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MEMORANDUM

Date: November 4, 1981
To: JPACT
From: Charlie Williamson

Regarding: Polling of JPACT Members In Lieu of a Meeting

Since there is only one item on the November JPACT agenda, we will poll the members for the recommended action. Enclosed is the Resolution endorsing the FY 82 Clark County TIP for JPACT's approval.

Please direct your response to Lois Kaplan by Tuesday, November 10, by 5:00 p.m. or you will be contacted on the morning of November 12.

During December, expect additional JPACT involvement with the RTP and Interstate Transfer priority setting.

CW:AC:1mk
Enclosures
CC: TPAC
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 6, 1981
To: JPACT/RDC
From: Andrew Cotugno
Regarding: JPACT/RDC Briefing on RTP - Dinner Meeting

Please be advised that a joint JPACT/RDC meeting has been scheduled on Wednesday, December 2, at 5:30 p.m. in Metro's Council Chambers for a briefing on the Regional Transportation Plan.

This is scheduled as a dinner meeting, so we would appreciate a confirmation of your attendance so we can order the correct number of meals. Please RSVP to Lois Kaplan, 221-1646, ext. 382, by December 1.

AC: lmk
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: October 8, 1981

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Charlie Williamson, Bob Bothman, Larry Cole, Dick Pokornowski, Ed Ferguson, John Frewing, Robin Lindquist, and Al Myers

Guests: Metro Councilors Bob Oleson and Mike Burton; Ted Spence, ODOT; Bebe Rucker, Multnomah County; Winston Kurth, Clackamas County; Carl Neuburger, Citizens for Better Highways; Greg Kullberg, Jerry Markesino, and Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; John Price, FHWA; David Peach, WSDOT; Paul Bay, Tri-Met; Alan Willis and Sarah Salazar, Port of Portland; and Gil Mallery, Regional Planning Council of Clark County

Staff: Andrew Cotugno, Keith Lawton, Terry Bolstad, Peg Henwood, Karen Thackston, and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

1. REVIEW OF OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S SIX-YEAR PLAN

Bob Bothman, Administrator of ODOT, presented ODOT's proposed Six-Year Plan which constitutes the capital improvement program and includes all highway projects for the next six-year period. The Plan is updated every two years and this year's program has been compiled from incomplete projects in the program and a "want" list that was developed from previous hearings, high accident studies, signal investigation warrants, etc. Projects were prioritized at the ODOT-regional level and then integrated into a statewide priority list.

Mr. Bothman stated that there are 32 different funding sources available from federal revenues and that the projects were categorized accordingly. Eighteen public hearings would be held throughout the State, five of which would be held in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Bothman further indicated that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) policy at the present time is for preservation of the system; 75 percent of the program is planned for preservation with the remaining 25 percent to be utilized for new projects and improving the system. He stressed the fact that they've experienced an average inflation rate of 14 percent on
highways while the current program anticipated only an 8 percent inflation rate -- leaving more projects in the current program than could be funded.

Another factor affecting the program is that revenues have dropped off in the last sixteen months. Factors such as deterioration of the present highway system, the present rate of inflation and a decrease in revenues have caused a shift in funding from construction to maintenance. The effect on the improvement program has been a delaying or slipping of projects and the deletion of others. Mr. Bothman then reviewed the projects listed for deletion in the Six-Year Plan.

Andy Cotugno explained to the Committee that $300 million of Interstate Transfer projects and the approximate $300 million of Interstate projects comprise the two major components of this region's highway program. Approximately $288 million of Interstate funds is proposed to be deleted from the Six-Year Plan -- being deferred with no certainty of when they might be built.

A draft letter was presented to the Committee in response to the proposals in the Six-Year Plan. It cited the need for the State to consider breaking down projects based on need or phasing projects over a two to three-year period. The Committee indicated support of the requests that the State give further consideration not to delay the I-5/Greeley Avenue ramps and the I-5/N. Tigard - South Tigard projects nor to delete the following projects: I-405/ramps to Yeon Avenue (I-505 Alternative); I-5/East Marquam and Water Avenue ramps; I-5/Slough Bridge/Delta Park interchange; and I-84/181st Avenue interchange.

Questions raised by Committee members included how the projects were prioritized, what distinction is made between maintenance projects and construction or reconstruction projects, whether traffic volume weighed in ODOT's prioritization, whether the number of accidents on a freeway entered into project consideration, and what chances there were of getting any of these priorities changed.

