# BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF SELECTING	)	Resolution No. 79-67
PROBLEM AREAS TO BE CONSIDERED	)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
FOR FUNDING WITH THE MSD INTER-	)	Requested by
STATE TRANSFER RESERVE	)	Rick Gustafson

WHEREAS, The CRAG Board of Directors in Resolution BD 781213, established a MSD Regional Reserve Account, a \$20 million reserve of Federal Interstate Transfer funds (as of September 30, 1978) to fund regional transit and highway improvement projects outside of the City of Portland; and

WHEREAS, The MSD Council in Resolution No. 79-48 established a study process and a schedule for establishing priorities for the MSD Regional Reserve Account; and

WHEREAS, The MSD Council in Resolution No. 79-54 adopted criteria for establishing problem priorities and evaluating proposed projects; and

WHEREAS, MSD staff, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, ODOT and Tri-Met, has identified an extensive list of problem areas; and

WHEREAS, MSD staff has applied the Council approved criteria to screen problem areas down to a high priority list of 23 problems; and

WHEREAS, The remainder of the study process will concentrate on analyzing the high priority problem areas; now, therefore, BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the MSD Council hereby establishes the 23

problem areas outlined in Exhibit "A" as the high priority problem areas eligible for funding from the MSD Regional Reserve.

2. That in accordance with the approved study process the MSD Council directs the staff to report back on which of the 23 problem areas are recommended for funding.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 26th day of July, 1979.

Presiding Officer

MBurles

GS/gl

4371A

0033A

# Staff Report No. 48 (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY) MSD REGIONAL RESERVE PLANNING PROCESS PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION INITIAL SCREENING HIGH PRIORITY PROBLEMS

Metropolitan Service District

## PUBLISHED BY

# Metropolitan Service District 527 SW Hall Street Portland, Oregon 97201

C. William Ockert

Director, MSD Transportation
Department

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT -- PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Report Authors

Gary Spanovich , Bob Haas Dan Seeman Senior Planner Planner Research Assistant

Report Production

Bill Chidester Christy Day Alan Holsted Karen Thackston Word Processing Graphics Graphics Administrative Aide

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### AND RECOMMENDATIONS

# PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report describes the MSD staff analysis to assess funding priorities for the \$20 million MSD Interstate Transfer reserve fund. The report describes the 88 suggested problem areas and documents the initial screening of the problems according to criteria adopted by the MSD Council in June. Based on this analysis, MSD staff recommends 22 high priority problem areas for further study.

#### MSD REGIONAL RESERVE ACCOUNT

In December, 1978, a \$20 million Interstate Transfer reserve account was established from Mt. Hood Freeway withdrawal funds as a result of a reallocation of the Oregon City Transitway Reserve. The reserve account is to be allocated by the MSD Council for various regional highway and transit projects located outside the city of Portland. This reserve account is, however, contingent on the official approval of the I-505 withdrawal by the US Department of Transportation.

#### RESERVE PLANNING PROCESS

The primary focus of funding decisions is on solving proglems, both existing and future. Transportation problems and deficiencies in the region are critical and will continue to worse in many areas of the future. Because problems associated with the transportation system cross jurisdictional boundaries, the MSD Council recognized that a sound technical process applied on a regional scale was needed to identify and prioritize problem areas to be addressed with federal funds. The technical analysis would provide a basis for sound decisions identifying the most cost-effective projects. A process and schedule for undertaking such an analysis was established by the MSD Council in April, 1979. An important part of the process includes the identification of criteria to be used in defining funding priorities. In June, the MSD Council adopted a set of criteria to be used in the study process.

#### PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Local jurisdictions, implementing agencies, and MSD Councilors have identified 88 problem areas which they wish to have considered for funding from the MSD reserve. These problems were identified at a number of meetings with local jurisdiction and implementing agency staff. In addition, requests were solicited from local elected officials and MSD Councilors.

