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AGENDA

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: May 14, 1981
Day: Thursday
Time: 7:30 a.m.
Place: Metro Conference Room A1/A2

*1. SPECIAL MOBILITY 16(b)(2) PROJECTS - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Bill Pettis.

*2. FY 82 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.

*3. PROCESS AND GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEN-YEAR INTERSTATE TRANSFER PROGRAM - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.

*Material Enclosed
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: April 9, 1981

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


Guests: Steve Dotterrer, Bebe Rucker, Dave Peach, Winston Kurth, Gil Mallery, Sarah Salazar, Anne Sylvester, John Rosenberger, Dave Hill, Elton Chang, Paul Bay, James Kuffner, John Price, and Lee Hames

Staff: Rick Gustafson, Andy Cotugno, Keith Lawton, Bill Pettis, Karen Thackston, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: Claudia Brown, KPTV; Bob Ballantyne, KPTV; and Ron Baker, KYXI

SUMMARY:

At the onset of the meeting, Chairman Williamson introduced and welcomed Ed Ferguson of the Washington Department of Transportation who has replaced Richard Carroll's position on JPACT.

1. AMENDING THE TIP TO INCLUDE AN IMPROVEMENT TO THE SOUTHBOUND ON-RAMP TO HIGHWAY 217 AT BEAVERTON-HILLSDALE HIGHWAY

Following review of the Agenda Management Summary by Andy Cotugno, it was clarified that funding for this project would be allocated by the State and that it was prompted from a water drainage problem.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the TIP amendment for an improvement to the southbound on-ramp to Highway 217 at the Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway. Motion CARRIED.

2. REALLOCATION OF THE SAFER OFF-SYSTEM ROAD FUNDING

Following review of the Agenda Management Summary by Andy Cotugno, action was as follows:

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval for reallocating City of Portland uncommitted Safer Off-System Road (SOSR) funds for use by the city of Gresham, and that the TIP be so amended. Motion CARRIED.
3. AMENDING THE FY 81 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING FOR WESTSIDE CORRIDOR HIGHWAY PROJECTS

In review of the Agenda Management Summary, Andy pointed out that the UMTA Interstate Transfer grant did not provide for detailed highway/street studies of the Westside Corridor and was geared to be used to study transit options. This amendment of the TIP is necessary for completion of the project.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the FY 81 TIP amendment to include funding for highway elements of the Westside Corridor project. Motion CARRIED.

4. ENDORSING THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE BI-STATE TASK FORCE

Andy Cotugno related that two reports are available documenting the conclusions of the Bi-State Task Force, one prepared by the Washington Department of Transportation, and the other contracted out by Economic Consultants of Oregon, Limited. There was mutual agreement that a third bridge would neither be feasible nor cost-effective, that low-cost improvements should be sought as an alternative, that the study recognizes the fact that some level of congestion will persist, and recommends the establishment of a permanent Bi-State Coordinating Committee that would function under the auspices of Metro and the Clark County Regional Planning Council.

Andy explained that two major line-haul trunk services were planned across the I-5 and I-205 bridges, one from downtown Portland and Interstate Avenue to the new transit center in downtown Vancouver, and the second from the I-205 bridge connecting from the Gateway light-rail station to the Vancouver Mall transit center. The two Clark County transit centers would serve as two major hubs of their system. The question to be assessed by a continuing study is whether that service in the I-5 or I-205 corridors can be more cost-effectively provided by light rail.

One Committee member questioned why the Coordinating Committee would report to the Metro Council rather than to JPACT. It was explained that the Bi-State Coordinating Committee's function with regard to interstate coordination was not restricted to transportation and that it would deal with other areas of interstate significance. The details of how the Committee is to be organized is still in the planning stage and no money, other than for transportation, has been budgeted for.
Commissioner Veysey related that he envisions the Coordinating Committee as trying to accomplish what the report recommends relating to improvement of the I-5 corridor with the additional task of developing the political strategy for getting that proposal funded. He emphasized that the year 2000 is unacceptable as a goal for solving the problems. He felt that the Bi-State Coordinating Committee's top priority should be the follow-through on the recommendations contained in the Bi-State study. With regard to the formation of the Coordinating Committee, Commissioner Veysey felt that specific tasks should be spelled out before endorsing such a Committee. Inasmuch as the proposed Resolution encompassed the need to work out the scope and organization of such a Committee with the Clark County Regional Planning Council, the following action was taken:

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to recommend approval for endorsement of the conclusions of the Bi-State Task Force; with the further recommendation that the revised Work Program be accepted; and that a Bi-State Coordinating Committee be established whereby Metro agrees to work out the organization and scope of such a Committee with the Clark County Regional Planning Council. Motion CARRIED.