The Committee was in agreement that 1) the State should commit to building the highest priority segment of all the projects concerned to ensure maximum benefit from the limited available funding; 2) ODOT should take into consideration existing and projected traffic volume in setting priorities for use of scarce funding; 3) ODOT should pursue discretionary Interstate funds available for the completion of "critical gaps" to advance I-205 as well as retain a "backup" program of projects in the event
additional discretionary funds are available and actively pursue preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition on all deferred projects; 4) ODOT should ensure that their program for use of State funds includes previous match commitments toward Interstate Transfer funded projects; 5) If the Six-Year Plan results in the loss of federal funds due to insufficient State match, ODOT should consider releasing these funds for use by local jurisdictions; 6) ODOT should consider lowering their maintenance standards on low-use State facilities; and 7) ODOT should reconsider the decision to delete proposed improvements on the Tualatin Valley Highway through Hillsboro and Highway 43 at Marylhurst College.

Committee members expressed interest in having WDOT respond to the program because of improvements going into the western part of Clark County vs. I-82. Mr. Ferguson assured the Committee that there would be a response from WDOT and added that the two transportation commissions would be meeting in November to discuss the problem with the intent of producing some policy guidelines.

Chairman Williamson indicated that he felt the Metro Council may wish to make a separate recommendation regarding the I-405 Freeway because of its relationship with the garbage hauling.

Bob Bothman pointed out that the Six-Year Plan has not addressed projects based on the 3¢ proposed gas tax and indicated that the 1¢ gas tax would give the State funds to match the federal funds on these projects.

Action Taken: The Committee was in agreement that Andy draft a letter on behalf of JPACT, to be signed by its Chairman, reflecting the comments stipulated above for transmittal to the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Ed Ferguson, Administrator of WDOT, announced that bids would be opened on the SR-14/I-5 interchange just north of the river on Wednesday, October 14, and that the project would be underway and completed in the next two to three years.

2. REPORT ON STATUS OF LEGISLATIVE FUNDING FOR TRANSPORTATION

Andy reviewed the current status of dealings in Washington, D.C. on the Interstate Transfer program. He stated that the House Appropriations Committee adopted both Section 3 and Interstate Transfer funding to keep the Banfield on schedule plus $34.5 million for other Interstate Transfer highway projects, which would maintain a number of priorities in each jurisdiction. The Senate
Appropriations Committee started their work on September 16. The proposal from Senator Hatfield was a recommendation that the Interstate Transfer "transit" funding fund $50 million of Banfield construction and that the Banfield be funded strictly with Interstate Transfer funds. His proposal was for increasing the Interstate Transfer level on the Banfield and dropping Section 3 funds for that purpose. He also suggested that the Committee appropriate $200 million of highway funding, the amount appropriated last year, with the understanding that the House and the Senate would compromise at the Conference Committee at a little more than $300 million of highway funding. It was anticipated that Oregon would receive 19 percent of that amount, which is the latest calculation of what our pro-rata fair share is.

The $60 million share to Oregon would include the $34.5 million needed for other highway projects plus $14.5 million that Salem needs for its program plus about $12 million for some of the highway aspects of the Banfield. Before the Senate Committee adopted this Appropriations Bill, they received the President's request for 12 percent across-the-board cuts. If the Senate cuts 12 percent across the board, the Interstate Transfer transit funding would be cut from $600 million to $528 million and our ability to get $50 million of that amount would be jeopardized. The Interstate Transfer highway program would be cut from $200 million to $177 million. Andy related that there are several suggestions that the 12 percent be taken out of different parts of the Appropriations Bill at different rates. He stressed the fact that Senator Hatfield's proposal did present a program that included everything we need but it carried that program without the Section 3 funds for the Banfield. It did, however, include the provision for Section 3 funds for other transit purposes that would otherwise use Interstate Transfer funding. Whenever this is cleared up, Andy pointed out that it will likely be a Federal decision rather than a local one as to how much funding will be received. Andy related that Bob Duncan is still maintaining communications in this regard.

If the Section 3 trade of the Banfield funds for the Westside and a few other Interstate Transfer transit projects is the only manner in which we'll receive a funding package, then Washington County has indicated that that's an acceptable program (if that includes the commitment that Section 3 funds will flow for those other projects).

