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AGENDA

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: November 6, 1980
Day: Thursday
Time: 7:30 a.m.
Place: Metro Conference Room A1/A2

#*1. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENT - UMTA URBAN INITIATIVES GRANT FOR PIONEER SQUARE - APPROVAL REQUESTED.

*2. METRO/CLARK COUNTY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING - COMMITTING TO REACHING AGREEMENT ON CLARK COUNTY POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT FORECASTS - APPROVAL REQUESTED.

*3. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN - PROCESS FOR PROCEEDING WITH REMAINING WORK - DISCUSSION.

*4. HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT SERVICE GOALS - RECOMMENDATION ON LONG RANGE POLICIES - DISCUSSION.

*5. TRI-MET TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM - DISCUSSION AND ENDORSEMENT OF FIVE-YEAR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

*Material enclosed.
Also enclosed for your information is written testimony from the October 13, 1980 public hearing on the RTP. A copy of the October 13 minutes of the hearing are included as well.
#Available at meeting.
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 9, 1980

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: John Frewing, Donald Clark, Lloyd Anderson, Robert Bothman, Bill Young, Larry Cole, Connie Kearney, Al Myers, Dick Pokornowski, Charles Williamson

Guests: Winston Kurth, Ted Spence, Lubin Quinones, Elton Chang, John Price, Bebe Rucker, Sarah Salazar, Steve Dotterrer, Paul Bay, Dave Peach, Anne Sylvester

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Rick Gustafson, Keith Lawton, Terry Bolstad, Karen Thackston, Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

1. REVIEW OF THE CLARK COUNTY FY 81 TIP AND AIR QUALITY CONSISTENCY STATEMENT

Andy Cotugno reported that the Clark County portion of the TIP is up for adoption at this time. It is very similar to our report, listing projects scheduled and included for the next five-year period. One major difference that has occurred is its shift to the same fiscal period as ours -- October 1 to September 30, as encouraged by UMTA.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval to the Council of the Clark County FY 81 TIP and Air Quality Consistency Statement. Motion CARRIED.

2. TRANSFER OF CITY RESERVE FUNDS (e)(4) TO THE PORTLAND/VANCOUVER CORRIDOR ANALYSIS (BI-STATE TASK FORCE PROJECT)

Andy Cotugno stated that only $50,000 has been awarded for this Bi-State study effort and is all that is available through Federal Demonstration Grant funding. The City of Portland has recommended utilizing $170,000 from one of their Contingency Funds while local jurisdictions would have to come up with an additional $30,000 in match money -- $3,000 each from five jurisdictions in Oregon (Metro, Tri-Met, Portland, ODOT, and Multnomah County) and $5,000 each from the three jurisdictions in the State of Washington (Clark County, City of Vancouver, and WSDOT).
The Resolution allocates funding to the project. The Bi-State TAC will then complete the scope of work and submit the actual grant application to the Federal Highway Administration. It is anticipated that the funding would be underway about January or February because of the time element involved in obtaining the necessary grant.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval to the Council of the transfer of funds for the above project.

3. UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

A memo was distributed at the meeting which recommended that the schedule for completion of the Regional Transportation Plan be extended and that a subcommittee be appointed from JPACT to meet on a more regular basis for a more thorough review of the Plan. Andy Cotugno then reviewed the proposed schedule towards adoption of the Plan.

Andy pointed out the need for Metro's endorsement of Tri-Met's five-year TDP and the need to adopt a State Implementation Plan for Air Quality in order to meet the Federal deadline of January, 1982. The SIP must have detailed commitments to implement whatever strategies will be adopted in the RTP.

Andy further reported that the Air Quality Committee is also considering these strategies in great detail and will bring its recommendations before JPACT. This review would set air quality targets and also decide the carpooling strategy that would be incorporated in the RTP.

The third component recommended is the long-range strategy to determine what role light rail should play, what should be the long-range transit improvement program, what should be the policy for protection and implementation of transitways, and the establishment of a functional classification system for transit to guide land use and protect rights-of-way. It is the intent of the staff to make sure that the principal arterials and freeways work for the regional system.

Connie Kearney pointed out the need to reconcile the differences relating to population/employment data used for Clark County. In the RTP, Metro used data for its population/employment forecast for Clark County with an estimate of 260,000. Clark County's MPO estimate differs from that inasmuch as their estimate places the population at 340,000. She expressed concern over this conflict in data and hoped that it would be resolved before the report proceeded in much
greater detail. Andy Cotugno related that four different sets of regional assumptions for population/employment forecasts were utilized, and a middle-of-the-road range was picked. If the overall population were increased, its impact would have to be recognized and would involve a major task in dealing with all the jurisdictions involved. The Committee felt that perhaps a compromise could be reached. Andy Cotugno pointed out that the land use plans throughout the region are in a constant state of flux and subject to continual change because of comprehensive plan updates that would affect distribution. He felt there was a need to be closer to Clark County's estimate, but that we also need to recognize that, in each annual update of the RTP, there will likely be a revised population/employment forecast. It was brought out that Clark County did utilize Metro's lower population figure in its air quality analysis to determine emissions.

It was suggested that perhaps the proposed schedule should be turned around and that population, land use, and strategies should be matters taken up first. If Tri-Met is to get its necessary funding, the Federal Government is requiring that it must first get MPO endorsement of its TDP. Under new regulations, UMTA must obligate funds each quarter rather than once a year.

With regard to a change in population figures for Clark County, Andy Cotugno stated that it would also involve a major change in the data used for the Air Quality Analysis as well. In order to make the modifications proposed, he felt it would take more than a month just to generate the information. It was discussed that the Institute of Policy Studies at Portland State University, PP&L and PGE are starting on some type of a scoping study to improve migration models, and the question was raised as to whether this might be of any benefit to the staff.

It was felt that there needs to be a systematic way to make population forecasts inasmuch as they are fundamental to a great many projects. It was discussed that population data has been compiled by Transportation, "208", CRAG, and BPA. It was the consensus of the Committee that there was need for the population base to be adopted by the Metro board.

Keith Lawton related that, under new Federal ruling, when jurisdictions in two states within the SMA are in disagreement on data where Federal funding is concerned, arbitration is settled by referring the matter to a "Bi-State" task force for settlement.
Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to refer this matter to the Metro Council for adoption of a population forecast as a base for the RTP. It would then be referred back to JPACT for further study of the Plan. Motion CARRIED.

Regarding the formation of a subcommittee of JPACT to study the Plan in more detail, it was agreed that a subcommittee first be appointed to deliberate on its approach and report back at the next JPACT meeting. Appointments to the subcommittee were as follows: Connie Kearney, Bob Bothman, Ernie Bonner, and Andy Cotugno representing Metro staff. It was also agreed that, following this committee's initial report, new subcommittees would be formed to consider the various components of the RTP in greater detail. The Committee should be polled by questionnaire as to which subcommittee they would prefer to serve on.

