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MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

DATE: March 15, 2001
DAY: Thursday
TIME: 7:30 a.m.
PLACE: Metro Conference Room 370 A & B

1. Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum.

* 2. Minutes of January 18 and February 8, 2001, JPACT meetings – APPROVAL REQUESTED

* 3. Resolution No. 01-3038 – For the Purpose of Approving the FY 2002 Unified Work Program – APPROVAL REQUESTED – Andy Cotugno

* 4. Resolution No. 01-3039 – For the Purpose of Certifying that the Portland Metropolitan Area is in Compliance With Federal Transportation Planning Requirements – APPROVAL REQUESTED – Andy Cotugno

* 5. Endorsement of ODOT Pedestrian and Bicycle Grant Applications – APPROVAL REQUESTED – Dave Williams, ODOT/Bill Barber, Metro


7. Transit Oriented Development Program – INFORMATIONAL – Phil Whitmore, Marc Guichard, Metro

8. Adjourn

* Material available electronically. Please call 503-797-1755 for a copy.
** Not all material on this agenda item is available electronically.

All material will be available at the meeting.
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Enter Metra visitor parking from Irving St. and have 2 hours service from the plan.
MEETING NOTES

DATE OF MEETING: January 18, 2001

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Rod Monroe, Chair
Rob Drake
Rod Park
Fred Hansen
Bill Kennemer
Jim Kight
Rex Burkholder
Andrew Ginsburg, alternate
Dave Lohman, alternate
Craig Pridemore
Roy Rogers
Karl Rohde
Grace Crunican, alternate
Don Wagner

AFFILIATION:
Metro
City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Metro
Tri-Met
Clackamas County
City of Troutdale, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Metro
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Port of Portland
Clark County
Washington County
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
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Clark Berry
Lonnie Roberts
Larry Haverkamp
Mary Legry
Tom Mills
Bernie Bottomly
Debbie Elven
Deb Wallace
David Bragdon
V. Chatterjee
Jessica Hamilton
Mark Lear
Beckie Lee
Kathy Lehtola
Louis Ornelas
Lynn Peterson
John Rist
Karen Schilling
Jason Tell
Kay Van Sickel
Ramsay Weit
Dave Williams
Ross Williams

AFFILIATION:
Washington County
Multnomah County, to represent Multnomah County
City of Gresham, to represent Cities of Multnomah County
Washington State Department of Transportation
Tri-Met
C-Tran
Washington State Department of Transportation
Presiding Officer, Metro Council
Calcutta Tramways Ltd.
U.S. Representative David Wu’s Office
City of Portland
Multnomah Commissioner Serena Cruz’s Office
Washington County
Oregon Health Sciences University
Tri-Met
Clackamas County
Multnomah County, TPAC Member
ODOT
ODOT – Region 1
Citizen
ODOT
Citizens for Sensible Transportation/CLF
MEDIA:
Bill Stewart The Oregonian

STAFF:
Andy Cotugno Richard Brandman Gina Whitehill-Baziuk
Mike Hoglund John Houser Rooney Barker

SUMMARY:
The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Chair Monroe at 7:36 a.m.

Councilor Jim Kight, City of Troutdale, introduced Councilor Larry Haverkamp, City of Gresham, who will be the new member representing the Cities of Multnomah County, beginning at the February meeting. Councilor Kight said he would continue his representation as the alternate member to Councilor Haverkamp. Chair Monroe and the members welcomed Councilor Haverkamp.

Chair Monroe then introduced Commissioner Lonnie Roberts who will be representing Multnomah County on this committee, and the two new committee members from the Metro Council, Councilor Rex Burkholder (who will be Vice-Chair to Chair Monroe on this committee), and Councilor Rod Park. Again, Chair Monroe and the members welcomed Commissioner Roberts and Councilors Burkholder and Park.

MEETING REPORT:

Action taken: Councilor Rohde moved, with a second by Councilor Kight, to approve the November 9, 2000, meeting report (the December meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather). The motion passed unanimously, with the new members abstaining.

RESOLUTION REF. NO. 1479 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO APPROVE TRI-MET'S FY 01 APPROPRIATION

Mr. Cotugno briefly described the projects included in this resolution, and said that in order to receive the federal funds, the projects need to be included in the MTIP, which is what this resolution would accomplish.

Action taken: Fred Hansen moved, with a second by Councilor Rohde, to approve Resolution Ref. No. 1479 with a technical correction to amend references to the Jobs Access Program regarding the Rockwood Transit Hub in the staff report and the resolution to read Rockwood Jobs Access Transportation Hub. The motion passed unanimously. (Mayor Drake was not present for this vote.)
RESOLUTION REF. NO. 1487 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE PROCEDURES
AND CRITERIA FOR THE PRIORITIES 2002 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) UPDATE

Mr. Cotugno called attention to the staff report and resolution (the tan sheets) that were recommended by TPAC at their last meeting, the three proposed amendments submitted by members of the Metro Council Community Planning Committee (he asked them to look at the January 17th pink version rather than the January 11th purple version), and the summary of public comments sheet (gold) dated January 17th which summarized testimony from the Council public hearing on January 16th as well as the e-mail and letters received. Mr. Ginsburg called the Chair’s attention to the January 16th fax to the membership that included staff revisions to the staff report and attachment 3 to that report.

The purpose of this resolution, Mr. Cotugno said, is to adopt a set of criteria and a process and schedule to be followed for allocating the next round of MTIP funds. Those funds are a portion of the funds that come into the metropolitan region; they are the dollars that this committee and the Metro Council have the greatest degree of discretion over, and they are fairly flexible dollars. There are two categories: approximately $20 million are STP funds, which can be spent on virtually any transportation oriented purpose – roads, transit, or any other transit alternative. There are $18 million of CMAQ funds, which can only be used for things that reduce vehicle emissions, and generally are only used for transportation alternatives, not roads. Responding to a question from Commissioner Roberts, Mr. Cotugno said bridges could be included in the STP funds, but that there were other funds strictly dedicated to bridges. Commissioner Roberts expressed concern about the bridges crossing the Willamette River in Multnomah County.

This resolution does not deal with some other federal funds that come into this region, Mr. Cotugno continued. ODOT’s spending in the region mostly goes toward preservation-type projects. The staff report to this resolution, on page 2, reflects ODOT’s intent to program one modernization project in this next two-year time period (the next phase of the US Hwy. 26 project in Washington County). In addition, this resolution doesn’t reflect the federal dollars that come into Tri-Met for routine transit capital purposes. By the end of the year an overall Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) will be adopted that will include all of those funds, but this resolution only addresses the $38 million.

Responding to a question from Councilor Rohde regarding the first paragraph on p. 2 of the staff report, Mr. Cotugno said that even though the OTC is cutting back as mentioned in the report, they aren’t cutting back funds that were already committed. They’re cutting out funds from 2004-05, and since the allocation being dealt with in this resolution is for 2004-05, their comment is relevant but they aren’t cutting anything that has already been allocated.

Issues that have been discussed over the past few months were the next subject Mr. Cotugno spoke to, as outlined in the staff report on p. 2-3 under Process Goals in the series of bulleted principals are those agreed by TPAC that be followed.
Next, Mr. Cotugno addressed the Base Package which TPAC recommended, made up of the unfunded projects from the previous “150 percent list.” They’ve already been ranked but were not funded in the last round. However, TPAC recommended that the process not be restricted to just those projects because things change, and deletions need to be allowed if jurisdictions have different priorities with substitute projects accepted. The organizations listed on the bottom of p. 3 would be those allowed to submit projects for consideration. Process acknowledgement recommendations are on the top of p. 4 of the staff report. TPAC also noted that a lot of benefit can come out of some fairly small projects and there should be an allowance for some additional “low cost” projects. It was also requested that the projects be submitted with a letter from the approving jurisdiction’s governing body.

**Freeway projects** was the next issue addressed in the staff report. There aren’t enough federal dollars to go around any more, so the issue, Mr. Cotugno said, is whether or not to start using these funds toward freeway projects, which was discussed at TPAC. TPAC made three distinctions in this category: 1) Preliminary Engineering to get a project ready so it could, perhaps, compete at the state level for state modernization funds or at the federal level for earmarked funds; 2) Interchange-related projects – this has been done in the past, i.e., Greenberg Road/Hwy. 217 ramp and signal modifications; and 3) Freeway lane construction itself. TPAC recommended unanimously to allow projects to be applied for through this process. They recommended in a split vote on construction projects, so there is that distinction in their recommendation.

TPAC then looked at the process, Mr. Cotugno continued, and whether the process should target the money towards a few big projects (regardless of mode) or spread it around. They didn’t have a recommendation because some jurisdictions in the region want to do little projects and some jurisdictions want to do big projects. Consequently, they’re recommending not to restrict the projects, to let the applications stand on their own.

Previously we have funded projects as stand-alone allocations and have also funded programs, over time (TDM, ITS, etc.). TPAC’s recommendation is to continue to fund these first and figure out how much to commit to those programs on a continuing basis, and then go through the allocation process with individual projects.

On p. 5, Mr. Cotugno pointed out two areas that were discussed at TPAC, which are related to the criteria. First, the criteria now is based on the 100 point scoring system and is tailored to individual modes – boulevard projects are ranked against boulevard projects, transit projects against transit projects, etc. Grace Crunican asked if, in the large vs. small projects, there would be a large against large and small against small categories for the ranking. Mr. Cotugno said no, but there were generally four categories of criteria: effectiveness, cost effectiveness, safety, and support of the 2040 land-use goals, which predominantly emphasizes the degree to which a project supports regional centers, town centers and mixed-use areas. The exception to that is freight projects which are ranked based upon their access to industrial areas and terminals. Those are quantitative rankings that produce a score for a project. In addition to these criteria,
it’s recognized that there are other factors that affect the importance of a project. Anything that reflects the importance of a project, we want on the table.

Two issues discussed about this criteria were: 1) recommendation from the Metro Council that the weighting between the points be flipped, that is, now the criteria are based upon 40 points for 2040 support and 60 points for other factors (the four listed above); they recommend that the 2040 support be weighted 60 points and 40 points for the other four factors. TPAC recommended they stay the same with recognition of the first principal Mr. Cotugno mentioned earlier, that the whole program needs to be targeted to 2040. 2) The other issue discussed was the Endangered Species Act. Mr. Cotugno said we now have better information regarding culverts, which ones create fish blockage problems and where the biggest benefits are. This information wouldn’t really affect the points but would affect the additional information provided on the projects.

Chair Monroe said he would entertain comments on the TPAC recommendations. Councilor Rohde asked, on p. 3 of 6 (from the faxed version), why the language changed in the staff report and not the resolution, “funding” vs. “programmed due to a lack of funds.” Since the resolution is the instrument being adopted, he suggested that, for clarity, this be included in the resolution. Mr. Hoglund said he had made this change for clarity; Mr. Cotugno said the narrative change in the faxed document should be included because it’s descriptive and the more explanation the better. They said they would discuss the language for clarity.

Fred Hansen, referring to p. 4, under Freeway Projects, asked what had been done in the past. He said when he studied the Freeway Projects section, it spoke to him of minor interchange modification, and this paragraph reads simply “interchange projects.” His question was, did this mean projects that constitute a greater level of activity on an interchange. Mr. Cotugno replied that the sense was that this was an attempt to distinguish between the kinds of things that have been funded out of this money vs. the kinds of things that haven’t been. The things that have been funded have been on a relatively small scale, like $1, $2 or $3 million projects, unlike the I-5/217 interchange of $38 million, which was not funded with this money. The point was that while there was a split view at TPAC about funding freeways themselves (which do tend to be more expensive projects), there really wasn’t a split on doing relatively minor interchange related projects. Mr. Hansen then asked if the PE in that same paragraph referred to each of the three categories, and Mr. Cotugno said it was.

Commissioner Kennemer disagreed. He said it was not PE for intersections, but for freeways. Mr. Cotugno said it was for interchanges or freeways, but it was to fund the PE, not the subsequent construction of that interchange or freeway. Commissioner Kennemer said his understanding was that it was PE for freeways, or more specifically, the Sunrise Freeway. Mr. Hansen and Mr. Cotugno clarified: it was PE and construction of relatively small interchanges, but not construction of large interchanges; and on lane construction it would be the PE, not the construction. Mr. Cotugno said the reason this was called out separately was rather than simply asking the question of should we spend this money on freeways, it was felt that we ought to ask the more specific question of should we be able to spend this money on Preliminary Engineering.
to develop new freeways, yes or no. The recommendation from TPAC was yes. Then the question was, should we be able to spend this money on construction of interchange-related improvements – in the past we have, typically fairly small – should we do this or not. The recommendation was yes, we should allow that to happen. Here, Mr. Hansen interjected that it would be to continue the way it has been done before, to which Mr. Cotugno replied, exactly. Then Mr. Cotugno said a third question was asked: should we spend this money on freeway expansion, as in the past we have not typically used this money for that. The recommendation was that we consider allowing local governments to apply for at least one or two projects, which may or may not rank well, but they would be allowed to apply for them, for construction. TPAC’s “yes” recommendation was a split vote. If criteria was going to be set on who can apply for what, TPAC recommended that you decide what they can apply for, individually. Can they apply for Preliminary Engineering on freeway projects? Yes or no. Can they apply for interchange improvements? Actual construction of interchange improvements related to freeways. Yes or no. Can they apply for freeway expansion construction projects? Yes or no. If you decide to deal with freeways in the criteria, be specific about which kinds of projects will be allowed to be applied for in this process.

Chair Monroe clarified: the discussion was about what would get considered, not what would get funded. TPAC said yes, PE for any freeway project could be considered and ranked. TPAC said yes, interchange projects could be funded (and typically, we’ve only done small interchange projects). And, on a split 7-6 vote, TPAC said the actual building of freeways or adding lanes to freeways can be considered. Considered means applied for funding, not yet funded, he stressed. Today’s decision was to decide the criteria, not the actual funding.

Chair Monroe called a short recess at this point.

When the committee reconvened, Chair Monroe announced that Ms. Crunican would soon be leaving her position as the Director of the Oregon Department of Transportation, and presented her with a card signed by the membership. He invited her to speak. Ms. Crunican said the Oregon Department of Transportation is full of people who try to do the right thing, and the only thing she did while there was to get them to look more outward. ODOT is very much attuned to the public and the governor and his livability agenda. ODOT understands that transportation is not an end, but a means to livability and economic opportunity. Every locality around this state is different and we need to look at what this means for each. The Oregon Transportation Commission basically replicated the JPACT process by forming area commissions on transportation around the state, she said, and most of the counties have assimilated into groups of three or four. They’re trying to accomplish what JPACT does. While she looks at JPACT, she sees challenges, she sees factions in the region going one way and others moving another way. Looking back ten years, she thought there was a better regional perspective. Her parting words here, she said, would be to tell JPACT that ODOT supports them, but the real test is that they come together, knowing they come from one area, and they need to use the JPACT table, all of them, to look after the whole region. They need the compact development. They need a regional plan. They need to be able to get around and through the region. Industry needs to meet its needs. All of those are legitimate. They’d be better off as a group if they left their hats behind at
the door and came in and acknowledged as a group all of the things that need to be done, even though there’s never enough money to do all, so it all needs to be prioritized. This is the challenge that remains before the committee. Ms. Crunican was warmly applauded.

Chair Monroe then introduced Jon Kvistad, prior year’s chair to JPACT. Mr. Cotugno said Mr. Kvistad’s parting gift to JPACT had been to cancel the December meeting which was when he had planned to present Mr. Kvistad with a farewell gift of a print of the Hawthorne Bridge, the most multi-modal road in the region, signed by well wishers. Mr. Kvistad then turned the tables and did a humorous reverse-roast of the committee, person by person, with the exception of the Port of Portland representative. Chair Monroe wondered why Mr. Kvistad couldn’t dredge anything up to say about the Port. On the serious side, Mr. Kvistad told the committee that it was an honor and a privilege to have served with them, and to accomplish as much as they had. He thanked them for the opportunity to work with them, and for the gift.

Back to the MTIP discussion, Mr. Ginsburg brought forward some procedural items, hoping they might help clarify the discussion. On the pink sheet, there were three important amendments to the resolution. The second amendment dealt with limiting the total size of additions to the project list. Mr. Ginsburg said he thought that directly related to some of the questions raised earlier about whether it was appropriate to apply for funding for lane construction and whether that would swamp the overall list of projects. Rather than spend a lot of time talking about whether lane constructions could apply or not, he said the committee might want to deal with the question of limiting the total size of projects which would address that concern. The other two amendments were also good and he suggested those be discussed. In the staff report, as the criteria for applying for projects, he said he noticed there was no attachment to the resolution that actually listed the criteria, that they are only in the staff report. He suggested the committee might want to direct staff to create a new attachment for the resolution that lists the criteria as recommended by TPAC and amended by this body before an actual vote takes place on any amendment.

Mayor Drake said there was a requirement that there be public input on any project; he assumed that was for any additional project as opposed to any that were already on the 150% List. Mr. Cotugno replied that the recommendation was to actually have the jurisdiction’s/agency’s board endorse any project submitted. Chair Monroe said that was in the amendment, and would soon be addressed but that he was entertaining questions at this point.

Councilor Kight said the subject of the 60/40 weighting has come up and his understanding from ODOT was that this weighting would lean more toward the regional center, i.e., Portland. Mr. Cotugno said the 2040 points were not just toward downtown Portland, that they emphasize mixed-use centers which includes regional centers, town centers, light rail station areas, and the central city. It does include the central city but not exclusively. There is a bias toward large regional centers, but it doesn’t exclude town centers, main streets and light rail station areas. The scoring is based upon the size of the project. Chair Monroe added that flipping these numbers was not part of the recommendation. Councilor Burkholder said the issue mentioned in the staff
report in *Freeway Projects* from last November clearly stated that it needs to be solved. He wasn’t certain of the process to resolve it, however.

Mr. Cotugno said Mr. Ginsburg’s point was well taken, that there were places in the staff report with TPAC recommendations, and those should be collected and made an exhibit to the resolution so that they’re adopted. For the purpose of committee action, he suggested the base action of the committee be to approve the resolution with the TPAC recommendations that are outlined in the staff report which will be folded into the resolution, and then if there is a series of amendments the committee wants to entertain, entertain them one at a time.

**Action taken:** Dave Lohman moved, with a second by Commissioner Kennemer, to approve the resolution with the TPAC recommendations folded into the resolution, said amendments to be entertained one at a time.

The proposed amendments were as follows:

**Amendment #1 – Action taken:** Councilor Park moved, with a second by Fred Hansen, approval of the revised (underscored) text from Metro Council Community Planning Committee Amendment #1 as listed in the January 17, 2001, memo to JPACT from John Houser and which gave the amendments that came out of the Metro Community Planning Committee meeting of January 15th.

There was discussion on how this affected projects from the 150% list that had already gone through the public process.

Andy Ginsburg moved, with a second by Councilor Kight, a friendly amendment to the motion on Amendment #1 clarifying that this amendment referred to projects from the 150% list, i.e., adding the underscored text, “The list of proposed new or substituted projects shall be submitted . . .” This friendly amendment was accepted by Councilor Park and Mr. Hansen. Mayor Drake felt this still was onerous and reopened projects that didn’t need to be reopened. If it’s on the 150% list, he said, it’s already made it, i.e., leave it there. If it’s something new, or if a project has changed, he understood fully that that project would need public input.

Councilor Rohde clarified that this Amendment #1 includes changing the timeline for submittal of projects. The question of multi- and interjurisdictional issues was raised by Commissioner Rogers, particularly the county vs. the city being the submitting agency. Chair Monroe said this isn’t spelled out because it’s assumed that the jurisdictions will work together on these projects as they probably would anyway.

Commissioner Kennemer said he was going to vote no because he felt it was up to the jurisdictions to define their own processes, that this was another unnecessary layer.

**Vote:** The motion to approve the Metro Council Community Planning Committee Amendment #1, including Mr. Ginsburg’s friendly amendment **passed**. Those voting in favor – Mayor Drake,
Councilor Park, Mr. Hansen, Councilor Burkholder, Mr. Ginsburg, Mr. Lohman, and Councilor Rohde (7). Those opposed—Commissioner Kight, Commissioner Pridemore, Mr. Wagner, Commissioner Rogers, and Commissioner Kennemer (5). Ms. Crunican was not present for this vote.

Amendment #2 — Action taken: Per the amendment submitted, Councilor Park moved, with a second by Mr. Hansen, the inclusion of the additional text shown in Metro Community Planning Committee Amendment #2 to the section on Project Additions.

Councilor Bragdon explained that this amendment came out of the TPAC discussion of trying not to get people’s hopes up and then having to whittle the list back down to a comfortable level. Another reason was to use a dollar figure rather than the number of projects so as to allow a good and fair substitution of projects. Commissioner Kennemer expressed frustration that the list was already oversubscribed, and to put more into the mix only complicated it. Councilor Bragdon said the intent was to be responsive to local jurisdictions, not the other way around. A multijurisdictional project shouldn’t be handled any differently from the way it’s done now, he said, replying to a question from Councilor Rohde.