It was also the desire of JPACT that Commissioner Veysey's comments be conveyed to the Task Force regarding the need to proceed with the proposals contained in the Bi-State study as top priority.

5. ELIGIBILITY OF CLARK COUNTY AND CITY OF VANCOUVER FOR INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS

A letter was presented at the meeting to JPACT members relating the City of Vancouver and Clark County's intent to prioritize those projects which would be appropriate candidates for Interstate Transfer funds for future consideration. At the meeting, Commissioner Veysey indicated that this was a request to get into the priority system for regional considerations on Interstate Transfer funds. He then named four projects of significance in the Clark County area, citing the Mill Plain extension between I-5 and I-205, the SR 500 link, the transit mall, and the Mill Plain truck route within the city limits of Vancouver. Dick Pokornowski also emphasized the need for a unified front on both sides of the river for a total lobbying effort in Washington, D.C.

Commissioner Schwab expressed concern in adding new projects into a program that was developed and approved three years ago and is now faced with limited funds. A discussion then followed on whether Clark County's needs might be prioritized in
terms of the Regional Transportation Plan as opposed to funding needs. Commissioner Veysey indicated that the intent of their letter was also to make the region aware of Clark County's needs.

Ted Spence related that criteria has been developed to see what projects would go first in the Interstate Transfer program over the next ten years. Committee members emphasized that it would be impossible to try to add more projects in an already crowded program of limited funding, encouraging Clark County's projects to be evaluated by criteria set for the Regional Transportation Plan.

After further discussion, Commissioner Veysey related that, by prioritizing Clark County's projects in terms of regional significance, it was hoped that, over a ten-year period, a reassessment might be made as to rank of priority and that some consideration might be given to Clark County's priorities.

Inasmuch as the two Metropolitan Planning Organizations are involved, it was suggested that the Bi-State Task Force look into the total relationship rather than a fund-by-fund basis. Dick Pokornowski stated that he did not wish to have this passed on to the Bi-State Task Force, as suggested by some Committee members, and felt that, as a community, it was paramount for JPACT to address these issues. The question was then raised of Clark County as to why they have never initiated an Interstate Transfer project in the past.

Rick Gustafson indicated a loss of $37 million in Interstate Transfer funds affecting the Oregon side of the river. He felt that this issue is more substantial than the request submitted and added that the relationship between the two MPO's should be explored further to determine whether a combined effort would be sensible in order to meet the region's interests. He stressed the point that the financial losses must be taken into consideration.

Action Taken: It was moved and seconded to refer this matter to the staff for a recommendation on how to respond to the letter from the Clark County and Vancouver participants.

In discussion on the motion, Commissioner Schwab expressed concern over the feasibility of going back now and adding new projects and categories to a program which was developed and approved three years ago. The City of Portland's understanding at that time was that Clark County identified I-205 and I-5 improvements as their highest priority. Commissioner Schwab pointed out that the new I-205 bridge (cost of $300 million)
and the I-5 improvements (approximately $100 million) were paid for by Oregon's regular Interstate funds and that, although it's true that no local Clark County projects are being funded with Interstate withdrawal, many Oregon communities likewise have not been funded. She hesitated in disturbing the prioritized list at this time.

In calling for the question, the motion CARRIED.

6. OVERVIEW ON INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDING

Andy Cotugno related that Paul Bay has had contact with Federal officials in an effort to seek funding for our full Interstate Transfer program rather than for one particular project, recognizing that there will likely be a stretch-out of funds. Andy added that the U.S. DOT announcement on Wednesday, April 8, indicated that the Banfield will be allowed to proceed under the "No New Rail Starts" policy. Two points have yet to be clarified, one being the status of Section 3 (UMTA Capital Assistance) funds for the Banfield, and the other is the question of whether this commitment to the Banfield represents our entire Interstate Transfer funding or whether we will still be in contention to receive funding for our other projects as well.

Paul Bay indicated that the information coming from the Federal Government was a bit vague in some areas as to the use of Section 3 funds. James Kuffner, Executive Assistant to Mayor Ivancie, stated that the Mayor had received a telephone call from the Federal representatives indicating that the Banfield would be funded entirely from Interstate Transfer funds rather than Section 3. Mr. Kuffner indicated that a response from this region was in order. The Committee indicated, however, that more concise information is needed before a proper response could be executed.

