BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING)	RESOLUTION NO. 81-223
PROJECT PRIORITIES USING INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDS IN FY 1981)))	Introduced by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 80-186 which endorsed the FY81 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, The program of projects set forth in the TIP was based on the likelihood of receiving \$70.4 million in Federal Interstate Transfer funds for its accomplishment; and

WHEREAS, The actual federal allocation to the Portland region was released in late December 1980 and amounted to \$21.0 million for highway projects and \$17.6 million for transit projects; and

WHEREAS, The TIP Subcommittee has developed a revised FY 1981 program in keeping with the newly allocated funds; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

- 1. That the Metro Council endorses the projects identified as Priority 1 (Exhibit A) as eligible for use of the available \$21.0 million of Interstate Transfer funding for highway projects under the following conditions:
 - a. They will be submitted to FHWA for funding on a first-come, first-served basis.
 - b. Each project is restricted to no more than 10 percent over the specified level of funding.

Res. No. 81-223 Page 1 of 2

- c. Jurisdictions are authorized to transfer projects within the designated funding earmark.
- d. Funds to cover project costs in excess of those authorized in the TIP are to be transferred from other project funding within a jurisdiction and in accordance with the cost overrun process adopted by Resolution No. 79-103.
- 2. That the Metro Council endorses Priorities 2, 3 and 4 as the basis for proceeding with project development and federal approvals.
- 3. That the Metro Council endorses the projects and priorities identified in Exhibit B for use of "Transit" Interstate Transfer funds.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 26th day of February, 1981.

Presiding Officer

AC:BP:et 1799B/188

PAGE 1					HECHIAY		00 00 01
the state of the s	OTD	WORK	ABCY ARAC	SFEK PRIORITIES- PRIORITY 1	PRIDRITY 2	PRIORITY 3	PRIORITY 4
PROJECT TITLE	u						
			non:	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
1 26 - GLISAN, FRONT	2	PE	PORT	100,000	-0	0	5,000,000
2 26 - GLISAN, FRONT	4		PORT	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
3 65-CAPITOL, REA-HILLS	. 1	PE		45,000	757000	178,925	178,925
4 65-CAPITOL, BEA-HILLS	2		PORT	0	Ö	1,211,250	1,211,250
5 ARTERIAL OVERLAYS(PH2	2	CUN	PORT	U		1,211,200	
6 ARTERIAL ST.LGT.CON.	1	CON	PORT	1,190,000	1,170,000	1,190,000	1,190,000
7 ARTERIAL ST.LGT.CON.	1	CON	PORT	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
B BARBUR-TAYLORS F. TERW	ĩ	PE	PORT	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
9 BASIN-GOING INTCHGE.	- 3	CON	PORT	0	1,688,879	1,488,879	1,688,879
10 BASIN-PACIFIC H. GOING NOISE	1	PE	PURT	76,000	76,000	76,000	76,000
					070 577	972,537	972,537
11 BASIN-PACIFIC H, GOING NOISE	3	CON		0	972,537 0	240,000	240,000
12 BURNSIDE @ TICHNER	3	CON		0	190,000	190,000	190,000
13 COL.BLVD.@ N. FORT.RAMP	_ 4		PORT	190,000		2,800	2,800
14 COLUMBIA @ 47,SIGNAL	1	PE	PORT	2,800	2,800	61,200	61,200
15 COLUMBIA @ 47, SIGNAL	4	CON	PORT	61,200	61,200	817200	817200
44 O TOAN OF EMICOD 70		CON	PORT		0	1,600,000	1,600,000
16 GLISAN-GLENWOOD, 39 17 HOLLYWOOD BUSINESS IMP	1	PE	PORT	170,000	170,000	190,000	190,000
	7		FORT	0	0	100,000	100,000
18 HOLLYWOOD BUSINESS IMP	_ <u>i</u> _	PE	PORT	6,967	6,967	6,967	6,967
19 INTERSTATE @ TILLAMOOK	3		PURT	28,033	28,033	28,033	28,033
20 INTERSTATE @ TILLAMOOK	J	CON	1 0101	20.000		and the same and t	
21 SANDY BLVD-WASH, 82ND AVE	1	PE	PORT	16,000	16,000	16,000	14,000
22 SANDY BLVD-WASH, 82ND AVE	4	CON		. 0	0	0	246,500
23 SELLWOOD TRAFFIC DIVR.	À	PE	PORT	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
24 THURMAN-COL.,14-16 CUP-ADD'L PE	;	PE	PORT	6,000	4,000	6,000	6,000
25 THURMAN-COL.,14-16 CUP	ร	CON		0	0	700,000	700,000
						3,672,000	3,672,000
26 WCL PORT-OSWEGO AVE	4	CON		Ů,	. 0	75,000	75,000
27 WEBSTER-FLAVEL, 82	4	R/W		050.000	250,000	250,000	250,000
28 MACADAM SUPPLEMENT	1	COW		250,000	2301000	50,000	50,000
29 NW INTERSECTIONS	1	PE	PORT	0	30,000	30,000	30,000
30 MCLOUGHLIN PED CROSSING	2	PE	PORT	30,000	307000	307000	00,000
31 SIGNAL COMPUTER STUDY	<u>.</u>	PE	PORT	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
32 SIGNAL REPLOMNT-16 LOC	ī	₽Ē	PORT	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
32 SIGNAL REFEGUATE LOC	÷	COM		248,000	248,000	248,000	240,000
33 COLISEUM SIGNALS 34 CITY RESERVE	. <u>†</u>	RES		53,000	53,000	53,000	53,000
OH OFFI IMPRINAM	_				F F / 4 A 4 /	13,388,591	18,635,091
-		TOTAL	PORT	2,900,000	5,561,416	1313801371	10,033,071
75 00 1/2. CANTIV TOM	1	PE	MULT	8,500	8,500	8,500	8,500
35 99-162, SANDY TSM	-	,	110-1				

