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Meeting: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Date: March 12, 1992
Day: Thursday
Time: 7:15 a.m.
Place: Metro, Conference Room 440

*1. MEETING REPORT OF FEBRUARY 13, 1992 - APPROVAL REQUESTED.


* b. RESOLUTION NO. 92-1582 - CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS - APPROVAL REQUESTED - Andy Cotugno.


*4. DISCUSSION OF WESTSIDE LRT FUNDING ISSUES - INFORMATIONAL - Andy Cotugno

*5. COMMENTS ON REVISION OF OREGON BICYCLE MASTER PLAN - Richard Brandman.

*6. FOLLOW-UP ON SIX-YEAR PROGRAM PRIORITIES - STATUS REPORT - Andy Cotugno.

*7. STATUS OF REGION 2040 PROJECT - INFORMATIONAL - Andy Cotugno.

*Material enclosed.
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NEXT JPACT MEETING: APRIL 9, 1992, 7:15 AM
MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: February 13, 1992

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

PERSONS ATTENDING: Members: Chair Richard Devlin, Jim Gardner and Susan McLain, Metro Council; Earl Blumenauer, City of Portland; Ed Lindquist, Clackamas County; Steve Greenwood (alt.), DEQ; Larry Cole, Cities of Washington County; Don Forbes, ODOT; Gerry Smith, WSDOT; Les White, C-TRAN; Carter MacNichol (alt.), Port of Portland; Tom Walsh, Tri-Met; Roy Rogers, Washington County; Bob Liddell, Cities of Clackamas County; and Pauline Anderson, Multnomah County

Guests: G.B. Arrington, Tuck Wilson and Bob Post (JPACT alt.), Tri-Met; Grace Crunican and Steve Dotterrer, City of Portland; Craig Lomnicki (JPACT alt.), Cities of Clackamas County; Kim Chin, C-TRAN; Bebe Rucker, Port of Portland; Dean Lookingbill, Clark County IRC; Rod Sandoz, Clackamas County, Roger Buchanan, Metro Council; Rick Root, City of Beaverton; Molly O'Reilly, Citizen; Susie Lahsene, Multnomah County; Don Adams (JPACT alt.), John Rist and Ted Spence, ODOT; Jim Howell, Oregon Association of Railway Passengers; Keith Ahola (JPACT alt.), WSDOT; and Dale Chambers, Land Use Advisory Commission

Staff: Andy Cotugno, Gail Ryder, Keith Lawton and Lois Kaplan, Secretary

SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order by Richard Devlin who announced that the Metro Council had appointed him to serve as Chair of JPACT this year.

MEETING REPORT

The January 9, 1992 Meeting Report was approved as written.
RESOLUTION NO. 92-1559 - ENDORSING TRI-MET GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING UNDER 1) SECTION 20 HUMAN RESOURCES PROGRAM AND 2) SECTION 16(B)(2)/CIGARETTE TAX SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM

Andy Cotugno explained that this action would amend the Transportation Improvement Program for two unrelated items: The Section 20 program (encouraged by the Federal Transit Administration) is requested to better serve the disadvantaged community and the Section 16(b)(2) project (through ODOT) is for special needs transportation through use of cigarette tax funds.

Action Taken: Tom Walsh moved, seconded by Don Forbes, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 92-1559, endorsing Tri-Met grant applications for funding the Section 20 Human Resources Program and the Section 16(b)(2)/cigarette tax Special Discretionary Program. Motion PASSED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1561B - PROVIDING THE ASSESSMENT OF DUES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR FY 1992-93

Andy Cotugno noted that this consideration is in line with the 120-day legislated requirement for dues notification to jurisdictions. A revised resolution (Resolution No. 92-1561B) was distributed reflecting action taken at the February 12 TPAC meeting. Andy reviewed TPAC's recommendation to assess local governments at a rate between $.43 and $.51 per capita with the Council establishing the final assessment rate based upon deliberation of the FY 1992-93 budget with input from JPACT and RPAC.

Andy reviewed Attachments A and B to the Staff Report and Exhibit A to the Resolution. He noted the proposed contractual support for Region 2040 and the fact that no work program has been established for Phase II. He cited possible use of a dues increase as follows: 1) a Portland State University proposal to assess local governments using RLIS (for training and technical advice); and 2) a source of funds to enhance the Region 2040 program. Because of the uncertainty of the work program, it is recommended that the dues assessment be placed between $.43 and $.51 for factoring in the final budget process.

Commissioner Anderson reported that RPAC recommended unanimously to keep the dues assessment at $.43 or less and felt that JPACT's recommendation should be consistent with theirs.

Action Taken: Pauline Anderson moved, seconded by Earl Blumenauer, to recommend approval of Resolution No. 92-1561B with
language consistent with RPAC for a dues assessment at a rate of $.43 or less.

In discussion on the motion, Commissioner Blumenauer noted that, given the revised population figures, most jurisdictions will pay a higher amount than last year and have figured budgets based on that.

Councilor Gardner, Chair of RPAC, did not feel the recommendation must be consistent with RPAC's, noting the difference in representation on the two committees. He hoped that JPACT could keep an open mind when the work program is approved and would be open to revising its recommendation on a case-by-case basis if something is deemed appropriate for the dues money.

Mayor Cole noted that the Cities of Washington County support a $.43 cap on the dues assessment.

Mayor Liddell cited the need to be prudent and to revisit all work programs before setting the rate.

Commissioner Blumenauer spoke of the need to be flexible in terms of long-term requirements and the variety of sources of funds. The money derived from dues comes from the least flexible pool, and it is a mandatory assessment. He felt there may be projects for which we may want to seek ways to enhance the budget, particularly the Region 2040 Program.

The motion to adopt Resolution No. 92-1561B as amended PASSED unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Devlin announced that Susan McLain, Jim Gardner, and he would be serving as JPACT representatives from Metro Council along with George Van Bergen as alternate. He also noted that Mayor Bruce Hagensen of Vancouver has filled the vacancy left by Ron Hart.

WESTSIDE LRT ACCESSIBILITY STUDY

Tuck Wilson introduced Denny Porter, Jan Schaeffer and Bob Pike, staff support and consultant, respectively, for the Special Citizens Advisory Committee.

Bob Pike explained that a number of jurisdictions made the recommendation to do away with the Eastside lifts and look at a means of level boarding. The three types investigated include:
1) full-length high platforms; 2) Mini-high platforms; and low-floor light rail vehicles. Bob spoke of mobility impairments, user problems, and difficulty with accessing one door only (which is not in compliance with ADA requirements).

Bob spoke of low-floor cars which have been built from an operational standpoint to get everyone on faster. Bob reviewed the conclusions, concerns and priorities of the study, citing the following major issues: 1) to establish a program for full-level boarding regionally; 2) to minimize a permanent impact on the downtown area; and 3) to minimize technical risks to development of the Westside system.

Bob acknowledged that articulated cars and raised cars will be studied.

Denny Porter provided an overview of the five-month study and spoke of the need for an integrated system in keeping the Westside LRT an extension of the Eastside LRT line but cited ease of use as a consideration. Other considerations he noted include the differences between U.S. protection standards and what is in place in Europe. Tri-Met's engineering staff feels there are ways to overcome the technical difficulties for low-floor cars. To accommodate low-floor cars, it is estimated there will be a 20 percent cost increase. He spoke of coupling new cars with old cars and getting rid of the lifts. Denny stated that costs are determined in 1992 dollars based on a fleet of 39 light rail vehicles. Ten cars are planned for the Eastside line and 29 for the Westside. Tri-Met anticipates some reconstruction on existing platforms and some modification to the existing maintenance facility.

The conclusions he noted were:

. The need to meet ADA compliance;
. The need to meet local expectations;
. To determine what the system will look like;
. To determine whether it can be done technically;
. To establish what it will cost; and
. To ascertain how we will pay for it.

A discussion followed on unacceptable impacts on the downtown area.

Recommendations of the Advisory Committee are as follows:

. Adopt Tri-Met's preference for low-floor light rail vehicles as the single level-boarding technology for the MAX system.
Assess further the type of low-floor vehicle best suited for the MAX system.

Design Westside light rail station platforms for use with the recommended low-floor cars and modify the Eastside platforms and other facilities to accommodate low-floor cars when they are operational.

Determine a plan for funding the additional costs of 39 low-floor cars and associated facilities and seek regional consensus in support of this plan.

Denny Porter indicated that the Advisory Committee must now deal with the conceptual desirability, technical feasibility (internal process at Tri-Met), and financial capability in partnership with the region ($23-30 million range). He noted that the technical feasibility has yet to be determined and that analysis will be undertaken by consultants. If the technical risks can be alleviated, Tri-Met will move forward with a plan for its financing.

Councilor Gardner asked about the financial impact of the boarding applications -- whether there would be any pluses or cost advantages. Tuck Wilson responded that there are ridership impacts and that long-range and systemwide costs are yet to be determined. He added that he did not feel there would ever be high platforms in Portland and noted that the life expectancy of the cars is 20-30 years.

Commissioner Lindquist suggested seeking federal help under 90/10 provisions for ADA compliance. He stated it would be long-term relief but wouldn't help the short-term cash flow.

Bob Post felt that through "equivalent facilitation," we would be meeting ADA compliance. The Rehabilitation Act of 1974 was in effect in 1974 so those regulations were applied when the Eastside light rail was put in place.

Councilor Devlin reported that this matter would be back before JPACT next month along with a funding recommendation.

John Rist, ODOT, informed the Committee of a movement in Congress relating to public buildings, which is a supplemental package for ADA requirements. He felt there may be an infusion of new money. The co-sponsored bill is aimed at demonstration projects.

OVERVIEW OF INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT (ISTEA)

Andy Cotugno encouraged JPACT attendance at the February 25 JPACT-sponsored lunch meeting scheduled for FHWA Administrator Tom Larson at the Convention Center.
Andy highlighted the ISTEA table for the Committee, noting there would be about a 20 percent increase in the highway category and a 40-60 percent increase in the transit level for the next fiscal year. He explained use of funds in Interstate Construction, Interstate Maintenance, National Highway System, Surface Transportation Program, Congestion/Air Quality, Bridge, and Interstate Transfer for the highway side. On the transit side, he explained use of Section 9, Section 9 Operating, Section 8 Planning, Section 3 funds and Interstate Transfer transit funds.

ODOT SIX-YEAR PROGRAM

Andy noted that ODOT is in the process of a Six-Year Program update and they are seeking recommendations on projects. Project recommendations were previously formally approved by JPACT. ODOT is now in the public review process of the draft update.

At a special TPAC meeting on February 12, committee members deliberated on comments for a regional position. ODOT will consider comments received prior to final adoption of the Six-Year Program in either July or August. Andy Cotugno indicated that freight rail and transit are included along with a Development Section identified for engineering, right-of-way acquisition and EIS.

Because of the changing environment of the funds being programmed and a changing STA, the region is asking for changes to meet the eligibility and flexibility of fund requirements during that time period. Andy reviewed the memo that acknowledges that the priorities included are important ones and would advance the highway program.

Andy pointed out that there is $386 million of new money in the ISTEA but that the Six-Year Program is $173 overprogrammed. Changes in the new ISTEA present broader opportunities for multi-modal projects as candidate projects. He then reviewed the types of projects to be considered as reflected in the memo. He noted the recommendation of a separate Bike and Pedestrian Section and that use of the Enhancement and Air Quality funds should consider a broader set of candidate projects.

Andy expressed TPAC concerns over the shortfall and apprehension over use of bonds to meet the unfunded portion of the Program against future federal funds that are flexible and could be tied up. Also included in the memo is an opportunity to use a different approach in addressing the Bridge Program. One comment suggests that the region undertake a multi-modal project evaluation for newly available STP, Enhancement funds, Air Quality/Congestion Mitigation funds and Section 9 funds.
In addition, Andy reviewed the optional language proposed for JPACT consideration pertaining to flagging of specific new projects in the Six-Year Program in a cooperative effort with ODOT to consider alternative projects by October.

Andy asked that JPACT consider approval of the memo, noting that, if delayed, it would miss the ODOT hearing date.

Commissioner Rogers spoke of critical projects to Washington County in the Six-Year Program and the integration of transit with road projects. He acknowledged the $173 million shortfall and questioned whether those critical projects would be reprioritized and held in abeyance if the recommendation is followed.

Don Forbes commented on the need to honor the flexibility issue. He reported that ODOT is doing its best to follow the region's priorities. As a region that wishes to shift focus, he cited the need to develop consensus.

Councilor Devlin noted that ISTEA is a piece of legislation that has "Oregon" written all over it. He felt that this is a region-wide issue and that the flexibility component will be evaluated again in the future.

Councilor McLain felt the important issue is that the Six-Year Program is not a static document and the region has the ability to re-evaluate new issues and new technologies. She felt it was a clarifying device rather than a tracking device.

Carter MacNichol pointed out that the approach should be to meet the timelines and proceed with high priority projects but have the flexibility to change things. He noted that we asked for increased flexibility. Carter asked why this approach was chosen as the preferred alternative as opposed to internally flagging lower priority projects in keeping them off the list. A portion would be held in reserve for reprioritization.

Don Forbes stated that ODOT uses the Six-Year Program as an implementation document. In terms of flexibility, the transportation needs might be met by some other alternatives. He felt the region needs to flag those projects that might be met by alternate use.

Councilor Gardner noted that ISTEA indicates a new environment. By flagging a project, it doesn't mean it's not going to be built and he pointed out the short term between now and October recommended in the memo.

Commissioner Blumenauer expressed concern that we not "pass the buck" and felt that re-evaluation should be done at the state and
local level. He cited the use of flexibility, a favorable borrowing climate, some federal opportunities and some aggressive planning in the region at a time when new circumstances prevail and was hopeful the memo could be "toughened up." He felt some unique opportunities are present that afford clever and more aggressive planning but accompany some risk.

Mayor Liddell expressed concern regarding slippage of some projects but felt there is need to look at the big picture and presenting information to the public during this transition period that is not "business as usual." He spoke in terms of livability, that this is a good approach, that there needs to be a public outreach, and that it needs to be defined to the rest of the region.

Tom Walsh felt that the significance of the new Surface Transportation Act is predictability and flexibility. He cited it as a significant major opportunity for future STAs. He felt we need to plant the message that if legislation is to be done differently, one state will respond.

Andy Cotugno noted that the new Six-Year Program adds two years to the old program. It does not change predictability of old projects in the first four years but the last two years are predominantly new projects. Andy cited the difficulty involved in deprogramming something that is already committed so this is a modest way to include projects in the Six-Year Program by flagging them as "new projects."

Commissioner Rogers felt we need to look at different alternatives but wanted a better understanding of the flagging, regional priorities and participation in the process. He asked for further clarification as to what would be given up.

Councilor Gardner understood Commissioner Rogers' concern but noted that those concerns will be driven by the OTC hearings. If there is an opportunity to give comments, then it should be decided as quickly as possible. The flagging would be done between now and October for regional discussion with some suggested amendments to ODOT at the end of that period. He cited the need to state that this is a transition period and in view of the timetable.

Action Taken: Councilor Gardner moved, seconded by Commissioner Blumenauer, to endorse these comments to ODOT on their Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program and include the additional language in Paragraph 4 (noted as optional JPACT language) with inclusion of the word Modernization preceding the word "projects."
In discussion on the motion, Mayor Cole spoke as representative from the Cities of Washington County and their preference to keep the Six-Year Program intact during this update with re-evaluation during the second year, voicing concern about looking at the whole package.

Don Forbes reminded the Committee that there would be a second round of comments in June.

Andy Cotugno cited the importance of moving forward with the comments that lay out principles to deal with the flagged projects. He indicated that the flagging issue could take place in May and felt it would be a mistake to miss the hearings.

Carter MacNichol was willing to support the motion and, at another time, drop the flagged projects but concurred in the need for flexibility for consideration of alternative projects. He felt it might be a disservice to some jurisdictions whose projects are being "flagged" and suggested a delay until March.

The motion PASSED unanimously.

JPACT FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Andy Cotugno felt it would be timely to appoint a JPACT Finance Subcommittee with the task of preparing a funding resolution for JPACT consideration for the next legislative session. Chair Devlin asked members interested in serving on the Finance Subcommittee to contact him.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Lois Kaplan

COPIES TO: Rena Cusma
           Dick Engstrom
           JPACT Members
PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would: 1) approve the Unified Work Program (UWP) containing the transportation planning work program for FY 1993; 2) authorize the submittal of grant applications to the appropriate funding agencies; and 3) certify that the Portland metropolitan area is in compliance with federal transportation planning requirements.

TPAC has reviewed the FY 1993 Unified Work Program and accompanying federal certification planning requirements and recommends approval of Resolutions 92-1575 and 92-1582.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The FY 1993 UWP describes the transportation planning activities to be carried out in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1992. Included in the document are federally-funded studies to be conducted by Metro, Intergovernmental Resource Center of Clark County (IRC), Tri-Met, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), the City of Portland, and local jurisdictions. Major commitments continue to the Clean Air Act, Demand Management, Urban Growth Management, the Westside Corridor project and Hillsboro DEIS, the I-205/Milwaukie Pre-Alternatives Analysis, the I-5/Vancouver Pre-Alternatives Analysis, and High Capacity Transit studies. Also of major priority are the Regional Transportation Plan major update, the Southeast Corridor Study, the response to Rule 12 and the new Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA).

In the past, regional Interstate Transfer or FAU funds have been allocated towards work elements in the UWP. This practice is continued with an allocation from the region's Surface Transportation Program, the replacement for FAU.

Federal transportation agencies (FTA/FHWA) require a self-certification that our planning process is in compliance with certain federal requirements as a prerequisite to receiving federal funds. The self-certification documents that we have met those requirements and is considered yearly at the time of UWP approval.
The UWP matches the projects and studies reflected in the proposed Metro budget to be submitted to the Tax Supervisory and Conservation Commission.

Approval will mean that grants can be submitted and contracts executed so work can commence on July 1, 1992 in accordance with established Metro priorities.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolutions 92-1575 and 92-1582.
WHEREAS, The Unified Work Program describes all federally-funded transportation planning activities for the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area to be conducted in FY 1993; and

WHEREAS, The FY 1993 Unified Work Program indicates federal funding sources for transportation planning activities carried out by the Metropolitan Service District, Intergovernmental Resource Center of Clark County, the Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met and the local jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, Approval of the FY 1993 Unified Work Program is required to receive federal transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, The FY 1993 Unified Work Program is consistent with the proposed Metropolitan Service District budget submitted to the Tax Supervisory and Conservation Commission; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District hereby declares:

1. That the FY 1993 Unified Work Program is approved.

2. That the Surface Transportation Program funds in the amount of $250,000 are authorized.

3. That Regional FAU funds toward Technical Assistance to jurisdictions outside the City of Portland are authorized in the amount of $36,000.
4. That it is recognized that full funding for this work program has not been secured which could result in amendment, reduction or elimination of some work elements or funding through alternate sources. These changes will be reviewed by TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council.

5. That the FY 1993 Unified Work Program is consistent with the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process and is given positive Intergovernmental Project Review action.

6. That the Metropolitan Service District Executive Officer is authorized to apply for, accept and execute grants and agreements specified in the Unified Work Program.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this ____ day of ________, 1992.

Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

KT:bk
2-20-92
92-1575.RES
FY' 93 Unified Work Program

Transportation Planning in the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan area

Metropolitan Service District
Intergovernmental Resource Center
Oregon Department of Transportation
Tri-Met
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OREGON PORTION
INTERIM REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) provides the region with a comprehensive policy and investment blueprint for an effective long-range transportation system. To ensure that the RTP adequately reflects current demographic, travel demand, economic conditions and trends, and federal, state and regional policy regulations and legislation, ongoing maintenance of the RTP database and timely updates are necessary to the plan.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. The RTP was adopted in 1982 and updated in 1983 and 1989. A minor revision was completed in FY 91-92. The revision was necessary in order to position projects for federal funding and to incorporate policy direction as specified in recent state and federal regulation and legislation, including State Transportation Rule 12, the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1991.

Also, in FY 91-92 a detailed scope of work and transportation networks (base and forecast year and high growth) were developed for the current update. Analysis was begun to evaluate the adequacy of the current RTP in meeting the needs of the region based on updated 10 and 20-year regional forecasts and travel demand projections. Analyses of the high growth and high transit networks was also initiated, and demand management techniques were evaluated in conjunction with the Governor's Portland Area Task Force on Automobile Emissions (see Transportation Demand Management Study).

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. The program will involve the following elements:

• 2010 RTP Update. The 2010 Update will begin the transition to a "Final" update after Region 2040 and will provide a means of developing transportation alternatives to support the Region 2040 alternatives. Initial emphasis will be placed on updating the "committed" and "current" RTP, followed by definition of additional alternatives to consider. For the "committed" and "current" RTP tasks, include to complete evaluation of adequacy of these alternatives to meet forecast needs, identify amendments to the RTP required in the areas of transportation policy, regional transportation system elements, improvements to the systems (10 and 20-year needs), financing shortfalls, coordination, implementation and consistency with other plans, programs and outstanding issues.
This RTP Update will be carried out consistent with adopted local comprehensive plans and Metro's RUGGOs. The update will coordinate, comply or be sensitive to the following activities:

- The recommendations of the Oregon Roads Finance Study for the distribution of revenues;
- ODOT's Multi-Modal Oregon Transportation Plan;
- ODOT's plan for arterial corridor studies intended to identify improvements on key urban arterials;
- Congestion management plans as required by the Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991;
- The State Transportation Rule 12 and federal CAAA and ADA; and
- Changes to local jurisdictional and agency transportation plans, programs and policies.

Evaluation will include determinations of VMT/capita, mode split and auto occupancy targets, air pollution emissions, energy consumption and level of mobility provided.

Particular emphases will be placed on definition of demand management and transit system additions to the RTP.

- RTP Maintenance/Consistency. Maintain and update the RTP database consistent with changes in the population and employment forecasts, travel demand projections, cost and revenue estimates and amendments to local comprehensive plans.
- Assist Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington counties in evaluating consistency of the I-84/US 26 Connector (Mt. Hood Parkway, Sunrise Corridor and the Tualatin-Hillsboro Corridor (Western Bypass) with land use goals.
- Participate as a representative from Metro to various planning or engineering technical advisory committees involved with refinement and implementation of various projects identified in the RTP.
- Develop revised functional classification and designation of national highway system.
- Assist Tri-Met in establishing program and policies to ensure private enterprise participation in planning and provision of mass transit service.
• Support the findings of the Suburban Transit Study which calls for contracted service to serve developing areas, continue to identify transit markets and types of service areas appropriate for implementation by the private sector.

• Identify elements of transportation alternatives and data regarding transportation needs as input to 2040 project.

**Work Program Anticipated after FY 92-93.** This program is an ongoing activity consistent with past budget levels. Similar maintenance and update tasks will also be required in future budget years. The RTP satisfies Metro's federal and state planning obligations and is a required task in both cases. A future update will be required to incorporate conclusions from the evaluation of alternative and land use and transportation as part of Metro's Region 2040 planning process.

**PRODUCTS AND TARGETS**

• Alternative Scenarios Report (October 1992). The report will provide a description of committed and RTP scenarios and possible additions to the RTP, a preliminary analysis of impacts on the system, an overview of demand management strategies (in conjunction with the Transportation Demand Management Study) and procedural and policy recommendations for transportation planning and project development responding to Rule 12, CAAA and ISTEA and ADA requirements.

• Evaluation of Alternative Scenarios Report (March 1993). Detailed evaluation of scenarios, including estimated costs and performance, including consistency with state and federal regulations.

• Final Recommendations Report (July 1993).

• Congestion Management Plan (December 1993).

**EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services:</td>
<td>$145,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 2.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$17,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>$38,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$3,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVENUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 PL/ODOT:</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 Section 8:</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 STP:</td>
<td>$27,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 Tri-Met:</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 92 Section 8:</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 88 Section 8:</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro:</td>
<td>$19,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGION 2040

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Transportation Department will provide support and coordination to the Planning and Development Department on issues related to the Region 2040 Planning Process (formerly Urban Growth Management). Coordination will be necessary particularly in the development and subsequent analysis of alternative long-range land use/transportation scenarios. Activities related to regional urban growth management began in FY 89-90 with the initiation of the development of the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs). Region 2040 is intended to provide a process to refine the intent of the RUGGOs and to develop a regional framework for their implementation. The analysis of alternative land use/transportation scenarios will also satisfy the land use alternative requirement as required in State Transportation Rule 12, and respond to the RTP directive that a transit intensive alternative be considered.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. The RUGGOs were adopted in September of 1991. Phase I of Region 2040 was initiated in January 1992 with the signing of consultant contracts and work began on the following tasks: development of evaluation criteria; public involvement process; and development of alternative scenarios to be evaluated.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. The Region 2040 Phase I activities identified above will be completed over the first half of FY 92-93. Phase II activities will follow, including:

- Conduct detailed transportation alternatives analyses of scenarios developed in Phase I. Analysis will utilize evaluation methodology also developed in Phase I.

- Coordinate Phase II public involvement effort consistent with alternatives analysis.

- Select a preferred alternative and forward for review and adoption. The review period would necessitate intensive jurisdictional and public review over the second half of the fiscal year.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. The RTP will be updated following completion of Region 2040 to reflect the adopted recommendations and to satisfy the requirements of State Transportation Rule 12 requiring consideration of alternative land use scenarios.
PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

- Phase I Revised Land Use/Transportation Alternatives incorporating technical review comments (3rd Draft - September 1992).
- Phase I Final Products: Final text; alternatives recommendations; evaluation methodology; GIS database (December 1992).
- Phase II Scope of Work (February 1993).
- Initiation of Phase II work elements (February/March 1993).

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

Phase I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>FY 93 PL/ODOT</th>
<th>FY 93 STP</th>
<th>FY 93 Section 8</th>
<th>FY 92 ODOT</th>
<th>FY 92 Tri-Met</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$47,910</td>
<td>$35,850</td>
<td>$5,320</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$31,250</td>
<td>$31,250</td>
<td>$68,830</td>
<td>$192,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE .86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S)</td>
<td>$4,435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>$12,755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$192,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>FY 93 PL/ODOT</th>
<th>FY 93 STP</th>
<th>FY 93 Section 8</th>
<th>FY 92 ODOT</th>
<th>FY 92 Tri-Met</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$66,850</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$84,500</td>
<td>$257,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 1.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S)</td>
<td>$17,741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>$19,099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$3,810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$257,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$257,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT STUDY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In cooperation with Tri-Met, the Department of Environmental Quality, the Oregon Department of Transportation and local jurisdictions, Metro will act as the lead agency in an analysis of alternative transportation demand management (TDM) techniques applicable in the Portland region. The objectives of demand management are to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the region, thereby reducing the demand for transportation capital expenditures, improving air quality, improving neighborhood livability and reducing energy consumption. Appropriate evaluation methodologies will be identified or developed for an alternatives analysis of various demand management techniques. The analysis will lead to recommendations for a demand management implementation strategy for the region which may include amendments to the RTP and to local comprehensive plans and ordinances. Each technique will be evaluated for its emission reduction potential. In addition, the "Base Case" RTP and an amended RTP to incorporate recommended measures will be evaluated.

Metro will also participate with DEQ to provide support for the Governor's Portland Area Task Force on Automobile Emissions established by the 1991 Oregon Legislature. Analysis conducted as part of the TDM study will be forwarded to the Task Force.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. The TDM Study was initiated during the third quarter of FY 91-92. Activities included: working with DEQ to define a detailed scope of work intended to support and coordinate with the Governor's Task Force; identifying regional TDM issues and objectives consistent with the goals of the study and of the Task Force; formalizing technical and citizen involvement processes; conducting a literature search to identify a broad list of promising TDM alternatives, both "traditional" (existing) and "innovative" and, both regulatory and market-based; the development of an evaluation methodology to analyze the list of demand management techniques for VMT, air quality, energy and other cost/benefit related impacts, as well as the technical, legal and policy implications; and the initiation of the alternatives analysis stage of the study.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

- Complete air quality alternatives analysis phase of the study and provide information to the Governor's Task Force by October 1992.
Complete remainder of Alternatives Analysis and prepare a Recommendations Report describing the study alternatives, the results of the analysis and a recommended comprehensive strategy for demand management in the Portland region for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan.

**Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93.** Work with local jurisdictions, transportation agencies and major employers to implement and monitor the demand management strategy. Coordinate TDM strategies with Region 2040 recommendations and the subsequent update to the RTP. Review and monitor "state of the art" TDM strategies for further consideration for use in the Portland region.

**IDENTIFIABLE PRODUCTS AND TARGETS**

- Report to Governor's Task Force on Air Quality Related TDM Strategies (September 1992).
- Final Report and Recommendations on Comprehensive TDM Strategies for the Portland region.

**EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services:</td>
<td>$ 79,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 1.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$ 8,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>$ 21,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$ 2,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$137,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVENUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 STP:</td>
<td>$ 38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 ODOT Supp.:</td>
<td>$ 23,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEQ:</td>
<td>$ 52,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro:</td>
<td>$ 22,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$137,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AIR QUALITY PLANNING

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In cooperation with DEQ, Metro will update current year estimates and future year forecasts of emissions to determine whether standards for carbon monoxide (CO) and ozone established by the Clean Air Act of 1990 can be achieved by the mandatory deadline and maintained thereafter. In accordance with federal law, the standard for ozone (hydrocarbon emissions) must be met by November 1993 and CO by November 1995. Initial updates to current hydrocarbon and CO emission will be submitted to USDOT and EPA by November 1992. In conjunction with the demand management study, Metro will provide air quality planning support to the Governor's Portland Area Task Force on Automobile Emissions established by the 1991 Oregon Legislature. Metro is also participating in Portland's Central City Transportation Management Plan which, in part, is intended to lead to attainment of the CO standard in downtown Portland.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. As required by the Clean Air Act, Metro, in FY 90-91, has worked with the region to redefine CO and ozone attainment areas and, in FY 91-92, determined "interim conformity" of the Transportation Improvement Program defined detailed scopes of work for the air quality planning program, participated in the Portland Central City Transportation Management Plan and established base year, RTP recommended and high growth forecasts. Air quality impacts have been evaluated in conjunction with the demand management study.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. Two submittal dates determine air quality planning for FY 92-93.

• The first is November 1992 and the requirement to update emissions forecasts. FY 92-93 activities involve completing model runs and finalizing documentation in preparation of the submittal.

• The second submittal date is early in the next fiscal year (November 1993) and is for the ozone SIP update. Activities will include the identification and analysis of Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), incorporation of viable measures and preparation of submittal documentation.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93

• Submit updated ozone SIP, documentation for attainment and maintenance plan (November 1993).
• Submit updated CO SIP, documentation for attainment and maintenance plan (November 1995).

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

• Complete emissions inventory and submit to EPA/USDOT (November 1992).

• Complete Central City Transportation Management Plan Assistance.

• Define scope of work for November 1993 ozone SIP update, attainment submittal and maintenance plan (December 1992).

• Identify and analyze TCMs for inclusion in SIP and maintenance plan (May 1993).

• Begin final report and recommendations for SIP update, attainment submittal and maintenance plan (June 1993).

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services: (FTE 1.23)</td>
<td>$65,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$4,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>$17,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$2,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$90,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEQ:</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro:</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$90,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NORTHWEST TRANSPORTATION SUBAREA STUDY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Northwest Transportation Subarea (formerly Cornell/Barnes-Burnside) Study addresses general transportation circulation and access issues resulting from high growth in an area north of the Sunset Highway, west of northwest Portland into eastern Washington County. The study was initiated in the third quarter of FY 90-91. FY 92-93 work activity will be limited to adoption of the Study Recommendations Report.

The study focuses on east-west through traffic in the Cornell/Barnes-Burnside corridor on north-south access to and across the Sunset Highway, and on options for improving alternatives to the single-occupant auto in the study area. The study evaluates alternatives solutions through cost/benefit analysis for their ability to address goals for reducing through traffic. Alternatives are also being evaluated for their consistency with state, regional and local objectives and plan consistency.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK


OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. Activity will be limited to the preparation and adoption of a Study Recommendations Report. Recommendations will be adopted for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan and will appropriate local transportation plans.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. None. The project will be completed during FY 92-93.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

### EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services:</td>
<td>$16,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE .30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>$4,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 93 PL/ODOT:</th>
<th>$21,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WILLAMETTE RIVER BRIDGE CROSSING
(SOUTHEAST CORRIDOR STUDY PHASE II)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In conjunction with the structural need to replace the Sellwood Bridge, this study will examine the need for additional river crossing capacity across the Willamette River and the most practical location to provide that capacity. Ultimately, after an extensive public involvement process, the study will result in the conclusion of whether a new bridge, a reconstructed Sellwood Bridge or adding capacity to the Ross Island Bridge should be added to the RTP. This work program will be coordinated with I-205/Milwaukie HCT Study and ODOT's I-405 Reconnaissance and Highway 43 Metropolitan Area Corridor studies.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. The project was initiated during the third quarter of FY 91-92. Major products included the development of a detailed scope of work and background report defining study issues, problems, objectives and assumptions for analysis; and an inventory of existing study area information (traffic counts, accident rates, etc.). A study travel forecasting model was also developed. Work on Base Year and Forecast Year Conditions reports, project coordination and citizen involvement efforts were initiated.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

• Identify capacity deficiencies for the existing bridge crossings (Ross Island and Sellwood).

• Evaluate the performance of McLoughlin Boulevard from the Ross Island Bridge to Highway 22 and Macadam/Highway 43, north and south of the Sellwood Bridge, as well as I-5 between the Ross Island and Sellwood bridges.

• Identify capacity deficiencies on the arterial system, west of the Sellwood Bridge, including the Terwilliger Extension and the Macadam/I-5 access.

• Identify and evaluate transit alternatives which maximize transit usage for cross river trips. Coordinate the evaluation with the HCT study.

• Identify options for improving and increasing bicycle and pedestrian river crossings and connections with their respective networks.
Identify alternative Willamette River bridge crossings, options for upgrading or replacing existing bridges, and feasible locations of new bridge alternatives.

Measure the ability of the RTP highway system (No-Build) to accommodate projected (forecast) traffic demand.

Determine the impacts of increased bridge capacity on:

The need for other system improvements on both sides of the river to make the proposed alternatives work.

The ability of the alternative to solve problems identified in the RTP problem assessment and scope of work.

The operation of the RTP arterial system.

The need for improvements to the RTP arterial system or additional arterial capacity.

Determine the neighborhood traffic impacts of the increased bridge capacity alternatives.

Evaluate the ability of TDM measures and transit alternatives to minimize the need for increased river crossing capacity.

Coordinate with studies of transportation needs for the new development in the South Waterfront area.

Identify the significant environmental impacts and costs for each of the proposed alternatives.

Work with jurisdictions and the Citizens Advisory Committee to gain consensus on the preferred alternative.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93

Integrate study recommendations into the RTP, the Oregon Transportation Plan and local transportation plans, as necessary.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

Base Year (Existing) Conditions Report (September 1992).


## EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services:</td>
<td>$138,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 2.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$8,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>$36,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$5,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$190,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY '93 PL/ODOT</td>
<td>$69,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '93 Section 8</td>
<td>$28,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '93 ODOT Supp.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '93 HPR (FHWA)</td>
<td>$34,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY '92 Section 8 (FTA)</td>
<td>$19,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro:</td>
<td>$7,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$190,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM/ISTEA IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) serves as a regional policy document describing which projects will be given priority, and is prepared in response to USDOT regulations. The regulations state that a program of highway and transit projects which use federal funds is to be developed annually under the direction of the MPO and is to set forth cost estimates for the Annual Element year. The report is to be endorsed by the Metro Council and submitted to the Governor, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration and to the Federal Highway Administration administrator. In addition to including cooperatively developed projects defined by the cities and counties, the Transportation Improvement Program incorporates major regional actions such as Tri-Met's Transit Development Plan and ODOT's Six-Year Highway Improvement Program.

Beginning with FY 93, the TIP must conform to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) which was signed by the President in December 1991. The new ISTEA contains a number of funding program revisions and planning actions which will require specific response and action from State's and MPO's. Given the more flexible nature of the programs within the new ISTEA, substantial discussion and coordination through TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council will be necessary to determine those priorities.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. Generalized Support:

- Various analyst and reports related to the Interstate Transfer Program in support of the State's Roads Finance Study Revision.

- Historical documentation of federal transportation appropriations.

- Revised Interstate Substitute Cost Estimates.

- Annual TIP Report.

- Staff participation in new ISTEA discussion and information sessions through TPAC and JPACT.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

- Ongoing TIP maintenance and monitoring.

- Review and comment on the Tri-Met 5-year TDP.
• Funding allocation. Integration of revised and new projects to be funded with federal funds. Identify priorities, federal funding source, project estimates, project descriptions and responsible implementation agency. Focus of attention will be on Surface Transportation Program funds, Enhancement funds, Air Quality/Congestion Mitigation funds and Section 9 funds. Plans and programs will be developed as required.

• Annual Report. Annually, the Transportation Improvement Program is updated and adopted to reflect current costs, schedules and funding action approved throughout the year.

• Determination of TIP conformity with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

• Update JPACT ranking criteria associated with ODOT's Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program and as appropriate for other ISTEA funding programs with assistance of the TIP subcommittee.

**Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93**

Elements of the ISTEA of 1991 will be finalized and fine tuned in combination with the continuing maintenance requirements of the Transportation Improvement Program and its annual submittal, and periodic review and update to the congestion management plan.

**PRODUCTS AND TARGETS**

• Periodic amendments - ongoing.

• Annual Transit Development Plan (TDP) endorsement.

• Adopt the 1993 TIP, Annual Report and updates to the TDP, Six-Year Highway Improvement Program and jurisdictional projects.

• If no previous action, adoption of the TIP would also include:
  
  Tri-Met's compliance with private sector participation;

  Metro's certification of compliance with federal requirements;

  Evaluation of the financial ability of Tri-Met to construct and operate projects proposed in the TIP; and

  Clean Air Act conformity determination;

• Updated JPACT ranking criteria (January 1993.)

