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AGENDA

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: March 12, 1981
Day: Thursday
Time: 7:30 a.m.
Place: Metro Conference Room A1/A2

1. REDESIGNATION OF HIGHWAY 123 (NORTH PORTLAND) - APPROVAL REQUESTED.

2. INTERSTATE TRANSFER REPORT - Andy Cotugno.
   - Results of Trip to Washington
   - Proposed 3-Way Strategy:
     Federal Lobbying
     Priority Setting
     Development of Local Financing

3. STATUS OF FEDERAL LOBBYING EFFORT - Paul Bay.

4. STATUS OF LOCAL PRIORITY SETTING - Bob Bothman.

*5. ENDORSEMENT OF 221ST/223RD AS A HIGH PRIORITY FOR ANY REMAINING FY 81 INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDING AFTER 1ST PRIORITY LIST IS FUNDED - APPROVAL REQUESTED.

*Material Enclosed
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: February 12, 1981

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


Guests: Ted Spence, Gilbert Mallery, David Peach, Sarah Salazar, Martin Nizlek, John Price, Bebe Rucker, Paul Bay, Steve Dotterrer, Winston Kurth, Dave Hill, Wink Brooks, Bill Greene, Rick Walker, Byron York, Bob Prowda, and Mike Borresen

Staff: Rick Gustafson, Andy Cotugno, Sue Klobertanz, Terry Bolstad, Ellen Duke, Keith Lawton, Karen Thackston, Caryl Waters, Lubin Quinones (FHWA), Richard Brandman, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Phil Adamsak, the Oregon Journal

SUMMARY:

At the onset of the meeting, Chairman Bonner introduced and welcomed Vern Veysey as the new appointment to JPACT representing Clark County.

An announcement was also made by Chairman Bonner to the effect that Charlie Williamson will assume the chairmanship of JPACT at its next meeting while Mr. Bonner will take over chairmanship of the Regional Planning Committee.

1. FY 81 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT

Andy Cotugno reviewed the Agenda Management Summary and Resolution for proposed amendment to the FY 81 UWP for the purpose of deleting a previously programmed grant that will not be received, for additional work effort to complete the RTP, and for programming of Tri-Met FY 80 carryover funding into FY 81.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the FY 81 Unified Work Program amendment. Motion CARRIED.
2. RESOLUTION SETTING PRIORITIES FOR PROJECTS USING INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS IN FY 81

Following review of the Agenda Management Summary and Resolution, it was stressed that this would be the final action taken on the setting of priorities for projects using Interstate Transfer funds in FY 81. It was pointed out that this package was developed by the TIP Subcommittee with recommendations from JPACT at its January 8, 1981 meeting. The Portland region has been allocated a total of $21 million and $18 million for use on highway and transit projects, respectively. Andy stated that the overprogramming is intended as a means of providing insurance for a project that slips into next year to be replaced by another.

A summary table depicting the monetary breakdown of highway funding by jurisdiction was exhibited at the meeting. The affected jurisdictions included Multnomah County, City of Portland, Clackamas County, ODOT, Tri-Met, and Washington County.

It was moved and seconded to approve the Agenda Management Summary and Resolution setting priorities for projects using Interstate Transfer funds in FY 81.

In discussion on this motion, Mayor Meyers spoke of the critical need to his jurisdiction for the 221st/223rd project to be included in the Priority 1 listing. He, therefore, moved that the motion be amended to provide for placing 221st/223rd in the top priority of FY 81 for use of supplemental or re-allocated funding and top priority for funding in FY 82 (after the Banfield). The amended motion was seconded by Commissioner Buchanan. A letter supportive of this request was mailed to Committee members prior to the meeting.