4. NOVEMBER BALLOT MEASURE - STATE OF WASHINGTON

Connie Kearney reported on an upcoming measure on the November ballot, sponsored by the Public Transit Benefit Area, for transportation funding which would amount to three-tenths of 1 percent of a sales tax. She spoke of a "carless" day to be tried on October 15th in Clark County in which WSDOT and Clark County are trying to promote alternative measures of travel. Incentives such as free bus service and "pledge" cards are being encouraged so that a tally can be made of miles saved and its impact on air quality.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

An announcement was made of an upcoming October 21 conference on hazardous materials to be held at Portland State University. The Committee was also reminded of the public hearing scheduled for JPACT and the RPC on the Regional Transportation Plan for Monday evening, October 13, at 7:30 p.m., and everyone was encouraged to attend.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: JPACT Members
Denton Kent
Rick Gustafson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andy C/Kyser</td>
<td>MTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Freyting</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston Koeth</td>
<td>Clack, Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Spence</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Gustafson</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruben Quiros</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Chang</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pride</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebe Rucker</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Salazar</td>
<td>Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dotyree</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bay</td>
<td>Trimet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Clark</td>
<td>Mult Co Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Anderson</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bothman</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Young</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Peache</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Cole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Kearney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Myers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Potomowski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Williamson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Sylvester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Kauton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Bolstad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Thackston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 13, 1980
To: TPAC and JPACT
From: Andy Cotugno
Regarding: Meeting Schedule for October through December

TPAC and JPACT meetings for November and December are being rescheduled because of the holidays. Please mark the following dates on your calendar:

October 31 (Friday, 10:00 a.m.) - TPAC
November 6 (Thursday, 7:30 a.m.) - JPACT
November 26 (Wednesday, 10:00 a.m.) - TPAC
December 4 (Thursday, 7:30 a.m.) - JPACT

AC: lmk
Joint Regional Planning Committee &  
JPACT Meeting on Regional Transportation Plan - Public Hearing - Monday  
Oct. 13, 1980 at 7:30 pm

PERSONS ATTENDING:  
Couns. Banzer, Bonner, Deines, and Oleson  
Staff: Andy Cotugno, Ellen Duke, Richard Brandman, Terry Bolstad,  
Dick Bolen, Janet Gillespie, Rod Sandoz and Toby Janus  
JPACT: Connie Kearney, Larry Cole, Bob Bothman, John Frewing  
Others: Lee Ann MacColl, Richard Carlson, Bill Parish, John Gillam  
Robert Hoffman, Charlsie Sprague, George Ruff, Herb Gullixson,  
Richard T. Gross, Stan Kahn, Ray Polani, G. Madson,  
Caroline Skinner, Marc Frommer, Berkeley Holman, John  
Griffiths, Gordon Bower, Jim Herlihy, Val Southern,  
J.M. Ardon and Priscilla Senior.

SUMMARY:  
The meeting was called to order to hear public comment on the Regional Transportation Plan at 7:30 pm by Chairman Ernie Bonner.

Coun. Bonner introduced Councilors, JPACT members and Metro staff. He then stated that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Draft Two is a major update of the Interim Plan. This updated plan addresses itself to concerns facing the region - possible increase of population to 1,600,000 in the next twenty years which will mean cars, congestion, pollution, etc. In an attempt to try to maintain our quality of life we must now find ways of alleviating some of the impact of an increasing population. The RTP outlines the problems we face and details some specific steps we can take to overcome some of the problems. The second draft has been sent to neighborhood groups, local governments and jurisdictions and tonight's Public Hearing is meant to find out how people in this region feel about this draft. He then asked Andy Cotugno, Acting Director of Transportation, to give a quick overview of the RTP's provisions before calling on those present who wish to give testimony regarding this Plan. Andy Catugno said that the first Draft of this Plan was presented in February and identified the transportation problems we are facing. Draft Two is the main means for public input and Draft Three will be based on public input, surveys and recommendations made by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee and Metro's Regional Planning Committee which will be adopted by May or June 1981. This Plan is intended to satisfy both the State and Federal requirements which provides the authority under which Metro is developing this Plan. The RTP is intended to provide the overall policy direction on what kinds of strategies should be used for air quality standards. He then spoke of population expansion in the region, the energy situation which continues to be costly, the necessity of not being in violation of air standards and then explained the importance of an improved multi-purpose transit system to accommodate a 400,000 ridership by the year 2000.
modes of transportation. He said the group was supportive of the plan objectives as stated, especially the main goal: "... to reduce dependence on the single-occupant automobile." He pointed out that the group disagreed on the means, i.e. vanpools as a substitution and stated this group's preferences:

- Development of a light rail alternative for the Southeast area
- Commitment to transit in the Northern area
- Investigation of heavy rail alternatives using existing right-of-way, e.g. Hillsboro-Portland and Vancouver-Portland
- More attention to retaining existing rights-of-way for future transit use: Portland Traction Lents-Oregon City, Southern Pacific Lake Oswego-Beaverton, etc.

He offered other suggestions for RTP's Draft which can be read in detail in the written testimony distributed (copy on file).

Bill Parrish - 3215 N.W. Lauray Terrace, Portland, said he is here as a private citizen although he has worked with Mr. Carlson preparing some of the testimony given above. He questioned some of the numbered legends (symbols) and suggested that alternative routes be labeled as such to avoid confusion in reading the maps. He also suggested that the Urban Growth Boundary line be made clearer and pointed out the transit needs in the southwest area (Tualatin, Sherwood, Lake Oswego) aren't being addressed sufficiently.

Mr. Parrish noted that if population and employment growth are shown in the final RTP draft then it would be necessary to also show the current population figure and the projected population figure for the year 2000. Similarly, the current employment figure must also show the projected employment figure to the year 2000.

His remarks were appreciated and noted by Coun. Bonner and Mr. Cotugno.

John Gillam - City of Beaverton, Transportation Planner, speaking on behalf of the City, following consultation with the Mayor and City Council stated that they were supportive of efforts being undertaken to develop a comprehensive and functional RTP in their urban area but that there are 7 items of current or potential concern that Beaverton needed reassurance or answers to. (These items are listed in a letter from him to Andy Cotugno on October 13/80 and is on file).

Coun. Bonner in response to Mr. Gillam's concern about protecting alternative transit routes (Westside Corridor), said that to a certain extent the RTP is asking local jurisdictions to help Metro in this area by keeping options open so that potential transit ways may not be built before a decision can be made.

Coun. Bonner commended Mr. Gillam for taking the initiative in getting responses from the Beaverton Mayor and Council regarding the RTP.

Robert Hoffman, 8585 Canyon Lane, Portland, said that what he has heard this evening is 100 years old technology-wise and if a system analysis of transportation were done, it would point to a different approach than what the RTP proposes. After emphasizing people's needs to obtain door-to-door transportation service, he suggested
in his Buckman neighborhood contends with too much traffic on Stark and thought that if the 4 major bus routes could be consolidated better so that people living in that area could count on meeting a bus in a central location more frequently (e.g. every 5 minutes as opposed to an hour wait) then more people might use the bus instead of using their cars.

Mr. Kahn also suggested that Tri-Met consider running a Trolley-line from Washington Park to Mt. Tabor. He said that it might become as popular as the Trolley Car in San Francisco. It would be a way for tourists to see the city and there happens to be an old Trolley just for that purpose.

Ray Polani - Citizens for Better Transit, said that 40% of our population is dependent on public transportation for mobility, in that they do not have access to a car, i.e. senior citizens, young people, and those who cannot afford an automobile. In order to illustrate how an efficient transit system might work in the Portland area, he asked the Joint Committee to view a slide-show (adapted from the San Diego County Department of Transportation) entitled "Fundamentals of Successful Transit" or "How to Make the System Get You from Here to There." During the half hour slide presentation Mr. Polani commented on the cities covered: Toronto, Edmonton and glimpses of Geneva. He also showed a System Comparison Chart which gave the Edmonton Adult Fare at 25¢ as compared to the Tri-Met Adult Fare at 40¢ in 1976. Mr. Polani said that he would send a copy of the slide show's manuscript to the Joint Committee tomorrow (copy on file).

