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Agenda

Date: June 14, 1979
Day: Thursday
Time: 7:30 a.m.
Place: Conference Room "D"

1. **CANDIDATE PROBLEMS FOR MSD RESERVE**

   This is an informational item requested by JPACT. TPAC had no comment or recommendation. Staff intends to firm up a list of candidate problem areas by June 22, 1979.

2. **RECOMMENDED CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING PROBLEM AND PROJECT PRIORITIES FOR THE MSD RESERVE**

   Major Issues:

   What policies are to be used to screen a large number of problem areas to a smaller group and determine which projects should be funded with the MSD Reserve.

   TPAC Concerns:

   A. What funds are available for projects serving only local circulation needs?

      **Staff Response:** Traditional FAU funds (or Interstate Transfer funds replacing FAU funds) or Title II Safety funds are available for these types of projects.

   B. Why shouldn't cost overruns on previously funded projects be eligible?

      **Staff Response:** Contingency funds have been established to cover such overruns. Information on the extent of overruns (which projects and how much cost) won't be available for some time.

   C. What is the definition of regional travel movements?

      **Staff Response:** Included are major travel flows between cities, counties and other large-scale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DICK CARROLL</td>
<td>WADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bothman</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLINE MILLER</td>
<td>MSD #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Fisher</td>
<td>Washco Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Borresen</td>
<td>Wash Co. Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Johnson</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Cole</td>
<td>Beaverton City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL MYERS</td>
<td>Mayor of Gresham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Batsin</td>
<td>DIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN FREINDS</td>
<td>TRI-MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Stush</td>
<td>MSD Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Schadeen</td>
<td>MSD Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Williams</td>
<td>MSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Edwards</td>
<td>WDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John MacGregor</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Oglee</td>
<td>Wash Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Haas</td>
<td>MSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bay</td>
<td>TRI-MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Murphy</td>
<td>Mult. Co. Oreq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna Mueller-Crispin</td>
<td>Portland liaison at MSD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAME

Gary Spanovich
Alan Harvey
Rose Besserman
Connie Kearney
Karen Hackston

AFFILIATION

MSD
City Manager, Vancouver
Vancouver
Clark Co.
MSD
activities (such as regional shopping centers, large industrial complexes, or regionally significant cultural centers).

D. What kind of citizen involvement is planned?

_Staff Response:_ The approved study process describes a citizen involvement process including public hearings (meetings may also be called by sponsoring jurisdictions).

E. Will an assessment of the likely implementation schedule be made when a project is funded to ensure correspondence with the availability of federal funds?

_Staff Response:_ This type of check is needed to ensure funds are only spent on preliminary engineering on projects which can be implemented within the federal timeframes.

**TPAC Recommendation:**

Approve the criteria subject to the following qualifiers:

A. _Staff Report #44, p. 6, Policy II, Criteria 2 - add "residential areas."_

B. _Staff will review the proposed "measures of effectiveness" for each criteria with local jurisdictional staff before applying the policies and criteria to the 15-20 high priority problems._

C. _A schedule for obligating PE funds be set when projects are funded._

_Staff Recommendation:_

Approve with TPAC changes and forward for Council Adoption

3. **QUARTERLY REPORT**

This information report shows the status of MSD funding authorizations.

4. **TRANSPORTATION RELATED ENERGY PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MSD REGION**

**Major Issues:**

What has been done for energy planning and what are other agencies doing? What should MSD be doing?
TPAC Concerns:

If additional energy planning becomes a priority, which work item would be dropped?

TPAC Recommendation:

None.

Staff Recommendation: The recommendations are included in the forwarding memo.

5. STATUS REPORT ON WATER TRANSPORTATION PROPOSALS

An oral information report will be given.

6. DESCRIPTION OF TRAVEL SIMULATION TECHNIQUES

This information report was prepared in response to a request from JPACT members. Staff will present a short oral report.

7. AMEND THE INTERIM TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM AND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE I-505 ALTERNATIVE

Major Issues:

Need to process the I-505 alternative so that the project can be programmed once the I-505 withdrawal is approved.

