

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING	)	RESOLUTION NO. 81-250
PROJECT PRIORITIES USING	)	
SUPPLEMENTARY INTERSTATE TRANSFER	)	Introduced by The Joint
FUNDS EXPECTED FOR FY 1981	)	Policy Advisory Committee
	)	on Transportation

WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 81-223 which endorsed Priority I highway projects using \$21.0 million of Interstate Transfer funds in FY 1981; and

WHEREAS, By this same action projects using supplementary Interstate Transfer funds if they become available were endorsed as Priority II; and

WHEREAS, Metro and other jurisdictions have aggressively sought additional Interstate Transfer funds over those allocated to the region; and

WHEREAS, Supplementary Interstate Transfer funds to the region in the amount of \$12.6 million are expected for FY 1981; and

WHEREAS, The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Subcommittee has refined Priority II projects in keeping with their current status and probability of implementation in FY 1981; and

WHEREAS, The TIP subcommittee has developed a strategy to ensure that all available Interstate Transfer funds are fully obligated by September 30, 1981; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council endorses the projects identified as priority II (Exhibit A) as eligible for use of supplementary Interstate Transfer funds for highway projects subject to the following conditions:

- a. They will be submitted to FHWA for funding by September 30, 1981
- b. Those Priority II projects that cannot be submitted by that date will be substituted on August 1, 1981 with projects selected from Contingency I projects.

2. That the Metro Council endorses Contingencies I and II and supports the strategy of fully obligating all Interstate Transfer funds made available to the region.

3. That this action does not commit the Metro Council to any priorities for future Interstate Transfer funding.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this 25th day of June, 1981.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Officer

BP/srb  
3309B/236

EXHIBIT A

INTERSTATE TRANSFER PROJECT - HIGHWAY  
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UTILIZATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDS  
(in millions)

	<u>WORK</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
1. Adopted Priority I Projects		\$21.967	
2. Recommended Priority II Projects			
a. Priority Commitment			
Cost Overrun Provision	-	0.350	
Priority I Overprogramming	-	0.967	
Burnside/Tichner	CON	0.265)	Replaces Going Noise Priority II Project
14th/16th Couplet	CON	0.650)	
Columbia/47th Signal	CON	0.057)	
Basin-Going Interchange	CON	1.689	Original Priority II + \$300,000 for ROW + \$520,000;
221st/223rd	CON	2.275	
158th/Jenkins			
185th-Walker to Sunset	CON	3.350	\$500,000 also included in Contingency I
Beaverton/Hillsdale Signals	PE	0.010	Original Priority II Additional Priority I Cost
Nyberg Road	CON	0.166	
Clackamas Town Center Signals	CON	0.080	New Project
72nd Avenue Interchange	R/W	0.200	Emergency ROW
Oswego Creek Bridge	CON	2.415	Original Priority II
	TOTAL	12.474	
b. Contingency I Projects			
Sandy TSM	R/W	0.030	
Gladstone/Milwaukie TSM	CON	0.248	
Price-Fuller/Harmony King/Harmony			
158th/Jenkins )	CON	0.500	Additional to Priority II
185th-Walker to Sunset)			
Barnes Road	R/W	0.210	
Powell II	R/W	2.066	
Cherry Park Road	CON	0.957	
	TOTAL	4.011	
c. Contingency II Projects			
Barbur/Terwilliger	PE	0.375	Additional to Priority I

Burnside/Tichner	R/W	0.045	
39th Avenue Corridor	CON	1.700	
185th-Walker to Sunset	CON	0.500	
Cornell Road	PE	0.053	Additional to Priority I
BH Signal Intertie	CON	0.100	
Oatfield/Thiessen TSM	CON	0.240	
Highway 212 - Unit 1	CON	2.000	
RR/Harmony	PE	0.230	
257th Avenue	PE	0.103	
	TOTAL	5.346	

BP/srb  
3309B/236

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

TO: Metro Council  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Endorsing Project Priorities Using Supplementary  
Interstate Transfer Funds Expected for FY 1981

*Res 81-250*

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution which prioritizes highway projects using supplementary Interstate Transfer funds in FY 1981. This action is consistent with the Five Year Operational Plan.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action:
- Establishes projects and amounts eligible for use of \$12.6 million supplementary Interstate Transfer funds expected for FY 1981.
  - Establishes two contingencies to ensure that all FY 1981 Interstate Transfer highway funds (\$21.0 million + \$12.6 million) are fully obligated by September 30, 1981.
  - Establishes sufficient 'over-programming' to utilize an additional \$2.4 million, which if not used by other areas in the State, can be used by the Metro region.
  - TPAC and JPACT have reviewed and approved these project priorities.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: None.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: In February, 1981, Metro Council endorsed a series of projects (Priority I) eligible for use of the then available \$21.0 million of Interstate Transfer funding for highway projects. The same action established additional project priorities (Priority II) to utilize supplementary funds should they become available.

