

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 81-247
PROCESS AND GUIDELINES FOR)
DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEN-YEAR INTER-) Introduced by the Joint
STATE TRANSFER PROGRAM) Policy Advisory Committee
) on Transportation

WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 81-223 which endorsed project priorities using Interstate Transfer funds in FY 1981; and

WHEREAS, These projects and priorities were geared to federal funding limitations for FY 1981; and

WHEREAS, Federal funding limitations are anticipated to continue throughout this decade; and

WHEREAS, A planning assumption was made that the Interstate Transfer Program will become a ten-year program; and

WHEREAS, A working group of member jurisdictions was established by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) to address the problems associated with the stretchout of the Program; and

WHEREAS, The working group has recommended a process and guidelines for development of a Ten-Year Interstate Transfer Program as described in Attachment A; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council approves the process and guidelines for development of the Ten-Year Interstate Transfer Program described in Attachment A, Staff Report No. 76.

2. That the Council directs its staff to work with affected local jurisdictions, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Tri-Met in implementing the process and guidelines for development of the Ten-Year Interstate Transfer Program.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this 28th day of May , 1981.



Presiding Officer

BP:ga
3057B/236

STAFF REPORT NO. 76

PROPOSED PROCESS AND GUIDELINES
FOR DEVELOPMENT OF
THE TEN-YEAR INTERSTATE TRANSFER PROGRAM

May 1, 1981

METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

PROCESS AND GUIDELINES
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THE TEN-YEAR INTERSTATE TRANSFER PROGRAM

A hybrid programming process is recommended to use the attributes of each of the alternatives as well as maintain past policy commitments for the Interstate Transfer program. The recommended prioritization process is as follows:

1. Highway projects and transit projects should be prioritized separately since funding is received from USDOT in this manner. However, interrelated transit and highway projects should be programmed consistently.
2. All highway projects should be divided into two categories, thereby providing the basis for dividing the funding into categories. The recommended categories are as follows:

Category I

- a. Regional Corridor Projects.
- b. Interstate Withdrawal Replacement Projects.

Category II

Other projects.

3. The projects, by category, are shown in Figure 1. In principle, past commitments on Interstate Transfer funding call for top priority to be placed on Category I projects. As such, under a condition of constrained funding over a ten-year period, the rate of expenditure on Category I projects would start out the majority of the program and generally diminish to be a small percentage of the program by the tenth year. At an absolute minimum, Category II funding should be \$3.4 million to replace FAU funds transferred downstate.
4. Annual programming levels for the Banfield Transitway project will be developed by ODOT and Tri-Met. For planning purposes, the balance of the Category I and Category II program will be developed over a 10-year period based upon \$10, \$20 and \$30 million starting points.
5. Category II highway projects will be programmed by each county/Portland based upon a five- and ten-year completion schedule. This will be merged into a regional program based upon a consistent set of guidelines (Section 8). This process applies to all city, county and ODOT sponsored projects.
6. Each of the four jurisdictional areas will receive, at a minimum, the per capita share of \$3.4 million as follows:

Multnomah County - \$691,500; Clackamas County - \$578,700; Washington County - \$797,000; and City of Portland - \$1,332,800. This funding will be used for the highest priority Category II project that is identified in each county and Portland.

7. Projects in Category II will be programmed over the ten-year period based upon realistic schedules for project development (i.e., allowing sufficient time for PE and right-of-way) and realistic estimates of local match availability.
8. Policy guidelines for use by each county/ Portland for programming Category II projects and by TPAC and JPACT to integrate these into a single regional program are as follows:
 - Projects addressing an existing or known, near-term (three years) capacity deficiency (v/c program) will be scheduled before future capacity deficiencies for a logical roadway segment.
 - Projects necessary to sustain existing or create new permanent jobs will be programmed before others.
 - Projects supporting transit service as defined in the Transit Development Program will be programmed before others.
 - Projects with a higher local match contribution than required (including R/W dedication or investment in supporting or parallel facilities required for optimum operation of the completed project) will be programmed before others.
 - All other factors being equal, projects on Principal and Major Arterials will be programmed before others.
 - Critical Category II projects will be programmed consistent with the schedule established for Category I projects.
 - Projects addressing deferred maintenance or structural inadequacy or to protect an existing investment will be programmed before others.
 - Other pertinent factors, including, but not limited to:
 - safety
 - air quality
 - energy conservation

