIES OF CLACKAMAS Co
Gerry Smyth	WSDOT
Don Adams	ODOT
Susan McLean	Metro
Ed Weigelt	CLACKAMAS Co.
Steve Greenwood	DEQ
Jim Gardner	Metro
Cliff Clark	Cities of Wash County
Larry Sprecher	
Richard Brandman	
Karen Shackston	
Bob Wick	T-M
Janice Clark	ODOT
Dale C. Chambers	WASHINGTON Co LAND USE Advisory Committee - CHAIRMAN
PICK TEENEY	TRI MET
STEVE DOTTERER	CITY OF PORTLAND

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE SPACT

DATE 7-9-92

NAME

AFFILIATION

Lois Anderson	WSDOT - Olympia
Dean Lookingbill	(KTC) Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Keith Ahola	WSDOT
LAVIE GARRETT	TRI-MET
Robert Cook	Operating Engineers
Bud Roberts	City of Beaverton
John Rosenberger	Washington County
GEOFF LARKIN	The Larkin Group, Inc.
John Riel	ODOT
Ted Spencer	ODOT
David Lohman	Port of Portland
GB ARRINGTON	TRI-MET
Richard S	Metro