In discussion on the proposed amendment, several jurisdictions indicated that their jurisdictions in kind were faced with the same financial dilemma and felt that this was a time for the various jurisdictions to be unified in their efforts. The group particularly felt that it is inappropriate to set any priorities for FY 82 without having evaluated other candidate projects. In addition, Bob Bothman related that, in the case of 221st/223rd, ODOT is not as yet authorized to purchase right-of-way. In discussion on the proposed amendment, Mayor Myers stated that it was not his intent to place the importance of the 221st/223rd project over that of the Banfield. In voting on the proposed amendment, the motion FAILED.
Action Taken: In calling for the question on the initial motion, the motion CARRIED for approval of the Resolution setting priorities for projects using Interstate Transfer funds in FY 81.

3. DRAFT ISSUE PAPER ON USDOT FUNDING POLICIES

A copy of the Draft Issue Paper was distributed to Committee members for information and discussion purposes. Andy related that this paper was presented at two separate meetings of LOAC and stated further that Bob Duncan has been retained by Metro for lobbying purposes. As the Federal Highway Act progresses, there will be more involvement on our part. The immediate priority is the funding level.

Andy then reviewed and familiarized the Committee on the rules and processes for Interstate Transfer withdrawals and funding, stating that, in some areas, they are in conflict with one another in Congress. A chart depicting the Federal funding for transportation (covering the period of 1976 through 1981) was displayed at the meeting. Andy stated that next year, we will be reaching the critical point of our Interstate Transfer funding schedule.

A delegation comprised of Metro Executive Officer Rick Gustafson, Mayor Frank Ivancie, State Transportation Director Frank Klaboe, and former Congressman Bob Duncan will meet in Washington, D.C. on February 17 and 18 with U.S. Transportation Secretary Drew Lewis and key Congressional transportation leaders to request a supplemental appropriation for FY 81 of $39 million more for highway projects and $4 million more for transit projects in the region and full appropriation of the region's highway and transit funding requests for FY 82. Further delegations to Washington, D.C. will be necessary as Congress considers transportation funding proposals.

4. ESTABLISHING A PROCESS FOR SETTING FUTURE YEAR PRIORITIES FOR USE OF INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDING

Andy Cotugno related that he merely wanted to introduce the proposal for the establishment of a logical regional process for prioritizing future funding of projects. He added that we would have a better picture in the fall concerning where our sights should be set. He asked the Committee to deliberate on what the process should consist of and which projects should be prioritized for future discussion.

It was recommended that the staff prepare for the next JPACT meeting an Issue Paper that reflects past commitments, what
types of projects are competing against one another, and what the potential priority policy should be. Questions to be discussed include what assured funding we can expect by the year 2000 and how much is realistic to try to build by that year into the RTP. It was brought out that a lot of past Resolutions establishing priorities by the TIP Subcommittee need to be re-affirmed or re-evaluated.

Action Taken: The Metro Transportation staff was delegated to prepare an approach and past-history paper on transportation commitments and priorities for presentation to JPACT at its next monthly meeting. Chairman Bonner related that part of the problem is that not all of the jurisdictions in the region are represented by JPACT or TPAC, and cited the terrific job that Andy has performed in getting out to reach some of these jurisdictions.

5. USDOT COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE

Richard Brandman related that UMTA, FHWA, and NHTSA are now soliciting proposals for TSM projects for improvement of the operation of local transportation systems. A total of $28 million is available under three separate programs, and the following projects are being recommended for consideration: 1) Freeway Ramp-Metering Monitoring and Management; 2) Carpool/Vanpool Loan Incentive Program; 3) Flextime Program; 4) Bicycle Marketing, Promotion, and Intermodal Shelters; 5) McLoughlin Boulevard Rideshare Program; 6) Clark County Rideshare Promotion; and 7) Signal Modernization Interconnect Program (proposing 82nd Avenue - OR 213 and Tualatin Valley Highway - OR 8). These projects were considered and endorsed by an ad hoc committee of TPAC.

A TIP amendment is necessary to include these projects so that, if funds become available, they can be approved. Applications for funding are due March 1.