PRELIMINARY

FIGURE 1 - Interstate Transfer - Highway Projects

Category I - Regional Corridor and Freeway Replacement

Banfield Freeway	\$ 66.4 million
McLoughlin Boulevard - North	19.5 million
Yeon/Vaughn/Nicolai	26.3 million
McLoughlin Boulevard - South	1.0 million
Powell Boulevard	7.2 million
Westside Corridor - Highway Elements	*

\$120.4 million

* Since the Westside Corridor preferred alternative has not been selected, the highway portions cannot be identified.

Category II - Other Arterials and Collectors

Principal and Major Arterials:

Oregon City Bypass	\$ 15.5 million
Highway 212	5.2 million
Highway 217/72nd	1.1 million
221st/223rd	4.5 million
TV/185th	1.8 million
SW 185th Avenue	1.3 million
Sunset/217	14.0 million
SE 182nd Avenue	1.1 million
Columbia Boulevard	3.7 million
NE Lombard/Columbia (at 60th)	2.8 million
NE Portland Highway	1.5 million
SE Burnside	1.7 million
Oswego Creek Bridge	2.4 million
State Street	1.4 million
Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway	1.5 million
St. Helens Road	3.2 million
Cornell	1.6 million

\$ 64.3 million

Minor Arterials and Collectors:

Barbur/Terwilliger	\$ 15.9 million
Front Avenue	5.0 million
Marine Drive	3.6 million
Towle Road	3.5 million
RR/Harmony	2.9 million
Allen Boulevard	2.4 million
190th/Powell	2.7 million
257th	2.5 million
Hollywood Business District	2.3 million

FIGURE 1
(Continued)

Minor Arterials and Collectors (cont.):

Basin/Going.	\$ 1.7 million
Going Noise.	1.0 million
158th/Jenkins.	1.6 million
39th Avenue.	1.6 million
Sunnyside Road	1.2 million
82nd Avenue.	1.3 million
Barnes Road.	1.3 million
Arterial Overlays.	1.2 million
Cherry Park Road	1.1 million
Farmington Road.3 million
14th/16th.7 million
Sandy Boulevard TSM.4 million
Gateway TSM.4 million
Gladstone-Milwaukie TSM.	1.5 million
McLoughlin Pedestrian Underpass.	<u>.3 million</u>
	\$ 56.4 million
Other Unassigned Projects and Reserves	<u>42.9 million</u>
GRAND TOTAL.	\$284.0 million

INTERSTATE TRANSFER PROGRAM PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET

The following is an outline of project information needed for each Interstate Transfer project. This information will be used to prepare the region's "Concept Plan" and assist the counties/Portland, TPAC and JPACT in establishing priorities. The material should be complete but concise and include a map for each project.

Project Name _____

1. Project Description (attach clear graphics describing project location and conceptual design; functional classification):

2. General Description of Transportation Problem to Be Solved and How Project Solves Problem:

3. Objectives of Project:

4. Alternatives Explored:

5. Current Project Cost Estimate (include cost estimates in March, 1981 dollars for logical segments and a breakdown of cost by PE, R/W and construction; include date of original cost estimate):