MSD staff's input into the problem identification workshops was an identification of regional and subregional corridor deficiencies. These corridors account for a majority of the travel movements made in the region. An analysis was also prepared which (1) identified these regional and subregional corridors, and (2) compared corridor trips to the ability of each corridor to move people.

# SCREENING OF THE PROBLEMS

The 88 problem areas identified involve a variety of problems. It is not possible for MSD staff to study each of these in depth, nor would it be beneficial as the cost of projects appropriate to solve the problems would greatly exceed available funding revenues. In addition, a number of the problems may represent marginal transportation problems. For these reasons, an initial screening has been undertaken based on criteria adopted by the MSD Council in June.

The MSD Council criteria contain both eligibility and evaluation criteria. Eligibility of funding is determined based on the following conditions:

- . The problem area must be located outside the City of Portland, within the MSD Boundary, and within the Urban Growth Boundary.
- . Cost overruns on currently funded projects would not be eligible for funding consideration.

Criteria for evaluating eligible problem areas are:

- 1. Problems affecting regional travel flows
- 2. Environmental problems
- 3. Problems resulting from insufficiently maintained facilities
- 4. Scale of the problem
- 5. Local jurisdictional interest
- 6. Geographic distribution

#### RECOMMENDED HIGH PRIORITY PROBLEMS

Based on the initial screening, staff recommended that 22 problem areas be analyzed further.

However, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) at their July 12 meeting has requested changes to staff recommendations.

First they have requested that a Tri-Met proposal for new bus purchase be included in the high priority problem list. Staff recommendations originally found it ineligible because Tri-Met was to pursue bus purchase through other federal funding sources and because of the requirement that Regional Reserve funds not be programmed for improvements within the City of Portland.

JPACT has also requested that the City of Portland be requested to also consider the funding of bus purchases from their \$50 million reserve. Tri-Met also indicated they are doubtful they will be able to secure Section 3 funding. The need for buses is serious in the region and does support the MSD criteria.

Secondly, JPACT has requested that three problem areas originally identified by staff be expanded. Originally staff identified three subregional corridor movements and recommended for each corridor that one particular facility be placed on the high priority problem list.

JPACT recommended that for each of the three subregional corridors that additional facility improvement options be included. Staff recommended the following in response to JPACT's direction.

# Subregional Corridor Movement

# 1. Troutdale North-South Corridor

# 2. West Beaverton North-South Corridor

3. Milwaukie East-West Corridor

# Facility Options

- 1. 242nd Ave--I-80N to US 26
- 2. 257th Ave--I-80N to US 26
- 1. 158th Ave--Jenkins Road to Farmington Road
- 2. Murray Blvd--US 26 to Scholls Ferry Road
- 1. Harrison/King--99E to 82nd Ave
- 2. Railroad/Harmony--99E to 37th Ave

These additions along with the original study recommendations are identified on the attached map.

## THE NEXT STEP

Once the high priority problem list has been approved by the MSD Council, the next step in the process will be to study each problem in depth. Baseline data will be assembled and summarized about problem characteristics in terms of criteria as a basis for formulating improvement objectives and for evaluating the anticipated effectiveness of alternative projects.

Each problem will be analyzed in depth and two questions will be answered: (1) What is the severity of the problem? and (2) What is its cause? Criteria previously developed will be used to assess the severity of the problem measured across a broad range of issues.

Next, improvement objectives will be formulated for each problem area. Objectives in the process are extremely important as they serve as a reference point for identifying a complete range of project alternatives and provide a basis for judging the merits of competing projects. Improvement objectives are necessary in order to understand what function facilities should serve. Definition of the

major movements a facility is expected to serve and the improving of a facility so that it can serve those movements is necessary in order to define the most effective transportation solution.

Finally, in October, local jurisdictions and implementing agencies will be requested to officially submit candidate projects for consideration by the MSD Council. Subsequently, MSD staff will perform an evaluation of the projects and submit final recommendations to the MSD Council.

