



**METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT**

527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

**MEMORANDUM**

Date: January 29, 1981  
To: Bi-State Task Force Members  
From: Mike Burton *M.B.*  
Regarding: Next Steps

Shortly after our last Task Force meeting, the TAC received comments from FHWA on our proposed work program. These comments (see attached FHWA memo) questioned the proposed scope of work, given the limited funding available and the conclusions of the previous studies. Specifically, FHWA staff does not believe that the \$200,000 available is sufficient to carry out an Alternatives Analysis substantial enough to convince FHWA or UMTA to fund preliminary engineering and environmental impact studies on major construction projects such as LRT or a third highway bridge. Since the WDOT and FHWA studies have concluded that a third bridge is not justifiable, FHWA questions the desirability of even undertaking such an analysis. Because of the importance of this work scope to the efforts of the Task Force, I have included this issue for discussion on the February agenda.

To aid these discussions, I asked the TAC to outline options for further Task Force work. These options are described in detail in the attached memorandum. Based on this memo and an initial reading of Don Barney's report on the concerns of various policymakers, I recommend that the Task Force consider option 2 as identified by the TAC. This option would appear to best meet the concerns summarized in Don Barney's report and would generally provide the technical information necessary to move ahead.

For discussion purposes, I suggest that we consider the following Task Force direction statement. Further, I suggest the Task Force adopt a statement on interstate travel at its March meeting. In order for the statement to accurately reflect the concerns of the entire Task Force, I urge all members to attend our February and March meetings. At our February meeting, we will need to identify a process for adoption and public announcement of our statement.

Task Force Direction on Interstate Travel (Draft)

1. Concur with the WDOT report's highway recommendation that a third bridge should not be examined further at this time. TSM is the appropriate highway strategy in the foreseeable future.

2. It is expected that congestion will continue to be a characteristic of travel in the Bi-State corridor, particularly in the peak travel periods. In the short term, the level of congestion experienced will depend upon the TSM actions (such as ramp-metering) undertaken.
3. In the long term, the level of congestion will also be affected by the type and amount of land development. While Clark County development will have the greatest impact on interstate corridor congestion, decisions concerning development of Hayden Island and similar areas will also affect congestion levels.
4. With the TSM approach to highway operations in the Bi-State corridor, the most important priority is to ensure that the already "committed" projects are actually constructed. Of particular importance are ODOT's Slough bridge and I-5 North projects and the S.R. 14 interchange in Washington. The region should make every effort to achieve federal and state funding for these projects.
5. The arterial circulation patterns on each side of the Columbia River should be designed around access to two bridges (I-5 and I-205). Arterial circulation needs should be studied by the appropriate local jurisdictions on each side of the river.
6. Major transit service and rideshare expansions will be necessary to accommodate expected growth in interstate travel. The appropriateness of transitways in either or both of the I-5 and I-205 corridors should be examined. In particular, the capital costs of LRT construction should be weighed against the potential for operating cost savings over bus operation. This issue should be examined as part of Metro's RTP effort. The analysis, similar to that already carried out for the McLoughlin Corridor, could be funded using UMTA-approved Interstate Withdrawal funds and the local match funds collected from members of the Bi-State Task Force.
7. The FHWA study should not be pursued.
8. The ECO final report should concentrate on the following issues:
  - a. How should long-term policies or projects for the corridor be developed?
  - b. How should interstate transit and rideshare services be operated and financed?

Bi-State Task Force  
January 29, 1981  
Page 3

- c. What are the opportunities and constraints for inter-state cost sharing for TSM, transit and rideshare programs?
- d. What mechanisms are necessary to insure a coordinated Bi-State TSM approach?

I look forward to discussing these issues with you at our February 5 meeting.

MB:AC:lmk

Enclosures  
CC: Metro Council



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**  
BUREAU OF PLANNING

Mildred A. Schwab, Commissioner  
Terry D. Sandblast, Acting Director  
621 S.W. Alder  
Portland, Oregon 97205  
(503) 248-4253

27 January 1981

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Burton, Task Force Chairman

FROM: Anne Sylvester, TAC Co-Chairperson  
Steve Dotterer, TAC Co-Chairperson

RE: Discussion Options for February 5th Task Force Meeting

As you requested, we have developed several optional directions for the Bi-State Task Force to pursue in the coming months. Each option is based upon slightly different conclusions by the Task Force concerning the WDOT and Transpo studies. These alternative conclusions result in different study needs for the remainder of the Task Force's work and each of the options outlines the next steps necessary. As the option chosen will affect the Task Force's application for additional study funds, and will also determine the final study elements and report format for the ECO study, an option should be selected as quickly as possible. The presentation of Don Barney's draft policy issues report at the February 5th meeting should provide aid in selecting an option.