Mr. Polani stressed the importance of setting up a central Light Rail network capability in Portland and that the draft RTP presently does not make that provision such as in the north-south corridor (Vancouver to Oregon City) which will be needed in the future. He recommended that there ought to be a build-up of ridership by design to create a Light Rail network around a centerpiece in Portland.

Coun. Bonner thanked all those who came to give testimony this evening and said that if they left their name and address on the sign-up sheet, they would receive further information on the RTP as it progressed.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent Sullivan</td>
<td>2517 S.W. 4974 Corbett 97219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George H. Ruey</td>
<td>10114 N.E. Aulton Portland 97220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Parish</td>
<td>9110 N.W. Stark Ct. Portland 97229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Carlson</td>
<td>Ore Assoc of RV Passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hoffman</td>
<td>Oregon Assn of Railway Assn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gillam</td>
<td>6525 Canyon Lane Apt 6 Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hudson</td>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Skinner</td>
<td>290 S.E. Eleventh Portland 97222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Polani</td>
<td>N.W. P.I.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Frommer</td>
<td>Citizens for Better Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Halman</td>
<td>P.O. Box 97301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Pence</td>
<td>Highway Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tellam</td>
<td>OR ASSN. OF RV PASS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordell Bower</td>
<td>4835 S.E. 30th Apt 54 Portland 97220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil</td>
<td>Bower Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F.</td>
<td>809 N.W. Malmisford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Herley</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Southern</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1444 97207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.M. Anderson</td>
<td>11060 S.W. 13th Ave 97220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Senior</td>
<td>2234 N.W. Clark Avenue 97220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie P. Freague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 27, 1980
To: JPACT
From: Andy Cotugno
Regarding: Testimony from RTP Public Hearing

Attached for your information is written testimony from the RTP public hearing on October 13, 1980.

AC: lmk

Enclosure
Councilor Ernie Bonner  
Metropolitan Service District  
527 S.W. Hall  
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Mr. Bonner,

Enclosed is a copy of the manuscript describing a systems approach to transportation which we discussed at the meeting of October 13th.

The Rideway is not like anything proposed heretofore although all the bits and pieces to make it work are in use out there somewhere. They have just never been put to this use.

In listening to the presentations of the various ideas offered at the meeting, one soon becomes aware that each proposal offers nothing better than some approach someone has tried somewhere else in the past. Whether the devices were ever successful in a free, competitive market - or even suitable to the application here - is never discussed. I'm afraid the truth is that a close examination and proper evaluation of the various schemes based on existing systems will reveal that each was abandoned for good cause. This is a complete text unto itself!

In developing The Rideway concept, marketing requirements were delineated first. There were no preconceived notions regarding hardware. But once the marketing aspects had been developed, then various hardware approaches were considered. Thus far, the only approach that can satisfy all requirements is the one described in the enclosed manuscripts. If there are others, they are not known to me.

Sadly this indicates that the plant upon which the existing transportation system is based is terribly obsolete. There truly is no solution to it. But the same situation has occurred often in the past. Could our society survive without the "water closet", the internal combustion engine, or - especially - the telephone. Yet, there have been no radical innovations in the transportation field since the creation of the wheel. New power sources for turning the wheel are not really innovations in transportation.

Now, I'm saying all that is obsolete. There is a much better way. And it is such a departure from all that we have experienced and learned all our lives that I do believe people have trouble coping with the idea. Yet the closer it is examined, the more suitable it becomes.

The manuscript is simply an outline. I hope that we will have an opportunity to discuss the details further.
There are two manuscripts enclosed. The original simply listed the marketing considerations without developing the rationale behind them. When it became evident that the readers were only interested in "what" without ever giving a thought to the "why", the Marketing Features were developed in some detail. After all, there is no virtue in the hardware if there is no market for it. And if there is a firm and large market, then surely the most outrageous idea is worth examining in some depth.

One important piece of information was intentionally left out of The Rideway description: while it is stated that the base capacity of the system is 26,400 individual cars per hour, the information is pointless until compared with automobile traffic. Automobile traffic peaks at 1750 cars per hour per lane on surface streets. And freeways, surprisingly, raise this to only 2200. Thus, The Rideway offers a tenfold improvement in volume over the best that automobiles can achieve.

Finally, I would appreciate having the manuscripts restricted to circulation within the organization of the Metropolitan Service District. If others wish to examine The Rideway, please have them get in touch with me.

Very truly yours,

Robert Hoffman
MARKETING FEATURES
OF
THE HOFFMAN RIDEWAY

While the original manuscript lists each of the marketing features, it is simply a tabulation; there is no development of the individual ideas. Yet, the marketing aspect is the most important part of the entire concept. If the hardware is not marketable, there is no point in fooling with it. Therefore let me take a few pages here to expand these points - points which were well developed before the means was ever selected.

But let me pause here to satisfy that peculiar human curiosity that wants to know what it is without ever giving a thought to why it is. The Rideway is, in essence, a conveyor system. That a conveyor can satisfy all the marketing requirements to follow is a special blessing in itself because there is no other form of transportation that can do that, including the automobile. In addition, it can offer economies of operation, simplicity, reliability, and safety that are difficult to produce by other means.

Now to the marketing aspects:

1. Immediate availability

This is an obvious requirement. Probably no expansion of the idea is needed. Let's be more specific, though, by saying that for routine, day-to-day needs of the consumer where a regular schedule is followed, a Ridecar would be waiting for the customer when he leaves his house or place of employment. If the Ridecar is not used by twenty minutes after the normal time of departure, it will be returned to the Rideway.

For those calling for service on an irregular or non-scheduled basis, the requirement is that a Ridecar be made available to them within thirty seconds.

2. Door-to-door service

Individuals want to go from the door of their house to the door of their office, market, theater, or any other destination. The number of cars parked in the no-parking zones at shopping centers certainly verifies this. Isn't it something we all would do if we could?

3. Most expeditious route

It must be mentioned at this point that The Rideway is conceived as being on every street and highway someday in the distant future. However as in every other public utility, the service would be limited to the most lucrative areas in the beginning. The cost and revenue features are developed in the original manuscript accompanying these pages.
Now, it can be pointed out that the most expeditious route is not necessarily the most obvious nor the most direct route. Fires or other emergencies may interrupt normal service. Repairs, parades, special events, and who-knows-what-other possibilities may require rerouting to achieve expeditious service. Because the Rideway would be constantly monitored, irregularities would be noticed immediately; and the Ride Director would re-route traffic to avoid delay. For such situations as scheduled events at the auditorium, the coliseum, or wherever, the Ride Director would be programmed to avoid congestion.

4. Privacy

Until you have traveled extensively on public transit, this aspect cannot be truly appreciated. There are many distressing social and economic problems that are forced onto the customers of public transit. But beyond that, there is a psychological need.

Evidently J. B. Jackson first described this as "human territoriality". Tabor R. Stone defines it in psychological terms as "spatial" needs.

For many years, those trying to solve transportation problems have cursed the "love affair" with the automobile. And while I'm sure we all agree that it exists, no one has ever successfully explained it to my knowledge. I think now it is clear to me what is happening; Stone's comment on spatial needs was the keystone.

If one grants that the automobile gives the driver spatial fulfillment, then it is but a short step to realize that there has never been anything heretofore that so completely satisfies that infantile desire for instantaneous and complete self-gratification. The driver has control over his world defined by the automobile but also over his passengers. Thus, he has the capability of social dominance as never before.