Commissioner Rogers had three points to make: he agreed with Commissioner Kennemer that two or three would make more sense than five; he thanked the Chair for clarifying the $2 million referred to the aggregate, not $2 million per project; and he said the 10 percent seemed to be arbitrary and may be a problem. Chair Monroe agreed that that was an arbitrary number, and said it may need to be modified, that this would be something to look at. Mr. Ginsburg asked how the 10 percent and $2 million work together. Chair Monroe said the 10 percent is if a substitution was being done; the $2 million would get added onto the base. What’s substituted could be up to 10 percent more than what you substituted for. Councilor Rohde asked for example if a multijurisdictional project had a $2 million or $6 million cap. Chair Monroe reiterated the ten jurisdictions allowed to submit projects; Mr. Cotugno added that if they want to use these funds for interjurisdictional projects, the portions could be worked out. Chair Monroe asked that the record show, to clarify, that it is the aggregate that’s being discussed. Responding to a question from Andy Ginsburg, Mr. Cotugno replied that the DEQ was one of the ten entities listed to submit projects and that this would also be for CMAQ funds.

Vote: The motion to approve Metro Community Planning Committee Amendment #2 passed unanimously.

Amendment #3 — Action taken: Councilor Park moved, with a second by Councilor Burkholder, to approve Metro Community Planning Committee Amendment #3. Vice-Chair Burkholder briefly explained the amendment. Commissioner Kennemer said the amendment worked against where he felt Clackamas County’s best interests lie, as their fundamental priority now is PE on the Sunrise Corridor. They’re scheduled for a big piece of new urbanization and are committed that there will not be a repeat of Sunnyside Road. He said this amendment just didn’t apply to Clackamas County, except for possibly one or two criteria, as they do not anticipate advancing urban development without infrastructure, and infrastructure is, principally, transportation.
Commissioner Rogers concurred with Clackamas County, saying that Washington County was a mixture or highly urbanized areas and highly rural areas and this amendment fit well for some of these areas but not at all for others, and this caused him concern.

Mr. Hansen said this committee recognizes that the Metro Council had the responsibility to review the list and that it may return it to the committee, but he felt it would hurt everybody if their perspective was to do an evaluation. He asked if, instead of having this as an amendment, we could make sure that in the information that goes out it be clearly described that the Metro Council, when they exercise their independent review, will look at these issues and that people will need to be able to present those for that process, but not have it as an amendment.

Councilor Park was comfortable with that concept, adding that he thought that this criteria actually would benefit Clackamas County. He understood Mr. Hansen’s advice, that acting in an advisory capacity would be more appropriate in this circumstance. If Councilor Burkholder agreed, Councilor Park said he would withdraw this amendment. Councilor Burkholder agreed. He then asked the committee to look at p. 3 of 7 on the January 19th faxed document to the Process Goals that this committee has already adopted. He thought Amendment #3 was reiterating these goals. Also, he said to Commissioners Kennemer and Rogers that this discussion was about a very special and particularly small pot of money and that half of it couldn’t be used for some of the things they mentioned, and that it was being looked at as to how to use the money strategically to leverage the 2040 development as best as it could. Some of the issues raised were way beyond the ability of this money to do anything about. We can’t control ODOT money, he said.

Vote: Amendment #3 was withdrawn by Councilors Park and Burkholder. The Metro Council, by its action the following week and by resolution or letter, would make it clear that they would be considering these criteria when making their final determination of the projects that will be funded. Mr. Hansen said he had requested that this also be clearly conveyed to everyone. Councilor Bragdon agreed, and said it was important that the important elements be stressed: 1) industrial areas are as integral to 2040 as town centers; also 2) regional town centers are as integral to 2040 as downtown Portland. These all need to work, he said, they all have transportation challenges. The Metro Council’s intent was to serve all of those with no geographic bias.

Chair Monroe said it was extremely critical to enhance the industrial base in Clackamas County and he felt this was the way to do it. Also, he said, by Metro Council action most of the new land brought into the UGB was in that area and needed to be developed or it was a worthless action. Commissioner Kennemer appreciated Chair Monroe’s comment and said he’d like this committee to keep that in mind. He thought the PE for Sunrise Corridor would be feasible within this pot of money. Also, in the spirit of how the prioritization would be done, he was grateful that the recommendation was not to go to the 60 point system instead of the 40 point system. Inherent in that, though, he wanted to ask that that be looked at again because he thought there was some bias there that didn’t do justice to the goal for the region of moving out into the urban areas.
Commissioner Rogers asked for clarification on p. 3 of the resolution, Resolve 5. regarding the procedures and criteria summarized in Exhibit C. He said Exhibit C showed the 60/40 point value which was indicated earlier in this discussion as not to be considered. He asked that this be removed from Exhibit C, in the second column under Step 3. Mr. Cotugno said that the motion on the table now was to adopt the TPAC recommendation, and that recommendation was to retain the current point value split. Mr. Cotugno quoted Mr. Mike Hoglund, who said Exhibit C would be corrected, depending on the outcome of the vote.

Mr. Hansen, referring to p. 4 of the staff report regarding Freeway Projects in the italicized language which was the TPAC recommendation, said his understanding from what Commissioners Rogers and Kennemer had said earlier, was of the projects that are the ones at issue, which are Sunset Highway 26 and the Sunrise Corridor, that these are what the two Commissioners want to be able to put forward in this process as covered in the freeway-related PE. He asked them if his understanding was correct. Commissioner Rogers replied, yes, that they want to be able to advance PE, that was correct, and the interchange and land construction projects, as it reads. Mr. Hansen said the work they were looking for was covered under the freeway-related PE; Commissioner Rogers agreed, no question. Mr. Hansen then went on to express his issue and why Tri-Met's TPAC representative voted no on this, which was the issue of adding lane construction may or may not be a good idea but he thought it was a significant policy shift around this table, and that he needed more debate on this. As long as there are no projects that are coming forward that need that language, he said he would prefer, and would therefore offer an amendment to delete, to have a broader discussion before this committee took action on adding lane construction. That was what Tri-Met's vote at TPAC represented. This was a big issue. This would then make the TPAC amendment read, “Permit submission of freeway-related PE, and interchange and lane construction projects by local governments as one of their few allowed add projects in the allocation process.” Mr. Hansen said the two issues at hand here were covered under freeway-related PE. He said he expected that there would be a process that would bring this back for further JPACT debate about whether they could take a small regional pot of money and go to areas they haven’t been before and ask for these large construction projects. He said this would allow PE for lane construction.

Action taken: Mr. Hansen moved, with a second by Councilor Rohde, that lane construction be removed, as stated above (italics).

Mayor Drake asked, using the Sunset at Camelot as an example of an overall plan for Westside light rail and other projects, how Mr. Hansen’s amendment would affect that. Mr. Hansen said he wasn’t sure because his understanding was that it would be covered under the PE for freeway-related or under the interchange construction language. He asked Mr. Cotugno if he was correct; Mr. Cotugno said there were about eight phases of Sunset Highway-related construction, about five of which have been funded through ODOT’s program. To take out lane construction would not advance any more of those construction projects through this program. Camelot was programmed out ten to twelve years, per Ms. Van Sickel. She said this proposed amendment wouldn’t affect ODOT’s program, as she understood it, just the pot of MTIP dollars being
addressed today. Dave Williams added that Washington County should not have a problem with their projects; Mr. Hansen’s amendment simply stated that MTIP money will not be programmed for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 for freeway lane construction. The Washington County projects cannot move before 2006, so they can come back to the next MTIP if they need to make that project whole, but MTIP money for freeway lane construction (not PE) will not be funded for the next two years.

Mr. Hansen said he wanted it clear that his amendment needed to come back to this body as a policy debate.

The vote on Mr. Hansen’s amendment to delete “and lane” passed unanimously.

Mr. Ginsburg asked for clarification that Exhibit A would be the criteria used in nomination, ranking and selecting, and all the items in the TPAC recommendation that are in the staff report need to be in a new Exhibit which would be the criteria for proposing projects. Chair Monroe concurred. Mr. Ginsburg asked what the difference was. Chair Monroe said nominating and proposing were synonymous and Mr. Ginsburg then suggested removing the word “nomination” from Exhibit A. It was agreed to delete the word as a technical change, with no motion required.

Action taken: The motion to approve Resolution Ref. No. 1487, with the TPAC recommendations and the above amendments, passed unanimously.

BI-STATE TRANSPORTATION MEETING WITH STATE LEGISLATORS

Chair Monroe, as Chair of the Bi-State Committee, briefed JPACT on the Bi-State Committee action of scheduling meetings with legislators, especially transportation leaders, from Olympia and Salem, to meet with the Bi-State Committee members in the next two months to discuss regional transportation priorities, specifically dredging of the Columbia Rover, high-speed rail, the I-5 Corridor, etc. The Southwest Washington RTC has approved this proposal and the Bi-State Committee is asking that JPACT also approve it.

Councilor Rohde, referring to a previous vote on expanding the powers of the Bi-State Committee, asked if this was appropriate. Chair Monroe said that was why JPACT was being asked to anoint this project. Councilor Rohde said he understood that and he was willing to approve, as long as there was some assurance that JPACT have a review process of what they are doing. Chair Monroe said this would have been brought before this committee in December, but that meeting was canceled. He added that there needs to be more communication between the Oregon and Washington key legislators and transportation leadership. Mayor Drake said he supported any effort toward understanding between the two states and their elected officials and he encouraged others to give their support. Councilor Rohde asked what the process was for JPACT review; Chair Monroe said he regularly reported, together with Commissioner Pridemore who was the Vice-Chair of the Bi-State Committee, the actions of that committee, and any recommendations and/or action from that committee comes before this body automatically for approval.
Action taken: Mayor Drake moved, with a second from Councilor Rohde, to approve the Bi-State Committee scheduling the bi-state transportation meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

**ELDERLY AND DISABLED TRANSIT UPDATE – PROGRAM PROPOSALS; LETTER OF SUPPORT TO OREGON LEGISLATURE**

Due to time constraints, this agenda item was deferred to the February meeting.

**FEDERAL PRIORITIES POSITION PAPER**

Mr. Cotugno asked the committee to review the January 11, 2001, draft of the federal priorities position paper as it would be up for approval next month. The lobbying trip was scheduled for March 6 – 8, so this was time sensitive. Also, the March JPACT meeting would be scheduled for March 15th rather than March 8th.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:42 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker
Recording Secretary
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The meeting was called to order and a quorum declared by Vice-chair Burkholder at 7:30 a.m.

Vice-chair Burkholder introduced himself to the committee and said he would be conducting the meeting this month in Chair Monroe’s absence. He then introduced Councilor Larry Haverkamp from the City of Gresham who has taken the seat representing the Cities of Multnomah County. Councilor Brian Newman, the newly appointed alternate representative for the Cities of Clackamas County was also introduced, as well as visitors Tom Markgraf of Representative Earl Blumenauer’s Office and Suzanne Kunse of Representative Darlene Hooley’s Office.

There were no meeting notes to approve.

RESOLUTION APF (Agenda Placement Form) NO. 1501 – FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING PORTLAND REGIONAL FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FOR FFY 2001 APPROPRIATIONS

Action taken: Commissioner Hales moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to approve the resolution.

Mr. Cotugno called the committee’s attention to the latest (orange) version of the resolution (which updated the yellow version sent in the agenda packet) which included TPAC’s recommendations. He said this position paper was relative to this year’s Appropriations Bill, and was tailored to the types of programs available for earmarking as well as to the size of projects Congress tends to earmark. In addition, he said, this paper reflected the projects that are clearly ready to go in the timeframe requested. The worst thing this body could do would be to ask for the money and then not spend it in time. With those caveats, he then briefly addressed each project outlined in the paper (in Exhibit A).

Responding to a request from Mr. Hansen to please put this in context with all the other projects for which the region has requested funding, Mr. Cotugno said New Starts is the big money that comes into the region and only comes through an earmarking process – that process happens in Congress when you’ve gone through the administrative procedures (EIS, Ranking, etc.). Those are the big dollars. The transit categories are additional, and also flow through a formula available to transit districts for routine projects. The majority of federal highway funds are not formula and are not earmarked. All highway categories add up to maybe $10 to $15 million. The total federal highway funds that come to the states is maybe $300 million, of which we receive maybe $5 to $10 million. The MTIP process is involved in allocating that amount to about $25 million.
There was a discussion in which Councilor Haverkamp suggested the possible removal of the words “for Preliminary Engineering” from the first bullet on p. 3 of 6, under D., Regional Highway Projects, in Exhibit A. Councilor Haverkamp said he’d like more wiggle room. Some of the committee felt it best to keep it as written, not to change words that have been traditionally used. Councilor Haverkamp said he would speak with his staff and address this later in the meeting.

Councilor Park said there were some concerns brought up by the Metro Council Community Planning Committee, the first of which was corrected or adjusted — it is the partnership between Metro and JPACT. The second was concern about the appropriateness of having the Columbia River Channel project in this particular document. Specifically, Councilor Park asked for clarification as to exactly what the following sentence from p. 3 meant: “Whether the sponsoring ports will seek additional construction appropriations in FFY 2002 depends upon the schedule for compiling the Biological Opinion.” He wondered why a statement like that would be in here. Mr. Lohman said the Port, the Corps, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and NMFS count on the Biological Opinion and they have asked that it be completed by the end of June and have asked for a regular update to make sure it stays on course. Whether that happens or not is a question, but if it does, the Port would be in a position to move forward to seek further funds. The money appropriated last year to start the construction will be held up until the Biological Opinion is complete.

Mr. Hansen asked, hypothetically, the Biological Opinion came in and indicated that the project could not proceed, would the Port then not try to seek a Congressional override of that opinion. Mr. Lohman said yes, if they couldn’t proceed he didn’t think there would be any way to get a congressional override.

Councilor Park asked if perhaps the sentence was placed in the document to ensure some environmental groups that the Port wouldn’t proceed until that occurred. Mr. Lohman said he was not involved in crafting this particular paragraph, so could not respond. He said it might be there to provide reassurance because obviously the Port would not be able to proceed until all the environmental requirements were met. In that sense, he said, it was unnecessary but perhaps provided insurance.

Councilor Park then asked whether this document was the appropriate vehicle for this request since it would be from a different pot of money. Commissioner Hales said most of these listed projects were from different pots, but they represented the region’s transportation priorities regardless of the source of funding. Mr. Lohman agreed. Councilor Roberts stated that the dredging was extremely important to this region and he agreed it needed to be done, but asked if these funds weren’t used for this project, what they would be used for. Mr. Hansen said he was supportive of the language in the paper, that this committee had always taken a broad sense of their projects and that since this was a high priority last year, the committee needed to keep the congressional delegation informed on what they’re doing today, and so he thought it very appropriate to leave the project in.
Commissioner Hales said the clarity of this body's presentation would matter quite a bit; the congressional delegation has lots of other things to do, so the clearer our request is, the better off we will be.

Responding to a comment from Councilor Haverkamp, Commissioner Hales cautioned the members that if they weren't going to build a project, do not ask for it to be requested, and to let the committee know ahead of time so they don't go back to D.C. and ask for the money.

Councilor Park, on p. 3, D. Regional Highway Projects, brought up the question of the appropriateness of the Preliminary Engineering for the Sunrise Corridor. There had been a motion in the Community Planning Committee to withdraw that portion, but after discussion that motion was withdrawn. He asked if the Clackamas County members would speak to the appropriateness of this item. Councilor Burkholder added that the question, as he heard it, was were we ready to go with it, was this the time.

Commissioner Kennemer said their point was well taken, but he felt this was not the time to have a full discussion. Briefly, he said, under the 2040 Plan Clackamas County is expected to have very substantial urban expansion. They already have a very congested Sunnyside area. The county's new policy of concurrency (so as not to repeat the mistake of Sunnyside) was that they won't approve urban zoning unless they can support it with infrastructure. The time span to get the Sunrise Corridor operational is of such a long nature that they need to put it on the table right now; it's big and it will take time. Also, he said, they have other issues to deal with such as the hobs/housing balance, which will mean more transportation issues. The whole process of trying to bring the inadequate infrastructure of Clackamas County up to livable standards is why they're also pushing so hard on the South Corridor project.

Mr. Hansen reminded the committee that, while this discussion was appropriate and informative, they all recognize that this is a process of give and take. He felt it critical to acknowledge that the reason they've been able to have such a strong voice in Washington, D.C., was that when they're all there, they speak with one voice. He said he speaks as strongly as in Washington as Commissioner Kennemer on the Clackamas County projects and not just when everyone's in the same room but privately as well. Some of these projects weren't necessarily his priorities, but when the committee reaches agreement they all need to say that's what they're there for. He concluded by saying he felt it appropriate to leave the PE for the Sunrise Corridor in the request. Councilor Park said the Metro Community Planning Committee's intent was to ask questions, to be more active and to make sure transportation planning and growth management were occurring together. Mr. Cotugno asked if JPACT wanted a presentation on the Sunnyside/Sunrise/Damascus area to understand the broader area UGB development, saying that Sunrise doesn't stand by itself. Mayor Drake said no, he felt it necessary to trust Clackamas County, that they were doing what they wanted to do and he didn't feel the need to delve into the specific of their business. He recognized that their need was great and expressed confidence in them. Clackamas County agreed that a presentation was not necessary.
Action taken: The motion to adopt Resolution APF No. 1501, as amended, passed unanimously. Councillor Haverkamp said he would withdraw his question regarding the possible removal of the words “for Preliminary Engineering” from the Regional Highway Projects on p. 3.

ELDERLY AND DISABLED TRANSIT UPDATE – PROGRAM PROPOSALS: LETTER OF SUPPORT TO OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. Hansen gave the committee a brief overview of the Tri-County Elderly and Disabled Transportation Plan, beginning with the 1999 Legislature providing $19 million in statewide funding. He pointed out the tri-county area plan, and said one of the things the Elderly and Disabled Committee felt very strongly about was that there should be a bigger picture of the needs within not only the UGB but in the entire three-county area, as well. Some of the state’s Special Transportation Fund authorized looking at a comprehensive needs assessment in a way that had not been done before. Tri-Met offered to take the lead and provide staff to do the study. Mr. Hansen introduced Patty Fink, who presented an update from the committee (a copy of which is included in the record).

There was discussion on the amount of service and costs, comparing the existing system to Strategy A (the Elderly and Disabled Committee’s recommendation) and then to Strategies B & C. There were questions regarding cost per ride and cost efficiencies. Mr. Bottomly interjected that the matrix showed expanding the system in outlying areas where efficiencies were harder to come by. There are about 65,000 elderly and disabled people living within walking distance of an existing fixed route system, he said, and the committee focused on the challenge of how to get them to use fixed route systems which cost far less per ride than a door-to-door system (such as the lift system).

Mayor Drake thought the legislators would dig their heels in on providing funding, and suggested that anything the Elderly and Disabled Committee could do to further explain their case would increase their chance of success. He said this program was a political football the last time the legislature looked at it and he didn’t think the elderly and disabled deserved that.

Councilor Rohde questioned the second page of the draft letter that JPACT was being asked to approve, and asked if the first full sentence on that page, encouraging the legislature to take the opportunity to expand funding, meant that we would ask for identified sources or was it a plea. Mr. Bottomly replied that the Governor’s budget proposed a reduction over the last biennium from $19 million to $18.2 million, statewide. The message to them is that we appreciate being included this time as we’re not starting from $0, but if they can bump it up to the full $19 million, it would be appreciated. The $19 million allocation is statewide, he said, and this region received approximately 40 percent of the statewide total.

Another discussion began comparing Strategies B and C to Strategy A; Vice-chair Burkholder intervened, saying Ms. Fink was interrupted in the middle of her presentation and since the Elderly and Disabled Committee’s recommendation was Strategy A, he asked that the committee let her finish, which she did.
Ms. Liebe said she saw two requests of JPACT from the committee: to ask the legislature to continue funding at the same level as last time around, and to endorse Strategy A. She then asked if JPACT had seen this recommendation prior to this meeting; Vice-chair Burkholder explained that, although it had been scheduled previously, this was the first meeting where it was presented.

Commissioner Rogers said he thought that people chose where to live, and some of them made the choice of not living within the service boundary. Was it then incumbent upon those who formed the transit district and pay transit taxes to provide some sort of funding for those who chose to live outside transit district. Should we be considering providing urban services outside the urban boundary, he asked.

Mr. Bottomly said they struggled with that exact issue and what the correct balance should be. The committee makeup is primarily social service providers and their approach was that they want the program to reflect the region’s strategy of land use and development. He felt Strategy A struck a good balance.

Vice-chair Burkholder reiterated the two issues requested in the draft letter, as pointed out by Ms. Liebe: to approve Strategy A and to approve sending the letter of endorsement.

Commissioner Kennemer had no objection to doing this, and felt it was appropriate, and then asked what other packages this body was suggesting go before the legislature. Mr. Cotugno replied that that information wasn’t available now. Mr. Hansen reminded them that although Tri-Met was providing this presentation, it was not a Tri-Met request, they were only the messenger. He suggested each member check with their own elderly and aging services staff, particularly if they had a different view or concern, and that they work with their representatives.

**Action taken:** Commissioner Kennemer moved, with a second by Mayor Drake, to approve the recommended Strategy A as consistent with Metro’s 2040 Plan and also approve sending the letter of support to the Governor and legislature in support of funding for elderly and disabled transportation.