r aur.		INTERS	TATE TRA	ANSFEK PRIORITIES-1	HIGHWAY		
PROJECT TITLE	QTR	WORK	AGCY	PRIORITY 1	PRIORITY 2	PRIORITY 3	PRIORITY 4
36 99-162, SANDY TSM	3	CON	MULT	0	429,250	429,250	429,250
37 242-TROUTDALE+CHERRY	4	R/W	MULT	0	. 0	200,000	200,000
38 DIVISION-POWELL, 182	Δ.	R/W	MULT	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
39 GATEWAY TREC SIG.INT.	i	PE	MULT	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000
40 GATEWAY TRFC SIG.INT.	4	сои	MULT	0	391,000	391,000	391,000
41 POWELL-BUTLER, 2218223	3	R/W	MULT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · o	519,350	519,350
42 SANDY-HENSLEY, 257	1	PE	MULT	• 0	. 0	0	148,750
43 STARK-DIVISION, 242	1	PE	MULT	0	0	0	140,000
44 STARK-MAIN, E. BURNSIDE	- Ā	R/W		0	0	200,000	200,000
45 UPRR X'ING-BIRCH,238	i	R/W	MULT	55,250	55,250	55,250	55,250
46 UPRR X'ING-BIRCH,238	4	CON	MULT	407,000	407,000	407,000	407,000
		TOTAL	MULT	804,750	1,625,000	2,544,350	2,853,100
	2	D /1.1	GRES	45,000	645,000	645,000	645,000
47 FARRIS-POWELL, UN. 182	-		GRES	0.0,000	1,975,230	1,975,230	1,975,230
48 FARRIS-POWELL, UNIT 1	4		UNCS	··································		A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	
		TOTAL	GRES	645,000	2,420,230	2,620,230	2,620,230
49 97-122, SUNNYSIDE RD	3	R/U	CLAC	136,000	136,000	134,000	136,000
50 CLACK.HWY-NCL;GLADSTON	1	PE	CLAC	13,345	13,345	13,345	´ 13,345
	÷		CLAC	8,500	-8,500	8,500	8,500
51 CLACK, HWY-NCL, GLADSTON	 -	CON		318,750	318,750	318,750	318,750
52 CLACK.HWY-NCL.GLADSTON	7	R/W	CLAC	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000
53 COURTNEY-ROTHE, DATFLD.		1(7 W	CLING	31,000			
54 COURTNEY-ROTHE, DATFLD.	A	CON	CLAC	0	. 0	204,000	204,000
54 CUURINET-KUIHETUHITEUT	1	PE	CLAC	12,155	12,155	12,155	12,155
55 GLAD NCL-DAT., WEBSTER-ADD'L PE	1		CLAC	275,825	275,825	275,825	275,825
56 GLAD NCL-DAT WEBSTER	7-	CON		000,82	000,86	\$8,000	68,000
57 HARMONY @ INT'L WAY 58 HARMONY @ PRICE FULLER	1 2		CLAC	2,040	2,040	2,040	2,040
The second secon		COM	CLAC	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0	141,440	141,440
59 HARMONY @ PRICE FULLER	- 4		CLAC	3,910	3,910	3,910	3,910
60 HILL RD - VISTA AVEADD'L PE	1 -	PE		3,710	0	104,675	106,675
61 KING-PRICE F. HARMONY	\$		CLAC.	29,750	29,750	29,750	29,750
62 MILWAUKIE-ORE.CITY.MCL	1	PE	CLAC	11,135	11,135	11,135	11,135
63 DATFIELD @ ALDERCREST	2	CON	CLAC	117133	11,155	/	
64 DATFIELD @ LAKE RD	2	CON	CLAC	179,435	179,435	179,435	179,435
		TOTAL	CLAC	_ 1:092:845	1,092,845	1,544,960	1,544,960
65 MADRONA-JEAN,LOW.BOON	2	R/U	LAKE	438,600	438,300	438,600	433,600
A TERM LARR CONTROL UNIV. AND A			LAKE	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000
		E 🚾	مباوا الميها	1,,000	-		