• Methodology for ISTEA application of ranking criteria (February 1993).
- Address ISTEA requirements for financial analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services:</td>
<td>FY 93 PL/ODOT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 2.0)</td>
<td>$ 74,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>FY 93 Section 8:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 400</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>FY 93 STP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,774</td>
<td>$ 24,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>FY 93 ODOT Supp.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>Metro:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 27,222</td>
<td>$ 8,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,458</td>
<td>$137,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $137,500
HILLSBORO CORRIDOR AA/DEIS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this program is to prepare the Hillsboro Corridor Alternatives Analysis and Draft Environmental Impact Statement and to select a Locally Preferred Alternatives that will advance into Preliminary Engineering and preparation of a Final Environmental Impact Statement. The program is evaluating four alternatives: 1) No Build with light rail between downtown Portland and 185th and Baseline; 2) Transportation Systems Management; 3) Light Rail extended from 185th and Baseline to Downtown Hillsboro; and 4) Light Rail extended from 185th and Baseline to the Washington County Fairplex.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program Prior to FY 92-93. The project was initiated in June 1990. All study methodology and description of alternatives have been completed. Throughout the remainder of FY 92 the environmental analysis, travel demand forecasting, cost analysis, conceptual engineering, financial analysis and technical reports documenting the analysis will be complete. Several draft chapters of the DEIS will be initiated or concluded.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. All chapters of the DEIS will be completed. Additional technical analysis and modifications to the technical reports will be prepared as required. Following approval by FTA, the DEIS will be published. A public hearing on the DEIS will be held following notification in the Federal Register. A locally preferred alternative will be recommended by the project CAC and study participants, and Tri-Met will select the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Metro will document the decision in the LPA Report and will forward it to FTA. If LRT is selected as the LPA, a request will be submitted to FTA to advance the corridor into PE/FEIS.

This UWP element includes an increase in the approved project budget as detailed below. The projected budget increases are due to: 1) increased complexity within the environmental and travel demand analysis; 2) the increased duration of the study; 3) a longer and more extensive public involvement program; and 4) additional work required to complete the definition of alternatives and project methodologies.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. None. This phase of the project will be completed within FY 1992-93 (see Hillsboro Corridor PE/FEIS).

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

- DEIS Published in the Federal Register - 12/92
- Selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative - 4/93
**EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION**

**FY 93 Metro**

- Personal Services: $175,958  
  (FTE 3.02)
- Materials & Services: $476,816
- Computer (M&S): $ 4,435
- Capital Outlay:  
  $ 0
- Transfers: $ 42,607
  **TOTAL** $699,816

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES**

- Personal Services: $ 568,329
- Material & Services: $1,285,624
- Computer (M&S): $ 54,547
- Capital Outlay: $ 0
- Transfers: $ 177,800
  **TOTAL** $2,086,300

**REVENUES**

**FY 93 Funding**

- Hillsboro Section 9: $559,853
- Local Match: $139,963
  **TOTAL** $699,816

**TOTAL REVENUES**

- OR-90-2031 Sec. 9: $ 518,370
- OR-90-2035 Sec. 9: $ 547,104
- Proposed: OR-90-2041 Sec. 9: $ 603,536
- Local Match: $ 417,290
  **TOTAL** $2,086,300
HILLSBORO CORRIDOR PE/FEIS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

If the LRT alternative is selected as the Locally Preferred Alternative within the Hillsboro AA/DEIS program, then the project will advance into this phase where the Preliminary Engineering and Final Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared. Metro will manage the preparation of the FEIS and will coordinated the preparation of mitigation plans with Tri-Met as they complete the Preliminary Engineering.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program Prior to FY 92-93. None.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. Work will begin on preparation of the FEIS and mitigation plans. Responses to the DEIS will be prepared and documented.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93

- Compile and respond to all public comment on the DEIS.
- Develop mitigation plans for all elements of the project.
- Coordinate those mitigation plans with Tri-Met Engineering to ensure constructability, cost-effectiveness and implementation.
- Prepare the FEIS.
- Secure a Record of Decision from FTA for the project.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

FEIS Completion - 9/93
Record of Decision - 11/93

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Services: $114,792</th>
<th>Hillsboro FEIS: $300,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services: $150,000</td>
<td>TOTAL: $300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S): $4,435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay: $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers: $29,862</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency: $911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I-205/MILWAUKIE PRELIMINARY AA

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program will select either the I-205 or Milwaukie corridor as the priority to advance into AA/DEIS as the region's next high capacity transit corridor. The study will identify the corridors' transportation problems, narrow the range of alternatives to be considered within AA/DEIS, estimate the preliminary cost effectiveness of those alternatives, and prepare a scope and budget for the AA/DEIS process.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program Prior to FY 92-93. The program's work plan and budget has been prepared and approved locally and by FTA. IGAs and consultant contracts for services to assist in completion of the project will be executed. Initial work in preparing background information, analyzing past and concurrent transportation studies, and determining methodologies to be used throughout the study will be completed prior to FY 92-93.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. Screen alternatives, selection of a priority corridor, and preparation of documentation necessary to advance the study into AA/DEIS.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. Metro will submit application to FTA to advance the corridor into AA/DEIS. The AA/DEIS is expected to begin in January 1994.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

- Screening of Alternatives - July 1992
- Priority Corridor Selection - May 1993
- Application to Initiate AA/DEIS - September 1993
- Initiate AA/DEIS - January 1994

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 93 Metro</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 93 Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services:</td>
<td>$166,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$11,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>$43,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$2,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>TOTAL GRANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services: $235,556</td>
<td>I-205/Milwaukie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services $830,000</td>
<td>(OR-29-9020): $997,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S): $25,000</td>
<td>Local Match: $175,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers: $82,444</td>
<td>TOTAL $1,173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $1,173,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program will select either the I-5 or the I-205 corridor as the priority to advance into AA/DEIS concurrently with or following the I-205/Milwaukie Corridor. The study will identify the corridors' transportation problems, narrow the range of alternatives to be considered within AA/DEIS, estimate the preliminary cost effectiveness of those alternatives, and prepare a scope and budget for the AA/DEIS process.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program Prior to FY 92-93. The program’s work plan and budget has been prepared and approved locally and by the WSDOT. IGAs and consultant contracts for services to assist in completion of the project will be executed. Initial work in preparing background information, analyzing past and concurrent transportation studies, and determining methodologies to be used throughout the study will be completed prior to FY 92-93.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. Screen alternatives, selection of a priority corridor, and preparation of documentation necessary to advance the study into AA/DEIS.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. Metro will submit application to FTA and WSDOT to advance the corridor into AA/DEIS. The AA/DEIS is expected to begin in January 1994.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

- Screening of Alternatives - July 1992
- Priority Corridor Selection - May 1993
- Application to Initiate AA/DEIS - September 1993
- Initiate AA/DEIS - January 1994

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 93 Metro</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services: $156,608</td>
<td>Washington State: $1,052,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 2.99)</td>
<td>Local Match: $230,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services $1,101,500</td>
<td>Metro: $32,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S): $11,532</td>
<td>TOTAL: $1,315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay: $0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers: $41,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency: $4,003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: $1,315,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>TOTAL GRANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown Undetermined</td>
<td>Washington State: $1,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Match:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL HCT STUDY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the program is to prepare a regional High Capacity Transit (HCT) plan for the Portland/Vancouver metropolitan region. It will concentrate on achieving the following objectives: First, the study will reassess the primary HCT corridors identified within the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) using updated travel demand forecasts. Second, the study will analyze the impacts of expanding LRT capacity on the Portland Mall or adjacent streets. Third, system operational needs, such as vehicle maintenance requirements, will be determined. A systemwide financing plan will be developed for the next corridor(s) and for the HCT system plan and staging strategy.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program Prior to FY 92-93. The program's work plan and budget has been prepared and approved locally and by the WSDOT. IGAs and consultant contracts for services to assist in completion of the project will be executed. Initial work in preparing background information, analyzing past and concurrent transportation studies, and determining methodologies to be used throughout the study will be completed prior to FY 92-93.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

• Determination of a HCT system plan and HCT phasing plan.

• Determination of systemwide infrastructure needs for the HCT system.

• Determination of Portland CBD HCT needs and alternatives to be considered within the region's next Alternatives Analysis.

• Development of corridor financing strategies and a systemwide financial plan.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. None.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

• Interim HCT System Plan - July 1992
• Final HCT System Plan - July 1993
• Final HCT Financing Plan - July 1993
## EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services:</td>
<td>$129,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 2.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$13,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>$34,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$4,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$237,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 Tri-Met:</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 C-TRAN:</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro:</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$237,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WESTSIDE STATION AREA PLANNING

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program is part of the Final Design of the Westside LRT and support for the Hillsboro LPA. The program will provide land use station area design and development for all LRT stations included within the Westside and Hillsboro Projects. The intent is to maximize transit and LRT use through implementing modifications to the land use patterns and design requirements, and access within a half-mile radius of LRT stations. This program is required by the State of Oregon as a condition of the local match that it will provide for the Westside and Hillsboro Projects.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program Prior to FY 92-93. Tri-Met is preparing recommendations for interim development controls which can be implemented in station areas until the overall program is implemented. A work plan has been developed for the station area development program during the project final design and construction phases. Tri-Met is working with local jurisdiction staff to define individual agency workscopes which will be incorporated into the existing Westside Project design services agreements.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. Tri-Met's Work Plan for FY 92-93 will consist of: 1) defining program goals and objectives; 2) establishing models for transit-supportive development; 3) analyzing regulatory and implementation mechanisms and any necessary zoning changes; 4) conducting corridor-wide and station area demographic, land use and marketing studies; 5) evaluating possible changes to Westside Station locations to maximize development potential; 6) designs for pedestrian access to stations; 7) preliminary determination of development opportunities around LRT stations.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. It is anticipated that this program will extend through FY 96-97. In FY 93-94, local community plans, design standards and zoning ordinances would be developed and adopted by local jurisdictions. In the following years, detailed plans and implementation strategies and capital improvement programs would be developed and implemented.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

- Work Program and IGAs - June 1992
- Regional/Corridor objectives and standards - December 1992
- Market demographics, land use analysis, station area development opportunities identified and evaluated - June 1993
- Local station area plans, design standards and zoning ordinances adopted - FY 93-94
EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

Funding for Westside Station Area Development will come from the Westside LRT Project through a combination of local, regional, state and federal funds dedicated to the project. The precise allocation of those funds dedicated to the project. The precise allocation of those funds and jurisdictional responsibilities will be determined subject to discussions with FTA.

REVENUES

TOTAL: $1,900,000
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MONITORING

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this program is to establish an inventory of transportation related data. This data is updated on a regular basis. The data is useful to Metro, the jurisdictions, developers, and consultants in monitoring travel trends and in project planning.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work elements for this program are described below.

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. Each year, data is gathered so that the state of the transportation system can be defined and evaluated. In prior years, information regarding travel costs, traffic count and transit patronage, and speed data has been collected and summarized.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

• Monitor and summarize trends in transit fares, auto operating costs, and parking costs. These are important data input items to the travel demand model and are necessary for trend analysis.

• Prepare a document which summarizes the count data gathered in the spring of 1992.

• Prepare a travel trend document. This document will present a historical summary of travel costs and counts.

• Determine peak and midday auto travel speeds for selected facilities. This data augments the speed data gathered in FY 1991-92. These are important calibration items needed in the travel forecasting process.

• Develop methodology for estimating regional VMT by evaluating count data from selected locations. This task provides a technique for estimating that is independent of the modeling process. EPA currently favors a count based VMT estimation process.

• Develop and administer a regional count program. This element is necessary to insure that 1) proper inputs are necessary for the VMT estimation process and 2) quality count data is available for the model calibration process. This data is essential to provide information for trend analysis.
Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. Since this is an ongoing program, work elements similar to those defined above will continue.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

• Document summarizing the 1992 count data - Third quarter.

• Travel trend document - Second quarter.

• Summary of travel speeds for selected facilities - Fourth quarter.

• Methodology for VMT estimation - Second quarter.

• Regional count program - Third quarter.

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 93 Metro</th>
<th>FY 93 PL/ODOT</th>
<th>FY 93 Section 8</th>
<th>FY 93 STP</th>
<th>FY 93 ODOT Supp.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services:</td>
<td>$ 61,969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 61,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 1.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$ 3,548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>$ 16,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$ 1,252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 83,019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 83,019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUES

| FY 93 PL/ODOT:            | $ 15,000    |
| FY 93 Section 8:          | $ 10,000    |
| FY 93 STP:                | $ 20,000    |
| FY 93 ODOT Supp.:         | $ 30,519    |
| Metro:                    | $ 7,500     |
| TOTAL:                    | $ 83,019    |
TRAVEL MODEL REFINEMENT

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the Model Refinement Program is twofold: 1) maintain the state-of-the-art travel demand forecasting models and up-to-date computer simulation networks for current and long range travel plans; and 2) maintain up-to-date short and long range travel forecasts which reflect changes in land use assumptions, projected highway and transit investments, and socioeconomic conditions.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work elements for this program are described below:

Work Program Prior to FY 92-93. This program is an on-going one. Each year, various elements are scheduled to achieve the objectives of this program. The most notable recent model improvements have been made using data derived from the 1985 and 1988 travel behavior surveys.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

• Investigate travel characteristics at special trip generator locations. This task is a continuation of the effort begun in FY 1991-92. The current travel demand model identifies several land use types that receive special treatment. Shopping centers, the Zoo, colleges, and universities are all given special trip attraction rates. In addition, special peak hour factors are applied to the PIA and Swan Island areas. Transit usage at the special locations should also be analyzed.

• Continue to assess the ability of the delay functions used in the modeling process to replicate reasonable travel speeds. Speed data collected in the Monitoring work program will be compared to synthesized results.

• Develop ARC/INFO - EMME/2 interfaces. Many opportunities exist to share data between the two systems. In order to improve the technical and presentation quality for both, areas of information exchange will be investigated and implemented. This will be of particular importance to pedestrian accessibility and transit accessibility.

• Update computer simulation networks to include a 1991 base, committed RTP, and full RTP. Update travel forecasts (i.e. trip matrices) to a 1991 base and long range forecast.

• Conduct a travel behavior survey in order to determine the importance of certain elements in the trip making decision.
process. This work element is critical in order to insure that the travel demand model accurately represents choice decisions.

• Conduct a study to evaluate bus and LRT schedule reliability. Wait time is a key factor in the decision to use transit for a journey. For that reason, it is important that realistic wait times be used in the modeling process. In addition, research will be conducted to investigate if any relationship exists between the number of freeway incidents and the operational level of service.

• Continue to improve the existing walk and bike mode choice models.

• Continue the exploration of environmental and supply variable feedback loops to the auto ownership model.

• Continue to improve the feedback loop to the socio-economic allocation models ("land use").

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. The travel behavior study will be held in the spring of 1993. Consequently, a major portion of the analysis will be in the following fiscal years. Since this is an on-going program, other tasks leading to the improvement of the travel demand forecasting process will be continually scheduled.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

• Summary of special trip generator updates - Second quarter.
• Summary of delay function performance - Third quarter.
• As necessary, new interfaces between ARC/INFO and EMME/2 - Continual through the year.
• Update to 1991 base year and long range forecasts - Third quarter.
• Completion of travel behavior survey - Fourth quarter.
• Documentation summarizing the findings of the travel reliability study - Fourth quarter.

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services:</td>
<td>$ 82,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 1.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$ 17,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>$ 23,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$ 3,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$126,981</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 PL:</td>
<td>$ 19,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 Section 8:</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 STP:</td>
<td>$ 31,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 ODOT Supp.:</td>
<td>$ 55,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro:</td>
<td>$ 10,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$126,981</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRAVEL BEHAVIOR SURVEY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this program is to provide the detailed disaggregate data which will be used in two other programs in future years; model refinement and transportation system monitoring. The purpose is improving models in response to the Transportation Rule and Clean Air Act and providing monitoring data in a time series to respond to the requirements of these two rules.

It will consist of the design, fielding and coding of travel behavior surveys, primarily at the household level. Travel diaries for 5,000 to 7,000 households; 2/3 random and 1/3 from a random sample of transit riders. All modes of travel, including walk and bike, will be recorded as is our past practice.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. Similar, but not as detailed surveys of this sort were carried out by CRAG in 1977, and Tri-Met in 1985. These past surveys provided the information for the development of Metro's past and current transportation forecasting and policy evaluation models.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

• With the help of consultant services and a carefully chosen peer group, design the survey instrument(s).

• Prepare the RFP for a contract to field, code and geocode the survey(s).

• Manage and closely supervise the contract.

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services: $75,106</td>
<td>FY 93 PL/ODOT: $15,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 1.38)</td>
<td>FY 93 Section 8: $25,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services: $715,000</td>
<td>FY 93 STP: $38,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S): $17,741</td>
<td>FY 93 Tri-Met: $21,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay: $0</td>
<td>Misc. Income: $715,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers: $21,211</td>
<td>Metro: $15,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency: $2,942</td>
<td>TOTAL: $832,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $832,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Metro staff support is funded through the "Base Budget." Consultant support requires further definition in cooperation with ODOT and determination of the final budget and funding source.
TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Provide technical assistance to ODOT, Tri-Met, the Port of Portland, and the cities and counties using Metro travel forecasts in local transportation studies and project design.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work elements in this program are as follows:

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. This program is ongoing with service being provided as needed.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

- Provide assistance as requested by client. Assistance is provided in terms of 1) staff support to obtain data and/or evaluate a particular transportation problem; 2) computer usage; and 3) training to jurisdictional staff. Assistance to the jurisdictions is based on a budget allocation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$ 18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>$ 15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$ 28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>$ 21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>$ 29,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>$ 24,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td>$ 3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>$ 7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$ 4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$151,850</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. This program will continue as long as the jurisdictional need exists.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

- Products and timing subject to jurisdictional request.

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services: (FTE 1.51)</td>
<td>$ 69,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$ 26,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>$ 20,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$ 34,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$151,850</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 Section 8:</td>
<td>$ 60,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 Tri-Met:</td>
<td>$ 6,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 ODOT Supp.:</td>
<td>$ 18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 TA (FHWA):</td>
<td>$ 36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro:</td>
<td>$ 25,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Sales:</td>
<td>$ 4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$151,850</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - WESTERN BYPASS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Provide travel forecasts for transportation alternatives identified during the Western Bypass Study. Provide assistance to the Western Bypass Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) in evaluating alternatives, particularly related to the effect on the overall transportation system and land use impacts.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work elements are defined as follows:

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. This study has defined and evaluated numerous strategies and alternatives in an effort to find the optimal transportation solution. 1000 Friends of Oregon has assumed a major role in the study to insure that land use issues are fully considered in the decision making process (DRAM/EMPAL, LUTRAQ).

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

• Develop travel demand forecasts for specified alternatives.
• Provide evaluation material for use in analysis.
• Participate in team meetings for the study.
• Assist 1000 Friends' consultants as necessary.


PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

• Western Bypass project decision - date uncertain.

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$10,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE .41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S)</td>
<td>$710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>$2,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$1,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Bypass (ODOT)</td>
<td>$15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35
INFORMATION MAINTENANCE, RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Data Resource Center is a cooperative data gathering and research program. The Center eliminates the need for costly duplication of its functions by individual governments and businesses. Databases are maintained annually for small areas (e.g., census tracts) on population, households, construction, employment and earnings. Key census items are monitored and updated between decennial U.S. censuses. Long range forecasts of population, housing and employment are made on a four-year cycle. These data are being integrated into Metro's geographic information system, RLIS.

The Regional Land Information System (RLIS) is a computer mapping system providing a comprehensive single source for land information in this metropolitan area.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program prior to FY 92-93

- **Population, Housing and Employment Programs**: The US Census Bureau's decennial census is updated annually for census tract geography for key items such as number of persons, housing units, person age and income. In addition, information not covered by the US census, employment at the work place, is geocoded to census tract. In previous years this work was done on biennially but was moved up to an annual cycle this fiscal year. Population and housing data are derived primarily from building permit information. Building permits will continue to be collected on a monthly basis, using the services of an independent contractor. Over the years this has proven to be the least costly and most efficient means of obtaining this information.