The remainder of this memo describes three suggested options. It identifies several other important conclusions concerning interstate travel which we suggest the Task Force consider. We have not prepared a draft resolution, as was suggested at the last Task Force meeting. However, these or similar statements could be included in any Task Force resolution or public statement on interstate travel needs and solutions. The memo concludes with a list of institutional issues which we suggest the final ECO report should address.

Option 1: Maintain Existing Direction

At the present time, the Task Force has applied to FHWA for approval of a \$200,000 study consisting of two major elements. First, the long term options for interstate travel (third bridge, transitway or continued TSM) would be examined and an appropriate alternative recommended. Second, the Task force would identify specific TSM measures, based on the WDOT work and the conclusions from the first part of the study. FHWA staff has questioned the efficiency of this approach for several reasons (see attached letter). Their primary concerns are that adequate study and construction funding is not available and that

CODE  
ADMINISTRATION  
248-4250

LONG RANGE  
PLANNING  
248-4260

SPECIAL  
PROJECTS  
248-4509

TRANSPORTATION  
PLANNING  
248-4254

HOUSING AND  
POPULATION  
248-5525

the study will be repetitious of previous studies, particularly the WDOT and FHWA studies, both of which concluded that a third bridge should not be examined further. They make no comments on the TSM portions of the proposed study.

Further consideration of this approach in our opinion, requires that the Task Force reject the WDOT study's conclusions and identify areas where additional analysis is necessary. It may also be necessary for the two MPO's to identify potential funding sources for a major investment such as a third bridge or LRT. Additionally, the TAC would need to prepare a more detailed Scope-of-Work.

#### Option 2: Include In Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

In considering previous Task Force and TAC discussions, it appears that TSM, and not a third bridge, is the preferred highway alternative for the foreseeable future but that further examination of transitway alternatives is desirable. The desire to examine these transit alternatives, however, is not based on the belief that they will provide substantial relief to existing river crossings. Rather, the concern is whether a major capital investment in transit will provide long-term operating cost savings and/or a strong focus for other development activities on each side of the river. The RTPs currently being prepared by both MPO's would appear to be the appropriate mechanism to address these questions.

If the Task Force follows this approach, a portion of the funding (both federal interstate withdrawal and local match) could be used, primarily by METRO, to do analysis of a transitway in the I-5 and I-205 corridors. This analysis would determine the ridership levels needed for cost-effective LRT operation and identify other benefits. The analysis would be similar in scope to the recent McLoughlin Corridor LRT analysis which identified operating costs and a recommended alignment. The Task Force would not pursue the FHWA study further. The Task Force would need approval of a revised scope of work by agencies providing local match and a request to UMTA for use of the interstate withdrawal funds for the study. If UMTA approval is not forthcoming, a reduced study effort using local funds could be pursued.

#### Option 3: Endorse WDOT Conclusions

The final option would be simply to endorse all of the WDOT report conclusions, including those related to transit operations. These conclusions were that TSM is the appropriate strategy for both highways and transit. Under this option, the remaining questions are the specific TSM measures and the institutional and funding mechanisms needed for implementation of both TSM and substantially increased transit service. Under this alternative, the last phase of the ECO study could be targeted to answer these questions and the Task Force would apply to FHWA for approval of a TSM preliminary engineering study.

27 January 1981

Page 3

### Additional Conclusions

In addition to the conclusions embodied in the three options above, there are several other subject areas which have been raised by Task Force members or consultant studies. We recommend that the Task Force consider the following additional conclusions in any statement on interstate travel.

1. In the Bi-State corridor, the most important priority is to insure that the already "committed projects are actually constructed. Of particular importance are ODOT's I-5 North project and the equivalent project in Washington. During PE for both of these projects, the TSM actions suggested by the WDOT report should be examined for feasibility.
2. Major transit service and rideshare expansions will be necessary to accommodate expected growth in interstate travel.
3. It is expected that congestion will continue to be a characteristic of travel in the Bi-State corridor, particularly in the peak travel periods. In the short term, the level of congestion experienced will depend upon the TSM actions (such as ramps metering) undertaken.
4. In the long term, the level of congestion will also be affected by the type and amount of land development. While Clark County development will have the greatest impact on interstate corridor congestion, decisions concerning development of Hayden Island and similar areas will also affect congestion levels.
5. Arterial circulation needs should be studied by the appropriate local jurisdictions. The arterial circulation patterns on each side of the Columbia River should be designed around access to two bridges (I-5 and I-205). (This conclusion would be altered if Option 1 was followed.)