	PAGE _3		•.					30 -Jun - 31
1	SON IFAT TITLE	03.0	INTERS WORK	TATE TRA	ANSFER PRIORITIES- PRIORITY 1	HIGHWAY PRIORITY 2	PRIORITY 3	PRIORITY 4
,	PROJECT TITLE	U 1 K		HULT	rnioniii i			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
•	67 TERWLADD.OSWEGO HWY	3	R/W	LAKE	0	0	25,500	25,500
•	·		TOTAL	LAKE	455,400	455,600	481 / 100	481,100
4			iome					•
1	68 CLACK H32, HARRISON	1		MILW	43,350	43,350 212,600	43,350 212,600	43,350 212,600
<u>,'</u> L_	69 CLACK H32:HARRISON	4	CUN	"WIFM ""	212,600	2127600		2127600
;)			TOTAL	MILW	255,950	255,950	255,750	255,950
7 L	TO SEE SEE STATE OF THE SECOND			WASH			290,000	290,000
	70 185-CEDAR HILLS, FARMINGTON	3 4		WASH	. 0	1,555,500	1,555,500	1,555,500
	71 CORNELL-MURRAY,158%JEN	7		WASH	_	210,400	210,400	210,400
<u>`</u>	72 SUNSET-CO LINE, BARNES 73 SUNSET-WALKER, 185	4		MVSH		1,275,000	1,275,000	1,275,000
u	73 SURSET-WHERERY 183	4	R/W		. 0	0	850,000	850,000
:1	74 IV HWT @ 185	-1	1(7 W	WHOII	•			
10						,		
76			TOTAL	WASH	0	3,040,900	4,180,900	4,180,900
" <u></u>	75 HALL BLVD TSM-ALLEN TO ECL	3	CUN	BEAV	329,500	329,500	329,500	329,500
73	76 LOMBARD-91, BEA, HILLS	3	PE	DEAU	0	10,000	10,000	10,000
•	78 COMBARD-917BEA. MICES 77 MAIN-ALICE, ALLEN	-	R/W	EFAU	378,250	378,250	378,250	378,250
5F	78 HALL BLUD TSM-ALLEN TO ECL	2	R/W	BEAU	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
,,	79 HALL BLVD TSM-ADD'L PE	1	PE	BEAV	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
n _	// HALL BEVD 13H ADD E 1E	-				The second secon		
18 78			TOTAL	REAU	777,750	78 7 - 750	787,750	787,750
×			TOTAL	DELIA	,,,,,,,			
4	80 MAIN-ECL, CORNELL	1	PE	HILL	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
12 T				=	400.000	400 000	100.000	100,000
"L_			TOTAL	HILL	100,000	100,000	1001000	100,000
	81 NYBERG RD, 89TH AVE TO 15	3	CON	TUAL	379,506	379,504	379,506	379,504
•	32 NYBERG RD, SOTH AVE TO IS		CON		1,062,093	1,062,073	1,062,073	1,062,093
, r	பது உடர் இது இது இதியத்தின் இது இதி இது படுக்கியது. இதிய வாம் இதிய இதிய பிலியாக இது இரு உடி இது வரை உடிப்புக்க இது							
16		•	TOTAL	TUAL	1,441,599	1,441,599	1,441,599	1,441,579
1	AT DIRECHARE I E CORRIBOR	₁	OPC	TRIM	A	0		54,112
	83 RIDESHARE,I 5 CORRIDOR 84 RIDESHARE PROG EXPAN	1	oro	TRIM	217,445	2197 645	219,645	219,645
	84 KIDESHARE FROD EXPAR	-	0, 0	11/2/1	2177010	22770		
•• <u>[</u>	The second secon		TOTAL	TRIM	217,545	219,645	219,645	273,757
								0.045 750
• •	85 50-92, POWELL 2	1		COTOT	2,045,750	2,065,750	2,045,750	2,045,750
•-	86 72 AVE INTERCHANGE-ADD'L PE	1	FE.	OUG	41,705	41,905	41,905	41,705
•	87 72 AVE INTERCHANGE	2	R/W		0	0	127,500	127,500
••	88 72 AVE INTERCHANGE	4	CON		0	0	0	752,000
* <u>:</u>	89 NYBERG RD, 89TH AVE TO IS	3	CON	ODOT	105,400	105,400	105,400	105,400
*!				ODOT	4 700 700	1,372,300	1,392,300	1,372,300
i -	90 BANFIELD TRANSITUAY-ADD'L PE	1	PE	ODOT ODOT	1,392,300 1,744,625	1,744,625	1,744,625	1,744,625
	91 BANFIELD TRANSITWAY	1	K/W	וטעט	17/441020	17/447020	11/11/020	2,,,,,,,,,,,