Committee members asked whether any consideration had been given to free fares during off-peak hours. Mr. Brandman related that they were discussed but fell out of contention. Mr. Brandman was further questioned as to whether any consideration was given to a program that encouraged people to work at home or close to their residence. He related that a cable TV program on ridesharing was explored and that tele-communications would offer a good research program but that there was nothing on hand to implement.

It was explained that it was up to each sponsoring agency to come up with the local match for these projects and, if
the local match is not available, the jurisdiction could not proceed with the application.

Concern was expressed in approving such projects at a time of such tight funds for transportation planning. Mr. Brandman pointed out that these projects would draw from supplemental funds and would in no way take money away from the region.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to amend the TIP to include the above TSM projects for improvement of the operation of local transportation systems. Motion CARRIED.

6. TIP AMENDMENT FOR THE URBAN AREA OF CLARK COUNTY

A letter was submitted at the meeting from Richard Carroll of WSDOT requesting approval of a TIP amendment for the urban area of Clark County for inclusion of a pavement overlay on I-5, starting at Burnt Bridge Creek and going north to I-5's intersection with I-205. This request was being channeled directly through JPACT, rather than TPAC, because of the immediacy of proceeding with the project.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the TIP amendment to the Clark County urban area for the provision of the pavement overlay on I-5. Motion CARRIED.

7. RETIREMENT OF RICHARD CARROLL

Chairman Bonner related that this was Mr. Carroll's last meeting with JPACT and cited him for his dedication in protecting the interests of his jurisdiction and that of the region. On behalf of JPACT, a Certificate of Appreciation was extended for his untiring efforts.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: JPACT Members
Denton Kent
Rick Gustafson

ACC: lmk
I. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached resolution amending the ITP and making the Functional Classification and Federal Aid Route Number of Highway 123 consistent with its alignment.

B. POLICY IMPACT: This action will change the Functional Classification and Federal Aid Designation of certain streets in the St. Johns area requested by the City of Portland and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT):

   - Remove the FAU designation from N. Lombard St. between St. Louis and Richmond and from N. Philadelphia St. between Lombard and Ivanhoe, since they now function as a neighborhood collector.

   - Add as minor arterials, N. Richmond Avenue between Lombard and Ivanhoe; N. Ivanhoe St. between Richmond and Philadelphia. Also add as minor arterials, N. St. Louis and Philadelphia to complete the link between Lombard and Philadelphia as FAU 9956 and the designated truck route.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: None.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: The US 30 Bypass has been relocated to pass around rather than through the St. Johns Business District. This relocation was accomplished by the Portland Development Commission (PDC) and the Oregon State Highway Division through the use of special signing, signals and traffic diverters. This diversion was made so that mall type amenities could be constructed to encourage development of a pedestrian-oriented retail core.

   As a result of this relocation, changes to the Functional Classification and Federal Aid Designation should be made as shown in Exhibit A.
B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Retain the existing classifications and designations. This would defeat the purpose of rerouting the Bypass, be inconsistent with actual traffic flow pattern, and make those streets under heavy traffic use ineligible for federal funding.

C. CONCLUSION: Staff recommends adoption of the attached resolution based on the functions now being performed by the facilities and on the City of Portland's Arterial Street Classification Policy.
WHEREAS, The City of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) have formally requested that certain streets in the St. Johns Business District be reclassified and redesignated; and

WHEREAS, These requested changes have been brought about by the US 30 Bypass being relocated to pass around rather than through the St. Johns Business District; and

WHEREAS, This relocation was accomplished by the Portland Development Commission (PDC) and ODOT through use of special signing, signals and traffic diverters; and

WHEREAS, This diversion was made so that mall type amenities could be constructed to encourage development of pedestrian oriented retail core; and

WHEREAS, Staff analysis indicates that the proposed changes are consistent with the functions served and with the City of Portland's Arterial Street Classification Policies; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council amend the ITP to incorporate Exhibit A.