Robin Lindquist felt that the decision for determining where the money is spent should be reached by a committee such as JPACT rather than the Federal Government. While she acknowledged that the Banfield had been placed in a Number 1 priority position, she suggested that perhaps the needs of the region should be re-evaluated if all the Interstate Transfer funding were confined to the Banfield. She indicated further that this was also the position of the Clackamas County Committee member not in attendance.

Rick Gustafson cautioned the Committee in responding to the proposal until more definite information is received and that it continues in its unified effort to seek the needed Interstate Transfer funds.
Action Taken: The Committee indicated agreement to wait until a definite proposal has been offered with more complete information at which time the Metro staff will schedule a JPACT meeting to propose a response.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rick Gustafson
Denton Kent
JPACT Members
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Brown</td>
<td>KPTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Ballard</td>
<td>KYXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Baker</td>
<td>City of Beaverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Cole</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bothman</td>
<td>Vancouver Air Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Pohowskis</td>
<td>Mayor of Gresham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Myers</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Frening</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern Veysey</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Ferguson</td>
<td>City of Gladstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Lindquist</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Bonder</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Williamson</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Love</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Tuttle</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Price</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dorsey</td>
<td>Mult. County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebe Rucker</td>
<td>WDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Peach</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston Kurth</td>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gil Mallyery</td>
<td>Clark Co. RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Salazar</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Sylvester</td>
<td>Clark County RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rosenberger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Hill</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elton Chang</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bay</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kshiner</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Hames</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Cotugno</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Gustafson</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Lewton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Pettis</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Thackston</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Kaplan</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

TO: JPACT
FROM: Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Authorizing Federal Funds for 16(b)(2) Special Transportation Projects

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:
   A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution which would authorize $223,440 of Federal 16(b)(2) funds to support the purchase of eight (8) lift equipped vehicles and related equipment to provide special transportation services in the Metro region.
   B. POLICY IMPACT: This action is consistent with the adopted Interim Regional Special Transportation Plan.
   C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget includes funds to monitor federal funding commitments.

II. ANALYSIS:
   A. BACKGROUND: Section 16(b)(2) authorizes the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) to make capital grants to private, nonprofit organizations to provide transportation services for elderly and handicapped persons. Capital investments include purchase of conventional and paratransit vehicles and other equipment associated with providing local and regional (non-intercity) transportation services to the elderly and handicapped. Apportioned 16(b)(2) funds are not available for operating expenses. Transportation Improvement Programs and their Annual Elements must be amended to include new 16(b)(2) projects.

The adopted Interim Special Transportation Plan, in part, established plan objectives, service priorities and implementation strategies to be used in the regional evaluation of candidate 16(b)(2) applications. The Metro Council makes recommendations regarding the applications to the Oregon Department of Transportation based on these policies. Local providers have submitted two applications for the use of federal funds. The staff analysis concludes that these projects are consistent with the Interim Special Transportation Plan:
Project 1

Applicant: Special Mobility Services, Inc.

Project Description: Special Mobility Services requests UMTA 16(b)(2) capital assistance to purchase five mini-buses (all lift equipped) and five mobile radios for special transportation services in Multnomah County. This project would constitute a portion of the region's special effort. This application is coordinated with Tri-Met.

Project Cost: 
UMTA 16(b)(2) $139,650 
Local (20%) 34,913 
Total $174,563

Project 2

Applicant: Special Mobility Services, Inc.

Project Description: Special Mobility Services requests UMTA 16(b)(2) capital assistance to purchase three mini-buses (all lift equipped) and three mobile radios for special transportation services in Washington County. This project would constitute a portion of the region's special effort. This application is coordinated with Tri-Met.

Project Cost:  
UMTA 16(b)(2) $83,790 
Local (20%) 20,948 
Total $104,738

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Inasmuch as these are nonduplicative services, the alternative would be to provide no special transportation services in these areas. This alternative is not acceptable.

C. CONCLUSION: Based on Metro staff analysis, it is recommended that the attached Resolution funding the projects be approved.
FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING FEDERAL FUNDS FOR 16(b)(2) SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

WHEREAS, The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has requested the Council to make recommendations regarding the allocation of Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) 16(b)(2) funds in the Metro region; and

WHEREAS, To comply with federal requirements the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) must be amended to include projects recommended for UMTA 16(b)(2) funds; and

WHEREAS, The adopted Interim Special Transportation Plan established regional policies and criteria for purposes of evaluating UMTA 16(b)(2) applications; and

WHEREAS, Local providers have submitted two projects for funding authorization involving $223,440 in Federal 16(b)(2) funds; and

WHEREAS, The projects described in Attachments A and B were reviewed and found consistent with federal requirements and regional policies and objectives; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That $223,440 of Federal 16(b)(2) funds be authorized for the purchase of special transportation vehicles and related equipment for the two projects.