6. Status and Current Project Schedule Assuming Funding is Available (PE, R/W, Construction):

7. Previous Regional and Local Priority Commitments:

8. Specific Description of Project Relationship to the Following Programming Guidelines:

- A. Current, near-term (3-year) and future year volumes and current and improved capacities.
- B. Relationship of improvement to system continuity.
- C. Economic consequences/benefits of improvement, especially in relationship to development investment (in dollars), land development (in acres by type) and jobs (number of existing and expected).
- D. Relationship of project to transit service and Transit Development Program.
- E. Source, amount and type (including R/W dedication or investment in supporting or parallel facilities required for optimum operation of the completed project) of local match beyond 15 percent share of total project cost.
- F. Fiscal and/or operational interrelationship to programming of other projects identified for Interstate Transfer funding.
- G. Relationship of project to deferred maintenance or structural inadequacy of existing transportation investment.
- H. Other factors, including, but not limited to:
 - safety
 - air quality
 - energy conservation

BP/ga
3058B/233

A G E N D A M A N A G E M E N T S U M M A R Y

Res
81247

TO: Metro Council
 FROM: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)
 SUBJECT: Approving the Process and Guidelines for Development of
 the Ten-Year Interstate Transfer Program

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution and its attachment which sets forth the process and guidelines for development of a Ten-year Interstate Transfer Program.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action refines the Interstate Transfer programming process to establish a schedule that completes the program over the next 10 years, rather than the previously anticipated five-year period. It responds to recent federal funding limitations by establishing project priorities to be used in their implementation and as funds become available. TPAC and JPACT have reviewed and approved the process and guidelines for this program.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: None

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The Portland metropolitan area has nearly completed the process of identifying projects to use the \$487 million (as of December 31, 1980) of Interstate Transfer funding that resulted from the withdrawal of the Mt. Hood and I-505 freeways. However, based upon recent changes in federal funding availability, it is apparent that the remaining \$372.7 million will not be forthcoming within the next five years as expected. As such, it is necessary to further examine the projects that have been identified to develop an implementation schedule that completes the projects over a longer time period, consistent with a reduced annual funding level.
- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Four basic alternatives are available to develop the Ten-year Interstate Transfer program. These are:
1. The allocation of funds beyond the Banfield to the three counties (for all projects in the counties) and the City of Portland on a per capita basis. (A second alternative is to allocate the funds on a 25 percent basis to each jurisdictional area.) The four areas would then define their program for their respective areas utilizing either local criteria or regional criteria.

The allocated amounts per jurisdiction resulting from a per capita division of \$30, \$20 and \$10 million are as follows:

	<u>\$10m</u>	<u>\$20m</u>	<u>\$30m</u>
Multnomah County (20.34%)	2.034m	4.068m	6.102m
Clackamas County (17.02%)	1.702m	3.404m	5.106m
Washington County (23.44%)	2.344m	4.688m	7.032m
City of Portland (39.2%)	3.92m	7.840m	11.76m
TOTAL	10.0m	20.0m	30.0m

Unresolved issues to be discussed with this concept include how to address previous policy commitments and priorities, transit improvements, and ODOT projects. Additionally, the decision would have to be made to develop and use regional or local policies and criteria to identify the proposed programs. The overall drawback of this method is that high cost, high priority projects would have to be stretched out over several years or eliminated. In addition, issues revolving around potential retroactive applications of this formula for prior years would need to be resolved.

2. An additional major concept is to agree upon categories of projects, divide the funding into these categories and prioritize the projects within the categories. A possible categorical breakdown is as follows:
 - a. Regional Corridors (current regional priority status).
 - b. Replacement Projects (previously committed projects for replacing withdrawn Interstate segments).
 - c. Supportive Major Arterial Improvements on the Regional System.
 - d. Supportive Minor Arterial/Local Projects.

This concept would be intended to allow the region to define a hierarchy of projects for incorporation in the regional ten-year program. Along with additional information, such as estimated project schedules, selected policy/evaluation criteria to discriminate among projects in each of the categories, and the information received from the three-county areas and the City of Portland, the region would identify which projects should be scheduled first in developing the program.

3. Prioritizing all projects at the regional level based upon a single set of criteria.

4. Prioritizing projects at the county/Portland level and merging this into a ten-year regional program.

C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution which is a hybrid of the four alternatives, taking advantage of the best features of each.

BP:ga 3055B:236