- **Population and Housing Detail**: The procedures described above provide data only on the overall level of population, housing, and employment. In addition, Metro's transportation model requires information on detailed characteristics of these data as well, such as household income and age distributions, vehicle ownership, etc. In its current state of design, the Regional Waste Flow Model will require similar detail on data characteristics in the future. These data are also in high demand by public users, and their inclusion in the DRC's Market Profiles is a primary reason for the success of this program. Each year a random sample household survey is conducted and used for revising the population and housing detail.

- **Forecasts**: Periodically updated forecasts are required of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) by the federal government prior to allocation of transportation funds.
Metro's long-range Regional Forecast provides this foundation for the Regional Transportation Plan on a four-year cycle. After the next forecasting round, the Regional Forecast will play a central role in urban growth management as proposed in the revision of Metro Code Chapter 3.00. The forecast is also used by local governments and businesses for medium and long term planning. It is the only local source of small area forecast data for this region. The four-year forecasting cycle falls in FY 91-92. The program will to carry over into FY 92-93.

The final product of previous forecast rounds has been a projection of small-area data for the region, published in an attractive book format. The forecasts being developed this fiscal year involve orders of sophistication and complexity which were neither needed nor possible in previous forecast rounds. The formal integration of Metro's UGB-related planning with long range transportation planning will require consideration of normative effects. Different scenarios will be evaluated. The completion of RLIS provides more detail and precision on land supply and constraints.

At the start of FY 91-92 DRC staff began preparation for the long-range forecasting effort itself, to begin during spring 1992. These preparations include data base development and calibration of econometric tools for forecasting and allocation of population, housing, and employment. The immediate uses for these tools is to provide contextual information and quantitative tools for the participants in the long-run forecasting program. But if maintained, these efforts will have significant spinoff effects, including the ability to provide better data for the current ridership elements of the transportation model, detailed data for the Regional Waste Flow Model, the ability to make short-run forecasts outside (but consistent with) the long-run forecast program, and will allow the DRC to satisfy the numerous requests it receives from member jurisdictions and the public regarding short run trends.

- **Urban Area:** Procurement of system and conversion of hard-copy and digital records obtained from cities, counties and PGE to develop 552 square mile coverage of three counties, using tax assessor maps and data as the base and superimposing information such as vacant lands, comprehensive plans, etc.

- **Rural Area:** Mapping of 350 square miles outside current UGB to support urban reserve analysis.

- **TIGER Map:** A contract was awarded which used funds from an consortium of sources to enhance the US Census Bureau's digital street address map to render it useful for local government needs.
RLIS Database Maintenance: In February of 1992 the process of updating the data original collected for RLIS from July, 1990. Ultimately, ongoing maintenance will ensure an updated database current to within at least three months. Work is underway to share maintenance responsibilities with local governments having their own GIS capabilities.

Census 1990: Beginning April 1991 the DRC began receiving products from the 1990 Census of Population and Households. At Metro, these products are being used mainly for benchmarking the DRC's data base. Published reports are being prepared as each release of census information arrives.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93

- RLIS Database Maintenance: the challenge next fiscal year will be to keep the information in RLIS current with the rate of land development and change. Continued effort will be put into sharing database maintenance responsibilities with local governments. It is expected that several more will procure GIS next fiscal year, offering further opportunities for mutual agreements.

- TIGER Map Maintenance: this product will be used by police and emergency managers and reliability is therefore important. As new streets are platted they will be add along with the range of addresses.

- Population, Housing and Employment Programs: Annual updates of these items will continue and be made available to Metro departments, member jurisdictions and the general public.

- Population and Housing Detail: The annual household survey will be conducted and used as the basis for updating demographic and housing detail for items such as age, income and rent.

- Forecasts: During the current fiscal year, the DRAM/EMPAL activity location model was installed in conjunction with the LUTRAQ project. DRAM/EMPAL models the spatial arrangement of population, jobs and land uses in the regional landscape. This model will continue to be of use to Transportation, Solid Waste and Planning and Development programs needing data and forecasts for small areas.

Program expansion at Metro dictates the need for a "front-end" for DRAM/EMPAL. This front-end would be an econometric and demographic modelling system which is flexible, consistent and linked to the state and national economies. This tool would provide the regional "direction" for economic and demographic quantities which would then be allocated to small areas by DRAM/EMPAL. As with DRAM/EMPAL, this tool would be supported...
by DRC for use in short, medium and long-range forecasting and simulation by Metro departments. Purchase of a subscription to a major, reputable econometric modelling system (such as from Data Resources, Inc. or Wharton Econometrics) is proposed for this purpose in FY 92-93.

A non-exhaustive list of currently identified applications by department are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Horizon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TIP Monitoring</td>
<td>medium-range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RTP Update/Revision</td>
<td>long-range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region 2040</td>
<td>very long-range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revenue Forecasting</td>
<td>short-range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flow Simulation Model</td>
<td>medium-range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solid Waste Planning</td>
<td>long-range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UGB Management</td>
<td>medium and long-range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census 1990: Historically, the DRC has been a principal center for distribution of census products and information on their uses. These programs will continue during the 1990s. The number of products available to Metro from this census is greater than for any previous census, and the completion of RLIS significantly enriches the quality of census data for the Portland region. Both of these factors combine to increase the quantity of census materials which will be processed through the DRC during FY 92-93.

Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93

• RLIS Database Maintenance: this will be an ongoing activity that is expected to decrease in work load as local jurisdictions develop GIS capability and are able to share in ongoing maintenance.

• TIGER Map Maintenance: this too will be an ongoing activity which is expected to benefit from future sharing of digital land information but is best place at Metro for integration of local address records into a single information source.

• RLIS Enhancements: it will become possible to increase the quality of some of the data layers, such as sewer and water lines, as local service providers develop digital systems which can be easily transferred to Metro's system.
Each of the information components will be annually updated and continued progress made toward providing quality information needed by the DRC's client base.

The future level of support will depend upon the success of the store front and the amount of services requested by Metro departments and member governments and the public from the DRC databases and the RLIS system. Given the increase in types and quality of data, coupled with the type of products available from RLIS, a steady increase in demand from all sectors is expected.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

- **RLIS Database Maintenance:** by January, 1993 have RLIS on a quarterly update schedule.

- **TIGER Map Maintenance:** by January, 1993 have the TIGER map current to the previous month.


- In winter 1993 publish a forecast of population, housing and employment for the years 2000, 2005, 2010 and 2015.

- Publish census data as it is released.

A measure of activity will be the rate at which member clients are expending their assistance account and for the store front the level of sales, projected to be $130,000.

**EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$607,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FTE 2.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$299,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S)</td>
<td>$174,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>$175,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$16,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,281,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVENUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 PL/ODOT</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Supp.</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$867,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,281,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Provide for overall ongoing department management, including budget, Unified Work Program (UWP), contracts, grants, personnel and activities required by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC), the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

Work Program prior to FY 92-93. This is an ongoing element.

OBJECTIVES

Work Program for FY 92-93. Ensure compliance with all federal requirements for receipt of grants and maintain "certification" of the region for continued receipt of transit and highway construction funds and provide documentation to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) of such activity.

Provide support to JPACT, TPAC and subcommittees to ensure coordination between state, regional and local transportation plans and priorities.

Provide departmental management, including personnel matters, management of expenditures for materials, services and capital, contract compliance and departmental work programs. Particular products and activities are as follow:

Provide liaison between management and union.

• FY 93 Unified Work Program.
• Management of department budget, staff time and products.
• Required documentation to FHWA and FTA (UMTA) such as quarterly narrative and financial reports.
• Monthly progress reports to the TPAC.
• Minutes, agendas and documentation.
• Execution and monitoring of various pass-through agreements.
• Interdepartmental coordination.
• Periodic review with FHWA and FTA (UMTA) on UWP progress.
• Tri-Annual Title VI Report.
Anticipated Work Program after FY 92-93. Continue ongoing elements of department management and coordination.

PRODUCTS AND TARGETS

- Budget adoption (June); UWP adoption (April).

- Grant approvals (June and December).

- Contract approvals (as needed).

- Federal certification (annual).

- Progress reports for Council and federal agencies (quarterly).

EXPENDITURE ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services: (FTE 3.05)</td>
<td>$142,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services:</td>
<td>$119,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (M&amp;S):</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay:</td>
<td>$99,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$23,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$415,556</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 PL/ODOT:</td>
<td>$81,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 STP:</td>
<td>$39,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 93 HPR:</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro:</td>
<td>$269,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$415,556</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Assessment of Title VI Planning Efforts**

Metro works with Tri-Met to assure that the provision of existing transit service is non-discriminatory. While the responsibility for planning actual routes and service headways is at Tri-Met, Metro provides Tri-Met with data based on the 1980 census showing where concentrations of minority populations are throughout the region. Tri-Met examines the zones with high minority populations and analyzes how accessible transit is in those areas, as compared to the general population. This analysis indicates that minority residents in the Portland metropolitan area do, in most instances, receive equal or better transit accessibility than predominantly non-minority areas with similar local characteristics, and significantly better accessibility than the regional average.

With respect to capital improvements, Tri-Met prepares impact analyses for fixed facility projects as required by UMTA regulations. Any project which requires an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement includes an analysis of the impact on minority populations. To date, there have been no Title VI concerns raised during either compliance reviews or other activities.

• **Monitor Title VI Activities**

a. With technical assistance from Metro, Tri-Met performed a transit accessibility analysis which enabled the population data (general and minority) to be converted to traffic analysis zones and census tracts. By allocating the minority population to traffic analysis zones and to census tracts, Tri-Met was able to accurately locate minority communities. With that knowledge, Tri-Met is able to target information concerning changes in transit service to the affected areas.

b. In 1987, Metro assisted Tri-Met in developing an information base for use in addressing Title VI issues. This information was included by Tri-Met in a report to UMTA titled *Title VI Report Update, September 30, 1987, Route Revisions Due to Light Rail* (included in the FY 1989 Section 8 application). The data prepared by Metro included a population and employment update, transit travel time data and transit accessibility measures.

The transit accessibility data and travel time data were used to provide information on minority and non-minority travel times to employment, shopping and major public
facilities. Using existing travel behavior data, Metro can provide Tri-Met with updates of this information as needed.

- **Information Dissemination**

Tri-Met has an established public involvement process which is used when service changes are proposed. The process involves the steps listed below:

- Notification of the proposed change and pending community workshops. Notification is placed on buses in the affected areas, in the general circulation newspaper and in minority-oriented newspapers. In addition, neighborhood associations are informed of upcoming community workshops.

- Community workshops are held at public facilities (i.e., schools, community centers, etc.) in the affected neighborhoods. These workshops are informal gatherings at which Tri-Met staff solicits opinions of those in attendance regarding proposed route changes. Revisions to the proposals are then made based on public comment from the workshops.

- Public hearings before the Tri-Met Board of Directors are then held on the revised service modification proposals. At this time, the Board makes a final decision.

Many Tri-Met decisions must be approved additionally by Metro. Those items are included in the Metro public awareness process. Tri-Met projects are included on TPAC, JPACT and Council agendas. Public meeting notices and meeting agendas are sent to the general circulation and minority-focused newspapers such as the Skanner. Metro projects are subject to the public meeting and public hearing process. Information is disseminated through the media, newspapers and mass mailings. Metro's information dissemination process is fully explained in the FY 88 Title VI submittal. Metro's Title VI submittal has been certified by UMTA through September 1992.

- Both Metro and Tri-Met focus their decision-making processes on a subject or project rather than a particular group or community. When a project is being considered, a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is formed with membership made up of affected citizens. All citizens within the affected area are encouraged to participate in the citizen process.

Members for CACs are solicited through neighborhood groups, public service announcements, and ads in the daily newspaper and minority publications. Formed at the beginning of the project, the CAC is encouraged to develop alternatives and make recommendations to staff throughout the decision-making process of the project or study. Citizen recommendations are a critical part of the entire process and play an important role in determining the recommended project.
In 1991, Metro has one non-elected committee that deals with transit issues:

TPAC, the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee, deals with all transportation issues facing the region. TPAC has 20 members, three of whom are women. TPAC has six citizen members who are the only ones Metro has authority to appoint. Openings for those positions are advertised in the daily and weekly newspaper (Skanner). Press releases are mailed to special interest groups such as the League of Women Voters, neighborhood groups, Chambers of Commerce, etc. Applicants are screened and interviewed before new members are chosen. Terms are for two years. These six positions are now in the process of being refilled. 75 applicants from throughout the region are being considered.

Other citizen committees will be formed in 1991 if the Environmental Impact Statements are performed in the Milwaukie/I-205 Corridors and when the Willamette River Crossing Study commences. All affected interest groups and populations will be recruited to sit on these committees.

Currently, two citizen committees are active. The Hillsboro Alternatives Analysis Study CAC is being staffed by Tri-Met. The Northwest Subarea Transportation Study Citizen Advisory Committee was formed in January 1991. The committee has 17 members, five of whom are women. Members represent neighborhood associations, CPOs, hospital and industrial associations.
ODOT PLANNING ASSISTANCE

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Major accomplishments for FY 93 by the Metro region include supporting Metro and other agencies in the RTP Update. Major assistance will also be given to the local plan updates and completing corridor studies. Work activities will include:

FY 1993 HPR PROGRAM

1. Perform Metropolitan Area Corridor (MAC) studies, including accompanying access management plans for Sandy Boulevard, McLoughlin Boulevard and Highway 213.

2. Develop interim access management classifications for state highways in the metropolitan region in coordination with local jurisdictions.

3. Identify next phases of regional freeway management strategy.

4. Support RTP update, including subarea analysis (Willamette River Bridge Crossing and Northwest Subarea Study).

5. Support development of regional demand management program, including transportation system monitoring and travel behavior programs.

6. Support Metro transportation/land use integration efforts, i.e., 2040, Rule 12 and State Agency coordinating council objectives.

7. Integrate Oregon Transportation Plan with the RTP.

8. Support regional high-capacity transit (HCT) studies.

9. Participate in development of state and regional congestion management systems.

10. Participate in regional air quality planning.

11. Perform local land use development and traffic impact reviews.

12. Coordinate with Tri-Met in identification of transit-supportive capital improvements on the state highway system.

13. Participate in TIP development and ISTEA implementation.

14. Continue jurisdictional highway rationalization, highway functional classification study and identification of NHS.
15. Participate in Westside Station Area Planning.

16. Undertake policy and technical coordination with Metro, TPAC, JPACT, Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington counties, Intergovernmental Resource Center (Washington State) and city governments in the development of land use and transportation plans and subarea studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel: $250,000</td>
<td>HPR/ODOT: $300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services: $50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL: ................ $300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRI-MET
SPECIAL AREA PLANNING

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Study of Minority/Women Business Utilization in Public and Private Contracts

- Factual findings to determine if discrimination exists in contracting and to what extent.
- An economic and market analysis of M/WBE contractors.
- Legal conclusions.
- Recommendations for legislative/administrative actions resulting from such findings and conclusions.

RELATION TO PREVIOUS WORK

This project was delayed awaiting the fall 1991 appointment of a governor's representative to the multi-jurisdictional committee. The committee will be convening in early 1992 to finalize the Request for Proposal for the feasibility study. The consultant contract should be awarded so the study can proceed by July 1992.

PRODUCTS/MILESTONES

Study of Minority/Women Business Utilization in Public and Private Contracts

- Summary of factual findings.
- Economic/market analysis.
- Legal analysis and conclusions.
- Recommendations for legislative/administrative action and M/WBE program design.

EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;S</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 91 Section 8</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(08-0063)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met Match</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 93 Unified Work Program
### Funding Summary

| METRO                | 93     | 93     | 93     | 93 HPR | 93     | DBQ     | 93      | West-   | CIRAN | 93      | 93      | CARRY OVER | 93     |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|-------|---------|---------|------------|--------|--------|
|                      | PL/ODOT| ODOT Sec 8 | STP (e)(4) | TriMet |         |         | 0063    | Hillsboro | 921205 | 0068    | 0051    | 93 Local Match | 93 TOTAL |
| RTP Update/Refinement| 40,000 | 30,000 | 27,600 | 70,000 |        |        |         | 15,000  |        |         |        | 18,150     | 200,750|
| RTP Privatization    |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |        | 5,000   |        | 1,250      | 6,250  |
| Demand Management    | 23,375 | 38,000 |        | 52,900 |        |        | 19,900  |         |        | 7,153   |        | 190,000    |        |
| Southeast Corridor   | 69,967 | 30,000 | 28,615 | 34,275 |        |        |         |         |        | 131,330 |        | 192,500    |        |
| Rgn 2040 Phl-UGM     | 35,850 | 20,000 | 5,320  |        |        |        |         | 84,500  |        |        |        | 257,500    |        |
| Rgn 2040 Phil-UGM    | 60,000 | 37,500 | 25,000 | 13,000 | 37,500 |        |         | 0       |        |        |        | 0          |        |
| Northwest Subarea    | 21,000 |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |        |        |        | 21,000     |        |
| Air Quality          | 72,000 |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |        | 0       |        | 90,000     |        |
| Hillsboro AA/DEIS    |        |        |        |        |        |        | 559,853 |         |        |        |        | 699,815    |        |
| Hillsboro FEIS       |        |        |        |        |        |        | 300,000 |         |        |        |        | 300,000    |        |
| I-205/Milwaukie      |        |        |        |        |        |        |         | 718,250 |        |        |        | 845,000    |        |
| I-5/Phl-Van          |        |        |        |        |        |        | 1,052,000 |        |        |        |        | 1,315,000  |        |
| High Capacity Transit| 80,000 | 80,000 |        | 0      |        |        |         |         |        |        |        | 227,500    |        |
| WS Station Area Ping |        |        |        |        |        |        | 77,500  |         |        |        |        | 227,500    |        |
| Data, Growth Monitoring| 207,000 | 9,800 |        | 10,000 |        |        |         | 1,054,500 |        |        |        | 1,281,300  |        |
| Travel Model Refinement | 50,873 | 85,825 | 45,450 | 89,692 | 21,375 |        |         | 33,785  |        |        |        | 327,000    |        |
| Technical Assistance | 18,500 | 60,860 | 36,000 | 6,125  |        |        |         | 30,365  |        |        |        | 151,850    |        |
| Trans Improvement Prog | 74,675 | 20,000 | 10,000 | 21,460 |        |        |         | 8,565   |        |        |        | 134,700    |        |
| Coord & Management   | 81,694 | 39,728 | 25,000 |        |        |        |         | 269,134 |        |        |        | 415,556    |        |
| Metro Subtotal       | 641,059 | 225,000 | 219,925 | 234,800 | 95,275 | 225,000 | 124,900 | 80,000  | 93,500 | 0      | 859,853 | 718,250 | 1,052,000 | 34,990 | 5,000 | 2,286,670 | 6,896,222 |
|                      |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |        |        |        | 300,000    |        |
|                      |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |        |        |        | 300,000    |        |
| TRIMET               |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |         |        |        |        | 0          |        |
| Special Area Planning| 20,000 |        |        |        |        |        |         | 5,000   |        |        |        | 25,000     |        |
| Westside LRT         |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | 0          |        |
| TriMet Subtotal      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0      | 0      | 5,000   | 25,000     |        |
| GRAND TOTAL          | 641,059 | 225,000 | 219,925 | 234,800 | 95,275 | 225,000 | 124,900 | 80,000  | 93,500 | 20,000  | 859,853 | 718,250 | 1,052,000 | 34,990 | 5,000 | 2,291,670 | 7,221,222 |

Note: PL/ODOT is $641,059.26

Note: Includes System Monitoring, Model Refinement & Travel Survey

Note: PL/ODOT is comprised of $483,555.97 (80%)

Note: PL/ODOT is comprised of $120,888.99 (20%)

ODOT. Includes $36,614.30 carryover.
INTRODUCTION: FISCAL YEAR 1993 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

PURPOSE

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is prepared annually by the Intergovernmental Resource Center (IRC), as designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Clark County urban area. In 1990, the state Growth Management Act (GMA) authorized the creation of Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) and IRC was designated by local governments as the RTPO for the three-county area of Clark, Skamania and Klickitat. All regional transportation planning work activities proposed by the MPO/RTPO are included in the UPWP. The UPWP details the technical activities to be completed as part of the continuing transportation planning process and covers a state fiscal biennium (a two-year period beginning on July 1 and ending June 30).