TPAC Concerns:

None.

TPAC and Staff Recommendations:

Forward to Council recommending adoption of resolutions.

8. AIR QUALITY PROGRESS REPORT

Major Issues:

How should the SIP planning process accommodate the decision of the Environmental Quality Commission to have a state ozone standard which is lower than the federal standard?

TPAC Concerns:

A. What types of controls would need to be examined to achieve the state standard?
B. Who would fund the additional planning needed to examine and achieve agreement on control measures addressing the state standard?

C. What happens on the Washington side of the river?

D. Would it be possible to use .12 as the primary standard and .08 as the secondary?

E. Could the time frame for meeting the state standard be set beyond the federal compliance dates?

TPAC Recommendation

None.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff should work with DEQ to outline the impacts of the .08 standard and how it should be addressed in the SIP.

9. MSD CONTRACTS

Attached is a list of contracts described in the UWP which are to be signed on or about July 1, 1979. The Council has requested JPACT to review the contracts.
MEETING REPORT

DATE: May 10, 1979

SUBJECT: Meeting of Joint Policy Advisory Commission on Transportation (JPACT)

GROUP: Council Transportation Committee:
Charlie Williamson, Chairman, Donna Stuhr, Caroline Miller

Implementation Agency Representatives:
Bob Bothman, (ODOT), Bill Young (DEQ), Lloyd Anderson (Tri-Met), Florence Walker (Tri-Met), Gerald Edwards (WSDOT)

Elected Officials:
Larry Cole, (Beaverton), Don Clark (Multnomah County), Stan Skoko (Clackamas County), Allen Manuel (Milwaukie)

Others:
Doug Wentworth, Bill Ockert, Frank Angelo, Gary Spanovich, Terry Waldele, Ted Spence, Dick Arenz, Bill Parrish, Bebe Rucker, Winston Kurth, Joan M. Cartales, Alayne Woolsey, Karen Thackston

Charlie Williamson called the meeting to order and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

IA. Voting Procedures for JPACT

The committee agreed with Mr. Williamson's recommendation that votes of the various members not be mixed. Instead, on votes which do not have unanimous support, the names of members voting on each side of an issue be listed.

IB. JPACT Meeting Schedule

Members were surveyed to determine preferences for meeting time. After reviewing the survey findings (absentee's will also be polled), Mr. Williamson indicated he will set a permanent day and time. The June meeting will be held on June 14. Karen Thackston will notify members of the time and place.

2. Tri-Met Radios-TIP Amendment

Bill Ockert summarized the questions raised by TPAC in April and answers provided by Tri-Met. He reported that TPAC was satisfied with the answers and had unanimously endorsed the amendment.

Don Clark moved and was seconded to forward the TIP amendment for approval by the full Council. Motion passed unanimously.
3. Work Trips and Air Quality (Information)

Bill Ockert reviewed the staff analysis concerning the role of work trips in the ozone problem. The analysis shows that 1) major reductions in work trips by the automobile can significantly improve air quality and 2) work trip reductions alone would not bring about compliance with ozone standards. Federal standards would be violated even if all auto commuters were eliminated in 1982. Based on the analysis, staff recommended that efforts continue to identify and evaluate measures which would attract the auto commuter from the single occupant auto. Other measures directed toward reducing emissions from non-work trips, truck trips, and stationary/area sources should also be emphasized.

4. Air Quality State Implementation Plan (SIP)

Terry Waldele explained that the SIP is basically a work program describing transportation control measures which will be evaluated to bring about conformance with federal air quality standards. He summarized a number of comments received from members of TPAC and the AQMA Advisory Committee as well as staff responses. He pointed out that TPAC had recommended approval of the SIP.

Councilman Cole moved and was seconded to forward the SIP to the full Council for adoption; motion passed unanimously.

5. FY 1980 UWP

Bill Ockert pointed out changes made to the draft document distributed at the last meeting.