### Institutional Issues

At the present time, the ECO work program covers a wide range of institutional issues. At a minimum, however, the ECO final report should address the following issues:

1. How should long-term policies or projects for the corridor be developed?
2. How should transit/rideshare operation and cost sharing be arranged for interstate services?
3. What mechanisms are necessary to insure a coordinated, bi-state TSM approach?

SD:AS:db

Attachment

cc: Bi-State TAC

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

12-18-80  
COPY TO  
Bothman  
THE OREGON DIVISION - SALEM  
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

# memorandum

Subject: Scope of Work for Portland-Vancouver  
Corridor Project

Date: December 17, 1980

From: G. L. Green, Division Administrator

Reply to HRP-OR/724.4  
Attn. of: HPD-OR

To: Mr. H. Coulter, State Highway Engineer  
Oregon State Highway Division

The scope of work, transmitted with Mr. Bothman's December 11, 1980 letter, for a Portland-Vancouver Corridor Project proposed by the Bi-State Task Force has been reviewed by FHWA and briefly discussed with UMTA. The proposed project could be eligible for funding with Interstate transfer funds. We would like to offer several comments for consideration by the Task Force before the project is submitted for funding approval.

The project appears to be another in a series of studies aimed at analyzing transportation problems in the Portland-Vancouver corridor. Each study has made recommendations but there has been little, if any, consensus on the results of those studies. This corridor project is purportedly different from those earlier studies in that its purpose is to again analyze the corridor alternatives and select a program of projects for which State and/or local agencies will subsequently proceed into further project development. While this is a desirable objective, it appears that this project could be no more successful than past efforts in defining a clear course of action.

Our concern over the proposed work is based on several items - (1) the level of effort of the project, (2) reliance on a consultant to do the bulk of the work (\$135,000 out of a \$200,000 project), (3) availability of funding for implementation, and (4) the continuing analysis of a third bridge.

The proposed work appears to provide some additional refinements to past studies. However, if serious consideration is intended for advancing a major investment into the project development phase, the scope of work appears too limited. A work effort similar to UMTA's Alternative Analysis process (especially with the inclusion of an LRT alternative) would be necessary to permit advancement to a draft EIS. To obtain that level of detail would of course require considerably more than a \$200,000 budget. If one can accept the recommendations of the WSDOT study, then further analysis of a wide range of alternatives is unnecessary. The focus of this effort would be more concerned with project development of feasible alternatives in the corridor such as TSM improvements.

We have no background on the reasons for using a consultant to do most of the work. It seems that the familiarity, detailed knowledge, and technical capabilities of the several involved agencies would suggest that only some supplemental specialized consultant services would be needed.

Funding for implementation must be seriously considered. The area's experience with availability and use of Interstate transfer and other Federal-aid highway and transit funds have shown the limitations in those sources of funds. Without additional new funding, the area will need to reevaluate its priorities if any major investments are to be implemented in the Portland-Vancouver corridor.

As a final comment, we are surprised that a third bridge is being retained as an alternative. Both the FHWA and WSDOT studies have concluded a third Columbia River bridge is not cost-effective. Further analysis of the need, jurisdictional support, and funding feasibility does not appear warranted.

Original Signed By  
E. J. VALACH  
Program Development  
Engineer

G. L. Green

cc:

✓METRO (R. Bothman)  
Region (R. Boeglin)  
WA Division (Lyle Renz)  
UMTA (Pat Levine)





29 January 1981

MEMORANDUM

TO: Bi-State Task Force and TAC

FROM: Terry Moore

SUBJECT: Agenda for February Meetings

The Task Force will meet at noon, Thursday, February 5, at METRO. The TAC will meet at 10 a.m., Tuesday, February 3 at METRO. The tentative agenda for those meetings is presented below. Please recall that lunches for Thursday's meeting must be ordered in advance and purchased at the meeting. TAC members should give me a count at the Tuesday meeting.

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Minutes
- III. Election of Co-Chair
- IV. Presentation of Technical Memorandum #2: Policy Issues (Mailed separately)
- V. Discussion of Next Steps (See attached memorandum from Mike Burton)
- VI. Other
- VII. Adjournment