Mr. Cotugno said this committee’s questions raised about Strategies B and C were really the crux of the issue. The elderly and disabled community asks why they can’t have the service everyone else has. Strategies B and C speak to that, but they are too expensive. That’s why that service isn’t provided. Strategy A, the recommendation, does involve an increase in service to some extent to these smaller communities outside the transit service district. The issue that comes next is how to pay for it. Forty million dollars for Strategy A is good, cost effective service for today. He thought the letter to the legislature should be more explicit and say thank you for the proposal in the Governor’s budget for $18.2 million but it sure would be nice if we could have $19 million to get us partway towards Strategy A. He said he would be more specific in the letter and suggested a friendly amendment to tighten the language.
Councilor Park said he would support the motion but thought Commissioner Rogers had a valid point, and said he would like to continue discussion on this at a later time. Mr. Hansen said aging was a fundamental part of the elderly area and that needed a debate. Councilor Burkholder added that ensuring that housing would be provided in close proximity to transit service would be another issue to discuss in the future.

Commissioner Kennemer and Mayor Drake said they agreed to include tightening the language of the letter in their motion.

Action taken: Voting in favor of approving Strategy A and sending a letter of support (with amended language) – Mayor Drake, Councilor Park, Commissioner Hales, Mr. Hansen, Commissioner Kennemer, Ms. Legry, Ms. Liebe, Commissioner Pridemore, Commissioner Roberts, Commissioner Rogers, Councilor Rohde, and Ms. Van Sickel (12). Abstaining – Councilor Haverkamp (1). Mr. Lohman was not present for this vote. As Vice-chair and since there was not a tie vote, Councilor Burkholder did not vote. The motion passed.

WASHINGTON LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Ms. Legry briefed the committee on the Blue Ribbon Commission, formed in 1998 by the Washington State legislature to look at transportation issues. The commission is composed of 46 members with the emphasis on people from business and environment as well as local jurisdictions to have an outside view. The commission is totally independent, even to having their own staff. They were asked to look at new approaches, constraints, and things that are in the way of making improvements to how Washington does business now. It was not business as usual, she said. One of the main things they are looking at is that it should not be up to individual jurisdictions to solve their transportation problems, but there is a big emphasis on regional discussions, regional decision making and regional funding. This means the counties and the state will possibly put their decisions and funds together. It may not be happening yet, but you will see the shape of how they’re going to approach things in the future, she said. They’re trying to address what they call the crisis of competence, the view of the general public, meaning that the public doesn’t believe it when a jurisdiction says it doesn’t have the money for a project; they’re trying to find a way to approach this. Some of the commission’s recommendations address efficiencies and services within agencies. They very much tried to tie these to benchmarks so as to say we’re trying, we’re giving you service, we’re getting things paved, etc.

Another emphasis they’re looking at, she said, is can they have a more private sector approach to things, can they have more private sector actual delivery of the services. That would involve changes in union contracts, changes in contracting out, some fairly major changes. This has resulted in 27 bills having been introduced into the Washington Legislature early on, and they expect to consolidate them into fewer than that. Regionalization could result, she added, with providing them with some sort of council where decisions will be made, but with no new bureaucracy or governmental structural redundancy.
She then referred the committee to the January 10th memo from Don Wagner, which listed the commission’s recommendations on six critical elements, a closer look at regional empowerment, and a summary of their recommendations. She said they would report back later this year on what happens in their legislative session.

PORTLAND OZONE CONTINGENCY PLAN AND STATUS

Due to time constraints, this agenda item was postponed to the next meeting.

Vice-chair Burkholder reminded the committee that because of the Washington, D.C. trip March 6-8 that the next meeting would be March 15th. He then invited the committee to the groundbreaking for the 9:30 a.m. Oregon Convention Center expansion across the street.

Vice-chair Burkholder then welcomed a special guest, former Metro Councilor Ed Washington. Mr. Cotugno presented Mr. Washington with a framed “Walter Richfield” photograph, signed with well wishes by the committee members and many Metro staff, thanking him for his years of distinguished service on behalf of JPACT and the region. Mr. Washington thanked everyone, saying he appreciated the recognition and that he had enjoyed serving with them all. He was enjoying his retirement, he said, and he wished them well, adding that with all the hands around their table, they’ll get it all done. He was resoundingly applauded.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:58 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rooney Barker
Recording Secretary
CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 01-3038 FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE FY 2002 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM.

Date: February 15, 2001
Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would: 1) approve the Unified Work Program continuing the transportation planning work program for FY 2002; 2) authorize submittal of grant applications to the appropriate funding agencies; and 3) extend the Memorandum of Understanding with the Regional Transportation Council (RTC).

EXISTING LAW

Federal transportation agencies (Federal Transit Administration [FTA] and Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]) require an adopted Unified Planning Work Program as a prerequisite for receiving federal funds.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The FY 2002 Unified Work Program (UWP) describes the transportation planning activities to be carried out in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2001. Included in the document are federally-funded studies to be conducted by Metro, Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Tri-Met and local jurisdictions. Continuing commitments include implementing the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), identifying solutions to improve goods flow in the I-5 Corridor; completing the South Corridor preliminary engineering (PE) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), and increasing the communication of transportation system performance, needs and proposed plans. In addition, it includes a greater emphasis on freight planning and further advancements in travel modeling in cooperation with Los Alamos National Laboratories. Environmental Justice also will be an emphasis area.

BUDGET IMPACT

The UWP matches the projects and studies reflected in the proposed Metro budget submitted by the Metro Executive Officer to the Metro Council and is subject to revision in the final Metro budget.

Approval will mean that grants can be submitted and contracts executed so work can commence on July 1, 2001, in accordance established Metro priorities.
WHEREAS, The Unified Work Program describes all federally-funded transportation planning activities for the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area to be conducted in FY 2002; and

WHEREAS, The FY 2002 Unified Work Program indicates federal funding sources for transportation planning activities carried out by Metro, Regional Transportation Council, Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met and the local jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, Approval of the FY 2002 Unified Work Program is required to receive federal transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2002 Unified Work Program is consistent with the proposed Metro budget submitted to the Metro Council; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Metro Council hereby declares:

1. That the FY 2002 Unified Work Program is approved.

2. That the FY 2002 Unified Work Program is consistent with the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process and is given positive Intergovernmental Project Review action.

3. That Metro’s Executive Officer is authorized to apply for, accept and execute grants and agreements specified in the Unified Work Program.
4. That the Memorandum of Understanding between Metro and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) is renewed for FY 2002.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ________ day of _________, 2001.

________________________
David Bragdon, Presiding Officer

Approved as to form:

________________________
Daniel B. Cooper, General Council
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PORTLAND AND METROPOLITAN AREA
UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM
OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Metro is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) designated for the Oregon portion of the Portland/Vancouver urbanized area. It is required to meet the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) "Transportation Management" areas, the Land Conservation and Development Commission Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements and the Metro Charter for this MPO area. In combination, these requirements call for development of a multi-modal transportation system plan, integrated with land-use decisions and plans for the region, with an emphasis on development of a multi-modal transportation system which reduces reliance on the single-occupant automobile and consistent with realistic financial constraints.

The Unified Work Program (UWP) includes, primarily, the transportation planning activities of Metro and other area governments with reference to land-use planning activities, for fiscal year July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Metro is governed by a directly-elected council in accordance with a voter-approved charter. The council is comprised of seven districts. The agency is administered under the direction of an executive officer, elected by voters district-wide.

Metro uses a decision-making structure that provides state, regional and local governments the opportunity to participate in the transportation and land-use decision of the organization. The two key committees are the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). These committees are comprised of elected and appointed officials and receive technical advice from the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC).

JPACT

This committee is comprised of Metro Councilors (three); local elected officials (nine, including two from Clark County, Washington) and appointed officials from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Tri-Met, the Port of Portland and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). All transportation-related actions (including federal MPO actions) are recommended by JPACT to the Metro Council. The Metro Council can approve the recommendations or refer them back to JPACT with a specific concern for reconsideration. Final approval of each item, therefore, requires the concurrence of both bodies.

The Bi-State Transportation Committee was created by joint resolution of the RTC Board and Metro in May, 1999. The Committee is charged with reviewing all issues of bi-state significance for transportation and presenting any recommended action to RTC and JPACT. The intergovernmental agreement between RTC and Metro states that JPACT and the RTC Board
“shall take no action on an issue of bi-state significance without first referring the issue to the Bi-State Transportation Committee for their consideration and recommendation”.

**MPAC**

This committee was established by the Metro Charter to provide a vehicle for local government involvement in Metro’s planning activities. It includes local-elected officials (eleven), appointed officials representing special districts (three), Tri-Met, a representative of school districts, citizens (three), Metro Councilors (two with non-voting status), Clark County, Washington (two) and an appointed official from the State of Oregon (with non-voting status). Under the Metro Charter, this committee has responsibility for recommending to the Metro Council adoption of, or amendment to, any element of the Charter-required Regional Framework Plan.

The Regional Framework Plan was adopted on December 11, 1997 and addresses the following topics:

- Transportation;
- Land Use (including the Metro Urban Growth Boundary and urban reserves);
- Open space and parks;
- Water supply and watershed management;
- Natural hazards;
- Coordination with Clark County, Washington; and
- Management and implementation.

In accordance with this requirement, the transportation plan developed to meet TEA-21, Rule 12 and Charter requirements have been developed with input from both MPAC and JPACT. This ensures proper integration of transportation with land-use and environmental concerns.

**TPAC**

This committee is comprised of technical staff from the same jurisdictions as JPACT plus six citizens.

**MTAC**

This committee is comprised of technical staff from the same jurisdictions as MPAC to develop recommendations to MPAC on land-use related matters.

**Planning Priorities Facing the Portland Region**

ISTEA, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA), the LCDC, the Transportation Planning Rule, the Oregon Transportation Plan, the Metro Charter, the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO), the Regional 2040 Growth Concept, and the Regional Framework Plan, in combination, have created a policy direction for the region to update land-use and transportation plans on an integrated basis and define, adopt and implement a multi-modal transportation system. Major land-use planning efforts underway include:

- Implementation of changes to local comprehensive plans to comply with the Regional Framework Plan;
- Planning for designated Urban Reserves (including an effort funded with FY 2000 TCSP funds);
- Initiation of an affordable-housing program; and
- Periodic review of the Urban Growth Boundary; and
- Natural resource and habitat protection planning to implement the State's Goal 5.
These federal, state and regional policy directives also emphasize development of a multi-modal transportation system. Major efforts in this area include:

- Implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan;
- Development of a financing strategy for the RTP;
- Initiation of I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership;
- Update to the State and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs for the period 2002-2005;
- Implementation of projects selected through the STIP/MTIP update; and
- Multi-modal refinement studies in the corridors.

Finally, these policy directives point toward efforts to reduce vehicle travel and vehicle emissions, in particular:

- The state goal to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita;
- Targeting transportation investments to leverage the mixed-use land use areas identified in the 2040 Growth Concept;
- Adopted maintenance plans for ozone and carbon monoxide with establishment of emissions budgets to ensure future air-quality violations do not develop;
- Adoption of targets for non-single occupant vehicle travel in the RTP and local plans; and
- Publication of the Regional Transportation Plan update to implement the Region 2040 growth concept.
PROGRAM

The adopted 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) serves as a policy and investment blueprint for long-range improvements to the region's transportation system. Ongoing maintenance and periodic updates of the RTP ensure that the plan adequately reflects changing population, travel and economic trends; including Federal, State and regional planning requirements.

Local transportation plans in the region must conform to the RTP. Metro provides ongoing technical and policy support for local transportation planning activities. The RTP program also includes corridor studies conducted in cooperation with the state and local jurisdictions.

Relation to Previous Work

A major update to the RTP began in FY 1996 and was concluded with Council action on the 2000 RTP on August 10, 2000 and a determination of air-quality conformity by USDOT on January 26, 2001. The purpose of the update was twofold. First, the plan was updated to meet requirements set forth in the State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Among other provisions, the rule seeks to reduce reliance on the automobile and promote the use of alternative modes of transportation. Second, the update reflected the ongoing Region 2040 planning effort and the RTP now serves as the transportation element of the Regional Framework Plan. During the four-year update, the RTP update advanced through three distinct phases, including policy revisions in 1996 (approved by Council resolution), a system alternatives analysis in 1997 and the project development and analysis phase in 1998-99. Finally, an adoption phase occurred from December 1999 to August 2000.

The 2000 RTP update represents the most dramatic change since the plan was adopted in 1982 and will significantly affect local transportation plans. As a result, a process was developed to foster extensive involvement of the public and local jurisdictions at every step. This included ten technical work teams made up of local planners, engineers and citizen experts and a 21-member RTP Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) that met monthly to discuss each step. The CAC's final recommendations on transportation policies and principles for project development were forwarded to both JPACT and the Metro Council. Regular joint RTP workshops of TPAC/MTAC and JPACT/MPAC were also held to ensure an ongoing dialogue on the policy implications of the update. In addition, more than 2,000 citizens participated in RTP workshops and open houses, and nearly 25,000 people visit the RTP displays on a traveling display in 1997-98. A variety of newsletters, brochures and technical documents were also prepared, and more than 400,000 documents describing the RTP update were distributed in the region during the course of the project.

In fall 2000, RTP activities shifted toward local implementation of the updated plan. The state TPR requires the 24 cities and 3 counties in the Metro region to update local plans to be consistent with the RTP within one year of the August 10, 2000 adoption date. To assist local governments in this update, Metro project staff focused on producing a number of supporting fact sheets and other materials that will help local officials interpret the new plan. Specific Metro staff are also assigned to each implementing jurisdiction and will work closely with local staff to ensure that local plan updates proceed successfully.

In FY 2001-02, the work program will continue to focus on implementation, since many jurisdictions will continue to be involved in local transportation updates that implement the new regional policies. Though state transportation planning rules require the 24 cities and three counties in the Metro region to update their local plans within one year of adoption of the RTP for consistency with regional requirements, it is likely that several jurisdiction will need more time to fully address the new RTP.
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Technical and policy support and review of these local plans will be the primary focus of RTP staff during this period, which roughly extends through FY 2001-02.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Local TSP Implementation: Metro will work closely with local governments during the next fiscal year to ensure that regional policies and projects are reflected in local plans. This work element will include the following activities:

- Publish a final 2000 RTP, pending acknowledgement by the state Land Conservation and Development Commission;
- Development of fact sheets, maps and other background materials that help interpret 2000 RTP requirements for local officials;
- Upgrade and expand the Metro RTP website to include a new emphasis on the “how-to” aspects of the 2000 RTP and other new planning directives in the region;
- Foster an ongoing online discussion of transportation and other planning issues as part of the expanded web presence;
- Professional support for technical analysis and modeling required as part of local plan updates;
- Professional support at the local level to assist in the development of local policies, programs and regulations that implement the 2000 RTP;
- Written and spoken testimony in support of proposed revisions to local plans; and
- Provide public information and formal presentations to local government committees, commissions and elected bodies and interested citizen, civic and business groups on the 2000 RTP.

Management Systems: Congestion (CMS) and Intermodal Management Systems (IMS) products were completed in FY 1997-98. Key activities for FY 2002 will be to incorporate information into planning activities, system monitoring based on management-system performance measures, local project review for consistency with the systems and ongoing data collection and input to keep the systems current.

Street Design and Connectivity: Metro will conduct a follow-up study on street connectivity standards to determine the mode-split benefits for transit, bicycling and pedestrians as well as refine estimates for VMT reduction. The study will assist local governments in meeting Regional Framework Plan mode-split targets. Work is beginning on an environmental street design handbook to guide transportation improvements in sensitive areas. The handbook will be completed in FY 2002.

Regional Transportation and Information: A multi-modal transportation “annual report” will be prepared detailing key RTP policies and strategies. It will list information and data commonly requested by the public and media, including supporting text and graphics. The report will include a user-friendly public-release version and a technical appendix. This objective will be completed in coordination with the 2040 Performance Measures project.

Public Involvement: Metro will continue to provide an ongoing presence with local citizen, civic and business groups interested in the RTP, as well as public agencies involved in local plan updates. The work site will be continually upgraded and expanded to include emphasis on 2000 RTP implementation as well as an online public forum for transportation and other planning issues.
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Publish a final 2000 Regional Transportation Plan with corresponding “citizen’s handbook” version for regional distribution, pending acknowledgement by LCDC (August 2001);
- Complete and publish the RTP Technical Appendix for regional distribution (August 2001);
- Complete follow-up studies on street design and connectivity (June 2002);
- Create and publish a series of local transportation tools based upon the updated RTP (February 2001);
- Expand the web presence of the RTP to include a public forum and implementation tools (September 2001);
- Coordinate and provide technical assistance in local transportation system plan development and adoption (February 2001);
- Continue to coordinate regional corridor refinement plans identified in the RTP with ODOT’s corridor planning program;
- Maintain and update the RTP database consistent with changes in the population and employment forecasts, travel-demand projections for people and goods, cost and revenue estimates and amendments to local comprehensive plans. Produce a corresponding “annual report” highlighting key information and trends; and
- Participate with local governments involved in implementation of the updated RTP and development of local transportation system plans.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $ 245,999</td>
<td>$ 163,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$ 29,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>$ 96,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>$ 25,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $ 397,780</td>
<td>TOTAL $ 397,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Full-Time FTE</th>
<th>3.215</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONGESTION RELIEF PROGRAM

PROGRAM

The adopted 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identifies hundreds of needed transportation improvements throughout the region, including numerous capacity improvements and system management projects aimed at relieving congestion in chronic traffic "hot spots". The 2000 RTP is also a largely unfunded plan, which means that congestion relief projects may not otherwise proceed in a timely manner. The Congestion Relief Program seeks to identify the most acute traffic "hot spots" in the region and propose a short-term action plan for relieving congestion in these areas.

Relation to Previous Work

A major update to the RTP was completed in FY 2000-01. An air-quality conformity determination was made on January 26, 2001. The purpose of the update was twofold: First, it had to meet requirements set forth in the State Transportation Planning Rule and federal planning regulations. Among other provisions, the rule seeks to reduce reliance upon the automobile and promote use of alternative modes of transportation. Second, revisions must reflect the ongoing Region 2040 planning effort and serve as the transportation element of the Regional Framework Plan. Together, these state and regional policy initiatives are expected to go far in slowing the growth in travel demand and congestion in the region.

A new congestion policy in the 2000 RTP recognizes that different congestion measures should be applied in different areas. In the updated plan, the peak-hour congestion standard is relaxed in densely developed areas with high quality transit, for example, since these areas are less dependent upon motor vehicles as a means of travel. The standard is higher in major statewide “through-traffic” corridors and key freight connections. These corridors are identified in both the adopted RTP as well as the region’s Congestion Management System (CMS).

The remaining congestion relief projects in the 2000 RTP were developed subject to the congestion management system provisions in the plan. These provisions require jurisdictions to consider other solutions, such as alternative mode improvements, before making capacity improvements to address congestion. These provisions resulted in a combination of capacity projects and alternative mode improvements in cases where alternative mode projects were not sufficient to meet projected travel need.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Congestion Relief Background: A summary will be prepared of 2000 RTP policies, technical findings and projects for use in the Congestion Relief Program. ODOT Region 1 will be asked to prepare a summary of Oregon Highway Plan requirements that govern local congestion policies and project development.

Inventory of Congestion Hot Spots: Staff will closely work with TPAC, ODOT, the Port of Portland and local governments to develop an inventory of known congestion hot spots. This element will be conducted in concert with the data inventory requirements of the Congestion Management System.

Ranking of Congestion Hot Spots: Metro will work with TPAC and ODOT as well as local and bi-state governments to develop ranking criteria for evaluating the relative magnitude of known congestion hot spots, including measures addressing safety, system mobility and relative accessibility. These criteria will be used to develop a ranked list of congestion relief projects, incorporating existing multi-modal (transit, bike, pedestrian, ITS and motor vehicle) RTP projects and others identified through this effort.
CONGESTION RELIEF PROGRAM

Congestion Action Plan: Working with JPACT and Council, develop an action plan for implementing the multi-modal congestion relief projects, including specific funding strategies for unfunded improvements.

Public Involvement: All activities require early, ongoing and responsive public involvement techniques, consistent with Metro public involvement policies. Newly-developed procedures to address environmental justice issues will be applied to this effort.

OBJECTIVE/TARGETS

- Prepare background summary of existing congestion relief projects as well as regional and state policies, technical findings and projects (October 2001);

- Prepare and map an inventory of congestion hot spots that affect the regional transportation system consistent with corridors and measures identified in the RTP and CMS (February 2002);

- Develop criteria for ranking congestion hot spots, and prepare a ranked list of proposed multi-modal congestion relief projects that improve the movement of people and goods for review by JPACT and Council (April 2002); and

- Develop a Congestion Action Plan through JPACT and Council incorporating both project needs and a financial strategy for completing the improvements in a timely manner (June 2002).

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 61,188</td>
<td>$ 59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>21,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,112</td>
<td>16,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 99,000</td>
<td>$ 99,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Full-Time FTE</th>
<th>.710</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIG STREETS PROGRAM

PROGRAM

The 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identifies an extensive need for transportation improvements across the region, including numerous capacity projects that would result in four to six travel lanes on the region’s arterial streets. The 2040 Growth Concept designated these major routes as corridors that will support increased development, with a compact mix of commercial and residential activities. The Big Streets project seeks to foster the orderly development of these corridors and to ensure that the region’s transportation and land-use objectives can be met in a mutually beneficial manner.

Relation to Previous Work

The purpose of updating the RTP was twofold: First, it had to meet requirements as set forth in the State Transportation Planning Rule. Among other provisions, the rule seeks to reduce reliance on the automobile and promote use of alternative modes of transportation. Second, revisions must reflect the ongoing Region 2040 planning effort and serve as the transportation element of the Regional Framework Plan. The combined effects of these policy initiatives are to place a new emphasis on joint land use and transportation planning activities, particularly along major streets.