Gerry Edwards, (WSDOT) questioned the handling of the Clark County RPC portion since it has not been approved in Washington. Staff response was that the Council should adopt the UWP subject to the Washington portion being approved by RPC.

Bill Young asked how energy planning was being included in this year's work program. Staff responded that a number of planning projects included efforts to assess the energy impacts of transportation alternatives but that funds were not available for broader energy conservation activities. The Committee discussion centered on the need to pursue energy conservation planning. Staff was asked to survey various parties to find out who is doing what, what has been done and what else needs to be done and to report back the findings next month to the committee.

Don Clark moved and was seconded to forward the UWP to the Council for approval subject to approval by RPC and adjustment of Table Four of the Washington component to reconcile differences in the pass-through funds to MSD with the other budget tables. Motion was unanimously approved.
6. Priority for the Oregon City Bypass

Bill Ockert summarized their analysis of the projects having committed federal funds. He pointed out that it was the only project involving significant increases in the capacity to move people along a major regional corridor which could use additional state matching funds in the future.

Commissioner Skoko commented that Clackamas County and Oregon City very strongly support the project.

Mr. Cole suggested that the Sunset/217 interchange should be designated "yes" on attachment A of the resolution. The Staff agreed to this change. Lloyd Anderson moved to amend attachment A to change 217/Sunset to "yes". Motion passed. The full resolution was moved by Lloyd Anderson and seconded to forward to the Council for approval. Motion passed unanimously.

Bill Young asked about access controls on the bypass. Access controls on new facilities were discussed. JPACT asked staff to consider having access control as one of the criteria to be used in allocating funds to projects.

7. Criteria for Identifying and Selecting Projects to Use Interstate Reserve

The draft criteria were outlined by Gary Spanovich. Bob Bothman of the state gave high priority to projects involving the maintenance of current facilities. A copy of the introduction to the state's six year program will be distributed to the committee in that the introduction contains the state policy.

Lloyd Anderson requested a list of the problems already identified by the local jurisdictions. The committee was requested to contact Gary Spanovich. A final draft of the criteria will be distributed prior to the next meeting. Committee action is scheduled for the June meeting.


Bill Ockert said that TPAC had recommended MSD coordinate emergency energy planning. He said that limited effort could be made in coordination by using technical assistance funds. The committee withheld further discussion until staff returned with a survey of energy planning activities.

9. Coordination of Computers

Bill Ockert explained the MSD will be receiving a small computer at the end of June which will be available to Tri-Met and ODOT.

If Tri-Met gets a larger computer, it will probably be two years away and the MSD computer can be used to feed the larger computer.
10. Status of Contingency Accounts

The staff memo explaining the MSD contingency accounts was distributed. Bill Ockert suggested the Committee review the process to allocate contingency funds and cover cost overruns in July.

No further business, the Committee meeting was adjourned.
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### MSD CONTRACTS SPECIFIED IN THE FY 1980 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM
**WHICH ARE TO BE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT WITH</th>
<th>TYPE OF CONTRACT</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF CONTRACT</th>
<th>TYPE OF FUNDS</th>
<th>MSD MATCHING FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>Receive Funds</td>
<td>$ 65,000</td>
<td>Federal PL Funds&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68,593</td>
<td>Federal TQX Funds&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Matching Funds&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>Federal TQX Funds to be Passed Through to Tri-Met</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMTA</td>
<td>Receive Funds</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>Federal Sect. 8 Funds</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87,200</td>
<td>Federal Sect. 8 Funds to be Passed Through to Tri-Met</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,605</td>
<td>Interstate Transfer Funds</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,250</td>
<td>Interstate Transfer Funds to be Passed Through to Clackamas County</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Co.</td>
<td>Receive Funds</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td>Federal Sect. 8 Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Federal Sect. 175 Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>Federal PL Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,250</td>
<td>Federal HPR Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>RPC Matching Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri Met</td>
<td>Discharge Pass</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>Federal TQX Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: June 14, 1979

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

PERSONS IN ATTENDANCE: MSD Councilors Williamson, Miller, Stuhr and Schedeen, Dick Carroll, Com. Connie Kearney, Councilman Larry Cole, Lloyd Anderson

Ted Spence, Connie Cleaton, Ken Rose, Ken Johnson, Dick Arenz, Frank Angelo, Lynn Dingler

MSD staff members Bill Ockert, Terry Waldele, Keith Lawton, Gary Spanovich, and Karen Thackston

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

General Announcements:

Coun. Williamson has received numerous letters requesting a traffic signal at Marylhurst College. Staff should have a recommendation in July.