I doubt that there is anything in The Rideway which could be made so completely gratifying to the customer as the situation described above. But the controls associated with addressing and starting or, perhaps, calling may be a partial substitute. They give control over complex systems, an interplay between machine and user, and a certain mystique of mastery. So there may be an offset to the automobile's psychological satisfaction after all.

Wilfred Owen mentions another aspect of the "love affair" that should be addressed. This is the purely subjective concept of cost of the service. Most times you can jump into the car and complete the trip without any out-of-pocket cost; occasionally gasoline, maintenance, repairs, insurance, or time-payments must be bought. But the impact is not the same as paying for the service every time it is used.

6-12-80
In a public transit system, a charge occurs for every service, of course. However it is quite likely that the sting would be taken out of the charge if the ubiquitous credit card were used. In The Rideway, riders will be encouraged to use credit cards rather than cash. Credit cards can be read right at the control panel in the Ridecar; cash payments require special routing to a collection point. Cash collections in the Ridecars would lead to intolerable security problems.

5. Comfortable environment

Of course, heating and cooling of the Ridecars are necessary.

6. Elimination of personal transfers

After having once acquired transportation, having to give it up to shift to another direction or route before completion of the journey is an aggravation, especially if baggage or packages must be transferred too. Insofar as The Rideway is concerned, the equipment to shift the entire vehicle is inherent because of the above goal of door-to-door service. The same equipment that loads the Ridecar onto the Rideway could transfer the vehicle from conveyor to conveyor.

Station-to-station service was obsoleted by the automobile and is now unacceptable.

7. Unlimited availability

Herein is one of the most subtle and obscure problems in public transportation. Much has been said about the drop in use of public transit outside of peak hours. But no one has really examined the situation for causes and solutions. Surely a major cause is a simple lack of convenience which, for the shopper, the traveler, or the family, may suddenly escalate under the right circumstances to an outright hazard.

For example, on busses there is the inconvenience of obtaining coins and paying the fare while burdened with packages or bags. In addition, there is the subtle peer pressure of the passengers or those still waiting to board to get on with it. And finally there is the difficulty of simply wrestling those packages through the door and down the aisleway.

On trains, starting can be a moment of terror if the doors start to close while you are still trying to board.

All these situations are aggravated when there are children in tow or aged or infirm persons are involved. Doubtless, all these matters seem quite picayune to the sophisticated traveler; however those who use public transit consist, to a significant degree, of those who lack worldliness or savoir faire.
In the Rideway system, the Ridecar is made available to the individual for as long as it takes to load or unload. It is under the command of the customer. There is no urgency, no immediacy. However should the Ridecar remain at the destination over twenty minutes, it will be examined to assure that it is simply not customer negligence that makes it appear to be in use.

8. Elimination of the parking problem

Be there a city planner or engineer who wouldn't give a cheer for this item? Even property owners should be happy to see more productive use of their real estate.

The Ridecar is conceived as being part of The Rideway System much as the telephone is part of the telephone system. Thus, the Ridecar would be returned to the Rideway immediately upon release by the customer at the destination. Since another Ridecar would be readily available when needed again, there is no purpose in retaining a Ridecar. If Ridecars are to be "parked" because of a system surplus during certain hours, they would be stored in low-cost areas chosen for this purpose.

Private ownership of Ridecars would be discouraged because of safety and reliability considerations. If private automobiles are an example, maintenance and repair are deferred as long as possible. The Rideway, transporting human beings as it is, cannot tolerate shoddy and hazardous maintenance. Private Ridecars would be required to meet the same standards of frequent inspections and maintenance as system vehicles.

9. Minimization of smog

Because The Rideway is an all-electric system, the source of smog does not exist.

The question does arise about the source of electricity when there are frequent promises of power shortages in the near future. The answer to this lies in the more efficient use of fuel in The Rideway.

It is expected that fuel saved when customers patronize The Rideway will be diverted to power generating plants. If nothing more occurs, the generating plants can achieve a 18% improvement in fuel utilization. The thermal efficiency of a motor car engine can achieve 22% while for a steam generating plant it can be as high as 40%. But an automobile engine in peak condition is bound to be a rarity while

commercial generating plants are constantly monitored for efficiency. So the improvement is bound to be better than 18%.

10. Safety

A primary consideration where human beings are concerned. The conveyors, which are the backbone of the system, are likely the safest means of motion devised. There is no possibility of collision as in rail or guideway systems, and this is achieved without additional devices, usually complex, to assure vehicle spacing. The simplicity of the arrangement enhances reliability as well as safety.

The Intrarporters for loading and shifting Ridecars would follow that maxim stated by Lewis Carroll and later adopted in computer use: "What I tell you three times is true." Thus, any moves made by an Intraporter would be verified in three different ways before being executed. A discrepancy would put that Intraporter out of service.

This ended the original list of features. With the advent of BART, especially, and the Morgantown, West Virginia systems, it was evident that there were other advantages in The Rideway that hadn't even occurred to me. So more features were added.

11. Elimination of driving responsibilities

While driving may be a pleasant release or diversion, there is too much evidence that the human being is a poor servomechanism. Distractions, exhaustion, illness, or any other degradation of performance can be disastrous.

12. Free of intermediate stops

From the point of view of the customer, stops to pick up or discharge other passengers, to wait for traffic lights, or for any reason whatsoever are aggravating.

Intermediate stops also cancel any advantage that trains may achieve through higher speeds.

13. High reliability

Necessary to achieve quality service and safety. This will be accomplished in The Rideway by the use of parallel and redundant functions. Serial operations, such as used in rail or guideway systems, will be scrupulously avoided.

14. Low cost to customer

The cost should not be more than the apparent expense of an automobile for subjective reasons. No one thinks of automobile costs in terms more complex than the immediate cost of gasoline and, perhaps, monthly payments. Then to achieve parity in the mind of a potential customer, a trip on The Rideway should cost on the order of the gasoline
expense when going by car.

When cost figures were developed for The Rideway back in 1972, a base fare of 30¢ was proposed; this was comparable to a gallon of gasoline then. Nowadays, there should be a differential in favor of The Rideway because the cost of the electronic devices used very extensively in the system has not increased to the degree of the cost of living.

15. Return on investment

To be of interest to the private sector, this is essential. In the projections of Appendix A which were prepared in 1972, it appeared that only two customers per minute as an average would achieve the break-even point. The capacity of a conveyor at its minimum speed is 440 Ride cars per minute. If the concept is truly competitive with the automobile, then there should be no problem in achieving a profitable operation.

16. Personal entertainment, education, or diversion

For the driver of a car, there is no real grasp of the dullness and boredom of a trip even when it is a daily occurrence. The passengers are the ones who are truly aware of the tiresomeness of confined inactivity.

Eventually this should be recognized and accommodated in The Rideway system. Probably something similar to cable TV should be offered, something that can entertain, inform, educate, offer games, telephone, or whatever else might eliminate boredom.

17. Free user of routing or scheduling responsibilities

Here is another case where existing transportation concepts create hurdles for the customer. The daily routine trip to work is readily learned and accommodated. Even occasional variations by the transit company are accepted. But trying to make the single trip to a new destination is a challenge. Changes of service with time of day, fares, transfer points, and a host of details critical to success and tranquility do not entice customers.

There really is no reason, nowadays, for the customer to have to know all the internal operations of a transportation system. The critical items, unique to each customer, are the point of origination and the destination; all the rest would be better left to machines designed specifically to handle routing and volume. Having indicated his purpose, the customer should be able to relax and enjoy.