The 1997 publication Creating Livable Streets was the first step in establishing a set of best practices for street improvements that complement the 2040 Plan. Another upcoming publication, Green Streets, will establish best environmental practices for the transportation system, and designs for major streets that mitigate stream impacts. Together, these documents provide important transportation tools needed to address the 2040 Plan. The Big Streets project will incorporate best practices from these previous works and develop new practices into a fully integrated set of land use and transportation solutions for major streets, with specific action plans for four pilot corridors.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Big Streets Handbook: Develop a set of guidelines for integrated land use and multi-modal (including freight) transportation plans as well as system management along major streets, addressing a broad range of mixed commercial and residential land uses with varied transportation improvements. These guidelines would be based on real-world locations within the Metro region and provide "what if" concepts of how both land use and transportation objectives can be met through careful design and implementation. Transportation strategies may include access management, street design, transit service and amenities, parking layout and local/internal street circulation. Land-use strategies may focus on building location, design and mix of uses.

Big Streets Pilot Projects: Develop four pilot corridor plans, with proposed land use and transportation components for each area. Pilot corridor plans would cover an area of roughly two to three miles in length. The plans would be developed in partnership with the local jurisdictions and the citizens and business communities in the corridors. Pilot areas would be segments of major street corridors where redevelopment of existing land uses is planned and where major street improvements are proposed in the 2000 RTP. The pilot projects would be developed in conjunction with local jurisdictions, technical support provided by Metro and a consultant and public-outreach activities sponsored by the local agency.

Big Streets Forum: The forum will be a public event serving as a first review of the Big Streets handbook and pilot project proposals. The forum will include members of the development community...
BIG STREETS PROGRAM

and local planning agencies as well as residents of successful major street communities. The forum will focus on design elements needed to make communities along these corridors successful. A summary CD and web information on the Big Streets forum will be prepared for future use by local jurisdictions, developers and interested citizens.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

1. Prepare and submit a TGM or other grant proposal to fund the following aspects of the Big Streets project through a consultant contract (Spring 2001):
   - Develop Big Streets site planning handbook and brochure (June 2003);
   - Develop concepts and analysis for a series of four Big Streets pilot corridors, in conjunction with local jurisdictions, Metro and the Technical Advisory Committee (June 2002);
   - Coordinate Big Streets forum and supporting visual and printed materials (September 2002);
   - Create Big Streets forum CD for use by local jurisdictions, developers and interested citizens (August 2002); and
   - Develop a Big Streets implementation strategy for pilot corridors (September 2003).

2. Recruit and chair a technical advisory committee to guide consultant work.
3. Promote and recruit attendees and host the Big Streets forum.
4. Publish the Big Streets handbook and brochure.
5. Reproduce and distribute the Big Streets CD.
6. Monitor the implementation of the pilot corridor plans.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services $53,892</td>
<td>PL $22,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services 36,300</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match 26,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant 200,000</td>
<td>Section 5303 9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant 50,000</td>
<td>Other (TGM) 271,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers 21,808</td>
<td>Metro 32,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $362,000</td>
<td>TOTAL $362,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.740</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

PROGRAM

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is responsible for: 1) multi-year identification of federal and state funds available for transportation system improvement purposes in the Portland urban area; 2) allocation of such funds to projects; 3) assuring compliance of transportation projects with federal and state air-quality requirements and 4) recording the expenditure of authorized project funds. These activities require special coordination with staff from ODOT and other regional, county and city agencies as well as management of significant public-involvement efforts.

Relation to Previous Work

The previous fiscal year saw significant migration of the TIP database to an Oracle software platform moving to more automated production of program updates as well as quarterly and annual reporting of project obligations and funding amendments. A paperless, e-mail driven MTIP amendment protocol was implemented within the region. The FY 2002-05 MTIP update process neared approval of allocations to projects. Documentation of CMAQ eligibility was completed and preliminary work began on a quantitative analysis of program conformity with the State Plan.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

MTIP/STIP Update Focus: The immediate focus of TIP Update-related activity at the start of fiscal year FY 2002 will be preparation of the 2001 Air Quality Conformity Determination (see Conformity topic, below). Metro staff will coordinate integration of the approved MTIP program with the FinalFY 2002-05 State TIP for approval in September/October 2001 by the Oregon Transportation Commission. In January 2002, coordination will begin with ODOT, the TIP Subcommittee as well as the public to initiate a new 21-month TIP update process. This update will culminate early in FY 2003 with adoption of the FY 2004-07 MTIP/STIP. Two elements of this next Update will occur in FY 2002.

First, in January, work will begin with ODOT to agree upon anticipated revenues. One major factor effecting the revenue projections will be federal progress on a new multi-year authorization bill to succeed TEA-21, which expires September 2003.

Second, as revenue projections are identified, staff will assess whether modification of project selection criteria is warranted. One issue that could effect the criteria is the apparent early success of regional corridors at attracting redevelopment, ahead of Regional Centers. If further monitoring suggests a trend, it may be appropriate to assess whether supporting transportation investments might be desirable beyond the current criteria. Congestion Management System monitoring may also suggest new arterial “hot spots” meriting targeted relief not now favored in the criteria. Adoption of new criteria would entail significant public involvement activity.

Amendment Focus: Requests to process both administrative and policy-based amendments of the TIP will be received at any time throughout FY 2002-03. Provisions of Metro Resolution No. 85-592 govern all TIP amendment activity. Administrative amendments can be staff-initiated and require only monthly notification to TPAC and quarterly notification to JPACT. They are limited to currently approved projects, or those that fall within previously defined program scopes. Policy amendments are processed only by Resolution and are needed to include significant new projects into the TIP. It is probable that several amendments will occur related to final allocation of FY 2004-05 revenue and reallocation of transit revenue due to the highly politicized FTA Discretionary transit grant programs. Virtually all TIP amendments require coordination with effected/requesting jurisdictions and ODOT Region 1 and Salem Headquarters staff. The region’s e-mail driven amendment process will continue to be refined to
expedite amendments and improve feedback to affected agencies. Federal review of the MTIP/STIP amendment process specifically noted need for enhanced public involvement. During this fiscal year, an interface will be crafted so that electronic amendment forms can be posted to Metro’s website, and completed amendments of the STIP can be viewed in a real-time and cumulative context.

Database Maintenance Focus: Provide ODOT and local jurisdictions essential funding information to better schedule project-implementation activities. Metro monitors past and current funding allocations and project schedules to manage cost overruns and underruns. Quarterly reports are produced documenting funding authorizations, obligations and reserves by funding category and jurisdiction. An annual report also will be prepared during October/November updating the TIP to reflect current costs, schedules, priorities, actual appropriations and other funding actions approved throughout the year. The annual report will address progress and/or delays in implementing major projects as mandated by ISTEA.

Federal review of the MTIP/STIP process also specifically noted desirability of developing broad agency and public electronic access to a common TIP database. Metro will continue to work with ODOT to implement this objective.

Updating the TIP hardware/software platform began in FY 1999. Development of specialized report formats, cross connection with ODOT data sources and other database refinements are expected to continue in the first half of FY 2002. Metro will continue working with ODOT Region 1 staff to fully implement the new electronic project amendment forms.

Conformity Focus: Preparation of the FY 2002-05 MTIP/STIP Air Quality Conformity Determination will occur almost wholly within FY 2002. The Determination is composed of both a quantitative and qualitative element. The Determination must account for projects programmed in the STIP and incorporates any new amendments that may be processed for the 2000 RTP Constrained 20-year network. Federal and State Conformity regulations mandate public involvement during adoption of the Determination.

Under adopted state regulations, Metro staff are responsible for coordinating inter-agency consultation. This is to determine the regional-conformity status of individual projects that may not be included in a conforming MTIP/STIP or whose concept and scope have significantly changed. Such consultation can be triggered at any time by project changes. Full public outreach, including notification, reports and a public hearing are required as part of the Conformity process.

OBJECTIVES

• Adopt a FY 2002-05 MTIP (leading to subsequent year publication of the Update);
• Submission of technically accurate Conformity-Determination addressing as many as two TIP amendment/updates; Prepare and distribute hard copy and electronic editions of quarterly reports in July, January and May and an annual summary in November, including an annual list of projects obligated the prior year;
• Linkage of MTIP and STIP authority and obligation databases;
• New amendment protocols to ensure timely, efficient processing of all requested TIP amendments;
• Preparation and distribution of TIP document and outreach materials; and
• Sponsorship of (and participation in) allied public-involvement initiatives mandated by federal, state and Metro policies and regulations.
## Budget Summary

### Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$159,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>$56,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>$29,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$252,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>$63,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td>$84,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5303</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
<td>$39,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>$15,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$28,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$252,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Type</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>1.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.835</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RTP FINANCING

PROGRAM

Metro, through JPACT and MPAC, provides a forum for cooperative development of funding programs to implement the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Framework Plan. In order to fund the Priority System of the RTP, new or expanded revenue sources will need to be pursued.

Relation to Previous Work

In FY 2001, the business community took the lead in regional discussions on transportation finance. This program is intended to provide Metro staff support to transportation finance efforts in FY 2002 that are oriented towards implementing key elements of the Priority System of the RTP. Lead for any particular funding proposal could be a local government, Tri-Met, the Oregon Legislature, Congress, the business community or other public interests, or Metro itself.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Working with the project lead agency or interest group, Metro staff will support RTP-related finance efforts to:

- Establish an array of transportation finance options;
- Evaluate the options for feasibility and ability to address the finance shortfalls;
- Establish a plan to pursue promising transportation finance options; and
- Establish an outreach program to gain public input on key issues and strategies.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Develop regional priorities for funding through federal sources (June 2002);
- Coordinate with funding strategies for Tri-Met’s Transit Choices for Livability (on-going);
- Adopt a funding strategy for the “priority” element of the RTP (June 2002); and
- Work with local partners, the public and business community to set project priorities and seek funding alternatives/solutions at the federal, state, regional and local level (June 2002).

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 74,989</td>
<td>$ 43,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>STP/ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>17,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>Other (TGM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>416,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads &amp; Legal</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>41,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 519,750</td>
<td>$ 519,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Green Streets Program

Program

The Green Streets project began in FY 2000-01 and has a number of elements that address this growing conflict between good transportation design, planned urbanization in urban reserves and the need to protect streams and wildlife corridors from urban impacts. Key elements of the project include:

- Expanding the regional database to include an inventory of culverts that channel stormwater from streets to the stream system;
- New regional street connectivity provisions that address the tradeoffs between stream protection and an efficient, connected street system; and
- A best practices guidebook that establishes acceptable design solutions for conflicts between major street or connectivity needs and stream protection.

Relation to Previous Work

The Green Streets project builds upon the 1996-97 Regional Street Design project and complements the current update to the Regional Transportation Plan (see RTP Program Description). Like the "Creating Livable Streets" handbook, the products from the Green Streets project will be used to develop future transportation improvements in the region that support the 2040 Growth Concept and the Oregon Salmon Recovery Plan.

During FY 2001-02, the focus will be on implementing recommendations from the project, including final production of the Green Streets handbook and consideration of adoption of new connectivity requirements in the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan.

Responsibilities

The proposed Green Streets project has a number of objectives to:

- Build on the regional database, which already includes a detailed inventory of stream and wildlife resources. The Green Streets project will complete a needed inventory of culverts and other runoff catchments that channel stormwater from streets to the stream system;
- Propose new street connectivity provisions for adoption into regional and local plans that address tradeoffs between stream protection and an efficient, multi-modal transportation system;
- Develop a Green Streets handbook that builds upon the recently completed Creating Livable Streets handbook. The handbook would provide acceptable design guidelines for situations where major street corridors or connectivity requirement conflict with protecting or restoring streams or wildlife corridors. The handbook may also be proposed (subject to Metro Council and JPACT action) as a threshold requirement for projects nominated for regional funding, as the Creating Livable Streets guidelines are now; and
- Complete a demonstration project that tests proposed connectivity and environmental design proposals as part of the Pleasant Valley-Damascus future street plan. This element of the project would result in a future street plan for this urban reserve area that would address both future travel needs and stream protection. The future street plan would be incorporated into affected comprehensive plans in Portland, Gresham, Happy Valley, Multnomah County and Clackamas County, as well as the Regional Transportation Plan.
GREEN STREETS PROGRAM

During FY 2001-02, the remaining responsibilities will include final production of the Green Streets handbook and adoption of new connectivity requirements and culvert retrofit improvements in the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Complete a final version of the Green Streets handbook for distribution to local officials and interested citizens; concurrently publish an online version on Metro's web site, downloadable as a PDF file (December 2001);
- Work with TPAC to refine recommendations for street connectivity along stream corridors, and forward final recommendations for amendments to Chapter 6 of the 2000 RTP to JPACT, MPAC and the Council (December 2001); and
- Work with TPAC and WRPAC to develop a final draft action plan for culvert retrofits and forward final recommendations as amendments to the 2000 RTP to JPACT, MPAC and the Council (September 2001).

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Resources:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 27,335</td>
<td>$ 35,102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $ 44,000  TOTAL $ 44,000

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.320

TOTAL .320
PROGRAM

The State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), the Transportation Equity Act of 1998 (TEA-21), Title 6 of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) and the Regional Transportation Plan outline areas of local transportation planning cooperation, coordination, consistency and compliance. This program ensures that Metro transportation policy objectives are considered in local implementation of the Region 2040 Growth Concept and the Regional Transportation Plan. The program also provides for Metro staff participation in state and local transportation planning and project development activities.

Metro is responsible for the ongoing review, comment and coordination of local and regional plans, projects and studies conducted by other agencies for their consistency with regional transportation policies as primarily identified in the RTP and the UGMFP. Metro's review authority is specifically identified in the Transportation Planning Rule. Under TEA-21, inter-agency coordination is also required with transit agencies, Port authorities, State departments of transportation and air-quality agencies.

The Local Project Coordination (LPC) Program provides for Metro's ongoing involvement in the following activity areas:

- Local and State corridor and sub-area plans;
- Local and State policy and project development;
- Compliance with state and federal planning requirements;
- General coordination with ODOT, Tri-Met, DEQ and the Port of Portland; and
- Shared responsibility with the RTC of Southwest Washington for coordinating the review of actions of bi-state significance amongst the transit agencies, ports, DOTs and jurisdictions in the Portland/Vancouver area.

The Local Project Coordination program compliments the Local Implementation Program that focuses on local government efforts to implement the policies and objectives of the RTP in their local transportation system plans.

Relation to Previous Work

Metro's involvement in these activities is ongoing from previous fiscal years. However, this work area directly relates to the completion of the 2000 RTP, as it provides the basis for review of local planning activities that affect the regional transportation system. The policy, performance and system objectives contained in the RTP direct staff review of local and state implementation activities.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The Local Project Coordination program is responsible for involvement and assistance in planning and project development activities where regional policy and system objectives are affected. Typically, Metro Transportation Planning staff will be involved in a number of project oversight or review committees at any one time. In the past, these have included committees on projects such as the I-5/Kruse Way/217 Interchange, the Newberg/Dundee Bypass, St. John's Truck Study, the Columbia Corridor Transportation Study, the PDX Transportation Study and PDX Master Plan, the SW 170th Project, West Hayden Island and numerous Regional Center and Town Center studies. These studies may or may not conclude with amendments to Metro Planning documents such as the RTP.
The LPC program also is responsible for Metro involvement in policy coordination with each of the four Metro area counties: Washington, Multnomah, Clackamas and Clark (WA). Each has a policy body consisting of local jurisdictions and transportation providers. The policy bodies will often take action on items of regional significance that will be discussed by JPACT and the Metro Council. Similarly, each policy body has a technical committee, on which Transportation Planning staff have been, and will be, represented.

One key area of policy coordination is in the bi-state area. Metro, along with RTC of Southwest Washington, established a Bi-State Transportation Committee as a subcommittee of JPACT and RTC in 1999. This Committee meets regularly to review issues of bi-state significance and to forward recommendations or transportation issues to JPACT and RTC. Staff from each of the 13 agencies and jurisdictions represented on the Committee meet in advance of the Committee meeting to prepare agenda materials. For each activity, Metro staff will attend all technical meetings, review and comment on materials and represent Metro policy positions at numerous citizen, project management, or steering committees. In the case of major studies, Metro staff is responsible for preparation of reports and adopting resolutions for review by JPACT and the Metro Council.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

The LPC Program is generally subject to the timetables of local jurisdictions or agencies. Therefore, Metro's products will be focused on participation and timeliness of review. However, it is expected that major work activities will center on jurisdictional policy coordination through county, agency and city coordinating processes and technical review through participation on project technical committees. Significant effort is anticipated for urban reserve planning, Bi-State coordination, project development and study oversight.

For all activities involved in this program, Metro will:

- Participate in those activities having regional transportation planning, programming, or project development significance;
- Attend all meetings, hearings, workshops and forums to the degree necessary and practicable;
- Provide timely review and comment of all draft materials;
- Offer expertise to the extent practicable and necessary;
- Coordinate and assist agencies and local jurisdictions on matters requiring JPACT/Metro Council action or review;
- These activities will be performed on-going, as-needed with targets determined by each project.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>PL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$69,626</td>
<td>$11,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials &amp; Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>STP/ODOT Match</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>64,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interfund Transfers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 5303</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,374</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>ODOT Support Funds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$98,000</td>
<td>8,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Metro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROGRAM

The program guides implementation of the pedestrian and bicycle mode policies in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), as well as implementation of the regional transportation demand management (TDM) and regional parking policies in the RTP. The focus of the program is implementation of requirements set forth in the State Transportation Planning Rule. Among other provisions, the rule seeks to reduce reliance on the automobile and promote the use of alternative modes of transportation. Metro is the lead agency for coordinating, implementing and monitoring of pedestrian and bicycle-related policies incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan. Those policies are oriented in helping to build livable communities in 2040 centers and main streets.

Services, products and activities provided by the Alternative Mode Implementation Program relate to both the Regional Transportation Plan Implementation Program and the Local Project Coordination Program. Target groups served or affected by the program include local cities and counties, state and regional agencies as well as the public at-large. This program relates to Metro's mission and value statement by ensuring that people have the ability to get around the region while using a variety of transportation choices.

Relation to Previous Work

FY 2000-01 was the second year for the Alternative Mode Implementation Program. The program finalized bicycle and pedestrian components of the RTP, including key bicycle and pedestrian projects; provided expertise to corridor studies; ranked and prioritized bicycle and pedestrian projects in the MTIP process; provided public outreach and education and provided project-development activities related to street design. Metro chairs the TDM Subcommittee of TPAC and works with Tri-Met, DEQ, local jurisdictions and private employers to plan, fund and implement TDM strategies.

RESPONSIBILITIES

• Provide a leadership role in assisting local jurisdictions with local pedestrian and bicycle system planning related to city and county transportation system plan (TSP) updates and implementation;
• Develop a regionally-based pedestrian, bicycle and traffic safety/education program;
• Periodically revise and update the Bike There! Map;
• Provide assistance to local efforts to improve pedestrian access to transit;
• Staff the TPAC sub-committee on Transportation Demand Management (TDM);
• Coordinate with state-wide transportation demand management efforts;
• Participation (in-kind sponsorship) in annual Bridge Pedal and Bike Month events;
• Coordinate with local jurisdictions and agencies in gathering bicycle and pedestrian data; and
• Coordinate with Tri-Met staff on the Access to Work FTA Grant Steering Committee and Bikes on Light Rail Committee.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

Provide pedestrian and bicycle facility planning and design expertise in the following areas:

• Coordination with the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department to plan and implement multi-use trails;
• Coordination with regional studies such as the Interstate Max, South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study, I-5 North and Hwy. 217 Corridor Studies;

FY 2001-02 Unified Work Program
• Pedestrian and bicycle access to station areas and park-and-rides, bicycle parking at station areas and park-and-rides and coordination with the Bicycles on Tri-Met Program;
• Plan and implement a “bicycle station” at an LRT station as a pilot project (June 2002);
• Coordinate bicycle and pedestrian design workshops on AASHTO and regional street design guidelines and RTP policies (December 2001);
• Work with local jurisdictions and agencies to implement alternative mode implementation programs and projects in four regional centers in the metropolitan area (June 2002);
• Update the region-wide pedestrian system inventory (September 2001);
• Complete development of a bicycle network travel demand model (June 2002);
• Develop interactive bike route mapping on Metro’s web site (June 2002);
• Initiate a shopping by bicycle pilot project (January 2002);
• Staff and chair an Alternative Modes Implementation Subcommittee of TPAC;
• Produce an annual report on Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) projects (November 2001);
• Update Bike There! map for reprint (September 2001).

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 49,450</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>31,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>16,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ 72,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 72,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

| Regular Full-Time FTE        | .605                             |
| TOTAL                        | .605                             |
REGIONAL FREIGHT PROGRAM

PROGRAM

The Regional Freight Program will help Metro meet its responsibility to plan for goods movement needs, document freight project priorities and support livability in the region. The program supports Metro's ability to coordinate with ODOT, the Port of Portland, the private sector, FHWA, local jurisdictions and other agencies on freight mobility research and policy development, identify freight project priorities and lead outreach activities that support freight mobility.

The Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations to meet seven planning factors which include planning for people and freight and to support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and equity. The 2040 Growth Concept identifies the importance of industrial activity to the region by establishing special industrial districts as a priority land use. The Regional Framework Plan (RFP) and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identify policies to ensure the efficient movement of freight to these industrial districts. The Regional Transportation Plan further identifies project priorities to support the movement of goods in the region.

The Regional Freight Program is one component of a series of transportation activities that address economic aspects of goods movement. The RTP Business Partnership, RTP Implementation and Corridor Initiatives are complementary to the Regional Freight Program and also address economic and freight needs.

Relation to Previous Work

Over the past several years, Metro, working in partnership with the Port of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation, made a significant contribution to the understanding and communicating goods movement needs by documenting regional freight mobility issues and involving the private sector in that discussion. This Regional Freight Program builds upon previous Metro, Port of Portland, ODOT and other freight program efforts which involved development of:

- The regional truck forecasting model;
- Commodity Flow Study;
- National Highway System Intermodal Connectors Report for FHWA;
- Metro area Shipper and Carrier Interviews;
- Freight policies for the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan;
- Publication of a regional brochure on freight needs in the region.

Previous work also includes coordination with other freight-related efforts in the region such as: Regional Industrial Lands Study; City of Portland's St John's Truck Study; Portland State University's Regional Connections Study and the I-5 Trade Corridor Study.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Maintain the involvement of private sector business representatives in identifying and assessing freight mobility issues;
- Identify freight mobility bottlenecks and advance project priorities to respond to freight mobility needs;
- Update and refine the commodity flow forecasts to provide best available information for use in the truck travel demand forecasts and for assessing the relative growth sectors of the economy;
REGIONAL FREIGHT PROGRAM

• Work with local jurisdiction and agency representatives to ensure that the regional freight needs are reflected in local plans, programs and project development;
• Coordinate with the Federal Highway Administration as new freight programs and policies emerge and represent our regional freight interest;
• Coordinate with freight planning activities within Oregon to ensure consistency between state and regional planning through the Freight Data Group and other forums;
• Coordinate with freight research and planning activities in adjacent states to efficiently utilize research efforts; and
• Coordinate with other Metro planning activities, including RTP Implementation, MTIP private evaluation, RTP Business Partnerships, Congestion Relief and Corridor Initiatives.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

• Throughout the year, distribute 2000 copies of the Regional Freight Brochure to key business and industry stakeholders;
• Complete technical report on sub-regional truck and commodity flow patterns to assist local plan development and corridor project planning, including the corridor initiatives and the congestion relief program (December 2001);
• Identify key stakeholders for periodic meetings to focus on key freight transportation needs, issues, policies and plans in coordination with the RTP business partners (June 2002); and
• Identify freight research areas and opportunities for collaboration at the state, northwest region and federal level (June 2002).

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 31,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 30,130</td>
<td>$ 31,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This work program is designed to facilitate completion of additional analysis for Corridors called out in Chapter 6 of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In these corridors, a transportation need has been identified but additional work is needed before a specific project can be developed. In FY 2002, this work program will focus on undertaking an Alternatives Analysis for a priority corridor that was identified in FY 2001. The outcome of this work program is intended to be a set of feasible alternatives for consideration by JPACT and the Metro Council.

Relation to Previous Work

As provided by the State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), Chapter 6 of the RTP calls for completion of sixteen specific corridor refinements and studies. These corridors require further analysis before a specific project can be developed. The TPR requires prompt completion of corridor refinements and studies as part of a TSP.

In FY 2001, the Corridor Initiatives Program established the region's approach to completion of those refinements and studies. It prioritized completion of the corridor studies, identified the resources necessary to complete them and established guidelines for addressing a number of common scope and technical issues. The FY 2001 work program also allowed for background analysis and obtaining agreement from resource agencies and jurisdictions on the purpose and need for improvements in the selected priority corridor.

RESPONSIBILITIES

For the selected corridor, the study process will:

- Develop a consensus on objectives for improvements in the corridor that address relevant areas for goods and people;
- Establish a public-participation program consistent with Metro's Public Involvement Policies;
- Define and evaluate a reasonable range of transportation alternatives that, given existing and potential funding plans for the corridor, address the identified need and are consistent with regional and local plans as well as the region's adopted Congestion Management System; and
- Coordinate with other affected jurisdictions and agencies in technical analysis and public outreach.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Review/create background documents (October 2001);
- Establish review committees and roles in study process (December 2001);
- Hold scoping/goal setting meetings (February 2002);
- Develop evaluation criteria and methodology (April 2002);
- Identify an initial series of alternatives (June 2002);
- Refine a group of improvement scenarios which will be evaluated for travel demand forecasting, conceptual engineering, operating and capital cost estimation, reconnaissance level environmental review and preparation of financing and phasing plans;
- Provide a strategy to address Environmental Justice issues within the corridor; and
- Provide opportunities for public participation at key study milestones that are consistent with Metro's Public Involvement procedures.
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## Budget Summary

### Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$312,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>17,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads &amp; Legal</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print 1ng</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>122,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>15,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfer</td>
<td>115,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$848,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>$312,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td>100,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (TGM)</td>
<td>395,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>39,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$848,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full-Time Equivalent Staffing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Type</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>3.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.965</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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RTP BUSINESS PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

PROGRAM
Resolution No. 00-2969B adopting the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan provided for additional work with the region's business community. Specifically, the resolution stated: "That Metro will undertake additional analysis of the region’s transportation problems and solutions with various regional business coalitions in the metropolitan area and that JPACT, MPAC and the Metro Council consider resulting modifications or refinements to the RTP within one year of this additional effort."

This work program completes a series of activities designed to engage the business community in the Regional Transportation Planning process, to establish partnerships and to develop agreement upon a 3-5 year Action Plan for implementation.

Relation to Previous Work
This work program completes work begun in FY 2001 that engaged the business community in the regional transportation planning process. Outreach activities identifying the key transportation problems confronting businesses throughout the region were conducted. Based upon that outreach, the business advisory committee prioritized projects and recommended studies, policies and processes for inclusion in the regional transportation planning process.

RESPONSIBILITIES
• Increase awareness on the part of public agencies of transportation needs and priorities of businesses in the metropolitan area;
• Coordinate activities with the Transportation Summit and other related efforts;
• Develop a common understanding regarding economic transportation and land-use planning concepts and principles;
• Establish a process for involving the regional business community in regional transportation planning decisions for the movement of both people and goods; and
• Create joint business/government ownership of transportation problems and a partnership to develop a more efficient and effective transportation system.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS
• Based upon prior outreach and analysis, finalize agreement with the business advisory committee on a short list of projects and processes to address key concerns to be included in the RTP, as necessary;
• Through workshops or other public involvement techniques, establish agreement with the business community on a short-term (approximately 3-5 year) Action Plan, including specific processes, policies and projects with deadlines to implement identified priorities. Medium-term goals may be developed as well. This Action Plan may include specific transportation finance strategies identified by the Transportation Summit;
• Obtain TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council approval of the recommended Action Plan (June 2002); and
• Produce and distribute final brochure or other outreach materials to highlight Action Plan (March 2002).
# RTP BUSINESS PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

## Budget Summary

### Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$47,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>$2,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>$27,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interfund Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td>$41,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5303</td>
<td>$26,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
<td>$11,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$6,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM

The I-5 Corridor is critical to the metropolitan economy and to national and international trade. Traffic congestion on I-5 affects goods moved by air, rail, barge, pipeline and truck as well as passenger travel. Within the Portland/Vancouver region, I-5 has a number of bottlenecks. The most significant is between I-205 in Vancouver, Washington and I-84 in Portland. Also in this corridor across the Columbia River is one of the last and most active remaining drawbridges on the interstate system. Because of the importance in the region of community livability, the environment and national and international trade, plans must address a broad range of issues and include numerous stakeholders and the public. ODOT and WSDOT are co-leading the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership in cooperation with Metro, RTC and other jurisdictions and agencies.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) recognized the importance of trade corridors to the national economy and designated I-5 within the Portland/Vancouver region as a Priority Corridor under the National Trade Corridors and Borders Program. ODOT and WSDOT have successfully applied for funding through the National Corridors and Borders Program for the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership.

Relation to Previous Work

In FY 2001, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership, previously known as the I-5 Trade Corridor Study, broadened the discussion of the problems and solutions in the Corridor to include the corridor business and residential community and broader regional interests. The Study established a forum for public participation and the two Governor’s appointed a task force of elected officials, civic and business leaders to evaluate the range of options and develop recommendations.

RESPONSIBILITIES

In FY 2002, the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership will evaluate the range of possible rail, transit, highway and arterial projects that improve the flow of goods across the Columbia River and support the region’s land use goals. The Partnership will also identify reasonable demand management policies to reduce the need for additional capacity. The Partnership will continue to work with the public, business community, jurisdictions and agencies on both sides of the Columbia River to develop a corridor plan that supports the community’s vision for the area. A funding and phasing strategy for the plan will be developed, including working with state and congressional delegations to identify possible funding sources.

Activities will include:

- Briefing of the Bi-State Transportation Committee, JPACT, Metro Council and other elected officials and agencies on options for the plan elements;
- Participation in the various management, technical or outreach committees;
- Completing an assessment of the land-use impacts; and
- Conducting the travel demand modeling and analysis for the various options.

I-5 Corridor improvements would affect travel patterns and land use in both the Metro and Clark County areas. This will affect the public at large, the shipping and carrier industries at large, the Ports of Portland and Vancouver, access to intermodal facilities and industrial area in North Portland and in Clark County and neighborhoods in both North Portland and Clark County.
OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

Metro staff will participate with other agency staff, the public and elected officials to work together as one region to:

- Identify priorities for federal funding requests for the Corridor that have regional and bi-state support;
- Identify the rail, transit, highway and arterial projects for consideration as part of the I-5 Corridor plan and analyze their feasibility and extent to which they support land use goals;
- Identify public support for projects, policies and programs in the Corridor;
- Identify policies and programs that lead to reducing travel demand in the corridor;
- Identify level of support from private sector, including the railroads, for the plan;
- Identify a financing strategy and phasing plan; and
- Seek approval of the corridor plan.

Specific tasks Metro will accomplish include:

- Complete travel forecasts for I-5 scenarios and summarize in technical report (November 2001);
- Complete assessment of regional land-use impacts with (and without) I-5 investments, and develop Task Force Report (December 2001); and
- Provide Metro Council, JPACT oversight of the various technical recommendations reports for the Study (January 2002).

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 151,191</td>
<td>$ 38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services – IGA</td>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264,614</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>ODOT Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,151</td>
<td>197,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,158</td>
<td>264,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 517,114</td>
<td>$ 517,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

| Regular Full-Time FTE         | 1.660                     |
| TOTAL                         | 1.660                     |
Metro's Transportation Planning Public Involvement Procedures (adopted July 1995) calls for "the removal of barriers to public participation to those traditionally under-served in the planning process." Since 1995, Metro's transportation staff has made a concerted effort to broaden public outreach to include as many people as possible. Through various planning projects (e.g.; RTP Update, Traffic Relief Options, MTIP/STIP, etc.) outreach has expanded to include additional public meetings and workshops; use of surveys and questionnaires, newsletters and other mailings, focus groups and stakeholder meetings; speaker's bureaus; the mobile transportation outreach bus (MILT) and an expanded web site. The result of these efforts has been a significant increase in the numbers and the diversity in public participation.

Despite these efforts, the vast majority of the public continues to be absent from the public discussion on transportation and growth management issues. The OPB Pilot Program will broaden considerably regional discussion on transportation. Through use of public television, a one-hour program is proposed that will discuss key transportation and related growth management and environmental issues facing the Portland metropolitan area. The program will be linked to other media and to community outreach activities. Project partners include local governments and transportation agencies as well as Oregon Public Broadcasting (OPB). If successful, OPB and the project partners hope to inspire ideas and funding for five years of television programming on current issues facing Oregon communities, including others related to transportation. FY 2002 activity will complete a second phase of the project, produce the one-hour program. This represents carryover from FY 2001:

Relation to Previous Work

The OPB Pilot Project relates to the development of Metro's Procedures for Public Involvement and previous outreach activities. The pilot will facilitate discussion and understanding of transportation and related land-use and environmental issues. The project was funded through Metro's Priorities 2000 process, and $100,000 of STP funds was approved for use as part of the pilot program. The request was approved in July 1999 by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council and was adopted into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) in September 1999.

The project name was changed to "Community Media Project" to better reflect the project goals, particularly the goal of developing television programming that is effectively linked to other media, including print, radio and the Internet. An advisory committee representing the project partners was formed to provide review and input during the research and development (first) phase of the project. A request for proposals was developed and a consultant team was hired to conduct research on successful models for public affairs programs that are linked to other media and community outreach activities.

In addition to looking at programming models, the research included interviews with key stakeholders and community leaders, a focus group with filmmakers and artists and two focus groups with randomly selected citizens. Information was compiled about community outreach efforts and successful community building projects that have been undertaken by Metro and the study partners with regard to growth and development, transportation and the environment. An Oregon television audience profile was compiled utilizing existing data. The research phase was completed and the consultant team recommended a model for the pilot program and future programming as well as a process for selecting a filmmaker to produce the pilot program.
COMMUNITY MEDIA PROJECT (OPB)

RESPONSIBILITIES

The work program is focused on developing the pilot program and involves the actual production, airing, distribution and follow-up for the pilot.

- The objective is to produce an up to one-hour program about key transportation and related land-use and environmental issues affecting the Portland metropolitan area;
- The program objective is to generate an informed discussion of issues. The program is not intended to push messages, just issues;
- In airing the program, OPB hopes to generate a significant rating so that additional revenues can be raised, particularly from the private or non-profit sectors in order produce other community (state of Oregon) based programming. Future programs could then address other growth, transportation and community issues;
- Project partners hope to coordinate and work with other media, including print, commercial and public radio, commercial television and the Internet to promote the pilot program and its subject matter; and
- OPB and the project partners hope to have widespread distribution of the program or program segments beyond the OPB telecast. For example, the video could be placed in libraries and schools, or segments could be shown to specific interest groups.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

The following objectives will be completed in FY's 2002. The work is carryover from FY 2001 and represents second-phase activities:

- Contract or contracts for services related to development of the pilot program (October 2001);
- Final edited version of pilot program (October 2002);
- Up to 200 copies for distribution (October 2002); and
- Report evaluating the success of the program (December 2002).

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$ 5,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>2,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 68,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Full-Time FTE</th>
<th>.050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>.050</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Transportation Model Improvement Program is a large national program initiated for the purpose of developing a new transportation-modeling paradigm in response to policy issues in ISTEA. It is intended to accurately evaluate air-quality impacts of proposed actions. It will depict travel demand response to transportation infrastructure changes and travel demand management actions (i.e., road pricing, parking supply actions, fuel price changes and employer travel-reduction programs). This is a multi-year program with wide-scale application targeted for the year 2002.

As part of USDOT's TMIP program, the Los Alamos National Laboratory is developing a new model framework known as TRANSIMS (TRANsportation SIMulationS). The first demonstration of interim operating capability was in Dallas. The dynamic ("real time") assignment algorithms were showcased in that application. The second demonstration is in the Portland metropolitan area. The trip-planning capabilities are being developed in this demonstration.

Relation to Previous Work

During the past several years, Metro has engaged in a major data collection and analysis effort to provide information to the Los Alamos National Laboratory team. Major work areas include:

Data Acquisition: An "all streets" network was created for project use. The network is very detailed and includes all facilities in the region, including local streets. A significant amount of data was collected for the system, including capacity estimates; traffic control devices; signal locations and timing plans; turning lane locations and the length of each; parking provisions (on and off street) and transit-system specifications (stops, headways, etc.). In addition, operating speed measurements have been taken. Count data (vehicular and transit patronage) have been assembled in a GIS database for use in the model validation.

Model Improvement and Data Manipulation: To improve spatial acuity, zonal data (households, employment, parking costs, etc.) have been disaggregated and correlated with roadway link records. This provides a more precise location indicator and serves as an intermediate step before future increases in acuity are potentially implemented. These data are being used to estimate a second-generation activity scheduler and travel model. (The original prototype was developed in concert with the Traffic Relief Option study). The resulting model will be used to complement the suite of modules being prepared by the Los Alamos team.

Model Implementation: As the USDOT and Los Alamos Laboratory work toward the completion and implementation of the software, Metro staff are participating on committees and special teams that serve to advise the project coordinators.

RESPONSIBILITIES

During FY 2002, work will continue with model implementation. The intent of the USDOT is to deploy the TRANSIMS software to multiple sites over the next several years. In the first half of FY 2002, Portland will be the first installation site for the commercial version. Other sites will follow. To that end, a commercialization vendor has been selected to prepare a user interface and to assist in the deployment. Metro staff will work with all affiliated parties to facilitate the transition of the software to the marketplace. The principal task will be to install the new software for Metro use, on either the vendor's hardware (or on hardware purchased for Metro's use) to implement a model for the Portland
area, including calibration and validation and to carry out a forecast for the region using this new software. An analysis of this implementation along with a comparison to the existing models will be required. Other work areas will include service on coordination teams, assistance to Los Alamos in the validation of the simulation software and interaction with the commercialization vendor to produce a viable hardware and software interface design. The vendor may choose to add new capabilities to the software. If so, Metro staff will assist in the field-testing of the features.

OBJECTIVESS/TARGETS

- Continue to serve on TRANSIMS coordination teams;
- Assist Los Alamos National Laboratory in the validation of the simulation software;
- Interact with the commercialization vendor to produce a viable hardware and software interface design. If necessary, assist in field testing of new features;
- Implement application of this model for the Portland area; carry out a future-year forecast to demonstrate the implementation; and
- Document the model performance, including a comparison with current techniques.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>TMIP – Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 322,981</td>
<td>$ 385,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,748</td>
<td>96,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122,803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ 482,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 482,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MODEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

PROGRAM

The Model Development Program defines work elements that are necessary to keep the travel demand model responsive to the issues that emerge during transportation analysis. Model maintenance activities ensure that the model reflects the current infrastructure assumptions and is operating in a computationally efficient manner. Research work elements lead to development of new models with enhanced capabilities.

The program is very important because results from travel demand models are used extensively in analysis of transportation policy and investment. In addition, federal and state legislation (Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, Clean Air Act Amendment, Oregon Transportation Planning Rule) specify data needs that require a high degree of modeling proficiency.

Relation to Previous Work

Prior year's documents contained a program entitled New Models/Model Refinement. The Model Development Program replaces that element in FY 2002. The work elements are comparable between the two.

The tasks identified in this program are ongoing. In terms of model maintenance, recent accomplishments include the addition of more zone detail and a recalculation of network capacities based upon newly acquired signal-timing data. New model work has focused on development of an activity model prototype (further advancement is now being funded by the TMIP Program), creation of an improved trip based model and development of software to assist in freight analysis.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The program relates to the following areas: research, maintenance of the person demand models, maintenance of the freight models, model syntax improvements, maintenance of the simulation networks, maintenance of the user manuals, involvement with committees and conferences and participation on the Oregon Modeling Steering Committee. Each is discussed below in more detail:

Research activities will focus on the preliminary planning steps associated with the deployment of a Willamette Valley panel survey. The last survey was conducted in 1994. In order for a potential survey to take place several years from now, discussions are needed to address multi-agency coordination, funding, methodology and transport issues (e.g., the effect of e-commerce and telecommuting on personal travel).

Attention also will be given to improving the measurement of two variables used in the travel demand model. Mixed-use development sites exhibit different trip making characteristics from the region as a whole. While model variables have been defined to capture the effects of mixed-use, other specifications have emerged that should be tested. Similarly, model estimations will be run to estimate the effectiveness of an improved variable to measure bicycle accessibility. The RTP emphasizes the importance of non-vehicular modes for travel. Hence, it is important that the model specification for that variable be improved.

In FY 2001, improvements were made to the trip-based and activity-based person models. The two models will be updated to a more current base year under the model maintenance work element. This effort requires the collection of data for multiple model variables. Similarly, the horizon year will be updated as well.
The Portland area commodity flow database is being updated in FY 2001-02. The project is partly funded through an intergovernmental agreement ($75,000) with the Port of Portland. That agency is serving as the lead for the project. The regional freight model will be modified to integrate with the new database.

Model syntax improvements are occasionally made to the code of the travel demand models. This is necessary in order to improve computational speed and efficiency.

The simulation networks are regularly reviewed to ensure their consistency with roadway conditions and assumptions. Transit networks are also updated to ensure their accuracy.

Routinely, user manuals are prepared describing the technical specifications of the demand model and the coding conventions of the simulation network. Updates are necessary to keep the documentation current.

The primary function of the Oregon Modeling Steering Committee is to coordinate the transportation modeling efforts of state, regional and local agencies. It also serves as a consensus forum and support group with the goal of improving the state-of-the-practice and promoting state-of-the-art transportation modeling. Metro staff are active participants on the Committee. The Committee will have an active role in ensuring an integrated implementation of the new statewide model with the MPO models.

All agencies and projects that require the use of travel demand forecasting services benefit from the Model Development Program. Current clients include Metro (e.g., South Corridor, the Regional Transportation Plan, the I-5 Trade Corridor Study), regional agencies (the Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met, the Department of Environmental Quality) and governments (the cities and counties in this region).