1. Candidate Problems for MSD Reserve

The candidate problem list was prepared at JPACT's request. Staff has worked with jurisdictional staffs to identify problems. JPACT felt that elected officials should be notified of the process. The staff agreed to notify the chief elected officials of each jurisdiction.

2. Recommended Criteria for Establishing Problem and Project Priorities for the MSD Reserve

Lloyd Anderson expanded on his letter to Charlie Williamson. He felt that emphasis should be given to projects which:

(1) protect the mobility of regional facilities through roadway design standards, control adjacent land use, access control and other measures

(2) are sponsored by local jurisdictions that are financing road improvements through local revenue sources, and

(3) are sponsored by local jurisdictions that can demonstrate that local developers contribute to the financing of roadway improvements.
Mr. Anderson moved and was seconded to include these three items in the criteria. Motion PASSED unanimously.

The Committee discussed the need for more incentive to promote transit improvements. Coun. Miller moved and was seconded to add a policy stating that special consideration would be given to solutions involving alternatives to the single occupant automobile. PASSED unanimously.

Lloyd Anderson moved and was seconded to amend Policy IV -- Environmental Goals by adding projects which reduce noise and visual problems. PASSED unanimously.

Councilman Cole moved and was seconded to adopt the amended criteria (including the amendments recommended by TPAC) and forward to the Council. Motion PASSED unanimously.

3. TIP Quarterly Report

The report describing MSD funding authorization through December 31, 1978, was distributed. No discussion.

4. Transportation Related Energy Planning Activities in the MSD Region

This report was requested by JPACT. Bill Ockert explained the content and the staff recommendation. Dick Arenz, FHWA, stated that the Intermodal Planning Group will require some energy planning be included in the UWP. Caroline Miller moved and was seconded to recommend that the Council request Rick Gustafson, Mike Burton and Charles Williamson to meet with the state to discuss MSD's role in energy planning. Motion PASSED unanimously. Staff will report back in July.

5. Water Transportation

Ken Rose, president of Rose City Water Transit, asked that JPACT recommend the Council prepare a letter endorsing his efforts to undertake water transportation studies. He explained that his feasibility study will be done in conjunction with PCC.

Com. Kearney stated that she has been receiving letters and reports from Mr. Rose for several years and felt in view of Clark County's major transportation problems the study of water transportation was out of the question. She felt it is time to tell him no.

Coun. Miller felt there was no reason not to give him the endorsement as long as it did not require staff time or MSD
money. Mr. Ockert said that the staff felt that the potential of water transportation should be pursued. He, however, felt it was premature to endorse a feasibility study. Instead, the MSD should review the findings of the City of Portland study and then make a judgment as to whether such a study is warranted. Coun. Miller moved and was seconded to recommend to the Council that a letter of endorsement be given to Mr. Rose. A role call vote was taken. Couns. Miller, Williamson, and Schedeen, and Mr. Carroll voted yes. Coun. Stuhr, Com. Kearney and Mr. Anderson voted no. The motion PASSED 4 to 3.

6. **Description of Travel Simulation Techniques**

   Information item. No discussion.

7. **TIP AND ITP Amendment -- I-505 Alternative**

   Mr. Anderson moved and was seconded to approve and forward the amendments to the Council. Motion PASSED.

8. **Air Quality Progress Report**

   Terry Waldele explained the action taken by the Environmental Quality Commission to uphold the state ozone standard of .08 and place it in the SIP's.