3. REVIEW OF REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Andy Cotugno reviewed past presentations and draft material on the Regional Transportation Plan and opened discussion on the policy framework which will help answer the questions of whether
the Plan does work, what it is we're trying to make work, the level of service and mobility needs, and where the regional interest is. It also helps to define the desirable level of mobility of performance on that highway and transit system so that we can measure whether or not the system has been improved.

Andy cited the need for identifying transitways as a means of protecting that right-of-way for the future. He noted three major components of the transportation system necessary to provide the mobility -- how we want the highway system laid out, how we want the transit system laid out, and what kind of demand management programs we can actually use to reduce our need for investing in highway and transit.

In addition to traffic congestion measures, Andy stated that we should also have a minimum level of service defined for the transit system. He then reviewed those measures relating to guidelines for transit minimum level of service. Criteria has been developed to determine where regional trunk routes should go and what type of service should be provided by that regional trunk route. Those routes should be recognized as providing the most frequent and the most reliable service.

Andy then followed up with a review of the Demand Management section of the report, particularly the goal for 35 percent ridesharing. He indicated that what staff will be coming back with will be information on how well the recommended system works, what it consists of, how much it buys and how much it costs.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rick Gustafson
JPACT Members
FIRST ITEM - BOB BOTHMAN REVIEW OF THE SIX YEAR PLAN

RNB -- QUICK INTRODUCTION TO THE SIX YEAR PLAN. Our Six Year Program constitutes the capital improvement program for the Oregon Department of Transportation and includes all our highway projects for the next six year period. It's updated every two years, then theoretically, we have completed two years of our current program and we tack two years on the end.

We have built this program in-house. This year we have a list of projects in our current program that aren't completed and another list of projects, our "want" list which has been developed from previous hearings, high accident studies, signal investigation warrants and so forth. We have prioritized all the projects at both the regional level and then taken those priorities and integrated them in a statewide priority list. We have a long list of projects we have in mind, then use that on a priority basis to build this program.

As you may know, there are some 32 different funding sources in federal funding, and you have to categorize the projects into those sources, and that helps build the program.

We're moving into our hearing process. We've having 18 hearings scattered around the state. Five hearings are in the Metro area, including Beaverton, Gresham, Oregon City, Hood River, and St. Helens. The purpose is to get a response from the local jurisdictions and the public vs. our priorities. At the same time, we're going around to all the local jurisdictions, the media, the highway user groups, and chambers of commerce as another vehicle to get people to respond, so that we can get some measure of our priorities.
Commission policy two years ago was to concentrate our program on preserving the system. Two years later, this year, they have said that 75 percent of the program will be preservation and 25 percent will be for new projects and improving the system. That dictates to us the projects in the program. In addition to that, we've experienced an average inflation rate of 14 percent in the highway business. That complicated this program in that our current program anticipated an 8 percent inflation rate, so obviously we have more projects in our current program than we could fund.

The other thing is that our revenues have dropped off. Mileage on the roads was increasing until 1971 at the rate of about 6 percent a year and the gas tax and the larger cars in those days kept our revenues increasing to keep up with inflation. After the OPEC years, the mileage dropped off and the miles per gallon of the cars increased, so our revenues dropped off. In the last 16 months, our revenues have been decreasing.

We've shifted our funding from construction to maintenance. Our maintenance program is not addressed in this book, but it's at about the same level, down only 20 percent from where it was. It's now about $60 million whereas several years ago it was $20 million.

From our current program, a lot of things have happened:

1. A lot of projects have been delayed. In the far right-hand column of our program, that is our current approved program. (see Page 10).--gives explanation of how to read the program--

2. In addition to slipping projects, some projects dropped off the end. (see Page 11). As an expedient two years ago, we put a number of projects in the program and designated them "later". That means we could not fund them within the current Six Year Program, but we identified them as a project we intended to build.
This year we have not done that because we can't earmark projects that we're going to build later. Our funding just doesn't allow it.

OK, if Andy wants to pick up on how that affects this region, specifically.