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

• Prepare for the next travel behavior survey to be fielded in FY 2002-03;
• Test new demand model variable specifications for mixed-use development patterns and bicycle accessibility;
• Integrate the freight model with the updated commodity database for Portland;
• Adapt model syntax to improve computational speed and efficiency;
• Maintain simulation networks;
• Maintain demand model and network coding user manuals;
• Participate on advisory panels and attend selected conferences and workshops;
• Participate on the Oregon Modeling Steering Committee; and
• Integrate Metroscope.
## Budget Summary

### Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$233,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services – IGA (P of P)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>26,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>88,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$388,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>$202,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td>106,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
<td>21,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5303</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>16,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$388,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full-Time Equivalent Staffing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Type</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Transportation System Monitoring Program established and maintains an inventory of transportation related data. Data for the program is updated regularly. It also identifies work tasks necessary to benchmark characteristics of the transportation system. Factors that influence travel choices are also observed.

The Intermodal Transportation Efficiency Act, the Clean Air Act Amendment and the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule make the program important for monitoring system performance.

Relation to Previous Work

The Transportation System Monitoring Program is on-going. Established in 1989, the program has provided for the collection of a long history of data.

Each year data is gathered so that the state of the transportation system can be defined and evaluated. The data provides information necessary to monitor the transportation system. Information regarding travel costs, traffic counts (auto and truck), vehicle miles traveled (VMT), transit patronage and other data is collected and summarized. The data helps to understand current characteristics and establish a basis for estimating future conditions.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The objectives of the program include:

- Collection and summarization of transportation cost data (parking and auto operating costs);
- Administration of the regional count program for auto, truck and transit patronage counts;
- Review of national data to assess the performance of the Portland transport system as it compares to other cities;
- Provision of service regarding processing system performance data requests; and
- Preparation of materials for dissemination.

The information collected in this program is useful to Metro, the jurisdictions, developers and consultants because it provides an historical perspective on travel trends for use in project planning. The program also provides essential input and validation information (i.e., cost of travel and count data) for the regional travel demand model.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Continue to summarize data that tracks the cost of travel;
- Continue administration of the regional vehicle count program;
- Assess the performance of the Portland regional transportation system as compared to national data;
- Provide response to system performance data requests; and
- Prepare materials for dissemination.
## Budget Summary

### Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$108,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>41,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$150,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>$73,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td>42,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5303</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>4,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$150,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

PROGRAM

The Technical Assistance Program provides travel forecasting support to the Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met, the Port of Portland and the cities and counties of this region. Assistance is provided in terms of staff support, computer usage and training. A budget allocation is developed that defines the amount of assistance to be provided to each jurisdiction.

Relation to Previous Work

This Technical Assistance Program is ongoing. In FY 2002, it is anticipated that over 100 requests for services will be processed.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Three types of service are provided. Each is discussed below:

- The jurisdictions of this region perform a multitude of studies to determine the effects of development, transportation policy and changes to the infrastructure. Upon request, staff support is provided to assist in the travel forecasting aspects of the work;

- ODOT, Multnomah County, Clackamas County, Washington County, the City of Portland and the City of Gresham have modem connections to the EMME/2 transportation modeling database. These jurisdictions are able to use the software as a remote workstation. Analysis can be done in this way without directly using Metro staff. Computer charges are assessed relative to the use of the system; and

- Metro provides training to the jurisdictional staff regarding the use of the EMME/2 Transportation Planning Software, the theory of travel demand modeling and computer simulation network analysis. The service is provided on demand.

An expense report provides each jurisdiction the opportunity to assess their use of the program and the remaining dollars in their budget. The report is found in the monthly TPAC progress report. The financial data reflects the most current information available.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Provide travel forecasting assistance to ODOT, Tri-Met, the Port of Portland and the cities and counties of this region in terms of:

  1. Staff support;
  2. Access to the EMME/2 Transportation Planning Software via external connections; and
  3. Training on the topics of software use and demand modeling theory.
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

- Provide technical assistance based upon the following budget allocation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gresham</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Provide expense reports to each jurisdiction at least quarterly.

**Budget Summary**

**Requirements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$ 82,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>$ 21,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>$ 29,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resources:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td>$ 50,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
<td>$ 32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td>$ 8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants</td>
<td>$ 26,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$ 7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$ 7,744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $ 133,900

**Full-Time Equivalent Staffing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 1.000
MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION/GRANTS MANAGEMENT

PROGRAM

Provide for overall ongoing department management, including budget, Unified Work Program (UWP), contracts, grants and personnel. It also includes staff to meet required needs of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC), Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT); Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC); Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) and the Metro Council.

Relation to Previous Work

This is an on-going program.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Ensure compliance with all federal requirements. Maintain "certification" of the region for continued receipt of transit and highway construction funds. Provide documentation to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) of all such activity.

Provide support to JPACT, TPAC, MTAC, WRPAC and subcommittees to ensure coordination between state, regional and local transportation and land-use plans and priorities.

Provide department management, including budget, personnel matters, expenditures for materials, services and capital and grant and contract compliance as well as providing information to the public and departmental work programs.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Prepare and manage the department budget, personnel, programs and products (adopt budget June 2002);
- FY 2003 UWP adoption (March 2002);
- Prepare documentation to FHWA and FTA such as quarterly narrative and financial reports;
- Monthly progress reports to the TPAC;
- Minutes, agendas and documentation;
- Execute, administer and monitor contracts, grants and agreements (approvals June/July 2002 as needed);
- Interdepartmental coordination;
- Periodic review with FHWA and FTA on UWP progress;
- Federal Certification;
- Progress Reports for Council and Federal Agencies (Quarterly); and
- Tri-Annual Title VI Certification (September).
### Management and Coordination/Grants Management

#### Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>$154,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
<td>$26,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td>$124,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$48,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $354,000

#### Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>2.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2.960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2001-02 Unified Work Program
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND TITLE VI

PROGRAM

In keeping with federal laws, regulations and policies recipients of federal dollars must address three fundamental environmental justice principles:

- To avoid, minimize or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations;
- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process; and
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

Relation to Previous Work:

This is a new program.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Under proposed new FHWA/FTA guidelines, MPOs need to:

- Enhance their analytical capabilities to ensure that the long-range transportation plan and the transportation improvement program (TIP) comply with Title VI;
- Identify residential, employment and transportation patterns of low-income and minority populations so that their needs can be identified and addressed, and the benefits and burdens of transportation investments can be fairly distributed; and
- Evaluate and, where necessary, improve their public involvement processes to eliminate participation barriers and engage minority and low-income populations in transportation decision making.

The majority of the work to ensure compliance with the above will be done within the individual program/project work plans. However, broad community data collection, outreach and qualitative evaluation methods will be developed and employed to assist the Planning Department as a whole to effectively comply with the spirit and letter of the DOT guidelines.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

Since the census 2000 information will not be available for some time, staff will continue to develop data from school enrollment and lunch subsidy programs to track where a preponderance of minority and low-income children are attending school. This information will be used by programs such as the Corridor Study analysis or MTIP to assess if specific projects might impact predominately low-income, minority or non-english speaking neighborhoods. It will also provide a base from which to continue developing a dialog with school officials, parents, teachers, organizations and associations that might help to ensure better public involvement and communication with minority and low-income populations.

The information and contacts developed will be used to assess aspects of projects or programs that might be of significant interest or have potential impact or benefit to minority and/or low-income populations. It will then be possible to engage appropriate communities in effective communication and in transportation decision making processes.
## Budget Summary

**Requirements:**
- Personal Services: $41,234
- Materials & Services: 1,400
- Interfund Transfers: 27,366

**Total:** $70,000

**Resources:**
- PL: $20,000
- STP/ODOT Match: 15,858
- Section 5303: 12,000
- ODOT Support Funds: 7,911
- Metro: 14,231

**Total Resources:** $70,000

**Full-Time Equivalent Staffing**
- Regular Full-Time FTE: .500

**Total:** .500
SCHOOLS PROGRAM

PROGRAM/RESPONSIBILITIES

It is important to develop increasingly better, more effective and responsive methods of communication with the community at large. The Planning for a Livable Future school curriculum program not only allows us to engage future users of our transportation system (road, bike, pedestrian, transit etc.) but also enables us to get information into the home and into the school system (PTA, teachers, staff etc.).

Educational Priority

Phase I ($25,000), distribution of the curriculum, is targeted to 10 schools. Once additional funds are obtained, the curriculum-training program will be expanded to reach a broader number of schools throughout the region. The school-outreach program addresses four main priorities:

- It uses environmental lessons to support state and local education reform goals (the curriculum conforms to new Oregon benchmarks for education reform);
- It improves teacher's environmental education knowledge and teaching skills;
- It educates students about human-health threats from environmental pollution; and
- It focuses on culturally diverse and low-income schools in an urban setting where environmental degradation and environmental justice issues are often greatest.

Delivery Method

Workshops will be held in the summer to train teachers on how to effectively use Metro's environmental curriculum. Each trained teacher in 10 urban middle schools will have an opportunity to work with a master teacher who will facilitate lessons in their classrooms.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

The school outreach program promotes Metro's Transportation/Land Use Environmental Education Curriculum, Planning for a Livable Future, which supports the new Oregon statewide education reform standards. The curriculum focuses on environmental consequences of transportation and housing decisions that affect traffic congestion and sprawl. The goal is to create a pilot training program that increases student awareness of these issues through greater use of the curriculum and improved teaching methods. Teachers will be trained to use our lesson plans in the district's urban middle schools. The short-term outcome will be that teachers will use and evaluate the Metro curriculum. The long-term outcome will be that students will learn how their individual choices impact their community and environment.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>Other FHWA Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>(Environmental Justice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$ 25,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 25,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Full-Time FTE</th>
<th>.030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM

The South Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will consist of three main elements; a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), Preliminary Engineering (PE) and a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). These program elements will meet requirements to obtain federal funding for a major transit capital improvement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The DEIS will evaluate environmental impacts of several alternatives forwarded from the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study in FY 2000-01. From this evaluation the Metro Council will select the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for more detailed engineering and environmental analysis including identification of measures to mitigate environmental impacts. The PE phase of the project will occur concurrently with the FEIS. PE would advance the project's design to the 30% level, a level of design sufficient upon which to base a cost estimate for a federal funding request. The FEIS will respond to all of the public comments received and develop mitigation measures for environmental impacts identified in the DEIS. The process will culminate with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issuing a Record of Decision (ROD) certifying that the project has met the requirements of NEPA. After issuance of the ROD, Tri-Met will enter into a full-funding grant agreement (FFGA) with FTA, and the project would advance to Final Design and Construction.

Relation to Previous Work

The South Corridor EIS is a direct outgrowth of the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study (SCTAS). Completed in FY 2000-01, the SCTAS narrowed a range of alternatives in the corridor down to several promising alternatives to be moved forward into an EIS. The SCTAS came about because of the defeat of a local funding ballot measure for the South/North light rail in November 1998. This program of transit improvements in the South Corridor implements the Regional Transportation Plan.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Program objectives in FY 2001-02 include:

- Complete the DEIS begun in FY 2000-01;
- Select a Locally Preferred Alternative and develop a project finance plan;
- Complete conceptual engineering in support of the DEIS;
- Initiate Preliminary Engineering;
- Initiate FEIS;
- Continue comprehensive public involvement efforts in the Corridor, ensuring that Metro and the local jurisdictions make every effort and use innovative approaches to reach citizens not traditionally involved in transportation projects;
- Produce high quality documents with reasonable cost;
- Manage project on budget and on schedule; and
- Continue to reaffirm regional consensus regarding the priority of the South Corridor.
OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

Objectives for FY 2001-02 include completion and distribution of the DEIS, Public Comment Document and Locally Preferred Alternative Report.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>FTA Grant OR-90-X083 $ 119,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services (Misc.)</td>
<td>New FTA Grant 4,013,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>Metro 473,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads &amp; Legal Notices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typesetting &amp; Repro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGA's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,606,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>9.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.380</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM

Metro is the FTA grant recipient for this Washington County led project. Metro provides grant management and administration, FTA coordination, technical assistance and financial planning assistance to Washington County in support of the project. The Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail Project is currently in the Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase of project development. The Environmental Assessment (EA) was completed and was issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The current project phase will result in 30% design for the commuter rail line, structures, stations, park and ride lots, signals and communication systems, a maintenance facility and vehicle specifications. At the conclusion of PE, the project will move into Final Design and Construction once federal and local funding has been secured.

Relation to Previous Work

Washington County initiated the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail Project with two feasibility studies. These studies found no significant issues to prohibit use of the railroad right-of-way for commuter transportation. The County, along with affected local jurisdictions, Tri-Met, Metro and ODOT initiated an Alternatives Analysis and Environmental Assessment that led to selection of commuter rail as the Locally Preferred Alternative over Transportation System Management and No-Build alternatives.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Washington County responsibilities in FY 2002 include:

- Complete Preliminary Engineering, which began in FY 2000-01;
- Develop a project finance plan and affirm proposed federal share of less than $25 million;
- Continue comprehensive public-involvement efforts in the Corridor, ensuring that Washington County and the local jurisdictions make every effort and use innovative approaches to reach out to citizens that are not traditionally involved in transportation projects; and
- Manage project on budget and on schedule.

Metro assistance to Washington County in FY 2002 will include:

- Development of a strategy to secure federal funding approvals, identify local funding sources and complete the Annual FTA New Starts Report;
- Maintain a positive relationship with FTA to ensure that FTA meets the project schedule; and
- Manage FTA grant and provide all necessary documentation and reports to FTA.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

Washington County objectives for FY 2002 will include:

- Manage Metro elements of work program including preparation of the New Starts Report;
- Publish 30% design drawing package;
- Begin procurement process for rail cars and draft bid documents;
- Successfully negotiate purchase, lease or rent agreement with the Union Pacific Railroad and the Portland and Western;
WILSONVILLE TO BEAVERTON COMMUTER RAIL PROJECT

- Successfully negotiate vehicle compliance issue with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA); and
- Develop institutional framework for operation of the line.

Metro objectives for FY 2002 will include:

- Provide timely assistance in the development of financial plans;
- Complete Quarterly Reports for FTA;
- Provide all necessary grant administration documentation to the FTA; and
- Provide timely technical assistance.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>FTA Grant OR-90-X084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services (Misc.)</td>
<td>FTA Grant OR-03-0080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County IGA</td>
<td>Washington Cty (Local Match)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 54,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 1,079,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 27,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>940,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $1,079,000 TOTAL $1,079,000
TRANSIT PLANNING PROGRAM

PROGRAM

This Transit Planning Program supports the budget theme that Metro will identify and promote multiple transportation choices to easily access all areas of the region. Increased transit use and reduced dependency on single occupant vehicles supports the budget theme of improving air quality. This program will implement the transit policy direction established by the RTP with emphasis on coordinating with Tri-Met and other transit providers to ensure that short, medium and long-range transit needs of the region are addressed. Specific elements of the FY 2002 work program include support of Tri-Met's Elderly and Disabled Transportation Study and the Willamette Shoreline Consortium.

Relation to Previous Work

Management of the Willamette Shoreline Right-of-Way has been underway since the Consortium purchased the Jefferson Branch right of way between Portland and Lake Oswego in 1998. Metro has staffed the Consortium, made up of local government members, providing administrative, technical and policy support for the past several years. In FY 2001, Metro staff began to support Tri-Met's elderly and disabled transportation study and Committee for Accessible Transportation. The Transit Planning program in general follows up on the FY 2001 adoption of the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Transit Element of the RTP needs to be followed by concerted efforts to ensure that transit providers and local jurisdictions implement transit service that supports the policy direction of the RTP.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Program objectives in FY 2002 include:

- Evaluate the potential to provide interurban passenger rail or other transit service using the Willamette Shoreline Right-of-Way to Lake Oswego;
- Continue to support the Willamette Shoreline Consortium by staffing meetings, providing technical analyses and facilitating agreement on operating and maintenance agreements;
- Assist transit operators and local jurisdictions in the development of their short, medium and long range transit plans, in particular Tri-Met's Transit Choices for Livability program, Annual Service Plan and 10-Year Service Plan;
- Assist transit operators in meeting service requirements mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Environmental Justice Executive Order and other federal requirements;
- Assist transit operators in implementation and evaluation of the federal Access to Jobs and Reverse Commute initiative; and
- Provide guidance to transit operators and local jurisdictions regarding potential federal, state and local funding sources.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

Objectives for FY 2002 include:

- Develop ridership forecasts and analyze rail transit alternatives for transit service on the Willamette Shoreline Right-of-Way between Portland and Lake Oswego;
- Facilitate agreement among Consortium members on how to best use the Willamette Shoreline Right-of-Way in the future and how to fund ongoing maintenance of the track;
- Ensure that RTP policies are addressed when assisting with Tri-Met's elderly and disabled transportation study and while serving on the Committee for Accessible Transportation;
• Amend the RTP to incorporate strategies from the Elderly and Disabled Study and plan;
• Prepare detailed work programs, budgets and schedules for various activities;
• Manage the study in accordance with the work program, budget and schedule;
• Procure consultant assistance as required;
• Manage federal grant funding and execute Intergovernmental Agreements as needed; and
• Serve as liaison with the Federal Transit Administration.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$ 941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services (Misc.)</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Services</td>
<td>STP/ODOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer (Direct)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (Local Funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 262,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A transit-oriented development has three fundamental characteristics that combine to generate a high modal share for transit: a mix of moderate to high intensity land uses; a physical or functional connection to the transit system and design features that reinforce pedestrian relationships and scale. The mission of the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Implementation Program is to increase transit ridership and lessen risks and costs associated with the construction of TOD projects. The Program acquires sites, resells to the private sector with conditions and covenants and invests in the TOD project by land-value “write down.” It ensures that some regionally significant TOD demonstration projects are undertaken and that joint development tools are in place to help the region implement growth management plans for station areas.

Relation to Previous Work:

Work in FY 2002 builds directly upon previous FY 2001 work and towards the Program’s five and ten year goals. Projects that are in the pre-development stage will move into construction and new projects will be selected for implementation.

Since implementation commenced in April 1998, the TOD Program has selected 9 projects along the MAX LRT from Hillsboro to Gresham and one project on the primary transit network done with congestion-mitigation/air-quality funds. These include Hillsboro Central (acquisition of a vacant bank property downtown next to MAX Station in order to issue RFP for developer to build 3-4 story housing/retail project); Metro Access, Milliken Way & Schottky Road (mixed-use with office, day care and retail); the Round at Beaverton Central (mixed-use of 4-5 stories housing, retail, office and entertainment) surrounding a transit plaza; the Madison (6-story housing in Goose Hollow); Center Commons located at 60th and Glisan (314 units of mixed-income, mixed-use and completed except for 26 “for sale” row houses which are 80% complete); Russelville located at 102nd and East Burnside (479 units housing with retail, office and day care); Gresham Civic located at Civic Drive and the MAX tracks (260 units housing with retail); Central Point located in downtown Gresham (4-story housing unit with ground-floor retail) and Buckman Terrace located at 16th and Sandy Boulevard (122 market-rate apartments with ground-floor retail).

The program has completed, or has under construction, 875 units of TOD housing and 60,000 sq.ft. of retail. An additional 193 units housing, 120,000 sq.ft. office and 75,000 sq.ft. retail is soon to be constructed.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The program encourages the construction by the private sector of higher-density housing and mixed-use projects that increase transit use. Projects are located at light rail stations on the Eastside MAX, Westside MAX and potentially within the Interstate, PDX and commuter rail transit corridors. Public-private partnerships (enforced through Development Agreements) are forged to develop projects with a strong pedestrian environment by including street and sidewalk amenities, plazas, promenades and building massing and orientation that reinforce the street level activity. Land sale proceeds from the projects are returned to the Program for use in other TOD projects. Program activities also include providing technical assistance to agencies (local, national and international) working to implement TOD programs, plans and projects; to academicians studying TOD and public-private partnerships; and to members of the private real estate development community.
The major objectives for FY 2002 include:

- Completing the final phase of Russellville, a mixed-use project in the Gateway area consisting of 4-5 stories with housing above ground-floor retail located directly adjacent to the MAX LRT Station at 102nd and East Burnside Street;
- Disposition of the Hillsboro Central site to a selected developer;
- Initiation of a project at the Gresham Civic light rail station;
- Completion of predevelopment activities for the second round of projects selected through the Regional RFP process;
- Working with the Office of the Auditor to refine performance measures; and
- Implementation of a TCSP-funded project within the Kenton station area on Interstate MAX.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$ 222,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services (Misc.)</td>
<td>2,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>50,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>84,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 360,097</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97FTA (OR-90-X070 &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OR90-X073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: In addition to these planning funds, federal and local funds for land acquisition are also included in the Metro budget.
The Kenton Station Seed & Feed project will fund the acquisition of a joint development project site(s) that is physically or functionally connected to the Kenton LRT station, resulting in a mixed-use higher density transit-oriented development project(s). This will:

- Increase the ridership on the Interstate MAX LRT;
- Serve as an seminal high density project in an area (Kenton) targeted for such development in the Region's 2040 Plan; and
- Assist in "jump starting" the tax increment district which has been created along the Interstate MAX LRT corridor. Revenues from the tax increment district will provide $30 M of the funding for construction of the LRT.

Historically, the Kenton area was constructed as a "company town" by the meat packing firm, Swift & Company. The area north of Kenton was the cattle trading and stockyard center for the entire northwest, from shortly after the turn of the 19th century to the early 1960s. As recently as 1928 cattle were still driven down Denver Avenue, the main street of Kenton. Feed and seed stores and associated commercial businesses fueled economic activity in the area until 1963, when removal of the trolley system and completion of the I-5 Freeway drew interstate traffic away from Kenton's business district and drove commerce from the area.