   Mr. Anderson expressed a concern that the EQC action would paralyze the metropolitan area. Dean Cole moved and was seconded to recommend the Council approve a resolution at its meeting on June 14 reaffirming the past Council action that the .12 standard be included in the SIP.

9. **Contracts:**

   Mr. Anderson moved to table. Motion PASSED.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Karen Thackston

COPIES TO: JPACT Members
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Anderson</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Carroll</td>
<td>State of WA DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Slaaen</td>
<td>MSD Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Williamson</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Ockert</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Kearney</td>
<td>MSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Lucas</td>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Cole</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jef Spera</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Dingley</td>
<td>MSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Spurnich</td>
<td>M.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Lawton</td>
<td>M.S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auti Muhl</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Cleafen</td>
<td>MSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Theodore</td>
<td>Rose City Riv. Trans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Johnson</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Rold</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; WASH. CO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Angeles</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Cleary</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: June 14, 1979

GROUP/SUBJECT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

PERSONS IN ATTENDANCE: MSD Councilors Williamson, Miller, Stuhr and Schedeen, Dick Carroll, Com. Connie Kearney, Councilman Larry Cole, Lloyd Anderson

Ted Spence, Connie Cleaton, Ken Rose, Ken Johnson, Dick Arenz, Frank Angelo, Lynn Dingler

MSD staff members Bill Ockert, Terry Waldele, Keith Lawton, Gary Spanovich, and Karen Thackston

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

General Announcements:

Coun. Williamson has received numerous letters requesting a traffic signal at Marylhurst College. Staff should have a recommendation in July.

1. Candidate Problems for MSD Reserve

The candidate problem list was prepared at JPACT's request. Staff has worked with jurisdictional staffs to identify problems. JPACT felt that elected officials should be notified of the process. The staff agreed to notify the chief elected officials of each jurisdiction.

2. Recommended Criteria for Establishing Problem and Project Priorities for the MSD Reserve

Lloyd Anderson expanded on his letter to Charlie Williamson. He felt that emphasis should be given to projects which:

(1) protect the mobility of regional facilities through roadway design standards, control adjacent land use, access control and other measures

(2) are sponsored by local jurisdictions that are financing road improvements through local revenue sources, and

(3) are sponsored by local jurisdictions that can demonstrate that local developers contribute to the financing of roadway improvements.
Mr. Anderson moved and was seconded to include these three items in the criteria. Motion PASSED unanimously.

The Committee discussed the need for more incentive to promote transit improvements. Coun. Miller moved and was seconded to add a policy stating that special consideration would be given to solutions involving alternatives to the single occupant automobile. PASSED unanimously.

Lloyd Anderson moved and was seconded to amend Policy IV -- Environmental Goals by adding projects which reduce noise and visual problems. PASSED unanimously.

Councilman Cole moved and was seconded to adopt the amended criteria (including the amendments recommended by TPAC) and forward to the Council. Motion PASSED unanimously.

3. **TIP Quarterly Report**

The report describing MSD funding authorization through December 31, 1978, was distributed. No discussion.

4. **Transportation Related Energy Planning Activities in the MSD Region**

This report was requested by JPACT. Bill Ockert explained the content and the staff recommendation. Dick Arenz, PHWA, stated that the Intermodal Planning Group will require some energy planning be included in the UWP. Caroline Miller moved and was seconded to recommend that the Council request Rick Gustafson, Mike Burton and Charles Williamson to meet with the state to discuss MSD's role in energy planning. Motion PASSED unanimously. Staff will report back in July.

5. **Water Transportation**

Ken Rose, president of Rose City Water Transit, asked that JPACT recommend the Council prepare a letter endorsing his efforts to undertake water transportation studies. He explained that his feasibility study will be done in conjunction with PCC.

Com. Kearney stated that she has been receiving letters and reports from Mr. Rose for several years and felt in view of Clark County's major transportation problems the study of water transportation was out of the question. She felt it is time to tell him no.