This completes the current list of marketing features. Doubtless, the reader has ideas of his own against which The Rideway can be measured. Apply them! When The Rideway is truly understood, either it will meet the criteria or they will be found obsolete in this framework.
TO: JPACT
FROM: Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Endorsing an Urban Initiatives Grant Application for Pioneer Square and Amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution No. endorsing the City of Portland's Urban Initiatives Grant application in the amount of $1,880,000 in Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) funds to cover Pioneer Square related transit improvements, and amending the TIP to include this project.

B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will enable implementation of transit related improvements to Pioneer Square as an element of the Banfield LRT project, enable the timely coordination of the two projects, and amend the TIP to include the grant funding (See Exhibit A). Urban initiative funding is allocated by UMTA on a discretionary basis. This action is consistent with Metro's responsibility for allocating federal transportation funds as described in the 5-year operation plan.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: The responsibility to implement and provide local matching funds, previously set aside for the project, rests with the City of Portland and with Tri-Met. The approved Metro budget provides for staff involvement in establishing project priorities and monitoring project implementation.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: The City of Portland is requesting an amendment to the TIP for a portion of the Pioneer Square project in Downtown Portland. The proposed funding source is the UMTA's Urban Initiative Program. Pioneer Square, a key element in the City's Downtown Plan, has always included an important transit transfer and information element. In 1978, Tri-Met submitted a $1.5 million grant application to UMTA for Pioneer Square transit-related improvements. At that time, UMTA recommended that the application be deferred until a decision had been reached on the Banfield project. When the final Banfield grant was submitted, it was determined that the Pioneer Square related elements should be submitted as a separate grant. The City has recently completed the selection of a project design and will soon begin final design work on the Square, with construction scheduled to begin in July 1981. Tri-Met will shortly begin final design on the Banfield LRT project. It is critical that these two projects be carefully coordinated and that the grant application be submitted immediately.
The City, with Tri-Met's support, is submitting an UMTA Urban Initiative grant application for $2.35 million (total dollars). Urban initiative grants are funded on an 80 percent federal ($1,880,000) and 20 percent local share basis and the City and Tri-Met have reserved adequate local match for the project. Design funds would be programmed for the current fiscal year, with construction funds scheduled for the fourth quarter of this fiscal year and the following year.

Pioneer Station will enhance and facilitate connections with pedestrian, bicycle, light rail, bus, auto, and parking systems brought together at Pioneer Square and will provide appropriate access, shelter and stopping places for each system. The Station will provide a full range of terminal facilities, including seating, shelter, vendors, restrooms, telephone service, transit information and services, bicycle parking, eating and waiting facilities. These improvements will be developed with attention to security, lighting, accessibility, and an environment reflecting the quality of the surrounding urban area. The proposed plan for Pioneer Square appears in Exhibit B, Impact Area Plan.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Many design alternatives were considered including do nothing. The proposed design was selected based on cost and timing of implementation and offered maximum benefits in the form of:

- Opportunity to construct shelters at today's cost.
- Improvements to the Square consistent with the existing Transit Mall.
- Concurrent development of the Banfield LRT.

In the short term, the Pioneer Square improvements will serve transfer between east-west bus routes on Morrison and Yamhill and north-south bus routes in the Transit Mall. Without the facilities provided by the Pioneer Square Urban Initiatives Grant, Tri-Met will construct smaller shelter and information facilities as part of the Banfield LRT project. These facilities would not include amenities to be compatible with Pioneer Square and the Transit Mall.

C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution.

BP: lmk
11-3-80
WHEREAS, Metro Council Resolution No. 80-166 endorsed Tri-Met's capital grant application for construction of the Banfield Light-Rail project (LRT); and

WHEREAS, when the Banfield Grant was submitted it was determined that a separate grant be submitted covering a project of related transit improvements in Pioneer Square; and

WHEREAS, the City of Portland has completed selection of project design and will soon begin final design work on the Square with construction scheduled to begin in July, 1981; and

WHEREAS, the City of Portland, with Tri-Met's support, is submitting to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) an Urban Initiatives Grant application for $1,880,000 (Federal) to cover implementation of the Pioneer Square project; and

WHEREAS, this project is necessary to successful implementation of the Banfield LRT project and is a key element in the City of Portland's Downtown Plan; and

WHEREAS, it is critical that these two projects be concurrently developed; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council endorses the Pioneer Square Urban Initiatives Grant as submitted to UMTA by the City of Portland.

2. That the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) be amended to reflect the Section 3 Funds and schedule set forth in
Exhibit A.

3. That the Metro Council affirms that the project is in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process and hereby gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.

BP: lmk
11-3-80
**PROJECT INFORMATION FORM - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**PROJECT NAME:** Pioneer Square Transit Improvements  
**ID No:** Various  
**APPLICANT:** City of Portland

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION
**RESPONSIBILITY (AGENCY):** City of Portland  
**LIMITS:** See Impact Area Plan  
**DESCRIPTION:** The project will provide for widened sidewalks in the area adjacent to the Square, larger than standard passenger shelters for the LRT station and a transit information center within the Square. Additionally, the grant will provide for paving materials and other design features within the public right-of-way which are consistent with the Transit Mall and the Square itself.

### RELATIONSHIP TO ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LONG RANGE ELEMENT</th>
<th>TSM ELEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUNDING PLAN BY FISCAL YEAR ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 78</th>
<th>FY 79</th>
<th>FY 81</th>
<th>FY 82</th>
<th>FY 83</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI-MET</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOCATION MAP
See Impact Area Plan

### SCHEDULE
- TO ODOT __________
- PE OK'D __________
- EIS OK'D __________
- CAT'Y __________
- BID LET __________
- HEARING __________
- COMPL'T __________

### APPLICANT'S ESTIMATE OF TOTAL PROJECT COST

| PRELIM ENGINEERING | $ 200,000 |
| CONSTRUCTION       | $ 2,150,000 |
| RIGHT OF WAY       |            |
| TRAFFIC CONTROL    |            |
| ILLUMIN, SIGNS, LANDSCAPING, ETC | |
| STRUCTURES         |            |
| RAILROAD CROSSINGS |            |

**TOTAL:** $ 2,350,000

### SOURCE OF FUNDS (%)

**FEDERAL**
- FAUS (PORTLAND) __________
- FAUS (OREGON REGION) __________
- FAUS (WASH REGION) __________
- UMTA CAPITAL __________
- UMTA OPRTG __________
- INTERSTATE __________
- FED AID PRIMARY __________
- INTERSTATE __________
- SUBSTITUTION __________

**NON FEDERAL**
- STATE __________
- LOCAL __________
- TRI-MET __________
- 5
TO: Regional Planning Committee  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Endorsing an Urban Initiatives Grant Application for Pioneer Square and Amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution No. endorsing the City of Portland's Urban Initiatives Grant application in the amount of $1,880,000 in Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) funds to cover Pioneer Square related transit improvements, and amending the TIP to include this project.