Relation to Previous Work

In the Portland region, growth management strategies are being used to facilitate growing "up, not out" to make the development pattern more efficient and to avoid consuming valuable farm and forest land. Specifically, transportation and land use plans have been coordinated at the state, regional, city and neighborhood levels to plan and construct major transportation facilities that enhance regional mobility, utilize existing urban infrastructure and enjoy the support of nearby residents and businesses. The Kenton Station Seed & Feed project proposes to use TCSP funds to seed a station area development project which in turn will feed a tax increment financing district with revenues within the six-mile North Interstate Avenue light rail transit (LRT) corridor in Portland, Oregon. The LRT project will connect Portland's downtown to northside neighborhoods and could eventually connect to Vancouver, Washington. The tax increment revenues will be used to help fund the Interstate MAX project as well as a number of community and economic revitalization activities within seven inner-city neighborhoods that encompass over 1,500 acres of land developed within a traditional neighborhood (pre-WWII) development pattern. A broad spectrum of the City's population will be assured of improved access to jobs, services and centers of trade.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Increase transit ridership and walking;
- Complement and supports other Portland Development Commission projects within the corridor;
- Achieve neighborhood participation in the planning and construction of regional transportation facilities;
- Demonstrate replicable real-estate development models; and
- Channel a portion of the region's growth back into existing areas with underutilized urban infrastructure.
KENTON SEED & FEED PROGRAM

The grant from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will be funded through the TOD Implementation Program. The Portland Development Commission will be responsible for neighborhood and business involvement, overseeing the planning in the corridor and at specific project sites which will include city, neighborhood, Tri-Met and Metro objectives and will coordinate with the community solutions Team which will be working on larger issues in the Corridor. Metro will coordinate approvals from FTA, including environmental, appraisals, performance measures and project approvals.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Implements land-use and transportation plans that have been coordinated at the state, regional, local and community levels;
- Plans and initiates other development projects to increase private investments within the North Interstate Urban Renewal Area and LRT Corridor;
- Examines development patterns and identifies strategies to encourage private-sector development patterns which achieve the goals of the TCSP program;
- Encourages the construction of a transit-oriented development (TOD) project(s) which increases transit and pedestrian trips;
- Demonstrates market acceptance of TODs in the Interstate MAX Corridor;
- Maximizes utilization of existing urban infrastructure to take advantage of under-utilized infrastructure located near the center of the region;
- Improves the efficiency of the transportation system;
- Reduces impacts of transportation on the environment;
- Reduces the need for costly future investments in public infrastructure; and
- Ensures efficient access to jobs, services and centers of trade.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>FHWA/TCSP Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Project Management</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Solutions Teams</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Evaluation</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Boulevard Station Planning</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PDC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenton Action Plan</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>.750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Data Resource Center (DRC) serves a multi-faceted role within the agency and throughout the community. Within the agency, the DRC contributes to the success of analysis and projects undertaken by Growth Management Services, Transportation, Regional Environmental Management and Regional Parks and Open Spaces. The DRC provides state-of-the-art mapping and spatial analysis, regional economic and demographic forecasting, land-use and vacant-land studies and sophisticated urban-economic analysis.

Periodically updated economic and demographic projections are required of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) by the federal government prior to allocation of transportation funds. Other forecasting requirements include the Regional Framework Plan and periodic reviews to maintain the 20-year land supply required for inside the urban growth boundary. Metro’s long-range regional forecast (20 years) provides this foundation for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and various other urban growth management and Regional Environmental Management issues. The regional forecast is also used by local governments and businesses as a moderate economic growth scenario and long-term planning tool. It is the only local source of bi-state metropolitan level forecast data for this region.*

RLIS is a computer mapping system which provides land records (assessors’ tax database), urban development patterns (zoning, 2040 land-use concepts and data, developed and vacant land studies and other tax lot data) and environmental data (floodplains, parks and open spaces, slopes and contours and natural hazard mitigation data). RLIS was created and is maintained by the DRC as a source of information for the Portland area land, population and economy.

Relation to Previous Work

Metro has taken the lead position as a data clearinghouse for collecting, maintaining and producing vital land-use analysis, economic and demographic information in support of regional programs of significance. Metro is also a leader in providing desktop GIS to the regional planning community through RLIS-Lit and MAGIC on CD-ROM disk.

Regional Land Information System (RLIS) Program: RLIS is a computer mapping system which provides land records (assessors’ tax database), urban development patterns (zoning, 2040 land-use concepts and data, developed and vacant land studies and other tax lot data) and environmental data (floodplains, parks and open spaces, slopes and contours and natural hazard mitigation data). RLIS, created and maintained by the DRC, is an information source for the Portland area land, population and economy. The RLIS database provides key economic and demographic data needed for transportation forecasting and analysis.

The DRC Group is responsible for construction and maintenance of the integrated regional economic/demographic growth simulation model of the Portland-Vancouver area. This structural economic model is an econometric representation of the regional economy. The model is used in mid-range (5-10 years) and long-range (10-30 years) forecasting and analysis to support the RTP, Growth Management Services planning and revenue forecasting. Other uses include growth simulation scenarios and impact analysis.

Urban Growth Modeling, Simulation and Analysis: The DRC has developed a state-of-the-art land-use simulation model, MetroScope. This decision support tool is linked to the Travel Forecasting Model, making it possible to produce and analyze alternative growth scenarios. It is a vital tool for the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Periodic Review work program.
DATA, GROWTH MONITORING

RESPONSIBILITIES

The ongoing uses for the model for purposes of futures forecasting and scenario evaluation is to provide contextual information and quantitative support for policy makers and analysts investigating long-run growth options. The application of this model improves Metro’s standing and regional reputation for the quality of its analysis and quantitative expertise. Continuing model development and reliable forecasts not only satisfies Metro’s programmatic needs, but also provides useful planning information to our regional planning partners.

- Maintain timely and high quality economic and demographic analysis and reports to support Metro program needs;
- Provide quality GIS products and services to Metro programs, subscribing jurisdictions; Tri-Met, ODOT and Storefront customers (private sector businesses and the general public);
- Strengthen community (public and private) awareness of RLIS products and services;
- Continue to maintain the high accuracy of the RLIS database in spite of decreased FTE; and
- Provide timely information for meeting Performance Measurement requirements.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Revise the population/employment forecast to a 2000 to 2025 time span;
- Use MetroScope to develop alternate growth scenarios;
- Maintain timely and high quality economic and demographic analysis and reports to support Metro program needs;
- Seek grant funding for research using the MetroScope model;
- Use the Internet and the Electronic Storefront to market services and distribute data;
- Migrate RLIS UNIX applications to PC-Windows to empower desktop users with the data and the applications they need to work more efficiently;
- Integrate databases of the region’s building permit issuing jurisdictions and county assessor’s database with Metro’s RLIS database; and
- Enhance Metro Intranet and Internet applications to provide interactive capabilities to Metro staff, regional partners and the public.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 671,215</td>
<td>$ 74,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135,500</td>
<td>69,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>ODOT Support Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243,485</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,161,700</td>
<td>965,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TCSP EASTSIDE URBAN RESERVE PLANNING

PROGRAM

Conduct a cooperative planning project to provide conceptual planning for the Pleasant Valley area (former urban reserves 4 and 5) with a Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program (TCSP) grant from the Federal Highway Administration. Cooperating jurisdictions include Gresham, Portland, Happy Valley, Clackamas County, Multnomah County and Portland State University. Planning includes determining necessary surface-water facilities, transportation connections and improvements and the appropriate locations for various land uses. The project began in January 2000 and is expected to take 27 months.

Relation to Previous Work

The TCSP grant award is the first of its kind, involving several key stakeholders. During FY 2000-01, Metro developed and refined a work plan, completed work on Phases I and II and commenced work on Phase III. These phases included:

- Project start-up: Established all committees, held stakeholder interviews, developed public-involvement program and prepared base maps;
- Inventories: Several technical work teams completed inventories of natural resources, transportation facilities and issues, existing infrastructure and needs and land uses;
- Preliminary Analysis: Analyses were conducted on the inventoried data, including Goal 5 (Oregon state goal) natural resources; and
- Community Forums and charrette: Community forums were held for the local citizens to help with the inventory and analysis components. A three-day design charrette was held for the citizens to participate in preliminary transportation and land-use design for the generation of concept plan alternatives.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Land-use planning that ensures adequate densities and a good mix of land-uses to balance access to jobs and services;
- Development of a multi-modal transportation system plan that addresses deficiencies in the current road network to provide good local and regional access for future residents and employees;
- Creation of an efficient circulation system plan within the urban reserves that offers good connections to each other and the rest of the region;
- Protection of steelhead trout in Johnson Creek that has been listed as "threatened" under the Endangered Species Act by the National Marine Fisheries Service;
- Protection of cutthroat trout, listed as a sensitive species by the State of Oregon, in the Kelly Creek tributary to Johnson Creek;
- Minimized storm-water runoff from the increased urbanization that would otherwise worsen the severe annual flooding in the lower Johnson Creek; and
- Avoidance of further degradation of water quality due to increased sources of pollution in the upper Johnson Creek and Rock Creek watersheds.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Maps of natural resource and hazard areas including drainage basins, floodplains, steep slopes and streams and wetlands;
TCSP EASTSIDE URBAN RESERVE PLANNING

- A mediation framework for resolving issues between public agencies regarding infrastructure development and wildlife habitat protection;
- Urban reserve plan and policies for Pleasant Valley area (former Urban Reserves 4 and 5) that address future transportation connections, natural resource protection, storm water drainage, land use (including jobs/housing balance) and funding strategies for infrastructure;
- "Green Streets" Handbook (funds for transportation designs provided by a separate TGM grant) to provide model transportation and development designs that protect streams and wildlife corridors from urban impacts; and
- Comprehensive project evaluation performed by PSU, resulting in a model process.

### Budget Summary

#### Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2002</th>
<th>Full Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to Other Agencies</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$212,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$710,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2002</th>
<th>Full Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCSP Grant</td>
<td>$182,591</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>$4,409</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$212,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$710,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

TRI-MET – SOUTH CORRIDOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

In addition to providing support for the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study for which Metro is the agency lead, Tri-Met is planning and developing selected projects within this corridor that are defined by S.E. McLoughlin Boulevard, Highway 224 and I-205. The selected projects include an off-street transit center in downtown Milwaukie, a surface park-and-ride lot south of Milwaukie and coordination with Clackamas County for replacement of the transit center at Clackamas Town Center shopping mall.

Relation to Previous Work

This work builds upon:

- Successful service and bus-stop enhancements in the McLoughlin Corridor, introduced in fall 1999 as part of the first of three-year Tri-Met Service Plan improvements;
- The South/North Transit Corridor Study in which light-rail transit was identified as the preferred high-capacity transit mode within the McLoughlin and Highway 224 corridors;
- Long-standing discussions with the City of Milwaukie for development of an off-street transit center which would be coordinated with their downtown plan;
- The sale of the Southgate movie theater, which once served as a popular 285-space shared-use-and-ride. It survives as a little-used fee parking lot. This has focused the need for a replacement park-and-ride lot in that same area; and
- A road and bridge project, now under construction, as well as a planned expansion of the Clackamas Town Center shopping mall, which requires (and provides) opportunity for replacement and expansion of the transit center at that location.

These are capital projects with front-end planning and design activities.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Encourage transit ridership and decrease road congestion within this corridor;
- Provide a first installment for a South Corridor transportation development program;
- Develop visible, convenient transit facilities within the southeast corridor;
- Provide for continuity of transit services as existing facilities are sold or redeveloped; and
- Coordinate these near-term projects with long-term transit development goals for these corridors.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Prepare site-development plans for two transit centers and a park-and-ride lot. This work is complete for the Milwaukie Transit Center;
- Prepare Environmental Assessments reports for each of these facilities. The Milwaukie Transit Center Environmental Assessment is to be submitted to the FTA mid-January;
- Prepare plans for the integration of planned facilities with surrounding land uses and transportation facilities. A TOD project is planned for the remainder of the parcel being used for the Milwaukie Transit Center;
- Identify near and long-term services plans associated with the facilities; and
- Prepare construction plans and supporting documents.
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Budget Summary

Funding for the $5 million Milwaukie Transit Center is supported with $3,630,000 Federal funds, with an additional $370,000 Section 5309 funds yet to be designated.

TRI-MET – THREE-YEAR SERVICE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Tri-Met is using regional CMAQ funds for the development and implementation of service improvements throughout the Tri-Met service area, with a focus on S.E. McLoughlin Boulevard and S.W. Barbur Boulevard/Highway 99W. These service improvements have a substantial capital component in the form of bus-stop improvements. The McLoughlin improvements were introduced in fall 1999. A proposal for the S.W. Barbur/99W improvements, which are to be introduced in fall 2001, is in a public-comment period. Additionally, the McLoughlin Corridor is identified as being served by light-rail transit by year 2020.

Relation to Previous Work

This project builds upon another project being conducted in partnership with the City of Portland, named Streamline. The Streamline project encompasses the TEA-21 funded signal-priority project in combination with other locally-funded transit priority and customer-amenity improvements. By combining these projects, greater resources may be devoted to related customer amenities and accessibility improvements. This work will also be combined with the City’s Streetscape program, which is directed at developing pedestrian networks in neighborhoods such as those along S.W. Barbur Boulevard.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Encourage transit ridership through service and amenity improvements;
- Improve the total transit riding experience;
- Increase visibility and positive influence of transit in the community;
- Begin to implement a series of transit improvements within this corridor which are consistent with long-term needs and plans; and
- Promote regional livability, consistent with the 2040 Framework Plan.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Inventory of existing transit facilities within the S.W. Barbur Corridor;
- Review of service and facilities development opportunities;
- Community outreach effort to identify needs, constraints and priorities;
- Work program and budget for phased program implementation;
- Land-use interface plan including an assessment of Transit Oriented Development opportunities; and
- Construction plans and documents for these initial-transit facilities improvements.
Budget Summary

By JPACT resolution as part of the State Transportation Improvement Program, $5.7 million of regional CMAQ funds were set aside for the conduct of Tri-Met's Three Year Service Plan. Those funds have been allocated over a three-year period, principally as a capital improvement program. $1,425,000 of those CMAQ funds are to be supplemented with Tri-Met's general funds in FY 2002.

$100,000 of the FY 2002 program will be allocated for the planning of service and facilities improvements for S.W. Barbur Boulevard/Highway 99W as described above. It is expected that those funds will be use for consultant services. That effort will be supplemented by Tri-Met staffs' planning and design activities.

TRI-MET - STREAMLINE

This is the third year of a comprehensive program that incorporates the grant-funded signal priority treatment project that is managed by the City of Portland. In partnership with the City, Tri-Met has expanded that program to include other preferential street treatments and related bus-stop amenities. It is designed to reduce transit running times and thereby reduce operating costs, while also making the service more attractive to riders. Twelve-high ridership lines within the City of Portland are targeted for these improvements.

Relation to Previous Work

As noted above, this program builds upon the TEA-21 funded signal-priority project. The program is also coordinated with other City pedestrian and streetscape programs.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Decrease transit running time on twelve targeted routes by 10 percent or enough to eliminate one bus from the weekday operating schedule;
- Increase transit ridership on those same lines by 10 percent;
- Improve the transit-riding environment through enhanced rider amenities; and
- Increase the visibility of transit in the community.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Assessment of principal intersections used by targeted bus routes and prioritized for installation of signal-priority treatment, including Opticom preemption, potential queue jump lanes or curb extensions;
- Detailed review of each selected bus route, including inventory or facilities and compliance to bus-stop standards, ADA requirements and operating requirements;
- Identification of bus-stop improvements, including improved access, respacing of stops, amenity improvements, customer information and adjacent sidewalk/crosswalk needs;
- Work program, schedule and budget for each line; and
- Construction drawings and documents.
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Status

- Four bus routes are in active stages of implementation:

  1. Line 4: Division/Fessenden is under construction (bus-stop and traffic-management improvements nearing completion) with the basic signal priority features in place. Initial turning on of the system is scheduled for spring 2001 with full implementation, including all signals by summer 2001;

  2. Line 72: 82nd Avenue/Killingsworth is finished planning and is now in the permitting phase with construction in progress;

  3. Line 12: Sandy/Barbur is in active planning and final design. Public notices have been sent to property owners/residents along N.E. Sandy Boulevard; and

  4. Line 14: Hawthorne and Line 19 Powell/Broadway is in preliminary stages of planning with Line 14 improvements being coordinated with a planned City of Portland streetscape program along S.E. Hawthorne Boulevard.

- Signal priority emitters have been modified and will soon be operational on all Tri-Met buses. Opticom installation has begun at the 225 City of Portland intersections. Completion of software is in process and due by spring 2001.

Budget Summary

Tri-Met’s portion of this comprehensive four-year program is $6,650,000. The program uses $1.5 million of the City of Portland’s TEA-21 funded signal priority project for installation of Opticom emitters on buses, to be expended in years one and two of the program. Regional Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds provide a total of $3,600,000 over the four-year period of which $760,000 will be expended in FY 2002 budget. The balance come from a combination of Tri-Met and City of Portland local funds. Most of these funds are devoted to the capital elements of this program; however, 1.5 FTEs are supported directly out of the TEA-21 signal priority project budget at a FY 2002 cost of $122,060.

TRI-MET – REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds will be applied to the regional transportation demand management (TDM) program housed at Tri-Met. The funds will be used to support local jurisdictions with the implementation of Region 2040 mode-split goals, support regional carpool matching, assist employers to meet the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Employee Commute Option (ECO) Rule trip reduction goals and expand public/private partnership programs through the development of transportation management associations (TMAs).

- PASSport and employer transit pass programs - The regional TDM program serves over 500 employers (approximately 200,000 employees);
- Carpool matching and management of reduced parking fees for car-poolers;
- Employer/employee outreach - Technical assistance, training and alternative transportation promotion;
- TDM support services - Carpool matching and parking programs, emergency ride home, carpoo
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

- check, employer-fare incentives and vanpool subsidy;
- TDM marketing materials for employers and their employees;
- Public/private partnerships to increase TDM services at targeted employment centers;
- Technical assistance and partnerships with Transportation Management Associations, Chambers of Commerce and local jurisdictions to encourage alternative transportation in a specific area;
- Development of new TMAs;
- Technical assistance to employers/jurisdictions for regulatory compliance with the Employee Commute Option (ECO) rule and Transportation Planning Rule;
- Program evaluation;
- Vanpool Shuttle Program - Vans are provided to employers/ homeowners' associations to be used as a shuttle from their worksite/housing development to a MAX station or major transit corridor (employer/homeowner's association provides driver and fuel); and
- Vanpool Program - A subsidy is provided in coordination with employers to provide an incentive for employee vanpool use.

Regional Coordination: The TDM program is a key element of Region 2040, the regional land use and transportation plan. Region 2040 relies upon TDM to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips. In addition to established TDM programs, such as carpool matching, Tri-Met will use CMAQ funds to assist local jurisdictions with TDM strategies, including such things as, car-sharing, vanpool shuttles, TMAs in regional centers and focused partnerships.

Employer ECO Compliance Assistance: The regional TDM program has been key to the implementation of the ECO Rule. Tri-Met provides assistance to 60% of all ECO-affected employers. CMAQ funds will help Tri-Met continue to assist employers with ECO plan maintenance, plan updates, program implementation and worksite-program improvements. Marketing and educational programs will educate employees on how their mode-choice decisions affect regional air quality, land-use planning and improvements to the transportation network.

Public/Private Efforts: The TDM program will continue to involve the private sector to reduce commuter trips. The regional TDM program has leveraged over $4 million a year from employers for employee alternative transportation subsidies. This partnership effort started almost six years ago with CMAQ funds. New partnership areas to be pursued include substantial employer annual transit-pass subsidies, privately-funded community shuttles, employer shuttles, carpool subsidies and targeted marketing in regionally-significant areas.

Listed below are programs in the development phase where CMAQ funds will provide additional resources:

Shared Ride Taxi Demonstration: A service for customers in the Cedar Mill area that provides access to Sunset Transit Center and major destinations in Cedar Mill the area through a local taxi service operated under contract with Tri-Met.

Transportation Management Associations in Regional Centers: Private/public association that works with businesses, the local jurisdiction and Tri-Met to implement the land use, parking and transportation elements for Region 2040 implementation. TMAs have been implemented in two regionally significant areas: Columbia Corridor, Swan Island. TMAs are under exploration in three areas: Clackamas Regional Center, Gresham Regional Center and Downtown Portland. Additionally, TMAs will be provided assistance for ridesharing and outreach activities in Tualatin, Lloyd District and Washington County.
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

TMA Services: CMAQ funds are used to assist TMAs with on-street programs and services such as shuttle programs and bike racks based on the specific needs of their areas.

Job Access: Three elements include: improving information of transportation options through training and marketing materials at social service organizations; providing area services near targeted social service centers; and working directly with employers to provide access to jobs.

Carpool Incentives: In coordination with the Job Access program, incentives to encourage carpooling in the form of retailer coupons are distributed to car-poolers as an incentive to fill empty seats in cars in three areas: Columbia Corridor, Swan Island and Tualatin.

Accessible Community Service: Services that run within communities and is custom-designed to link key origin and destinations for disabled/elderly persons.