The planning activities described are related to several modes of transportation, including activities which are considered significant to the Regional Transportation Plan. The UPWP focuses on the transportation work tasks which are priorities to Federal or state transportation agencies, and those tasks considered necessary by local elected officials. The FY93 UWP includes the initiation of transportation planning activities and requirements as contained in the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and was developed in conjunction with the FY93 transportation planning program to be undertaken by WSDOT District Four. The UPWP also provides a summary of local, state, and Federal funding sources to support these planning efforts.

OBJECTIVES

The UPWP describes the transportation planning activities and funding sources required to meet the major transportation policy issues of the upcoming year. It reflects the regional transportation problems and projects to be addressed during the next fiscal biennium. Throughout the year, the UPWP serves as the guide for planners, citizens, and elected officials to track transportation planning activities. It also provides local and state agencies in the Portland/Vancouver Metropolitan Area and RTPO region with a useful basis for improving regional coordination.

PARTICIPANTS, COORDINATION, AND FUNDING SOURCES

Consistent with the 1990 State Growth Management Act legislation, a three-county Regional Transportation Policy Board is being established for the RTPO. Regional Transportation Policy Subcommittees in Skamania and Klickitat Counties are in place and the existing IRC Transportation Policy Committee in Clark County will continue to serve as the MPO policy committee and also serves as the Regional Transportation Policy Subcommittee in Clark County.

A. Clark County

The primary transportation planning participants in Clark County include the following: the Intergovernmental Resource Center, C-TRAN, Washington State Department of Transportation, Port of Vancouver, Port of Camas-Washougal, Port of Ridgefield, Clark County, Vancouver, Camas, Washougal, Ridgefield, and Battle Ground. Two federal agencies, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), are also key participants. In addition, the Department of Ecology (DOE) will be involved in the transportation program as it relates to the development of the 1992 State Implementation Plan for carbon monoxide and ozone. As the designated MPO for the Clark County Urban Area, IRC annually develops the transportation planning work program and endorses the work program for
the entire metropolitan area. IRC is also responsible for the development and endorsement of the Regional Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program, and other regional transportation studies. operational and near-term transit planning. The Transit Development Plan serves as the planning document that provides the guidelines for improving transit service over a five year period. The *Transit Development Program 1992-1997* will guide transit development from 1992 to 1997.

WSDOT and the Public Services Department of Clark County and Departments of Preservation and Development and Public Works of the City of Vancouver conduct project planning for the highway and street systems related to their respective jurisdictions. WSDOT is also responsible for preparing a State Transportation Plan.

The coordination of planning includes local and state officials in both Oregon and Washington. Coordination occurs at the staff level through involvement on advisory committees (IRC's CTAC and METRO's TPAC). Mechanisms for local, regional, and state coordination are spelled out formally in a series of Memoranda of Agreement. These memoranda are intended to assist and complement the transportation planning process:

1. The organizational and procedural arrangement for coordinating activities such as procedures for joint reviews of projected activities and policies, information exchange, etc.

2. Cooperative arrangements for sharing planning resources (funds, personnel, facilities, and services).

3. Agreed upon base data, statistics, and projections (social, economic, demographic) on the basis of which planning in the area will proceed.

**Issues of Interstate Significance**

Both IRC and METRO have recognized that bi-state travel is an important part of the Portland-Vancouver regional transportation system and it is in the best interest of the region to keep this part of the system functioning properly. Currently, several locations on the I-5 and I-205 north corridors are at or near capacity with long traffic delays occurring frequently. The need to resolve increasing traffic congestion levels and to identify long term solutions continues to be a priority issue. JPACT and the IRC Transportation Policy Committee agreed to undertake a Bi-State Transportation Study completed in FY92. Throughout FY94 the study of High Capacity Transit in the I-5 and I-205 corridors continues to be the major issue of interstate significance as work progresses on a pre-Alternatives Analysis.

**Clark County Transportation Policy Committee**

ODOT
Metro
City of Vancouver
Small Cities' Representative
Ports' Representative
WSDOT (District 4)
Clark County
C-TRAN

Don Adams
Lawrence Bauer
John Fischbach
Mayor Ralph Kraus
Commissioner Bob Moser
Gerry Smith
Commissioner David Sturdevant (Chair)
Les White
### Consolidated Transportation Advisory Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-VAN</td>
<td>Barry Cavanaugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-TRAN</td>
<td>Kim Chin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Washougal</td>
<td>Mike Conway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Andrew Cotugno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Battle Ground</td>
<td>Mayor Frank DeShirlia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT (District 4)</td>
<td>Steve Jacobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County Public Services</td>
<td>Murl Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Resource Center</td>
<td>Dean Lookingbill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT Headquarters</td>
<td>Judy Lorenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Camas</td>
<td>Doug Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td>Thayer Rorabaugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County Public Services</td>
<td>George Stillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Vancouver</td>
<td>Patricia Stryker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Camas-Washougal</td>
<td>Sheldon Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>David Williams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Skamania County

The Skamania County Transportation Policy Committee was established in 1990 to oversee and coordinate transportation planning activities in the RTPO Skamania region.

**Skamania County Transportation Policy Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Stevenson</td>
<td>Councilman Ann Jermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skamania County</td>
<td>Commissioner Ed Callahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT, District 4</td>
<td>Gerry Smith, District Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Skamania</td>
<td>Elmer Stacy, Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Klickitat County

The Klickitat County Transportation Policy Committee was established in 1990 to oversee and coordinate transportation planning activities in the RTPO Klickitat region.

**Klickitat County Transportation Policy Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klickitat County</td>
<td>Commissioner Sverre Bakke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT, District 4</td>
<td>Gerry Smith, District Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of White Salmon</td>
<td>Councilman Roger Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Klickitat</td>
<td>Port Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROGRAM

Introduction

The 1990 Growth Management Act (ESHB 2929) authorized the creation of Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) by local governments to coordinate transportation planning for regional transportation facilities among jurisdictions, and to develop a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Intergovernmental Resource Center was designated as the RTPO for Clark, Skamania and Klickitat counties. The RTPO program augments the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) program already required by the Federal Government in urbanized areas. IRC continues in its role as MPO/RTPO for Clark County.

All the RTPO planning activities will be incorporated into a Regional Transportation Plan to include Clark, Skamania and Klickitat counties. The decision-making process for each county’s RTP will be by the respective county’s transportation policy committee, while the three-county RTP will be adopted by the RTPO Policy Board. The RTP is the principal transportation planning document. Its goals, objectives, and policies help to guide the work of agencies throughout the RTPO region that are involved in transportation planning and programming of projects. Federal transportation funding for individual projects within the MPO is dependent upon their consistency with the RTP.

This region’s FY93/4 regional transportation planning program will focus on implementing the transportation requirements of the Growth Management Program. Following completion of an interim update of the RTP for the Clark County portion of the RTPO during FY92, FY93 will see the development and completion of an RTP to include the three-county RTPO region. Emphasis will be given to the development and incorporation of regionally coordinated level of service standards, regional development strategies and a performance monitoring program.

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 requires that the MPO, in cooperation with the state and affected transit operators, develop a Transportation Improvement Program which must include a priority list of projects and project segments for the next 3 years, together with a realistic financial plan. Projects included are those proposed for federal highway and transit funding.

ISTEA designates certain regions as Transportation Management Areas (TMAs). The Clark County region has been designated as a Transportation Management Area. Within the TMA the MPO, in consultation with the state, selects projects for Surface Transportation and Congestion Mitigation Programs, and Federal Transit Programs. Under ISTEA, TMAs must have a Congestion Management System in place to include both travel demand reduction and operation management strategies. National Highway System, Bridge and Interstate Maintenance Program projects are to be selected by the State, in cooperation with the MPO.
I. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROGRAM

A. Clark County RTPO Program

(i) Regional Transportation Plan

Work Element Objectives:

1. Continue previously established regional transportation planning process for the MPO, supplemented by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) requirements and regional transportation planning program standards formulated by WSDOT for RTPOs to meet requirements of the state’s 1990 Growth Management Act (GMA).

2. Certification that the transportation elements of local governments’ comprehensive land use plans conform with the requirements of Section 7 of the Growth Management Act and certify that local transportation elements are consistent with the RTP.

3. Develop the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Clark County which will become a part of the RTP for the RTPO region. The RTP should be consistent with state, local and regional plans. The new RTP will be completed by July 1993 to meet GMA requirements.

To comply with state standards the RTP will include the following components:

   a. Regional transportation goals and policies. Level of service standards will be established and used to identify deficient transportation facilities and services.

   b. Regional development strategy. Existing and proposed land uses defined on local comprehensive land use plans will be used to determine the regional development strategy and will serve as a basis for transportation planning.

   c. Identification of regional transportation needs. An inventory of existing regional transportation facilities and services, identification of current deficiencies and forecast of future travel demand will be carried out.

   d. Development of financial plan for necessary transportation system improvements.

   e. Regional transportation system improvement and strategy plan. Specific facility or service improvements, transportation system management and demand management strategies will be identified and priorities will be determined.

4. Review of the Transit Development Plan (TDP) in relation to the RTP and incorporation of the TDP findings and recommendations into the regional transportation plan.

5. Incorporation of High Capacity Transit (HCT) studies’ results into the RTP.

6. Development of an RTP in conformity with the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990
7. Review of the designated regional transportation system and classification of system highways relating to ISTEA e.g. National Highway System highway segments.

8. Re-definition of a future regional transportation system to be used in quantifying transportation performance and cumulative environmental impacts consistent with ISTEA, Clean Air Act and State requirements.

9. Designation of the Metropolitan Area Boundary consistent with ISTEA requirements.

10. Development of a performance monitoring program. Monitoring of the transportation system performance over time. Determination of the methodology, data collection and analysis techniques to be used. Congestion levels and locations on the transportation system will be monitored.


A. Clark County RTPO Program

(ii) Transportation Improvement Program

Work Element Objectives:

1. Development of a revised Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) process to produce a TIP consistent with ISTEA of 1991 requirements.

2. Development of a process to prioritize projects and project segments proposed for federal highway and transit funding for the following three years as required by ISTEA.

3. Development of a process to produce a realistic TIP financial plan.

Clark County RTPO Program, (i) RTP and (ii) TIP

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

The RTP takes into account the reciprocal effects between growth patterns and transportation system development. It also identifies the mix of transportation strategies needed to solve future transportation system problems. The RTP for Clark County is interrelated to all other work elements.

The process to prioritize TIP projects will draw from data from the transportation database, regional travel forecasting model output and production of the TIP document is covered under the UPWP and TIP work element.
FY93 Products:

1. RTP for Clark County meeting GMA standards.
2. TIP process as required by ISTEA.
3. Certification that local government comprehensive and transportation plans meet state requirements and are consistent with the RTP.
4. Further work on refining level of service standards.
5. Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) conformance documentation.
7. Established performance monitoring program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 Expenses:</th>
<th>FY93 Revenues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRC 87,000</td>
<td>FY93 PL 27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTA Sec. 8 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTPO 32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local 18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 87,000</td>
<td>Total 87,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROGRAM

B. Skamania County RTPO Work Program

Work Element Objectives:

1. Continue development of regional transportation planning process.

2. Review of designated regional transportation system for Skamania County.

3. Complete the development of a Transportation Plan for Skamania County's regional transportation system using regional transportation planning program guidelines formulated by WSDOT for RTPOs. The transportation plan will include the following components:

   a. Regional transportation goals and policies.

   b. Regional transportation needs identified. Relevant traffic and demographic data will be collected and analyzed to determine needs.

   c. Identified revenue sources for necessary regional transportation system improvements.

   The transportation database for Skamania County developed since the inception of the RTPO will be used as input to the Transportation Plan.

4. Develop transportation system performance monitoring program.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

The RTPO work program activities for Skamania County will be tailored to their specific needs and issues and, where applicable, coordinated across the RTPO. The Skamania Transportation Plan will be integrated into an RTP for the RTPO region.

FY93 Products:

1. Continue the development of a coordinated, technically sound regional transportation planning process in Skamania County.

2. Continue the development of a technical transportation planning assistance program.

3. Transportation Plan for Skamania County.

FY93 Expenses: $ IRC 15,000 RTPO 15,000

FY93 Revenues: $ IRC 15,000 RTPO 15,000

Total 15,000 15,000
I. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROGRAM

C. Klickitat County RTPO Work Program

Work Element Objectives:

1. Continue development of regional transportation planning process.

2. Review of designated regional transportation system for Klickitat County.

3. Complete the development of a Transportation Plan for Klickitat County's regional transportation system using regional transportation planning program guidelines formulated by WSDOT for RTPOs. The transportation plan will include the following components:

   a. Regional transportation goals and policies.

   b. Regional transportation needs identified. Relevant traffic and demographic data will be collected and analyzed to determine needs.

   c. Identified revenue sources for necessary regional transportation system improvements.

   The transportation database for Klickitat County developed since the inception of the RTPO will be used as input to the Transportation Plan.

4. Develop transportation system performance monitoring program.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

The RTPO work program activities for Klickitat County will be tailored to their specific needs and issues and, where applicable, coordinated across the RTPO. The Klickitat Transportation Plan will be integrated into an RTP for the RTPO region.

FY93 Products:

1. Continue the development of a coordinated, technically sound regional transportation planning process in Klickitat County.

2. Continue the development of a technical transportation planning assistance program.

3. Transportation Plan for Klickitat County.

FY93 Expenses:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>$ 17,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY93 Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTPO</th>
<th>$ 17,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROGRAM

D. RTPO Plan

Work Element Objectives:

1. Integrate regional transportation plans for Clark, Skamania and Klickitat counties to produce a RTP for the RTPO region.

2. Establish and coordinate meetings of the RTPO Policy Board to provide policy advice to the RTPO.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

This RTPO activity will draw from the individual work elements for Clark, Skamania and Klickitat counties to develop the RTP for the RTPO required under GMA by July 1993.

FY93 Products:

1. Draft RTP for RTPO region.

FY93 Expenses:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>$ 13,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY93 Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTPO</th>
<th>$ 9,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total  

13,000  

13,000
II. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STUDIES

A. Bi-State Transportation System Analysis

The Bi-State Transportation Study was completed in FY92. Study findings and recommendations were presented to a joint meeting between JPACT and the IRC Transportation Policy Committee. The purpose of this element will be to incorporate study findings into the RTP, further examine bi-state transportation issues and coordinate the development and application of the ITLUP model with METRO. The ITLUP model is an integrated land use and travel forecasting tool that will be used to help examine bi-state economic/transportation interrelationships.

Work Element Objectives:

1. Incorporate Bi-State Study recommendations into the Regional Transportation Plan.

2. In coordination with METRO identify potential solutions to unresolved transportation system deficiencies identified in the study (i.e. I-5 Bridge bottleneck).

3. Provide data and input into the development/application of the ITLUP model which will be used as a policy tool to examine bi-state economic/transportation issues.

Relationship To Other Work:

The Bi-state Transportation System Analysis serves as the focal element for analyzing and identifying potential solutions to bi-state accessibility problems. It incorporates information from the HCT studies as well as the travel forecasting model. Results and recommendations from this element will be brought forward into the Regional Transportation Plan.

FY93 Products:

1. Develop a technical memoranda that identifies bi-state transportation issues/problems, identifies potential solutions and documents the application of ITLUP.

FY93 Expenses: $9,000
FY93 Revenues: $9,000
II. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STUDIES

B. I-5/I-205 Portland/Vancouver Preliminary Alternatives Analysis

The I-205 Bridge LRT Retrofit Study and the Internal Clark County High Capacity Transit Study were completed in FY92. The recommendations in these two "systems planning" studies resulted in the decision to continue the HCT planning process with a pre-AA study in the I-5 and I-205 corridors. The I-5/I-205 Portland/Vancouver Pre-AA will be conducted concurrently with the I-205/Milwaukie Pre-AA. Both of the pre-AA studies will be coordinated with the Regional HCT Study and the Regional HCT Finance Study.

The purpose of the I-5/I-205 Portland/Vancouver Preliminary Alternatives Analysis study is to select a high capacity transit (HCT) priority corridor from the following candidates:

- I-205 Corridor, connecting the Gateway Transit Center across the Columbia River into Clark County Washington, including Vancouver Mall to I-5 north.
- I-5 Corridor, connecting downtown Portland, downtown Vancouver, and north Vancouver to I-205.

The result of this study will be a decision on how best to coordinate Alternatives Analysis, engineering, construction, and financing for a North Priority Corridor with the region's next HCT corridor in Clackamas County. In particular, this study will select a North priority corridor and will determine whether the North corridor will proceed into Alternatives Analysis concurrently with or following Alternatives Analysis for the region's next HCT corridor into Clackamas County.

For the remaining corridor, the study will develop an action plan for the development of mid- and long-term transit improvements to be included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). A critical element of this study will be the development of financing strategies for each corridor that are consistent with the systemwide financing plan to be developed within the Regional HCT study.

Work Element Objectives:

1. Develop and refine the guidelines and methodologies necessary to conduct the preliminary Alternatives Analysis Study.
2. Based upon local, state and FTA criteria, select a North priority corridor that may advance into Alternatives Analysis concurrently with or following the Southeast Corridor Alternatives Analysis.
3. Identify the type and severity of transportation problems in the priority corridor.
4. Develop a small set of promising alternatives for dealing with the identified transportation problems.
5. Determine the preliminary cost-effectiveness of the alternatives proposed for further study.
6. Determine the financial feasibility of fixed guideway alternatives through the development of a systemwide financial plan.

7. If required, develop a scope of work and budget for Alternatives Analysis for the priority corridor.

8. Develop a mid-term transit improvement plan and recommendations for further study of long-term improvements for the corridor not selected to advance into AA.

Relationship To Other Work Elements:

The HCT planning process and decision making process has been formally adopted by JPACT and the IRC Transportation Policy Committee. This agreement identifies a closely integrated approach for making HCT decisions that include state, regional and local agencies throughout the Portland/Vancouver region. The recommendations of the HCT studies will be incorporated into the regional system and the regional transportation plan.

FY93 Products:

Selection of the North Priority Corridor.

FY94 Products (September 1992):

Decision on how to coordinate Alternatives Analysis for a North Priority Corridor with the region’s next HCT corridor in Clackamas County.

Action plan for the development of mid- and long-term transit improvements for the remaining corridor.