2. That the TIP and its Annual Element be amended to reflect this authorization as set forth in the Attachments.

3. That the Metro Council finds the projects to be in accordance with the region's continuing, cooperative, comprehensive planning process and, hereby, gives affirmative A-95 Review approval.
**PROJECT INFORMATION FORM - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**RESPONSIBILITY (AGENCY)**: Multnomah County Special Mobility Services  
**LIMITS N/A**  
**LENGTH N/A**  
**DESCRIPTION**: Purchase of 5 mini-bus passenger vehicles and related equipment consisting of 5 wheelchair lifts and 5 mobile radios.

**RELATIONSHIP TO ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

- LONG RANGE ELEMENT: 
- TSM ELEMENT: X

**FUNDING PLAN BY FISCAL YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 80</th>
<th>FY 81</th>
<th>FY 82</th>
<th>FY 83</th>
<th>FY 84</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCATION MAP**

**APPLICANT'S ESTIMATE OF TOTAL PROJECT COST**

- PRELIM ENGINEERING: $ —
- CONSTRUCTION: 
- RIGHT OF WAY: 
- TRAFFIC CONTROL: 
- ILLUMIN, SIGNS, LANDSCAPING, ETC: 
- STRUCTURES: 
- RAILROAD CROSSINGS: 

**Capital Equip.**: 174,563  
**TOTAL**: $ 174,563

**SOURCE OF FUNDS (%)**

**FEDERAL**

- FAUS (PORTLAND): 
- FAUS (OREGON REGION): 
- FAUS (WASH REGION): 
- UMTA CAPITAL: UMTA OPRTG: 
- INTERSTATE: 
- FED AID PRIMARY: 
- INTERSTATE: 
- SUBSTITUTION: 
- 16(b)(2): 80

**NON FEDERAL**

- STATE: 
- LOCAL: 20

**SCHEDULE**

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

**PROJECT NAME**: Multnomah County Special Mobility Services  
**ID No**: 

**APPLICANT**: Special Mobility Services  
**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: $ —
- CONSTRUCTION: 
- RIGHT OF WAY: 
- TRAFFIC CONTROL: 
- ILLUMIN, SIGNS, LANDSCAPING, ETC: 
- STRUCTURES: 
- RAILROAD CROSSINGS: 

**Capital Equip.**: 174,563  
**TOTAL**: $ 174,563

**SOURCE OF FUNDS (%)**

**FEDERAL**

- FAUS (PORTLAND): 
- FAUS (OREGON REGION): 
- FAUS (WASH REGION): 
- UMTA CAPITAL: UMTA OPRTG: 
- INTERSTATE: 
- FED AID PRIMARY: 
- INTERSTATE: 
- SUBSTITUTION: 
- 16(b)(2): 80

**NON FEDERAL**

- STATE: 
- LOCAL: 20

**SCHEDULE**

- TO ODOT: 
- PE OK'D: EIS OK'D: 
- CAT'Y: BID LET: 
- HEARING: COMPL'T:
**Project Description**

**Responsibility (Agency):** Washington County Special Mobility

**Limits:** N/A

**Description:** Purchase of 3 mini-bus passenger vehicles and related equipment consisting of 3 wheelchair lifts and 3 mobile radios.

**Relationship to Adopted Transportation Plan**

- Long Range Element: __
- TSM Element: x

**Funding Plan by Fiscal Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>FY 80</th>
<th>FY 81</th>
<th>FY 82</th>
<th>FY 83</th>
<th>FY 84</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>104,738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td>83,790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location Map**

**Project Name:** Washington County Special Mobility Services

**ID No:**

**Applicant:** Special Mobility Services

**Schedule**

- To ODOT: __
- PE OK'D: __
- EIS OK'D: __
- CAT'Y: __
- BID LET: __
- HEARING: __
- COMPL'T: __

**Applicant's Estimate of Total Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 80</th>
<th>FY 81</th>
<th>FY 82</th>
<th>FY 83</th>
<th>FY 84</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelim Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination, Signs, Landscaping, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equip.</td>
<td>104,738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104,738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source of Funds (%)**

**Federal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAUS (Portland)</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAUS (Oregon Region)</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAUS (Wash Region)</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMTA Capital</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMTA Operating</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Substitution</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16(d) (2)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non Federal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment:** B
I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Approve the UWP containing the transportation planning work program for FY 1982. Authorize the submittal of grant applications to the appropriate funding agencies.