Andy -- This region's highway program has two major components. One, about 300+ million dollars worth of Interstate Transfer Projects which we've been dealing with for some time now. The other half is about $300 million worth of Interstate projects, also essential to this region. $288 million worth as described on my memo are in this last list that's getting deleted from the program. In effect, half this region's highway program is being deferred with no certainty of when they might be built. I've laid out some suggestions on how the Transportation Commission may want to consider the priority of these projects relative to what they are proposing in the Six Year Program, so that the parts that are essential to this region can move forward.

In the memo, a lot of these projects are bit items. $50 - $60 million worth of construction. A number of these projects can be broken into smaller pieces. Either break out the most important part of the project with the rest of it being deferred, or phasing over two to three years like the state's doing for I-205.

In particular, the East Marquam Bridge project consists of two different parts, ramps from McLoughlin and the ramps from Water Ave. The ramps from McLoughlin aren't essential until the McLoughlin widening takes place, but the Water Ave. ramps are essential to the industrial access in that area right now. The Slough Bridge project $60 million can be broken down, too. The Banfield widening east of I-205 includes widening the freeway itself, but also includes reconstruction of the interchange at 181st, which is essential for a
primary route connection to US 26 via Burnside through Gresham.

Secondly, the program does include $89 million worth of improvements to I-82 in eastern Oregon, another rather large project. We don't think it's practical to building one of our projects vs. building one of their projects. I think it's practical to suggest that the same thing be done with I-82 as is done with our projects; build critical pieces and free up some of the money for critical pieces of some of our projects.

There are discretionary funds that may become available, and ODOT will pursue those as a matter of course, but this reinforces that. And finally, the state does have commitments to match a number of Interstate Transfer projects with state money and the state should not lose sight of that commitment as we pursue the other half of our highway program, the Interstate Transfer half. I suggest these comments be forwarded in a letter form signed by the chairman to the Commission and as many jurisdictions as possible testify at the hearings to get some of these, and any other points you might have, across.

Q. How did you determine which projects to delete?  
A RNB - strictly on a priority basis. This is an in-house recommendation so in each of the five regions we prioritized projects and then blended at the state level, and went down as far as the money went. On the primary and secondary highway projects, we drew a line at $2 million per mile, so if the improvement of the facility was in excess of $2 million per mile it was dropped off the program. There were a few exceptions, but primarily those on the Coos Bay-Roseburg Hwy. were all dropped off. There are some new projects in here because of the preservation requirement.
I call your attention to the double asterisk. In the program it indicates projects caught up in the 1¢ gas tax. This goes into effect in January, if there is no referendum. The 1¢ gas tax gives us the state funds to match federal funds on these projects. The 3¢ gas tax is another issue. That's the one on the ballot in May. We have not addressed projects for that money.

Q. How did you distinguish between maintenance projects and construction or reconstruction projects?

A. RNB -- Maintenance is pothole patching, snowplowing, striping, electricity for signals, mowing lawns --. We draw the line in the paving at dumping it out of a truck and spread it with a shovel to patch, and construction is layed with a paving machine and by the mile.

Q. What about bridge?

A. RNB -- same thing. An in-house operation vs. a contracted operation. About $50,000 under state law, we do our own work. Over $50,000 is contracted and that's construction.

Q. How did you weigh the number of people that use your new freeway out at Pendleton or whereever vs. the number using the East Marquam Interchage?

Q. Was that an important factor in prioritizing? How many peole use it or how many accidents?
A. RNB - The key factor was, we didn't weight the traffic volume --
There we're dealing with about 7500 cars a day on I-82. That's
forecasted traffic in 20 years, and here we deal with over 100,000.
That's a critical link that's tied to the Interstate Freeway system.
That's the link between the freeway built in Washington and the
Tri-City areas north and down to I-84.

Q. You don't have some neat weighing of accidents, volumes, and things
and add 'em all up and that comes ahead of E. Marquam.

A. RNB - No.

Q. The project that widens I-205 to the full size, a few months ago
you said you'll build that when it's needed, and I see here that
it's in the program for 84-85. Is that a change?

A. Our Commission policy has placed a number one priority on I-205.
On I-205 we intially planned to complete it in 1982. Because of
funding being reduced, we've had to stage into three phases.
(explains interchanges, phases, etc.).
Possibly it might be better to delay that third phase and pick
up something else in the later years.