2. That the Metro Council amend the Functional Classification System to:
a. Establish N. Lombard Street between St. Louis and Richmond as a local service street.
b. Reclassify Ivanhoe St. between St. Louis and Richmond as a minor arterial.
c. Reclassify St. Louis and Richmond St. segments between Lombard and Ivanhoe as minor arterials.

3. That Federal Aid Route numbers be assigned in accordance with Exhibit A.

4. That Metro staff be directed to coordinate the amendment with the Oregon Department of Transportation.
AGENDA MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

TO: JPACT
FROM: TPAC
SUBJECT: Endorsing the 221st/223rd Project as a High Priority for any Remaining FY 81 Interstate Transfer Funds

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:
   A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached resolution endorsing the 221st/223rd Project as a high priority for any FY 81 Interstate Transfer funds which may become available in addition to, or as a result of, savings from projects on the first priority list.

   B. POLICY IMPACT: This action:
   - Will confirm Council action under Resolution No. 81-223 which, among other things, sets forth a Priority 2 array of projects (including the 221st/223rd project) eligible for use of supplementary Interstate Transfer funds should they become available for FY 81.
   - Will convey to the city of Gresham and other East Multnomah County cities that the Metro Council reaffirms its commitment to implement the full Interstate Transfer program as soon as possible.
   - Expresses the moral commitment to the 221st/223rd project as a high priority for funding.

   C. BUDGET IMPACT: None.

II. ANALYSIS:
   A. BACKGROUND: Metro Council by Resolution No. 80-223 endorsed four priority arrays of highway projects:

   1) Priority 1 — projects eligible for use of the available $21.0 million in FY 81.
   2) Priority 2 — projects eligible for use of supplementary funds in FY 81 if they become available and upon project review and prioritization by Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Subcommittee.
   3) Priorities 3 and 4 — projects which are to form the preliminary FY 82 TIP, or to use unspent funds/appropriations if they become available.

   Right-of-way for the 221st/223rd project was assigned to Priority 1, and construction to Priority 2.

   The city of Gresham has expressed concern over the 221st/223rd project in relation to the established priorities. This has
been brought about by two important considerations:

1) The project has a significant amount of private funds committed to its implementation. Any delays may cause the private sector, with its fiscal commitments, to lose faith and withdraw support.

2) Other projects in East Multnomah County have been downsized and their funds assigned to the 221st/223rd project. Delays on this project could call for a reassessment of the total East Multnomah County program in the matter of distribution of funds.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: The request sought by the city of Gresham was to specify the 221st/223rd project as a top priority for funding from any FY 81 reallocation and from the FY 82 appropriation. TPAC recommended endorsing the project as a high priority for FY 81 since it was included in the Priority 2 category in Resolution No. 80-223. However, TPAC did not recommend action on FY 82 priorities since the priority setting process for FY 82 is just starting and there have been no comparisons with other candidate projects.

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

BP/jmk
2252B/214
WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 80-186 which endorsed the FY 81 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), contingent upon receiving $83 million in Federal Interstate Transfer funds; and

WHEREAS, The federal allocation of Interstate Transfer funds to the Portland region released in December 1980 was substantially less than the anticipated revenues, necessitating a revised 1981 program and the setting of priorities for use of the limited available funds; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council has endorsed a list of Priority 1 projects as eligible for use of the available $21.0 million of Interstate Transfer funding for highway projects; and

WHEREAS, Additional Interstate Transfer funding may become available in FY 81 through additional federal allocations, project delays, cancellations and cost savings; and

WHEREAS, Additional Interstate Transfer funding should be available in FY 82; and

WHEREAS, The 221st/223rd project is considered to be a high priority, regionally significant project; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council reaffirms its commitment to implement the full Interstate Transfer program.

2. That the 221st/223rd project will be listed as a high
priority project eligible for the use of any additional Interstate Transfer funding that may become available in FY 81 and is the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee's top highway priority.