B. POLICY IMPACT: Approval will mean that grants can be submitted and contracts executed so work can commence on July 1, 1981 in accordance with established Metro priorities.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: The UWP matches the projects and studies reflected in the proposed Metro budget to be submitted to the Tax Supervisory and Conservation Commission.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: The FY 1982 UWP describes the transportation/air quality planning activities to be carried out in the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan region during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1981. Included in the document are federally funded studies to be conducted by Metro, Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC), Tri-Met, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and local jurisdictions.

The Oregon portion of the UWP is divided into six major categories for FY 82:

Regional Transportation Plan - Long-Range Element -- focuses on studies which will provide policies setting the direction for the transportation system, projections of long-range travel demands and deficiencies in the system and identify capital and service improvements to the system.

Regional Transportation Plan - Short-Range Element -- studies to identify capital and service improvements to serve travel demands over the next five years, including air quality improvement actions and energy contingency plans.

Corridor Refinement Studies -- include studies necessary for implementation of proposed corridor transit improvements along the Banfield, Westside and McLoughlin corridors.
Transportation Improvement Program — coordinates projects and programs of regionwide transportation improvements.

Technical Assistance — allows Metro staff to respond to jurisdictional requests for data and special analysis.

Coordination and Management — provides overall management to support the UWP and compliance with federal requirements.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: The alternative of not conducting the various studies was considered and rejected because of critical nature of issues to be addressed in solving the region's transportation problems.

C. CONCLUSION: Adoption of the resolution will ensure application for federal funds will be made in a timely manner so as to continue transportation projects in FY 82.
FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE FY 1982 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM (UWP)

WHEREAS, The Unified Work Program (UWP) describes all federally-funded transportation/air quality planning activities for the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan area to be conducted in FY 1982; and

WHEREAS, The FY 82 UWP indicates federal funding sources for transportation/air quality planning activities carried out by Metro, Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC), the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Tri-Met and the local jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, The FY 82 UWP contains an agreement on interagency responsibilities between ODOT, Tri-Met and Metro; and

WHEREAS, Approval of the FY 82 UWP is required to receive federal transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, The FY 82 UWP is consistent with the proposed Metro budget submitted to the Tax Supervisory and Conservation Commission; and

WHEREAS, The FY 82 UWP has been reviewed and agreed to by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT); now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the FY 82 UWP is hereby approved.
2. That the FY 82 UWP is consistent with the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process and is hereby given positive A-95 Review action.
3. That the Metro Executive Officer is authorized to apply for, accept and execute grants and agreements specified in the UWP including the Metro/ODOT/Tri-Met Interagency Agreement.
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COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT ON DUTIES
AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT,
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT OF OREGON
IN PARTICIPATING IN THE METRO TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING PROGRAM

THIS AGREEMENT made and entered into this _____ day
of _______________, 1981, by and between the STATE OF OREGON, by and
through its DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (ODOT), hereinafter called
"STATE"; the TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT of
OREGON, a public transit agency, acting by and through its Board of
Directors, hereinafter called "TRI-MET," and the METROPOLITAN
SERVICE DISTRICT, hereinafter called "METRO":

1. METRO is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
designated by the Governor of Oregon as the agency
responsible for cooperative regional transportation
planning pursuant to Section 134 of Title 23, U.S.C.
and Sections 1601, et. seq. of Title 49 U.S.C. for
the larger area of the Portland Area Urban Growth
Boundary and the Federal Aid Urban Boundary. For the
Metropolitan Service District boundary, METRO is also
the regional planning district under the provisions
of ORS Chapter 268.

2. METRO is eligible to receive Metropolitan Planning
funds (PL) as authorized under title 23 U.S.C.
Section 104 (f) for the continuing transportation
planning process in the Portland metropolitan area.

3. METRO is the eligible recipient of funds authorized
by Section 8 of Title 49 U.S.C. Urban Mass
Transportation Act for the continuing transportation
planning process and coordinated support activities.

4. TRI-MET is the transit agency for the Oregon portion
of the Metro planning area under the provisions of
ORS Chapter 267 and is the principal public transit
operator eligible for Section 8 Coordinated Support
funding through METRO for participation in the
region's transportation planning process pursuant to
State and federal law.