Q. What are the chances of changing any of these priorities?

A. Good Chance. I would say there won't be any major changes, but
a few of them can and will change. I think the area that Steve
brought up is a kind of thing that can change.
Steve -- Andy, it would seem that whatever kind of letter JPAC sends to that comment about having some relation between demand and use of the facility and its priority ought to be one of this region's comments. There ought to be some rational relationship to the accidents involved and priority.

Q. When do we have to have comments in on this?

A. RNB -- The hearings are all this month, so the comments should be in by the first of November.

My only comment is that Andy's comments seem very mild. One project I'm concerned about is the Stadium Freeway. The new landfill and all the garbage trucks to that Wildwood site through northwest Portland and that could hinge on that Stadium Freeway project that was dropped out, which is $2 million. I think there's got to be a way to build these. What about more funding? Is that an appropriate comment?

A. RNB -- I don't think at this point in time it is because this program is based on the funding we anticipated from initial FHWA administrations proposals back in March, an 8.2 billion national budget. As you all know, that should be cut 12 percent according to the President. I would guess that if anything, the federal level will be reduced.

Q. How about the fact that these are dropping off after 1986. Is the Interstate program end then or just the Interstate Transfer?
A. RNB -- Under current law that ends this year. Under the new law I don't think there's much question about extending it then. Just like I'm pretty sure the Interstate Transfer program will be extended.

Q. Was any consideration given to downgrading certain structures or state highway, with regard to maintenance, and thereby saving some bucks? Or is that outside this process.

A. RNB - That's a valid comment. I raise that question to local jurisdictions. If they feel our maintenance is too high or too low, that's a good comment. The only problem is that we've dropped it too low. Down in Oregon City, they were critical of our sanding through Oregon City in the wintertime. We've reduced our mainpower on the crew that takes care of the hills in Oregon City. In the old days, we put more equipment and people out quicker in the morning. Just look at landscaping, we dropped off it this year in the city of Portland, and the City said no that's unsatisfactory. So under duress we cranked up our landscaping maitnenace. We've dropped off almost all our mowing, turned off our water.

Q. Blumenauer gave this idea some weeks back -- downgrading some county roads, at Ottercrest loop at the beach, that aside from some houses, there's four miles there that basically serves only tourist value. That seems a case where those segments and let the bottom have of the highway slough off as it's doing.
A. RNB — That's valid, the sea route we get about 120 cars a day. We haven't gone to turning them to gravel, when the potholes get so bad.

Chair

If we want to take some action on this, we should do it shortly. Does anybody want to propose any additions to the comments or changes?

Andy

I've got an addition in using demand as part of the priority consideration that the last stage of I-205 be deferred and the suggestion that maintenance standards be reduced on low-use facilities.

Steve

I think there should be a fairly strong statement about I-505 as being a higher priority. When the freeway withdrawal was made by the city and by the region, the statement was made that the highest priority for that money was for the I-505 replacement. I think it's very important the region continue to say that.

I would agree with that if there's no objection --

Chair

Any other comments --

RNB — To reinforce that, with the e(4) program, we are moving forward with that portion. So if we follow our e(4) schedule, that's a little iffy, obviously, and if we follow this program, we'd end up with a gap in the middle from the Fremont Bridge down to nicolai and Vaughn and the city would have to do something to make
that connection. We'd have two ends built without the center.

**Andyxxx**

Steve — Relating to that, I think it's important to point out that we are planning to do some kind of couplet improvement that will last for a couple of years as an interim connection.

Chair — Any other comments? I think individual jurisdictions could make similar comments themselves.

-- I believe the city of Vancouver is planning to discuss the I-5 Slough Bridge project. If you were to use some criteria as far as demand is concerned, that would be right at the top of the list.

Steve -- We have in here the I-5 reconstruction Maruqam Bridge to Interstate Bridge project and I understood that had been rejected by FHWA. Are we still assuming?

RNB — That's deleted.

Steve -- Andy, you've got it on your list of projects of concern. I wonder if maybe we should take it out of there. If we're really not going to build it that will reduce by $9 million.

RNB -- We probably shouldn't have had it in our program two years ago. We put it in there because it was a real program to be funded out of Interstate and was rejected at the federal level.
DICK — Maybe a comment about what we're doing in Washington.

We

Chair — Are there any objections to the comments we have now? We can deem this to be a vote? Thank you for letting me know what you vote (into the silence).