Some \$15.0 million of supplementary Interstate Transfer funds are expected for the State of Oregon for use on highway projects. Of this amount, \$2.4 million is to be allocated elsewhere in the state, and if not used by September, can be made available to the Portland region rather than be lost.

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Subcommittee convened May 21 for the purpose of developing recommendations for use of supplementary Interstate Transfer funds. These recommendations, detailed in Exhibit A, were based on Priority II projects as to probable obligation in FY 1981.

The Subcommittee recommends the following:

- Priority I      No changes in projects (includes approximately \$1 million in overprogramming).
- Priority II      Projects in the amount of \$12.5 million including \$350,000 as a provision for cost overruns, and \$967,466 to compensate for overprogramming Priority I projects. These projects were drawn from those originally endorsed by Council as Priority II or Priority III. In some cases, they represent a need for additional funds (cost overrun) or represent a new project.

- Contingency I    These projects were established to ensure that all funds available will be obligated in FY 1981. The conditions set forth are:
1. Projects itemized in Priority II are to be ready to implement and obligate by September 30, 1981. If not then,
  2. On August 1, 1981, ODOT will obligate part or all of Contingency I projects.

These projects are readily implementable but are of lesser priority than Priority II. As such, they will be obligated as needed in order to fully utilize the \$12.6 million.

- Contingency II    As an additional backup and in the event more Interstate Transfer funds become available, or more project schedules slip, these contingency projects are recommended from those originally endorsed for Priority III. They are readily implementable but of lesser priority.

- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Metro, along with all other jurisdictions in the region, has aggressively solicited increased Interstate Transfer funds. Not to fully utilize available funds would seriously jeopardize future negotiations with U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). In evidence of good faith, the TIP Subcommittee

has developed a strategy to utilize the funds based on viable projects and sufficient "shelf" projects to cover unforeseen circumstances.

- C. CONCLUSION: Metro staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution.

BP/srb  
3309B/236

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

TO: Metro Council  
FROM: Executive Officer  
SUBJECT: Endorsing Project Priorities Using Supplementary  
Interstate Transfer Funds Expected for FY 1981

*Res 81-250*

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend Council adoption of the attached Resolution which prioritizes highway projects using supplementary Interstate Transfer funds in FY 1981. This action is consistent with the Five Year Operational Plan.
- B. POLICY IMPACT: This action:
- Establishes projects and amounts eligible for use of \$12.6 million supplementary Interstate Transfer funds expected for FY 1981.
  - Establishes two contingencies to ensure that all FY 1981 Interstate Transfer highway funds (\$21.0 million + \$12.6 million) are fully obligated by September 30, 1981.
  - Establishes sufficient 'over-programming' to utilize an additional \$2.4 million, which if not used by other areas in the State, can be used by the Metro region.
  - TPAC and JPACT have reviewed and approved these project priorities.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: None.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: In February, 1981, Metro Council endorsed a series of projects (Priority I) eligible for use of the then available \$21.0 million of Interstate Transfer funding for highway projects. The same action established additional project priorities (Priority II) to utilize supplementary funds should they become available.

Some \$15.0 million of supplementary Interstate Transfer funds are expected for the State of Oregon for use on highway projects. Of this amount, \$2.4 million is to be allocated elsewhere in the state, and if not used by September, can be made available to the Portland region rather than be lost.

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Subcommittee convened May 21 for the purpose of developing recommendations for use of supplementary Interstate Transfer funds. These recommendations, detailed in Exhibit A, were based on Priority II projects as to probable obligation in FY 1981.

The Subcommittee recommends the following:

- Priority I      No changes in projects (includes approximately \$1 million in overprogramming).
- Priority II      Projects in the amount of \$12.5 million including \$350,000 as a provision for cost overruns, and \$967,466 to compensate for overprogramming Priority I projects. These projects were drawn from those originally endorsed by Council as Priority II or Priority III. In some cases, they represent a need for additional funds (cost overrun) or represent a new project.

- Contingency I    These projects were established to ensure that all funds available will be obligated in FY 1981. The conditions set forth are:
1.    Projects itemized in Priority II are to be ready to implement and obligate by September 30, 1981. If not then,
  2.    On August 1, 1981, ODOT will obligate part or all of Contingency I projects.

These projects are readily implementable but are of lesser priority than Priority II. As such, they will be obligated as needed in order to fully utilize the \$12.6 million.

- Contingency II    As an additional backup and in the event more Interstate Transfer funds become available, or more project schedules slip, these contingency projects are recommended from those originally endorsed for Priority III. They are readily implementable but of lesser priority.

- B.    **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:** Metro, along with all other jurisdictions in the region, has aggressively solicited increased Interstate Transfer funds. Not to fully utilize available funds would seriously jeopardize future negotiations with U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). In evidence of good faith, the TIP Subcommittee

has developed a strategy to utilize the funds based on viable projects and sufficient "shelf" projects to cover unforeseen circumstances.

C. **CONCLUSION:** Metro staff recommends approval of the attached Resolution.

BP/srb  
3309B/236