. MAI	JL 4		THICRC	TATE TOA	NSFER PRIORITIES-	MADUDAM		30 Jan-81
	PROJECT TITLE	QTR	WORK		PRIORITY 1	PRIORITY 2	PRIORITY 3	PRIORITY 4
9:	2 DANFIELD TRANSITWAY	3	R/W	ODOT	7,613,375	7,643,375	7,443,375	7,643,375
90	3 BANFIELD TRANSITUAY	1	CON	דטינס	51,731	51,731	51,731	51,731
9.	4 CLACKAMAS HWY0 82 DR	1	CON	ODOT	26,541	26,541	26,541	26,541
	KITT-STAD.FWY,STREETS	2	R/W	ODOT	0	0	1,000,000	1,000,000
	6 KITT-STAD.FWY,STREETS	2	R/W	ODOT	o	0	0	3,000,000
97	7 MILWAUKIE-ORE.CITY,MCL	1	PΕ	ODOT	29,750	27,750	29,750	29,750
98	B OSWEGO CK.BRIDGE	3	CON	opor	0	287,724	289,726	289,726
99	7 OSWEGO CK.BRIDGE	3	COH	ODGT	•	2,125,000	2,125,000	2,125,000
100	O DSWEGD HWY @ CEDARDAK	2	CON	TOGO	34,437	34,437	34,437	34,437
10:	1 OSWEGO CK.BRIDGE ADD'L PE	1	PE	TOGO	24,013	24,013	24,013	24,013
102	2 HWY 212 PE-ADD'L PE	1	PE	ODOT	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
			TOTAL	onoi.	13,214,827	15,429,553	16,757,053	20,709,053
10.	3 SOUTHERN ARTERIALS	1	PE	REG	0	. 0	510,000	510,000
1	4 WESTSIDE ARTERIALS	· 3	PE	REG	Ö	0	0	700,000
	DI STATE TASK FORCE	1	PE	REG	170,000	170,000	170,000	170,000
			TOTAL	REG	170,000	170,000	480,000	1,380,000
			TOTAL		22,077,766	33,000,488	45,002,128	55,263,490

FY 1981 INTERSTATE TRANSFER FUNDING TRANSIT PRIORITIES

1.	Banfield Transitway	•
••	A. Final Engineering and Right-of-Way B. Station Area Planning Program	\$16,962,500 637,500
2.	Metro Corridor Planning	300,000
3.	McLoughlin Boulevard PE	100,000
4.	Westside Corridor Analysis	200,000
5.	Milwaukie Transit Station	1,050,000
6.	Oregon City Transit Station	465,000
7.	Clackamas Town Center Transit Station	208,000
8.	Balance of Westside Corridor Project	150,000
9.	Balance of McLoughlin Boulevard PE	100,000
10.	Tigard Transit Station	261,000
11.	Westside Circulation Study	161,000
12.	Articulated Buses	1,632,000
13.	Milwaukie Transit Station - PE and Joint Development Studies	120,000
	TOTAL	\$22,347,000
	Funds in TIP (excluded from above) to be Dropped or Delayed:	
	Drop: Southside Circulation Study Southwest Circulation Study	\$ 112,000 125,000
	Delay: Part of Station Area Planning Program	375,000
	TOTAL TO BE DROPPED OR DELAYED	\$ 612,000

Res 81-223

A G E N D A M CALL OATS EUMIE N T S U M M A R Y

TO:

Metro Council

FROM: Executive Officer

SUBJECT: Endorsing Project Priorities Using Interstate Transfer

Funds in FY 81

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached resolution which prioritizes highway and transit projects receiving Interstate Transfer funds in FY 1981. This action is consistent with the Five Year Operational Plan.