Dick — Just a comment that we're going to open bids on our SR 14 I-5 interchange just north of the river next Wednesday, the 14th. That project will be underway and completed in two to three years. It provides three full lanes coming in from the Vancouver area.

RNB — What he's saying is that he's having a six-lane freeway coming into our four-lane freeway.

Dick — We're in kind of a quandry as you folks are with I-82 on the Washington side, because we have the same amount of traffic about on I-82 compared to I-5 and I-90 and so forth.

-- Is there a possibility that Washington DOT could respond to the program because obviously the improvements going into the western part of Clark County vs I-82 and which the Department deems most important?

Dick — Oh, we'll respond to Bob and ODOT.
Q -- Will there be a Washington DOT judgement on I-5 vs. I-82?

Dick -- We're hoping that our two commissions are going to get together in November and discuss this problem and perhaps come up with some policy guidelines. I know we'll coordinate a response on it.

-- I wonder if we ought to add as one of our criteria that they should take into consideration interface with other abutting state projects?

A -- I think we have that now.

Chair -- I think the Metro Council may want to make a separate recommendation regarding that I-405 freeway because of its relationship with the garbage hauling.

Chair -- Is there anything else on the Six Year Program?

end of that section (indicator at DC90 - point 39).

JS
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AGENDA MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

TO: JPACT
FROM: Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Commenting on the Transportation Improvement Program and on the Determination of Air Quality Consistency for the Urban Areas of Clark County

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council concurrence of a resolution commenting on the Clark County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

B. POLICY IMPACT: Partial fulfillment of the Metro/Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC) Memorandum of Agreement setting forth interstate coordination requirements.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: The approved Metro budget funds staff coordination activities with the RPC.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: Each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) prepares a TIP describing projects programmed for its planning area. Coordination of these documents is set forth in the Metro/RPC Memorandum of Agreement.

Metro staff has reviewed the TIP for Clark County RPC and has identified projects which impact the Oregon side of the Columbia River. These projects and improvements consist of:

- I-5/SR-500 interchange - This provides the first phase of an important east/west arterial between I-5 and I-205; cost - $14 million.

- Vancouver freeway and SR-14 interchange - Reconstruction of interchange and widening of freeway to six lanes on north edge of the Columbia River bridge will improve traffic flow on I-5; cost - $25 million.

- I-205 completion from bridge to SR-500 - Final paving to eight lanes, signing, lighting and landscaping in accordance with ultimate design; cost - $15 million.

- Intermodal transportation center - Immediate construction of an interim, on-street facility (cost - $100,000) followed by a permanent intermodal station (cost - $5 million) will improve passenger/bus/auto transfers.
A phased program will be implemented to locate park and ride lots at Battleground, 164th, SR-14 and Camas; cost - $2 million.

Additional projects may be found in the text for the TIP available at Metro or Clark County Regional Planning Council.

B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: None.

C. CONCLUSION: Staff has reviewed the documents and finds that the projects proposed to be undertaken in Clark County are consistent with the policies, plans and programs of Metro.
WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Oregon portion of the Portland/Vancouver urbanized area, and the Clark County Regional Planning Council (RPC) is the designated MPO for the Washington portion; and

WHEREAS, Metro and the RPC have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement specifying mechanisms to ensure adequate coordination of transportation policies, plans and programs; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with the Metro and RPC Memorandum of Agreement, the RPC has requested comments from Metro on its TIP and Determination of Air Quality Consistency statement; and

WHEREAS, Metro staff has reviewed the FY 1982 TIP for the urban areas of Clark County and the Determination of Air Quality Consistency; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the projects and programs described in the FY 1982 TIP for the urban areas of Clark County and the Determination of Air Quality Consistency are found by Metro Council to be consistent with the policies, plans and programs of the Metropolitan Service District.

2. That the Clark County RPC be advised of this concurrence.
October 1, 1981

Metropolitan Service District
527 S.W. Hall St.
Portland, OR 97201

Att: Charlie Williamson
Metro Councilor, District 2
Chairman, JPACT

Dear Mr. Williamson:

I wish to personally thank you most sincerely and in behalf of the Oregon Transportation Commission and the department staff for your splendid commendatory letter of September 10, 1981. Actually, it is not with undue frequency that we receive letters commending us upon the actions we have taken and the plans we have made. Consequently, your letter is up-lifting and certainly most welcome.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Anthony Yturri
Chairman

AY: HRF