Coun. Miller felt there was no reason not to give him the endorsement as long as it did not require staff time or MSD
money. Mr. Ockert said that the staff felt that the potential of water transportation should be pursued. He, however, felt it was premature to endorse a feasibility study. Instead, the MSD should review the findings of the City of Portland study and then make a judgment as to whether such a study is warranted. Coun. Miller moved and was seconded to recommend to the Council that a letter of endorsement be given to Mr. Rose. A role call vote was taken. Couns. Miller, Williamson, and Schadeen, and Mr. Carroll voted yes. Coun. Stuhr, Com. Kearney and Mr. Anderson voted no. The motion PASSED 4 to 3.

6. **Description of Travel Simulation Techniques**

Information item. No discussion.

7. **TIP AND ITP Amendment -- I-505 Alternative**

Mr. Anderson moved and was seconded to approve and forward the amendments to the Council. Motion PASSED.

8. **Air Quality Progress Report**

Terry Waldele explained the action taken by the Environmental Quality Commission to uphold the state ozone standard of .08 and place it in the SIP's.

Mr. Anderson expressed a concern that the EQC action would paralyze the metropolitan area. Dean Cole moved and was seconded to recommend the Council approve a resolution at its meeting on June 14 reaffirming the past Council action that the .12 standard be included in the SIP.

9. **Contracts:**

Mr. Anderson moved to table. Motion PASSED.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Karen Thackston

COPIES TO: JPACT Members
Metropolitan Service District
527 SW Hall  Portland, Oregon 97201  503/221-1646

Agenda

Date:       June 14, 1979
Day:       Thursday
Time:       7:30 a.m.
Place:     Conference Room "D"

1. CANDIDATE PROBLEMS FOR MSD RESERVE

   This is an informational item requested by JPACT. TPAC had no comment or recommendation. Staff intends to firm up a list of candidate problem areas by June 22, 1979.

2. RECOMMENDED CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING PROBLEM AND PROJECT PRIORITIES FOR THE MSD RESERVE

   Major Issues:

   What policies are to be used to screen a large number of problem areas to a smaller group and determine which projects should be funded with the MSD Reserve.

   TPAC Concerns:

   A. What funds are available for projects serving only local circulation needs?

      Staff Response: Traditional FAU funds (or Interstate Transfer funds replacing FAU funds) or Title II Safety funds are available for these types of projects.

   B. Why shouldn't cost overruns on previously funded projects be eligible?

      Staff Response: Contingency funds have been established to cover such overruns. Information on the extent of overruns (which projects and how much cost) won't be available for some time.

   C. What is the definition of regional travel movements?

      Staff Response: Included are major travel flows between cities, counties and other large-scale
activities (such as regional shopping centers, large industrial complexes, or regionally significant cultural centers).

D. What kind of citizen involvement is planned?

Staff Response: The approved study process describes a citizen involvement process including public hearings (meetings may also be called by sponsoring jurisdictions).

E. Will an assessment of the likely implementation schedule be made when a project is funded to ensure correspondence with the availability of federal funds?

Staff Response: This type of check is needed to ensure funds are only spent on preliminary engineering on projects which can be implemented within the federal timeframes.

TPAC Recommendation:

Approve the criteria subject to the following qualifiers:

A. Staff Report #44, p. 6, Policy II, Criteria 2 - add "residential areas."

B. Staff will review the proposed "measures of effectiveness" for each criteria with local jurisdictional staff before applying the policies and criteria to the 15-20 high priority problems.

C. A schedule for obligating PE funds be set when projects are funded.

Staff Recommendation:

Approve with TPAC changes and forward for Council Adoption.

3. QUARTERLY REPORT

This information report shows the status of MSD funding authorizations.

4. TRANSPORTATION RELATED ENERGY PLANNING ACTIVITIES IN THE MSD REGION

Major Issues:

What has been done for energy planning and what are other agencies doing? What should MSD be doing?
TPAC Concerns:

If additional energy planning becomes a priority, which work item would be dropped?

TPAC Recommendation:

None.