BP/jk
2252B/214
FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING
THE 221ST/223RD PROJECT AS A
HIGH PRIORITY FOR ANY REMAINING
FY 81 INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS

WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 80-186 which endorsed the FY 81 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), contingent upon receiving $83 million in Federal Interstate Transfer funds; and

WHEREAS, The federal allocation of Interstate Transfer funds to the Portland region released in December 1980 was substantially less than the anticipated revenues, necessitating a revised 1981 program and the setting of priorities for use of the limited available funds; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council has endorsed a list of Priority 1 projects as eligible for use of the available $21.0 million of Interstate Transfer funding for highway projects; and

WHEREAS, Additional Interstate Transfer funding may become available in FY 81 through additional federal allocations, project delays, cancellations and cost savings; and

WHEREAS, Additional Interstate Transfer funding should be available in FY 82; and

WHEREAS, The 221st/223rd project is considered to be a high priority, regionally significant project; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the East County Transportation Committee reaffirms its commitment to implement the full Interstate Transfer program.

2. That the 221st/223rd project will be listed as a high priority project eligible for the use of any additional Interstate
Transfer funding that may become available in FY 81 and is Multnomah County's top highway priority.

BP/jk

2252B/214
To: TPAC
From: Ted Spence
Subject: Interstate Transfer Program Development Process Meeting
March 11, 1981

I. Objective:

TPAC was directed to develop and recommend to JPACT an Interstate Transfer Program based upon the current and anticipated shortfall in funding. The program must be adopted by September 1981 (before FY 1982 federal fiscal year beginning October 1). The objective of today's meeting is to:

1. Recommend a general process and schedule for consideration by JPACT at its March 12, 1981 meeting.

2. Agree on and recommend to JPACT several basic assumptions required to develop the program (3/12/81 JPACT meeting).

3. Discuss and begin development of evaluation criteria to be recommended to JPACT and the council at a future date.

II. Suggested Process and Schedule for JPACT Discussion:

1. General proposal of recommended process and funding assumptions to JPACT for discussion on March 12, 1981.

2. Develop and recommend evaluation criteria for JPACT and council review in April.
3. Document previous MSD/CRAG commitments by project for JPACT information in April.

4. Application of draft criteria for JPACT information in April (No recommendations on program scheduling etc.)

5. Identification of recommended program schedule by City of Portland, Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington counties to JPACT in May.

6. JPACT recommendations of regional program with clear identification of unresolved issues to JPACT in June.

7. Review and discussion by JPACT in June, July and perhaps August.

8. Council review, discussion and action in August/September.

III. Suggested Assumptions for Program Schedule and Funding Levels for TPAC Discussion:

1. Propose that the program developed cover ten fiscal years - FY 1982 through FY 1991.

2. Propose for planning purposes, the following funding levels for projects other than the Banfield Transitway (based on region receiving a minimum of $60 million per year for ten years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projects other than Banfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 82</td>
<td>$21 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 83</td>
<td>$21 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 84</td>
<td>$21 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 85</td>
<td>$21 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 86</td>
<td>$21 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 87-91</td>
<td>$60 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Project Information and Evaluation Criteria - Discussion

1. General description of the project problem to be solved and objectives of the project.

2. Identification, by project, of previous regional commitment and priority.

3. Estimated project costs.

4. Status and current schedule of project.

5. Possible "breakdown" of right-of-way and construction phases, i.e., build by small segments.

6. Regional significance of project, i.e., (a) proposed improvement to major regional corridors (regional objective to be accomplished); (b) support of existing or developing major job centers (description of how it supports the job center); (c) support of existing or major developing residential area (description of how it supports residential development); (d) implementation of current regional and local comprehensive planning (land use distribution and projections).

7. Relationship of project to documented (committed) private and public investments: (a) local agency and private participation financing a project; (b) related committed investments, i.e., public agency investments, sewers, other transportation, public buildings, etc., and private investments, commercial and transportation and other facilities.
V. Content and Nature of Status Report to JPACT - Discussion:

A. Overview of proposed process?
B. Assumptions?
C. Unresolved issues?
D. Possible criteria?
E. Other?