B. POLICY IMPACT: This action:

- establishes those projects listed as Priority 1 (in Exhibit A) as eligible for use of the available \$21 million of Interstate Transfer "Highway" funding on a first-come, first-served basis.
- allows each jurisdiction to transfer funding to other projects within their earmark.
- allows each project to exceed specified funding levels by no more than 10 percent.
- establishes those projects listed on Exhibit B in priority order for use of Interstate Transfer "Transit" funding.

TPAC and JPACT have reviewed and approved this project.

C. BUDGET IMPACT: None.

II. ANALYSIS:

A. BACKGROUND: The \$800 million which was appropriated by Congress for FY 1981 to fund Interstate Transfer projects was released in late December, 1980. Of the amount appropriated, \$182 million was allocated to highway projects and \$618 million to transit projects. From these amounts, \$21.0 million and \$17.6 million were allocated to the Portland region for use on highway and transit projects respectively.

To accommodate these severe funding limitations, the TIP Subcommittee has recommended the following priorities for use of the funds:

HIGHWAY PROJECTS

PRIORITY 1

A \$22,077,966 funding limitation is recommended by the Subcommittee rather than \$21.0 million. The reason is to make available 'shelf' projects from which to draw in the event of delay in implementation of other projects. This priority is characterized by

- a) First-come, first-served.
- b) An allowance of 10 percent overrun on a given project.
- c) Jurisdictional transfer of funds between projects within the earmarked amounts.

PRIORITY 2

This priority was established as an aid in using supplemental funds if they become available. The Subcommittee is to reconvene upon receipt of a supplemental appropriation to set priorities on these projects and to establish more precise estimates.

PRIORITIES 3 and 4

These priorities and amounts were recommended by the Subcommittee as a preliminary step in developing FY 1982 projects, or if unspent funds/appropriations become available.

TPAC, in its meeting of January 30, 1981, responded to three requests for changes to projects in Priority 1:

Gresham - increase right-of-way for 221st/223rd by \$45,000 to \$645,000 because of a more precise estimate.

ODOT - Add PE for Hwy. 212 in the amount of \$55,000 to supplement existing PE funds.

Beaverton - Increase Hall Blvd. TSM by \$169,500 to \$399,500 to cover additional PE, right-of-way and construction estimates recently released by ODOT. This project is expected to go to construction in June of this year.

TPAC also recommended that the resolution clarify that this action does <u>not</u> allocate additional funding to any projects. It simply prioritizes which funding will proceed to implementation. As such, any costs that exceed previous allocations as reflected by the TIP will require a funding transfer in accordance with adopted overrun procedures.

The relative priorities of the Nyberg Road project and the 221st/223rd project were discussed. TPAC agreed that they were equal in merit, but that since Nyberg Road was to be implemented in the 3rd quarter, it had priority over 221st/223rd being implemented in the 4th quarter.

TRANSIT PROJECTS

PRIORITY 1

The Banfield project was established as the Number 1 Priority because of its joint highway/transit impacts. One cannot proceed without the other, and this critical interdependence continues throughout the full development life of the project. The amount already programmed with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) for FY 1981, including Transit Station Area Planning Program, is \$17.6 million.

PRIORITIES 2 THROUGH 13

These projects are arrayed in priority order and will be implemented as such if supplementary funds become available.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: All projects previously programmed for use of Interstate Transfer funding have been previously reviewed and endorsed by the Metro Council. However, full funding is not available, causing a delay to selected projects. Highest priority was placed on providing full funding for the Banfield Transitway project (\$10.5 million) and fulfilling previous funding obligations. The remainder was distributed to local jurisdictions based upon the status of implementation of the individual projects. A number of large projects were deferred because of the inordinate proportion of available funding that would be required.
- C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends approval of the attached resolution in accord with Committee actions.

AC/BP:et 1796B/188