B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will enable implementation of transit related improvements to Pioneer Square as an element of the Banfield LRT project, enable the timely coordination of the two projects, and amend the TIP to include the grant funding (See Exhibit A). Urban initiative funding is allocated by UMTA on a discretionary basis. This action is consistent with Metro's responsibility for allocating federal transportation funds as described in the 5-year operation plan.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: The responsibility to implement and provide local matching funds, previously set aside for the project, rests with the City of Portland and with Tri-Met. The approved Metro budget provides for staff involvement in establishing project priorities and monitoring project implementation.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: The City of Portland is requesting an amendment to the TIP for a portion of the Pioneer Square project in Downtown Portland. The proposed funding source is the UMTA's Urban Initiative Program. Pioneer Square, a key element in the City's Downtown Plan, has always included an important transit transfer and information element. In 1978, Tri-Met submitted a $1.5 million grant application to UMTA for Pioneer Square transit-related improvements. At that time, UMTA recommended that the application be deferred until a decision had been reached on the Banfield project. When the final Banfield grant was submitted, it was determined that the Pioneer Square related elements should be submitted as a separate grant. The City has recently completed the selection of a project design and will soon begin final design work on the Square, with construction scheduled to begin in July 1981. Tri-Met will shortly begin final design on the Banfield LRT project. It is critical that these two projects be carefully coordinated and that the grant application be submitted immediately.
The City, with Tri-Met's support, is submitting an UMTA Urban Initiative grant application for $2.35 million (total dollars). Urban initiative grants are funded on an 80 percent federal ($1,880,000) and 20 percent local share basis and the City and Tri-Met have reserved adequate local match for the project. Design funds would be programmed for the current fiscal year, with construction funds scheduled for the fourth quarter of this fiscal year and the following year.

Pioneer Station will enhance and facilitate connections with pedestrian, bicycle, light rail, bus, auto, and parking systems brought together at Pioneer Square and will provide appropriate access, shelter and stopping places for each system. The Station will provide a full range of terminal facilities, including seating, shelter, vendors, restrooms, telephone service, transit information and services, bicycle parking, eating and waiting facilities. These improvements will be developed with attention to security, lighting, accessibility, and an environment reflecting the quality of the surrounding urban area. The proposed plan for Pioneer Square appears in Exhibit B, Impact Area Plan.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Many design alternatives were considered including do nothing. The proposed design was selected based on cost and timing of implementation and offered maximum benefits in the form of:

. Opportunity to construct shelters at today's cost.

. Improvements to the Square consistent with the existing Transit Mall.

. Concurrent development of the Banfield LRT.

In the short term, the Pioneer Square improvements will serve transfer between east-west bus routes on Morrison and Yamhill and north-south bus routes in the Transit Mall. Without the facilities provided by the Pioneer Square Urban Initiatives Grant, Tri-Met will construct smaller shelter and information facilities as part of the Banfield LRT project. These facilities would not include amenities to be compatible with Pioneer Square and the Transit Mall.

C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution.

BP: lmk
11-3-80
WHEREAS, Metro Council Resolution No. 80-166 endorsed Tri-Met's capital grant application for construction of the Banfield Light-Rail project (LRT); and

WHEREAS, when the Banfield Grant was submitted it was determined that a separate grant be submitted covering a project of related transit improvements in Pioneer Square; and

WHEREAS, the City of Portland has completed selection of project design and will soon begin final design work on the Square with construction scheduled to begin in July, 1981; and

WHEREAS, the City of Portland, with Tri-Met's support, is submitting to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) an Urban Initiatives Grant application for $1,880,000 (Federal) to cover implementation of the Pioneer Square project; and

WHEREAS, this project is necessary to successful implementation of the Banfield LRT project and is a key element in the City of Portland's Downtown Plan; and

WHEREAS, it is critical that these two projects be concurrently developed; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council endorses the Pioneer Square Urban Initiatives Grant as submitted to UMTA by the City of Portland.

2. That the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) be amended to reflect the Section 3 Funds and schedule set forth in
Exhibit A.

3. That the Metro Council affirms that the project is in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process and hereby gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.

BP:1mk
11-3-80
PROJECT INFORMATION FORM - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

RESPONSIBILITY (AGENCY) City of Portland

LIMITS See Impact Area Plan

DESCRIPTION

The project will provide for widened sidewalks in the area adjacent to the Square, larger than standard passenger shelters for the LRT station and a transit information center within the Square. Additionally, the grant will provide for paving materials and other design features within the public right-of-way which are consistent with the Transit Mall and the Square itself.

RELATIONSHIP TO ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION PLAN

LONG RANGE ELEMENT TSM ELEMENT X

FUNDING PLAN BY FISCAL YEAR ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 78</th>
<th>FY 79</th>
<th>FY 81</th>
<th>FY 82</th>
<th>FY 83</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI-MET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION MAP

See Impact Area Plan

PROJECT NAME Pioneer Square Transit Improvements
ID No Various
APPLICANT City of Portland

SCHEDULE

TO ODOT ______ PE OK'D ______ EIS OK'D ______ CAT'Y ______ BID LET ______ HEARING ______ COMPL'T ______

APPLICANT'S ESTIMATE OF TOTAL PROJECT COST

PRELIM ENGINEERING $ 200,000
CONSTRUCTION 2,150,000

SOURCE OF FUNDS (%)

FEDERAL

FAUS (PORTLAND) ______
FAUS (OREGON REGION) ______
FAUS (WASH REGION) ______
UMTA CAPITAL 80 UMTA OPRTG ______
INTERSTATE ______
FED AID PRIMARY ______
INTERSTATE ______
SUBSTITUTION ______

NON FEDERAL

STATE ______
TRI-MET 15
LOCAL 5
EXISTING MALL IMPROVEMENTS

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT AREAS

EXHIBIT "B"
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
AND
CLARK COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

For the purpose of establishing a process, schedule and
division of responsibilities for determination of Clark County
population/employment forecasts.

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) has
been designated by the Governor of the state of Oregon as the
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Oregon portion of
the Portland/Vancouver urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, The Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC)
has been designated by the Governor of the state of Washington as
the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Washington
portion of the Portland/Vancouver urbanized area; and

WHEREAS, In a Memorandum of Agreement between Metro and
RPC dated September 6, 1979, it was agreed that both agencies would
cooperate to the extent possible, in all transportation and air
quality planning activities to ensure that the products of these
activities are fully coordinated; and

WHEREAS, Developing and utilizing a consistent assumption
with respect to future population and employment levels in Clark
County is an important part of ensuring that transportation and air
quality plans are coordinated; and

WHEREAS, The population/employment forecasts presently
being used by Clark County for land use, "208" and other local
planning activities are different from the forecast developed by
incorporated into the FY 1981 Metro/Clark County Agreement.

This Memorandum of Agreement is entered into and effective this _____ day of ______________, 1980.

REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL OF CLARK COUNTY

By: Richard T. Howsley
   Executive Director

AC/gl
4184A/57A

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

By: Denton U. Kent
   Chief Administrative Officer
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 31, 1980
To: JPACT
From: Andrew Cotugno, Acting Transportation Director
Regarding: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

A subcommittee of JPACT met to discuss the process for completion of the RTP. Their recommendation is as follows:

November: JPACT review and accept long-range highway and transit service criteria to serve as the guide for evaluation of long-range alternatives.

NOTE: The November agenda also includes a review and endorsement of Tri-Met's TDP. This will be conducted in the context of the accepted service criteria.

December: TPAC development of a wide range of alternatives for general evaluation to determine which should proceed with detailed evaluation. This effort would involve evaluation of a "committed" transit and highway system to provide the basis for development of a series of alternatives that meet the accepted service policies. The range of alternatives would involve differing levels of transit investment, highway investment and carpooling.

JPACT progress report on development of alternative system concepts.

January: JPACT selection of a smaller set of alternatives for detailed staff evaluation. This evaluation would consist of travel forecasts, operating cost, maintenance cost, capital cost, access to jobs, energy consumption, air pollution and highway level of service. This evaluation would compare the alternatives to one another and to the committed system.