Elements of the work program and their respective funding source are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Summary</th>
<th>CMAQ</th>
<th>Tri-Met General Fund</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDM Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core TDM Program</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM Expansion Programs – Region 2040</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (DEQ)

DEQ – EMPLOYEE COMMUTE OPTIONS (ECO)

FY 2002 is the second of a four-year program. ECO Program activities include compliance work and technical assistance. Employer goals are to reduce their single occupant auto trips by ten percent from their baseline survey results and then maintain the reduction. Annual employee surveys are required of employers to measure progress toward their trip-reduction goal. Along with the usual non-compliance enforcement procedures, the ECO program places an emphasis on providing employers with technical assistance through the ECO Information Clearinghouse. Planned activities include quick one-on-one service for the busy employer, ECO training and the Shifting Gears newsletter to connect the employer to other regional service providers. DEQ will use federal (TEA-21) funding to continue operating the ECO Information Clearinghouse ($47K annually for four years with a $16,399 match).

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (ODOT)

ODOT – I-5 TRANSPORTATION AND TRADE PARTNERSHIP

The goal of the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership is to develop a bi-state strategic plan on how to manage and improve transportation within the I-5 Corridor between Portland and Vancouver. The Corridor stretches between I-84 in Oregon and I-205 in Washington.

The strategic plan will address freeway, transit, heavy rail and arterial street needs within the Corridor as well as how to manage demand for transportation within the Corridor.
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

The strategic plan will address freeway, transit, heavy rail and arterial street needs within the Corridor as well as how to manage demand for transportation within the Corridor.

Relationship to Previous Work

The strategic-planning effort for the I-5 Corridor between Portland and Vancouver was initiated in response to recommendations of a Bi-state Leadership Committee, which met over a nine-month period in 1999. That committee found:

- This corridor is a critical economic lifeline for the region and the state; serving two ports, two transcontinental rail lines, providing critical access to industrial land in both states and facilitating through freight movement;
- There will be economic and livability consequences if we do nothing within the Corridor;
- There is no silver-bullet. A solution for the Corridor will need to include highway and transit improvements, demand-management strategies and freight-rail improvements. Even substantial improvements will only maintain today's level of congestion; and
- Those physical solutions will be costly and will require innovative funding solutions in order to succeed.

The Leadership Committee recommended that the region undertake a public process to develop a strategic plan for the Corridor. In response to this recommendation, Governors of Washington and Oregon appointed a Task Force to guide the public-planning process and to develop the strategic plan.

During FY 2001, the Governors’ Task Force was established, along with a Community Forum consisting of representatives from neighborhoods, businesses and other interested groups. Both the Task Force and Forum met several times and developed Evaluation Criteria and Improvement Option packages for evaluation. Work also progressed on Land Use Assessment and Rail Capacity Analysis.

Expected Outcomes

This strategic plan may result in a wide range of outcomes, including:

- No improvements beyond those already planned within the Corridor, but implementation of policies and programs to manage demand;
- Moderate improvements and the implementation of policies and programs to manage demand; and
- Significant improvements and the implementation of policies and programs to manage travel demand.

In FY 2002, the I-5 Partnership will complete preliminary design of the Improvement Option packages and evaluate their performance. The Land Use Assessment and Rail Capacity Analyses will be completed. The Task Force will then develop Draft Recommendations on the strategic plan that will be circulated for review and feedback from the Forum as well as the Public.

There also will be work on any refinements to the Option packages (as needed) and development of Financing Options.
Final recommendations from the Governors' Task Force are expected August 2002. The final Corridor Development and Management Plan will be submitted to FHWA.

Implementation of Improvements

If the strategic plan calls for the implementation of improvements within the Corridor, the improvements would then go through a process of project development – to design and engineer the projects for construction.

Depending upon the scale of improvements and their likely impacts, the project-development process could include a significant environmental impact analysis phase.

Several potential solutions, including a new or expanded crossing of the Columbia River, would require an environmental impact analysis. The scale of such a project would result in an Environmental Impact Statement process that could take several years to complete.

Partners

• The Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation are sponsoring the project, with funding from the Federal Highway Administration; and

• ODOT and WSDOT are working in partnership with other transportation agencies within the Corridor: the cities of Vancouver and Portland, Metro, the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council, the ports of Vancouver and Portland, Tri-Met, CTRAN, Clark County, Washington and Multnomah County, Oregon.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing Requirements</th>
<th>FY 2001-02</th>
<th>Full Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Personnel Services</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT Personnel Services</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>$ 1,400,000</td>
<td>$ 2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 1,500,000</td>
<td>$ 3,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources:

| National Corridor Planning and Development Program Grant | $ 1,000,000| $ 2,000,000 |
| ODOT/WSDOT Match                                        | 500,000    | 1,000,000    |
| Metro STP                                                |            | 250,000      |
| TOTAL                                                    | $ 1,500,000| $ 3,250,000  |
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

ODOT – I-5/99W CONNECTOR FEASIBILITY STUDY

The I-5/99W Connector Study identifies feasible alignments and design concepts within the Southern Corridor. These alternatives must be reasonable (from a land-use perspective) as well as feasible and prudent (from a NEPA perspective). The studied alignments should represent a reasonable range (2-4) of alternatives consistent with a possible future NEPA process. The detail for identifying these alignment alternatives and designs should be at a planning or concept level; enough detail to understand broad feasibility and environmental effects.

The Southern Corridor was carefully chosen to avoid and/or minimize impacts to agricultural and forest resource lands; natural resources such as streams, wetlands and riparian corridors; public facilities, regional trails, parks and open spaces; existing development and aggregate resource-extraction activities. In addition, the corridor boundary was defined to remain close to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), south of Tualatin and Sherwood and within exception lands as much as possible, to allow the Corridor to serve as a future "hard edge" to lands outside the current UGB designated for future growth.

Relationship to Previous Work

In 1995, the Oregon Department of Transportation completed the Western Bypass Study, which evaluated five alternatives for addressing circumferential travel in the southwest Portland Metropolitan area, including the urban portion of Washington County and westernmost portions of the City of Portland and Clackamas County. The study also included portions of rural Washington County.

The recommended alternative from this study was a combination of improvements to the existing transportation system in conjunction with construction of new arterial and collector road improvements, implementation of transportation system management and demand-management strategies as well as expanded transit service within the study area.

- June 1997, the Metro Council adopted recommendations identified in the Western Bypass Study, including an amendment to add the I-5 to 99W Connector Corridor to the 1995 Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan for the Portland metropolitan area. The amendment established need, mode, function and general location (transportation need, highway mode, statewide and regional function in the specified corridor) consistent with state land-use statutes for the proposed I-5 to 99W Connector. A future selected alignment within the corridor would be subject to further land-use review and actions.

- Senate Bill 626, codified into Oregon Revised Statute 383 (ORS 383) and passed by the 1995 Oregon Legislature, authorizes the building, operation and maintenance of tollways by governments, private entities or a combination of the two. The law requires that ODOT obtain authorization of the Legislative Assembly before entering into any agreements for the construction or operation of any tollway facilities except for two: 1) the Newberg/Dundee Bypass and 2) the Tualatin-Sherwood Highway linking Interstate 5 and Highway 99W. This restriction was subsequently amended to include the Lewis and Clark Bridge in Columbia County and an unnamed project in the Portland urban area.

- August 14, 1996, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) approved proceeding with siting studies and land-use and environmental-feasibility reviews of the Tualatin-Sherwood and Newberg/Dundee tollway projects. This decision came after the OTC considered a staff report and public testimony regarding the preliminary assessment of the financial feasibility of these projects as toll roads.
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

RESPONSIBILITIES

The goal of this work is to produce a set of "concept-level" alternatives that are: 1) likely to be feasible for permitting under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; 2) likely to be approvable under USDOT Section 4(f) Procedures, 3) supportable under the Endangered Species Act requirements and 4) achievable under the State’s Transportation Planning Rule and other land-use goals.

- Decision-Making Process - Support Steering Team made up of affected government officials and representatives from key agencies;
- Stakeholder Interviews (with the assistance of Steering Team) - Develop a list of approximately 20 to 30 stakeholders for one-on-one;
- Alternatives Identification - Through the Steering Team process, identify an initial range of alignment alternatives and design concepts for study;
- Environmental Setting, Inventory and Comparative Evaluation - Compile a summary map of the study area showing significant environmental (physical, social and cultural) features that influence the location of a connector;
- Significant Land-Use Characteristics - Compile a summary map showing significant land uses, jurisdictional boundaries, the UGB, roadways, "Exceptions" lands, wildlife refuges, floodplains, etc.;
- Transportation Evaluation - Using existing regional transportation forecasts and comprehensive planning, document the need for the connector facility; and
- Summary Report - The findings and conclusions of the analyses will be summarized in a single report of a size and format suitable for distribution to public and elected officials. Sufficient narrative, graphs, maps, data, etc., should be included so that the reader understands the basis for the findings and conclusions, without having to refer to more detailed technical papers or reports.

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

- Technical memo documenting Steering Team process, involvement and outcome;
- Technical memo documenting the interview process and what was learned;
- Maps showing each alternative and its relationship to key environmental (physical, social and cultural) features;
- A technical paper describing the conceptual design characteristics and cost estimate of each alternative selected for further study beyond this contract. The paper would describe the process used for narrowing the alternatives to those selected and should also document the basis for rejecting other alternatives which were considered;
- Environmental resource summary map;
- Technical report and appendices describing the environmental setting and documenting the comparative environmental evaluation of studied alternatives;
- Land-use features summary map and technical report; and
- Transportation technical report.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>FY 2001-02</th>
<th>Full Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEA-21 High Priority Projects</td>
<td>$ 395,000</td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 395,000</td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ODOT – TRANSPORTATION AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT (TGM) PROGRAM

The TGM Program is supported primarily by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century federal funds. The program's mission is:

- To enhance Oregon's livability;
- Foster integrated land-use and transportation planning; and
- Encourage development that results in compact, pedestrian/bicycle/transit-friendly communities.

The program offers grants to local governments for two categories of planning:

- Local transportation system plans and implementation measures; and
- Land-use plan changes which help meet transportation needs, including planning for compliance with the Metro 2040 Growth Concept Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

Besides grants, the TGM program offers the following services:

- Quick-response consultants provide design alternatives to development proposals consistent with Smart Development principles;
- Code assistance is provided to local governments to prepare (or amend) local development codes to meet Smart Development principles;
- The TGM Outreach program is aimed at increasing understanding and acceptance of Smart Development principles through workshops, a partnership program and technical assistance for practitioners.

ITS – WASHINGTON COUNTY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT CENTER

Washington County is fast becoming an urbanized County and, therefore, faces traffic problems related to urbanized stress. There is a need to set direction and establish goals for traffic management on the arterial roadways.

The proposed project would further the development of a traffic-monitoring, regulation system on the major road network that would allow the county to maximize the existing roadway capacity at a low cost. The needs assessment will be developed into an appropriate implementation plan.

The Needs Assessment will:

- Identify challenges, vision and benefits of ATMS;
- Identify the core elements such as:
  1. Traffic monitoring;
  2. Traffic control; and
  3. Traveler information.
- Define existing ODOT/Portland Regional ITS Architecture that may be applicable, to Washington County ATMS.
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

• Identify ATMS implementation strategies to include:
  1. Communications;
  2. Operations/Maintenance; and
  3. Information sharing.

• Define critical path and a schedule for implementation,
• Identify staffing and budget needs for implementation; and
• List of specific projects and costs.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>FY 2001-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS/ATMS STP</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>$8,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$78,056</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITS – CLACKAMAS COUNTY PLAN DEVELOPMENT & IMPLEMENTATION

Traffic within the Clackamas County area continues to increase and with the traffic, more congestion. The County received a grant as part of the METRO Priorities 2000 process to develop and implement an ITS plan. The proposed plan would assess the ITS needs of the County, determine the core elements, phasing of implementation and coordinate the plan with the existing regional ITS plans. The first phase will likely include signal system upgrades for County and City systems. It may also include possibly larger traffic management projects on the busy routes such as Sunnyside Road, Highway 212/224 and McLoughlin Boulevard, although projects have not yet been chosen.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>FY 2001-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS/ATMS CMAQ</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>$18,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$183,885</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSIBILITIES

In partnership with local and regional governments, refine and implement the Portland MPO Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Coordinate the RTP with the Metro 2040 Growth Concept and Regional Framework Plan as well as the Oregon Transportation Plan, Oregon Highway Plan and the Transportation Planning Rule.

Relationship to Overall Program

Transportation improvement projects in the Portland MPO must be included in the Metro RTP, before they can receive federal funds for project development.

Relationship to Previous Work

Continue work on refining and implementing the RTP

OBJECTIVES/TARGETS

• Coordination and Support of Metro Programs:

  1. Coordinate TIP Development: ODOT staff work with Metro to assure the process for selecting federally-funded transportation projects is balanced, fair and provides for a range of needs;  

  2. Support RTP Implementation: ODOT staff works closely with Metro to assure the implementation accurately reflects ODOT projects and incorporates the State's interest into regional policy making. ODOT staff will continue to participate in development of the Corridor Initiatives Program, RTP Business Partnership, Model Refinement and Local Plan Coordination.  

  3. Support Regional High Capacity Transit (HCT) Studies: ODOT staff to work with Metro to assess the utility of HCT and proposed regional-policy response. HCT is responsible for analysis of alternative transportation modes and completion of project planning for major fixed guideway transit facilities, including commuter rail, light rail (LRT) and busways.  

  4. Support the Analysis of Alternative Funding: ODOT was a project partner in the Traffic Relief Options study to assure the study adequately addressed issues and concerns of ODOT as well as the Federal Highway Administration. ODOT will develop a policy response to the findings of the congestion pricing study and continue to investigate alternative sources of funding, including an analysis of congestion pricing implementation issues in the Highway 217 and Sunset (US 26) corridors.  

  5. Support Metro Transportation/Land-Use Integration Efforts: ODOT staff will work with Metro to implement the 2040 Growth Concept Plan. ODOT staff will participate in the Metro/Hood River Community Solution Team (CST) process to assist in selection of projects to implement the Plan. The CST will collaboratively solve transportation and community issues that affect the Portland MPO area. ODOT works closely with Metro to ensure that regional growth management policy does not adversely impact the State’s transportation system.
6. Assist Green Corridor Implementation Strategy: ODOT staff will assist in development of a strategy for assuring that ODOT facilities on the fringe of the urban growth boundary (UGB) can function as a green corridor as envisioned in the 2040 Growth Concept Plan.

7. Assist in the Development of the Transportation Model and Traffic Analysis: Assist with analysis and input from ODOT traffic engineers.

8. Assist in Transportation Model, Traffic Analysis and Methodology: ODOT staff to provide assistance with traffic input and analysis. ODOT, Metro and local governments will develop traffic analysis methodology to identify new land-use patterns. ODOT will participate in the Regional Industrial Land study for the metro area.

Coordinate Transportation Planning Activities:

1. Local Land Use and Development Review: ODOT staff process almost 5,000 land-use notices and provides comments on several hundred that potentially affect state highways. Staff response usually consists of a letter of record; however, it sometimes requires extensive negotiation and traffic analysis.

2. Coordinate Local TSP Development: ODOT staff to participate in development of TSPs for every jurisdiction in the region. The TSPs are critical in identifying the impact of future growth on the state highway system. Staff will assist in development of these plans to assure consistency with the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP), Oregon Highway Plan (OHP), Corridor Plans and the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR).

3. Local Street Network and Access Management Programs: ODOT staff will process these programs to maintain and improve the local transportation system and protect (and promote) state highway safety and efficiency. The Oregon Legislature created the state funding with bonds financed by Oregon Highway Fund revenues.

4. Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) Coordination: ODOT staff will coordinate with regional and local jurisdictions in the process of selecting Special Transportation Areas (STA) as well as expressways in the Portland metropolitan area. ODOT staff will continue to negotiate the transfer of state highways whose function is primary local or redundant. Staff will work with Metro and local jurisdictions to redefine the national highway system (NHS), state freight route and the functional classifications system in conjunction with adoption of local TSPs and RTP.

5. Regional Air Quality Planning: ODOT staff to participate with DEQ to ensure that the region's transportation projects comply with federal air-quality regulations.

Conduct Transportation Planning Studies:

1. Freeway Interchange Management Studies: Conduct studies of various freeway interchanges in the Portland metropolitan area to assess potential to accommodate growth. The studies will identify any short-term, relatively inexpensive improvements that can be made to add capacity. The studies will determine the feasibility of acquiring additional right-of-way for access control in the vicinity of the interchange.
2. I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership: Assist and participate in the Assessment Phase of the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership study.

3. Urban Corridor Studies: Participate with Metro and local governments in studies of the urban corridor in the Portland metropolitan area. The studies will identify long-term management strategies for the corridor while identifying and prioritizing future improvements within the corridor. It will include technical analysis, policy development and on-going public involvement. The study will include an evaluation of congestion pricing, HOV/HOT and transit capital improvements on selected corridors as a possible strategy to accommodate future traffic growth. The urban corridor studies will provide recommendations on future level of service standards as specified in the OHP and the Metro RTP.

4. Innovative Improvements Studies: Assist and participate in studies to identify and examine potential freight improvements on interstate freeway corridors and participate in regional efforts to develop a freight network to better accommodate goods movement. Forecast of commodities for the Portland area indicates a substantial increase in freight demand over the next 30 years.

DELEVERABLES

Technical Assistance for Metro Programs:

- TIP (end of FY 2002);
- RTP Refinement and Implementation (on-going);
- HCT and Commuter Rail Studies;
  1. Interstate MAX (on-going participation);
  2. Beaverton/Wilsonville Commuter Rail (on-going participation); and
  3. South Bus (on-going participation);
- Alternative Funding (end of FY 2002);
- OHP Coordination (on-going participation);
- Green Corridor Implementation (end of FY 2002);
- Development of the regional transportation model (on-going participation); and
- Development of traffic analysis methodology (on-going participation).

Linking Local Land Use with Transportation Planning:

- Development Review Program (on-going participation);
- Technical Assistance with the development of local transportation systems plans (end of FY 2002);
- Technical Assistance in Regional Air Quality Planning (on-going participation); and
- Metro/Mt. Hood Community Solution Team (on-going participation).
ODOT - PLANNING ASSISTANCE

ODOT Studies:

- Freeway Interchange Management Studies (on-going participation);
- Urban Corridor Studies (end of FY 2002);
- I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Study Assessment Phase (end of FY 2002);
- Local Street Network Program (on-going participation);
- Access Management Program (on-going participation); and
- State Infrastructure Bank Studies (on-going participation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Summary</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor &amp; System Planning:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (Region 1)</td>
<td>$ 428,549</td>
<td>SPR: SPF 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portland Transportation Study:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (MPO Coordination and Support)</td>
<td>$ 636,640</td>
<td>SPR: SPF 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,065,189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 2002 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM FUNDING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO</th>
<th>RTP Update/Refinement</th>
<th>Congestion Relief</th>
<th>Freeway Improvement Pgm</th>
<th>RTP Financing</th>
<th>Greenstreets</th>
<th>Local Plan Coordination</th>
<th>Alternative Mode Implementation</th>
<th>Regional Freight Plan</th>
<th>Corridor Initiative</th>
<th>RTP Business Partnership Program</th>
<th>FY02 STP</th>
<th>ODOT Support Funds</th>
<th>FY03 STP</th>
<th>Sec 5309</th>
<th>Sec 5309*</th>
<th>Sec 5307</th>
<th>Sec 5307*</th>
<th>Sec 5307</th>
<th>Sec 5307*</th>
<th>Sec 5307</th>
<th>Sec 5307*</th>
<th>Sec 5309</th>
<th>Sec 5309*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02UWP</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02STP</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>163,578</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>43,856</td>
<td>45,812</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,016</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>337,235</td>
<td>87,235</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td>62,084</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>1,084,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Federal funds only, no match included.

1. The full $1,246,255 shown is based on assumption of $80,312,013 fed + $2,000,000 000T (1/2 match) plus carryover of $192,000.
2. FY02 STP is comprised of $699,000 federal + $44,000 000T (1/2 match) plus $100,000 000T (1/2 match) + $35,992 000T (1/2 match) + $250,000 000T (1/2 match).
3. FY02 program has the land acquisition.
4. See narratives for anticipated funding source.

**Note:** The GRAND TOTAL includes the anticipated funding from the $222,018. The total is estimated to be $1,065,189, with $1,065,189 from the $222,018 and $1,065,189 from the additional funds.
### FY2002

**OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE - FUNDING SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASHINGTON COUNTY: ITS</strong></td>
<td>ATMS/STP</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>8,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,056</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clackamas County: ITS</strong></td>
<td>ATMS/CMAQ</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>18,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>183,885</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEQ: Employee Commute Options (ECO)</strong></td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>16,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,399</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ODOT/WSDOT: I-5N Trade Corridor</strong></td>
<td>FHWA Corridors &amp; Borders Program</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ODOT/WSDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-5/99W Corridor</strong></td>
<td>TEA 21</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>395,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TGM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRI-MET: Transportation Demand Management Program</strong></td>
<td>CMAQ OR-90-x77 &amp; or-90-x88</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tri-Met</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three-Year Service Plan Implementation</strong></td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,425,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streamline</strong></td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>760,000</td>
<td>122,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T21High Priority Project</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Corridor Project Development</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,630,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec 5309</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>370,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>