Staff Recommendation: The recommendations are included in the forwarding memo.

5. STATUS REPORT ON WATER TRANSPORTATION PROPOSALS

An oral information report will be given.

6. DESCRIPTION OF TRAVEL SIMULATION TECHNIQUES

This information report was prepared in response to a request from JPACT members. Staff will present a short oral report.

7. AMEND THE INTERIM TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM AND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE I-505 ALTERNATIVE

Major Issues:

Need to process the I-505 alternative so that the project can be programmed once the I-505 withdrawal is approved.

TPAC Concerns:

None.

TPAC and Staff Recommendations:

Forward to Council recommending adoption of resolutions.

8. AIR QUALITY PROGRESS REPORT

Major Issues:

How should the SIP planning process accommodate the decision of the Environmental Quality Commission to have a state ozone standard which is lower than the federal standard?

TPAC Concerns:

A. What types of controls would need to be examined to achieve the state standard?
B. Who would fund the additional planning needed to examine and achieve agreement on control measures addressing the state standard?

C. What happens on the Washington side of the river?

D. Would it be possible to use .12 as the primary standard and .08 as the secondary?

E. Could the time frame for meeting the state standard be set beyond the federal compliance dates?

**TPAC Recommendation**

None.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff should work with DEQ to outline the impacts of the .08 standard and how it should be addressed in the SIP.

**9. MSD CONTRACTS**

Attached is a list of contracts described in the UWP which are to be signed on or about July 1, 1979. The Council has requested JPACT to review the contracts.

CWO:KT:gh
3975A
D/2
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Agenda

Date: June 14, 1979
Day: Thursday
Time: 7:30 am***
Place: MSD Office "Room D"

Proposed Agenda:

1. MSD Reserve Problem Area Listing - Information
2. Recommended Criteria for Establishing Problem & Project Priorities for the MSD Reserve - Action Requested
3. TIP Quarterly Report - Information
4. Transportation Related Energy Planning Activities in the MSD Region - Information
5. Status Report on Water Transportation Proposals - Information
6. Description of Travel Simulation Techniques - Information
7. TIP Amendment - I-505 Alternative - Action Requested
8. Corridor Analysis & Strategy - Information

* denotes material enclosed
# material available at meeting

***Coffee and Donuts will be provided
June 12, 1979

Charles Williamson, Chairman
Joint Policy Advisory Committee
on Transportation
Metropolitan Service District
527 S.W. Hall Street
Portland, OR 97212

Dear Charlie:

We have reviewed the draft MSD Staff Report Number 44: MSD Regional Reserve Planning Process and offer the following comments. The analysis which will accompany the I-505 withdrawal allocation appears to be technically sufficient. We have concerns, however, about whether the process adequately addresses the long-range financing needs of the region's transportation system.

The Mount Hood and I-505 withdrawal actions have represented "windfall" opportunities to greatly extend the use of federal money. There are, however, incentives in the withdrawal process which tend to reduce the total local dollar commitments to transportation. We question whether this makes sense given the long-term financing needs of the region. As you know, funding requirements outstrip existing federal programs and money from established local sources.

Given this, it appears that the allocation process should be designed to "stretch" the total federal and local dollars to the greatest extent possible. One method of doing this would be to give preferential withdrawal funding to local jurisdictions that are willing to pledge new money for transportation in excess of their local match for specific projects. By setting aside part of the reserve for this purpose, jurisdictions would have an incentive to develop new transportation funding sources such as gasoline taxes, roadway construction bonds or system development fees.

Procedurally, the allocation of the transfer dollars also requires more careful control. The Mount Hood withdrawal projects required a local match "pledge" upon project submission. Many projects have greatly expanded in scope and/or inflated in costs. While there are provisions for inflating the federal contribution, many local match commitments are falling short without a guarantee for increases. The federal money has been effectively "frozen," and new demands are being placed on state funds to make up deficiencies.
To correct this, more binding initial pledges should be required. A realistic and budgeted source of local match could be identified. Perhaps a system of annual recertification of pledges and a weeding out of projects that no longer have an acceptable match is appropriate. To support this procedure, a list of alternate or substitute projects should be available. It is important to remember that Congress has set deadlines for the use of the federal money. The annual financial checkup insures that funds will actually be spent and not simply "committed."