FY93 Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>341,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-TRAN</td>
<td>191,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>160,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>579,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,800,000

FY93 Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington HCT</td>
<td>1,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-TRAN</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. **ONGOING PLAN REFINEMENT AND DATA MANAGEMENT**

A. **Regional Transportation Data Base**

This element includes the development, maintenance and management of the regional transportation database to support the regional transportation planning program. Use of the data includes measuring system performance, evaluating level of service standards, calibration of the regional travel forecasting model, the functional classification of roadways, routing of trucks, support for studies by local jurisdictions, support for regional HCT studies and air quality analysis. The database will be used in FY93 for work in designating the metropolitan area transportation planning boundary and development of a congestion management plan as required by ISTEA. Data will be analyzed to reveal growth trends in traffic counts, population, housing and employment and in FY93 new 1991 base population, housing and employment data will be developed and used as the basis for new future year forecasts, e.g. years 2000 and 2015.

The database includes travel data, transit ridership data as well as travel-related demographic, employment and land use data. Work will continue on developing a GIS transportation database and on collection and dissemination of 1990 Census results. Preparations will be made for use of the Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP).

**Work Element Objectives:**

1. Maintain an up-to-date transportation data base and map file for transportation planning and regional modeling.
2. Collection, analysis and reporting of regional transportation data.
3. Analyze growth trends and relate these to future year population and employment forecasts.
4. Co-operate with, and participate in, METRO's process to update the region's forecast population and employment data to the year 2015 and allocate the region-wide growth total to Clark County's transportation analysis zones.
5. Maintain and update the TIGER highway network as necessary.
6. Continue to incorporate transportation planning data elements into the Arc/Info GIS system.
7. Continue to collect and analyze transit ridership statistics.
8. Analysis of transportation-related 1990 census data including the CTPP data when it becomes available.
Relationship to Other Work Elements:

This element is the key to interrelating all data activities. Output from the database is used by local jurisdictions as well as supports the development of the RTP and TIP.

FY93 Products:

1. Regional transportation database.
2. Monthly, weekly, and year-to-date transit ridership data (reports and graphs).
4. Transportation planning data and GIS Arc/Info data integration.
5. Maintenance and update of the geographically correct highway network and local street system.
6. 1990 census data.
7. Update geo-coding of places of employment, by TAZ, for use in CTPP.
8. Allocation of population and employment forecast data to year 2015 to Clark County transportation analysis zones.
9. Gathering of available data on truck use of the regional highway system.

FY93 Expenses:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>$33,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY93 Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 PL</th>
<th>$17,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPO</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. ONGOING PLAN REFINEMENT AND DATA MANAGEMENT

B. Regional Travel Forecasting Model Maintenance and Refinement

The regional travel model serves as the forecasting tool to estimate and analyze future transportation needs. EMME/2 software is used to carry out travel demand and traffic assignment steps. In FY91, the forecasting models used by IRC and METRO were integrated, allowing the Clark County region to carry out mode split analysis of person-trip assignments. Work was undertaken in FY92 to refine and develop the integrated model for local use. Further work will be necessary in developing and maintaining the model in FY93 because of the dynamic nature of the travel forecasting and modeling process.

Work Element Objectives:

1. Develop and maintain the regional travel model to include: periodic update and re-calibration, network changes, speed-flow relationships, land use changes, and interchange/intersection refinements.

2. Coordinate the utilization, development and refinement of the Clark County regional travel forecasting model with Metro, Clark County and WSDOT.

3. Develop procedures to carry out post-processing of results from travel assignments.

4. Develop base data on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle occupancy measures for use in air quality and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) planning.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

This element advances work toward the development and maintenance of the regional travel forecasting model which is the most significant tool for long-range transportation planning. It relates to the RTP, TIP, traffic count, transit planning, clean air and environmental elements.

FY93 Products:

1. Refined travel forecasting methodology using EMME/2 program.


3. Refined interchange/intersection network configurations.

4. Review of capacities coded on network links.

5. Base data for air quality data analysis and documentation.

6. Post-processing techniques.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 Expenses:</th>
<th>FY93 Revenues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>FY93 PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPO</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total        | 39,000        |
III. ONGOING PLAN REFINEMENT AND DATA MANAGEMENT

C. Computer Operations

Computer maintenance and application problems develop while completing the work elements identified in the Unified Planning Work Program. This element addresses those needs, as well as computer training and research into computer improvements. In order to efficiently and effectively apply current hardware and software to transportation projects, a continued evaluation and revision process is followed to mesh computer capabilities/constraints to project needs.

Work Element Objectives:

1. Review hardware and software applications for transportation planning purposes.

2. Incorporate new transportation planning software tools into the program to include staff training, evaluation of software, and software adaptation.

3. Continue to integrate travel forecasting data with the GIS data base and develop interfaces between ARC/INFO and EMME/2.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

The computer operations activity is related to all UPWP elements requiring the use of the computer.

FY93 Products:

1. Efficient and effective use of existing computer system capabilities and research into future needs.

FY93 Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>$14,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY93 Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 PL Local</th>
<th>$4,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total 14,000 14,000
III. ONGOING PLAN REFINEMENT AND DATA MANAGEMENT

D. Traffic Count Program

The traffic count program will continue to update and maintain the traffic count database. The program will also continue to incorporate permanent traffic recording data and intersection turning movement data. FY93 activities will concentrate on enhancing the traffic count software program which was redeveloped in FY91/92. The traffic count program is now housed in a customized program developed in-house, using Microsoft BASIC software. The program allows for enhanced graphic output. Inclusion of the UTM geocodes for each traffic count station provides for a wide range of future applications in linkages with GIS applications and for automating the EMME/2 calibration process. Regional traffic count data is periodically published in the Regional Traffic Count Manual compiled by IRC. The manual is widely distributed to local government agencies, to private developers and to the public within the region.

Work Element Objectives:

1. Maintain a comprehensive, continuing, and coordinated traffic count program.

2. Continue implementation of seasonal and daily factorization on raw counts based on updated permanent traffic recording (PTR) information, continue processing of turning movement counts, and update jurisdictional count requests.

3. Further develop the graphic display of count data by linking the traffic count program with the GIS system and EMME/2.

4. Continue to improve the utility and efficiency of traffic count data for transportation planning and analysis in the calibration of the regional travel forecasting model.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

The traffic count program is an ongoing data activity that is critical in understanding existing travel patterns and future travel growth. The program is also a source of county-wide historic traffic data, and is used to calibrate the regional travel forecasting model in EMME/2.

FY93 Products:

1. Updated traffic count database, output maps and count locations.

2. Further development of traffic count program with automated links with GIS and EMME/2.

3. Investigate incorporation of traffic count program output into a performance monitoring program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 Expenses:</th>
<th>FY93 Revenues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. ONGOING PLAN REFINEMENT AND DATA MANAGEMENT

E. Transit Data Assistance

This element provides for transit data assistance. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and state Growth Management Act require public transit providers to develop and update transit plans and reports. Data from the regional transportation database can be provided to assist in the development of reports on such subjects as transit use, transit fares, performance standards, capital facilities, the land use transit relationship, transportation systems management, marketing and promotion, future demand for service, park-and-ride facilities, accessibility issues/Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, Title VI, high capacity transit, air quality impacts, transportation demand management and route design.

The transit provider's requirements for assistance with data analysis, mapping and graphical output including 1) transit statistics, 2) GIS data (rider O/D, park-and-ride O/D, and facilities inventory), 3) 1990 census data, 4) future demand data, and 5) transit system mapping for use in these plans and reports is provided for in this element. The element also includes monitoring of changes in transit service and assistance in development of annual transit surveys of transit use characteristics and trends.

Work Element Objectives:

1. Provide transit-related data for the development and update of transit plans and reports as needed by C-TRAN.

2. Monitor changes in transit service and transit ridership characteristics.

FY93 Products:

1. Transit service data.

2. Maps and graphics to assist transit provider.

FY93 Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>$ 16,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY93 Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 PL</th>
<th>$ 4,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 16,000

16,000
III. ONGOING PLAN REFINEMENT AND DATA MANAGEMENT

F. **Transportation and the Environment**

State and Federal air quality conformity requirements are major considerations in the development of transportation plans and programs. Clark County is currently designated as a marginal non-attainment area for ozone and a moderate non-attainment area for carbon monoxide. The transportation conformity requirements contained in the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and the State Clean Air Act mandate that transportation plans and programs are to be a part of air quality improvement strategies. To meet these requirements, additional data and analysis methodologies will be required to develop population and employment forecasts for attainment years, develop a VMT grid, monitor changes in VMT and analyze air quality implications through the EPA Mobile Emissions model. In addition to meeting the air quality conformity requirements it have become increasingly important to also address other environmental considerations such as sensitive lands while developing plans and programs.

**Work Element Objectives:**

1. Develop data and analysis methodologies to meet Federal Clean Air Act requirements.
2. Develop data and analysis methodologies to meet State Clean Air Act requirements.
3. Cooperate and coordinate with State Department of Ecology in their research and work on air quality in Washington State.
4. Participate in the development of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and implementation of appropriate Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) for the region.
5. Prepare and provide data for DOE to assist in the expansion of a car exhaust and maintenance (I/M) program to the Clark County region.
6. Review Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to ascertain effect on Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).
8. Gather inventories of environmentally sensitive areas from local jurisdictions to be used in assessing the impact of regional transportation plans and projects on these areas and to aid in the development of mitigation proposals.
Relationship to Other Work Elements:

This work element relates to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), regional travel forecasting model, transit planning and transit development activities and planning for high capacity modes of travel.

FY93 Products:

1. Gathering of sensitive area inventories from local jurisdictions.
2. Data and conformity documentation required by the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.
3. Assistance to local and transit agencies working on a TDM program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 Expenses:</th>
<th>FY93 Revenues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY93 PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

A. Coordination and Management

This work element provides for the overall coordination of regional transportation planning activities, the staff support for committees and for the management of the program. This element includes the coordination aspects of the following new program areas: Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, Growth Management Act, Transportation Demand Management, High Capacity Transit and Air Quality.

Work Element Objectives and Procedures:

1. Develop meeting packets, agenda, minutes, and reports/presentations for the following committees: Transportation Policy Committee, Consolidated Transportation Advisory Committee, and IRC Board of Directors.

2. Participate and coordinate with the following committees and Boards: I-5/I-205 Project Management Group and TAC, Regional High Capacity Transit Project Management Group and TAC, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, Technical Policy Advisory Committee, C-TRAN Board of Directors, Joint Regional Transportation Policy Advisory Committee and others.

3. Participate in special purpose state/local transportation committees such as Vancouver Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee, Transportation Subcommittee of the Technical Advisory Committee Clark County Perspectives, WSDOT Highway Access Management Advisory Committee, RTPO/MPO Advisory Committee, State Implementation Plan Development Committee, Transportation Demand Management Committee and others.

4. Monitor new legislative activities as they relate to regional transportation planning and certification requirements.

5. Continue to involve the private sector and business community in the transportation planning process through information sharing and attendance at meetings.

6. Participate in key transportation seminars and training.

7. Manage the transportation program.

8. The State's High Capacity Transit Act (HB 1825) of 1990 includes the provision that jurisdictions, working through their MPOs, should manage a right of way preservation review process. MPOs are to review development proposals within and adjoining the rights of way for conformance with the regional transportation plan and to distribute the proposals for local and regional agency review, RCW 81.104.080 (4)(a)(b)

9. Certification of the transportation planning process as required by ISTEA.
Relationship to Other Work Elements:

Coordination and management is interrelated with all the administrative aspects of the regional transportation planning program and to all the program activities.

FY93 Products:

1. Coordination and management of the regional transportation planning process and activities.
2. Required documentation to FHWA and FTA and response to planning requirements.
3. Participation in transportation committees at the state, regional and local levels.
4. Involvement of the business community in the transportation planning process.
5. Participation in a HCT right of way preservation process.
6. MPO certification as required by ISTEA.

FY93 Expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>$64,100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY93 Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 PL</th>
<th>$26,100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPO</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$64,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

B. Americans With Disabilities Act and Title VI Requirements

In 1990 the federal government enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to ensure that persons with disabilities enjoy access to the mainstream of American life. The ADA expands on the Section 504 program to comprehensively address mobility needs of persons with disabilities.

FTA Circular 4702.1 outlines reporting requirements and procedures for transit agencies and MPOs to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. IRC and C-TRAN have worked cooperatively to provide FTA with the necessary Title VI documentation and updates to the information. C-TRAN Title VI documentation was updated with the release of 1990 Census data in FY92.

Work Element Objectives:

1. Assess the planning activities needed to support implementation of the ADA's provisions.

2. Assist C-TRAN in their implementation plans for a wheelchair-accessible fixed route transit service.

3. Participate as a staff member of C-TRAN's Special Services Advisory Committee (SSAC). The SSAC makes recommendations for the accessibility and paratransit Plan required by ADA. The Plan will be reviewed and adopted by the MPO and C-TRAN Board.

4. Prepare demographic and service profile maps, overlays and charts required for public transit providers, based upon 1990 Census data, consistent with the Title VI requirements outlined in FTA Circular C4702.1, Section III-3 a(1).

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

This element is related to the Data Development and Management element as well as the Transit Data Assistance elements.

FY93 Products:

1. A clear understanding of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

2. Assistance, particularly in production of maps and data analysis, to C-TRAN in their efforts to comply with the requirements of ADA and Title VI.

3. Title VI documentation as required by FTA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 Expenses:</th>
<th>FY93 Revenues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY93 PL</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

C. Competitive Services Planning

The integration and utilization of competition and the private sector in the provision of public mobility continues to be a top priority policy objective of FTA. IRC has adopted a policy to promote the early involvement of the private sector into the transportation planning process. IRC and C-TRAN jointly continue to consider how private sector operators can provide new and existing transit services, where practical. A process is in place to systematically analyze opportunities for private sector involvement in an effort to keep the transportation industry strong and competitive.

Work Element Objectives and Procedures:

1. Develop TIP/AE privatization documentation including the following elements: 1) description of involvement of private sector in development of projects, 2) description of private sector proposals for transit service, 3) description of improvements to putting service out for competition, and 4) description and status of private sector complaints.

2. Continue to notify and consult private providers in plans for new service.

3. Continue to coordinate with C-TRAN in the examination of existing and new transit services for competitive contracting opportunities.

4. Continue to evaluate which sectors of the transit system could be more effectively provided by private sector.

5. Continue to use fully allocated costs in the private/public decision.

6. Continue the dispute resolution process.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

This element is related to the Coordination and Management element, but specifically addresses the FTA private enterprise participation regulation.

FY93 Products:

1. The integration and utilization of competition and the private sector throughout transportation planning activity areas.

2. TIP/AE competitive services documentation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 Expenses:</th>
<th>FY93 Revenues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

D. Emergency Preparedness Planning

Regions should have in place strategic plans to cope with emergency situations such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, flooding, fires and spills of hazardous materials. This element provides for resources to amass information and documentation on emergency plans in Clark County and to assist in the coordination of emergency planning.

Work Element Objectives and Procedures:

1. Contact such organizations and agencies as C-TRAN, the Red Cross, State Patrol, Sheriffs’ Departments, Fire Districts, Public Works Departments, and State Department of Transportation to establish the status of emergency preparedness plans for the region.

2. Provide assistance to agencies in coordinating their emergency plans.

3. Provide data from the regional transportation database to assist in planning for routing of hazardous materials, identification of vulnerable transportation links and alternative routes.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

Emergency preparedness planning should be considered in the RTP and the regional transportation database and travel forecasting model can be used to garner data of use in emergency plans.

FY93 Products:

1. Review of emergency preparedness plans for the region.

FY93 Expenses: $5,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>5,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FY93 Revenues: $5,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 PL</th>
<th>2,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

E. Public Participation and Transportation Forum

Work Element Objectives and Procedures:

1. Publish newsletters and press releases to provide a communication link with residents and community leaders. Communications will be mailed to interested citizens, agencies, and businesses in the county.

2. Throughout the year requests are consistently received from various groups, agencies and organizations to provide information and give presentations on a series of regional transportation topics. These requests provide an important opportunity to gain public input and discussion on a variety of transportation issues.

3. Provide a regional transportation forum for public discussion of transportation policy issues, technical issues, and transportation projects. One public forum and/or one technical seminar will be sponsored by IRC, including the development of the theme, the agenda, advertising, and the local coordination.

4. Conduct public review process for the RTP.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

This element interrelates the pencil and paper aspects of the transportation program to community issues and information needs.

FY93 Products:

1. Increased awareness and information about regional and transportation issues.

2. Public information and input on transport issues and activities affecting the regional transportation system in Clark County and the Portland area.


FY93 Expenses: $13,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRC</th>
<th>13,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY93 PL</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY93 Revenues: $13,000
IV. TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

F. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The UPWP and TIP for Clark County are developed in cooperation with CTAC members. Recommend IRC adoption of the UPWP in March of each year and adoption of the TIP in September of each year.

Work Element Objectives:

Develop and adopt a UPWP that describes all transportation planning activities to be carried out in the Washington portion of the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area. Develop and adopt a TIP containing a prioritized listing of the region's scheduled transportation projects in 3-year blocks, consistent with ISTEA requirements. The TIP must meet federal requirements and conform with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Relationship to Other Work Elements:

The UPWP represents a coordinated program that responds to regional transportation planning needs. The TIP represents the implementation tool to meet transportation needs identified in the RTP. The TIP project selection and prioritization process is developed under the Clark County RTPO Program work element.

FY93/94 Products:

1. Documentation and coordination of transportation planning activities and transportation improvement projects. Both reports are key elements in maintaining the area's eligibility for federal capital and operating transportation funds.
2. An adopted UPWP.
3. An adopted TIP.
4. UPWP and TIP amendments, as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY93 Expenses:</th>
<th>FY93 Revenues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>FY93 PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Sec. 8</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPO</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 23,000 23,000
### FY93 Unified Planning Work Program

#### Summary of Expenditures by Funding Source ($000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>FTA</th>
<th>RTPO</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>C-TRAN</th>
<th>WSDOT</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Regional Transportation Planning Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Clark County RTPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Skamania County RTPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Klickitat County RTPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. RTPO Board and Plan</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Regional Transportation Planning Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Bi-State Transportation System Analysis</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. I-5/I-205 Portland/Vancouver Pre-AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Ongoing Plan Refinement and Data Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Regional Transportation Data Base</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Regional Travel Forecasting Model</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Computer Operations</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Traffic Count Program</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Transit Data Assistance</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Transportation and the Environment</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Transportation Program Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Coordination and Management</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ADA and Title VI Requirements</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Competitive Services Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Emergency Preparedness Planning</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Public Participation and Transp. Forum</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. UPWP and TIP</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>187.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>581.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GLOSSARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQMA</td>
<td>Air Quality Maintenance Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAC</td>
<td>Consolidated Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTPP</td>
<td>Census Transportation Planning Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Ecology (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>Department of Transportation (U.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highways Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (formerly UMTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Financial Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA</td>
<td>Growth Management Act (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>High Capacity Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/M</td>
<td>Inspection/Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTEA</td>
<td>Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPA CT</td>
<td>Joint Policy Advisory Committee, Metro, Portland, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>Lane Mile Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Light Rail Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Service District, Portland, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTBA</td>
<td>Public Transportation Benefit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPO</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>State Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>Special Services Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAZ</td>
<td>Transportation Analysis Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCMs</td>
<td>Transportation Control Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDP</td>
<td>Transit Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>Transportation Management Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPAC</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee, Metro, Portland, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPC</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Transportation System Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMTA</td>
<td>Urban Mass Transportation Administration (now FTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPWP</td>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>Washington State Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE
COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
AND OREGON STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT)
THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS)
IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANS-
PORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS)

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1582
Introduced by
Councilor Richard Devlin

WHEREAS, Substantial federal funding from the Federal
Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration is
available to the Portland metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, The Federal Transit Administration and Federal
Highway Administration require that the planning process for the
use of these funds comply with certain requirements as a
prerequisite for receipt of such funds; and

WHEREAS, Satisfaction of the various requirements is
documented in Exhibit A; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the transportation planning process for the Portland
metropolitan area (Oregon portion) is in compliance with federal
requirements as defined in Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations,

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service
District this ___ day of ________, 1992.

Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

APPROVED by the Oregon Department of Transportation State
Highway Engineer this ___ day of ________, 1992.

State Highway Engineer
EXHIBIT A
Metropolitan Service District
Self-Certification

1. Metropolitan Planning Organization Designation

The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) is the MPO designated by the Governor for the urbanized areas of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties, Oregon.

Metro is a regional government with 12 directly elected Councilors and an elected Executive Officer. Local elected officials are directly involved in the transportation planning/decision process through the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) (see attached membership). JPACT provides the "forum for cooperative decision-making by principal elected officials of general purpose local governments" as required by USDOT.

2. Agreements

Though cooperative working agreements between jurisdictions are no longer required, several are still in effect:

a. A basic memorandum of agreement between Metro and the Intergovernmental Resource Center (Clark County) which delineates areas of responsibility and necessary coordination and defines the terms of allocating Section 8 funds.

b. An agreement between Tri-Met, Public Transit Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Metro setting policies regarding special needs transportation.

c. An intergovernmental agreement between Metro, Tri-Met and ODOT which describes the roles and responsibilities of each agency in the 3C planning process.

d. Yearly agreements are executed between Metro and ODOT defining the terms and use of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) planning funds and Metro and Tri-Met for use of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds.

e. Bi-State Resolution -- Metro and Intergovernmental Resource Center jointly adopted a resolution establishing a Bi-State Policy Advisory Committee.
f. Bi-State Transportation Planning -- Metro and IRC have jointly adopted a work program description which is reflected in this UWP and a decision-making process for high capacity transit corridor planning and priority setting.

3. Geographic Scope

Transportation planning in the Metro region includes the entire area within the Federal-Aid Urban boundary.

4. Transportation Plan

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was adopted on July 1, 1982. The document had one housekeeping update in 1984, a major update in 1989, and was revised in 1991. A second major update is scheduled for 1992-93 and is included in the FY 93 work program. A rigorous review process is followed during updates which allows for extensive citizen and technical comment. The short-range Transit Development Plan (TDP), the detailed transit operations plan for the region, was completely revised and adopted by the Tri-Met Board in January 1988 and is being updated in 1992.

5. Transportation Improvement Program

The FY 1992 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), adopted in September 1991, is amended continuously throughout the year. Future amendments will include authorization of FY 1992 Interstate Transfer funds and Federal-Aid Urban funds, updates of the Section 3 Letter-of-Intent Program, the Section 9 Capital Program and incorporation of the state Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program.

6. Issues of Interstate Significance

The Bi-State Study was completed in FY 92. The study generated recommendations which will be further analyzed as part of the update to the Regional Transportation Plan. Unresolved issues may require additional separate analysis or study. Metro continues to participate on Bi-State transportation and air quality issues.

7. Public Involvement

Metro maintains a continuous public involvement process through citizen members on technical advisory committees, newsletters and press releases. Major transportation projects have citizen involvement focused specifically on the special needs of the project.
The Southeast Corridor Study involved not only its own citizens committee but neighborhood associations, business groups and community groups. Final recommendations were approved by the concerned interest groups as well as the involved jurisdictions. The second phase of this study began in early 1992 and includes a similar public involvement program.

The Northwest Subarea Transportation Study includes a Citizen Advisory Committee comprised of neighborhoods, community, and business groups. Additional public comment is and will be provided through general public meetings and through the approval process of study recommendations (Metro Council and local jurisdictions).

The Western Bypass Study has a very active Citizen Advisory Committee which is supported by the Oregon Department of Transportation.

8. Air Quality

Oregon's State Implementation Plans (SIPs) for ozone and carbon monoxide were both adopted by Metro and the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) and approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 1982. The region is close to attainment of both standards. The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is currently discussing the attainment status of the ozone and carbon monoxide standards with EPA.

New federal clean air regulations and the new ISTEA will require major efforts from all metropolitan area jurisdictions. Metro's TDM/Air Quality program responds to the Clean Air Act as well as to the Oregon Legislature to identify demand management techniques which improve air quality. The program will report findings to the Governor's Task Force on Auto Emissions in the Portland region. The TDM program will also provide the basis for updates to the SIPs and for CO and ozone attainment and maintenance plans. All recommendations will include extensive public review and be carried through TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council.

9. Civil Rights

Metro's Title VI submittal is certified until September 1992. The ODOT/FHWA on-site review in March 1988 found the agency to be in compliance. DBE, EEO and citizen participation all have programs in place which have been UMTA-certified.
10. **Elderly and Handicapped**

The ADA Joint Complementary Transit Plan was adopted by the Tri-Met Board in December 1991. The Complementary Transit Plan was certified as compatible with the Regional Transportation Plan by Metro Council in January 1992.

11. **Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program (DBE)**

A revised DBE program was adopted by the Metro Council in September 1989. Overall agency goals were set for DBEs and WBEs as well as contract goals by type. The annual goal for all Department of Transportation-assisted DBEs is 12 percent combined DBE/WBE. The DBE program is very specific about the request for proposals, bidding and contract process.

12. **Public/Private Transit Operators**

Tri-Met and C-TRAN are the major providers of transit service in the region. Other public and private services are coordinated by these operators.

Tri-Met also contracts for demand-responsive service with private entities such as ATC, Dave Systems, Inc., School Bus Services, taxis, Buck Medical Services and Special Mobility Services, Inc. Tri-Met also coordinates with those agencies using federal programs (FTA's 16(b)(2)) to acquire vehicles. Service providers in this category are coordinated by Volunteer Transportation, Inc. Special airport transit services are also provided in the region (Raz Transportation and Beaverton Air Porter Services). Involvement with these services is limited to special issues.

Two areas, Molalla and Wilsonville, were allowed to withdraw from the Tri-Met District on January 1, 1989. A condition of withdrawal was that they provide service at least equal to the service previously provided by Tri-Met. Dave Systems, Inc. is providing alternative service to Molalla at approximately two-thirds the cost of Tri-Met service. In addition, Dave Systems, Inc. supplies fixed-route service between Clackamas Town Center and the Milwaukie Transit Center.

C-TRAN contracts with Dave Systems, Inc. for elderly and handicapped service.
JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

Metro Council . . . . . . . Councilor Richard Devlin
Councilor Jim Gardner
Councilor Susan McLain
Councilor George Van Bergen (alternate)

Multnomah County . . . . . Commissioner Pauline Anderson
Commissioner Gary Hansen (alternate)

Cities in Multnomah County . Councilor Marge Schmunk (Troutdale)
Councilor Bernie Giusto (Gresham) (alt.)

Washington County . . . . . Commissioner Roy Rogers (Washington Co.)
Commissioner Bonnie Hays (alternate)

Cities in Washington County . Mayor Larry Cole (Beaverton)
Mayor Clifford Clark (Forest Grove) (alt.)

Clackamas County . . . . . Commissioner Ed Lindquist

Cities in Clackamas County . Mayor Robert Liddell (West Linn)
Mayor Craig Lomnicki (Milwaukie) (alt.)

City of Vancouver . . . . . Mayor Bruce Hagensen
Les White, C-TRAN (alternate)

Clark County . . . . . . . . Commissioner David Sturdevant
Les White, C-TRAN (alternate)

City of Portland . . . . . . Commissioner Earl Blumenauer
Commissioner Mike Lindberg (alternate)

Oregon Department of
Transportation . . . . . . Don Forbes, Director
Don Adams, Region I Engineer (alternate)

Port of Portland . . . . . . Mike Thorne, Executive Director
Carter MacNichol, Director (alternate)
Real Estate Management and Development

Washington State Department
of Transportation . . . . . Gerry Smith, District Administrator
Keith Ahola, Project Development Engineer

Tri-Met . . . . . . . . . . . Tom Walsh, General Manager
Bob Post, Asst. General Manager (alternate)

Department of Environmental
Quality . . . . . . . . . . . Fred Hansen, Director
Steve Greenwood, Administrator
Air Quality Division (alternate)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>Steve Dotterrer&lt;br&gt;Vic Rhodes (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>Susie Lahsene&lt;br&gt;Larry Nicholas (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities of Multnomah County</td>
<td>Richard Ross&lt;br&gt;Greg Wilder (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Brent Curtis&lt;br&gt;Mark Brown (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities of Washington County</td>
<td>Rick Root&lt;br&gt;Roy Gibson (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>Rod Sandoz&lt;br&gt;Tom VanderZanden (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities of Clackamas County</td>
<td>Maggie Collins&lt;br&gt;Jerry Baker (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>G.B. Arrington&lt;br&gt;Joe Walsh (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>Dean Lookingbill&lt;br&gt;Richard Warren (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Ted Spence&lt;br&gt;Dave Williams (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Steve Jacobson&lt;br&gt;Keith Ahola (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>Fred Patron&lt;br&gt;Caleb Frobig (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td>Bebe Rucker&lt;br&gt;Brian Campbell (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>Howard Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenry:</td>
<td>Greg Oldham/Richard Berman (alt.)&lt;br&gt;Molly O’Reilly/Ellen Vanderslice&lt;br&gt;Ray Polani/Jim Howell (alt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Members:</td>
<td>Kim Chin&lt;br&gt;Don McDowell (alternate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 92-1583 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE FY 92 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM (UWP)

Date: February 20, 1992 Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would amend the FY 92 Unified Work Program (UWP) to allow the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Tri-Met pass-through funding to 1000 Friends of Oregon to support regional policy aspects of the LUTRAQ project.

TPAC has reviewed the FY 92 UWP amendment and recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1583.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

1000 Friends of Oregon have initiated a study to develop improved techniques to link land use, air quality and transportation planning and to apply these techniques to development of an integrated land use and transportation alternative to the Western Bypass.

The study is predominantly funded through private sources, although it is not fully funded. In addition, a number of tasks support improved planning methods for public agencies and are not specifically focused on developing alternatives to the Western Bypass. In recognition of this, Metro has committed the following:

- Cash contribution for improved models . . . . . . . . $40,000
- In-kind support to refine models . . . . . . . . . . $20,000
- In-kind support to model LUTRAQ scenarios . . . . $20,000

This amendment would allow Metro to pass through FHWA and Tri-Met funds for the following: survey transportation impacts of existing land use configurations, define development building blocks, develop supportive public policies, enhance the Metro travel demand model, test scenario elements and models, test for impact on vehicle emissions, assess the infrastructure costs and transportation capital, operations and user costs, and provide a station area development market analysis. Exhibit A provides further detail for the FHWA funding.

Approval for the resolution would allow Metro to pass through to 1000 Friends $26,500 of Tri-Met funds and $101,200 of FHWA funds with the FY 92 UWP and Metro budget revised accordingly.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1583.
BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING
THE FY 92 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM (UWP)

RESOLUTION NO. 92-1583
Introduced by
Councilor Richard Devlin

WHEREAS, The Unified Work Program (UWP) describes all federally-funded transportation planning activities for the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area to be conducted in FY 1992; and

WHEREAS, The FY 1992 Unified Work Program indicates federal funding sources for transportation planning activities carried out by the Metropolitan Service District, Intergovernmental Resource Center of Clark County, the Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met and the local jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, The FY 92 Unified Work Program Resolution No. 91-1407 was adopted by the Metro Council in March 1991; and

WHEREAS, Included in Metro's budget was a commitment to 1000 Friends of Oregon's LUTRAQ study to support the development of improved models linking land use, transportation and air quality; and

WHEREAS, FHWA has an interest in interactive land use/transportation modeling which the LUTRAQ Study will assist in resolving; and

WHEREAS, Amending the FY 92 UWP will allow Metro to pass through to 1000 Friends FHWA and Tri-Met funds; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District hereby declares:
1. That the FY 92 Unified Work Program is amended to incorporate the LUTRAQ work element funded through FHWA as reflected in Exhibit A.

2. That the FY 92 UWP is amended to include a commitment of $26,500 from Tri-Met to be used with Metro and FHWA funds for a station area development market analysis and to design guidelines for station development.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this _____ day of ________, 1992.

Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

ACC:KT:1mk
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2-20-92
February 20, 1992

Proposal: FHWA Funding in Support of Making the Land Use, Transportation, Air Quality Connection

1000 Friends of Oregon requests FHWA funding for "Making the Land Use, Transportation, Air Quality Connection" (LUTRAQ), a national demonstration project designed to determine the impacts of alternate land use and transportation plans on future land use and transportation patterns, and on future air quality conditions. 1000 Friends seeks funding for a number of tasks and subtasks specified in an existing LUTRAQ work program.

Overview

This proposal includes an outline of the work we feel will most effectively promote the overall success of the LUTRAQ project, and ensure that the project results best meet FHWA's objectives. The proposed work is generally listed in priority order, as 1000 Friends and the LUTRAQ consultant team currently understands the combination of FHWA's and the project's combined priorities. Also, the initial estimate of the costs required to complete each work item is provided. We expect these priorities to be revised in future discussions between FHWA, state and local agencies, our consultants, and ourselves. In addition, new work items may be added based on these discussions. The purpose of this draft proposal is to provide a framework for these discussions.

Table 1 provides a prioritized listing of the work we propose for FHWA funding. Each area of work is referenced with a "Work Item" number and a "Task/Subtask" number. The latter number is for purposes of cross-referencing work items with relevant portions of the existing LUTRAQ work program (dated June 2, 1991).
Table 1. Proposed Work Items in Priority Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tasks/Subtasks</th>
<th>Estimated ($x1,000 ± 25%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Portions of the existing LUTRAQ work program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Survey transportation impacts of existing land use configurations</td>
<td>C.7</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Replicate identified land use and design features:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Define development building blocks</td>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>$15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5</td>
<td>Develop supportive public policies</td>
<td>C.4</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Enhance the metro travel demand model (EMME/2)</td>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>$14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Quantify the alternative scenario:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1</td>
<td>Test the scenario elements</td>
<td>E.5.A</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2</td>
<td>Test the models</td>
<td>E.5.B</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3</td>
<td>Vehicle emissions</td>
<td>E.6.B</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.4</td>
<td>Assess the infrastructure costs and transportation capital, operations, and user costs</td>
<td>E.9</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$101,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Item 1.1/Subtask C.7: Survey of Transportation Impacts of Existing Land Use Configurations

The primary focus of Work Item 1.1 is to identify a number of existing suburban land use patterns and development designs that generate fewer than average single occupancy automobile trips and/or greater than average walk, bicycle, transit, and/or carpool trips. For each identified development pattern, existing data on mode split and trip length, as well as other data useful to the enhancement of transportation forecasting models will be examined. Controlling for as many other variables as practicable, land use and design features of the development patterns most responsible for the differing travel behavior will be identified.

Work Item 1.2: Replication of Identified Land Use and Design Features

Work Item 1.2 will focus on replicating the features identified in Work Item 1.1 on the ground in a real, existing suburban context. The context involved is the suburban Washington County portion of the Portland, Oregon metropolitan region, the location of a current proposal for a bypass freeway.

The bypass proposal is based on traffic generation rates created by the continuation of typical suburban development patterns. Using the features identified in Work Item 1.1 an alternate future development scenario will be created for the same geographic area.

The development of the alternate scenario will include the following steps:

Work Item 1.2.1/Subtask C.1: Defining Development Building Blocks

In this step, the fundamental programmatic assumptions derived from Work Item 1.1 will be transferred to a development pattern prototype that can be applied to various settings in the study area. This prototype will consist of a pedestrian-scale land use program, including quantity, mix and type of housing, services, jobs, and retail, and a typical internal street system. Criteria will also be developed for site selection relative to proximity to transit.

Work Item 1.2.5/Subtask C.4: Develop Supportive Public Policies

A combination of land use and non-land use oriented policies will be developed that support the alternate land use scenario. Various demand management strategies, parking management or pricing schemes, and other related policies will be explored and included as appropriate.

Work Item 1.3/Subtask D.1: Enhancing the Metro Travel Demand Model (EMME/2)

To ensure that the alternate scenario developed in Work Item 1.2 is accurately quantified, Metro's existing travel demand forecasting model (EMME/2) will be enhanced to:

- calculate changes in the percentages of vehicular travel in peak periods
to and from heterogeneous transit and pedestrian-oriented development areas;

- include a transit serviceability index in the models used to predict transit ridership levels and mode of access to transit, reflecting the ease of accessing transit by walking or bicycling;

- predict bicycle usage as a potential primary travel mode;

- quantify changes in trip generation rates and automobile ownership levels to account for multi-use developments, difference by types of housing, and various development densities;

- evaluate the impacts of excess transit travel time (due to walking, waiting, and transferring) on transit ridership; and

- predict reductions in vehicular travel due to employer-based trip reduction strategies.

Sixty percent of this work has been funded through a grant from EPA's Climate Change Division. The remaining 40%, however, is still unfunded.

**Work Item 1.4: Quantify the Alternative Scenario**

Work Item 1.4 includes four unfunded quantification items from the original LUTRAQ work program:

**Work Item 1.4.1/Subtask E.5.A: Test the Scenario Elements**

As outlined in Work Item 1.2, the alternate land use scenario will be supported by a number of transit/roadway improvements and TDM policies. Each of these three primary elements (land use/design, transportation, TDM) will have a different qualitative and quantitative impact on land use, travel demand, air quality, and quality of life. By isolating and pairing these package elements for simulations with the improved computer modeling system, it will be possible to measure the relative importance of particular elements. This information could be very important in determining the relative effectiveness of potential implementation strategies.

**Work Item 1.4.2/Subtask E.5.B: Test the Models**

The LUTRAQ project includes two categories of improvements to the art of transportation/land use modeling. The first, as outlined in Work Item 1.3, will greatly enhance travel demand forecasting to account for the differing trip generation rates and mode splits of various development patterns. The second will link this enhanced system with an integrated land use model. To evaluate comprehensively the relative importance of each of these improvements, the alternate scenario from Task 2 will be run first through the unenhanced, unlinked travel demand model, and second through the enhanced but unlinked travel demand model. Comparing
the output of these two runs to the output of the funded LUTRAQ task that incorporates both the enhanced travel demand model and the linked interactive land use model (Subtask E.3) will indicate the relative importance of each category of modeling improvements. This information could be important in promoting improved and integrated land use/transportation policy making throughout the U.S.

Work Item 1.4.3/Subtask E.6.B: Vehicle Emissions

Through the work described in the previous two paragraphs includes calculations of travel demand and land use. Under this paragraph, each of the computer simulations from the prior paragraphs will also be tested for their impacts on vehicle emissions. This analysis will utilize the most recent version of the MOBILE air quality modeling system. If necessary, the "bag 1" cold start and "bag 3" hot soak emissions data incorporated into MOBILE 4.1 (and MOBILE 5) will be used separately so that trip-based emissions can be estimated as accurately as possible with the current configuration of the MOBILE model.