February & March: Monthly JPACT progress reports, public involvement, local jurisdiction involvement in the evaluation of alternatives.
TRANSPORTATION EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) will ensure that adequate mobility is provided throughout the urbanized area. To determine the desired level of mobility, criteria are described below. The minimum levels of accessibility will be provided through transit, carpool and highway improvements on the transit and highway routes of regional significance (i.e., regional transit trunk routes, sub-regional transit trunk routes, freeways, principal arterials, major arterials). Minimum level-of-service criteria for the transit and highway system are also described below. The RTP will present a cost-effective set of transportation improvements to meet these goals and objectives and define necessary funding sources.

Accessibility Criteria

Minimum levels of accessibility are primarily directed towards work-related activities since work is such a vital concern to individuals. Accessibility is, therefore, measured in terms of access to job opportunities and truck access to employment areas. Additional important accessibility objectives deal with the size of retail market areas and directness of statewide travel within the metropolitan area. Minimum levels of accessibility will be provided as follows:

1. Major residential sectors of the region shall have more job opportunities available within 30 minutes travel time during peak-hours than are currently available.

2. Major employment centers shall be provided with convenient access to a major arterial and bus service.

3. Population within 30 minutes travel time during off-peak hours of major shopping locations shall exceed current levels.

4. A principal arterial or freeway route will be provided for statewide travel within the region from each entry point to each exit point and from each entry point to the I-405 loop. If more than one route is available, the more direct route will be designated unless through traffic is incompatible with surrounding properties. Travel times shall not be lengthened by more than 10 percent through use of indirect routes.

Highway Service Criteria

Traffic volumes on the major regional highways should closely match available capacity to avoid excessive congestion problems. Adequate level of service is defined as follows:

1. Highway service will be directed at maximum throughput during the peak period subject to avoiding system breakdown. This is
defined as the maximum service volume at level of service "D." The following condition will not be exceeded during the peak 90 minutes:

a. Freeways - when freeway speeds fall below 35-40 mph during the peak period (depending on freeway design).

b. Arterials - When typical signal delay averages in excess of 35 seconds during the peak period (generally more than one signal cycle).

2. Level of service shall not exceed "C" for the highest volume off-peak hour. Level of service "C" is exceeded under the following conditions:

a. Freeways - When freeway speeds average less than 45-50 mph (depending on freeway design).

b. Arterials - When typical signal delay is in excess of 25 seconds.

Transit Service Criteria

The minimum level of transit service to be provided is dependent on not only capacity as with the highway system but also availability, speed, frequency, transfer convenience and fare. Adequate level of service will be provided as follows:

1. A regional trunk system will be provided to directly and conveniently serve long distance trips in each major travel corridor. The characteristics of regional trunk routes are as follows:

   a. Radial regional trunk routes will serve each major travel corridor connecting central Portland with major suburban activity centers. In addition to other purposes, these routes will be expected to carry the increase in work trips to downtown Portland due to new development.

   b. Circumferential regional trunk routes will interconnect major suburban activity centers. These routes will be designed to provide access to major trip attractors without transfer through downtown Portland.

   c. Regional trunk routes and highways must, in combination with carpooling, provide sufficient peak period capacity to serve peak period demand.

   d. Regional trunk routes will provide high-speed service. Preferential treatment for buses, limited stop service and/or express service during peak hours will be considered as needed to maintain a peak period transit travel time no longer than peak period highway travel time.
e. Regional trunk routes will provide the following service frequency to serve urban development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Base</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl</td>
<td>120 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Subregional trunk routes will serve intermediate length trips between major concentrations of development and downtown Portland and suburban activity centers. Subregional trunk routes will maintain the following minimum frequency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Base</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl</td>
<td>120 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Bus routes will be provided at approximately every one-half mile spacing as permitted by physical terrain, street patterns and pedestrian facilities.

4. Sufficient peak-hour transit capacity will be provided on every route to ensure that average peak-hour standees do not exceed 3.5 persons per square meter and crush load standees do not exceed 8 persons per square meter. Off-peak standees shall not exceed one person per square meter. Current and planned equipment would, therefore, have the following capacity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Off-Peak</th>
<th>Off-Peak</th>
<th>Off-Peak</th>
<th>Off-Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard bus</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulated bus</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulated Light</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Trunk and local routes will be designed with convenient transfer opportunities to allow travel between downtown Portland and all residential areas with no more than one transfer, between other major origins and destinations with no more than two transfers and within local areas with no more than one transfer. Transfer opportunities will be provided through provision of a grid system in high density areas and transit stations elsewhere.

6. Park and ride lots will be established to provide convenient auto access to regional trunk route service for areas not directly served by transit.
7. Local jurisdictions can, at their option and expense, establish special community transit services with connections to regular fixed route service.

8. The fare structure will meet the following objectives:
   - Fares should keep pace with inflation.
   - Passengers should pay at least one-third of the overall cost of providing service.
   - The amount of service (length of ride, speed, frequency) should be equivalent to the fare collected.
   - Special discounts should be provided to promote regular ridership and benefit low mobility groups.
   - Innovative fare programs should be used to promote increased ridership.
   - The fare collection system should be convenient for the user.

Regional Transitway Policies

Regional transitways (light rail transit or exclusive busways) provide an attractive method of providing regional trunk route service. With a partially separated right-of-way and larger vehicles, greater capacity and higher speed service can be provided while concurrently minimizing operating cost. Regional transitways have additional benefits of providing efficient high capacity service to high density developments, thereby providing a logical tool for targeting locations for high density developments. Regional transitways are, however, a very high cost public investment. As such, they are warranted in only the most heavily traveled corridors. The criteria for consideration of a regional transitway to provide desired regional trunk route service is as follows:

1. Regional transitways (i.e., light rail transit or exclusive busway) will be considered where a separated right-of-way is needed to economically provide high speed and/or high capacity operation on a regional trunk route. (Note: this policy requires further development to more precisely define an "economical" transitway).

2. Phase I studies will be initiated to document the "need" for a transitway and conduct a cost-effectiveness evaluation of a wide range of alternatives to identify a smaller set to be examined in more detail in Phase II. The Phase I studies will include an assessment of potential downtown Portland operations and identify the alternatives in downtown to consider during Phase II. Due to limited staff resources, a Phase I Alternatives Analysis will not be initiated unless other corridor studies have gained federal approval of the preferred alternative and authorization to proceed with completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).
3. Phase II studies will be initiated if warranted from the results of the Phase I Alternatives Analysis to examine the alternatives in detail and select the most cost-effective. Phase II studies will not be initiated unless other corridors have gained federal approval of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

4. Each transitway corridor will be annually evaluated to determine "eligibility" for initiating a Phase I and Phase II Alternatives Analysis and will be prioritized to identify which corridor will proceed next. Local jurisdictions in each corridor are encouraged to take local actions to provide transit supportive land uses and protect potential rights-of-way to increase the priority of the affected corridor. The criteria will be as follows:

- at least 75 percent of the minimum required ridership (to be developed to expand criteria #1) must be expected within five years (i.e., if 40,000 ridership is required to include a particular transitway in the RTP, at least 30,000 must be expected within ten years);

- capital cost, operating cost savings, duration for operating cost savings to recover capital cost;

- existing or planned transit supportive land uses surrounding potential stations;

- right-of-way availability;

- travel time savings.
AGENDA MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

TO: JPACT
FROM: Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Endorsing Tri-Met's Five-Year Transit Development Program (TDP) and Amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution No. _____ which endorses Tri-Met's TDP and amends the TIP to include additional TDP projects not now in the TIP.