I realize these suggestions on the MSD allocation criteria are formative and will require more work. I welcome your reactions and look forward to discussions on this matter at the June JPACT meeting.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Anderson
Executive Director

cc: Bill Ockert

PL2F
Memorandum

Date: June 6, 1979
To: TPAC/JPACT
From: MSD Staff
Subject: Energy Planning Activities In The Region

At the May JPACT meeting, a number of members asked for a listing of what MSD was doing in the area of energy planning. Members also wanted to know what activities other agencies were undertaking. The last concern was for a listing of energy activities which are needed and could be undertaken by MSD.

The attached report is a discussion draft whose purpose is to briefly review ongoing transportation-related energy activities in the region. The report suggests possible roles for MSD in energy contingency planning.

There are a number of agencies in the region involved in energy planning. Primarily they are the Oregon Department of Energy, Tri-Met, the City of Portland, the Oregon Department of Transportation, MSD and a number of private concerns. Most of these activities are transportation related although the City of Portland and the Oregon Department of Energy are involved in non-transportation energy conservation measures.

MSD's present involvement in energy planning is in four general areas. These include (1) reviewing local plans to assess how energy considerations are handled, (2) using energy consumption as a criteria in evaluating transportation/land-use alternatives, (3) estimating the energy implications of alternative Transportation Control Measures as detailed in the State Implementation Plan (SIP), and (4) developing and evaluating Transportation System Management (TSM) proposals which could be used to bring about conservation of energy consumed by transportation users.

MSD is currently not doing energy contingency planning. There is no single agency coordinating energy contingency planning nor is this activity being widely pursued by other agencies in the region. Tri-Met has undertaken some analysis of how they would deal with an energy crisis. MSD could pursue two activities in this area. The first involves a coordinating and dissemination of information function. This activity could be
pursued with existing MSD staff resources under the transportation technical assistance program.

The second activity involves a fuel shortage monitoring and allocation program. This activity would be primarily transportation related and could not be carried out with existing staff resources. The program would take approximately six man-months to develop and would require additional staff resources.

An inventory of possible energy-related activities which MSD could become involved in was prepared by a consultant to CRAG over a year ago. Most of these activities concerned ways to bring about the conservation of energy. Many of those concerned non-transportation users. Some of the activities involved actions which would have long-range implications on energy consumption such as requirements to incorporate energy saving techniques in planning communities. While some interest was expressed by staff from local jurisdictions, the general consensus was that the work proposed by the consultant not be pursued by CRAG. MSD does not have funds allocated to non-transportation energy planning activities in the upcoming budget.

A task force of the City of Portland has identified a number of measures which could be taken to reduce energy consumption within the city. Some of the measures are proposed to be applied regionwide. These proposals are currently undergoing review by citizen groups. The MSD Public Facilities Committee has had a briefing on the city proposal.

Staff recommends that current MSD energy planning activities continue and that energy conservation be given strong consideration in regional transportation/land-use decision-making. In the area of contingency planning for transportation, the staff recommends that MSD take on a coordinating and information dissemination function with funding to come from the technical assistance program already included in the Unified Work Program. The staff suggests that the function of allocating fuel continue to be handled by the Oregon Department of Energy in that they are in the best position to coordinate with federal officials and make the necessary trade-off between urban and rural users and between different types of energy consumers.

Lastly, Council may wish to consider MSD actively pursuing federal and state funding to 1) coordinate and plan for non-transportation energy conservation measures at the regional level (significant activities are already underway to plan for transportation conservation measures) and 2) develop a comprehensive energy plan for the region. Care should be taken to ensure that these activities be closely integrated with, and not duplicate, efforts underway by the City of Portland which focus on city users of energy.