5. The ODOT is the statewide transportation planning and
policy development agency under the provisions of ORS
184.610 to 184.640 and is the designated Oregon State
agency under Title 23 U.S.C. 134 responsible for the
cooperative transportation planning process in the
Portland metropolitan area.
6. The STATE has funds available, in part from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to support Metro and to participate in the transportation planning process.

7. METRO, STATE and TRI-MET propose to continue to cooperatively conduct a continuing, comprehensive transportation planning process in the Portland metropolitan area as defined and mutually agreed to in each year's Unified Work Program (UWP).

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual responsibilities of the parties described herein below, it is agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I
DUTIES OF THE PARTIES

A. It is agreed that METRO is the lead transportation systems planning agency, and that TRI-MET and STATE will assign resources at their own expense to accomplish work mutually agreed upon in the annual UWP and that results such as reports, technical memoranda and data from tasks completed will be made available through METRO as part of the Metro Systems Planning Process. A Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will be prepared using a process involving the public and in compliance with the State's Action Plan. The RTP is to contain a long-range element, special transportation element (describing actions to respond to the mobility needs of the elderly and handicapped) and a short-range element. The TIP will include an Annual Element. Both the RTP and TIP will conform to the State Air Quality Implementation Plan.

B. It is agreed that the METRO Systems Planning Process will provide mutually agreed-upon products to be supportive of STATE and TRI-MET project development and operating responsibilities under both UMTA and FHWA regulations.

C. It is agreed that it is the STATE'S intention to continue to participate in local match support for the FHWA Metropolitan Planning funds (PL) designated to METRO, as mutually determined by the parties to this agreement, for funding the annual UWP.

D. It is agreed that it is TRI-MET'S intention to continue to participate in the local match support for federal (either from the FHWA or the UMTA) planning funds as mutually determined by the parties to this Agreement for funding the annual UWP.

E. It is agreed that it is METRO'S intention to continue to have local jurisdiction service charges allocated to support the transportation program and continue to cooperatively work to finance TRI-MET'S Coordinated Support Planning with UMTA Section 8 funds as determined in the annual UWP.
ARTICLE II
AMENDMENTS

This Agreement may be amended only by written agreement of all parties hereto.

ARTICLE III
TERMINATION

In addition to any other remedy or right to withhold performance which may be provided by law, any party hereto may terminate this Agreement upon six (6) months written notice to all other parties in the event that local or federal funds, by which the activities set forth in the UWP are to be funded, are, in whole or in part, discontinued, withdrawn or suspended to a degree which renders that party substantially unable to proceed with performance hereunder.

Those provisions of State law required to be included in this Agreement are by this reference fully incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, STATE, METRO AND TRI-MET have caused this Agreement to be executed in their respective names by their authorized representatives, all as of the date hereinabove first written.

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By: ____________________________________________
Date: __________________________________________

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

By: ____________________________________________
Date: __________________________________________

TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN DISTRICT OF OREGON

By: ____________________________________________
Date: __________________________________________
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TO: JPACT  
FROM: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee  
SUBJECT: Approval of the Process and Guidelines for Development of the Ten-Year Interstate Transfer Program  

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:  
A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution and its attachment which sets forth the process and guidelines for development of a Ten-year Interstate Transfer Program.  
B. POLICY IMPACT: This action refines the Interstate Transfer programming process to establish a schedule that completes the program over the next 10 years, rather than the previously anticipated five-year period. It responds to recent federal funding limitations by establishing project priorities to be used in their implementation and as funds become available.  
C. BUDGET IMPACT: None  

II. ANALYSIS:  
A. BACKGROUND: The Portland metropolitan area has nearly completed the process of identifying projects to use the $487 million (as of December 31, 1980) of Interstate Transfer funding that resulted from the withdrawal of the Mt. Hood and I-505 freeways. However, based upon recent changes in federal funding availability, it is apparent that the remaining $372.7 million will not be forthcoming within the next five years as expected. As such, it is necessary to further examine the projects that have been identified to develop an implementation schedule that completes the projects over a longer time period, consistent with a reduced annual funding level.  
B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Four basic alternatives are available to develop the Ten-year Interstate Transfer program. These are:  

1. The allocation of funds beyond the Banfield to the three counties (for all projects in the counties) and the City of Portland on a per capita basis. (A second alternative is to allocate the funds on a 25 percent basis to each jurisdictional area.) The four areas would then define their program for their respective areas utilizing either local criteria or regional criteria.  