B. POLICY IMPACT: This action supports Tri-Met's service expansion program and the need for additional funding support. In addition this action will add nine transit/park and ride facilities utilizing UMTA Section 3 funds to the TIP, thereby, making the TIP consistent with the TDP.

Currently in the TIP (Utilizing Section 3 funds)

Tigard Transit Station
Tualatin Transit Station
Washington Sq. Transit Station
Columbia/Sandy Transit Station
Mall 205 Transit Station
Kenton Transit Station
Jantzen Beach Transit Station
St. Johns Transit Station
Lake Oswego Transit Station
Beaverton Park and Ride
Tigard Park and Ride

To be Added (Utilizing Section 3 funds)

Burlingame Transit Station
Sylvan Transit Station
Raleigh Hills Transit Station
Lents Transit Station
Hillsboro Transit Station
Tannasborne Transit Station
Lake Oswego Park and Ride
Hillsboro Park and Ride

Currently in the TIP (Utilizing (e)(4) funds)

Tigard Transit Center
Beaverton Park and Ride
Clackamas Transit Center
Milwaukie Transit Center
Milwaukie Park and Ride
Oregon City Transit Center

To be added at later date utilizing Interstate funds

Clackamas TC Park and Ride
Oregon City Park and Ride
Columbia/Sandy Park and Ride
Foster/I-205 Park and Ride
Tualatin Park and Ride

It will also program in the TIP the purchase of an additional 30 articulated buses and 147 standard buses for service expansion, and the repowering of 165 buses. These, together with the 162 buses already programmed in the TIP, will allow expansion of the fleet to 886 buses.
Endorsing the TDP will serve to fulfill objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in reducing traffic congestion, relieving adverse impacts on the environment caused by the automobile, increasing energy conservation and improving overall efficiency and mobility of the transportation system.

The Five Year Operational Plan provides for development of the RTP and allocation of federal transportation funding. Adoption of this Resolution will provide for incorporation of Tri-Met's TDP into the RTP and allow use of federal funding for its implementation.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget funds staff involvement in coordinating project priorities and monitoring project implementation.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: The Tri-Met TDP sets forth a series of proposed improvements to transit service through 1985. It was adopted by the Tri-Met Board in June, 1980, after an extensive review by citizens and local governments.

The TDP recommends a Major Service Improvement plan, highlights of which are summarized below:

1. Increase Service Capacity - expand the Tri-Met fleet to 886 buses. Of these, 125 will be more efficient articulated buses. This bus fleet, plus the LRT system, will almost double transit capacity by 1985, and will serve about 230,000 average weekday riders. This represents an average annual growth of about 11 percent. Moreover, the recommended system will be more productive. The longer articulated buses will carry 50 percent more passengers per labor unit. Consequently, by 1985, these vehicles can carry the same number of passengers for about $2 million less (per year) than an equivalent number of standard buses. Twenty-six LRT vehicles will carry up to 300 percent more passengers per labor unit than standard buses, producing even greater efficiencies.

2. Increase Transit Service - Improve frequency of transit service, especially in east Portland; provide new grid routes in East Multnomah County, a fully developed timed-transfer service in Clackamas County, Southwest Portland and the suburbs in Washington County; increase direct accessibility in downtown Portland; include the option of using trolley buses on five major lines. With full implementation, the 1985 system will look like this: In Eastside Portland and East Multnomah County, the Banfield LRT line provides trunk line service between Portland and
Gresham. North/South grid service is provided, connecting to most of the LRT stations. In other areas of the Region, trunk bus lines connect transit centers with downtown Portland, or other transit centers. Local or crosstown lines connect to the trunk lines at the transit centers and to surrounding residential areas or major trip generators. To the maximum extent possible, local-to-trunkline service at these transit centers is synchronized to minimize waiting time between transfers.

Provide New Service - Towle Road, Roberts and Palmquist in Gresham; Stark Street and Troutdale Road in Gresham; Sandy Boulevard and Columbia Boulevard in Northeast Portland; Cornell and Thompson in Northwest Portland; Patton Road and Scholls Ferry Road in West Portland; Jenkins, Baseline and 216th in Washington County; 121st and Scholls Ferry in Beaverton; and 112th, Mt. Scott and 92nd in Happy Valley.

The TDP outlines a program of service improvements and expansion designed to meet the community's needs for transit and transportation services. Financial projections, however, indicate that current sources of revenue will prove inadequate to support these service improvements by FY 1982. While the region has not yet adopted a financing formula to ensure sufficient funding for transit's expanding role, Tri-Met must realistically define its ability to meet these demands and the cost involved, and identify resources and revenues required. The implementation of the service plan will depend primarily upon the agency's financial ability to obtain buses and develop the facilities which are critical to the coordination of the proposed schedule of service improvements.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: The Existing Services Commitments alternative simply allows the minimal improvements necessary to support the Banfield Light Rail Line, with new lines in East Multnomah County, and two new lines from Milwaukie and Clackamas Town Center. This level of growth would provide no new service beyond commitments Tri-Met has already made. It would meet an average annual ridership growth of only four percent, accommodating merely 183,000 average daily riders in 1985. Although it would increase the fleet to 501 standard buses, 125 articulated buses and 26 light rail vehicles, it would not be sufficient to develop the feeder bus infrastructure necessary to support a new transitway on the Westside. The virtue of its affordability under present revenue sources is overshadowed, however, by its obvious inadequacy in light of growing demand.
C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution endorsing the TDP and amending the TIP to include the noted projects.
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WHEREAS, Tri-Met has developed a five-year Transit Development Program (TDP) which outlines systematic improvements to transit service; and

WHEREAS, The TDP was adopted by the Tri-Met Board of Directors in June, 1980; and

WHEREAS, The TDP meets regional goals for transit service improvement; and

WHEREAS, Federal guidelines require that Metro adopt a transit system management program including transit service improvements to provide the basis for federal funding eligibility; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council endorses the five-year TDP.

2. That the Metro Council amends the FY 81 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and its Annual Element to include the capital improvements identified in Attachment "A."

3. That the Metro Council finds these actions to be in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process and hereby gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Cost Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Transit Station</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>$640,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvan Transit Station</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh Hills Transit Stn.</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repowering 50 buses</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>1,248,400</td>
<td>312,100</td>
<td>1,560,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repowering 40 buses</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>1,139,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>1,424,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lents Transit Station</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro Transit Station</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannasborne Transit Station</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of 60 Stand. Buses</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>10,284,515</td>
<td>2,571,128</td>
<td>12,855,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repowering 40 Buses</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>1,275,120</td>
<td>318,780</td>
<td>1,593,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Articulated Buses</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>7,469,600</td>
<td>1,867,400</td>
<td>9,337,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Oswego Park and Ride</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>1,410,400</td>
<td>352,600</td>
<td>1,763,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukie Park and Ride</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>1,410,400</td>
<td>352,600</td>
<td>1,763,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repowering 35 Buses</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>1,249,600</td>
<td>312,400</td>
<td>1,562,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro Park and Ride</td>
<td>Post 84</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>1,392,000</td>
<td>348,000</td>
<td>1,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of 90 Stand. Buses</td>
<td>Post 84</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>17,278,000</td>
<td>4,319,500</td>
<td>21,597,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**: $45,373,035 | $11,343,508 | $56,716,543