Work Item 1.4.4/Subtask E.9: Assess the Infrastructure Costs and the Transportation Capital, Operations, and User Costs

As public infrastructure costs continue to rise and government budgets become further stretched, the relative cost efficiencies of alternative methods of solving problems is assuming an extremely important role in public decision making. Given this enhanced, three alternatives (no-action, bypass, alternate scenario) will be measured for their respective general infrastructure costs, transportation infrastructure costs, and user costs.
Date: March 2, 1992
To: TPAC/JPACT
From: Andrew Cotugno, Transportation Director
Re: Comments on State Bicycle Plan Element Update

Attached are Metro's comments to the State Bicycle Advisory Committee regarding the updated State Bicycle Plan. Our comments include recommendations for revising bicycle financing in light of the new ISTEA and relate funding of specific projects to Rule 12 requirements for per capita VMT reductions. The letter was submitted to the Advisory Committee on Monday, February 24.

For TPAC, we wish to discuss sending the letter (revised, as necessary) with a JPACT resolution to the Oregon Transportation Commission as part of their public hearings on March 17.

ACC:MH:lmk
February 20, 1992

Mr. Dick Unrein
Bikeway Program Manager
Oregon Department of Transportation
200 Transportation Building
Salem, Oregon 97310

Dear Dick:

Metro appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed revisions to the Oregon Bicycle Master Plan. The State Bike Plan has been a useful resource for local and regional planners and bicycle activists throughout the state. The comments we have made are aimed at improving the plan through full recognition of the changing transportation planning environment in the state as described in the LCDC Goal 12 Transportation Planning Rule.

Background

The past two years have seen a dramatic change in transportation policy at the federal and state levels. At the federal level, the new Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) has placed a new emphasis on funding flexibility aimed at providing adequate financing for non-traditional transportation solutions. An example of this funding flexibility is the new Enhancement category under the Surface Transportation Program. This new category provides funding for transportation projects which have the potential to "enhance" the environment. Metro supports a cooperative process with the state, regions and local jurisdictions for developing project priorities for this funding.

The state Transportation Planning Rule seeks to more fully integrate land use and transportation planning. Metro, along with the state and local jurisdictions, has been involved in developing new processes which respond to the mandates contained in the Rule. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the Rule for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) is the goal of no VMT growth per capita over the next 10 years and a 10 percent reduction for per capita VMT over the next 20 years.

The Rule holds the four MPO areas in the state (Portland, Salem, Eugene and Medford) to a higher standard of
compliance than is required of the non-MPO areas of the state. Metro recognizes that the Rule will require innovative new programs and strategies to deal with reducing the reliance and dependence on the single-occupant automobile. Some of the work already underway includes the development of a regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan; a new Tri-Met Strategic Plan that envisions a major role for transit in reducing VMT in the region; and an update to the RTP which will, among other things, evaluate VMT reduction strategies and Region 2040 land use scenarios. Metro recently prepared an RTP revision which recognized the new transportation policy environment and, although it did not incorporate new programs, it did spell out the work that needed to be done.

Given this background, Metro encourages the OBAC and the Bicycle Program staff to incorporate as much of this new policy direction as possible into the revision of the Oregon Bicycle Master Plan.

Recommendations

Metro staff has developed three specific recommendations on the plan revision. They are as follows:

1. Chapter 4 - The discussion of federal funding in Chapter 4 should include reference to the Enhancement category of the Surface Transportation Program as a potential source of bicycle facility funding. As discussed earlier, these funds are available for transportation projects which enhance the environment.

2. Chapter 6 - Metro recommends eliminating Category 3 and Category 4 funding and replacing these categories with an Urban - MPO (Commuting) category, an Urban - non-MPO (Commuting) category and a Rural (Touring) category. It is further recommended that the two Urban categories of funding not be restricted to use on or parallel to state highways but be available for use on any appropriate facility. Each of these categories would have its own unique fund, with the three funds totaling the current Category 3 and Category 4 allocations. The level of funding for each category would be based on a formula which fairly allocates funds based on historic use and future need, population, and VMT.
The rationale for this change is to eliminate competition for funding between rural/touring uses and urban/commuting uses and to recognize the potential role that bicycling can play in reducing per capita VMT as called for in the Transportation Planning Rule. Touring and commuting are clearly two distinct uses, both providing many benefits for Oregonians. Discrete funding for touring and commuting can provide for a more dependable planning environment for both.

The distinction between MPO and non-MPO areas is needed to eliminate inappropriate competition between large urban areas and smaller cities and towns. For example using potential VMT reduction as a criteria for comparing competing projects is appropriate at the MPO level but would unfairly disadvantage projects from smaller areas.

This proposal would still encourage competition among projects submitted within the appropriate funding categories. This system provides for the comparison of like projects and helps to reduce the amount of subjectivity in the funding decisions. Objective criteria could be developed appropriate to a particular funding category. Urban projects funded through this process would require local match at a level deemed appropriate and the ultimate funding decisions would still rest with the OBAC and the OTC.

3. Chapter 7 - Metro recommends more detailed language in the description of the Transportation Planning Rule and its relationship to bicycle planning. For example, the Rule requires that local bike plans identify improvements which meet local travel needs and that new developments include bicycle and pedestrian access between major activity centers and include bikeways along all arterials and collectors.

The plan should also mention ODOT's Best Management Practices (BMP) project which is developing model bicycle and pedestrian ordinances for use by local jurisdictions. One goal of the BMP project is to provide jurisdictions with the tools they need to make bicycles a viable transportation option for as many trips as possible.

These recommendations strengthen the recognition of bicycling as a legitimate mode of transportation, particularly in an urban environment. Reducing the
competition for funding and establishing appropriate funding levels for various uses can provide an improved level of surety for planning for each of those uses. Providing an MPO fund can provide the MPO areas, which include two-thirds of the state's population, a dedicated fund for developing bicycle projects which reduce automobile trip-making.

Metro will continue to work with the Bicycle Program Office, OBAC, OTC, other state agencies and local jurisdictions to implement policies at a regional level which can result in a reduction of single-occupant vehicle trips and overall VMT.

Sincerely,

Andrew C. Cotugno
Transportation Director

ACC:JC:lmk

CC: OBAC
Local Bicycle Coordinators
Don Adams, ODOT
Ted Spence, ODOT
Larry Olson, ODOT
Date: March 2, 1992

To: TPAC/JPACT

From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Transportation Director

Re: Follow-Up on Six-Year Program Priorities

The following actions to implement the JPACT position on the Six-Year Program priorities are recommended:

1. Initiate a solicitation process to develop a recommendation to ODOT for funding under the new Enhancement Program. Eligible activities in accordance with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) are as follows:

"The term 'transportation enhancement activities' means, with respect to any project or the area to be served by the project, provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles, acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites, scenic or historic highway programs, landscaping and other scenic beautification, historic preservation, rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities (including historic railroad facilities and canals), preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including the conversion and use thereof for pedestrian or bicycle trails), control and removal of outdoor advertising, archaeological planning and research, and mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff."

The process for consideration is recommended as follows:

- Submit candidate projects by March 30.
- Define evaluation criteria by March 30.
- Evaluate and develop recommendation by May 30.
- Review draft at May 1 TPAC and May 14 JPACT meetings.
- Adopt at May 29 TPAC and June 11 JPACT meetings.
- Transmit to ODOT by June 30.

Because of the broad range of eligible activities, solicitation should be from environmental interests.
2. Charge the TDM Committee to develop a comprehensive regional TDM program for consideration for funding from the Air Quality/Congestion Mitigation Program. Recommendations should be developed for both implementation projects as well as development of potential programs for future implementation.

Eligible activities in accordance with ISTEA are as follows:

"Eligible Projects. Except as provided in Subsection (c), a State may obligate funds apportioned to it under Section 104(b)(2) for the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program only for a transportation project or program --

"(1)(A) if the Secretary, after consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, determines, on the basis of information published by the Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Section 108(f)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act (other than clauses xii and xvi of such section), that the project or program is likely to contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard; or

"(B) in any case in which such information is not available, if the Secretary, after such consultation, determines that the project or program is part of a program, method, or strategy described in each section;

"(2) if the project or program is included in a State Implementation Plan that has been approved pursuant to the Clean Air Act and the project will have air quality benefits; or

"(3) the Secretary, after consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, determines that the project or program is likely to contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard, whether through reductions in vehicle miles traveled, fuel consumption, or through other factors.

"No funds may be provided under this section for a project which will result in the construction of new capacity available to single-occupant vehicles unless the project consists of a high occupancy vehicle facility available to single occupant vehicles only at other than peak travel times."
The process for consideration is recommended as follows:

- TDM Committee develops guidelines by March 15.
- Submit candidate projects to TDM Committee by March 30.
- TDM Committee develops evaluation criteria by March 30.
- TDM Committee evaluates and develops recommendation by May 30.
- Review draft at May 1 TPAC and May 14 JPACT meetings.
- Adopt at May 29 TPAC and June 11 JPACT meetings.
- Transmit to ODOT by June 30.

3. Consideration of alternative projects for funding under the ODOT STP and NHS programs is recommended as follows:

- Develop broader evaluation criteria by March 30.
- "Flag" new projects to be considered further based upon May Draft Six-Year Program.
- TIP Subcommittee to identify alternative projects to be reviewed by TPAC at the May 29 meeting.
- TIP Subcommittee to evaluate "flagged" and alternative projects by August 15.
- Review Draft prioritization at September 4 TPAC and September 17 JPACT meetings.
- Adopt at September 25 TPAC and October 8 JPACT meetings.
- Transmit to ODOT by October 31.
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**Region 2040: Transportation & Land Use Concepts, Phase I**

**PURPOSE**
To better understand the alternatives for accommodating the growth expected within the region in the next 50 years and the choices that may be involved. This project results from a recommendation made as part of the process leading to the adoption of the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO). The project is intended to provide guidance for the testing and implementation of concepts in RUGGO.

**PRODUCTS**
1) An explanation of the likely outcome of relying on existing transportation and land use plans to accommodate growth within the region; 2) up to 5 additional regional transportation and land use development alternatives; 3) criteria with which to evaluate the alternatives.

**PARTICIPANTS**
The project will strive to include participation from citizens, cities and counties of the region, special districts, business and trade organizations, environmental organizations as well as Metro committees (RPAC, JPACT and their technical committees) and the Metro Council.

**TIMING**
Phase I of project is expected to be a 12 month effort, beginning January, 1992.

**FUNDERS**
This work effort is funded by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Tri-Met and Metro.

**NEXT STEPS**
Phase I will include two rounds of public involvement, the first being "kicked off" by the Regional Growth Conference, April 21. Once Phase I is completed, Phase II, scheduled to begin in 1993, will include a detailed evaluation will be made of each alternative and selection of the preferred alternative.

**DETAILS**
For more information, a copy of RUGGO, or to get on our mailing list, please contact Ethan Seltzer or Mark Turpel at Metro, Planning and Development Department, 2000 SW First Avenue, Portland, OR 97201. Telephone: 503/221-1646.

METRO
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The final product will consist of camera-ready: 1) tabloid; 2) final report and 3) final technical report.
## PUBLIC PROCESS

Following is a schedule of public involvement events for Phase I of the Region 2040 project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February/March</td>
<td>Initial briefing for the elected bodies of all cities and counties of the region about the purpose and timing of Region 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of March 21</td>
<td>Region 2040 media kickoff. A formal announcement of the project and description of 2040 workshops to be conducted at the annual growth conference will be given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March/April</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews regarding growth values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March/April</td>
<td>Statistically valid telephone survey regarding growth values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Annual Growth Conference with lunch presentation and afternoon workshops devoted to Region 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Four public workshops to assess growth values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/June</td>
<td>City and County Planning staffs use the Public Involvement Kits to assess growth values of their council/commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Statistically valid mail survey to detail public interest or concerns with Regional Growth Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September/October</td>
<td>City and county elected officials review of growth alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September/October</td>
<td>Public review workshops of Regional Growth Alternative Maps and materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Metro Council final review of Regional Growth Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region 2040: Transportation & Land Use Concepts, Phase I

What's the Process?
The Region 2040 project will include the following steps: 1) technical research and development; 2) public involvement; 3) further review and revision by advisory committees; and 4) review, revision and adoption by the Metro Council.

Who's Involved?
The technical parts of the project will be handled by the consultant team and the Management Committee, composed of planning staffs from many agencies in the region, as listed below. Public involvement will include all interested persons and organizations. JPACT (Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation) and RPAC (Regional Policy Advisory Committee) are primarily committees composed of elected officials who advise Metro. The Metro Council adoption process relies on its Transportation and Planning Committee which may refer actions to the Metro Council for consideration.

For more information, call Ethan Seltzer or Mark Turpel at 503/221-1646
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Date: March 11, 1992
To: JPACT
From: Andrew Cotugno, Transportation Director
Re: Westside LRT Funding

I. Issues/Background

A. Westside LRT funding was predicated on:

. A project from downtown Portland to downtown Hillsboro
. 75 percent federal funds
. $110 million from a Tri-Met General Obligation bond measure
. $21 million of Regional Compact funds from Portland, Washington County and Metro
. $115 million of lottery funds from the State of Oregon

B. The ISTEA provides a firm six-year commitment of $500 million toward a needed $567 million of Section 3 funds for the project segment to 185th Avenue and $15 million toward a needed $135 million for the segment to Hillsboro.

Added funds, borrowing or changes in project scope are needed within this six-year ISTEA period in order to bridge to the next ISTEA for the remaining Section 3 funds.

C. Approximately $33 million is needed if low floor cars are going to be added to the scope of the project to 185th and to retrofit the Eastside; $4 million for the Hillsboro extension.

D. Approximately $18 million is needed to upgrade the Eastside line to allow through operations with the Westside (doubletrack in Gresham, storage expansion at Ruby Junction and improved operations control).

E. Considerable uncertainty in cost and schedule for the Hillsboro extension exists due to ongoing process and FTA control of schedule and approvals (we clearly have an uphill battle for a 75 percent funded project).
F. The region's ability to pursue the next regional corridor is hampered until the Hillsboro extension is complete.

II. Policy Options

A. Status Quo:

Maintain the current approach to seek 75 percent Section 3 funds for the project to 185th and the Hillsboro extension.

Execute a Full-Funding Contract for the 185th segment with language recognizing a future amendment to add the Hillsboro extension; persevere with FTA and Congress on meeting environmental requirements, gaining approval of the extension and securing the 75 percent Section 3 funding commitment.

Secure in the Full-Funding Contract a commitment of "Intent" to provide funds from the next ISTEA to complete the project.

Secure an increased federal funding commitment for low-floor cars and Eastside-related costs (will not increase funds within this ISTEA); dependent on the "intent" for funds out of the next ISTEA.

Borrow funds in anticipation of repayment in the next ISTEA; pledge state, local or flexible federal highway funds to back credit.

Attempt to advance the next regional corridor concurrent with Hillsboro so that it can be constructed as soon after completion as possible.

B. Separate 185th from Hillsboro:

Secure a firm Full-Funding Contract for 185th; eliminate or reduce complication on the 185th segment by advancing Hillsboro as a separate issue.

Tailor a 185th project to fit firm resources; cut back project and/or dedicate local resources to fully fund and/or borrow to complete the project within the available $500 million.

Allocate flexible federal highway funds for low-floor cars in the event Section 3 funds cannot be obtained.
Continue to pursue 75 percent funding for the Hillsboro extension.

C. Accelerate the Hillsboro project:

Allocate state, regional and local funds for the Hillsboro project to fund it with no more than a one-third Section 3 share; take advantage of an ISTEA provision for an expedited project.

Execute a Full-Funding Contract with FTA for 75 percent to 185th and a commitment for one-third for the Hillsboro extension, 90 percent for low-floor cars, 75 percent for Eastside-related costs.

Reduce or eliminate borrowing through use of all available funds within this ISTEA; secure an "intent" for remaining Section 3 funds from the next ISTEA.

Shift attention to next regional corridor.

III. Related Issues

Allocation of Regional STP funds implies some other project will not be funded using these funds (Note: Funds are currently unallocated); proceed with allocation process over the next six months for the residual.

Allocation of state STP or NHS funds implies some Six-Year Program project will not be added to the Six-Year Program in this update.

Allocation of Tri-Met Section 9 funds implies some other bus-related improvement will be foregone or require a replacement source of funds; consideration should be given to seeking FTA Section 3 "bus-related" funds.

Importance of developing new "Bus Improvement" and "Arterial Fund" funding programs is elevated due to above actions; JPACT attention critical for developing this strategy.

JPACT can turn its attention to developing a funding strategy for future LRT expansion.

Resolution of Westside funding issues needed ASAP in order to finalize a Full-Funding Contract with FTA; local funds to maintain the schedule run out in July.

ACC: lmk
March 12, 1992

Dear J-PACT Member:

Last fall Tri-Met authorized an independent consulting team to develop and evaluate options for level boarding for MAX. Level boarding had been recommended by the regional participants in the Westside Light Rail Project.

Tom Walsh, Tri-Met General Manager, put together an advisory committee to follow the progress of the level boarding study.

After thoroughly reviewing the study, the Advisory Committee drew up the attached draft recommendations.

The Committee on Accessible Transportation (CAT) is an ongoing advisory committee to the Tri-Met Board in the area of accessible transportation services for people who are disabled and/or elderly. CAT, at their February 19th monthly meetings, unanimously passed a motion to recommend the Tri-Met Board of Directors approve the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

CAT wholeheartedly agrees with the consensus of the Advisory Committee that the ultimate goal for MAX is "system-wide universal level boarding", i.e. stepless boarding at every station of every train and every car at every door.

The approximately 30 million dollar price tag for moving toward that goal now looms large, but the question becomes "How many times 30 million dollars will it cost to retrofit the system if we wait?"

You will be asked to consider the Advisory Committee's recommendations. CAT strongly recommends you vote to support those recommendations which move toward universal level boarding which will significantly improve service for all riders and most especially those using mobility aids, the elderly, parents with strollers, those who are sight-impaired, or have arthritis or heart conditions and the list goes on and on.
Without steps at vehicle entries, boarding and alighting will be faster, station stops shorter and service more reliable.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jan Campbell
Jan Campbell, Chair
Committee on Accessible Transportation

JC:NM:et
Attachments
DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
LEVEL BOARDING FOR MAX STUDY

After considering the study's analysis, evaluation and conclusions, the advisory committee has recommended that Tri-Met pursue a course comprised of these steps:

- State Tri-Met's preference for adopting low-floor light rail vehicles as the single level-boarding technology for the MAX system.

- Further assess the type of low-floor vehicle best suited for the MAX system, after discussions with carbuilders, and prepare a revised set of specifications and procurement schedule.

- Design Westside light rail station platforms for use with the recommended low-floor cars, and modify Eastside platforms and other facilities to accommodate low-floor cars when they are placed in service.

- Determine a plan for funding the additional costs of 39 low-floor cars and associated facilities, and seek regional consensus in support of this plan.
Advisory Committee
Level Boarding for MAX Study

Nita Brueggeman
Roger Buchanan
Jan Campbell
Tom Ciesielski
Elsie Hastings
Jim Howell
Bob Woodell

convened by Tom Walsh, Tri-Met General Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARL BLUMENAUER</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Watson</td>
<td>TRI-MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les White</td>
<td>C-TRAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Thorne</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Hagenesenn</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Ahola</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Forbes</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gardner</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Greenwood</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Rogers</td>
<td>Washington City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Neweggist</td>
<td>Clackamas Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Cole</td>
<td>Cities of Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Lawrence</td>
<td>Cities of Clackamas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie M. Schmunk</td>
<td>City of Multco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Devlin</td>
<td>METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Campbell</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Feeney</td>
<td>TRI-MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre Garrett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Shackleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Laster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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