The allocated amounts per jurisdiction resulting from a per capita division of $30, $20 and $10 million are as follows:  

...
Unresolved issues to be discussed with this concept include how to address previous policy commitments and priorities, transit improvements, and ODOT projects. Additionally, the decision would have to be made to develop and use regional or local policies and criteria to identify the proposed programs. The overall drawback of this method is that high cost, high priority projects would have to be stretched out over several years or eliminated. In addition, issues revolving around potential retroactive applications of this formula for prior years would need to be resolved.

2. An additional major concept is to agree upon categories of projects, divide the funding into these categories and prioritize the projects within the categories. A possible categorical breakdown is as follows:
   
a. Regional Corridors (current regional priority status).
b. Replacement Projects (previously committed projects for replacing withdrawn Interstate segments).
c. Supportive Major Arterial Improvements on the Regional System.
d. Supportive Minor Arterial/Local Projects.

This concept would be intended to allow the region to define a hierarchy of projects for incorporation in the regional ten-year program. Along with additional information, such as estimated project schedules, selected policy/evaluation criteria to discriminate among projects in each of the categories, and the information received from the three-county areas and the City of Portland, the region would identify which projects should be scheduled first in developing the program.

3. Prioritizing all projects at the regional level based upon a single set of criteria.

4. Prioritizing projects at the county/Portland level and merging this into a ten-year regional program.

C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution which is a hybrid of the four alternatives, taking advantage of the best features of each.
WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 81-223 which endorsed project priorities using Interstate Transfer funds in FY 1981; and

WHEREAS, These projects and priorities were geared to federal funding limitations for FY 1981; and

WHEREAS, Federal funding limitations are anticipated to continue throughout this decade; and

WHEREAS, A planning assumption was made that the Interstate Transfer Program will become a ten-year program; and

WHEREAS, A working group of member jurisdictions was established by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) to address the problems associated with the stretchout of the Program; and

WHEREAS, The working group has recommended a process and guidelines for development of a Ten-Year Interstate Transfer Program as described in Attachment A; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council approves the process and guidelines for development of the Ten-Year Interstate Transfer Program described in Attachment A, Staff Report No. 76.

2. That the Council directs its staff to work with affected local jurisdictions, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Tri-Met in implementing the process and guidelines for development of the Ten-Year Interstate Transfer Program.
STAFF REPORT NO. 76

PROPOSED PROCESS AND GUIDELINES
FOR DEVELOPMENT OF
THE TEN-YEAR INTERSTATE TRANSFER PROGRAM

May 1, 1981

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
A hybrid programming process is recommended to use the attributes of each of the alternatives as well as maintain past policy commitments for the Interstate Transfer program. The recommended prioritization process is as follows:

1. Highway projects and transit projects should be prioritized separately since funding is received from USDOT in this manner. However, interrelated transit and highway projects should be programmed consistently.

2. All highway projects should be divided into two categories, thereby providing the basis for dividing the funding into categories. The recommended categories are as follows:

   Category I
   a. Regional Corridor Projects.
   b. Interstate Withdrawal Replacement Projects.

   Category II
   Other projects.

   The projects, by category, are shown in Figure 1.

3. In principle, past commitments on Interstate Transfer funding call for top priority to be placed on Category I projects. As such, under a condition of constrained funding over a ten-year period, the rate of expenditure on Category I projects would start out the majority of the program and generally diminish to be a small percentage of the program by the tenth year. At an absolute minimum, Category II funding should be $3.4 million to replace FAU funds transferred downstate.

4. Annual programming levels for the Banfield Transitway project will be developed by ODOT and Tri-Met. For planning purposes, the balance of the Category I and Category II program will be developed over a 10-year period based upon $10, $20 and $30 million starting points.

5. Category II highway projects will be programmed by each county/Portland based upon a five- and ten-year completion schedule. This will be merged into a regional program based upon a consistent set of guidelines (Section 8). This process applies to all city, county and ODOT sponsored projects.

6. Each of the four jurisdictional areas will receive, at a minimum, the per capita share of $3.4 million as follows:
Multnomah County - $691,500; Clackamas County - $578,700; Washington County - $797,000; and City of Portland - $1,332,800. This funding will be used for the highest priority Category II project that is identified in each county and Portland.

7. Projects in Category II will be programmed over the ten-year period based upon realistic schedules for project development (i.e., allowing sufficient time for PE and right-of-way) and realistic estimates of local match availability.

8. Policy guidelines for use by each county/Portland for programming Category II projects and by TPAC and JPACT to integrate these into a single regional program are as follows:

- Projects addressing an existing or known, near-term (three years) capacity deficiency (v/c program) will be scheduled before future capacity deficiencies for a logical roadway segment.
- Projects necessary to sustain existing or create new permanent jobs will be programmed before others.
- Projects supporting transit service as defined in the Transit Development Program will be programmed before others.
- Projects with a higher local match contribution than required (including R/W dedication or investment in supporting or parallel facilities required for optimum operation of the completed project) will be programmed before others.
- All other factors being equal, projects on Principal and Major Arterials will be programmed before others.
- Critical Category II projects will be programmed consistent with the schedule established for Category I projects.
- Projects addressing deferred maintenance or structural inadequacy or to protect an existing investment will be programmed before others.
- Other pertinent factors, including, but not limited to:
  • safety
  • air quality
  • energy conservation
PRELIMINARY

FIGURE 1 - Interstate Transfer - Highway Projects

Category I - Regional Corridor and Freeway Replacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banfield Freeway</td>
<td>$66.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLoughlin Boulevard - North</td>
<td>$19.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeon/Vaughn/Nicolai</td>
<td>$26.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLoughlin Boulevard - South</td>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell Boulevard</td>
<td>$7.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Corridor - Highway Elements</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$120.4 million

* Since the Westside Corridor preferred alternative has not been selected, the highway portions cannot be identified.

Category II - Other Arterials and Collectors

Principal and Major Arterials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City Bypass</td>
<td>$15.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 212</td>
<td>$5.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 217/72nd</td>
<td>$1.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221st/223rd</td>
<td>$4.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV/185th</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 185th Avenue.</td>
<td>$1.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset/217</td>
<td>$14.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 182nd Avenue.</td>
<td>$1.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Boulevard</td>
<td>$3.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Lombard/Columbia (at 60th)</td>
<td>$2.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Portland Highway</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Burnside</td>
<td>$1.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswego Creek Bridge</td>
<td>$2.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>$1.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helens Road.</td>
<td>$3.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>$1.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$64.3 million

Minor Arterials and Collectors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbur/Terwilliger</td>
<td>$15.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Avenue</td>
<td>$5.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Drive</td>
<td>$3.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towle Road</td>
<td>$3.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR/Harmony</td>
<td>$2.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Boulevard</td>
<td>$2.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190th/Powell</td>
<td>$2.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257th</td>
<td>$2.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood Business District</td>
<td>$2.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1  
(Continued)

Minor Arterials and Collectors (cont.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basin/Going</td>
<td>$1.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going</td>
<td>1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158th/Jenkins</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th Avenue</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Road</td>
<td>1.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82nd Avenue</td>
<td>1.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes Road</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Overlays</td>
<td>1.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Park Road</td>
<td>3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington Road</td>
<td>0.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th/16th</td>
<td>0.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Boulevard TSM</td>
<td>0.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway TSM</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone-Milwaukie TSM</td>
<td>0.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$56.4 million**

Other Unassigned Projects and Reserves  **42.9 million**

**GRAND TOTAL**  **$284.0 million**
INTERSTATE TRANSFER PROGRAM PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET

The following is an outline of project information needed for each Interstate Transfer project. This information will be used to prepare the region's "Concept Plan" and assist the counties/Portland, TPAC and JPACT in establishing priorities. The material should be complete but concise and include a map for each project.

Project Name

1. Project Description (attach clear graphics describing project location and conceptual design; functional classification):

2. General Description of Transportation Problem to Be Solved and How Project Solves Problem:

3. Objectives of Project:

4. Alternatives Explored:

5. Current Project Cost Estimate (include cost estimates in March, 1981 dollars for logical segments and a breakdown of cost by PE, R/W and construction; include date of original cost estimate):


7. Previous Regional and Local Priority Commitments:

8. Specific Description of Project Relationship to the Following Programming Guidelines:
A. Current, near-term (3-year) and future year volumes and current and improved capacities.
B. Relationship of improvement to system continuity.
C. Economic consequences/benefits of improvement, especially in relationship to development investment (in dollars), land development (in acres by type) and jobs (number of existing and expected).
D. Relationship of project to transit service and Transit Development Program.
E. Source, amount and type (including R/W dedication or investment in supporting or parallel facilities required for optimum operation of the completed project) of local match beyond 15 percent share of total project cost.
F. Fiscal and/or operational interrelationship to programming of other projects identified for Interstate Transfer funding.
G. Relationship of project to deferred maintenance or structural inadequacy of existing transportation investment.
H. Other factors, including, but not limited to:
   - safety
   - air quality
   - energy conservation